Recent Developments and Evolution Perspectives of the Constitutional Justice in Romania. From Institutional Dialogue, to Jurisprudential Confrontation Between the Constitutional Court and the High Court of Cassation and Justice of Romania

"When power is right, justice has no power." - Japanese proverb

Valentin – Stelian BĂDESCU

ABSTRACT
In the context of the pandemic, the entire codification process and the way in which the Administrative Code was adopted brought into question the relationship between political power, administration and society and public administration, as well as the general quality of regulation in Romanian public law. From this perspective, everything that happened in the local administrative space during this period confirmed the vulnerability, and not the solidity of the rule of law, which we know works with and on the basis of democracy, with rules established and applied in close accordance with the will freely expressed by the population, any legislative vacuum having the ability to generate anarchy. A member of the European Union, Romania currently operates on the basis of and in the application of internal legislation, in legislative harmony with European Union and international regulations. The rules established, through multilateral European and international legal instruments, require that any democratic society is obliged to ensure a fair balance between the respect of human rights, proportionately, and the satisfaction of the general interest, but neither of the two sides of the balance can be dominant in a democratic society, in which the concept of the rule of law represents a constitutional reality whose foundation is found in the mechanisms of the exercise of state power, in the relationships between power and the freedom of each individual in society and in the application of the principle of legality to the entire state activity, but also to the behavior of each member of society.
KEYWORDS: *The administrative code, the Covid-19 pandemic, the rule of law, the legal system, the health system, victims*

1. Introduction. Warning: the vulnerability of the rule of law in the Romanian administrative space during the Covid-19 pandemic

I don't know if, three years after the adoption of the Administrative Code, a substantial perspective can be drawn on the quality of the regulation, as well as on the way in which this true administrative Constitution of Romania responds to the requirements and expectations of citizens, civil servants and practitioners, actors of public law and private and last but not least to the academic environment and specialists in the matter, since in this short period, on the scale of history, two years were marked by the harmful, criminal effects of the pandemic that affected the Romanian administrative space as well, with the consequence of altering our entire legislations. So, even if the adoption of the Administrative Code in 2019 represented an important moment in

the matter of the regulation of the public sphere, we will analyze, in our study, some aspects regarding the effects of the pandemic on the public administration in Romania. In the context of the pandemic, the entire codification process and the way in which the Administrative Code was adopted brought into question the relationship between political power, administration and society and public administration, as well as the general quality of regulation in Romanian public law. From this perspective, everything that happened in the Romanian administrative space during this period confirmed the vulnerability, and not the solidity of the rule of law, which we know works with and on the basis of democracy, with rules established and applied in close accordance with the will freely expressed by the population, any legislative vacuum having the ability to generate anarchy. A member of the European Union, Romania currently operates on the basis of and in the application of internal legislation, in legislative harmony with European Union and international regulations. The rules established, through multilateral European and international legal instruments, require that any democratic society is obliged to ensure a fair balance between the respect of human rights, proportionately, and the satisfaction of the general interest, but neither of the two sides of the balance can be dominant in a democratic society, in which the concept of the rule of law represents a constitutional reality whose foundation is found in the mechanisms of the exercise of state power, in the relationships between power and the freedom of each individual in society and in the application of the principle of legality to the entire state activity, but also to the behavior of each member of society.

From a normative point of view, the requirements of the rule of law are manifested in a double meaning: the first meaning, the formal one, expresses the requirement that the state, its organs respect the laws, strictly obey the legal rules that have as their object the way of composition of the organs of the state, their attributions and functions. and the other, the material meaning – the requirement that the state bodies, exercising their powers, respect the legal guarantees regarding the exercise of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizens. In terms of ideology, the rule of law confers a logical system of ideas, through which people represent their society, the state, in all its manifestations and through which legitimacy is conferred to the state. The phrase "rule of law" is not a simple logical concept, but expresses a fundamental constitutional necessity according to which: a) the state is indispensable to law in order to create its rules and to ensure the finality and effectiveness of legal rules.; b) the right to express power is indispensable to the state, by establishing a general and mandatory behavior. In essence, the rule of law expresses a condition regarding power, a movement to rationalize it, but also a new conception regarding law, its role and functions. Professor Tudor Draganu, in his work "Introduction to the theory and practice of the rule of law", proposes an interesting and comprehensive definition of this concept of constitutional law: "The rule of law is considered that state which is organized on the basis of the principle of the separation of state powers, in the application of which justice acquires a real independence and following through its legislation the promotion of the rights and freedoms inherent to human nature, ensures the strict compliance of its regulations by all its organs, in their entire activity". The definition reproduces the main elements of the rule of law - the separation of powers, as a reality of state activity, the application of the principle of legality in the activity of all

state bodies, the respect and guarantee of fundamental human rights. This definition also results in the basic features of the rule of law, namely: first, the freedoms of the human person demand guarantees of security and justice through the primacy of law and especially of the Constitution. Second, the moderation of the execution of power calls for the organization and adaptation of the functions of the eratic bodies and a hierarchical normative system. From the corroboration of the principles inscribed in international documents, as well as in relation to the doctrine of constitutional law, we consider the following to be conditions or characteristics of the rule of law:

- the accreditation of a new conception regarding the state, especially under the following aspects: the voluntary or consensual nature of the state, the delimitation of the state from civil society, the responsibility of the state and the authorities that make it up and the moderation of coercion as a means of state intervention in society through appropriate forms and reasonable;
- capitalizing on the reasons and mechanisms of the principle of separation of powers in the state;
- the establishment and deepening of an authentic and real democracy;
- the institutionalization and guarantee of the rights and freedoms of man and citizen;
- establishing a coherent and hierarchical legal order and a field of law.

The functionality and systematic coherence of the rule of law must be ensured through several regulatory systems, respectively: the political control that is carried out by the Parliament, as one of its essential functions, through various institutional means; the administrative control that is carried out in the system of public administration bodies, either at their initiative or at the initiative of citizens; jurisdictional control over the legality of administrative acts, entrusted either to common law courts or to specialized courts; control of the constitutionality of laws; control of respect for fundamental rights and freedoms through the authority bodies and the judiciary; the conciliation and control procedure, which is carried out through the institution of the "ombudsman" or the People's Advocate; free access to justice and the organization of judicial activity in several degrees of jurisdiction.

However, not infrequently, during this pandemic, discussions were held, but there were also tendencies to replace individual rights, only with the idea of "general interest", precisely to materialize the need to be "absolute", in a moment of necessity that targeted society as a whole. This complex situation generated the establishment of two "camps", based on divergent legal opinions: one, unanimously favorable to the rules imposed by the state authorities, and another, whose opinions converge towards an extremely sensitive plan, certain ideas or positions being categorized at least subjectively, either "fundamentalist", "extremist", "pan-orthodox", both imposing the need to be anchored within the limits of the current legal framework. It is no less true that the COVID-19 pandemic has, unfortunately for a democracy, entailed the paradox that an important series of representatives of some segments, called to ensure state stability under special conditions, including top representatives of the political class, to to be noted negatively, repeatedly and constantly, at the level of the collective mind, with violations of the rules of law, in an exceptional context, in the conditions where all the legal elements intended to regulate the legal order started precisely from them, the fact being meant to erode, decisively, the trust in the

institutions, in the representatives of the state and in the application of the law. We believe that we are facing a "slippage" from social equality but also from the relationship between social equality and political equality. It must be said that, for Tocqueville, in the 19th century, democracy was fundamentally a state of society, not a form of government, where the state was manifested by the tendency towards the progressive and irreversible equalization of the living conditions of individuals, the ways their way of life, the rejection of any form of aristocracy, of any hierarchy. It tended towards the progress of social welfare which implicitly led to the implementation of political equality before the law, and not a manifestation of the famous expression primus inter pares.

Moreover, a confirmation of the degradation of trust in the force of law is also the rhetorical question formulated by the voice of the French philosopher Fulcran Teisserenc4: when the one who rehabilitates a law is not a genuine politician, its value lies in its only effects - the stability and unity of the political community - distancing himself from private interests, from the predictability of individual behavior. In the complex context of the pandemic, to which was added the infusion of news and manipulation, the state institutional evolution aimed mainly at protecting the citizen, the city, materializing the purpose for which it functions, under exceptional conditions. Any exceptional measure adopted and implemented is intended to ensure the functioning of the state, for the benefit of the citizen. Under these conditions, I believe that individual rights can no longer be guaranteed their absolute character, being burdened by certain limitations, determined by ensuring the exercise of democracy at the macro level, of society as a whole, with the exception of non-derogable rights, which represent the "irreducible core" : the right to life, the right to be protected against torture and other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the right to be protected against slavery or servitude and the principle of non-retroactivity of criminal laws. The COVID-19 pandemic has generated and will continue to generate many comments and debates in the legal world, according to the emergence of various norms that, through social utility, were, are and will be - or not - in a position to confer the rule of law - on Romania - the allure of a solid partner, attached to democratic values, at the same time, independent.

Thus, we consider that any idea and attitude, far from this vision, can enroll a state in the dangerous path of breaking the law, of social slippages, through the lack or non-application of the essential element, the respect for democratic values, translated into human rights. We watched helplessly, the way in which, in this period of social crisis, the functions of law underwent substantial changes, since the relationship of law as imperative normativity with conflict and crisis is inherent.

Law itself is a regulatory social reaction. Commenting on the need for law in society, Eugeniu Speranţia emphasized: "If people's lives were not forever dependent on the satisfaction of certain requirements, if it did not involve the pursuit of certain ends, if it were not reducible to the tendency to possess certain values and if in this tendency, rivalries and conflicts between people could not arise, the right would not have the reason to be". Furthermore, the divergences, discord, enmity in society, as a result of the tendency to possess values, can lead to endangering coexistence, because this, by its nature, implies a minimum of harmonic convergence of

consciousnesses. In this perspective, law is "a deductive system of social norms intended to ensure a maximum of sociality in a determined social group through a maximum of realizable justice". The true purpose of law, writes E. Speranţia, is to help society in what its nature does: the affirmation and expansion of spirituality. Coherence, cohesiveness, functionality and dynamic balance of society is not a given, but rather a result that presupposes compliance with the desirable cultural-normative models of the behaviors of the majority of individuals and social groups. This complex and contradictory process is shaped by the interference of various processes of socialization, adaptation and integration, social control, the latter aiming at the correspondence between the prescribed roles and the ones actually played and including a set of cultural, moral and normative ways, means and mechanisms through which society imposes a series of constraints and prohibitions on the individual to oblige him to comply with the basic norms and values of society.

The notion of social control was included in the vocabulary of legal sociology by the American school of "sociological jurisprudence" in connection with the identification of the main mechanisms and levers through which any society ensures its cohesion, stability and functionality. In the general concept of the "sociological jurisprudence" school, an important role was given to law, considered to be the most perfect means of social control. In this context, in which, as N. Bobbio remarked, the sociological theory of law examines law as a system dependent on the global social system, functions as actionable services that satisfy a systemic need. In the opinion of Italian professor V. Ferrari, law performs three functions: social regulation; dealing with declared conflicts and legitimizing power. The analysis of the point of view expressed by L. Friedman in this matter emphasizes the fact that the interaction between the legal system and the social context which is conditioned and directed by the legal culture, law not being an independent and autonomous entity, but sensitive to external pressures, reflecting the wishes and the power of social forces that receive . The functions of the legal system according to L. Friedman are: mitigating conflicts, resolving controversies, social control, social engineering and behavior change. We also recall N. Bobbio's distinction between the repressive function of law, which enshrines freedom and order through the legal sanction, and the stimulating function, which conditions human behavior, considering the complex level of the legal sanction, not only punitive but and positive, stimulating. Therefore, in short stage conclusions, the analysis of the teleological dimension in law in relation to conflict and social crisis reveals, among others: the relations of determination, influence and interaction between the general interest, the formalized general will, the system of legal norms; the multiple conditions of law as an intentional product, guided by a goal, but also the internal legalities and the relative autonomy of law that exceeds the position of a simple instrument of social control; the extremely significant position of law in the system of social control which must not be distorted, reduced to some defining notes such as imperativeness and repressibility, but also seen the social-constructive valences of law, the complex interactions it has with politics, morality, science, education, religion, art; There are only a few theoretical considerations regarding law in relation to society, with a major impact on the orientation of legal policy, the elaboration and application of law, depending on the different social contexts. Of

course, it is up to the political decision-making factor, the specialists in the matter, but also some multidisciplinary teams, to critically filter this vision, to renovate and innovate, assuming the responsibility of configuring a strategy, depending on the entire social normative system, of a concrete social space, of context, of the historical time we are going through. And now, after these theoretical considerations, let's move on to something more applied regarding the object of our study - the application of the Romanian Administrative Code during the Covid-19 pandemic, with particular reference to the systemic interaction between the legal system and the health system.

2. About the systemic interaction between the legal system and the health system

Both systems, both the legal and the sanitary, face communication problems, especially between the two normative cultural spheres, respectively the sphere of internal culture and that of external culture. Moreover, we believe that in both cases it is necessary to distinguish between the component of understanding these norms and the component of accepting them. Both systems are characterized by autonomy, being circumscribed by the concept of autopoiesis. The legal system was considered in the specialized literature as a closed operational system, which after the acquisition of autonomy becomes susceptible to external information. From the point of view of the location of the two systems in the broader framework of the normative social system, the normative sanitary system is placed, at least at first glance, in the system of technical norms, which act as a macrosystem, alongside the system of law, within the normative social system . The hard core of the sphere of personality rights, which are otherwise circumscribed to natural law, is closely related to the notion of human rights, fundamental freedoms and other similar notions. Analyzing the interaction between the legal system and the health normative system, it follows that the latter tends to overlap with the common law norms with priority. This effect could be explained, at least on a theoretical level, by resorting to the well-known adage specialia generalibus derogant, in which sense we could consider that the norms of the sanitary normative system have the character of special norms, which are applied as a priority over the norms of law common. Such a hypothesis would lead to the idea that these norms should be immediately applied and strictly interpreted. If the immediate application is undoubtedly simple to explain and understand, the strict interpretation seems to have been replaced by a form of extensive interpretation, justified at least at the declarative level by the urgency and necessity imposed by the effects of a pandemic. This last aspect leads us to the attempt to analyze the point of origin of the overlap of the two normative systems that we discussed above.

From a systemic point of view, the emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic, classified first as an epidemic and later as a pandemic, generated a series of systemic reactions within the health system. Moreover, this system has the nature of an open system, but it is also a cyber system. From an informational point of view, when the first information about the existence of the epidemic/pandemic enters the system, a reaction is triggered by which the system tries to anticipate, prevent and counteract the negative effects of the epidemic/pandemic. The reaction is materialized by sanitary technical norms, most of them being mandatory. Moreover, the instrument

for the material application of measures to prevent and counteract negative effects in the health field is characterized by issuing the norms mentioned above. Depending on the seriousness of the information inputs into the system, the applicability of the sanitary norms have a narrower or wider scope of application, both from a spatio-temporal perspective and from the perspective of the recipients of these norms. The main problem with the enactment of these rules, however, seems to come from the lack of communication of the arguments that justify the need for such measures. Thus, the activity of decoding specialized information fails to ensure the transmission of a clear message, which can be received by the recipients of these norms, respectively the general public. This problem has also been encountered by the legal system, over time, in the conditions where a good part of the legal norms were characterized by a technical and hermetic language, often inaccessible to litigants. Under these conditions, it seems unlikely that the content of these norms will be accepted by the recipients, as long as their understanding and especially the arguments on which these norms are based are not sufficiently clearly explained. We believe that in this situation the opinions of the renowned jurist Jurgen Habermas can be considered, who showed that in the case of the communication of law, a tripartite system must be taken into account, in the sense that signs and symbols can be perceived in a certain way in the external world, in in another way they can be perceived in their own social world and in a third way, distinctly they can be perceived in the internal world of the issuer, in which his internal experiences are essential.

In the case of the Covid-19 pandemic, it can be observed that the health regulations tended to restrict certain fundamental human rights, invoking a higher general health interest, such as to ensure the good existence of the community. Obviously, the norms in question overlapped with the legal norms, including those regarding some fundamental human rights, circumscribed by the concepts of natural law. On the other hand, in its turn, the legal system reacted to the signals sent by the health system, in several directions. On the one hand, it regulated both at the legislative and judicial level protection norms based on the information provided by the health system. On the other hand, through its instrument for the implementation of legal norms, namely the judicial system, it also began to implement some punitive measures even against the applicability of some sanitary administrative norms, which were annulled. Between the two systems there are similarities, but also obvious differences. The legal system is less focused on the notion of anticipatory behavior, it intervenes in the normative social system through the legislative policies it implements, but their effective application is usually carried out over a fairly long period of time, the legislative process being often very laborious. The legal system, however, has numerous instruments of a punitive nature, through which it effectively implements its legislative policies. The health system is characterized by a much more pronounced temporal dynamic, generated by the need for very fast response times to various medical emergencies, as well as due to its pre-eminent anticipatory feature. As regards the instruments of a punitive nature, as a rule, the health system calls on the legal system, and with the help of its instruments, it ensures the implementation of health policies, both from a preventive and a punitive perspective. The mechanism by which the health interest overlaps in a priority way including on some norms related to human rights is

achieved using even concepts of the legal system, considering that the legal system presents diversification valences, both intra-systemic and inter-systemic.

In this sense, the concept of preventing damage to the interests of others, namely neminem laedere or alterum non laedere is increasingly used to justify the immersion and superimposition of the health interest with priority over other fundamental legal norms. From this point of view, it can be considered that through a genuine systemic effect, the emergence and evolution of the Covid-19 pandemic is likely to directly influence the perception of natural law concepts, both at the level of the internal legal culture, of law operators, and at the level of external legal culture, of the general public. So, in short, these are some particularities of the interaction between the legal system and the health system, as a result of the incidence of the Covid-19 pandemic, but also some possible future legal developments. Obviously, a good part of the concepts of natural law regarding the absolute inalienability of some human rights are to change, considering that the situations generated by future pandemics will determine the approach of some immediately applicable solutions, which may have the object of restricting or limiting some human rights. Undoubtedly, the legal system will not remain without a reaction to the action of the health system, generated by the need to anticipate, prevent and counter the effects of future epidemics and pandemics, these reactions having, as I have shown in the content of the paper, preventive values as well as sanctions. The pandemic did not only produce human victims, but it also had a strong impact on administrative law, on the entire administrative system in Romania, which we will insist on in the future.

3. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on administrative law

At the end of January 2020, the first case of COVID-19 was officially registered in Europe. Within just a few weeks, the disease had spread throughout the EU, forcing most member states to implement measures to slow the rate of infection. As citizens were encouraged to stay at home and work remotely, EU institutions had to find ways to ensure business continuity. In this context, the ability of public administrations to continue to function was essential for governments and international organizations to fulfill their roles and respond to the emerging crisis. This capacity is called resilience, i.e. the ability to absorb a negative impact or recover from a disaster as the impact of the coronavirus pandemic has spread rapidly across all areas of activity. As for the impact on administrative law, we must draw attention to the facts resulting from the imposed government rules: more than half of the world's population was in isolation, many businesses closed, airplanes flew much less, public transport was significantly reduced. According to experts, the pandemic, although temporary, stopped human activity, transport, industry and consumption, but this is only a respite from nature, a breath of fresh air, because in the future everything will start to return to its natural course. The analysis of the nature and legal effects of the pandemic generated by the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus is a recent and ongoing concern of legal specialists, in order to anticipate potential contractual and/or litigious crisis situations, likely to arise during the state of emergency or even after its termination (including by the termination of some of the effects of the

special, derogatory legislation adopted during this period, and, therefore, after the restoration of the domestic legal order). The central element of the discussions is COVID-19, which has caused enough victims to cause the World Health Organization, on 11.03.2020, to declare that we are in the presence of a pandemic - a qualification that can, by itself, entail legal effects not negligible. We appreciate that it is not possible to analyze in abstracto the nature and legal effects of the pandemic, respectively a legal qualification universally valid for all branches of law. The same fact of the pandemic has different nature and legal effects, depending on the matter analyzed or even depending on the specific situation. So, before associating COVID-19 with the conspiracy theory or the great reset, it is recommended to analyze the legislation that refers to the notion of epidemic/pandemic, so the way in which the legislator chose to relate to these exceptional situations in different branches of law. As far as the branch of administrative law is concerned, force majeure does not have an express regulation, such as in labor law or tax law. But, according to art. 5 para. (3) from Law no. 554/2004 of the administrative case, disputes related to administrative acts issued for the application of the state of emergency, as well as for the removal of the consequences of epidemics (a fortiori of pandemics) are exempted from the application of the provisions of art. 14 of the same normative act, respectively, cannot be suspended. So, on the one hand, these acts are not exempted from the control of legality, and on the other hand, they represent an exception from the suspension of the execution of administrative acts. Specifically, the administrative acts adopted during the state of emergency by the President of Romania and the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Presidential Decree no. 195/2020 and Military Ordinances no. 1/2020, no. 2/2020 and no. 3/2020) do not are exempted from the plano from legality control, through administrative litigation - an action to cancel them in whole or in part, based on Law no. 554/2004, is not susceptible to "non-receipt fines".

A brief and historical analysis of the evolution of the rules of the Administrative Litigation Law is useful, however, for establishing the limits of the control of the above-mentioned administrative acts, given that we have established that an action for annulment can be exercised against them. Thus, initially, art. 2 lit. a) Law no. 29/1990 on administrative litigation included an express provision to the effect that the acts issued to combat epidemics could not be challenged in court. The reference to these documents can currently be found in the content of art. 5 para. (3) from Law no. 554/2004. It is concluded that the legislator returned to the initial decision to exclude acts of this nature from control. But the legitimate question is: what are the limits of control? In the absence of express regulations, in the relevant doctrine in the matter, it was held that the limits of referring the courts with an action to cancel the administrative acts issued for the application of the state of emergency and to remove the consequences of the epidemics in abstracto are circumscribed by the notion of excess of power. However, discussing applied to the present situation, under the conditions in which the Secretary General of the UN and the Secretary General of the Council of Europe were notified of the measures adopted (according to art. 48 letter b) of Presidential Decree no. 195/2020), can we discuss the possible "illegality" of these acts, which are in themselves a violation of human rights norms? To answer, the provisions of art. 15 of the European Convention on Human Rights (and, subsidiarily, those of art. 53 of the Romanian

Constitution), which stipulates that Member States may derogate from the provisions of the Convention, if the situation requires it and on the condition that these measures are not in contradiction with other obligations arising from international law. It is undeniable that the provisions and measures to combat the spread of the infection with the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus are legal from the perspective of the first condition: the establishment of the state of emergency, as well as the measures ordered by the military ordinances, are necessary measures and, for the moment, proportionate to the actual situation against which they were issued: the global pandemic COVID-19. It would therefore remain to analyze the administrative measures from the perspective of the violation of international law, or, we believe that, at least at first sight, there is no question of such a violation. Obviously, at the time of commenting on the provisions of Law no. 554/2004, the doctrine does not seem to have taken into account administrative acts issued during a pandemic, such as those in question, but those adopted in special situations, susceptible to excess of power. On the other hand, ad absurdum, if it could be demonstrated that the acts in question were issued with an excess of power (notion regulated by art. 2 par. (1) letter n) of Law no. 554/2004), they could be annulled by the court in the legality control. It should not be overlooked, however, that judicial activity is suspended until the end of the state of emergency, and the lists of urgent reasons do not include actions to cancel administrative acts issued during the state of emergency for excess of power. Consequently, despite the fact that they are exempt from suspension (which implies that their legal effects can be stopped exclusively by retraction - as an act of the issuing authority - or annulment - as a result of the admission of a judicial action -), however, there is a multitude of difficulties in adjudicating such an action for annulment. Does the exclusion of the control of these documents from the list of urgent cases represent a timely solution of the CSM or an omission? We appreciate that this is not an omission, since given the obviously exceptional situation we are facing, it would be ineffective to carry out a legality control at present. Moreover, if an immediate control of acts such as the ones we are discussing would really be required, with certainty such an action could be included in the category of "any other requests aimed at exceptional situations, which can be considered of particular urgency ", and the courts would analyze it and proceed to judge it.

We do not appreciate that we are in the presence of such a situation, a fact for which the norms of Law no. 554/2004 must be combined with the provisions of CSM Decision no. 417/2020, which leads to the conclusion that, although they are not exempt per se from the control of legality, nevertheless the administrative acts issued during the state of emergency are (at least for the moment) difficult, if not impossible to challenge in administrative litigation . What can we do in the matter of administrative litigation? The answer carries multiple implications and produces important legal effects in relation to the institutions regulated by Law no. 554/2004, and the technical editorial space being limited, we leave it to the researchers of the specific field for further investigation. We will limit ourselves to affirming the fact that legal education is a necessary topic not only for students, but for all people who have contributed to the degradation of society. An important role in solving the problems caused by the pandemic also belongs to the educational system. This means that a massive civic education is needed to create a legal culture of society. A

civic education of the population involves all levels of education, starting with preschool, where behavioral principles and habits are founded, which in the future are expressed through love and respect for nature, for other people and for oneself. The current concept of society, as we have seen in the preceding, has a dynamic character that seeks to know, analyze and follow the functioning of human society in its complexity. Paradoxically, the number of days with good air quality increased during the pandemic. The air has become cleaner around the globe. Satellite images released by NASA and the European Space Agency show a significant decrease in emissions in all the world's metropolises. The clouds of toxic gas visible over the big cities have almost disappeared after a few months of quarantine.

4.Conclusions

The complex reality generated by globalization has its rapid ramification effects in a context generated by a pandemic. History has revealed to us that these conditions for the emergence of a pandemic can always be recreated in today's reality, generating a situation full of uncertainties until the restoration of the world order we are used to. The extent to which we are affected by globalization is a question with many answers, but what we can learn from these humanitarian crises is that today's society should move towards a more humane globalization as the Covid-19 pandemic was one of the worst challenges the world has faced in recent times. The total cost in terms of human lives is still far from being known. Strangely, even if the "central" press is silent, vaccination is established more and more clearly as a vaccine epidemic or, even more clearly, as death by syringe. The statistics are more and more convincing, the people are more and more enlightened, the fear and indignation are growing, but the assassination by syringe continues little disturbed. And the "big press" is silent. "Cold-blooded mass murders. Death drips from the syringe". "You can't remain indifferent when you see so many dead or very sick people in one group. Open your eyes, because this - the huge wave of sudden death - is happening all over the world", writes the American academic and publicist Wayne Allyn Root: "33 of the friends who attended our wedding, just 8 months ago have died or they got sick. And they were all vaccinated," he said to an American radio station. Non-COVID-19 deaths have increased dramatically in the United States, Canada and around the world. Life insurance companies report that non-COVID-19 deaths are up 40% or more among young Americans. And Lincoln National reports that death insurance payouts increased more than 163% in the year that the COVID-19 vaccines came out. There are increases in deaths comparable to those during World War II. Since then, such a vertiginous increase in the hecatomb has never been recorded. But the victims are considerably more, most of them are people much too young to die or suffer strokes or heart attacks. And in all cases there is a common element: they are vaccinated. "It's a tsunami. A plague. A real pandemic. All are relatively young people who either died suddenly or became seriously ill with the two most common side effects of the COVID-19 vaccine: heart attacks and strokes. The COVID-19 vaccine is the biggest disaster and failure in healthcare history and a non-stop machine of death and serious illness." The American author compiled a detailed list of studies published by governments and

medical authorities around the world, all of which point to three absolute conclusions: the COVID-19 vaccine is a horrible failure, it is dangerous and deadly, and those who take two or more vaccines can have much more (un)likely to get COVID-19, to be hospitalized with COVID-19, or to die from COVID-19. Recent studies show that the COVID-19 vaccine can damage and destroy the immune system like a form of AIDS; 91% of those in the UK who have died from COVID-19 this year were triple or quadruple vaccinated. Are these studies being written about in the media? Why not? – asks Wayne Allyn Root. And he returns to his personal story: "It's only been eight months since I got married, and since then 33 of the people we know and love have died or contracted fatal non-Covid-19 illnesses." This "hecatomb of death" that should be investigated by scientists, doctors and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention should attract media headlines. But the mainstream press is silent. All 33 were vaccinated. The ranks of vaccinated friends are decimated like a platoon of Marines destroyed by an enemy ambush and brought home in black body bags. Even more astounding is that "none of my friends and family who aren't vaccinated have died or gotten sick since the pandemic started," adds Root. “Something is very wrong. Americans are dying at the highest rate in history. The media must report on this disaster. The Food and Drug Administration needs to react to what is happening. Vaccines must be stopped. But instead, it doubles. Notably, they recommend the coronavirus vaccination for babies, toddlers and teenagers." This is either the largest health care scam and cover-up in the history of the world, or a mass murder on a large scale. Or both, concludes media "conservative warrior" Wayne Allyn Root, host of the national USA Radio Network's "Wayne Allyn Root: Raw & Unfiltered." Along with the cost in human lives and the profound health crisis, the world is witnessing an economic recession that will have a serious impact on the well-being of a large part of the world's population in the coming years. Some of the measures taken to counter the pandemic may have an impact on our future. These measures came from the political space, with full awareness of the economic aspects and the social effects it can cause. The vast majority of economic sectors were affected, borders were closed and global value chains were disrupted. Most estimates show a contraction in production levels globally. More than 30 million people could fall into poverty in the absence of policies to protect the vulnerable population. We are facing a crisis that requires unconventional responses. We are concerned with the effect of the impact of the crisis on the size of economies and their ability to recover growth after the shock caused. But we are equally concerned about the distributional impact of the shock. The crisis interacts with asset holdings, income generation capacity, working conditions, access to public services and many other aspects that make some groups of people particularly vulnerable to such an economic freeze. Entrepreneurs, vulnerable people such as women in precarious working conditions should be at the center of the policy response. It is an attempt to promote a collective reflection on the response to the health and economic crisis generated by the Covid-19 pandemic as well as the social effects on our society. Solutions must be found that are based on evidence, experience and reasoned political intuition, all of which are essential to guide this effort. Ben Bernanke, former governor of the US Federal Reserve, reminds us in his book The Courage to Act that during crises, people fall into two categories, those who act and those who are afraid to act. A public debate is needed, providing

timely, technically sound proposals to take decisive action to protect vulnerable groups. And this, under the conditions of European integration, the Romanian legislator had and has the obligation to carry out both the harmonization of internal regulations with European law, as well as the unification and normative systematization, through codification and consolidation, in order to ensure good governance and administration and better protection legal rights of citizens. Obviously, the approach to the administrative phenomenon is a systemic one, which will never be reduced to a strict technical interpretation of the normative acts. All the more so since the pandemic was ended by the invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation! Evil never comes alone! Only the Good God can defend and protect us!

REFERENCES:

1. Andeescu, M., Puran, A., 2021, *Statul de drept şi situaţiile excepţionale,* în volumul *Starea excepţională şi alerta ordinii de drept. Implicaţii juridice ale crizei sanitare generată de pandemia COVID-19*, al Sesiunii anuale de comunicări ştiinţifice a Institutului de Cercetări Juridice "Acad. Andrei Rădulescu" al Academiei Române, pp. 151-159, preluat de pe site-ul: https://www.academia.edu/63539841.
2. Bogasiu, G., 2015, *Legea contenciosului administrativ*, Bucharest, Romania: Ed. Universul Juridic.
3. Butculescu, C.R., Măgureanu, A.F., 2021, *Consideraţii privind reconfigurarea percepţiei conceptelor dreptului natural în lumina dinamicii sociale generate de criza Sars-Cov-2*, în volumul *Starea excepţională şi alerta ordinii de drept. Implicaţii juridice ale crizei sanitare generată de pandemia COVID-19*, al Sesiunii anuale de comunicări ştiinţifice a Institutului de Cercetări Juridice "Acad. Andrei Rădulescu" al Academiei Române, pp. 102 - 107, preluat de pe site-ul: https://www.academia.edu/63539841.
4. Craiovan, I., 2021, *Despre societate şi drept în criza socială contemporană,* în volumul *Starea excepţională şi alerta ordinii de drept. Implicaţii juridice ale crizei sanitare generată de pandemia COVID-19*, al Sesiunii anuale de comunicări ştiinţifice a Institutului de Cercetări Juridice "Acad. Andrei Rădulescu" al Academiei Române, pp. 97-102, preluat de pe site-ul: https://www.academia.edu/63539841.
5. Deleanu, I., 2006, *Instituţii şi proceduri constituţionale*, Bucharest, Romania: Ed. C.H. Beck.
6. Drăganu, T., 1992, *Introducere în teoria şi practica statului de drept* , Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Ed. Dacia, 1992;
7. Gheorghe, V., 2021, *Pandemia Covid-19 - confirmare a solidităţii sau vulnerabilităţii statului de drept?,* în volumul *Starea excepţională şi alerta ordinii de drept. Implicaţii juridice ale crizei sanitare generată de pandemia COVID-19*, al Sesiunii anuale de comunicări ştiinţifice a Institutului de Cercetări Juridice "Acad. Andrei Rădulescu" al Academiei Române, pp. 108-121, preluat de pe site-ul: https://www.academia.edu/63539841.

8. Kassai, C.M., 2021, *Conturarea unei noi ordini mondiale în contextul de pandemie*, în volumul *Starea excepţională şi alerta ordinii de drept. Implicaţii juridice ale crizei sanitare generată de pandemia COVID-19*, al Sesiunii anuale de comunicări ştiinţifice a Institutului de Cercetări Juridice "Acad. Andrei Rădulescu" al Academiei Române, Bucureşti, pp.262-266, preluat de pe site-ul: https://www.academia.edu/63539841.
9. Muraru, I., Tănăsescu, E.S., 2019, C*onstituţia României. Comentariu pe articole*, Bucharest, Romania: Ed. C.H. Beck.
10. Preda, M., *Perspective juridice și analiză comparată a impactului pandemiei COVID-19 în importante ramuri ale dreptului*, preluat de pe site-ul: file:///D:/Documents/CONFERIN%C8%9AA%.
11. Speranția, E., 1946, *Introducere în filosofia dreptului,* Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Ed. Tipografia, p. 347.
12. Voinea, M., Banciu, D., 1993, *Sociologie juridică*, Bucharest, Romania: Universitatea Româno-Americană.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Valentin-Stelian BĂDESCU, PhD, lawyer at the Bucharest Bar and scientific researcher of the Legal Research Institute of the Romanian Academy and titular member of the History of Science Division within the Romanian Committee for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology of the Romanian Aacademy.

Email: valentinbadescu@yahoo.com