

THE ADMINISTRATIVE UNIFICATION OF THE COMPLETED ROMANIA. THE STAGES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE INTEGRATION OF TRANSYLVANIA, 1918-1925

Gheorghe CALCAN

Gheorghe CALCAN

Associate Professor, Department of Law and Social Sciences,
Faculty of Letters and Sciences, Petroleum - Gas University,
Ploiești, Romania
Tel: 0040-244-573171
E-mail: calcangheorghe@yahoo.com

Abstract

This article presents the administrative evolution of Transylvania from the moment of its unification with Romania on December 1, 1918 until the integration of this province into the unitary administration of the Romanian state, confirmed by the administrative unification law from the 4th of June, 1925. The administrative integration of Transylvania was progressive. In the beginning, the existing administrative structures were maintained and they functioned for a while, based on the Hungarian legislation from 1886. Gradually, at the same time with the organization of the Controlling Council ("Consiliul Dirigent") from Sibiu which temporarily led Transylvania until the 20th of April, 1920, decisions that brought the organization of the province close to the structures approved by the Romanian state administration were adopted. The administrative law from 1925 unitarily organized the entire national territory into counties, subdivisions, rural and urban communes and villages.

1. Premises

In 1918, the Romanian provinces under foreign domination, i.e. Basarabia, Bucovina and Transylvania, joined Romania (Agrigoroaiei, 2003a, pp. 463-539). As it is known, Romania joined the operations of World War I for the liberation of its occupied allies (Constantiniu, 2008, p. 14; Torrey, 1973, p. 3). This fact was well known abroad, too. For example André Tardieu, a personality involved in the technical apparatus of the Peace Conference from Paris-Versailles from 1919-1920, highlighted this fact (Tardieu, 1931, p. 88).

In the autumn of 1918, when the principle of the nations' self-determination could assert itself on large areas of the European continent, the unionist movement has intensified in the province. On October 12-13, 1918, the Romanian National Party elaborated the self-determination Declaration of Transylvania, a document that was read in the Budapest's Parliament on October 18, by Alexandru Vaida Voievod (Hitchins, 1994, p. 281). At the end of the same month, the Central Romanian National Council was constituted, as a unique political organism that overtook the leadership action regarding the Transylvania's union. On the 9th of November, the Central Romanian National Council asked, by means of an ultimatum note addressed to the Hungarian government, for the right to govern the territories inhabited by the Romanians. After the failure of the negotiations from Arad, on the 13th-15th of November, between the representatives of the Central Romanian National Council, of the Hungarian National Council and of the Hungarian government, the leading political forum of the Romanians initiated the organization of the Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia. On the 21st of November 1918, *Românul* newspaper published the text of convocation to Alba Iulia and distributed 12,000 copies (Agrigoroaiei, 2003b, p. 183).

1,228 democratically chosen deputies in open sittings representing all the social categories (peasants, teachers, priests, lawyers, students, officers, soldiers, workers, craftsmen, etc.), political and military organizations, cultural societies, churches, cultural and teaching institutions, and professional associations and that had the right to vote arrived at the assembly held on the 1st of December, 1918 in Alba Iulia. In addition, there were more than 100,000 persons from Transylvania, Banat, Maramureş and Hungarian areas. The assembly unanimously voted the resolution of Transylvania's unification with Romania.

2. Administrative centralization and decentralization after the Great Union

The necessity of administrative unification of the Romanian society after the achievement of the national unity was unanimously admitted both by specialists and politicians. The administrative unification was integrated within the vast process of unification of the whole Romanian legislation. Thus, *Romania's Encyclopedia* from 1938 specified that it was necessary that "in the moment of the union, beside the legislation unification, there should have been raised the problem of the administrative unification for achieving a common regime of organization, meant to assure the country

a spiritual and political unity” (Filitti and Vântu, 1938, p. 306). The lawyer Andrei Rădulescu supported the same opinion specifying that the political union achieved by the Romanians in 1918 had to be completed with a legislative unification, otherwise someone could have thought that the event had a provisional character: the state “should not create for a long time the impression that it did not have a definitive form”. The legislative diversity “worsens life from all points of view and it mostly maintains the old borders” (Rădulescu, 1927, p. 4).

In his turn, C. Hamangiu pleaded for the necessity of achieving the legislative unification of the completed Romania: “the unification of the legislation means ultimately, the expression of a nation’s spiritual unification”. The absence of this unity can “fatally lead to the state’s lack of unity”, to the citizens “distrust regarding the state’s structures” (Hamangiu, 1931, pp. 10-11). The urge for administrative and legislative unification was also addressed to the Parliament of Romania by the state’s chief, King Ferdinand, on the 31st of December, 1920 (Agrigoroaiei *et al.*, 2008, p. 211).

The concrete achievement of this desideratum was gradual. Out of practical reasons, there were at first maintained the legislation and administrative organization already existing in the united provinces. This also happened for example in Alsacia-Lorena, reintegrated in the French administration after the end of the military operations of the World War I (Madaule, 1973, p. 129). Gradually, decisions were adopted that prepared the complete administrative integration of the new provinces. The Constitution from 1923 marked a decisive moment in this process, stipulating the administrative unitary organization of the entire national territory. This process was finalized by the administrative law from 1925, which had a centralizing character. At the same time, it also had a decentralizing character, essentially materialized in the attribute of elected organisms and local leaders and the right of these organisms to settle their local administrative properties and the financial funds necessary for their materialization.

Famous theoreticians of the administrative law from France emphasized that “decentralization is applied to a local collectivity which is integrated into another larger collectivity and manages all by itself” (Laubadère *et al.*, 1999, p. 122) and “election by the citizens of their representatives in charge with business administration is the best way to achieve local autonomy” (Debbasch, 1968, p. 70); decentralization grants “the power of decision on all or on a part of the local problems” to the chosen authorities (Rivero, 1977, p. 308). The administration of the local problems by the chosen authorities and the free administration of local business represent, undoubtedly, the attributes of a democratic administration (Gruber, 1986, p. 123).

Regarding the centralization-decentralization relation, Anibal Teodorescu specified: “when a state is so organized that the fulfillment of the specific or local interests is performed by public services, depending directly on the central power and whose leaders are named by it, then it could be said that the state was centralized (...). But when the care and the solution of the specific or local interests are entrusted

to the authorities whose leaders are chosen from local communities, then we have decentralization” (Agrigoroaiei, 2001, p. 233). Thus, there cannot be a complete separation between centralization and decentralization (Teodorescu, 1929, pp. 239-247).

In fact, the universal evolution of the centralization-decentralization report was a difficult one. If some specialists think that the core of the French administrative decentralization can be noticed in the Revolutionary Constitution of 1791 (Marcou, 2009), the real concrete steps were achieved by the 1871 laws regarding department organization and by 1884 laws regarding communal organization (Guilloud, 2008, p. 51; Laubadère *et al.*, 1999, pp. 137-138). At the beginning of the 20th century, in 1906, Clemanceau, the French President of Ministers Council and minister of Interior, insisted, during a speech, on adopting an administrative reform supposed to increase the decentralization degree of the French society. In his turn, Charles de Gaulle admitted in 1968 the difficulties of the administrative decentralization imposition, the administrative centralization being a necessity for the stages of organization and consolidation of the national state, and decentralization imposing itself only after these stages (Lamy Gestion et Finances des Collectivités Locale, étude 115). The administrative law adopted by the Romanian state in 1925 consolidated the unitary national character of the country, but it made room for the principle of the application of the administrative decentralization (Scurtu, 2003, p. 254).

3. Stages of the administrative integration of Transylvania

From an administrative point of view, on the 1st of December, 1918, when Transylvania joined Romania, the province was organized according to the stipulations of the Hungarian law no. XXII *on Municipalities* from 1886. So, Transylvania was divided, as the whole Hungary, into districts, municipalities and cities with municipal right. The province was divided into 22 districts distributed as follows: 15 in Ardeal, four in Crişana, two in Banat and one in Maramureş. At the same time, in Transylvania there were 6 cities with municipal right, namely: Arad, Cluj, Oradea Mare, Satu Mare, Târgu Mureş and Timişoara (Teodorescu, 1935, p. 367).

The districts and the municipalities were the largest administrative units and they were called jurisdictions. The districts were similar to counties. The six municipalities were large cities and had the same administrative structure as the districts. These administrative units aimed to achieve the local administration autonomy, on the one hand, and to make connection between the local and the central levels, on the other hand. The central authority held the responsibilities for public instruction, finances, civil status, the matter of the public works, sanitary service (except that from the communes) and the local organization of the police.

The jurisdictions were in charge with the adoption of decisions regarding the local matters, with choosing the clerks (except for the legal decisions), with constituting the local budget and elaborating their own regulations and statutes. The statutes locally adopted had to follow the decisions centrally adopted. The functional organisms of the jurisdiction had a deliberative and an executive character. The deliberative one

was called congregation. The congregation consisted of 120-600 members from the districts and 48-600 members from the municipalities. Half of the congregation's members were elected and the other half consisted of men who were elder than 24 and who paid the largest taxes to the state. A mandate lasted six years but, once in three years, half of the members were renewed. The way of convoking the congregations was done by the statute but the prefect could convoke them whenever he considered this necessary. The congregation meetings were presided by the prefect or by his substitute. At the congregation meetings, the main clerks and certain state clerks had the right to vote, as well. The matter to be discussed by the congregation was elaborated by a permanent board which, according to the practice, had the greatest responsibility in the elaborations of the proposals.

As a rule, the congregation easily adopted the proposals of the permanent board. An Administrative Committee also functioned in the congregation, The committee was made up of 21 members, six of which were state clerks (the prefect, the court prosecutor, the school inspector, the financial manager, the chief of the public works department and the economic expert-subsequently an agricultural adviser), five of them were county clerks (the sub-prefect, the main notary, the solicitor, the president of the orphanage and the main doctor) and ten members elected from the congregation members for two years, half of them being re-eligible yearly. The role of the Administrative Committee was to assure the running of all the administrative institutions from the district and to carry out laws and local decisions. The committee's decisions were compulsory for all the administrative institutions of the committee, no matter if they belonged to the state, to the district or to the commune.

The executive organs of the congregations were the sub-prefect, the main notary, the notaries, the solicitor, the main doctor and the office's clerks. The sub-prefect was the chief of the district's administration.

The prefect was the representative of the central power at local level. He was not a career clerk, but a political appointee, paid by the state, with an office and distinct subordinates, belonging to the district. He was in charge with checking all public institutions, no matter if they belonged to the state or to the local authorities.

The district was divided into circles, very much alike to the subdivisions of the Old Romanian Kingdom, led by a first governor elected for a period of six years, and who, according to the tradition, could be elected again for this position until retiring (Teodorescu, 1935, pp. 368-373).

The communes were divided into four categories, namely: 1) small communes, 2) large communes, 3) magistrate towns, and 4) municipalities. Small communes were those which had little financial resources to cover the expenses. The communes that were able to handle their financial problems were considered large communes. Magistrate towns corresponded to the urban settlements from the Old Romanian Kingdom, and they had their own administrative organs supported by the local income. Municipalities were the big cities (declared so by the law) that had a regime similar to

that of the districts, as they were run by a prefect appointed by the king. According to the Hungarian law, the communes enjoyed autonomy regarding their local interests.

The commune had two functional institutions: a representative body with a deliberative role and the communal town-hall. The representative body consisted of ten to 200 members, depending on the size of the commune. The town-hall of small communes was made up of: a judge, at least two lawyers and the doctor. For the bigger communes, the town-hall was made up of: a judge and his substitute, at least four lawyers, the cashier and the notary, the manager of the orphanage, the doctor and the veterinarian. In the magistrate towns, the town-hall was more numerous; besides the mayor and the magistrate's counselor, there were other clerks. The members of the town-hall were elected, both in the small and in the big communes, by the communal representatives and by the electoral corps. As the process of convoking the town-hall was slow, another executive organ, a smaller one, called the senate was created and it was made up of the mayor, the police captain, the lawyers, the main notary, the main attorney and the doctor, who were supposed to solve all the current problems of the commune. The municipalities had an organization which was similar to that of the districts (Teodorescu, 1935, pp. 373-375).

Transylvania's administrative organization also kept this form after the union of the province with Romania. On the 18th of November/1st of December, 1918, when the Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia decided the unification, The Great National Council ("*Marele Sfat Național*") was constituted; it consisted of 217 persons (a woman was included) and it became the leading forum in Transylvania. The next day, on the 19th of November, the Ruling Council was set up, a genuine provisional government of Transylvania. The American historian Keith Hitchins considered it the institution meant to achieve "the ad-interim administration of Transylvania" (Hitchins, 1994, p. 406). The Ruling Council consisted of fifteen ministers, three of them without portfolio. Iuliu Maniu held the Presidency and the Ministry of Interior, Vasile Goldiș – the Culture, the Public Instruction and the Relations with the Co-inhabiting Nations, Ștefan Ciceo Pop – the Army and the Public Security, Ion Suciu – the Organization and Preparation of the Constitution, Alexandru Vaida Voievod – the Externals and the Press, Aurel Lazăr – the Justice, Emil Hațiegan – the Codification, Aurel Vlad – the Finances, Victor Bontescu – the Agriculture and the Commerce, Romul Boilă – the Communications, the Public Works, the Post, the Telegraph and the Food, Ioan Fluieraș – the Socials and the Hygiene, Iosif Junonca – the Industry, and Vasile Lucaciu, Valeriu Braniște and Octavian Goga did not occupy any specific portfolio (Agrigoroaiei, 2003a, pp. 523-524).

The administrative integration of Transylvania, as well as that of other provinces united in 1918 with Romania, was done both by the extension of the competence spheres of the government from Bucharest to the united territories, which meant the express extension of some arrangements from the old Romania to the united provinces, and also from the regional organisms to the central spheres (Agrigoroaiei, 2001, p.

219). A decree from the 1st/14th of December, 1918 stipulated that all the decisions of the Great National Council, the decrees, orders and circulars of the Controlling Council, as well as those of other authorities, became executive without any delay (Teodorescu, 1935, p. 377).

The law decree no. 3631 from the 11th of December, 1918 amended the decision adopted at Alba Iulia on the 1st of December, decreeing that the united territories “are and will stay forever united with the Romanian Kingdom”. The decree no. 3632 also from the 11th of December provisionally admitted the authority of the Controlling Council until the final organization of the completed Romania. According to the same document, the Controlling Council had, as a first task, to carry out an electoral reform project which was supposed to take into account the principle of the universal suffrage and an agrarian reform project. The above-mentioned law-decree specified that the matters regarding the external affairs, the army, the railway, the customs, the public loans and the state’s security were the problem of the central authorities from Bucharest. Transylvania was to be represented in the government from Bucharest by ministers without portfolio, who, in their turn, could name their councilors.

By decree no. 1 from the 24th of January, 1919, Transylvania’s Controlling Council extended the application of the Hungarian administrative law no. XXII *on Municipalities* from 1886 with all the orders, regulations and statutes of law; however, there were some exceptions. Districts and municipalities were going to be led by a prefect who overtook the duties of the Hungarian prefect. Big and small communes, royal cities and those owning a council were going to be managed according to the law from 1886. All the municipal assemblies and the communal representatives were abolished. The municipalities’ clerks were going to be appointed by the Minister of the Interior, at the proposal of the prefect (Teodorescu, 1935, pp. 377-378).

Thus, according to an administrative report, the Controlling Council provisionally decided to keep up all the valid laws, orders, regulations and statutes existing before the 18th of November/December 1st 1918. It can be estimated that after the union of Transylvania, out of practical reasons, the Hungarian law and the Austrian Civil Code, with the imposed exceptions were adopted. This meant, in fact, their neutralization (Agrigoroaiei, 2001, p. 219). The Romanian language became the official language and “all the functions of the elected or appointed clerks were reconfirmed”.

By the decision of the Controlling Council from the 2nd/15th of January, Transylvania was organized in the following 23 counties: Făgăraș, Sibiu, Hunedoara, Alba, Turda-Arieș, Bistrița-Năsăud, Târnava-Mare, Târnava-Mică, Mureș-Turda, Cojocna, Solnoc-Dăbâca, Ciuc, Brașov, Trei-Scaune, Sălaj, Sătmar, Bihor, Arad, Maramureș, Bichiș, Cenat, Timiș-Torontal, Odorhei (Turliuc, 2005, p. 79).

By decree no. 3, Sibiu, where the Controlling Council was established, was proclaimed a city owning the rank of a municipality, and by decree no. 4 from the 7th of February, 1919, the Controlling Council replaced the Hungarian administrative terminology with the Romanian one. Thus the district became a county, the circle

became a subdivision, the magistrate town became a council town, the supreme leader became a prefect, the vice notary became a notary, the notary became a secretary, the circle court became the administrative court, the royal table became the Court of Appeal etc.

The series of administrative decisions adopted by the Controlling Council continued with decree no. 6 from the 19th of February, 1919, through which the administrative solicitor's office was reorganized, which functioned at that time according to the Hungarian law no. XXVI from 1896 (Teodorescu, 1935, pp. 378-379).

In 1918, in order to intensify the activity of the administrative integration of the united provinces, besides the Ministers Council, the Central Board for Unification and Administrative Matters was constituted. This board established regional boards at Chişinău, Cernăuţi and Cluj. The general secretariats of these boards were in charge until the 1st of April, when they were changed into general management units, which had tasks for each ministry. They progressively ceased their activity in the period 1922-1924, as their attributions decreased (Iancu, 1988, pp. 45-46; Turluc, 2005, p. 81).

Among the decisions adopted by the government from Bucharest aiming the administrative integration of Transylvania, we can highlight the law-decree no. 3621 from the 26th of August, 1919 that made recommendations for the organization of elections in Transylvania for the Chamber of Deputy and Senate, the law-decree no. 3911 from the 12th of September, 1919 regarding the agrarian reform in Transylvania, the law-decree no. 4090 also from the 12th of September, 1919 by which the Hungarian University from Cluj was transformed into a Romanian University, the law-decree no. 4709 from the 13th of November, 1919, by which the law of administration and extension of the state monopolies could be also applied in Transylvania etc. (Teodorescu, 1935, pp. 378-379).

The Parliament of the united Romania, in a sitting from the 29th of December, 1919, ratified the document according to which Basarabia, Bucovina and Transylvania decided their union with Romania in 1918. It was a new moment regarding the administrative integration of the new provinces into the new national edifice.

On the 20th of April, 1920, the activity of the Controlling Council from Sibiu ceased and all the decisions regarding Transylvania naturally came from then on from the central institutions.

The Constitution from 1923 stipulated, in its turn, the unitary territorial administrative organization for the whole country. Article 4 stipulated that Romania was divided into counties and these into communes, their number and surface being established by the laws that were going to be adopted regarding the administrative organization.

The organization of the administrative institutions was supposed to rely on the principle of administrative decentralization and the members of the county and communal councils were going to be elected by the principle of the "universal, equal, direct, secret, compulsory vote, with the minority representation", as well. Also, according to the law, co-opted members could also be elected. Women could be among

the co-opted members (art. 108 of the 1923 Constitution). The express inclusion of the universal suffrage principle regarding the election of the members of the administrative councils was a salutary act, also bearing the role of removing the restrictive criteria which had previously existed in the selection of the administrative leading organisms from Transylvania before the 1st of December, 1918 (Iancu, 1988, p. 56).

The provisions of art. 137 emphasized the unifying character of the Constitution, specifying that: “all the codex and laws that exist in different parts of the Romanian state will be revised, so that they suit this Constitution and assure the national unity (...). After the Constitution is promulgated those disposals of laws, decrees, regulations and any other documents that are in contradiction with the provisions of the present Constitution will be abolished” (Romanian Constitution, 1923, p. 40).

The approaches for the elaboration of a unitary administrative law at national level started to take shape after adopting the Constitution from 1923. In this context, we emphasize the proposal of people from Ardeal, represented by a constitutional law professor from Cluj, Romul Boilă, who stipulated in article no. 24 of his ante project that in the counties where minorities represented more than 1/5 of the population, they had the right to administrate and judge in their mother tongue, through their own representatives. The same author thought that the principle of the separation of power within the state should have been replaced by that of unity and power indivisibility, supposed to emanate from the Romanian nation (Turliuc, 2005, p. 83). In fact, after 1920, in the whole Balkan area, a tendency to protect the national minorities could be identified (Krulik, 2005, p. 10). Express provisions in this respect had been included in the peace treaty signed at the Peace conference from Paris-Versailles, 1919-1920 (Varenes, 2001, p. 5).

It is remarkable that, by chance or not, the percentage proposed by the professor Boilă, of 20%, was taken into consideration by the legislator nowadays to grant the rights specific to the co-inhabiting nationalities in Romania. Thus, the Romanian Constitution from 2003, in art.120, paragraph 2, states that: “in the territorial administrative unities where the citizens belonging to a national minority have a significant consideration, the use of the respective national minority language is guaranteed, written and orally, in the relation with the local public institutions” (Romanian Constitution, 2003, p. 34).

The law of local public administration no. 215/2001 (art. 90, paragraph 2), republished in 2007 included further information specifying that “in the territorial administrative units where the citizens belonging to a national minority are more than 20% out of the total number of the inhabitants they can address, orally or written, in their mother tongue with the local public authorities and the institutions subordinated to the local council” (art. 76, paragraph 2),

On the 14th of June, 1925, law for the administrative unification was adopted (Calcan, 2009, pp. 119-158). Romania’s territory was unitarily organized in counties, subdivisions, urban and rural communes and villages (art. 1-3). According to the Royal Decree no. 2465 (art. 1, paragraph 5) from the 25th of September, 1925, 17 urban communes were proclaimed municipalities at the national level. The municipalities

from Transylvania were: Arad, Braşov, Cluj, Oradea, Sibiu, Târgu-Mureş and Timişoara. At the same time, the residences of some counties were changed. So, Alba Iulia became a residence instead of Aiud, Baia Mare instead of Carei, Blaj instead of Diciosânmartin. More county residence urban communes became non-residence urban communes: Diciosânmartin, Aiud, Carei, Brad, Cojocna, Năsăud, Nădlac, Beclean and Salonta (Alexandrescu and Badea-Păun, 2001, p. 495).

According to the Royal Decree from the 7th of October, 1925, the territory of the country was divided into 71 counties. The following counties were part of Transylvania: Braşov with the capital in Braşov, Făgăraş with the capital in Făgăraş, Sibiu with the capital in Sibiu, Târnava Mare with the capital in Sighişoara, Târnava Mică with the capital in Blaj, Trei Scaune with the capital in Sf. Gheorghe, Odorhei with the capital in Odorhei, Ciuc with the capital in Miercurea Ciuc, Mureş with the capital in Târgu Mureş, Năsăud with the capital in Bistriţa, Someş with the capital in Dej, Cluj with the capital in Cluj, Turda with the capital in Turda, Alba Iulia with the capital in Alba Iulia, Hunedoara with the capital in Hunedoara. In Maramureş was constituted Maramureş County with the residence in Sighetul Marmaţiei. In Crişana the following counties were constituted: Satu Mare with the capital in Satu Mare, Sălaj with the capital in Zalău, Bihor with the capital in Oradea, Arad with the capital in Arad; and in Banat area: Severin with the capital at Lugoj, Caraş with the capital in Oraviţa, Timiş-Torontal with the capital in Timişoara (Agrigoroaiei, 2001, p. 234; Iancu, 1988, pp. 53-54; Turliuc, 2005, pp. 90-91).

The following modifications were performed comparatively with the previous administrative organization: Bistriţa Năsăud county became Năsăud county, Alba de Jos became Alba, Solnoc-Dăbâca became Someş, Turda-Arieş became Turda, Mureş-Turda became Mureş, and Cojocna county changed the name into Cluj county. The counties Caraş, Severin (made up of Caraş-Severin County), Lugoj and Timiş-Torontal were organized by a later decree. Table 1 presents the area of the counties from Transylvania and the number of the rural and urban communes from these counties (Alexandrescu and Badea-Păun, 2001, pp. 495-496).

Table 1: Counties from Transylvania

Crt.	The county	The area of the county in km ²	The no. of the urban communes	The no. of the rural communes
1	Alba	2,433	2	176
2	Bihor	7,467	3	416
3	Braşov	2,603	1	48
4	Ciuc	4,993	2	54
5	Cluj	4,813	2	223
6	Făgăraş	2,432	1	75
7	Hunedoara	7,695	6	416
8	Maramureş	3,381	2	56
9	Mureş	4,856	2	237
10	Năsăud	4,326	2	61

Crt.	The county	The area of the county in km²	The no. of the urban communes	The no. of the rural communes
11	Odorhei	2,977	1	140
12	Sălaj	5,191	3	267
13	Satu Mare	4,242	2	207
14	Sibiu	3,531	1	87
15	Someș	3,965	3	267
16	Târnava Mare	2,836	2	117
17	Târnava Mică	2,081	3	135
18	Trei Scaune	3,337	2	97
19	Turda	3,158	1	128

A brief analysis of Table 1 shows some interesting conclusions. The largest counties were Hunedoara and Bihor and the smallest were Făgăraș and Alba. There were differences between the large counties, as is the case of some of them which were three times larger than the smaller ones. The disproportions were noticed at the time of their creation, as there were opinions that pleaded for the reduction of the counties' number, mainly due to financial reasons (Iancu, 1988, p. 54). Hunedoara County had the largest number of urban communes (six), followed by Bihor, Sălaj, Someș and Târnava Mică counties which had 3 communes; however, most counties had at least two urban communes.

The adoption of the administrative law from 1925 represented a necessity, which was generated by the creation of the Romanian national state in 1918. Each historical province which joined Romania in 1918 had its own administrative organization: Basarabia was organized in "*zemstve*", Bucovina in districts, Transylvania in "*comitate*", while the old Romania was organized in "*judete*". The administrative law from 1925 organized in a unitary way the entire territory of the country. This law ended the provisional organization of the Romanian administration existing after 1918.

At the same time, the administrative law from 1925 established in detail the organization and functioning of the communal and county administrative levels. These levels were organized based on the principles of the universal, equal and direct suffrage, and the inclusion of the representatives of the national minority into local public institutions (art. 17 and 101). It combined the principle of centralization with that of administrative decentralization, which was reflected into the functioning of the basic elements of the administrative structures: the mayor, the commune and the council (Laubadère, 1980, pp. 89-90). The administrative law from 1925 represented a genuine reform in the administrative field and it became a reference law in the Romanian public administration. The adoption and the implementation of this law reflected the modern evolution of the epoch and the increased democratic spirit of the society. The law stipulated specific provisions regarding the citizens' involvement in the administration of communities and the enhancement of the education level of the adults. It emphasized the care for creating a profession for public employees. It created the base for women's participation in some structures of local public administration

and it introduced provisions for stimulating the implementation of local development programs in urban and rural communities. The law introduced procedural provisions with regard to the stages of the administrative act and it increased the responsibility of the public employees, etc. The administrative law from 1925 represented a sum of other Romanian administrative laws and, at the same time, a source of inspiration for the laws to come (Calcan, 2009, p. 120, pp. 156-157).

Thus we can conclude that the main goals of the territorial administrative reorganization of the Romanian society were: the unification of all administrative structures from the country, a modern organization by implementing the democratic principles of the administration, the increase of citizens' training and their involvement in public matters, etc. The results of the implementation of these principles were positive as they worked effectively, proving their efficiency during the entire inter-war period and not only. The administrative structure and its fundamental principles were the basis of the administrative organization of the Romanian society until today.

4. Conclusions

Considering all these, we conclude that the process of the administrative integration of Transylvania into the Romanian unitary national state, created on the 1st of December, 1918, was a complex one. In the beginning, out of practical reasons, the existing administrative structure was maintained, a fact which implied, at least partially, taking over and “naturalizing” the Hungarian legislation. Gradually, once the activity of the Controlling Council was organized, the province started to get closer and closer to the Romanian traditional administrative structures.

The first changes with an administrative character included those aspects which, besides the fact that they were unknown to the traditional way of organization, had also a clear democratic character. In this respect, we have in view the use of the Romanian language and the democratic organization of the elections based on the principle of universal ballot. In the same time, the law abolished the congregations, and the communal representatives, who were people that had the right to occupy those positions and who obligatorily came from the Hungarian population and had the highest financial power.

The Controlling Council and the central government acted in the same time for the administrative integration of Transylvania. The adopted measures completed each other. The ratification of the Union document by the completed Parliament of Romania, the organization of the parliamentary elections in 1919, on the ground of the universal ballot, the beginning of the agrarian reform, the cease of the Controlling Council activity, the adoption of the Constitution from 1923 were the stages that prepared the administrative unification law from 1925. But legally, the complete integration of Transylvania into the Romanian unitary state took time and it was finalized in the late '40s of the 20th century. The complete process of the administrative integration of Transylvania into the Romanian unitary state was similar to that of integration of the other provinces united in 1918 with Romania: Basarabia and Bucovina.

References:

1. Agrigoroaei, I., *România interbelică*, vol. I, Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2001.
2. Agrigoroaei, I., ‘Marea Unire’, in Agrigoroaei, I., Bulei, I., Cristian, V., Iacob, G., Iacobescu, M., Maior, L., Mureșanu, S., Platon, G., Platon, M. and Zbughea, G. (eds.), *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VII, tom II, *De la Independență la Marea Unire*, București: Editura Enciclopedică, 2003a, pp. 463-539.
3. Agrigoroaei, I., ‘Unirea Transilvaniei, Banatului, Crișanei și Maramureșului’, in Scurtu, I. (ed.), *Marea Unire din 1918 în context european*, București: Editura Enciclopedică, 2003b, pp. 173-197.
4. Agrigoroaei, I., Preda, G. and Calcan, G., *România interbelică. Economie-administrație-apărare*, Ploiești: Editura Universității Petrol-Gaze, 2008.
5. Alexandrescu, I. and Badea-Păun, G., ‘Organizarea administrativ-teritorială a României, 1859-2001’, in Scurtu, I., Alexandrescu, I., Bulei, I. and Mamina, I. (eds.), *Enciclopedia de istorie a României*, București: Editura Meronia, 2001, pp. 491-508.
6. Calcan, G., *Administrația publică românească în secolele XIX-XX. Legi și reforme importante. De la reformele lui Alexandru Ioan Cuza la cele ale Marii Uniri*, vol. I, București: Editura Universitară, 2009.
7. Constantiniu, F., ‘Marea Unire din 1918: Război sau autodeterminare’, in Preda, G., *1918 un vis împlinit*, Ploiești: Editura Universității Petrol-Gaze, 2008, pp. 13-16.
8. *Constitution of Romania*, București: Editura Tempus Dacoromânia Comterra, 2003.
9. Debbasch, C., *Droit Administratif*, Paris: Edition Cujas, 1968.
10. Filitti, I.C. and Vântu, I.G., ‘Administrația locală în România’, in *Enciclopedia României*, vol. I, București: Imprimeria Națională, 1938, pp. 296-310.
11. Gruber, A., *La décentralisation et les institutions administratives*, Paris: Armand Colin Editeur, 1986.
12. Guilloud, L., ‘Transferts de compétences et pouvoir normatif des collectivités territoriales’, 2008, *Petites affiches*, no. 138, p. 51, PA200813808, [Online] available at <http://www.lextenso.fr/weblextenso/article/afficher?id=PA200813808&origin=recherche>, accessed on May 3, 2010.
13. Hamangiu, C., *Unificarea legislativă a României. Proiect de lege și expunere de motive întocmit de C. Hamangiu, ministrul Justiției*, București: Imprimeria Națională, 1931.
14. Hitchins, K., *Rumania 1866-1947*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
15. Iancu, G., ‘Unificarea legislativă. Sistemul administrativ al României Mari (1919-1939)’, in Pușcaș, V. and Vese, V. (eds.), *Dezvoltare și modernizare în România interbelică, 1919-1939*, București: Editura Politică, 1988, pp. 39-67.
16. Krulik, J., ‘Droits des minorites: Protection individuelle et protection collective en Europe (UE, Conseil de l’Europe)’, paper presented at the International Conference “Les Balkans de l’Ouest: Nouveaux défis pour l’Union Européenne”, July 4 and 5, 2005, Opatija, Croatia, [Online] available at <http://www.oefz.at/fr/Opatija/presentations/docKrucic.pdf>, accessed on May 3, 2010.
17. Lamy Gestion et Finances des Collectivités Locales, ‘La décentralisation en marche. Etude 115’, [Online] available at <http://www.lamylinereflex.fr/>, accessed on May 3, 2010.

18. Laubadère, A., *Traité de droit administratif*, 8th edition, Paris: Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1980.
19. Laubadère, A., Venezia, J.C. and Gaudemet, Y., *Traité de droit administratif*, vol. I, *Droit administratif générale*, 15th edition, Paris: Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1999.
20. Law no. 215 from April 23, 2001 regarding the local public administration republished in the Official Monitor no. 123 from February 20, 2007.
21. Law for the unification of public administration published in the Official Monitor no. 128 from June 14, 1925, pp. 6849-6893.
22. Madaule, J., *Istoria Franței. De la Republica a III-a la Republica a V-a*, vol. 3, București: Editura Politică, 1973.
23. Marcou, G., 'Dossier spécial – réforme des collectivités territoriales', in *Revue Lamy Collectivités Territoriales*, no. 44, 2009, [Online] available at <http://www.lamylinereflex.fr/>, accessed on May 3, 2010.
24. Rădulescu, A., *Unificarea legislativă*, București: Cultura Națională, 1927.
25. Rivero, J., *Droit administratif*, 8th edition, Paris: Dalloz, 1977.
26. Scurtu, I., 'Decada brătienistă, (decembrie 1918 – noiembrie 1928)', in Agrigoroaei, I. Axenciuc, V., Bold, C.B., Bozga, V., Buzatu, G., Dobrinescu, V.F., Grigorescu, D., Iancu, Ș., Ioniță, I., Micu, D., Otu, P., Retegan, M., Scurtu, I. and Zbughea, G. (eds.), *Istoria Românilor, România întregită 1918-1940*, vol. XIII, București: Editura Enciclopedică, 2003, pp. 221-270.
27. Tardieu, A., *La Paix*, Paris: Payot, 1931.
28. Teodorescu, A., *Tratat de drept administrativ*, vol. I, 3rd edition, București: Institutul de Arte Grafice "București", 1929.
29. Teodorescu, A., *Tratat de drept administrativ*, vol. II, București: Institutul de Arte Grafice, 1935.
30. Torrey, G.E., 'Rumania's Decision to Intervene: Brătianu and the Entente. June-July 1916', in Hitchins, K. (ed.), *Rumanian Studies. An International Annual of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. II, 1971-1972, Lieden: E.J. Brill, 1973, pp. 3-29.
31. Turliuc, C., 'Construcția națională românească și identitățile regionale. Modernizare și omogenizare în secolul al XX-lea', in Agrigoroaei, I., Buruiană, O., Iacob, G. and Turliuc, C. (eds.), *România interbelică în paradigmă europeană*, Iași: Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2005, pp. 65-106.
32. Varennes, F., 'The Linguistic Right of Minorities', in Trifunovska, S. (ed.), *Minority Rights in Europe. European Minorities and Languages*, Hague, Netherlands: T.M.C. Asser Press, 2001, pp. 3-30, [Online] available at <http://books.google.decenturl.com/minority-rights-in-europe>, accessed on May 3, 2010.