Abstract: The highest efficiency, general desideratum in any human action, projected over the whole potential of the geo-system, imposes the highest and a responsible competence. This one supposes a strictly systemic orientation in any fundamental or applying demarche. The actual, huge, information demonstrates that even this orientation is still a desideratum. Based on an analytic subjectivism, the fundamental scientific research is fixed on quasi-exclusive analytical fields, the fields of interdisciplinary interference being rarely followed and generally non-systemic approached. The applicative area is even more distant from the systemic status of the „resources”, these ones being treated exclusively in the purpose of a rapid evaluation and valorization, in the possible greatest quantities. But, ignoring the necessary regeneration dynamics of these „resources”, their status of components of the system reserves, therefore of their role of interactive inner support and of transferable utility in the specific network or in the supra- or subordinated ones, ignoring the spatial and chronological variability of this complex role, vital for the self-regulation of the natural, social-economic or mixed systems produces the most varied and severe dysfunctions. At the level of the “resources” these ones produce degradation or exhaustion, as weakening or destructurant effects on the structures with oversolicited “resources”. The general, frequently “wrong”, therefore loser attitude, concerning the “resources” begins many times relatively correctly at the conceptual and declarative level, level dominated by the global unison of the protection and of the conservation of the “resources”, in conformity with the principle of the sustainable development. But, the concepts accede to be applied, through the agency of legislative/juridical, administrative, political, economic, military etc. documents, documents which, in order to become operating, use terms. With terms concerning the “environment” and the “resources” begins a veritable uproar, the initially declared conceptual unison showing its illusory nature. The area of the social-economic structures adopts the most permissive (sometimes deliberately ambiguous) meanings, wordings and terms, from the legislation, treaties, conventions etc., and the area of the protection of the environment, with its well intentioned (when honest) ecological standard bearer, adopts the most restrictive and inevitably reductive terms (because the ecology has no possibility to surpass its specific limits). It should be expectable that in a so-named dialogue of a category of completely different interests towards an unique reason, approached from different positions, in different terms, to result anyway, some time, a consensus. But, repeated conferences, at any level, demonstrate that this desideratum is not coming true even in national frames and that in more complex structures the consensual connections are even more discouraging difficult. Obviously, the failures are produced by great systemic background differences in the level of the social-economic development, in the real situation of the reserves, in the manner of thinking and operating on the Earth and on the humans. But, if even for the small consensual conceptual patrimony in application one cannot build up an unitary attitude, the acute necessity to homogenize at least the terms of the communication language in the frame of the domains or between the domains becomes obvious. In conclusion, the essay pleads for a rigorously systemic
conceptual basis and for a strictly adequate and unitary terminology of the organization and valorization by the human society of the “environmental” “resources”.

Rezumat: RelaŃiile dintre mediu, resurse şi societatea umană. EficienŃa maximă – deziderat general în orice acŃiune umană, proiectat asupra întregului potenŃial al geosistemului impune competenŃă maximă şi responsabilă . Aceasta presupune orientare strict sistemică în orice demers fundamental sau aplicativ. InformaŃia actuală, imensă, demonstrează că însă această orientare este încă un deziderat. Din subiectivism analitic, cercetarea ştiinŃifică fundamentală se fixează în domenii evasiune exclusiv analitice, domenii de interferenŃă interdisciplinară fiind rar urmărite şi – în general – nesistemic abordate. Aria aplicaŃiei este şi mai îndepărtată de statutul sistemic al "resurselor", pe care le tratează cu scopul exclusiv al evaluării şi valorificării rapide, în cantităŃi cât mai mari. Ignorarea necesară dinamică de regenerare a acestor "resurse", a statutului lor de parte componentă a rezervelor sistemului, deci a rolului lor de sprijin interactiv intern şi de utilitate transferabilă încasă reŃea specifică sau în reŃelele supra- ori subordonate, ignorarea variabilităŃii spaŃiale şi cronologice a acestui rol complex şi vital pentru autoreglarea sistemelor naturale, social-economic sau mixte produc însă cele mai variate şi mai grave disfuncŃii. La nivelul "resurselor" ele produc degradare sau epuizare, cu efecte debilitante sau destrucŃionare asupra structurilor cu "resurse" suprasolicitate. Atitudinea generală – greşită frecvent şi astfel perdantă – în ceea ce priveşte "resursele", debutează de multe ori relativ corect la nivel conceptual şi declarativ, nivel la care domină unisonul global al protecŃiei şi conservării "resurselor", în conformitate cu principiile dezvoltării durabile. În aplicaŃie, însă, concepele ajung prin intermediul documentelor - legislativ/juridice, administrative, politice, economice, militare etc., iar acestea - pentru a fi operative – se folosesc de termeni. Cu termenii referitorii la "mediu" şi la "resurse" începe un veritabil vacarm, unisonul conceptual declarat iniŃial vădându-şi fondul iluzoriu.Aria structurilor social-economice adoptă sensurile, formulările şi termenii cei mai permisivi (uneori deliberat ambiguşi) din legislaŃie, tratate, convenŃii etc. iar aria protecŃiei mediului, cu portdrapelul său ecologic, bine intenŃionat (atunci când este onest) adoptă termenii cei mai restrictivi (deoarece ecologia nu are cum să-şi depăşească limitele specifice). Ar fi de aşteptat ca, dintr-un aşa-zis dialog al unor categorii de interese total diferite faŃă de un mobil unic, pe care-l abordează de pe poziŃii diferite, în termeni diferiŃi, căndva, să rezulte, totuşi, un consens. Reuniunile repetate, la toate nivelurile, demonstrează totuşi că acesta nu se realizează nici în cadre naŃionale, şi că în structuri mai complexe racordările consensuale sunt încă mai descurajant de dificile. Evident, echelele sunt produse de mari diferenŃe ale fondului sistemic, ale nivelului de dezvoltare social-economic, ale situaŃiei reale a rezervelor, ale modului de a gândi şi acŃiona asupra Pământului şi a oamenilor. Dacă însă nici pentru micul patrimoniu conceptual sensual – care nu se poate construi o atitudine unitară, devine clară necesitatea acută a omogenizării cel puŃin a termenilor limbajului de comunicaŃe intr-şi interdomeni. În concluzie, eseu plădează pentru o bază conceptuală riguroasă sistemică şi o terminologie strict adecvată şi unitară a organizării şi valorificării de către societatea umană a "resurselor" "mediului".
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1. INTRODUCTION

The highest and, as possible, fast efficiency is, since a long time, the symbol-grievance of any form of progress realized by the human society.

Conceiving the most adequate modalities to estimate and to activate the natural and human potential, to identify the obstacles, the risks etc. is current in the contemporary life and the even competitive management of the most different structures of the space, of the territory etc. is a omnipresent mark.

Evidently, reaching such important goals imposes the highest exactingness at the level of all the sequences of the action. It results that an objective conceptual basis, a realistic methodology and a precise terminology, capable to express correctly the concepts, to insure the adequate application of the methods, to formulate clearly the decisions and to present with a wide accessibility the benefits, the deficiencies a. o. are solid premises for new accumulations which can insure some equilibrated evolutions on a long term. Evidently again, the insurance of these premises and the order of their tackling impose themselves without saying.

As in any functional evolution with an interactive character, the last enumerated premise is so tight implicated – by interaction – in the existence of the others, that these ones can be operative in an equilibrated, beneficial manner, only by using a satisfactory terminology, from the point of view of its quality. Beginning with the nominalization of the most simple material entities, of the attitudes, states, relations etc., engaging at the level of the individuals or of that of the natural complexes or of the human masses, the language, the language terms, their accepting mark out the communication and its quality, conditioning the durable efficiency of any form of fundamental or applicative research.

2. COMMUNICATION AND TERMINOLOGICAL LANGUAGE IN THE FUNDAMENTAL AND APPICATIVE APPROACH

On the vital base of the communication in the frame of the natural living structures, the evolution of the human species and its social structuring have kept and are keeping, as an essential mark, the language, under its most different forms.

Built and permanently enriched by a more and more complicated social existence, by progressively diversified economic activities, by a rapid spatial extension of the oecumena and by the overtaking of the terrestrial space, the language has reached in our time a paradox condition: thanks to the immense specialized accumulations, from a general communication tool it became an extremely selective one, from the point of view of the accessibility of the terms. In this manner, even in the frame of some precisely delimited fields, the necessity and the utility of the standard denominations has got a larger and larger importance.

The obvious terminology is not more only a necessary tool for the fluent communication, but also a condition of the accuracy of the demarche, of the quality of the results and of their durability. So, the term has become a central place in the theoretical anteconstruction and in the development of the most diverse activities, in estimations, in decisions etc.
But, demanded and imposed by the human thinking, so much in the fundamental investigation as in its varied applications, which advance and become rapidly more and more various, the term is also, frequently, a creation with variable acceptations. It results that, in its utilization, firstly, besides the accessibilisation, the homogenization corresponding to its meaning, at least for duration of at least one and the same investigation/application sequence is strictly necessary. Concomitantly, naming realities often extremely dynamic, the term is a perishable creation. As the primate of the meaning remains unquestionable, it results that – secondary - the updating or even the substitution of some terms impose themselves.

Of course, these grievances can be realized only by a permanent communication in the frame of the same investigation field and between the investigation fields, however difficult this one could be, knowing that the dialogue on terminological themes can take also contradictory, frequently polemical forms.

If insuring a homogenous conceptual reference basis, which could guarantee useful results, imposes sufficient difficulties to the specialized terminology from any analytical field of the scientific research, in the geography – with its so vast research object – and especially in the geographic approach of the environment the difficulties are incomparably greater. These ones result not only from the diversity and the structural mobility of the investigated reality, but also from the holistic, systemic specific of the geographical demarche.

2. ENVIRONMENT – RESOURCES – SOCIETY.
THE GEOGRAPHIC TERMINOLOGICAL APPROACH

However imperious are the immediate pragmatic objectives of a human society in a multiple expansion and however quickly should take place the specialized analytic retort coming from different fields of the scientific research, the geographical one answers to this demand only in a systemic manner: no natural, social, economic, political or other type of element is tackled independently of its structural, functional, spatial and chronological context.

Corresponding to this conceptual non-omitting position, the terminology used in the investigation, in the checking, in evaluations, in the communication of the results to the applied fields etc. has a double role, not only as a mean of expression/communication but also as a control tool of the objectivity of the demarche.

A concise analysis of the relation concrete reality – concept – term – decision – action – real results, geo-systemic applied to the theme environment – resources – society, points out firstly that this theme inscribes itself, anthropocentrically, in the most complex functional area of the Earth system.

Conceptually, the theme is marked by the obviously utilitarian orientation of the human society, in relation to the natural offer. But, terminologically this clarity becomes progressively obscure.

In the mentioned sense, the generic term „environment”, for example, names an extremely large reality, non-specified neither after its structure, nor as functionality, (Incompletely) unloaded, after many decades, of the tautological determinative „surrounding”, it still wears a polysemantism which generates not only confusions,
incompletudes etc., but which is also responsible for their conceptual and decisional consequences. It stands, in the most cases, at the origin of some completely different acceptations, which fundament attitudes, measures etc. corresponding different, concerning one and the same reality, whose systemic complexity is not expressed by the term, this one inducing towards it an uniformizing, undifferentiated, irrational, aggressively utilitarian or excessively conservative attitude. Since a long time it is necessary this term to be replaced with that of geo-system, the second one expressing completely the terrestrial structural and functional reality – object of the geography from the oldest times, responsibilizing the fundamental and the applied specialty research and inducing also rational orientations in other fundamental or applied research fields, implicated in te research or the use of the terrestrial system.

The term “resources” is, in exchange, strongly reductive. Its deficiency, so in the context of the restricted theme as in that of the vast one, of the whole conference, is determinate by the general utilitarian orientation, which imposes it, compressing in exchange the real sphere to which it belongs. Nearly without any exception, beginning with the area of the official documents – political, diplomatical, juridical, economic, administrative a. o., with a national and an international origin, going threw the area of the most different decisions, forms of action etc., and finishing with the mass media and the current, „the resources” are understood only with the meaning of natural resources (Gabriela Marinescu, 1993, G. Tyler-Miller, 1995, N. Roberts – editor, 2002 a.o.) and are frequently tackled only summarily enough, as a reference structure and, as a rule, only in a quantitative manner, from the point of view of the evaluation. Only in the last years – and especially in the social, economic and political sphere one can find references to the human resources, but never in relation with the ”environment”, as an integrant and functional part of this one.

Analyzing afterwards the utilization/application of the term „resources” one can find that it doesn’t include a dynamic constituent: it doesn’t refer neither to the movement infrastructure in the respective structure, nor to links or mechanisms of inner or external connection, which sit in the patrimony of the respective structure/structures, links and mechanisms which can be in active state, being efficient, or can be degraded or even out of function (with the afferent negative consequences).

It results clearly that the term „resources”, so as it is used to-day, wears a strictly quantitative mark and cuts, unjustified, only a part of that is treated by the systemic organigram as reserves in the system. The general lexical legitimacy of the term cannot be extended in the context of the „environment”, where its wrong utilization is far from being neutral or unimportant from the point of view of the consequences.

Firstly, the strictly quantitative orientation concerning the resources, most commonly quickened and, on this manner wrong, leads to varied wrong evaluations, very vulnerable also in relation with numerous factors, which can be objectives, of immediate impact (for example, the demand on the market), or partially objectives (for example, the technological level of the sequence), or totally subjective (incompletitudes, group or even individual, interior or exterior, interests etc.)

Secondly, an important source of errors consists in the exclusively static sense of the utilitarian immediate orientation, which eliminates any form of modulation and dynamic framing of the presumed quantities. For example, ignoring the regeneration necessities of the substance, indifferently to its nature (the biodiversity of the natural ecosystems, the
The annual accumulation of the wood quantity, after the vegetal cycles, the amount of alluvial deposits seasonary accumulated in the river beds etc.) the respective resources are over evaluated. The unjustified euphorically produced results and the ignoring of some determinant relations in the frame of the natural balances - morpho-dynamic, hydro-geologic, microclimatic ones etc., over-evaluating the supercies able for building, the phreatic and the microclimatic potential etc. Based on the same, spontaneous or deliberated ignorance, one minimizes the consumption and the distribution necessary, variable inside the system, this shunting substantiating fluctuating over evaluations. Other resources are over evaluated by the neglecting or the exaggerate minimalizing evaluation of the natural risks, anthropically potentiated. In exchange, by comfort or by ignorance one goes over local natural energetic possibilities or over some others induced by co-generation, so as over some opportunities to supplement by reciprocally advantageous interactive relations with other structures, from supra- or subordinate networks, under evaluating the resource.

So, the managerial profitable demarche is undermined by an ab initio corrupt conceptual beginning, strengthened in its uncorrectitude by a term with scientific appearances, therefore encouraging ones, which insinuates itself and sustains wrong evaluations, wrong, inadequate decisions, mediocre or even negative, but resisting, results. Seemingly, the multiple error and its ill-fated consequences should affect a single active element/resource/segment etc. In the reality it travels interactively, in the whole system.

CONCLUSIONS

The complex process of the resource valorizing by the human society is one of the highest integrative ones of the whole geo-system. In order to maintain itself in the limits of its equilibrated functionality, the mentioned process must respect, as a law, its structural and dynamic characteristics. The only possibility to cover efficiently, on a long term, this exactingness is that to insure a wholly scientific demarche, beginning with a systemic conceptualization and a responsible implementation of a terminology which has to express clearly, firmly and in an adequate form, the reality being the object of a generally benefic decision, having the goal to valorize the reserves of the system not only in the highest degree, from a quantitative point of view, but also in the most utile and conservative manner.
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