



## ORIGINAL PAPER

# The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures

Florin Nacu \*

### Abstract

The article depicts the manner in which the socialist trend tried to influence the political life in modern Romania. The socialists tried to create theoretical patterns, influenced by similar trends from the industrialised societies of the Western Europe, along with those coming from the neighbouring Eastern society, the Tsarist Russia. The social conditions from Romania were not similar to those of the occidental states, as much as the level of the political culture did not allow the peasants and the workers to fight a battle. Moreover, the electoral system left only limited possibilities for the front-ranker peasants, who only wished to enlarge their property, not to adhere to the socialist values. Many of the socialists integrated among the liberals, those who remained faithful reorienting themselves towards the communist trend, after 1981. On the background of a relative antipathy against Russia, especially after 1979, the Romanian politicians kept the socialists under observation. After 1921, when the socialists organised themselves in the Communist Party from Romania, their ideological affiliation to the Soviet directives, obliged them to adopt an antinational attitude, not only an “anti-oligarchic” one, which, in 1924, outlawed them, for the following two decades.

**Keywords:** *socialism, oligarchy, political trends, social structures, revolution*

---

\* PhD, „CS Nicolăescu Plopor” Social Humanistic Research Institute, Craiova, Phone: 0040761617067, Email: florin\_nacu@yahoo.com

## **The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures**

### **Introduction. Chronological landmarks**

In the modern Romania, during 1859-1918, the ideas that can be framed into the socialist trend, entered relatively late in the autochthonous political space. This fact is due to the economical situation from our country, more precisely to the share that each occupation was holding in Romania. Agriculture was continuing to supply more than two thirds from the gross domestic product and 75% of the export realised by the national economy, while the labourers did not exceed more than 5%. The electoral system from Romania was one based on qualification, allowing only symbolic chances to a possible socialist electorate. The socialist ideas had been emerging from the occidental environment, where the industry was well represented, on the Russian political line. Another reason, for the peripheral interest on addressing the socialist ideas, was the maintaining, in the public space, of a reticent attitude towards the Tsarist Russia, preponderantly after the War of Independence, after which, in the exchange for Dobrogea, Russia regained the domination over the districts from the south of Basarabia, Cahul, Ismail, Bolgrad, which would conferred it the access to the Danube, districts that it had lost in 1856, after the Paris Peace Conference.

There can also be cited here the special situation in which another category of the autochthonous labour power was, that of the craftsmen and traders. Plenty of them were local Jews, who did not have Romanian citizenship, which they could obtain only if article 7 of the Constitution from 1866 was modified, and only due to individually applications, in which they requested naturalisation. It was obvious that an eventual socialist affinity would have created them problems in obtaining the naturalization and, implicitly, the Romanian citizenship.

Although in the Marxist Romanian historiography it was an attempt to create a connection between the wish of the peasants to do the agrarian reform and the fight for the socialist ideas, the reality was radically different. The socialists generally wanted to create the common property, especially in industry, being marginally interested in the peasantry, being positioned in the situation to not agree at all with the aspirations of the peasants, because they wanted to own a property, and the one who had already had it, to enlarge it. The year of 1865 marks the emerging of “Telegraful Român”-Romanian Telegraph, in which there can be noticed a social-democrat way of thinking. In 1872, Zamfir Arbore, Gheorghe Nădejde, Ion Nădejde, Titus Dunca published “Lucrătorul român”-Romanian worker. In 1881, Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea began the publishing of “Contemporanul”-The contemporary. Three years later, at Bucharest, it was founded The “Human Rights” Centre for Social Studies. The first socialist thinker from Romania, who tried to create a connection between the preoccupation of the peasants for a generalised agrarian reform, and the propagation of the socialist ideas, was Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea. He was the author of the leaflet “Ce vor socialiștii români”-“The desires of the Romanian socialists”, in 1886, which represented the basis of the socialist political platform, until the formation of Great Romania, in 1918 (Hitchins, 1994: 363-364). In 1888, after the finishing of the great liberal governing, (1876-1888), there were elected the two first socialists in the Deputies Assembly: Vasile Morțun and Ion Nădejde. On the 15<sup>th</sup> of August 1888, Alexandru Beldiman published the first issue of “Adevărul”-The truth newspaper. Between 1890 and 1894, Constantin Mille published “Munca”-The work magazine. The first socialist Romanian party was founded on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March 1893, at Bucharest, being called the Socialist-Democrat Party of the Labourers from

Romania. In August, the same year, at Zurich, took place the conference of the Socialist International, which the delegation of the Romanian socialists attended. Although in 1897, in Romania, there were almost 6 000 members of SDPLR, this party dissolved. The hardest strike was from the group of the “generous”, who joined the National Liberal Party (110 ani de social democrație-101 years of democracy, 2003: 1-3). In the interval January 1906-July 1907, there can be documented many notable actions, both in the occupied Romanian provinces, and the Old Kingdom. We mention, for this reason, the founding of a Romanian department of the Social-Democrat Party from Hungary, at Lugoj, the founding of Social-Democrat Romanian Party from Bucovina.

In the Old Kingdom, in 1906, it was founded the General Confederation of the Syndicates from Romania, and in 1907, in July, it was constituted the Socialist Union and the general Commission of the Syndicates. Under these names, it was desired the reconstituting of the socialists’ political expression, after the government had achieved the dissolution of the socialist clubs from villages and towns (Nacu, 2013: 315).

On the 31<sup>st</sup> of January, it was founded the Romanian Social Democrat Party. In March, it was created a youth organisation too. In the same year, Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea published “Neoioabăgia”-The new-serfdom, a work that described in a critical manner the harsh situation of the peasantry, whose interests were affected by the category represented by leaseholders, who had imposed themselves as intermediaries between the landlords and the manpower, represented by the peasants.

The period 1910-1918 was marked by a series of events, important for the existence of the socialist trend. Thus, in 1912, it was established “Cerc feminin”-Woman’s club. In 1913, a group of Romanian socialists attended the Congress of the Socialist International at Zimmerwald, declaring themselves pacifists, while the world was preparing for the World War I.

In 1917, whilst Romania was territorially reduced to Moldova and a pro-German Government was set up at Bucharest, the Romanian socialists founded an Active Social-Democrat Committee, in exile, at Odessa. In January 1918, it was renamed The Romanian Revolutionary Committee, with the headquarters at Moscow. There were Romanians who believed in the socialist ideas in Transylvania and Bucovina too, who helped at the creation of the Romanian National Committees from these provinces. The Union from Alba Iulia, from the 1<sup>st</sup> of December 1918, registered 150 socialist delegates. On the 11<sup>th</sup> of December 1918, it was adopted a new name for the party, transforming it into the Socialist Party.

### **The influence of the socialist trend on the political reforms from Modern Romania (1859-1918). Its position as related to other social trends**

The platform of the Romanian socialists, broadly, is founded on the ideas that Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea had taken from Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and Karl Kautsky. The last one proposed a socialism based on the existence of a parliament, meaning that the socialists could express their conceptions during the parliamentary debates. Thus, the ideas of revolution and uprising were not the first ones, among the socialist preoccupations, but nevertheless, they were not excluded either. The uprisings were regarded as retrograde actions, as medieval reminiscences. Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea considered that the institutional basis and the autochthonous manner of thinking were able to assimilate the influences that would come from the outside of Romania, fact that was obviously opposing the ideas of Titu Maiorescu, the author of “forms without a substance” (Dobrogeanu-Gherea, 1910: 1-3). Moreover, the political platform and the

## **The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures**

socialist trend spread in the same time with other trends, such was the Populism of Constantin Stere and the Semanatorism, promoted by Nicolae Iorga. To them, it was added the pro-peasant trend, endorsed by Constantin Dobrescu Argeş, Ion Mihalache.

Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea believed that the chance for a modern Romania was represented by the acceleration of industrialisation, seen as similar with “to exist or not to exist”. He was opposing these trends, asserting that: “as a general phenomenon of our social life, it is not only the socialism that can be depicted as an exotic plant, but, in the same manner and for the same meaning, our entire life, as a modern state, is an exotic plant; not only the socialism results from the deep social conditions of our national life, but, in the same manner and for the same meaning, not all the occurrences from our modern life emerge...we are dealing with a law specific for the backward societies, those left behind from the social development, in their capitalist development” (Dobrogeanu-Gherea, 1988, III: 481). We ought to specify another aspect, represented by the fact that the Romanian government was preoccupied to control the spreading of the socialist ideas. Hence, the institutions that were assuring public order (Police, Gendarmerie, Security) had the task to follow the propagandists expelled from Russia, accused of coming there with the purpose to play into the Petersburg government’s hands, with the intention to make Romania unstable. After 1883, Romania had secretly adhered the Triple Alliance, concluding a treaty with Austro-Hungary, to which Germany and Italy had also adhered, a situation maybe not known by the Russian government, but surely presumed.

The revolts from 1888 and 1907 were the consequence of the conditioned endured by the peasantry, which nevertheless did represent a condition meant to produce an uprising. It was actually the more complex result generated by certain factors, among which the interest for destabilisation, created by the force embodied by the Tsarist Russia. The socialists were subjected to control, from the governors, due to the fact that, one way or another, they were promoting the changing ideas, including a revolution: “one of the common causes, I might say the classical cause of the social revolutions, is the disagreement and the antagonism between the economical-material, moral and cultural fund of the society, and its political-social form, between real, as to fact condition, and its formal, as to law one... Next to the consistent changes of the social background, of the actual state of the society, it is usually a political-social formation, a legitimate old state, the last redoubt of the privileged upper-classed, who find here the last resort of their privilege” (Dobrogeanu-Gherea, 1988, III: 498). Practically, the socialist ideas were being propagated on two, or even three levels: through social-democrats, somehow close to the progressive liberals, through the socialist with international affinities, and the communists, who were planning to start a revolution that would change the old arrangements. The entering of Romania into to War for the Reunion, for Entente, transformed it into the ally of the Tsarist Russia, which had made the commitment to offer military support. The presence of the Russian and Romanian troops on the same side of the battle-front, was creating the danger that the socialist agitators, and even the communists, would act according to their interests.

Basically, the presence of the danger represented by the Tsarist Russia, determined the political decisional factors from Bucharest to consider a series of reforms. During the war, whilst the social revolution and the Bolshevik counter-revolution were breaking out, the modification of the electoral law and the agrarian reform were postponed for after the end of the war, by King Ferdinand.

### **The directions of the Romanian socialists' platform**

In 1910, the Social-Democrat Party, created a political platform based on three directions: political, economic and agrarian. In the view of the socialists, it was necessary the introduction of the universal voting for all the Romanian citizens who were 20 years old, the taking place of the elections on the free days, the establishing of autonomy and decentralisation in administration, the abrogation of the law that was stipulating the expulsing of foreigners (a service for the socialists colleagues that would have arrived on the Romanian territory), the regulation of the right to strike, the reduction of the military service, the abolishment of the political suspects' trials, in the military courts.

Economically, the socialists wanted that the minimal age for the employment of the workers to be 14 years old, the working programme to be of 8 hours, Sunday to be declared free day, to be created an institution that would assure social rights (pension funds, unemployment benefit, sickness or permanent disability benefit), to be introduced the progressive taxation (Dohotaru, 2013:1-4). As concerning the agrarian department, the socialists wanted to be abolished the payments in kind, a medieval reminiscence, to make possible the constitution of a public landed fund, the leasing on a duration of least half of a century, of the properties held by associations of peasants, to exist communal pastures, to be forbidden the acquisition of land, from the state, by private people and associations.

Fundamentally, the socialists from Romania, desired to impose an autochthonous industry that would process oil, ore, agricultural products, constituted after the redirection of funds obtained after the export. They also fought for the decreasing of the illiteracy rate. In the newspaper "Adevărul", there was given advice for the prevention of diseases, such is the lime-washing, the airing out of the rooms, the personal hygiene, especially at the countryside. The socialists could not have a dialogue with the democrat groups, because the governments tried to limit their activity, to dissolve their clubs. The socialists were protesting against the fact that the taxes paid by the payees were diverted towards the maintaining of the control and repression apparatus. Moreover, the promotion of anti-militarism, was based on the fact that the peasants were fighting a war, without having an economic motivation, besides the national one (Dohotaru, 2013, 5-8).

Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea also analysed the initial fight for power, between the landlords and the forming bourgeoisie, which accompanied the stages for the creation of the modern Romanian state: "from the beginning, this fight ought not have emerged especially between the oligarchy represented, on one hand by the category of the great landlords, the class that tended, due to its overwhelming economic importance, to seize the political influence, and, on the other hand, the other classes, the young bourgeois classes, which in their turn, desired to take control over a significant share of the oligarchic-political power" (Dobrogeanu-Gherea, 1988, V: 179). The socialists were criticising the fact that the peasants were receiving individual plots, instead of the right to commonly farmed wider surfaces, leased for symbolic prices, whose production to be valued on the national market.

Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea depicted realistically the way in which the category of the landlords modified its confirmation, in the detriment of the relation with the peasantry. Practically, the new created situation made indistinct the differences between the landlords and the bourgeois: "the highest number of estates were bought for an insignificant price, by the traders enriched in the state's departments, by lawyers enriched from the public businesses. Other oligarchs, using their political influence, took hold of the state's estates... The poor boyars, deprived along with their children, had to

## **The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures**

look for means of existence in the only place where they could find – the state: as civil servants, who were aspiring at better jobs, as politicians and professionals in policy, increasing the phenomenon of characteristic oligarchy... As soon as the great property started to be administrated by the liberals, between them and the conservator landlords, there was settled an patriotic agreement, *as regarding the reports of the agrarian production, and the more effective way to exploit the peasants' work; it was also commonly agreed the economic and judicial new-serfdom – one of the most painful and harrowing page from the history of the long oppressed Romanian peasantry. Through this agreement, there were even more wiped the fundamental differences between the two parties. The Romanian oligarch, lawyer or not, enriched in, and from the state's businesses, buys an estate and becomes, this way, a great landlord*" (Dobrogeanu-Gherea, 1988, V: 180-181).

Unlike the later communists, the socialists regarded the idea of revolution as a series of changes. Initially, they wanted a parliamentary competition, but it was regarded, not without a good reason, as an attempt to destroy Romania, through destabilisation. The ascension of the socialism represented the danger that imposed the governors the need for reforms, immediately after the Great Union. It was then when there was regulated the question for granting the citizenship to the national Jews, all the other minorities, whose members did not enjoy the protection of another state, or chose to remain in Romania. The universal voting and the agrarian reform were promised and, out of the fear that the Romanian soldiers would fraternise with the Russian regiments led by the Bolsheviks, which were retreating from the first line, and committing abuses, including the disarming of the isolated units and the taking of prisoners among the military men. The breaking out of the Bolshevik revolution, determined the orientation of a high share of the socialists towards the ideas from the Soviet Russia, fact that culminated with the affiliation to Comintern and the creation, on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 1921, on the Communist Party from Romania.

### **Personalities of the socialist trend**

The adepts of the socialist orientation intended to create the basis for a new political order. They imposed themselves due to a diminished interest of the governors as regrading education, health, political rights for a high share of the population made of peasants, and a smaller part one, made of workers, an ascending category, after 1859. Their publications – books, magazines, newspapers, had the purpose to inform and to prepare the population, who was struggling with difficult economic conditions, to have access to politic, economic, along with cultural, medical etc. information. Yet, the personal education of the peasants, consequent with the values of the Romanian countryside, especially those of the Orthodox religion, made them reticent to the "ideological imports". At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, some of the peasants, who left for the cities, as workers, came in touch with some socialist ideas (Stăiculescu, 2005:1-3).

The fact that, in 1888, or 1907, there were other interests, besides the dissatisfactions of the peasants about the difficult economic situation, can be obviously noticed from the aspect that the revolt from 1907 was repressed including with army, later, in the war for the reunion, there were no soldiers, neither corporals nor non-coms, to revolt against the superiors who had given the order to open fire on them and the members of their families, during the uprising.

The sociologist Henri H. Stahl, in his work *Gânditori și curente de istorie socială românească*—Scholars and Romanian social history trends, mentions the ideas of Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea (1855-1920), an adept of the “social-democrat ideas”. He was born in the Tsarist Russia, (Ukraine, Ekaterinoslav), in a Jewish family (his real name was Solomon Katz). He was naturalized in Romania, where he came when he was 20 years old, around 1875, being expelled for his socialist ideas (Stahl, 2001: 2012): “We ought to grant a special attention to Dobrogeanu Gherea, due to his exceptional merits, both in the Romanian sociology, therefore in the sociological analysis of the Romanian problems, and from the point of view of history, in general. Usually, Gherea is mentioned in our literature in relation to his special merits of literary critic, being especially analysed his polemics with Titu Maiorescu, on the topic “art for art” or “art with a tendency”. Nonetheless, Gherea is far more important as a sociologist, than as a literary critic, because he discussed issues more important than the literary ones. If his merits as a sociologist have not been cherished lately, this is due to his “social-democrat”, Menshevist, politic position, which was opposed to the Bolshevik one. Yet, it is imposed a more objective analysis of his theories, at least as far as Plehanov was reanalysed, acknowledging his cultural value, in very important areas.

About Gherea, there have been gathered enough insignificant details regarding his life, starting with the age of 20, until he arrived in Romania, as a refugee Russian revolutionary; because he belonged to the group of Narodniks that we have previously mentioned, who soon became not only the authorized spokesman of the new-created social-democrat party, but also a respected and cherished scholar, influencing many Romanian intellectual groups. Yet, what is missing, is a detailed study on addressing the fundamental problems of his way of thinking, mainly the way in which he operated the passing from a “Narodnik” conception, to the “Marxist” one, similar to that taken by Plehanov, in Russia. We do not have knowledge about the manner in which Plehanov could influence Gherea; nevertheless, a study of this problem is necessary, so someone ought to try one soon, basing their research on the thorough study of Plehanov and the other Narodniks’ works, who moved towards the Marxist trends. It is not possible for us to do it, due to the fact that the works of these Russians are known only translated in French and Romanian, but only few of them, the other being all printed in Russian, therefore inaccessible.

And we are especially lacking a study referring to the genesis of Gherea’s theory on the decisive importance that the capitalist impact had on our social history: it is formulated as a general law on the faith of all “the backward countries from the sphere of capitalism”, having as first consequence the birth of some hybrid forms of the “new-serfdom”, a mixture of feudal realities, with capitalist ones”.

However, Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea has the tendency to criticise the reforming initiatives, in the name of ideology that he represented. Hence, he condemns “the exaltation” of the forty-eighters, whose political platform he considered to be “a failure”, and to minimize the role of the reform from 1848: “Let’s take into consideration two ways of being put in the possession of land: one founded on the interests of the producers and the other on the great properties, of the bourgeoisie. The first appropriation had as leading principle the owning of the entire land by the peasant-producers, including it in the rural communes, its inalienability, the enclosing of a part of it for grazing and the dividing of the other parts among the peasant-producers and its redistribution after 15 years, for example. On these grounds, owning enough and too much land and grazing plot, not sharing from the highest share of their products, as today, being landlords, therefore

## The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures

not interested in the over-working the land, the landlords would have become rich with every passing year; moreover, each year there would have been improved the working tools, and the fields of Romania would have been lovelier. The production and richness would have grown on this basis, relatively wise and righteous (truly just and good they can be only in the socialist society), the bourgeoisie itself would not be so spoiled and rotten, the liberal thoughts would have been more fertile, bearing the fruit of righteousness; the relations with Europe would have been useful, instead of ruining.

It is understandable that this new form of appropriation would have left much to be desired. Through the natural game played by the economic powers, and also in the commune, could have been developed a rich and a poor class, even a proletarian one; but, under these circumstances, the development of these classes would have needed centuries, and until then, the intellectual and moral development from our country would have actioned against the founding of the rural proletariat, and the social changes from Europe would have regarded Romania as a healthy, strong, wealthy and moral people, which could have easily received more accomplished, more socialists social forces". "But for such an appropriation, we should have had a stronger, enlightened peasant power, which it was not, and the appropriation would have been entirely different (...) let's assume here the fact that, back then, the landlords conspired against the peasants and chose a more useful instrument when cheating them, which would have led to an appropriation of the peasants with small portions of land, that way being compelled to do statute labour, on the rest of the land, obtained from the boyars" (Stahl, 2001:2012). Hence, Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea remains the man of his time. He considers that the reforms can be also done after the proper understanding of their necessity, by the oligarchy. Yet, the idea that the workers should also enjoy political rights, is viable only if the oligarchy allows their granting. Then, the oligarchy is no longer a "class enemy", but a conjectural partner. From here, it results the problem of "the vicious circle", which Dobrogeanu-Gherea enunciates, but cannot solve.

Therefore, he remained in the position of theoretician, while other socialist leaders, aware of the necessity for partnership, chose to join the liberal ranks: "more important economic reforms can be obtained by the working people only by having, as a fighting tool, certain political rights. But we are spinning inside a circle then, from which we cannot escape; the political reforms are useless without the economic ones, and the last ones cannot be obtained without the first ones. The exit from this circle is a very simple one; it ought to be done along with certain political reforms, appropriate economic reforms and, especially, one must not forget that the most significant are the last ones". Finally, we can notice that Dobrogeanu-Gherea did not intend to offer saving solutions. For him, along with his colleagues, the collaboration with "the oligarchy" was not something impossible. By theorising the problems faced by the Romanian society and policy, he considered useful to try an eventual "historical reconciliation": "social life is too complex for the evil to be reduced to a single cause. In *Neoiobăgia* I have shown a more fundamental cause of the evil, but nobody can deny that the oligarchic political regime did not cause immense damage to this country. Sometimes the public voice exaggerates, by attributing this regime the evil deeds that it can hardly be hold responsible for. Come what may, in the country, one can always hear: «Policy is responsible for all the bad things, policy is our damnation», and by policy, they mean our oligarchic regime". Vasile Morțun and Ioan Nădejde are two representatives of the socialist trend that, later on, joined the liberal ranks, after they had reached the conclusion that the socialists, as a party, were not able to fulfil the ideas provisioned in their political platform. Vasile



Morțun even managed to attract numerous industrial workers among the liberals, who, in this manner, developed a policy of attracting new members. Sofia Nădejde, the wife Ioan Nădejde asserted herself as a promotor of the Romanian feminism. She had the intellectual force to confront Titu Maiorescu, the author of a theory that proclaimed the woman inferior to man, from the intellectual point of view.

### **Conclusions**

The socialist trend from Romania was constituted under the influence of the occidental ones, received here though the immigrants that arrived, especially, due to their expulsion, from Tsarist Russia. Since the beginning, we have intended to follow two directions: the internal specificity and the ability to adapt. The Romanian socialists as Ioan Nădejde (1854-1928), Vasile Morțun (1860-1919), Zamfir Arbore (1848-1933), Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea (1855-1920), Cristian Racovski (1873-1941), Constantin Mille (1861-1927), designed an idealist political platform, difficult to achieve, under the political circumstances from Romania. Cristian Racovski was a physician. With Bulgarian origins, he activated in several countries, where he militated for the socialist ideas. In Romania, he activated intermittently, between 1903 and 1917, leaving then for the Soviet Russia, where he held different positions, including during the Soviet Union, later a victim of the Stalinist repression. Many of the so-called “generous” socialists joined later the liberal ranks. Dobrogeanu-Gherea preferred the position of theoretician, of critic of the oligarchy, without excluding entirely the hypothesis of seizing the leading position, one day. Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea willingly exaggerated numerous aspects. He criticised the forty-eight revolution and trend, he found breaches including in the agrarian reform from 1864. He considered that the division of the land in small surfaces was another attempt of the political oligarchy to stop the generalised revolt of the peasants, with the purpose to later enslave them, which he called “the new-serfdom”. Although the researchers, among which Henri H. Stahl reveal the qualities of sociologist of Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea, we cannot entirely agree with him. It is obvious that the mentioned aspects of the socialist author on addressing the political deficiencies from Romania are real, but from here to the compromising of the fundamental reforms that constituted the bedrock of the social structures in modern Romania, or the platform of the people from 1848, is a long way. It was the background of the revolution agreed by the socialists in different measures that determined the representatives of the political class to make the decision, before the end of World War I, to deal with the agrarian and electoral reform at the peace conference.

The socialist spirit did not have the force of other trends, as the Populism, the Semanatorism, or the Pro-Peasants Trend. An adversary of it was the electoral system, along with the education of the peasants that did not allow them the possibility to adopt the foreign models. Not even the Russian trend of the Narodniks, nor the trend of the Iconographers attracted them too much. The peasants wanted from the political system an agrarian reform, the workers, a growing category, yet still small, aspired to better working conditions, considering that the politicians can offer them. Basically, the idea of revolution, after 1848, lacked the elites who had once been capable to promote themselves, the forty-eighters being the ones who had built the modern state, assuring its independence, while their followers were only trying to modernise and to achieve the union of all the Romanians.

Even under the circumstances of the universal voting, after the Great Union, the socialist ideas, associated with the communist power from Moscow, which had stopped

## The Socialist Trend in the Modern Romania and Its Influence on the Social Structures

the diplomatic relation with Romania, entered with difficulty. The declaration of the Communist Party as illegal, in 1924, only three year after its creation, while at Moscow were ordered anti-Romanian actions, determined the diminishing in the number of people who had adhered to this ideology, and the actions of revolt to become clandestine, taking place as activities of the political trends who had been outlawed. The fact that the Romanian socialism from the modern era was a relatively modest trend, vaguely remembering of the left wing of the democratic parties, determined the later communist to minimize the role of the socialists from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the “official history” of the communist trend starting from 1921, and being artificially built by hyperbolising the myth of “the illegal activity”.

### References:

- ”Ovidiu Șincai” Social-Democrat Institute (2003). *110 ani de social-democrație în România*, Bucharest.
- Berindei, D. (2003). *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VII, tom. 2, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică Publishing House.
- Dobrogeanu Gherea, C. (1910). *Neoiobăgia*, Bucharest.
- Idem (1988), *Opere complete*, vol. III, V, Bucharest: Editura Politică Publishing House.
- Dohotaru, Adrian (2013). *Mișcarea socialistă din România. Revoluție sau reformă (1881-1921)*, summary of the doctoral dissertation, Cluj-Napoca: “George Barițiu” Institute of History of the Romanian Academy, 1-8.
- Hitchins, K. (1994). *România 1866-1947*, Bucharest: Humanitas publishing House.
- Nacu, Fl. (2013). *Structuri sociale în România anilor 1859-1918*, Craiova: Aius.
- Stahl, Henri H. (2001), *Gânditori și curente de istorie socială românească*: Bucharest: The University of Bucharest Publishing House.
- Stăiculescu, Al. (2005). *Critica socială și principiile reformei, Sfera Politicii* (119), pp. 1-7. Retrieved from: <http://www.sferapoliticii.ro/index.html>.

---

### Article Info

*Received:* March 06 2016

*Accepted:* December 10 2016

---