

Brave New World

**Romanian Migrants'
Dream Houses**



Brave New World

Romanian Migrants' Dream Houses

Edited by Raluca Betea and Beate Wild

Bucharest 2016

CIP Description of the National Library of Romania

Brave New World – Romanian Migrants' Dream Houses

ed.: Raluca Betea, Beate Wild. – Bucharest: Romanian Cultural Institute, 2016

Includes bibliographical references

ISBN 978-973-577-679-4

I. Betea, Raluca (ed.)

II. Wild, Beate (ed.)

314.7

Generously supported by



Contents

- 4** Dreams Realised
The Exhibition Project
Beate Wild

The Exhibition

- 10** Exhibition Concept
Xaver Victor Schneider

Essays

- 40** Romanian Migration and the Construction Boom:
Multidisciplinary Perspectives
Raluca Betea

Migration and Social Recognition

- 48** Reading a House.
Migration, Households and Modernity
in Post-communist Rural Romania
Vintilă Mihăilescu

- 58** Prestige or Economic Calculus?
Reflections on Migrants' Houses in Romania
Remus Gabriel Anghel

- 68** From Occidental Houses to *case făloase*.
Material Cultures of Success in Oaş Country, Romania
Daniela Moisa

Transnational Dimensions

- 84** Reflections on the State's Role in the Development-
Migration Nexus: Romania at the Turn of Millennium
Romana Careja

- 94** "We feel at home, away from home."
Changing Domestic and Public Spaces
between Romania and Italy
Pietro Cingolani

- 106** Objects that Travel with Emigrants from Maramureș
Anamaria Iuga

- 118** The Left-Behind Kids are Alright
Lina Vdovii

- 124** Photographing the New Romanian Village
Petruț Călinescu

Urban Architecture in a Rural Setting

- 134** Houses of Cajvana:
Concrete Past, Uncertain Future
Amelia Tue

- 146** The Transformation Experienced in the Domestic
Space of Romanian Migrants' Homeland:
the Village of Marginea
Andra Jacob Larionescu

- 156** Travelling in Architecture through Europe
Rudolf R. Gräf

The Old vs a New Cultural Landscape

- 170** Assembled Territories.
Constructing Houses, Socialising
Resources in Moisei, Maramureș
Iulia Hurducaș

- 178** Rural Landscape and Migration
Mihaela A. Hărmănescu

- 186** The Changing Face of Bukovina.
The Transformation of the Cultural Landscape
Carmen Chașovschi

- 198** Biographies

- 200** Impressum

Rural Landscape and Migration

Mihaela A. Hărmănescu

Migration within Europe and between Europe and other parts of the world is a major driver of population change and has far-reaching effects on land use (Bell et al. 2010). In Romania, the rural landscape is most affected and is now in a delicate position. Its *fragile identity* highlights the dangers faced by the authentic rural in terms of the new dynamics taking place within the rural landscape, as different patterns emerge due to the migration phenomenon. This paper reflects on the new directions the rural landscape is presently taking as a result of migration, seen through the lens of various disciplines (ecology, architecture, urbanism, culture, etc.), as well as the increasingly blurred relationships evolving between these spheres.

Inhabiting the landscape

Throughout history, the landscape has been translated through signs, images, and material symbols in paintings, texts, maps, photos, and other representations, and can be understood as the relationship between human beings and the space they occupy. Oscillating between artistic practices and scientific knowledge, the landscape evolves around a pluralistic concept of the interconnectedness of humans, nature and culture, bringing into the discussion a multitude of ideas and representations, including the following: 1) The habitat is the social setting in which people exchange signs and ideas. 2) The social setting that expresses a landscape is created through the relationship established between representations of an image and its material and social reality, a source of tension and conflict that gives rise to actions in the landscape that are materialised through a given plan or project (without this tension between the idea and reality, landscape issues would not exist as a social fact). 3) The project, i.e., the intention for the landscape, forms the identity of an individual or group of individuals – and thus the landscape becomes a relationship between culture and society.

The concept of landscape is in a sense a progression of a society, derived from the cultural diversity of the community. In other words, it is its linkage with space and nature that gives rise to social constructions and is conditioned by the rules of use of the area as they evolve over time. The issues that develop here consist more in the dimension of objective practices carried out in the landscape, in its materially irreducible aspect, and especially in terms of space. The landscape's value is not considered first and foremost from an aesthetic point of view, but is rather considered in relation to the number of experiments, customs, and practices that a human group has developed in that particular place. This implies, in the end, a relaxation of the distinction between the artistic sphere itself and the social and cultural ones. The landscape is not nature, but instead the human world, emerging as a transformation of nature. A mixed world, in this sense, neither entirely natural, nor entirely human, but both natural and human. Humanised nature, naturalised humanity: The landscape is a kind of ontological reality in its own right, with a space and time of its own. "A landscape is not a natural feature of the environment, but a synthetic space, a man-made system of spaces superimposed on the face of the land, functioning and evolving according to natural laws, but to serve a community ... A landscape is a space created in order to speed up or to slow down the natural process ...

As Mircea Eliade expresses it, it represents man taking upon himself the role of time" (Jackson 1984). The landscape is an organised space that is made and designed by people on the surface of the earth. The landscape is a collective work of the community that transforms the natural substrate; it is a cultural production, but culture as considered here on the material and spatial levels, that is, as it is incorporated into works and productions of all kinds.

We no longer see the landscape, "as separate from our everyday life, and, in fact, we believe that now as being part of a landscape, to develop our identity is a fundamental condition for our being in the world, in the most solemn sense of the word" (Jackson 1984).

Contemporary rural landscape

The social and cultural forces associated with globalisation have joined the local practices within territories and generated major changes in the rural landscape, diminishing the distinctive aspects which have created the spirit of these places (ICOMOS 2008). These transformations have, in a relatively short period of time, brought about a new series of severe modifications of a lifestyle which was once considered idyllic and romantic. The indigenous rural landscape is now in a delicate position, and its *fragile identity* is vulnerable to the dangers faced by the authentic rural in terms of the new dynamics of the rural landscape, according to the territorial context, its degree of development, sustainability, memory, heritage and tradition, as well as cultural, social and economic elements. Rapid industrialisation, the accelerated rhythm of everyday life and a decrease in the quality of the collective's life have all intensified as the society moves towards faster informational and technological systems. Therefore, the actual rural landscape comprises all existing past or possible rural images and is under the imperative of evolutionary law.

Meanwhile, between rural societies and the territory that has been exploited in the past and present, a very deep bond is established and strengthened by activities, customs and very diverse interests for economic, political and socio-cultural reasons. Nevertheless, the rural landscape supports a certain type of social existence, a basis for human life and food and industrial resources. Therefore, we can state that within a rural landscape we can more clearly see how a community exploits a territory through means conditioned by technical, social, legal and historic factors, leaving a characteristic imprint on the rural landscape, which turns it into what we call a 'cultural landscape'. The value of the contemporary rural landscape can be defined in diverse, often contradictory ways, all related to its level of support for human activities that modify the environment depending on their needs. These different attitudes start from the idea that the landscape is intrinsic to culture in its representations of human relations with and in environment contexts, but one factor that has changed constantly is the *definition of culture*. We can examine the idea of landscape as a statement on its perceived cultural meaning (Glassie 1975) at any historic moment. The meaning provided through human activity shows that rural landscape patterns are influenced by a number of social driving forces, such as accessibility, urbanisation and globalisation (Antrop 2005), demography, technology, economy, political and social institutions, culturally determined attitudes, beliefs and behaviour, and information and its flow (Agarwal et al. 2003, 36). People modify the land for their purposes and, in turn, reap a series of benefits from the environment and landscape, which are then faced with increasing processes of degradation that come as a result of excessive modification. Such modification brings with it dangers and disadvantages to many areas, along with the cultural, historical and identity-based values inherent in them. Some of the most common effects of these changes are the profound alienation and fragmentation of the rural landscape.

Migration and rural landscape in transition

The political changes that took place in Romania in 1989 spurred economic, social and cultural transformations on both urban and rural levels, and both spheres have undergone a series of dramatic changes. These transformations have generated new patterns of landscape development (through sprawl and depopulation), as well as new patterns of mobility for populations and activities.

The most representative process that has affected Romanian space in the last two decades is the accelerated development of different activities, including migration. Economic factors, such as the loss of jobs and closure of industries in which most people worked, have prompted young rural people to move to Western Europe in search of seasonal or permanent employment, so that the number of people who leave the villages is higher than those already in cities. Because of this mass exodus, there is a considerable number of abandoned households and plots of productive agricultural land. Therefore, these demographic aspects along with accelerated development have extended these processes to rural territories and settlements, which are now threatened with losing their attractiveness due to increased consumption of the landscape. This will impact the evolution and dynamics of the landscape, whether we term it 'land use' or a 'cultural landscape'.

Migration results in the depopulation of different areas, creating a smaller or non-existent workforce against the background of various national and global contexts. Depopulation primarily affects poor villages and small towns with slower economies, and is a visible phenomenon that has accompanied human society from the beginning of its history and still continues to occur due to social and economical reasons, environmental issues and conflicts, as well as a lack of preventive policies and knowledge.

Since migration was recognised as an intrinsic part of global development and as encouraging "cooperation and dialogue between countries of origin and countries of destination in order to maximize the benefits of migration for the development of both sending and receiving countries" (United Nations 2004), different patterns can be observed in the more accessible parts of the landscape, in the areas to which people decide to return. Land use is in the process of being modernised, following a trend of built environments and agricultural intensification similar to those previously observed in Western Europe. "International migration" is considered "to be a positive force for development in both countries of origin and countries of destination, provided that it [is] supported by the right set of policies" (United Nations 2006). It encourages an understanding of how globalisation processes have an impact in reshaping rural economics, societies and culture, and how rural communities respond to these changes and challenges. The rural landscape is also influenced by political decisions, however, so that migration influences development under the umbrella of land-use planning and produces radical changes to the landscape over time.

The lack of literature available on the history and evolution of rural landscape dynamics makes it difficult to uncover all of the relevant questions regarding the relationship between migration, environment and landscape. In recent decades, however, one perspective focusing on rural national heritage has highlighted the actual landscape's impact and acted as a starting point for future research. The variety of impacts which migration has had and continues to have on the landscape and on land use has started to become a matter of both local and national interest.

The impact on the rural landscape is perceived all the way down from the regional to the domestic scale (Paquette and Domon 2003). Thus, migration provides directions and perspectives from which to shape the landscape by conducting a scale analysis, reading the various

dynamics, and identifying changes made by human activity through an assessment that takes into account the macro-, mezzo- and micro-scales (Härmănescu 2015a). Regardless of scale, an analysis of the reorganisation of a landscape is based on two levels: the morphology of the territory, and technological processes that occur on top of the morphology. Differentiation is carried out by examining specific interventions and peculiarities of the territory at hand. Transforming the landscape on the macro-scale is directly related to spatial planning, with all of its characteristics, and clarifies the various approaches and positions of its characteristics in relation to the wider landscape issues at play in the area. It focuses on migration resulting from environmental destruction and landscape changes. New communication corridors open up the territory and offer some new possibilities to build environments and extend settlements that lead to changes in how the land is used. Landscape transformation on the micro- and mezzo-scales involves geomorphological configurations, and interactions between society and culture are focused on the community and local materials (Härmănescu 2015b); therefore, landscape changes can be identified as the result of migration.

Landscape characteristics undergoing change

In Romania, in the first few years after 1990, particularly residents from urban areas migrated abroad. A veritable "explosion" in external migration was recorded from 2000–2001, when it produced a "massification migration", which led to a large number of the rural population leaving to work abroad (Sandu 2006). Romania has a population that is 45% rural (INS 2010), an area which is almost 50% rural land, and over a third of the country's households have had at least one member absent and working abroad since 1989 (Sandu 2006).

Rural migration is a response to the need for 'good living', and those who return home translate these needs into "stately houses" – imported or copied products with forms that are strongly related to the patterns of cultural behaviour they 'absorbed' from their 'adopted' country abroad. These houses symbolise their owners' social recognition that they require when returning home, and legitimise their success in the work completed abroad. In every village affected by migration, there is just such a house, one that has become a model for other houses, whose function lies in attaining the community's recognition for their owners as 'good householders'. Highlighting the fact that, in rural areas, a household's configuration is based on the human – landscape relationship realised in terms of continued adaptation to the inhabited space, landscape processing is the key to sustainable development. If rules are born naturally, they are also reborn periodically. The extent to which people benefit from the environment depends on the ecosystem itself, but also on how it is governed and on the values and beliefs of the local people. The relationship between local people and the environment appears to be evolving towards a preference for those elements of the ecosystem that promise a monetary benefit, and therefore the new houses are *changing the rural landscape* in the following ways:

1) The rural landscape loses some of its traditional identity and specific vernacular household typology, where local identity is determined by the indigenous landscape. This scenery is the spatial translation of migrants' lifestyles, beliefs and knowledge, as well as cross-connections between various cultures from their past and present (Luengo 2012) and from their native and host countries. The transformation of existing households is carried out through one of the following intervention strategies: a) keeping the old house and building a new one in the household garden and redefining the space, or b) adjoining a new building to the old and/or demolishing the old house and losing the household's traditional character. These changes

involve a new use of the existing household through changing the structures' use functions, and also by replacing the old garden with an 'urban' or 'decorative' garden.

One of the most urgent needs of human beings is a sense of identity, of belonging to a place (Luengo 2012), and further needs for modernisation and emancipation lead to changes in everyday life, to borrowing urban habits and abandoning rural ones. Household emancipation leads to changes in specific practices and a reorganisation of its 'production micro-units' into a different usage model, with radical, leisure-oriented changes appearing in the rural landscape. A garden in this landscape no longer boasts a specific use function, and, in the best-case scenario, is replaced by a space for contemplation, for 'taking in the view' or an aesthetic space, a joyful space, featuring influences from migration territories, from urbanisation and commercialisation as processes of globalisation.

Migration has also brought along with it new species of plants and animals from the migrants' host countries into their native landscape, which has an impact on the cultural landscape, resulting in a stylisation of hybrid cultural forms in both nature and society.

2) New households or farms are built, incorporating agricultural land, vineyards, orchards and forests, reducing and fragmenting the productive landscape. The new additions, depending on their position inside or outside of the settlement and the type of landscape in which they are found, may disturb the ecosystem and lead to natural hazards and climate-change effects due to the lack of geomorphological integration and lack of land-use maintenance. The consumption of the countryside includes not only the growth of recreation, but also of the purchase of rural properties for tourism and/or holidays (Woods 2011).

3) New constructions often fail to comply with the urban planning indications of the General Urbanism Plan, especially pertaining to the following specifications regarding building alignment and removal, building height, natural elements' settlement report (sun, slope integration), land occupancy, land-use coefficients, rhythm, colours, etc.

4) The loss of rural specificity and identity is an additional result, leading to irreversible or unmanageable changes in the landscape, fragmenting the spatial structure of rural dwellings. Starting from the premise that the rural landscape is made up of geographical areas whose characteristics have a value for society as a result of human-environment interaction nature's effect on humans emphasises the fact that the relationship between humans and nature is not purely subjective but also influences the physical, psychological, sensorial and emotional condition of human beings (Jackson 1959). In addition, the social sphere can modify the cultural sphere when the former loses its interest in the latter, thereby manipulating the population to act against cultural realities.

5) Different forms of tourism arise through the transformation of local households, usually in easily accessible areas and areas with cultural heritage landmarks, in turn developing infrastructure and changing settlement typologies. Increased urbanisation is closely linked with increased territorial mobility (Antrop 2005), generating new uses for infrastructure, new modes of transportation, and new development patterns within the landscape.

The depopulation and migration lead to land abandonment, while elsewhere the influence of global economic trends can cause land-use intensification and landscape simplification or even generate large areas of 'monocultures'. Monoculture land use is not traditional and does not play an important role for the conservation of either cultural traditions or biodiversity. Although land abandonment could support the eventual recovery of natural ecosystems in the short term, it poses a threat to farmland biodiversity. First, abandoned land gradually

turns into shrub land or forest, which is detrimental to species that depend on low-intensity farmland for their survival. Second, land that has previously been used for agriculture is at high risk of invasion by introduced plant species (Loos et al. 2016). Therefore, abandoning productive lands and pastures and trivialising the productive space makes it difficult to maintain them, and the trend results in the transformation of agricultural and livestock areas into spaces featuring leisure functions and non-agricultural activities. These changes identified in the rural landscape result in transforming or losing some specific compositional aesthetic and ecological attributes. These functional transformations are better highlighted by the households' lot typologies, which suffer structural transformations: the lots are decomposing, only to recompose into new lots with areas adapted to new functions, a process that also generates a number of unused or inaccessible lots. Because the landscape exists as a living and dynamic entity that forms the basis of a society's identity, the settlement pattern is changing from an integrated part of the indigenous landscape to more independent forms, subject to new rules encouraging individual efficiency and comfort.

Local architecture goes from one discrete state embodying the spirit of a place (ICOMOS 2008) to a new architecture that highlights the complex interrelation of the different cultural identities mentioned above, and does not respect the regional development strategies and the urban planning stipulations governing rural settlements. The widespread distribution of the new architecture is linked to the process of migration and its corresponding affected areas (Vellinga et al. 2007), as well as the use of building materials and resources, technologies or service systems, building forms and types, and decorative motifs and symbolic associations (Antrop 2005).

The use of imported materials and the need to meet new requirements leads to a reconfiguration of the rural landscape, one which tends to be banal and loses its identity and heritage. As architecture is the primary engine driving the creation of the landscape, the landscape becomes the primary engine for the development of the territory, as was mentioned in the introduction. This mechanism highlights the evolutionary process of the landscape and its concurrent sustainability and ecology issues, as well as social, economic and/or political problems.

A phenomenon of relatively short duration, these changes destroy the cultural stratification of time, and any new vocabulary introduced into this dialogue between built and natural environments can radically change the current linguistic understanding of the rural landscape. Contemporary rural space becomes predominantly an area of mono-production, with less space for traditional living, historically embedded in complex interconnections beyond the physical structures, including psycho-socio-cultural connections. Hence, the conclusion is that it is now more difficult to value the practical use functions of a rural area when the entire focus on practical approaches has become a memory of the past. One of the key drivers of modernisation in this area is a weak legislation which itself generates many of these changes. Migration of this kind is associated with urban planning regulations and provisions that actually create these changes in the landscape.

The evaluation of policies concerned with the rural landscape plays a marginal role in government, even in individual cases, compared to the country's many other priorities. In Romania, the European Landscape Convention is the only document "to promote landscape protection, management and planning, and to organise European cooperation on landscape issues" (Council of Europe 2000: Art. 3), and essentially aims to bridge past and future landscapes, but is not very specific on how to proceed. The variety and dynamics of the landscape are not given attention from the corpus of regulation documentation and do not fall into a category demanding mandatory protection. Most of the time, the landscape is mentioned only in general, and specific objectives are described by vague statements of principle and only in a few cases are specific terms and relevant aspects defined at all.

Lack of policy in the field of landscape planning results in irretrievable loss, proving even disastrous over the long term. Even changes related to the field of migration are elements that easily transform a village or town and, by implication, the landscape. Such interventions end up generating decomposition and fragmentation of the territory, and with it a loss of the natural ecosystem.

Conclusions

Many specific ecosystem components and landscape elements depend on certain types of human intervention. Today, cultural landscapes play an important role for the conservation of both human traditions and natural biodiversity. However, around the world, traditional, rural cultural landscapes are vanishing as a result of a myriad of socio-economic and ecological changes, while rapid changes in land use threaten biodiversity at the same time.

Anyone can participate spontaneously in the construction of the landscape, even in the absence of a coherent project envisioning the constructed landscape as a perceived and enriched space. By making the space vernacular, builders produce transformations both *in situ* and *in visu* – *in situ*, through direct effects on the spatial morphology, and *in visu* through an affirmation and a reading of the space as a grid made up of distinct models of the landscape. It becomes a landscape experienced through several different individual or collective models of understanding that exist alongside official models. This occurs because the place's image also reveals the individual's everyday experience of life: the material and emotional framework embedded in the space, the specific spirit of the place (Lobbel 1979, cited in Machedon 2006). The community which creates this landscape brings into it also the problems of identity and belonging, in a sense "landscaping" them into the inhabited space (Tudora 2006). Therefore, it reflects a common experience of a population in a certain territory, but also a certain way of life, of perceiving the exterior world, shared by people for whom connection with a territory has no relevance. From a migration perspective, it can be noticed that there is no single overarching vision for the contemporary rural landscape, because the way human activity affects the nature and the traces it leaves behind vary depending on the necessities and desires of society, which have changed especially over the last few decades. The rural landscape is a balance between the physical, aesthetic and social spaces, definable as a designed space, a lived space, or a perceived space (Lefebvre 1947). According to Lefebvre, a designed space is based on a series of representations of the space and the conventions of scientists and planners. The landscape is a place of conflict, a place of perpetual compromise (Jackson 1984), which we can consider as a sum of these three spaces.

The answer to the realities of the rural landscape highlights the disintegration of the community and its ways of life; traditional customs are rapidly changing within the current community. Behavioural mutations originating from outside interventions have and continue to erode the internal structures of the rural community, being in inadvertent contact with the inherited landscape: they remodel, build, modernise the landscape according to new human desires and understanding. Therefore, fewer rural settlements can sustain these massive changes and are evolving with the current landscape dynamics, offering new perspectives and receptivity to revealing possible future directions for development. The implications of migration for land-use change require further research and better data in order to ensure a more adequate level of certainty regarding ongoing trends.

References

- Agarwal, Chetan, Glen M. Green, J. Morgan Grove, Tom P. Evans, and Charles M. Schweik. 2002. "A Review and Assessment of Land-Use Change Models: Dynamics of Space, Time, and Human Choice." Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-297. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.
- Antrop, Marc. 2005. "Why Landscapes of the Past are Important for the Future?" *Landscape and Urban Planning* 70 (1–2): 21–34.
- Bell, Simon, Susana Alves, Eva Silveirinha de Oliveira, and Affonso Zuin. 2010. "Migration and Land Use Change in Europe: A Review." *Living Reviews in Landscape Research* 4 (2). <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrlr-2010-2>. Accessed 16 July 2016.
- Council of Europe. 2000. *The European Landscape Convention*: art. 3. Strasbourg.
- Glassie, Henry. 1975. *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Härmănescu, Mihaela. 2011. "The Landscape – a Made and Inhabited Territory in Dabija." In *Landscape – Architecture – Technology – Ambient*, ed. Ana-Maria, 103–112. Bucharest: "Ion Mincu" University Publishing House.
- Härmănescu, Mihaela. 2015a. *Patrimoniul și peisaj rural. Strategii de integrare și promovare [Heritage and Rural Landscape. Integration and Promotion Strategies]*. Bucharest: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române.
- Härmănescu, Mihaela, and Emil Sever Georgescu. 2015b. "Case Study: Local Seismic Culture in Romanian Vernacular Architecture." In *Seismic Retrofitting. Learning from Vernacular Architecture*, eds. Mariana R. Correia, Paulo B. Lourenço, and Humberto Varum, 117–118. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- ICOMOS. 2008. *About Saving the Spirit of a Place. Declaration of Québec Canada*.
- INS. 2010. *Anuarul statistic al României [Romanian Statistical Yearbook]*. Bucharest: INS Print.
- Jackson, John Brinkerhoff. 1984. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jackson, John Brinkerhoff. 1959. "The Imitation of Nature." *Landscape* 9 (1) Autumn: 9–12.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *La production de l'espace*. Anthropos: Paris.
- Loos, Jacqueline, David J. Abson, Ine Dorresteyn, Jan Hanspach, Tibor Hartel, Andra Ioana Horcea-Milcu, Friederike Mikulcak, Joern Fischer. 2016. *Sustainable Landscapes in Central Romania. A Social-Ecological Study on the Future of Southern Transylvania*. Lüneburg: Leuphana University Lüneburg.
- Luengo, Monica. 2012. "Looking Ahead: The Olive Grove Cultural Landscape". In: *ICOMOS 17th General Assembly, 2011–11–27 / 2011–12–02, 623–630*. Paris, France. [Conference or Workshop Item].
- Machedon, Florin. 2006. *Metodă de analiză morfologică a țesuturilor urbane [Method of Morphological Analysis of Urban Tissues]*. Bucharest: "Ion Mincu" University Publishing House.
- Paquette, Sylvain, and Gérald Domon. 2003. "Changing Ruralities, Changing Landscapes: Exploring Social Recomposition Using a Multiscale Approach." *Journal of Rural Studies* 19: 425–444.
- Sandu, Dumitru. Coord. 2006. *Locuirea temporară în străinătate. Migrația economică a românilor: 1990–2006 [Temporary Residence Abroad. Economic Migration of Romanians: 1990–2006]*. Bucharest: FDS.
- Tudora, Ioana. 2006. *Peisajul/peisajul urban: scurtă incursiune sau o încercare de definiție [Landscape/Urban Landscape – A Sneak Peek or an Attempted Definition]*. CNCSIS, Grant: Spațiul public și reinsertia socială a proiectului artistic și architectural. Artă, comunități urbane, mobilizare, Consorțiu Nr.23/2006. Bucharest: "Ion Mincu" University Publishing House.
- Vellinga Marcel, Paul Oliver, and Alexander Bridge. 2007. *Atlas of Vernacular Architecture of the World*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- United Nations publication. 2004. *The Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD)*. Sales No. E.95.XIII.18.
- United Nations publication. 2006. *First High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development*. United Nations, General Assembly Note, A/61/515.
- Woods, Michael. 2011. *Rural*. London: Routledge.



ISBN 978-973-577-679-4