Mukesh Shankar Bharti[1]

THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND DEMOCRATISATION PROCESS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA[2]

ABSTRACT: The fall of Communism in the Central and Eastern European countries in the year 1989, was a historical change had occurred after the demise of communism. The decline of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 was one of the most important proceedings of the period: the conclusive end of the Cold War and the Iron Curtain. After the disintegration of the former USSR, the Eastern bloc had started the modernisation of institutions and adopted the norms of democracy. The third wave of democratisation of Samuel P. Huntington's theory would apply the democratic changes in Central and Eastern Europe and Romania as well. It traces the discussions and opinions of institutional and political development in Romania with special attention to the events around 1989 Post-communism and Eastern enlargement of the European Union. The paper assesses the role of the European Union to promote democratization through Eastern neighbour policy. The paper broadly discusses the institutional and political development in Romania and the role of Copenhagen criteria and the country's accession to the EU in early 2007. The result of this article is that Romania has successfully integrated into the European Union but that democratization is declining in the country.

[1] Centre for European Studies, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3693-7247; msbharti.jnu@gmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

The fall of communism in 1989 revealed significant differences between the Central and the East European countries. The reforms initiated by the several communist regimes during the late 1980s smoothed the post-communist transition processes of these states. The Central European countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary were more dependent on Moscow's influence than Romania. In the aftermath of the 1989 revolutions, it was hoped that democracy itself would provide the new cement for the revived polities. In the discourse of the starting of the third wave of democratisation, the European Community has played a key role in consolidating the democratisation in Eastern-Southern Europe. This has also occurred in Romania early 1990s. At the end of the 1980s, Romania was struggling against the increasingly strong reformist stream initiated in the region. The communist dictatorship exerted control over the Romanian society through several means. One of the main instruments was the Romanian Communist Party (PCR) (Huntington, 1993). The legacy of a patrimonial and totalitarian communist system seems to have harmed the democratisation process in Romania and the ability of elected governments to govern effectively. Due to the lack of an active civil society and opposition during communism, the violent revolution in 1989, which led to the downfall of totalitarian President Ceausescu, was more o less a transfer of power among incumbent political elites, as large parts of the former nomenclature dominated the transition process and the crafting of new institutions after the fall of communism (Vladimir, 1998).

There are major problems around the definitions of democracy, between two aspects the positive thing and negative thinking assessment of their current democracy development towards Central and Southern Eastern Europe (Stan, 2010, p. 379; Marszałek-Kawa & Plecka, 2019, pp. 139-141). There are a lot of new requisites had been revolving in the region with fundamentally changed slight and thick criteria of the democratic system and with the resulting ambiguous evaluations and analysis. The conventional analyses have used the gracious terms as a mixture, discrepancy or fifty-fifty democratic institutionalisation since some pessimistic ideas are too marked, in primary level about all in the

Central and Southern Eastern European countries' political parties and party systems and especially it similar process has started by Romanian political in the country during the 1990s. There are a developing of political corruption and declining the trust of citizens in the country on bad political occurrence. It could be previously seen on the political ground, but they were treated in most of the cases independently and not in their unprocessed relations as the universal features that articulate the deep turn down in the innovative democracy (Agh, 2016, p. 8).

Attila Agh (1998) is analysing democratic shift as "the mixture of two systems in creative chaos, with the complicated and painful process of democratic institutionalisation and socioeconomic transformation". And the democratic transformation as "the coherent emergence of the new system in all social sub-systems, with the establishment of a democratic political culture – the invention of democratic traditions". The democratic transition and its processes constitute the consolidation of the strong institution's establishment and social harmony of people integration, participation in running a sustainable new political culture and democratic institutionalisation in the country (Agh, 1998).

Since the collapse of communist rule in Romania, the democratisation process had been started by the new democratic supported leadership in the country. The political leaders quickly started the political meeting with other stakeholders across the country, e.g. economists, social workers, political philosophers, getting support outside the country and with reformist groups. The media seems to be divided between some who unquestioningly support government propaganda, some other media personnel especially at the local county level are more prone to criticising the government. Since 1989 when communism had declined, the demand of people increasing day by day to adopt strong constitutional democracy with equal electoral rights for all citizens in the country. There will be a broad analysis of elections, data and statistics. This chapter will also focus municipality's elections and division of the county in the countryside (Ciobanu, 2008, pp. 58–62). The county elections are strengthening the democratic norms for strong institutions in Romania. After the closing stages of violence, the National Salvation Front attempts in Romania to consolidate accordingly by the new government. There was preliminary

uncertainty; the government called electoral process would initiate and underway the institutional process. However, on January 28th and 29th 1990 less important and peaceful political processes started were organised by anti-National Salvation Front forces (old-communist political parties and the student association) in opposition to the National Salvation Front's involvement in the elections. The student's protest in Bucharest and other places didn't have a success story in Romania (Siani, 2005). The student's movement had started across the country against communist dictatorship and Nicolae Ceausescu. The movement had been speared in several cities like Bucharest, Sibiu, Timisoara, Sighisoara, Sebes, Iasi and Cluj-Napoca. The role of the student movement in Romania created a path for democratic government in the country during the early1990s (Stan-Turcescu, 2005, p. 656).

In democracies, civil society is understood to be a key actor that strengthens democratic institutions and governments by drawing attention to multiple issues of society and keeping a check on political power. In Romania too in the aftermath of systemic collapse civil society has played an important role. It became very active with extensive and passionate peoples' involvement as indicated in the wide-ranging street protests. Nevertheless, in certain cases, many pre-existing and still essential laws were infringed, and even straightforward cohabitation rules variable social lives, as well as the certain decision of the new government, were sometimes despoiled. In Romania, civil society doesn't work well in comparison to other neighbouring country. It is necessary to study civil society's responsibility in the sense of a transparent mechanism in the county. Romania becomes a member of the European Union on 1st January 2007. The accession treaties endorsed according to an agreement and member states would have to apply for transitional limitations. In the meantime, Romanian workers organised an open movement for rights for up to seven years after being a member of the European Union, to look out against interruption of their labour markets. The labour movement is strengthening the democratic norms across the country through the labour movement. There will be discussions about the role of the student's movement for fair and transparent institutional bodies. The churches were playing an important role during the early 1990s. The research will empha-

sise the importance of the church and intellectual of Romania (Tismaneanu, 2008, p. 170).

Romania constitution was adopted on 21st November 1991. It was approved through the nationwide referendum on 8th December 1991 and introduced in the country. It remains the current fundamental law that establishes the constitution of the government of Romania, the rights and obligations of the country's people, and its mode of passing laws. This stands as the basis of the legality of the Romanian government. The constitution of Romania was amended once by a referendum on 18th October 2003. The new text of the constitution had taken effect on 29th October 2003. The constitution of Romania believes in full democratic practice for all citizens according to a different article. It described the social state, which is shaped by the rule of law, human dignity, democratic way of self-governing, equal liberties, the improvisation and free improvement merits, political pluralism and justice, stand for high-level values and in the spirit of the democratic behaviour of the Romanian citizens (Culi, 2003, pp. 38–42). Democratic development opened up possibilities of participation of all sections of the population including women. Gender equality and proportional representation is important scenario for any healthy democratic country. It is thus important to discuss women, their representation and their presence in Romanian political institutions. The women representation is strengthening the norms of democratisation in any democratic nation through the current Romanian political situation has a long way to concerning gender justice in political institutions. In the Romania case, there are two qualifying points needed at this stage. First, while political conditions are an important component of the accession process, there are other priorities that may or may not fit with democratisation. Secondly, we must distinguish between democratization and Europeanization. The two processes are autonomous and originally separate in Central and Eastern Europe (CEEC), especially since the first process started in 1989–1990 before integration seriously intruded. The country wanted to join the EU due to the broader picture on the economic spectrum (Pridham, 2007, pp. 233–235).

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

The concept of democracy merely reflects the evolution that has occurred in the last two and a half millennia of a system for organising the exercise of political power in society, which includes diverse and contradictory meanings. Democratic theorists are divided between those who defend their approach and draw even cruder conclusions about what democracy can achieve and those who defy their supposed descriptions by masking anti-democratic values, which they hold to be the true the motivation of Schumpeterian criticisms of classical approaches to democracy. Aristotle explicitly distinguished between the normative, descriptive, and semantic dimensions of political theories of government and built his theory of democracy around the distinctions. Aristotle's acknowledged the conflation of majority rule and rule by the poor in defining democracy. This is problematic not only because of his assumption that societies will always be divided into a few rich and many poor (an assumption challenged by Tocqueville's account, which saw a levelling out in American society) but also because poverty and virtue are negatively correlated for Aristotle. Although, when he ranks the best and worst forms of democracy it is in terms of the prominence of the middle class, that is, of those among the many who are the least poor and the most virtuous. Thus, one might suspect, Aristotle's aristocratic values find their way into his concept of democracy (Cunningham, 2002, p. 12). However, in different ways, each reflects what has been called the classical view of democracy. A pillar of this view is that democracy implies self-government: of the people in Tocqueville's formulation, or of the many in Aristotle's. The other great pillar of the classical theory is that democracy promotes or expresses the common good of what the public exercises. For the example, Romania joined the European Union to follow the rules and regulations that were established at the Copenhagen summit. The revolutions of the rose, the orange and the cedar have changed the roots. Surely these revolutions have yet to translate into fluid new democratic systems, but even so these dramatic developments seem to have witnessed progress, with a newly empowered street democracy driving out rotten regimes, with the will to do better. Due to these revolutions in the CEE countries, the path of

democratization also changed the scenarios in Romania (Emerson, 2005, p. 1).

Fukuyama, who embeds his conception of political and economic arrangements in a historically evolutionary theory according to which capitalism and liberal-democratic state-based government represent the pinnacle of human development, which had been applied to countries transforming from a dictatorial and authoritarian government to a liberal democracy. Furthermore, Romania during the 1990's started the democratisation and institutionalisation process in the country and saw how the West cooperated with political and economic ties. And the country had shaped the way toward stronger political institutions and applied the rule of law (Cunningham, 2002, p. 42). It is probably in this spirit that Dahl endorses consociational democracy: not as a theory of general application, but as a recipe for maintaining stability in societies divided by strong and distinctive subcultures (Dahl, 1989, p. 264). Dahl's objections would have been against a democratic theory that holds that all social problems admit of complete resolution through the spread of democracy, but the pragmatic orientation already outlined does not commit one to such democratism. Its main strength is to encourage flexibility in the search for democratic solutions, without assuming that all social problems can be adequately solved in this way or that a perfect democracy could it will never be achieved.

The EU is always keen to promote the demarcation process in the region through development in integration theory, since both the sets of interactions between the EU and candidate governments and between the latter and their national contexts are vital to understanding the dynamics of the enlargement process. Through the EU's integration policy for strengthening the roots of democracy in Romania. Due to the conditions, rules and norms of integration of the EU, the CEE countries accelerate the process of democratisation. Romania had also adopted the EU's integration policy and criteria to promote democracy at a large level (Pridham, 2007, pp. 234–235). Thus, the central theme of democracy must be sought in the meaning of political power, in the nature of the citizen and his role in society and in political institutions. In the Romanian case there are lack of honesty to build up strong public institutions in the country. The last

decade Romania faces severe corruption rate and organised crime graph have been increasing in across the county. Sartori (2003) analyses the idea of freedom as non-dependence, as autonomy, was completed with another essential aspect, which was the achievement of the social status of citizen by man, which allowed him to participate in the government of the State, in the exercise of collective power.

Content analysis is broadly understood as any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings. The methodology of this article uses the addition of narrative analysis and thematic content analysis to reach a synthetic evaluation of the material and political practices and representations in public institutions built in an institutionalist sociological epistemic approach, within the framework of the study of institutional development to achieve the democratic establishment in Romania (Quinn, 2002, p. 454). This article describes an integrated approach to measure the level of institutional transition and democratic promotion through deductive and standardised content analysis of EU and Romania statutes. Following the two main criteria of democratic transition - inclusiveness and decentralization - three main categories of intra-party democracy are theoretically derived: member rights, organizational structure and decision-making. However, Romania's institutional arrangements and level of socio-economic development place it closer to the categories of countries that have benefited from a strong associative segment. The content analysis is extensively used as a comparative technique by the press, media, think tank, and communication.

To analyse the results of the EU policy for democratisation and democratic transition in Romania, primary and secondary data, the case study analysis technique will be used. This is a technique for making a systematic comparison of different case studies. The intention of the case study is to integrate variable-oriented, case-oriented qualitative approaches. The tools of case study investigate what kind of policies had been adopted to promote democratic norms in Romanian. The Romanian government had started democratisation and institutional transformation in the country after the parliamentary elections in the country during the 1994–2008. To prove an argument, the study includes primary data such as press releases

from government officials, press releases from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, statements from the various associated government institutions and other government officials, reports and official websites. Secondary data includes articles, books, pieces of literature, magazines, reports, think tank articles, newspaper excerpts. Use the findings of the case study to identify the democratic configuration in Romania. And what kind of relationship has the Romanian government maintained with the European Union to achieve the political and economic objective. Although the purpose of this case study assesses the role of the European Union, democratic institutions, the rule of law, the parliamentary system and the transition in Romania (European Parliament, 2018, p. 156).

REVOLUTION AND SYSTEM CHANGE

The Romanian revolution had changed the totalitarian rule in the country in December 1989. Nicolae Ceausescu's draconian practice ended, and new political practices emerged in the country in the early 1990's. After the decline of communism new political elite adopted the democratic setup. The new political ruling party (NSF) adopted the past communist legacy under the leadership of Roman Petre. The ruling National Salvation Front and most of them carried on as nothing had significantly changed in Romanian political culture. The successor of NSF, the Social Democratic Party of Romania (PSD), showed an equivalent reluctance to question the past communist legacy (Antohi et al., 1989). The new political class didn't enthusiast quick political, cultural transform towards democratisation. After the revolution of December 1989, many parties participated in the first election which was held in 1990. They hold a successful election in the country, the multi-party system developed in Romania. After the Revolution of 1989, a new constitution was adopted 1991 (Tismaneanu, 2003). The Romanian constitution established the major fundamental law like a change in European governance, strong institutional formation, the function of political institutions, the legitimacy of government, Romanian citizen's rights and requirements, the parliamentary system of law-making and its further procedures (Deletant, 2017).

The constitution of Romania was adopted by a national referendum which was held on 8th December 1991. The Constitution of 1991, as revised in 2003, contains 156 articles, divided into eight major sections or "Titles": General principles; Fundamental Rights, Freedoms, and Duties; Public authorities; The economy and public finance; Constitutional Court; Euro-Atlantic integration; Revision of the Constitution; Final and transitional provisions. The post-revolution constitution marked a prominent step towards democracy, breaking the long age of communist constitutional provisions. The new Constitution imposes the rule of law as the framework of political and public life, and also as the standard and imperative of genuine democracy. The separation of powers principle and the check and balance idea began to take root in political philosophy, as well as in public discourse. Romania constitution revised (2003) describes the settlement of the organisation of the Parliament, the Presidency, Government, and bodies of public administration at the central and the local level, the judicial power structures, with relations of control and support among these political institutions. The political construction is far from being perfect, but the affirmation of relative independence and the interconnections of the parts of this institutional system (Goudenhooft, 2015, pp. 68–71). The newly revised constitution came into force on 29th October 2003. The freshly revised constitution adopted major changes, e.g. more focus on Euro-Atlantic integration had been added. In this revision, the democratic character of the state has been legally reinforced, and the citizens 'access to the decisional process has been established. A more efficient manner of guaranteeing citizens 'rights and freedoms has also been set in place.

The newly revised constitution (2003) coherently provided the specification of the cabinet reshuffle, the assumption of responsibilities about government. The legal provision was established regarding the emergency ordinances bill in the Parliament. In the constitutional procedure, strengthening and increasing the justice independence, together with the increasing the gross level of the Constitutional Court in the country (Ionescu, 2004). According to a new rule in the constitution, the Constitutional Courts have sufficient power to solve complex and critical cases. Joining the European Union and NATO do not require any further referendum in the country. A parliamentary vote by 2/3 majority is sufficient (Ionescu 2017).

POLITICAL INITIATIVES AND ECONOMIC REFORMS

According to the Constitution of Romania (2003), Romania is a democratic and social state governed by the rule of law, in which human dignity, the citizens' rights and freedoms, the free development of human personality, justice and political pluralism represent supreme values, in the spirit of the Romanian people's democratic traditions and the ideals embodied by the December 1989 Revolution, and shall be guaranteed establishment of democratic institutions in the country. The State shall be organized based on the principle of the separation and balance of powers - legislative, executive, and judicial – within the framework of constitutional democracy (Criste, 2020. pp. 60–62). The President of Romania shall represent the Romanian State and is the safeguard of the national independence, unity and territorial integrity of the country. The President of Romania shall guard the observance of the Constitution and the proper functioning of the public authorities. To this effect, he shall act as a mediator between the Powers in the State as well as between the State and the society (Muica, 2018, pp. 68–70). The President of Romania is the one who has the task to revoke and appoint members of the government in the case of the occurrence of a vacancy or the case of a government reshuffle (Saramet, 2016, p. 23). Pluralism in Romanian society is a condition and guarantee of constitutional democracy. Political parties will be constituted and shall pursue and their activities by the laws of the constitution. The definition and expression of the political will of the citizens, observing the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the legal order and the principle of the democracy (Dorneanu-Safta, 2015, pp. 612–614).

Article 41 of the Romanian Constitution mentions that property right is guaranteed. And according to Article 135, the property is protected by the state. With the fall of the dictatorship in Romania, in the 90s, major political confrontations occurred. The rapid reform procedures of the economic system, which initiated substantial budgetary limitations with negative consequences on the electors, could not be put off. The Romanian economic imbalances that had occurred throughout the period 1990–2009. The de-industrialisation and privatisation processes of the state companies launched after 1990 determined the increase of the unemployment rate

in the country. The economic measures of prices liberalisation adopted in the first years after 1990 led to the increase of the inflation rate until 256.1 percent in 1993. Following the start of the privatisation process of state companies, the unemployment rate knew an emphasised increase. The unemployment rate increased in Romania from 2.8 percent in 1990 to 10.9 percent in 1994. After this year, a fluctuating evolution was registered, with ups and downs of its level. The reductions recorded can be explained by the emergence and development of other activity areas specific to the market economy, such as constructions, commerce, financial activities and, real estate transactions etc. The economic and financial crisis stroke one of the areas that had known significant growth in the last years, namely the constructions sector, a fact that brought about the increase of the unemployment rate by 3.4 percent. The puzzling transition course followed by the country during the democratisation process and establishment of a free market in the 1990s (Bratic, 2008, pp. 152–154).

Although the Constitution states that Romania is a centralised state, several political voices in the 90s have raised the issue of creating "autonomous" regions given the historical development of the country. These voices originated mainly from Transylvania as it was seen by many as a wealthier and socially-economically more advanced part of the country. The regional development of Transylvania has to take into account the political interests of the Hungarian minority, largely concentrated in this area, and the unequal distribution of GDP per capita over the country as a whole (Vasile-Dobre, 2015, pp. 30–32).

Table 1. GDP per Inhabitant by Regions

Year	North East	South East	South	South West	West	North West	Centre	Bucha-rest
1994	75.9	94.9	97.4	98.3	106.9	91.7	103.3	149.1
1995	79.5	98.6	94.7	95.5	108.6	93.7	107	137.6
1996	80	100.9	91.7	89.5	105.7	92.8	112.3	142.6
1997	77.4	101.1	89.7	94.2	112.7	91.8	112.3	140.5
1998	76.2	100.4	86.1	89.7	104.8	94.7	107.7	163

Source: Romanian statistical yearbook, 2000.

At the outset of the transition, the country also presented features that could have constituted a comparative advantage concerning other countries in the region. Romania demonstrated the least dependence on the COMECON treaty, and the absence of previous hesitant reforming measures prevented the emergence of obscure 'quasi-property' rights. Moreover, an obedient population, disciplined by the experience of a police state and the severe recession previous to 1989 could have shown increased resistance to the difficulties of the reforming process (Daianu, 1994). Progress in economic reform has been significantly slower in Romania than in other countries in the region. No significant restructuring and institutional change were realised until 1993. The first democratic governments, consisting mainly of former communists, adopted a regular macro-economic program of stabilisation and price liberalisation.

Regarding the relationship between the representative and the direct democracy, the Parliament has to pass an organic law to organise a referendum. According to Article 73(1) of the Romanian constitution, the Parliament passes legitimate constitutional, organic and common law. (2) Legal, constitutional laws would be about the revision of the Constitutional parts. (3) The organic laws shall standardise, (a) the electoral process, the organisation and run of the stable electoral authority, (b) the functioning, organisation, and financing of political groups.

The process of democratic institutional-building in post-authoritarian Eastern Europe and Romania has primarily proceeded in an atmosphere of uncertainty in the country. Despite the problems of initiating political democratisation and the non-existence of certain important socio-economic prerequisites for achieving this, the impulsiveness surrounding the selection of institutions has also been unbreakable by the fact that this has been far from a purely realistic act. There is lack of proper information, time and enthusiasm to negotiation have prompted political leaders to act from time to time in a do too quickly and not to select that political entity and institutions which would be the best outfit a country's needs in an exacting moment in time or the outlook. According to the result, the executive and the legislative structures, the constitution and electoral laws have seldom had to be revised a couple of periods before being able to resolve (Dahrendorf, 1992, pp. 1482–1486).

Although there is also essentially a need to keep in mind that the belated establishment of some political institutions and their branches and especially the approval of constitutions have considerably reduced the chances of democracy being consolidated in some parts of the former Communist countries. The failure to decide on a concrete agreement between members of the communist representative from Eastern-Southern European countries and democratic oppositions has left a range of unresolved issues. Many issues are rising to resolve the uncertainties between stakeholders to start the process for the establishment of political and legislative institutions in the country. The unfinished institutionalisation and unenthusiastic solutions projected after each consecutive and successive election have tended to keep the disagreement surrounding institutional arrangement. The incomplete institutional activities and settlement have been very complicated to develop not only because of their low-down legitimacy and, thus, being short of interest in their function by the majority of inhabitants but also because of the concentrated bargaining perspective of institutional creators. In some such situations, it has been challenging to bring on political actors to examine the rules of the "democratic competition". There has been even a lesser amount of possibilities to get used to them, the institutional background set against these self-ruled democratic principles control has not so far crystallised to a satisfactory degree in a post-communist framework (Agh, 2002, pp. 58–62).

Romania had been ruled by the authoritarian communist regime before 1989; it was the one-party rule in Romania. The Romanian Communist Party (PCR) was in rule and a cult of individuality in the order of Dictator Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife Elena (Press's Role, I.I.R). Thus, in 1990 economic and social meanings associated with democracy seemed to prevail over purely political understandings of democracy. The other dictatorial regimes, the Department of State Security (DSS) were the key factor to strengthen the political power of Ceausescu. It is better known DSS as the Securitate was the political police of Ceausescu and during his regime and he used them cold-bloodedly to impose his rule and pressurise society. It was organised in the late 1940s to defend the new establishment, Securitate or "Secu" was a specially-trained force entrusted to

observe the interior safety measures of the Ceausescu regime (Deletant, 1996). There was an associate organisation of DSS which was focusing on controlling foreign intelligence and threatening counter-intelligence. It was very aware of who is living in exile as an opponent of Ceausescu, including espionage, disinformation to promote the national interest, monitoring the activities and foreign policy. The key moment started in the country from the authoritarian rule which was involved in many events, e.g., collapse of Ceausescu's dictatorship; there is in Romania polarisation and clashes started during the early 1990s between various stakeholders like growing democratic movements, various parties and the National Salvation Front lead and entirely controlled government (Tismaneanu, 1998).

The Romanian economy was too fragile, lack of truthfulness, segregation and moral disaster and instability were across the country, there was reality, diverse aspects of single trouble, and it was understood that the nation might be returned to regularity and normality by merely removing of odd factors and irrational things.

THREE THINGS SOON BECAME MORE EVIDENT IN ROMANIA

There was an entire common class that, having gained and benefited from the communist rule because all we're getting the benefit of privileges. The people of Romania were unable to get anything from the government without a struggle and fight. An additional significant problem was the understanding that the communist regime had driven its bitterest enemies to encourage an extreme and tremendous approach to the fights, expressed in an unambiguous determination to replace communist totalitarianism with a system embodying its exact reverse and characterised by authority.

The primary wave of enthusiasm that clamoured for the need for reforms and changes, it was renowned that from a personality indicate of view, such changes often ran the risk of being interpreted as a form of violent behaviour, and improvement. The most important obstacle on the road to restructuring is the reaction of traditional mentalities, still present

not only at the decision-making level but also in the middle of the general inhabitants.

There have been two senses of fear: the one of the past and fear of the future. Even though highly suspect, the comeback of communist authoritarianism is still apparent as a prime danger, causing some different political forces to call for more fundamental measures (measures that ironically enough are often frighteningly similar to communist ideology), whose approval may endanger the common operation of the social order. Suspicion- Although in standard persons think safe only in the middle of a multitude, their internal alertness clings to the idea that 'other people' are those who have spoiled them in the past, are hurting them in the present time and will keep on to hurt them in the future as well. Corruption – It is too far from sustainable development and reform which was suggested by many groups in the country. The communist leaders from ruling political groups were involved in corruption it spread under close examination, the underground communist leader engaged in a massive gross of corruption (King-Major-Marian, 2016, p. 64).

The collapse of communist rule in Romania coincided with the emergence of multi-party systems, although were many independent groups and other stakeholders had the probability of forming elected sovereign governments in the country. After the fall of communism first post-communist institutional entity and actors, the political parties grew on the rough soil of no prior struggle (Mair, 1997). Pro-democracy and National Salvation Front supporters clashed between January and June 1990 in different parts of the country. The key areas of disputes were over the National Salvation Front's negative response to call elections; it had happened finally in May 1990. Second, the National Salvation Front's pronouncement to participate in the elections was rejected by the rest of the political forces in several parts of the country, as Iliescu and most of the National Salvation Front leaders were neo-communist leaders in several parts of the country (Kitschelt, 1995, pp. 448–449).

The agitation and mobilisations that took place in opposition to the National Salvation Front were organised by the three conventional pre-communist parties and during the student movement and were not self-conscious by the security forces. On the other hand, they had been

producing clashes with pro-National Salvation Front old workers, mostly miners. The first mobilisation started of the National Salvation Front to share power until the elections were held in 1990 (Kitschelt, 1992, pp. 8–12). The second round of mobilisation failed in its endeavour to stop the National Salvation Front from participating in the elections. Furthermore, the National Salvation Front won the first free and open elections with 66 percent of the votes. After the miners' aggressive demobilisation of the students of the University of Bucharest, the student movement had ended its role in the midway (Lipset, 1994, p. 59).

The new government of Romania took the form of a Republic, organised under the standard of the division and balance of powers among legislative, executive, and judicial. Political pluralism was a condition and a guarantee of the Constitution of Romania. The National Security Law of 1991 recognised supervision of all governmental activities related to national security, including intelligence and security organisations in the Constitution. The establishment of new intelligence agencies and bringing them under an officially authorised basis and democratic oversight was challenging in a country where the populace's rage at the preceding intelligence machinery was giant. As in the past mentioned, during the revolution the former Securitate was placed under the carrying weapons forces and, for a definite period, the government administration did not want to an agreement with it. On the other hand, due to some procedures and events, this impacted the state's state security. The ethnic turbulence in two parts of the countries for example with a large Hungarian minority in Transylvania, the newly-formed transitional government well-thought-out the creation of an intelligence system to be essential. The establishing one provision was out of the question; a return to an awareness of power was not what the Romanian individuals wanted after the removal from the power of the communist regime. The government determined to segregate the former intelligence segment into several agencies (Szabo, 2002, pp. 3–5).

The combined international delegation handover report from the May 1990 elections concluded that the first post-communist round of elections was but a first footstep in Romania's political expansion and development. Two joint delegations visited Romania in February, and September 1992

felt that those elections were again tentative steps in an unfinished procedure. Two schools of thought emerged on the election and political reform in the country. The recent elections were a convincingly successful effort under the fear of circumstances since the government has been anxious with more instant crises and has not had a true prospect to embark upon a programme of elementary political reform. The government held elections for an exercise in legitimacy rather than an exercise in choice, opening the political development and electoral process immediate sufficient to gain the valuable endorsement of western powers.

The movement started on behalf of student organisations during the vacuum of power, and it had become the main opponent post-communist National Salvation Front lead government in Romania. The initial movement was focused on Bucharest, and well-thought-out and well organised in two main collective movement organisations, the Students' League (fundamental sector) and the Students' Union (Siani 2005, p. 232). The first appropriate protests led by students were organised on January 29th and February 9th, 1990 and called for the democratisation of the mass media, and mainly broadcasted by television (Ibid, pp. 234–235). The most significant protest that happened was the occupation of the square in front of the National Salvation Front head office to maintain for privileged rejuvenation, almost the National Salvation Front to renounce participation in the first free and open elections. Even even though Iliescu received them and discussed their claims, the National Salvation Front finally decided to participate in elections (Ibid, pp. 244–246). This student movement well-organised protest was one of the major events of the sequence of mobilisations against the neo-communist elites in Romania. Though, a few more supplementary and touching protest was planned by students on 22nd April 1990. A quantity of a few hundred students organised a protest march at the University of Bucharest to ask the National Salvation Front to accept the Timisoara Proclamation (a pro-democratic document). This protest was neglected by the National Salvation Front and had not persuaded on the transition process in the country (Tismaneanu 1998).

In the 1991 referendum held in the country, Romania had adopted a new constitution. During 1990 and 1992, Iliescu had won popular elections across the country. In the meantime, the National Salvation Front

divided between the more reform- liberal-oriented groups headed by Petre Roman (he was Prime Minister, 1990–1991). Iliescu's Democratic Party was renamed the Party of Romanian Social Democracy (PDSR). The split between the former allies was deep and resulted in Roman's increasing rapprochement with the anti-communist coalition gaining people's supports it was increasing day by day. Unluckily, the 1996–2000 government was not well-prepared, both in favour of citizens of the country as regards the priorities of reform and the human resources needed for implementing the changes required, it did not happen. The extensive development of poverty, because of mainly to slow rate of economic reform, created a national economic black hole in the country. Reconciliation with the past through right of entry to elderly paperwork from the 'Securitate' was enabled just following the 1996–2000 term of office.

The substance of the new law has offended many people in all fields, and the present government has promised to control the activities of the institution accountable for its submission of application. The 1996–2000 term of office enclosed several decisive moments for the self-governing and reformist interest group and their movement. Since the early commencement of the socio-political transition and reform, those two first political movements never embarked on promoting any form of realistic political affairs but as a substitute adopted counterproductive and prejudiced strategies. The ideological differences or debates on programmes and policies between left and right, between the former communists and the historical parties, had been replaced by an ongoing provocative argument over the country's communist and pre-communist regime. This separation persisted from beginning to end four elections 1990, 1992, 1996 and 2000 and produced a widespread condition of 'polarised pluralism in Romania'. The unbalanced political atmosphere that conquered the 1996–2000 episode of the centre-right democratic convention command government was a cause of sober concern within the European Union. The progress reports emphasised Romania's general lack of awareness concerning both political and economic conditions in the country.

The concept of 'civil society is not new to the literature in social sciences. It has been used by many political thinkers, among them Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, De Tocqueville, Hegel, Marx, and Gramsci. Neverthe-

less, many have interpreted 'civil society' differently, making it one of the most changeable terms in academic literature (Seligman, 1992). Moreover, only since Cohen's and Arato's 'Civil Society and Political Theory (1992) has the academic debate truly focused on the civil society's role in the promotion of democratic regimes (Dryzek, 1996, pp. 475–478). It is distinctive from 'society' in universal in that it implicates citizens acting together co-operatively in a public circle to prompt their interests, passions, and ideas, exchange information, achieve mutual goals, make demands on the state, and hold state representatives responsible (Diamond 1992, pp. 12–16). Civil society is often referred to as a 'democratic' phenomenon, but this is by no means a pre-requisite derived from many of the popular definitions. Account of civil society as necessarily pluralist in the liberal democratic sense, and the outright exclusion of religious fundamentalist, ethnic chauvinist, revolutionary or millenarian movements and other such organisations from the civil society phenomena is indeed an exception.

Some accounts of civil society even place it at the forefront of anti-democratic activity. In consequence, and by the method of rationality, civil society may take on one of four typical configurations: First, civil society organisations may actively and purposely seek to consolidate democracy. Such organisations have been labelled by Pedahzur (2002) as a 'pro-democratic' civil society. Second, organisations may act to achieve goals that are neither democratic nor undemocratic, but as long as these organisations are internally democratic, it may be assumed that they benefit democracy indirectly (perhaps by developing democratic norms, leadership, trust, social capital and so on). Third, organisations not seeking specific common democratic objectives may be inside unconstitutional democracy. The involvement of such organisations in democracy is more questionable. Finally, establishments may actively and intentionally seek to undermine democracy, as demonstrated by Booth and Richard (1998) in the concept of 'uncivil society'. These establishments, by their nature, make a negative contribution to a democratic polity (Zaidise, 2004, pp. 13–18).

Indeed, one of the complete accounts to date can still be found in the classic piece in which he lists no less than ten specific functions in which

civil society plays a crucial democratic role. The concept of civil society has been rediscovered in contemporary discourse concerning the relationship between democracy and governance. These are following points include:

the boundaries of state power;

1. The substitute networks for political participation, increasing the governmental efficiency and skilfulness of people, and encouraging a superior understanding of the rights and compulsions which make up democratic life;
2. The development and communication of democratic norms;
3. Channels for articulation, aggregation and representation of interest;
4. The mitigation in political conflict;
5. It provides training and experience for political leadership;
6. Non-biased monitoring of political activity and government;
7. The development and provision of information;
8. The formulation of political coalitions; and
9. The accretion of all earlier utilities, nonetheless, sometimes disturbing for the state, repeatedly strengthens it in the end. The 'total' encouragement, it can be said, is higher than the aggregated effect of the individual powers (Ibid, pp. 6–7).

As a result of the radical reforms and revolutions of 1989–1990 in East-Central Europe, new elites throughout the region have committed themselves to democratise political life in their countries. The reconstitution of civil society as a step-in creating forms of authority dependent on societal consent is an essential part of this process. Civil society is a necessary condition for democratic government. Civil society has also been acclaimed as playing a decisive role in the upsetting of dictatorial regimes in the Eastern Europe and as we in Romania (Nicholson, 2006, pp. 66–74). The conventional view is that civil society was weak and unorganised with no international contacts throughout Ceausescu's regime in Romania and to facilitate it was equally neither here nor there during the transition period. Even though there was no pro-democracy movement emerged, there were imperative troublemaking events that sometimes occurred that impacted elite attitude (Ekiert, 1991, pp. 285–288). Inside this context of

weak civil society, the trade unions were organising a protest against Ceausescu authoritarian rule. Nevertheless, there is no in order about waves of strikes or the similar larger labour and civil movement. The only strong labour movement happened against the government in the Transylvania region which is the cultural city, Brasov. During the 1990s, market fundamentalism shaped Romania's economic policies and promoted a dichotomous state-market model where the state plays an increasingly small part in public service provision and where market exchanges support profit-driven economic activities (Siani, 2005).

Over the last 25 years, civil society organisations have considerably increased in number while legitimising and consolidating their presence in the public space. The population has greater access to a variety of services offered by associations and foundations. Romanians' enrolment and participation in parents' associations, clubs and mutual aid associations has increased considerably. Those types of associations allow citizens to pursue their interests, passions and hobbies. At the same time, the associations facilitate the participation of their members in broad public consultation processes on topics of general or community interest. In the course of the last two decades, public trust in the roles and utility of the associations and foundations has followed a steady ascending trend. Thus, the level of confidence in associations and foundations were 19 percent in 1998 and 26 percent in 2004 (Soros Barometer, 1997–2010) and even reached 32 percent in 2010 (Omnibus research, CSDF 2010). At the beginning of the 1990s, the development of civil society organisations was characterised by a democratic enthusiasm that manifested itself in a dramatic increase in the registration of non-governmental structures, free labour unions and new political parties as an expression of the freedom of association. Tumultuous political and civic activism characterised that period. Like other CEE countries, Romania is a post-totalitarian society where we have witnessed a civil society boom that arose to fill the gaps left in the economy and state social welfare system. The Johns Hopkins comparative study conducted in 1996 described the non-governmental sector in Romania as one of the smallest, not for profit sectors in Eastern and Central Europe, not only by Romanian commercial standards but also about its international counterparts (Compton, 2006).

Due to the symbolic and vague nature of the constitution (of December 1991), the separation of powers is not explicit, nor are the prerogatives of various state institutions. The President Romanian constitution of 1991 allowed for a powerful presidency, where he had the power to dissolve parliament. The debate on whether Romania should have a more parliamentary or a more presidential system is still a salient issue today, and is perhaps one of the main reasons why the Judiciary is becoming increasingly politicised and less independent. Another important reason is the high level of competition and polarisation within the legislature, and within the executive, which makes it more difficult for the government to pass legislation. However, this also indicates that the legislature is relatively independent and able to hold the executive accountable. As a consequence of this development, an increasing number of political issues are being decided upon in the courts. Thus, the independence of the judiciary has decreased, severely weakening the ability of the judicial system to hold the executive accountable (Stan, 2012, pp. 274–278).

The final two trends refer to the respondents' expectations about the consistent professionalisation of the non-governmental sector, integrating highly qualified human resources, possibly with experience working in international business organisations. In the early 1990s, the non-governmental sector in Romania, which was in its early stages of development at the time, lacked information, expertise and experience, as it was dependent on training programs proposed and funded by international organisations and trainers. Nowadays, numerous specialised resource centres and several local networks of trainers provide capacity-building opportunities and counselling for organisations and interested citizens. Access to information (Papadimitriou-Phinnemore, 2004, pp. 619–623).

CONCLUSION

The parliamentary elections held first time after post-communist Romania in 1990 it was the first step toward political development in the country. According to the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the International Republican Institute's reports on Romania, the early

1990's scenario indicated social, political and economic instability. The communist regime didn't take the initiative to conduct elections and decisions on political reform in the country. The state institutions were not to function for people's development in Romania. After the 1992 and 1996 elections, Romania returned to a system of fragmented situations and political instability across the country. Since the 2000 parliamentary elections, Romania emerged as single-party domination. The situation has changed in the country during the 2004 and 2008 parliamentary elections in Romania; the time of coalition government came to power. Although, the country was being transformed into democratic institutions when the country conducted successful parliamentary elections. After the successful elections in the country, it doesn't take guarantee for political stability and the success of all efforts in the country. The Romanian political class still need to take strong initiative toward the establishment of political institutions in the country. The European Union has been played a vital role to force the countries to adopt the norms of democracy and building strong welfare institutions in their countries. The Eastward enlargement was historic for East and Central European countries when at least ten members states became full-fledged members of the European Union on 1st May 2004 and later on 1st January 2007 Romania and Bulgaria became a member of the union.

Romania has several problems in the country e.g., corruption and organised crime. Many things are there where the country needs to work the eradicate the problems. Although Visegrad countries pave the institutions across several fields according to the need of the people in their countries. EU political conditionality has been a powerful but not always effective instrument to promote democratic standards in candidate countries. In the light of EU's conditionality to promote democratisation is not fully guarantee that country will fully understand on the criteria. In the Romanian case, there is a lack of weakness in the political institutions to follow the standards of democratisation of the country. Democratisation is still fragile in the country even after joining the EU. This research concludes, finally, there is necessary to continue the work on the promotion of Romanian democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Ágh, A. (1998). *The politics of central Europe*. Sage.

Agh, A. (2002). *From nomenclature to clientura: The emergence of new political elites in east-central Europe*. Routledge, pp. 58–82.

Agh, A. (2016). The deconsolidation of democracy in East-Central Europe: The new world order and the EU's geopolitical crisis, *Politics in Central Europe*, *12*(3), pp. 7–36.

Antohi, S. et al. (2004). *Romania since 1989*.

Bratic, V. (2008). Local Self-government in Central and Eastern Europe: A Strong and Independent Local-level Management Tool or Just a Paper Tiger? *Financial Theory and Practice, 32,* No. 2, pp. 139–157.

Criste, M. (2020). Judicial Review: A Disputed Competence in the Romanian Legal System. *Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze , 4*(48), pp. 56–68.

Cunningham, F. (2002). *Theories of Democracy A critical introduction*, Routledge, London.

Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Dahrendorf, R. (1992). Reflections on the Revolution in Europe; in a letter intended to have been sent to a Gentleman in Warsaw. London: Chatto and Windus.

Daianu, M. D. (1994). *The Changing Mix of Disequilibria During Transition: A Romanian Background*. International Monetary Fund.

Deletant, D. (1996). *Ceausescu and the securitate: Coercion and dissent in Romania,* pp. 1965–1989.

Deletant, D. (2017). Romania: reflections on the street protests and the country's communist past. *LSE European Politics and Policy (EUROPP) Blog*.

Diamond, L. (1992). Introduction: Civil society and the struggle for democracy. In *The democratic revolution: Struggles for freedom and democracy in the developing world*, p. 1–27.

Dorneanu, V, & Marieta, S. (2015). Constitutional Court of Romania: The Requirements for the Registration of a Political Party. *ICL Journal, 9,* 4, pp. 612–620.

Dryzek, J. S. (1996). Political inclusion and the dynamics of democratization. *American Political Science Review, 90*, 3, pp. 475–487.

Ekiert, G. (1991). Democratization processes in East Central Europe: A theoretical reconsideration. *British Journal of Political Science, 21*, 3, pp. 285–313.

Emerson, M. (2005). *Democratisation in The European Neighbourhood.* Centre for European Policy Studies Brussels.

European Parliament (2018). *Prospects for e-democracy in Europe, Case studies*. Retrieved from: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/603213/EPRS_STU(2018)603213(ANN2)_EN.pdf.

Giurescu, D. C. (1980). Romania and the Crisis of 1876–78 in South-eastern Europe. *South-eastern Europe, 7,* 1, pp. 205–213.

Goudenhooft, G. (2015). The Romanian Constitutional Discourse Between Modernization and Europeanisations. *Europolity-Continuity and Change in European Governance, 9,* 1, pp. 67–87.

Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century*. Vol. 4. University of Oklahoma Press.

I.I.R, Press's Role, Romania's Transition to Democracy.

Ionescu, M. E. (2004). The Balkans after the 2004 Enlargement of NATO and the European Union *Connections, 3,* 2, pp. 115–120.

Ionescu, M. E. (2017). Romania's Position Towards the Evolution of the Transatlantic Link after 11 September 2001. In *Old Europe, New Europe and the US,* Routledge, pp. 259–280.

Jim, C. (2006). The struggle for civil society in post-revolution Romania. *The Seattle Times* (October 22nd, 2006).

King, R. F. (2016). Ivan Major and Cosmin Gabriel Marian. Confusions in the Anti-commons. *J. Pol. & L., 9,* 64.

Kitschel, H. (1992). The formation of party systems in East-Central Europe. *Politics & Society*, *20*(1), pp. 7–50.

Kitschelt, H. (1995). Formation of party cleavages in post-communist democracies: Theoretical propositions, *Party politics, 1,* 4, pp. 447–472.

Lipset, S. M. (1994). The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited. 1993 Presidential Address'. *American Sociological Review, 59,* pp. 1–22.

Mair, P. (1997). *Party system change: approaches and interpretations*. Oxford University Press.

Marszałek-Kawa, J., Plecka, D. (ed). (2019). *The Dictionary of Political Knowledge*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Muica, F. Z. (2018). The Head of State in Romanian Constitutionalism–Between A Monarch and A President. *Curentul Juridic, 72,* 1 pp. 67–77.

Nicholson, E. (2006). Civil society and the Media in Romania. *The EU and Romania: Accession and Beyond, London: Federal Trust*, pp. 64–77.

Papadimitriou, D., & Phinnemore, D. (2004). Europeanization, conditionality and domestic change: The twinning exercise and administrative reform in Romania. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 42,* 3, pp. 619–639.

Pridham, G. (2007). The Effects of the European Union's Democratic Conditionality: The Case of Romania during Accession. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics, 23,* 2, pp. 233–258. doi:10.1080/13523270701317505.

Quinn, P. M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (third edition). London, New Delhi: Sage.

Saramet, O. (2016). Powers of the President of Romania in Relationship with Government. *AGORA Int'l J. Jurid. Sci.* p. 23.

Sartori, G. (2003). *Qué es la democracia*? Madrid: Taurus.

Siani-Davies, P. (2005). *The Romanian revolution of december 1989*. Cornell University Press.

Stan, L., & Turcescu, L. (2005). The devil's confessors: priests, communists, spies, and informers. *East European Politics and Societies, 19,* 4, pp. 655–685.

Stan, L., & Zaharia, R. (2018). Romania: Political development and data for 2017. *European Journal of Political Research Political Data Yearbook, 57,* 1, pp. 244–254.

Stan, L. (2010). Romania: In the shadow of the past. *Central and Southeast European Politics since 1989*, pp. 379–400.

Stan, L. (2012). Witch-hunt or moral rebirth? Romanian parliamentary debates on lustration. *East European Politics and Societies*, *26*(2), pp. 274–295.

Szabo, K. F. (2002). Parliamentary Overview of Intelligence Services in Romania. In *Makalah untuk Workshop Democratic and Parliamentary Oversight of Intelligence Services.* Geneva, pp. 3–5.

Tismaneanu, V. (1998). *Communism and post-communism in Romania: Challenges to democratic transition*. National Council for Eurasian and East European Research.

Tismaneanu, V. (2003). *Stalinism for all seasons: a political history of Romanian communism* (Vol. 11). Univ of California Press.

Tismaneanu, V. (2008). Democracy and memory: Romania confront its communist past. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *617*, 1, pp. 166–180.

Vasile, V., & Dobre, A. M. (2015). Overview of demographic evolution in Romania. *Romanian Statistical Review, 4,* pp. 27–45.

Zaidise, E. (2004). The Role of Civil Society in Developing and Consolidating Democracy: Evidence from Israel. In *Uppsala, Sweden: In European Consortium for Political Research Workshop,* pp. 13–18.