CASE STUDIES

FELDIOARA: THE CITY COMES TO THE PEASANT

Steven Sampson

INTRODUCTION

During the last several years, numerous studies of social change have focused on village communities around the world. Typically, these studies of "social change in village X" describe the process whereby an isolated, "traditional" agrarian community based on crosscutting (multiplex) social ties becomes a "modern" heterogenous, semi-industrial community "integrated" within an international political and economic system. The upshot of this "rural revolution" (Halpern,1967) is the "inevitable" decrease of differences between life in the village and the cosmopolitan milieu of the town. Although a few scholars have explained the "traditional" poverty of communities in Asia, in Latin-America or the Mediterranean as being due not to their "isolation" from the world system (presumably being "progressively" rectified) but to their long contact with it – thus Frank's "development of underdevelopment" – the majority of anthropological studies have ignored this view [1].

Behind the social changes in "village X" are said to be the worldwide processes of "industrialization," "urbanization," and "modernization," the latter being ambiguously defined to include a complex of postwar changes as village and nation become increasingly "integrated." (See Tipps for a critique of "modernization" theory) [2]. Lately, anthropologists have extended their research scope to include not only people in the villages, but those who have left for the cities as well [3]. For most anthropologists, urbanization is equated with the migration of peasants to cities and the adaptations that take place among urban migrants [4]. Such studies make passing mention of how that complex of lifeways called "urbanism" is "penetrating" the village in the spheres of communication (radios), transportation (bus routes), or education (literacy). Anthropologists interested in Europe have also begun studying a new class of "peasant-workers," along with the "urban values" that the commuter or migrant brings from the city. Some work has also been done on the phenomenon of rural industrialization in Latin America and in Europe [5], and articles have begun to appear concerning a specific form of rural development known as tourism [6].

Against this background, I will describe the "urbanization" of a Romanian village called Feldioara, located in southern Transylvania in Romania. Urban development of Feldioara, however, differs in two significant ways from that in the studies I have mentioned. First, the

Steven Sampson studies anthropology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

village is changing into a town: the inhabitants are not leaving their environment, their environment is changing around them. Second, this urban development is not spontaneous, but is a direct result of Feldioara's having been chosen by the government to be "developed" into a town over the next decade.

I shall focus on the initial stages of Feldioara's conversion into a town during the first six months of 1974, with some added information resulting from my return to the village in fall of 1975 [7]. By examining how socialist planning is implemented at the village level, and by concentrating on one specific plan aimed at controlled urban development of one rural locale, I hope to point out the potential stress points in both the village and regional systems. A detailed analysis of this transition could help us to predict not only Feldioara's future, but the viability of this planning process in other less developed parts of Romania, in countries of the so-called Third World, and even, perhaps, in areas of the advanced capitalist countries.

The Setting

Following the territorial-administrative reorganization of 1967, Romania is divided into thirty-nine separate counties (*judeţ*) plus the municipality of Bucharest. The commune (*comuna*) is an administrative unit below that of county and may consist of as few as one or as many as twenty-five villages, the higher number occuring when villages are small or widely dispersed hamlets, especially in hill regions. In Braşov county, there are seven cities and forty-three communes, usually comprising between three and five villages with an average population per commune of about 5,000. Commune Feldioara contains as its commune center the village of Feldioara (population 3,100), the neighboring village of Rotbav (1,000 people), and a *colonia* of workers and their families living next to a brick factory (population about 1,000). The village of Feldioara is located on a fertile plateau known as the Bîrsei country (*Ţara Bîrsei*). It lies on a main road and rail line just 25 kilometers north of the industrial metropolis of Braşov, which is located in the geographic center of Romania. The Braşov district is the most industrialized and urbanized of Romania's counties [8]. Leaving out the municipality of Bucharest, Braşov county ranks first in proportion of wage earners to population, first in percentage of industrial workers in its work force (43.4 percent in 1966), first in industrial output per capita, lowest in percentage of work force in agriculture (26.6 percent in 1966), and has 60 percent of its population living in towns (Romania as a whole has only 40 percent).

Feldioara was first settled in the thirteenth century by German-speaking colonists called Saxons, and until 1945 the Saxons occupied a superior economic niche as prosperous farmers for the Braşov market. Besides the Saxons, the area around Braşov has been populated for at least several hundred years by three other ethnic groups: Romanians, Hungarian speakers called Magyars, and Gypsies. In addition, Jews and Greeks lived in the cities as merchants. Due to postwar out-migration, the Saxon population of Feldioara and of Braşov county has greatly decreased.

In 1974 Feldioara had a total population of approximately 3,100 [9]. The ethnic proportions are 60 percent Romanian, 20 percent Saxon, 10 percent Gypsy, and 9 percent Magyar, with 1 percent other or mixed. The village has a large cooperative farm, and out of a local work force of 1,600 (males between the ages of 16 and 59, females between 16 and 59, minus students), the cooperative farm employs more than 250 people. Many more are employed in nearby local industries, in local administration or services, or in one of the villages's growing number of shops. Nearly 40 percent of the work force commutes the twenty-five kilometers to industrial employment in Braşov by the frequent train and bus connections.

Most pertinently, Feldioara is one of three-hundred villages selected by Romanian planners to be developed into towns over the next decade. Feldioara will probably be declared a "town" during 1976, and in ten to fifteen years its population is projected to grow to 7,000. Apartments will be built, roads will be asphalted, and more transport links will be provided as the village becomes a satellite to the metropolis of Braşov. A polyclinic, a new cultural house, new shops, a tourist center, and a sports complex will make Feldioara a "central place" for about eighteen surrounding villages [10].

Before 1945 this growth was hindered by factors common to most "developing" nations. Romania had been repeatedly invaded and colonized over the centuries because it occupies a strategic location in the Balkan peninsula. The southeastern and eastern half of the country (Vallachia, Moldavia) was under Turkish rule until 1859, and the northwestern half (Transylvania) under the Turks until 1699 and under Austro-Hungary until 1919. Imperial rule, together with economic domination by Western European capital, produced a chronic rural population crisis in relation to domestic land, and widespread bureaucratic corruption via false land reforms extracted the wealth from the peasants that had not already been exported. Finally we should note the effect of the destruction of the two world wars, and, following World War II, of reparations to the Soviet Union.

Despite its current economic status as one of the poorest European states, the present socialist regime has succeeded in mobilizing Romania's material resources and ample labor power (population twenty million) and is now industrializing quite rapidly as a sovereign socialist state [11]. Since this socialist development is rooted in a centrally planned economy, some general remarks on the characteristics of socialist planning are in order.

Socialist Planning [12]

Despite differences among the Eastern European socialist countries, we can assume that socialist planning here is committed to the priority of heavy industry over other factors in accordance with the conventional wisdom of European Marxist regimes that may otherwise differ. Thus, in Romania urban/regional development strategies are determined by a larger plan for the economic development of a specific area of the country. Furthermore, resources are allocated administratively rather than by means of a price-setting market. Thus, during the spring of 1974, Feldioara's households were without running water during the daytime so that the local factory could use the limited supply. The same applies to consumer goods and social services.

Another aspect of socialist planning is that it does not simply passively forecast developments in the spheres of economic production or urban growth, but strives to be *active* planning. It emanates from the same state that controls and organizes material and human resources, and that allocates funds for specific projects or industries. Unlike Western planners or social scientists, East European experts can often see their projects develop quite rapidly, due to the concentration of all necessary resources in one political-economic-administrative unit – the state. This can lead to dramatic results, including dramatic mistakes.

Another universal characteristic of socialist planning is that it is predominantly centralized, *national* in scope, and ideologically critical. Planning campaigns are nationally publicized by the mass media, which are state controlled.

In the immediate postwar years of "socialist construction" in Romania, the fulfillment of the plan was carried out through such negative incentives as production quotas sold at below cost price to the state, forced labor brigades, migration restrictions, and involuntary resettlement. However, in recent years several East European development planners have realized

that a plan is only as successful as its execution [13], and that the success of the plan depends on local and regional participation in order to overcome specific local limitations. Successful implementation of the plan must rely on feedback among local, regional, and national levels, a problem which had plagued the highly centralized, bureaucratic states of Eastern Europe long before the advent of socialism.

This lack of coordination between localities, regions, and the national capital usually means that as the plans come down from the center, they are subject to varied interpretations according to the interests of lower level officials or local citizenry. Similarly, any response which reflects discontent with the plan or the planners often dissipates itself before it reaches the capital. Because of this lack of effective response, the large number of minute or gradual alterations needed to make a plan work well are left out of the process. Thus we find that in many socialist countries plans undergo abrupt changes as things get out of hand, and a radical policy shift is undertaken in the administrative apparatus of the government. In the West, we read about these changes as purges, liberalizations, centralizations or decentralizations, reforms, or new restrictions.

Finally, the success of any development planning policy, socialist or capitalist, depends on the ability of the political-economic order to offer a wide range of alternatives to individuals, so that the individual choices will be in harmony with those development policies that the state puts into effect. Efficiency here means fewer long-range costs (social and economic) and less political discontent than would be generated by a policy of forced labor or coercion. (See Denich for the congruence between Yugoslavia's urbanization policy and individuals' choices to migrate to urban industrial centers) [14].

Romania's strategy for economic development has included a variety of plans: immediate nationalization after 1948 of all industry, transport, and finance; gradual cooperativization of agriculture, begun in 1949 and completed in 1962; systematic rural industrialization in many traditional provinces; the administrative closing of certain overcrowded cities (e.g., Braşov); and the creation of new towns from old villages. Romania's rapid industrial growth has spawned a massive migration into the urban centers over the last twenty years and officials are cognizant of the problems of urban growth and the social and economic disadvantage of overurbanization [15].

In the 1950s, planning and policies were introduced which served to (1) control the rate of urban growth, (2) radiate development to all of Romania's rural areas, and (3) revamp the urban/rural hierarchy of settlements which has so long been dominated by a few large cities. This policy the Romanians call *sistematizare*, usually translated into English as "systematization." Following directives and resolutions finalized during the National Conference of the Communist Party in 1972 and reiterated during the Eleventh Party Congress in 1974, Law 58, "concerning the territorial systematization of urban and rural localities," was enacted on November 1, 1974. The systematization law is an elaborate set of land-use codes which not only sets limits on the expansion of urban and rural settlements, but at the same time sets up national, regional, and local organs to formulate planning and development strategies, and to carry these out in conjunction with national economic growth plans. Much of the law aims at restricting the encroachment of villages on valuable agricultural land. Thus, for each village a "constructable perimeter" is established outside of which no houses can be built. When houses are built, the law stipulates they must be at least two stories high. Each village must submit its systematization plan to regional officials for approval, but only after extensive debate, led by its own local "systematization commission." A continual stress is laid on the value of agglomerated settlements and the economic irrationality of improving tiny, dispersed hamlets (e.g., electrification, roads, water mains). As many

as five hundred of these villages "without perspectives for social-economic development" are scheduled to be phased out over the years, with their populations being moved to other villages or towns. These are mainly in the mountains or in flood zones and have populations below 500.

In 1972, anticipating the enactment of the systematization laws, county planners selected about three hundred of Romania's thirteen thousand villages, according to strategic location and growth potential. These "advanced" villages are to be developed into urban centers serving between ten and twenty villages each. In this fashion, each of the surrounding villages will be afforded an adequate number of administrative, economic, social, and cultural services. Hopefully, the systematization of rural settlements will serve to reduce the pressure on the few hard-pressed cities, although villagers will still be commuting to these for work.

It appears that Feldioara's specific advantages lay in its location and its preexisting economic development: as noted, it lies about twenty-five kilometers from the city of Braşov, on a major highway and rail line; it has rural industry in the form of a brick factory, a sugar refinery, and a construction site (for what will become a mineral-extraction plant), all within three kilometers of the village, and it is situated at a point on the "orbit of already existing satellite towns surrounding Braşov." Besides Feldioara, two other villages were chosen by the Braşov county planners to be developed into towns; one of these (Prejmer) has a small textile industry and also lies within commuting distance of Braşov, while the other (Hoghiz) is the site of a brand new cement factory in an area lacking any urban center.

The particular aspects of Feldioara's development into a town illustrate the general aspects of socialist planning very well: systematization is first and foremost an *economic* plan for Romania which aims to distribute the economic advantages beyond the major urban centers, and remove those disadvantages which accrue to cities with too rapid urbanization. Systematization is an *active* policy designed to deal effectively with the problems of urban growth before they become acute, while simultaneously changing the nature of certain villages and regions. Furthermore, it is a *national* plan; presumably, the three hundred villages are to be developed together according to Romania's overall needs as a nation. The plan is *centralized* and *bureaucratic*, and in 1974 the local leaders were receiving numerous experts with planning maps, directives, and advice. Economic institutions in the village (e.g., the retail and service establishments called consumer cooperatives) were being reorganized, as were the medical, educational, administrative, and recreational facilities. Various official meetings were held to stimulate support for the plan. And despite their healthy skepticism as to future claims, most residents of Feldioara were proud of the fact that their village had been chosen to become a town. As noted above, however, the lack of two-way communication between the village, the regional capital, and Bucharest means that any changes that do occur will take the form of abrupt shifts, for which the village will take the consequences while the bureaucrats take the credit. Finally, the success of systematization in Feldioara will depend as much on *individual* reactions as it does on the commitment of the national political system at large. The process of systematization involves the constant formulation of plans that reflect both national ideologies and local needs and desires. At the ideological level it implies some degree of discussion and consensus on the part of the villagers in order to receive the plan, modify it (if possible), approve it, and implement it.

SYSTEMATIZATION IN FELDIOARA: THE VILLAGE SYSTEM

We can now proceed to describe what has happened in the particular village of Feldioara by considering the latter as a small-scale, open system. The village system is composed

of various component subsystems: namely, the spatial, demographic, economic, social, political, ritual, leisure, and cognitive components that, in their ensemble, both create and reflect Feldioara's particular personality.

As anthropologists with some knowledge of peasant society know, the village system is itself embedded in a larger system characterized by shifting political and economic relations between village, region, and state [16]. These relations may appear to be stable, but there are times when the entire national system can be disrupted by international events, domestic repression of local communities, regional secession, or even by local rebellions which affect the capital.

Feldioara has outlasted the various national transformations in Romanian history. Precisely for this reason we cannot assume it to be an unchanging system. And we cannot doubt that the plan for the urban development of Feldioara will permanently alter the village cultural system.

Since we are only at the initial stages in this transition, and since socialist planning is subject to abrupt changes as local developments are sporadically fed back to the capital, this paper will concentrate on the description of this process as it appeared in 1974. We will focus on two sets of changes: first, in the various components of the village cultural system; and second, the effects at the regional level.

Spatial Component

The most easily recognized manifestations of the "citification" of Feldioara are changes in the village landscape. The village of Feldioara lies, as noted, on a fertile plateau between 400 and 500 meters above sea level, along the Olt River. The village was first settled over seven hundred years ago near the river, on top of a long hill running east–west and overlooking the plain below. As the village grew, it expanded westward (i.e., perpendicular to the river) and houses also spread down the hill and onto the plain. Today there is one long main street of perhaps two kilometers, on which are found the central buildings and facilities: city hall, two schools, the headquarters of the agricultural and consumer cooperatives, a dispensary, two cafés, two cafeterias (for students and farm workers), food, hardware, drygoods and other stores and service establishments, a post office, pharmacy, library, culture house, and the Saxon (Lutheran) church. As this main street has extended it has crossed over the national highway that runs through the western end of the village. Just off this main street is the Romanian (Orthodox) church and the police station, as well as the oldest dwellings of the Romanian population. Prior to World War II, wealthy German-speaking Saxons lived in the center of Feldioara, and the poor, non-Saxon ethnic groups – chiefly Romanians, with some Gypsies and Hungarians (Magyars) – lived in smaller houses on the periphery. As the Saxon population decreased in the village due to death and out-migration to West Germany, their place in the center was taken by Romanians. This move "up the hill" is socially and economically significant.

At the northern periphery of Feldioara are the headquarters and canteen for the workers at the State Farm, barracks for workers at a nearby construction site, and, about fifteen minutes walk from the center, on the Olt River, the railroad station and apartments for railway workers.

The urban development of Feldioara involves a proliferation of facilities in this central area, and will no doubt stimulate people to move up the hill into the larger, Saxon-owned houses. Much to the dismay of the close-knit Saxon minority, Romanians have shown no compunction about moving into Saxon neighborhoods. While the village has been electrified for decades, living in "the center" also has the practical advantages of piped water and proximity to the railway station and shops. To further accentuate the importance of the

central main street, it was almost completely asphalted during the summer of 1975, the only road in the village to be so treated.

The population of the village has grown because of its proximity to surrounding rural industries (a pig-raising complex, a brick factory, a construction site, and a sugar refinery) and to Braşov city. In 1974 Feldioara already had two four-story apartment buildings housing workers for the State Farm, and on my return in 1975 an eight-story "bloc" had been completed. Official plans for systematization call for the ultimate construction of 720 apartments, the first 280 to be completed by 1977. Also on the agenda are ten private homes of three stories each, a dormitory for unmarried workers, a fifty-room motel and restaurant complex for tourists visiting the ruins of a thirteenth-century fortress in the village, a sports complex, and administrative centers of a political and economic nature; these will be supplemented by the enlarging of boarding facilities to provide for 200 school pupils, a nursery with 100 places, a kindergarten with 240 places, and 16 more classrooms. I was told that the mineral extraction plant will be the biggest single attraction for young working families to come to Feldioara. However, the systematization process is not directly concerned with industry per se, but only with establishing "the most suitable places for the location of industries . . . and for the furtherance of rational long-term economic development of all the zones and localities" [17]. The village main street should, in a few years, begin to resemble a minor metropolis, with more and more buildings of a nonresidential character, more transport links than already exist, and "blocs" of light-green apartments at the edge of "town." The village main street is now actually two one-way streets separated by a twenty-meter-wide common. With accelerating wagon and vehicular traffic (cars, trucks, tractors, bikes), villagers are beginning to understand that the only safe place to walk is on the sidewalk.

As the "civic center" of the village is formulated by the planners, the controversey over demolishing residences and constructing shops in their place (in fact, a whole commercial complex) becomes the subject of vehement debate in the people's council meetings.

Demographic Component

One of the first indications of the city-like character of Feldioara is the varied composition of its population; it is this heterogeneity rather than sheer numbers that distinguishes towns from large villages. As a "village," Feldioara is larger than most other villages in Romania, and in fact a 1966 statistic showed that 73 percent of Romania's villages had under a thousand persons [18]. Present population projections call for an increase from 3,100 to 7,000 by 1990.

The apparent population stability in the postwar era has hidden numerous population shifts, chiefly in the village's ethnic composition. Virtually all of the adult Saxons of Feldioara were deported to Russia after the war. Some of these were, in 1950, repatriated to Western Europe rather than to Romania. With increasing out-migration to West Germany, there are now half as many Saxons as there were in 1945. A low birth rate has resulted in a rapidly aging and declining population, presently numbering about 500. The declining Saxon population has been replaced by Romanians, Hungarians, and Gypsies, who have migrated to Feldioara because of its work opportunities. Furthermore, Romania – like most East European countries – has experienced a marked drop in both mortality *and* fertility, in spite of a 1967 law making abortion and divorce difficult. This low overall fertility means that the population growth that has occurred in the community has been due largely to in-migration of young families rather than to internal growth.

The number of strangers in the village is a matter of continuing discussion among long-

time residents, who resent the fact that much of the neighborhood character of Feldioara is vanishing and that an increasing urbanism brings with it increasing sanitation problems, bar-room brawls, and petty crime. At a 1974 political meeting I attended, in which the "demographic problem" was the first order of business, many residents complained about the "bad element" in town and called for more "law and order" (*securitate*) in dealing with troublemakers. Local leaders also expressed their concern about the kind of people coming into the village, hoping that they would be conscientious citizens. The villagers consider it a matter of common knowledge that anything bad that happens is due to the *venetici*, the "aliens," who are destroying the civic character and reputation of Feldioara.

In reality, who are these "aliens"? The first thirty or so families of poor shepherd Romanians arrived right after the war to take over the houses and farms of the ousted "kulaks" (*chiaburi*). (These kulaks were rich peasants, mostly Saxons, having over twenty hectares of land.) Subsequently, most of these voluntary migrants, encouraged by the state, returned to their mountain villages. Another group has come from Moldavia, the most underdeveloped area of Romania; a few joined the cooperative farm, but most work in the Braşov industrial centers. Many of these new in-migrants (whom I shall call from now on "migrants") are Gypsies or Hungarian-speaking peoples (Magyars), and, as minorities, are looked down upon by the locally born Feldioarans ("locals"), whether Saxon or Romanian. There are also several hundred temporary workers who are employed seasonally on the cooperative farm or the construction site; these are mostly young males, also from Moldavia, who live in barracks in the village during the peak labor periods and then return home. Finally, the most important category of migrants are those occupying powerful positions in local government and economic concerns, agricultural and industrial technicians, and professionals such as doctors, priests, and teachers. While their numbers are small – perhaps no more than thirty-five – and while many of them have been residents in the village for more than a decade, the "locals" consider them still to be *venetici* and view them with some degree of suspicion. If we consider the local elite in 1974 – the mayor (who by law is also the party leader), the vice-mayor, the president of the collective (cooperative) farm, the chief of the consumer cooperative, the three doctors, the police chief, the school principal, the assistant party leader, and the party youth leader – we find that *not one* of them was born in the village of Feldioara. In 1975, locally born residents occupied three such positions: assistant party leader, party youth leader, and vice-mayor. In October 1973, according to official statistics, there were 270 individuals from other communes living in Feldioara, a figure representing mostly the recent immigrants rather than temporary workers. In contrast, only 65 Feldioarans were listed as living outside the village.

Economic Component

As in all rural communities in Romania, agricultural production has played the prime economic role in Feldioara. The German colonists who originally settled the area were probably attracted by the high fertility of the land, some of the best in the country. Farmers also benefited from the proximity of the Braşov market, and, by the 1880s, from the establishment of a refinery for their sugarbeets. Today, grains, sugarbeets, and potatoes are the main crops.

Because of its agricultural importance and the availability of expropriated land from the kulaks, Feldioara was one of the first villages to undergo cooperativization of agriculture in 1950, a process completed in 1959 [18]. Each of the cooperative farms boasts a small private plot on which to grow root crops or maize, but private agriculture remains negligible.

Feldioara also supports a State Farm, devoted chiefly to dairying and fodder crops, which employs about 150 salaried workers. This compares with the cooperative farm, whose 250 active (high season) members (350 are on the books) are paid in cash and kind. Those who are not members of the cooperative – for example, the skilled technicians or day laborers – are paid only in cash.

Every season, especially when the pay goes down because of a poor harvest, members of the cooperative farm are siphoned off by the higher cash wage industrial units nearby, or by the factories of Braşov city. Despite old plant, poor working conditions, and low salaries, factory work is a realistic choice for many of the locals, who can either supplement their income from the cooperative farm or get a family member to replace them. Meanwhile, most of the migrants to Feldioara work in the industrial plants. About one-half of the work force is employed in industries located outside the commune of Feldioara, practically all of them in the city of Braşov. Of these commuters, more than 25 percent are women.

The village itself also contains a local food-processing industry for meat and pastries, and the ten or so workers in this sector also provide food to other communes in the area. One of the systematization plans, in fact, is to enlarge this food-processing sector. The other local industries and commerce (Feldioara has over twenty retail or service establishments) generally employ locally born residents, especially women. These include two taverns which serve food and drink, a coffee shop, two cafeterias (for the students and farm workers), a grocery store, a hardware store, a clothing shop, a furniture shop, a gas station, a book store, a bank, a credit union, a barbershop/beauty salon, a bakery, a photographer, a shoemaker, a tailor, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, and two kiosks. An association of the stores and services for the fifteen surrounding villages is called the consumer cooperative and has its regional headquarters and clerical staff in Feldioara.

Municipal services are supplied by the three schools (nursery, elementary, and academic high school), a library, a pharmacy, a culture house used for meetings, dances, or films, a post and telegraph office, a dispensary with two doctors and a dentist, and the local government consisting of mayor, vice-mayor, town clerk, and two secretaries. There are no specialized Communist Party workers.

In summarizing the economic activities of the people of Feldioara, one must keep in mind its agricultural productivity, its central position relative to rural industry, and its proximity to Braşov, all of which serve to make the village attractive to some migrants as one "step" in the move to the large urban centers of the area.

The various economic groups can be categorized according to their natal origins. We can start with the native born Feldioarans, the "locals." The cooperative farm employs mostly elderly males and females who are paid in grain, cash, and pensions. The work force varies seasonally, and the women are most affected by the winter layoffs. Younger Feldioarans, both male and female, work either in local industry or commerce, or commute to Braşov. A number of women work in the service sector – in shops, schools, or offices.

The migrants are employed mostly in the industrial plants outside the village, at the construction site, or as day laborers on the cooperative farm. A large proportion are unmarried males, or males without their families. In addition, several of the administrative and professional positions are held by migrants (mayor, police chief, doctors, priests, school principal), although some of these have lived in the village for many years.

Finally, there are a certain number of workers who commute *to* Feldioara, and no doubt this phenomenon contributes to its urban character. These include industrial and commercial workers, who live in nearby villages, and also a significant number of intelligentsia – administrators, teachers, engineers, etc. who live in the city of Braşov. In 1974

over half the teachers, the mayor, and the chief of the consumer cooperative lived in Braşov. But in 1975 a law requiring the mayor to live in the village was enacted, and the commuter mayor, not wanting to leave Braşov, resigned and was replaced by the vice-mayor.

It can readily be seen that the state did not really have to invest much in the village in order to declare it a town. The plans do call, however, for the service and administrative centralization of Feldioara, so that people from surrounding villages will come there for health care, bureaucratic dealings, jobs, and higher education. On the completion of the construction site, a minerals factory will provide more jobs. Systematization is certainly not causing a shift to nonagricultural employment in the village, but it is accelerating it. For a member of the cooperative farm to leave for another job used to mean a daily commute to Braşov. With the urbanization of the village, increasing numbers of women have shifted from agricultural work, with its advantage of being at home, to higher income and more steady work in local commerce, services, or light industry.

This occupational shift has already had an effect on the productive capacity of the cooperative farm. As opportunities in industry, commerce, and service have opened up, many members have left the cooperative, and as the original members have aged, the youth have not been taking their places. Most of the active members of the cooperative are in their fifties, and the largest numbers are not active members but pensioners. To compensate for this loss of labor, the cooperative has had to import migrant laborers from Moldavia at high daily wages. Combined with faulty administration, poor harvests, and a lack of mechanization, this has lowered the real income of the cooperative farmers and alienated a significant number. Most of them talk of getting out when they can, or going on pension before they really have to; many cannot even guess who will be working Feldioara's farmlands ten years from now.

The shift to nonagricultural employment preceded the systematization of Feldioara. But the second major change, directly attributable to the planners, is the centralization of economic functions. Several years previously, the village cooperative farms were joined together into commune-wide units. The administrative reorganization of villages in 1968 made the commune the governing unit. In 1973 the consumer cooperatives of twelve villages (over 150 stores) were combined into a larger unit with headquarters in Feldioara. This centralization of administrative and economic functions will tend to differentiate Feldioara from surrounding communities even further, just as the fact that it is a place people are commuting *to* has begun to sever its formally egalitarian links with surrounding villages, which take on the character of satellites.

Social Component

Even in its most traditional phase, a peasant village can never be said to be socially homogenous. There are always complex, crosscutting divisions among kin groups, neighborhoods, occupational statuses, sex and age units and political factions. In Feldioara, the four ethnic groups must also be taken into account, along with the local, migrant, and commuting populations.

I would suggest three broad variables that can account for the nature of Feldioara's social organization under planned urban development. The first is demographic: higher population usually results in a shift from multiplex to simplex ties. The second is natal origin and it aggravates the first: many of the residents are recent migrants or temporary residents, so that the prior, informal means of social control, such as kinship, friendship, or mutual residence, have atrophied. The third variable is economic: the transition from village to town is defined by an urban socioeconomic structure founded on nonagricultural employment, increasing commercial and service activ-

ities, a more formal administrative apparatus, and a more stratified class/status hierarchy.

With the three variables in mind, the various groups I have mentioned can be considered internally (e.g., as relations within a kin group) or externally (as relations between kin groups). Regarding the kinship organization in Feldioara, the advent of industrialization and the "citification" of the village may have changed the character of relations among kinsmen superficially, but at a deeper level the strong ties between generations, between siblings, and even between inlaws remain. The advent of industrial opportunities, the effects of commuting and urban residence have chiefly affected the younger generation, especially the males. As John Cole has pointed out, industrialization has led to a variety of extended family strategies whereby this type of kin group (i.e., father, his spouse, one or more married sons, and their families) will try to maximize all the resources at its disposal [19]. This means that one member can work on the cooperative farm, with access to the private plot and other cooperative facilities, while an older family member can be at home taking care of the house, animals, garden, babysitting, and possibly collecting a pension. Other family members can be employed in industry, either locally or in the city. Another member of the household can attend a higher education institution and later on provide other essential services to the extended family. It should be stressed that this extended family strategy may transcend the residential situation of the family. The spate of housebuilding in Romania – a consequence of rising cash incomes – has led to more nuclear family *residences*, but not necessarily to more nuclear family *households*, if we define households as production and consumption units. This explains why statistics concerning the number of nuclear vs. extended family residences would be misleading, especially those derived from village registers, because tax laws make it advantageous for a household to appear nuclear.

Obviously, the locally born residents have a much better chance of maximizing this strategy than the migrants, who are members of young, nuclear families committed to industrial labor. The migrant families cannot approach the social and economic adaptability that characterizes the local Feldioara families. The increased opportunities available to the native-born residents will no doubt accentuate their economic advantages over the migrants, and for some extended families there may even occur the classic division of economic functions into nuclear family units. There are signs of this economic separation in the young building their own houses, or keeping larger proportions of their cash income for conspicuous consumption. Still, at crucial periods – when there is need for cash, for labor, or on ritual occasions – the young will come to the aid of the family patriarch, as will his siblings and in-laws. For the migrants, whose kin may be hundreds of miles away, family members are under more pressure to bring in cash, despite the fact that many of these families consist of only two adults and several young children. Not having any private production, often without gardens, and without any close kin ties in the area, these young families must obtain all commodities and services with cash. The mother is often forced to work, and children and household suffer.

Social relations between *occupational groups* are being transformed by the changing economic character of Feldioara and by the kinds of people taking new jobs. For village communities in a complex society, there is typically a grudging complementary relationship between the agriculturalists, the craftsmen, the shopkeepers, and the local elite. While under socialism the *ownership* of productive resources has been transferred to the state, the *access* to resources has not passed out of local hands. For locally born residents, their sphere of relations is still a social sphere, and their friends are often working at the same occupations as they are: the elderly and the women who work on

the cooperative farm are neighbors, friends, and kin; the workers in local industries have continuous contact both on and off the job. Both agricultural and industrial workers seek to maintain good relationships with each other, and with the local shopkeepers, who are ostensibly under the jurisdiction of the consumer cooperative but have wide discretion in dispensing their goods and services. For the locals, these contacts may be made during work, through intermediaries, by visiting each other at home, or at the local taverns. For the migrants, however, these social links have not been developed, and they are forced to frequent the local bar in order to get access to or obtain needed goods and services.

Certain occupational groups are quite isolated from the social life of the village – the day laborers at the cooperative farm, the construction site workers, and those who commute daily to Braşov. As expected, these are mostly new arrivals, and many know only each other, sticking to their own contacts without making any significant inroads into the local social network. As noted, Feldioarans generally hold these Moldavians, Hungarians, and Gypsies in low regard both because of their low status occupations and because of the ethnic groups they represent. If increasing in-migration occurs under the systematization of Feldioara, these prejudices may well be aggravated.

The highest occupational statuses are held by those who control the cooperative farm, the consumer cooperative, the political apparatus, and the doctors, engineers, and school teachers. Like elites everywhere, they generally try to interact only among themselves and minimize contact with the agricultural and industrial workers. Yet the status differentials are not very well marked: while they would always be addressed in the formal "you" form or by title ("Madame Doctor") the doctor's house is not much different from that of a worker, although the doctor may be the one with the car.

The future systematization of Feldioara will obviously bring in more commercial administrators and working-class individuals while reducing the agricultural population of the village; and this shift in the occupational structure is a shift in the class/status hierarchy in the village.

An important aspect of the urbanization of Feldioara is the changing character of relations between the *sexes* and the *age groups*. The ideological and economic needs of Romania have made strong inroads into the traditional concept of women's work, and many women are now employed in industry, commute to Braşov, and occupy such high positions as doctor, agricultural engineer, and accountant. Most of the commercial jobs are held by women, and they comprise the majority of the active members of the cooperative farm. Still, this does not match the opportunities available to males. The high number of women on the cooperative farms (60 percent throughout Romania) is more an indication of the low status and low pay of agricultural work than of occupational advance or greater freedom. In her discussion of developments in Czechoslovakia, Hilda Scott has also pointed out that most of the industrial jobs held by women are of the unskilled type, and that higher status doctors and teachers do not earn as much as skilled industrial workers [20]. These findings seem to apply to Romania. Generally more women work closer to home than men, in the fields and shops, and for this reason are able to maintain closer social ties with other villagers.

Several Romanian sociologists have remarked on how the changes in occupation and urban living have transformed the women's economic role in the family, giving her more independence in disposing of her cash income and greater equality with the husband in making decisions and dividing the housework [21]. Although Feldioara is still a village, its women are no exception, and as the village becomes more urbanized more women will become wage laborers. For young women this is quite acceptable. However, in many households,

especially those with substantial gardens or a number of useful animals, women taking up wage labor would be counterproductive; the private household or cooperative farm plot produces a large portion of the household food supply which would otherwise have to be paid for with cash.

Social relations for both sexes are mediated through kin and neighbors and there are in general no social clubs or associations for either sex. The Saxon minority is an exception: they have had a strong tradition of neighborhood, church, and age groups, but their population is both aging and declining rapidly. The local bar is not a nightly rite for most of the men in the village; even so, Romanians claim that Saxon men are less frequently at the bar than the other ethnic groups.

Informal youth activities are sometimes augmented by playing for the local handball team, or by the Union of Communist Youth (UTC), which holds intermittent dances and field trips. Other than that, there are no official age groups. One byproduct of Feldioara's secondary school, however, has been the thirty or so boarding students who live in a dormitory and mix with local residents during the school year. In the summer, the young people have an informal "discothèque," and there are weekly films and the usual round of wedding parties. Male and female locals who are unmarried get together for Saturday night parties at the houses of their parents, where those who may not have seen each other for the whole week (Romania having a six-day, forty-eight-hour work week) can gossip. Several of the "local" youth manage to schedule their summer vacations together in order to go to the Black Sea or on camping trips. About thirty of these are students in Braşov or other cities and manage to get home occasionally. The youth show no signs of segregating themselves from their parents or rebelling against them. Most live at home in order to use their hard-earned money for clothes, tape recorders, or motorcycles. The aged are respected and even the most senile are bought beer in the tavern by the younger men. Many of the young workers have parents who are cooperative farmers and they realize their parents' financial dilemma; the parents, it follows, are pleased if their children are in well-paying nonagricultural occupations. This seems to conform with the aspirations of the youth: in our 1974 survey of sixty-seven village school children aged fifteen to nineteen, not one wanted to go into agriculture, or even an agriculturally related occupation such as agronomy or veterinary medicine.

For the youth who are not locally born, social life is limited to the dormitory at the cooperative headquarters, to staying home and watching TV, or to frequenting the local bar. The migrants are mostly young males, but chances of forming strong ties with local males are slim, and with local females even slimmer. They generally steer clear of formal youth activities in the village, and are sometimes intimidated by the locals, who view the migrants as crude, rowdy, and drunkards.

Social relations among *ethnic groups* have been deeply affected by the changes that have been taking place in Feldioara's ethnic composition. The coming of poor Romanians, Hungarians, and Gypsies to Feldioara and the emigration of Saxons to West Germany has left a large complement of older, embittered Saxons. These older Saxons remember their high prewar social status vis-à-vis the Romanians, in contrast to their postwar experiences, including deportation to the USSR for all adults, confiscation of land holdings, and having boarders forced upon them until 1955. Then, as now, social relations between the two major ethnic groups were reasonably friendly, with some Saxon farmers acting as godparents for the children of their Romanian clients. In private, however, Saxon feelings about Romanians have become quite negative, and many of them long to go to West Germany where they can be reunited with their kin (both familial and ethnic), and get access to sought-

after Western goods [22]. Romanians do not seem to harbor too much animosity toward the Saxons, and in fact often refer to Saxon hard work, organizational ability, and industriousness.

However, Romanians are not so positively disposed toward the Magyar minority, whom they perceive as violent. Within the Romanian group are the Moldavian migrants, who, although they have slightly different clothing and accent, are looked down upon more for their low occupational status than for any ethnic association. The Magyars, meanwhile, see themselves as heirs to the great Austro-Hungarian tradition of civilization and characterize the Romanians as uncivilized. At the base of the ethnic pyramid are the Gypsies, seen by the other groups as dirty, unskilled, lazy, overly fertile, but naturally musical and always having money to spend. While public relations between the first three groups are cordial, and between Gypsies and others polite, purely social contact is restricted to the members of one's own ethnic group. Although a few interethnic marriages have occurred recently, the code of conduct holds as much for the young people as for the old.

While the systematization of Feldioara has had no discernable effect on ethnic relations per se, the fact that the projected civic center is populated by Saxon households means that they will be more affected by the plans than the Romanians, Magyars, or Gypsies, who live outside this core. During people's council meetings, variants of the plans have been formulated that call for the future demolition of between eight and twelve Saxon houses in the center of the village to make room for a new "commercial complex" of stores and offices. At present, these plans have been put off the immediate agenda, but are still on the ultimate planning dossier.

In the past, one of the byproducts of ethnic stratification in the village was the segregation of ethnic groups in various *residence units*, which were also social units. While this residential separation has broken down in the last several years, one can still point to concentrations of Saxons in the central area, Romanians in the central and peripheral areas, a Gypsy neighborhood of about twenty households, and a Hungarian street of new houses built by the in-migrants as they arrived in recent years. While the center of the village is frequently traversed by those availing themselves of village services, the peripheral areas have specific economic and demographic characteristics that tend to isolate them socially. The most conspicuous are the "temporary" residents at the construction site, living in rundown, barracks-like apartments that were once a German POW camp. These people, mainly Gypsies or Hungarians, are thus isolated as lower-class workers, as migrants, as ethnic minorities, and geographically as well. They are gradually being moved into the new apartment houses.

At the southern end of the village is a street devoted mostly to old pensioners and widows whose children have moved up the hill or to the city of Braşov. The only available area for building new houses is at the west end of the village and the new migrants tend to cluster there, rather than renting rooms from the pensioners in the empty houses in other neighborhoods. Other migrants live in the two apartment buildings, also at the fringe of the village.

The uneven residential development has made the center and the western end of the village desirable areas for higher income families and for new apartment houses. While neighborhoods in the social sense do not now exist among the Romanians (but are strong among the Saxons), increasing stratification may lead to true neighborhood social relations or associations as the village grows. If this uneven development should continue, the conventional city-like character of Feldioara will be confirmed by the formation of certain ghetto-type areas signifying separation by age, economic status, or ethnic group.

Party Membership

In any complex society, one may ask questions about the social implications of *political activity* in a community. In socialist Romania, this comes down to an analysis of the relations between members of the Romanian Communist Party, the core of active members, and the public. While I have no quantitative data as to party membership, it is my impression that the vast majority of the villagers are not party members (nationally only 20 percent of the adult population are, but that includes 60 percent of the intelligentsia). Most village youth have ties with the party youth league, which organizes social activities, excursions, and intermittent youth brigades for community clean up or agricultural work. Further, most of those who are party members are members in name only and generally do not take any active role in party functions. The meetings that take place regularly are the party chapter for the cooperative farm, and, more importantly, the party committee for the commune, which consists of representatives of party chapters at the school, cooperative farm, consumer cooperative, and the industrial enterprises in the commune. Party membership is typical among the village elite and the intelligentsia, and more evident among the migrants. About half the teachers are party members. Party meetings are not well attended, I am told, and are of little consequence other than to present party policy for approval by the membership. The "new class," mentioned so often by Djilas, seems to be more a product of bureaucratic position in the governmental hierarchy than of party activities. Since practically everyone in any high status position is a party member already, party membership as a social marker is superfluous.

In summarizing the systematization of Feldioara into an urban center, we have considered here the effects of this process on the social organization of the village, considered in terms of kin, occupational, sex, age, ethnic, residential, and political groupings. The final, and most important, aspect of social relations in the village is the opposition between the locally born on the one hand, and the in-migrant and commuter groups on the other. And it is this aspect of village social organization that has been most affected by, and will have most effect on, the urban development of Feldioara. This opposition between the native-born population and the newcomers permeates every aspect of village life.

The newcomers have a kin structure oriented to nuclear families; they are most often unskilled workers in local or Braşov industry; they are typically young families, young single males, and very often of ethnic/regional groups which have low social status in the eyes of villagers. They live in different neighborhoods of the village, which are described as run down. They are blamed for most of the failings of the agricultural cooperative: for creating shortages in the stores, for barroom brawls, and even for assaulting village women at night. They occupy inferior status positions at work and have little political power or social prestige. Aside from mutual church and bar attendance, they have no significant contact with the local population. They can only fall back on themselves and their kin, who are also recent migrants to a village in which they are made to feel as outsiders.

Another group of migrants are the intelligentsia, who regard themselves as alienated from many of the working-class locals, but they at least have some kind of compensation in their social and economic status or political power. These elite migrants typically compose themselves as a closed ingroup. A further category includes those who work in the village but do not live there – the "commuters," who interact with villagers and other commuters on a daily basis.

It is this composition of Feldioara's population, crosscut into occupations, internal neighborhoods, and generating local/migrant/com-

muter conflict, that has given Feldioara's social organization a distinctly urban cast, a cast that is most likely to harden under pressure of future urbanization. Returning to the three key variables presented at the beginning of this section, we can see that the demographic increase and the socioeconomic role differentiation were part of the plan of systematization. The tenuous relationship between the locally born, the migrants, and the commuters is an unintended result of this policy, but one which the planners could have foreseen.

Political Component

Up to 1945, the political and economic leaders of Feldioara were Saxons, especially two wealthy landowners. Although Romanians had been numerically superior even before the First World War (a 1910 census shows 1,200 Romanians, 1,000 Saxons, 200 Magyars, and 50 Gypsies), the first Romanian mayor was not elected until 1923, and he effectively remained under the control of the Saxons. Romania's fascist and conservative governments of the interwar era, as well as political affiliations with Hitler's Germany during the war years, solidified Saxon domination. Still, Saxons needed the Romanian labor. Patron–client ties combined with strong Saxon neighborhood associations were the basis of Feldioara's political organization through the Second World War. Expulsion of prominent Saxons and the traumas of Romania's political transformation into a socialist state with (ethnically) Romanian leadership led to a considerable flux in the local political order in the postwar period. Many of the prominent Romanian leaders that could have taken the Saxons' places were either unavailable or unsuitable to the socialist structure.

In analyzing the current political situation, it seems best to start with the formally recognized political statuses, keeping in mind that such statuses are usually coterminous with party leadership. By a 1972 law the mayor of the village must also be secretary of the party committee. The three locales of Feldioara commune (Feldioara, Rotbav, and the *colonia* at the brick factory) are unified only by their administrative union, each having proportional representation on the commune-wide people's council. (In 1975, the number of delegates on the council was reduced by 70 percent; now Feldioara commune has seventeen delegates.) Feldioara's town hall serves as the center for the commune, so that civil documents, bureaucratic directives, and property taxes flow in and out of it. It also serves as the meeting place for the executive committee of the council, and for the bimonthly meetings of the council itself. The leadership is composed of a mayor, who is often away from the village attending various political meetings around the country; the vice-mayor, who has day-to-day control of the commune and often receives visiting officials from Braşov (not to mention visiting anthropologists); a town clerk; and two secretaries. Other important leaders with quasi-formal political statuses are the president of the cooperative farm, a man who was earlier party chief, the party leader in the high school, and the intelligentsia (teachers, principals, doctors). Finally, there are the leaders of the party youth organization, various influential deputies on the people's council, and the two priests, who are treated more as respected community citizens than as power wielders. The various leaders try to keep things running smoothly for their own benefit, for that of visiting officials, and for the local citizenry. In order to do this they must keep in continuous contact with each other, since the problems of the village are interrelated. For example, in the agricultural sector, nonagricultural workers have to be mobilized for work in the fields during peak labor periods; this task is usually handed to the president of the consumer cooperative, who will declare all the shops closed for the day. On other occasions teachers will go into the fields with their students for agricultural work or into the

village on clean-up brigades.

What is most important to remember in looking at the leadership in Feldioara and how it has been affected by urbanization is the character of the leaders themselves, in particular if they are locally born, in-migrants, or nonresident commuters. Those who have held leadership positions have shifted from "local" to "migrant" to "commuter," a transition that has had the potential for stirring up local opposition to the urban development of the village. Earlier I pointed out how practically all of the elite positions in Feldioara were once held by people not born in the village, although some of these migrants (vice-mayor, police chief, priest) had lived there for many years and were bound by multiplex ties to the citizens – as neighbors, as kin or ritual kin, as fellow Saxons or Romanians, as farmers, and as Feldioarans. By shifting leadership to those with commuter status, the state apparatus probably hoped for more efficient and centralized control of village affairs, unaffected by the vicissitudes of multiplex social obligations that both locals and migrants have to contend with. Two examples of this alteration in political leadership can be given here:

1. After a series of short-lived mayors, L., a migrant from a coastal city, became mayor in 1969. L. had married one of the local women and had lived in the village since the 1950s. In 1973, as Feldioara was on the verge of the first stage of its systematization, L. was replaced by R., a man high in the regional party organization and living in the city of Braşov. R. commutes daily to Feldioara but does little day-to-day administration, although he does conduct meetings of the people's council. Villagers consider him an *om politic*, a "political man," rather than a civic leader, and he has developed no close social ties with anyone in Feldioara.

Meanwhile, the former mayor, L., has been demoted to vice-mayor, but he carries out his administrative-duties much as he has before. He is still addressed as "mayor" (*primar*) by the villagers. R. is often not seen in the village for weeks, since he may be off representing the party or village at a national conference or party school. I have no evidence that L. was incompetent at his job – only that regional political circles considered it important to have a "higher" official in charge of Feldioara, one tied residentially, politically, and socially to the city of Braşov.

2. S. was the head of the consumer cooperative, the association of stores and craftsmen, but apparently had had little experience running the administration or financial end of the organization. As part of systematization, the consumer cooperatives of five communes were merged into one organization, with Feldioara as the administrative and distributing center. To head the organization, P. was brought in, a man with long-time administrative experience P. lives in Braşov and commutes daily to Feldioara in a chauffered car owned by the consumer cooperative. He is a good administrator, well liked by his employees, and he sometimes attends people's council meetings. He has much say in the future commercial development of the village.

These two examples are indicative of a change in political leadership. Not surprisingly, the establishment of simplex ties has led to a degree of alienation from the leadership. The confidence that the citizens have in their leaders, and the leaders' effectiveness in getting things done will be important factors in Feldioara's future urbanization. The replacement of key local political/economic figures by others more fully connected, and defined by, the centralized state apparatus is an indication of the importance the state attaches to the systematization process. Outside leaders are the means by which state control is consolidated, while local control is subverted.

It is also important to note that inadequate knowledge of local conditions on the part of

leaders is often cited officially as the excuse for local failure in some plan or policy action. During 1975 there were news articles on this subject and, later on, directives stated that certain local intelligentsia – in this case the engineers for the agricultural cooperative – would now be required to live in the villages in which they worked. This was a major step in reversing the commuter-elite phenomenon, changing them into migrant-elite.

This alienation from the local leadership is often clear at the bimonthly meetings of the people's council, usually attended by between twenty and fifty deputies, plus other invited persons. These meetings are intended to provide an opportunity for people to debate the directives of the executive council of the commune, but in reality they are used to propagandize and approve the party/state directives for the village. The political ritualization reveals itself in poor attendance, and local people consider them anywhere from a joke to a waste of time. The debates range from downright silence to emotional tirades by local citizens protesting a myriad of social woes, which only serve to highlight feelings of helplessness, apathy, and futility. Meanwhile, even if the village leadership was inclined to contradict central directives and mobilize village resistance, the local organs are powerless to do so. From the standpoint of the elite, which is appointed (or nominated) by the regional authority rather than by the villagers, there would not be much sense in siding against the regional or national bureaucracy anyway.

This does not mean that the village has no political clout at the regional or national levels, only that there is no formal, unified body of local officials standing up to state policy. Romanian national policy has been changed, but apparently only when there was massive, countrywide opposition to a specific policy, or when the national implications of certain local policies dictated revision. Local problems are solved by bureaucratic directives rather than by dispute-settling organizations. In the spirit of "democratic centralism," factional disputes of a long-term nature are resolved, but usually in the interests of the larger regional or national polity. It is too early to gauge the effects of the new election laws, which not only require candidates to live in their districts but often have two candidates running against each other for the same position (and there are fewer positions available). In Feldioara, four of the nine deputies are in-migrants.

The village council meetings may take on added importance as Feldioara is subjected to further planning and implementation as it becomes an urban center. Already, some of the local leaders appear to be sympathetic to citizen concern about the changes (real and projected) in the community. These citizens have asked the leaders such questions as: "How will the building of apartments in Feldioara benefit *us*?" "What kind of people are coming into our community?" "Why has there been such a rise in street littering, burglary, and petty crime?" "Why hasn't the supply of goods in the stores kept up with population growth?" All these questions are common in any community that is undergoing "development," and only time will tell whether the political leadership will side with local interests, the planners' directives, or will be forced to mediate between them. Again, although the new election laws seem to recognize the importance of these local interests, by reducing the number of deputies the localities may become subject to more control.

Ritual and Leisure

Another way of looking at the changes wrought by systematization is to investigate the sphere of ritual activity. One would expect that an urbanizing village would retain some of its traditional ceremonies, and this has definitely been the case with the Saxon minority of Feldioara, who, despite their declining population, celebrate various seasonal rituals and

life-cycle rites (such as baptisms, weddings, and funerals), while dressed in folk costume. Life-cycle rites are being affected to some degree by the urbanization of the village, chiefly because of increased transportation to the city of Braşov, which has resulted in a change in the *location* of such ceremonies from village to city. Thus several weddings where both the bride and groom were local residents were celebrated at hotels in Braşov. This is also true of some baptisms, where the family may be able to have the party at a house or restaurant in the city. However, it should be noted that a family reunion in the village is often preferred by the city people. Now, if Feldioara's facilities are improved – and a new culture house is indeed due to be completed in 1976 – the trend of city wedding and baptism parties may be reversed.

The use of leisure time in the future may also reflect the changing urban nature of Feldioara. Increased cash income has provided well over half the households with their own television sets, which the other half may be invited to watch in the evenings or on Sundays. The culture house also receives two films a week, mostly American-made Westerns or gangster films, and this provides an outlet for many of the migrant youth who have neither TV nor strong social ties with locals. The two bars have become hangouts for many of the migrants, while the local youth have their own dances and private parties. Summers usher in outdoor activities, and it seems likely that the evening promenade so characteristic of Romanian cities may become a major institution as Feldioara's urban center grows and a third café is built. The promenade type of leisure activity is particularly pronounced on summer Sunday afternoons, when everyone sits outside, walks around the central commons, or heads for the coffee house.

At present, however, we can discern no change in ritual patterns or leisure activities that may be directly attributed to the planned urban development of Feldioara, although several directions of change have been pointed out. Another aspect of change, for which data are incomplete, is diffusion of information. In conjunction with its new urban status, Feldioara will start its own local weekly "gazette;" it already has a weekly half-hour of radio time for local broadcasts. Interestingly, even the local radio program is run by a commuter.

Cognitive Component

A final component of the village cultural system is what may be called the cognitive component – specifically, the beliefs and attitudes villagers have about their transformed social and natural environment. What concerns us here are those attitudes which may be related to the process of systematization.

There seems to be considerable variation in how Feldioarans view this process. Long before I arrived, most people had heard that Feldioara was going to be declared a town "one of these days," but were skeptical about the state's ability to affect any real change. This skepticism even came out in the terminology used: Feldioara was not going to become a full-fledged town (*oras*), but an *orasel*, the diminuitive form.

A major subject of conversation has been the increasing number of aliens, and the problems they are said to have caused in terms of crime and bar-room brawls, taking jobs away from locals, buying up the products of the stores, and so on. Several times I heard remarks by older residents about how when "they" move in "there goes the neighborhood," where "they" meant either the newcomers or the groups from which they came. National character stereotypes usually provide the villager with a vivid picture of these prospective neighbors, none of it appealing. One hears complaints about not knowing one's neighbors anymore, and about the necessity to keep the front gate locked (although everyone hides the key in the same places), and to keep to one's own business. The migrants have their own conception of the local Feldioarans as gossips, lazy, snobbish, and unfriendly.

Categorizations about the economic life revolve around the nonviability of agriculture as an occupation, although many young people have insisted to me that if only agriculture paid well, they would be willing to work for the cooperative farm. Commuting to work in Braşov usually means two hours a day, including walking to and from Feldioara's train station and the work place station, and waiting time.

Many citizens, despite their criticisms, realize that Feldioara has become a reasonably attractive place to live. The local youth share this view, no matter what plans they may have for the future. In 1973, only seventy-five Feldioarans were listed as living outside the village, about half of these in Braşov city. The state hopes that the advantage of a rural town with urban facilities will outweigh the attraction of the large cities. Still, the "administrative measures" (such as the internal passport) have been maintained in part to help control unrestricted migration into the hard-pressed cities.

The variety of opinions about village vs. city life are reflected in a questionnaire administered to sixty-seven secondary school (age 15–18) students in Feldioara during 1974 [23]. Asked whether they would prefer to settle in the village or the city after they finished their education, 28 said they would prefer the village, 21 mentioned Braşov or another city, 2 mentioned living abroad, and 11 couldn't decide or had no answer. These responses take on more significance in view of the fact that the sample includes those who aspire to high-status occupations and have stayed in school beyond the minimum age. These students would normally be inclined toward the city. But if the systematization policy succeeds, the percentage of those preferring Feldioara should increase. Feldioara's advantages are perceived by the students, and by others, as environmental ("free" air, no pollution), social (one's friends and relatives are here), and economic (living at home is cheap). Only further surveys as the systematization process continues will tell us whether the changes will have a positive or negative effect on the attitudes of those who live in the village.

Thus far we have conceived of the cultural system of Feldioara as analyzable into several interacting components: the geographic, demographic, economic, social, political, ritual, leisure, and cognitive. We have seen that the planned urban conversion of Feldioara has had or will probably have some effect on each component, and more importantly, on the way the components interact systematically. But the planned urbanization of a village affects not only that village (an assumption that limits many anthropological analyses of "changing village communities") but also the hinterland of villages which surround it, and touches all aspects of social life in these and other villages as well. Thus, before concluding, some of the results and prospects for systematization at the supralocal level will be described.

SYSTEMATIZATION IN FELDIOARA: REGIONAL AND NATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Spatial Component

The intended macro-effect of the plan to convert Feldioara into an urban center is to revamp the urban/rural hierarchy in the region north of Braşov. The choice of Feldioara becomes quite obvious when one looks at a map. Braşov, a city of 200,000, is surrounded by satellite towns ranging in size from 8,000 to 20,000. All these towns have some industry, but by and large they serve as dormitory communities for the thousands who commute to Braşov daily, most residents being unable to find housing in the city itself. These towns surround Braşov to the south, west, and northwest, and the growth of Feldioara will provide a satellite town and help complete the circle around Braşov. Feldioara is the nearest settlement due north of Braşov that lies on a main road, on a railroad line, has local industry, and

is in an area devoid of any other urban centers. Moreover, its large population and the new mineral-extraction plant make it an ideal candidate for conversion into a town.

Just as Braşov serves as a higher order central place for the surrounding towns in the region, Feldioara will become a central place for the surrounding five communes (eighteen villages all together), providing special economic, social, and political services for a total population of 28,000. Equal development of all of Romania's 13,000 villages is not possible, given the current emphasis on the development of heavy industry. Because of its importance, Feldioara has already had a priority claim in the allocation of the state's limited resources. As Feldioara prospers into a small-scale economic, social, and administrative center, planners have publically listed those villages that will have a "limited" spatial development, as well as those that will be phased out.

The Demographic Component

Because of its geographical primacy over other communes in planning, and its location near local industry and transport links to Braşov, the differences in population between Feldioara and the surrounding villages will no doubt be accentuated as it arrives at urban status. Feldioara will become demographically like any other town in relation to its rural hinterland: fertility will be lower, the rate of in-migration higher, there will be more non-agricultural workers, a younger, more heterogenous population occupationally, and in its particular case, because of the higher in-migration of non-Saxons, a different ethnic composition when compared to the surrounding polyethnic villages. Moreover, Feldioara will serve as a temporary stopping place in the "step-migration" from rural village to urban metropolis. Many people will be transients, waiting for legal permission or housing space in Braşov city and will not have as great a vested interest in the community as the more permanent residents. In the distant future, with more rapid transport or widespread use of private cars, one can imagine the village becoming a town for Braşov's middle classes, a kind of Romanian bedroom suburb.

Economic Component

In the area of production and consumption activities, Feldioara already has primacy in that it has several industrial factories, a small food-processing industry, and a machine tractor station for its cooperative farm. It has recently become the administrative and distributive center for the regional consumer cooperative. As a center for a network of well over 150 shops and service establishments, Feldioara's urban function is being enhanced, as is its ability to gain priority goods. It is also acquiring services that the surrounding villages cannot support because of their low population or poor location. Centralization of services and the addition of other economic enterprises are further differentiating the village from the surrounding hinterland in terms of occupational stratification and demographic heterogeneity. Of no small importance is the fact that Feldioara has now become a place that other people commute *to*, partially displacing the key industrial center of Braşov. Feldioara's large daytime population of commuting workers and students gives it a distinctive urban character, and thus an economically privileged position relative to other villages, which will not be able to regain parity without a massive reallocation of economic and social resources by the state.

Romanian villages have had a long tradition of individual autonomy and rivalry, and, in the Bîrsei country around Braşov, where the villages are relatively large and far apart, a high degree of village endogamy. The primacy of Feldioara means that a conception of social superiority may arise on the part of Feldioarans, particularly in relation to the other village in Feldioara's commune, and the *colonia* at the

brick factory, and to villages in other communes served by Feldioara. As Feldioara grows larger and more complex, as an increasing number of its daytime population is composed of migrants and commuters, the kinds of social interactions between Feldioarans and these outsiders will tend to be of the simplex type – as fellow worker on the job, as fellow Romanian, Hungarian, or Gypsy, as shopkeeper to customer, or as strangers. The services that Feldioara has will necessitate visits by other villagers in which Feldioarans will be expected to distribute equitably certain products or services. Feldioarans' access to increased economic and political power, and their special status in the eyes of the planners (not always an advantage, of course) may lead to changes in social relations between Feldioarans and others. On the few occasions that Feldioarans are in other villages, they will often be in positions of superior authority (as doctors, administrators, or service people) or they will be distributing economic goods and may tend to act capriciously, further harming the village's reputation in the eyes of its neighbors. Thus, from the standpoint of intervillage social relations, we can expect that the majority of interactions will be among relative strangers who are bound by simplex bonds only, and often the Feldioaran will be holding the political or economic purse strings.

Political Component

Since the political and economic orders are so tightly bound in socialist Romania, we can expect the urban growth of Feldioara under state planning to have its political ramifications, chiefly because of the administrative centralization of the village. Feldioarans will increasingly be making decisions (or be the object of decisions) that directly affect the quality of life in the surrounding villages, and, priorities being centered on Feldioara, most of these decisions will tend to favor it over other villages.

It is interesting to note that while such economic units as the cooperative farm and the consumer cooperative have been formally consolidated, the administrative organization of the region remains at the level of the commune, with nothing intermediary between the commune people's council and the Braşov county people's council, which represents the forty-three communes, nine towns, and Braşov city, a total population of about 500,000. With the creation of new urban centers and new hinterlands, some kind of accommodation will have to be reached between those villages that are not going to be urbanized and those that are. This might be a formally designated regional political council that is above the commune level but below the county level. Without such a political forum, intervillage relations will take on a new, more competitive character, and the role of Feldioara as a center that *serves* rather than exploits its surrounding hinterland will be less effective.

Ritual and Leisure

The conversion of Feldioara into a regional urban center will probably not affect the *traditional* ritual activities, such as religious festivals or life-cycle rites, in other villages. One can speculate, however, that as a political center Feldioara may also become a center for certain *political* rituals, such as May Day, Liberation Day, or International Women's Day. Traveling exhibits and speakers will no doubt stop at Feldioara rather than other less populous and more isolated villages, and Feldioara's politically symbolic role may increase.

Another consequence of urbanization is the decline of traditional ceremony among the local people. This may also occur in the hinterland population as the villages lose their individuality (due to increasing immigration transport and communication) and become oriented toward Feldioara or to the city of Braşov. The whole region has been experiencing in-migration for some time – all of the villages

along the rail lines and highways are attracting migrants – which serves to decrease the number of people familiar with the local customs and further contributes to a loss of village individuality. Villages become agglomerations of rural proletarians whose major activities take place outside the village setting.

Thus, if Feldioara is endowed with a restaurant and tourist complex, a sports arena, and an expanded culture house for films, dances, and plays, it could become a leisure-time center for the surrounding villages as well. These other villages would then become virtual dormitories.

Cognitive Component

The most noticeable change is in the realm of village stereotypes, and particularly in the perception of Feldioarans by immigrants and nonresidents. The Feldioaran is seen to have obtained superior advantages – fertile land, industrial income, transport – without having earned them through hard work. People of various occupations and ethnic groups from the surrounding villages think of Feldioarans as lazy, while Feldioarans feel the same about those from other villages, where the land is less fertile and industrial opportunities not as widespread. Feldioarans are conceived as being clannish, standoffish, and are imagined to gossip behind your back. On top of these regional identities is superimposed the stereotyped ethnic wisdom about Saxons, Romanians, Hungarians, and Gypsies. Village and ethnic stereotypes have become intertwined because many of the surrounding villages have large complements of one or another ethnic group, and many of the migrants are not Transylvanian Romanians but Moldavians, Hungarians, and Gypsies.

A further change may become evident in the relationship between village and regional identity. Since the commune system is solely administrative (and very recently created), there is no commune identity to rival that of the village. But there is a larger regional identity inherent in being from the Bîrsa country (a group of thirteen villages around Braşov, near the Bîrsa river) and from the Braşov district as a whole. In soccer-addicted Romania, there is a strong allegiance to the Braşov city team because they are "*al nostru*" (one of us) while the local football team is not that important. Perhaps the day Feldioara acquires its own big-time soccer club will be the day it really becomes a town in the eyes of its residents.

Braşov, just twenty minutes by bus or train, is referred to as "*oras*" (the city) by Feldioarans. Obviously, the rise of a new urban center (albeit small at 7,000) will change the rural perception of the environment as *either* city *or* countryside. If one means Braşov when one says *oras* today, then perhaps one day that term will come to connote Feldioara.

An ultimate shift in cognitive patterns may develop in relation to national identity. Feldioara will be, to outsiders as well as to locals, a manifestation of the state's plan to develop Romania "multilaterally" (the official word), and as such will serve to carry the nation-building propaganda to the rural dwellers in a new and exciting way. This will continue, of course, as long as the urbanization of Feldioara is seen as desirable by the residents and those villagers from the surrounding area who visit or work in Feldioara.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: THE CITY COMES TO THE PEASANT

This paper has been a detailed account of the planned urban transformation of a Romanian village into a small town designed to serve as economic, social, and administrative center to a network of villages. This systematization is part of a coordinated national plan aimed at developing Romania's rural economic potential by restructuring its urban/rural hierarchy. We have looked at the wide-ranging effects of this process on the components of the village cultural system, defined as spatial, demographic, economic, social, political, ritual, leisure, and cognitive.

The urbanization of the village has begun to differentiate the settlement pattern, resulting in a central business district and various distinct, ranked neighborhoods. Nonagricultural economic opportunities, the expansion of commercial and service centers, and the increasing centralization of economic and administrative functions have all contributed to this process. Extensive in-migration of Romanian, Hungarian, and Gypsy workers, combined with continuing Saxon out-migration, has increased occupational and ethnic heterogeneity, stimulated social friction between the native-born and in-migrants, and is reflected along the whole circumference of these social relations. In most urban areas the most recent migrants to the city occupy the lowest socioeconomic statuses. In Feldioara, both the lowest and *the highest* socioeconomic statuses are the province of migrants, and the village is partly administered by a commuter elite which lives in Braşov. Political power has been and is being concentrated in people who are more aloof from Feldioara's life style and less subject to local control. This is regrettable, since it is just at these crucial periods of change that locally based leadership that can *see* what is going on is most needed. Ritual and leisure-time activities have also changed somewhat, along with the cognitive apprehension of village life. Considered as part of an open cultural system, the components of Feldioara are being affected by the outside stimuli of systematization, and these components are in turn affecting each other. While strains have begun to show in the social life of the village, and in the villagers' attitudes, any statement about an urban crisis in Feldioara would be premature. The village system seems to be moving toward a new homeostasis at a higher level, somewhere between a village and a full-fledged town.

In the same systemic fashion we have looked at the wider, regional level, which is also affected by the systematization of the village, and we have anticipated certain changes in the regional network of villages as one of them – Feldioara – becomes urban.

Certain stresses have also been examined in detail, many of these in *both* the village and regional systems revolve around three axes: (1) the economic and political centralization of Feldioara; (2) the consequent heterogeneity of population in the form of new migrants or commuters to the village; and (3) the social and political position of these nonresidents in relation to the locals. One thing is certain, however: Feldioara is rapidly losing certain features that made it a village and is rapidly developing that complex of features associated with urbanism – increased population size and density, a nonagricultural work force, social heterogeneity, a higher density of role relationships and more simplex ties, and some sort of administrative recognition of these traits by the state. It should be emphasized that it is not the quantity of people or enterprises that makes this village city-like, but the "complexity" of demographic, economic, social, and political characteristics. These characteristics are by no means viewed benignly by all the residents. The large number of strangers, the petty crime, and the late afternoon shopping crowds are distinctly negative phenomena. But other changes are eagerly awaited, and a recent letter from Feldioara tells me proudly that when I return to the village, the whole place will look like a construction site.

Furthermore, it must be noted that many of the changes I have pointed out are not solely the result of planned, socialist citification, but of a wider, less conscious "Western" transformation related to the sheer imperatives of industrialization, "modernization," and the migration of peasants to cities (what we usually call urbanization). Other shifts may be wholly idiosyncratic to Feldioara itself, having nothing to do with any sort of transition from village to town. Clearly, the social dynamics of Feldioara, and even the direction of change, have their roots in Feldioara's particular situation, so that systematization may have only served to accelerate certain changes that would

have come inevitably, while dampening others. In further research in Romania, I hope to be able to distinguish those factors directly connected with planned urban development from the other, secular trends and from fortuitous factors, an absolutely critical problem in understanding the difficulties and possibilities of socialist transformation.

This paper, then, has examined a different kind of urban development in which the local residents do not move to a new environment, but where the city is brought to them, not haphazardly, but via state-directed central planning. Unlike the urban adjustments of migrants, certain "city-oriented" Feldioarans have not been preselected for urban migration – everyone in the village is undergoing urbanization, whether they want to or not. There is no "push" and there is no "pull," only the "press" of state planning.

We have noticed that two changes in Feldioara are happening *in spite* of the desires of the planners rather than because of them, and I would like to point out solutions that seem possible to a sympathetic anthropologist. Within the village it appears that the most serious potential stress point is the social cleavage between incoming migrants and local or long-term residents. In urbanization throughout the world, we have seen how the formation of voluntary associations has facilitated migrant adjustment to urban areas [24]. By letting them form their own groups, or by actively recruiting them into the party or the youth league, the migrants could achieve some of the political influence and social relations necessary for an adequate adjustment to life in the urbanizing village of Feldioara. The party could also act to see that there is no socioeconomic differentiation in residence patterns (read: ghettoization). A third response to migrant/local tension would be to close off Feldioara for a time so that the new migrants do not overwhelm the local population; this would, however, slow down urban growth and would thus entail consideration at the highest level.

The second issue I would like to emphasize concerns the interminable problem of routing and retrieving information from and to Feldioara and its hinterland of villages, and among local citizens, the various elite, and the regional and national planning agencies. A more responsive system would minimize abrupt policy shifts due to unrecognized failures which harm everyone equally.

While the experience of Feldioara would be important even if considered in isolation, the fact is that planned urban development has been employed elsewhere in the world. Just as the Braşov area (the most industrialized) may serve to adumbrate Romanian developments, the Romanian experience, and more widely the European socialist experience, is a competitive model for development planning in the so-called Third World countries: that is, planning which is government controlled, more or less centralized, at times very fast-paced, fraught with danger, and conceived as Marxist. For these reasons, the Romanian experience as a whole, and particularly Feldioara's future transition into a town, will continue to be of the utmost anthropological, and therefore political, significance.

NOTES

1 André Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Clifford Geertz, *Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963); Edward Hansen, Jane Schneider, and Peter Schneider, "Modernization and Development: The Role of Regional Elites and Non-Corporate Groups in the European Mediterranean," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 14 (1972), pp. 328-350.

2 Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Structure of Societies," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 15 (1973), pp. 199-226.

3 E.M. Eddy, ed., *Urban Anthropology: Research Perspectives and Strategies* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1968); George M. Foster and Robert V. Kemper, eds., *Anthropologists in Cities* (Boston: Little Brown, 1974); William Mangin, ed., *Peasants in Cities: Readings in the Anthropology of Urbanization* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970); Aidan Southall, *Urban Anthropology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Thomas Weaver and Douglas White, eds., *The Anthropology of Urban Environments* (Society for Applied Anthropology, Monograph No. 11, 1972).

4 Nancy B. Graves and Theodore B. Graves, "Adaptive Strategies in Urban Migration," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 3 (1974), pp. 117-151.

5 Frank C. Miller, *Old Villages and a New Town: Mexico* (Menlo Park: Cummings Press, 1973); Manning Nash, *Machine-Age Maya*, American Anthropological Association Memoir No. 87 (1958); Sigrid Khera, "An Austrian Peasant Village Under Rural Industrialization," *Behavioral Science Notes*, vol. 7 (1972), pp. 31-32.

6 Orio Pi-Sunyer, "Tourism and Its Discontents: The Impact of a New Industry on a Catalan Community," *Studies in European Society*, vol. 1 (1973), pp. 1-20; Harriet Rosenberg, Randy Reiter, and Rayna Reiter, "Rural Workers in French Alpine Tourism: Whose Development?" in ibid., pp. 21-38.

7 Research was carried out in Romania from January to July 1974 under the European Field Studies Program of the Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, under the direction of Prof. John W. Cole. Financial support provided by this program is gratefully acknowledged. The original version of this paper was written in April 1975. From Fall 1975 to Fall 1976 I returned to Feldioara to continue the research, with funding and official support provided by the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) and by a Fulbright-Hay Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad grant (grant number GOO-75-00196). As this paper was about to go press (January 1976), I was given the opportunity by the editor to make last-minute revisions and additions based on my current field stay. While most of these revisions are of a statistical nature, others deal with new laws enacted by the Romanian government or further developments in the village of Feldioara itself. For their many helpful suggestions and critiques in writing the final version of this paper, I would like to thank the following individuals: Prof. John W. Cole, Prof. Alfred Hudson, Prof. Bahram Tavakolian, Prof. Eric Wolf, Prof. Mihail Cernea, Marilyn McArthur, and Vibeke Sampson. Finally, I would like to dedicate this paper to the people of Feldioara.

8 Ion Blaga, *Romania's Population* (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1972).

9 These statistics come from a variety of local sources, including the census, labor force statistics, and street listings. They represent both averages and extrapolations, because many of them duplicate each other with a wide margin of error. Just to give an example, for the total population of the village, an official village (October 1973) census gives the total as 3,040, while my tabulation of the street listing yielded only 2,638, and villagers tell me there are really 3,500. Besides arithmetical and sampling errors, the population of the village varies seasonally due to the increase in farm labor and construction work. Officials have informed me that many of these transient individuals are not accounted for one census listings, thus boosting the population of the village even more. When I returned to Feldioara in October 1975, two local officials told me that the population was now 4,000, including the transients. For certain statistical breakdowns such as occupation, age/sex, or ethnic group, I relied chiefly on the street listing, which is called the *Registru Agricole*. Data from the 1973–74 *Registru* were coded, punched, and analyzed at the University of Massachusetts computer center using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programs (Version 5.8), with the assistance of Prof. Richard Wilkey. Until the statistics can be completely updated to reflect recent changes, as well as compared with past street listings, the numbers will serve more of an illustrative function than a substantive one. Certain statistics concerning natal origin of the residents and cooperative farm membership lists were either unavailable or unreliable, so that data reflect observations, interviews, impressions, etc.

10 Walter Christaller, *Central Places in Southern Germany* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966);

11 Romania's postwar economic development is summarized in English in David Turnock, *An Economic Geography of Romania* (London: Bell and Sons, 1974), in Blaga, *Romania's Population*, and in Ion Drăgon, "The Policy of Socialist Construction and the Urban Phenomenon," in M. Constantinescu et al., *Urban Growth Processes in Romania* (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1974), pp. 31–93.

12 The best summaries of socialist planning not meant for the specialized economist are in Jack C. Fisher, ed., *City and Regional Planning in Poland* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966); and Morris Zeitlin, *Socialist Cities* (Council of Planning Librarians, Exchange Bibliography No. 228-197, 1972). For a general view of regional development in Southeastern Europe, see George W. Hofman, *Regional Development Strategy in Southeastern Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, and Yugoslavia* (New York: Praeger, 1973), and Kosta Mihailovic, *Regional Development: Experiences and Prospects in Eastern Europe* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972). Romanian development is discussed in more detail in Turnock, *An Economic Geography of Romania*, as well as in I. Pacaruaru, "Planned Development and the Labour Force Structure in Romania, 1950–1966," *International Labour Review*, vol. 94 (1966), pp. 535–549. Other information on socialist planning characteristics is contained in Zygmunt Pioro, "Comment," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, vol. 31 (1965), pp. 31–35; Milos Savic, "Comment," in ibid., pp. 35–38; Jack C. Fisher, "Planning in the City of Socialist Man," ibid., Vol. 28 (1962), pp. 251–265, and "Comment," in ibid., vol. 31 (1965), pp. 38-42; Robert J. Osborn and Thomas Reiner, "Soviet City Planning: Current Issues and Future Perspectives,' in ibid., vol. 28 (1962), pp. 239–250; Michael B. Frolic, "The Soviet City," *Town Planning Review*, vol. 34 (1963), pp. 285-306; and Dragan, "The Policy of Socialist Construction and the Urban Phenomenon."

13 See Josef Pajestka, "Comments on Economic Planning in Poland," in Fisher, ed., *City and Regional Planning in Poland*, pp. 411-432.

14 Bette S. Denich, "Social Mobility and Industrialization in a Yugoslav Town," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1974; and "Why Do Peasants Urbanize? A Yugoslav Case Study," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 220 (1974), pp. 546-559.

15 See Gerald Breese, *Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), pp. 133-136; and John C. Friedmann, "The Strategy of Deliberate Urbanization," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, vol. 34 (1968), pp. 364-373.

16 Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Eric Wolf, "Aspects of Group Relations in a Complex Society," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 58 (1956), pp. 1065-1078; Anthony Leeds, "Locality Power in Relation to Supralocal Power Institutions," in Southall, ed., *Urban Anthropology*.

17 Drăgon, "The Policy of Socialist Construction and the Urban Phenomenon," p. 71.

18 All of Romania was cooperativized by 1962. The private agricultural sector is confined to the mountainous areas and contributes less than 5 percent of total agricultural production. See other papers on Romania in this and previous issues of *Dialectical Anthropology*.

19 John W. Cole, "Social Process in a Romanian Worker Village." Paper presented at the 1975 Northeastern Anthropological Association Meetings, Potsdam, New York.

20 Hilda Scott, *Does Socialism Liberate Women?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1974).

21 See, for instance, Tiberiu Bogdan, et al., *Processul de Urbanizare in R.S. Romania-Zona Braşov* (Bucharest: Editura Politica, 1970); and Natalia Damian, "Schimbari ale Structurilor Familiale in Cadrul Processului de Urbanizare," in M. Constantinescu *et al., Processul de Urbanizare in R.S. Romania: Zona Slatina-Olt* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 1970), pp. 209-254.

22 Saxon strategies are discussed in more detail by Marilyn McArthur, in "The Saxon Germans: Political Fate of an Ethnic Minority," in this issue of *Dialectical Anthropology*.

23 This questionnaire was administered by my research colleague in Feldioara, Marilyn McArthur.

24 Kenneth Little, "The Role of Voluntary Associations in West African Urbanization," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 59 (1957), pp. 479–496; "Urbanization and Regional Associations: Their Paradoxical Function," in Southall, *Urban Anthropology*; and William Mangin, "The Role of Regional Associations in the Adaptation of the Rural Population of Peru," *Sociologue*, vol. 9 (1959), pp. 23–55.

Dialectical Anthropology 1 (1976) 321–347