

Political elite in an agrarian country: Romania in 1866-1916

Liveanu, Vasile; Gavrilă, Irina

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Liveanu, V., & Gavrilă, I. (1985). Political elite in an agrarian country: Romania in 1866-1916. *Historical Social Research*, 10(1), 92-105. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.10.1985.1.92-105>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

POLITICAL ELITE IN AN AGRARIAN COUNTRY:
ROMANIA IN 1866 - 1916

Vasile Liveanu, Irina Gavrilă(+)

Abstract: We used the computer for the sorting and aggregation of non-numerical information such as for comparing lists of names. The comparison of lists of ministers with lists of landowners demonstrated that the proportion of the great landed proprietors was greater among the conservative ministers than among the liberal ministers. The struggle between liberals and conservatives was not only a conflict between representatives of different social classes and strata but also to a certain extent a struggle within the same class.

In the political history of modern Romania numerous works deal with the activity of the political elite. Quantitative analyses of the evolution of the "boyars" in the second half of the XVIIIth century and the first half of the XIXth century have also appeared⁽¹⁾ (the boyars represented in that period the social category which is called the "political elite" in this paper). Some attention has been devoted as well to the evolution of the former boyars after 1858, when the titles and privileges of the boyars were abolished.⁽²⁾ Matei Dogan published a statistical analysis of the parliamentary activity in Romania in which he used quantitative information on the social background of the members of Parliament.⁽³⁾ But no special quantitative analyses devoted to the Romanian political ruling circles in the second half of the XIXth century and the beginning of the XXth century have yet been published. Even the present paper is only a "byproduct" of another research project on the evolution of the great landowners' class after 1857.

Our research used the computer in order to compare tables of persons' names and other personal data of landowners and persons with positions in the state machinery. We sorted and aggregated qualitative data and then performed some simple arithmetical operations. We hope that our findings will clear up certain aspects of the social background of the political elite in modern Romania.

In order to establish the importance of the problem of the landowners' role in the political leadership of Romania in 1866-1916 we must mention some general aspects of the evolution of Romanian society. In the young Romanian national state constituted in 1859 through the union of Wallachia with Moldavia, industrialization was just starting (the utilization of the steam engines had begun in the previous decade). The development of trades and industry was much slower than in the western part of the continent. The retardation resulted from such inauspicious historical circumstances as the foreign domination, the distance from the axis of the world commerce and, because of this, the lasting persistence of the traditional, feudal relations.

(+) Address all communications to: Vasile Liveanu and Irina Gavrilă, Institutul de Istorie N. Iorga, Bulevardul Aviatorilor 1, București, Romania

Beginning with the seventh decade of the XIXth century the construction of the railways and of the ways of communication in general developed rapidly. Being hampered by the competition of foreign industry and by the narrowness of the home market (the union of all the Romanian provinces with Romania was completed in 1918), autochthonous industry developed more rapidly only beginning with the ninth decade of the XIXth century.

In 1912 there were 86.000 workers from the industrial enterprises with more than 25 employees, representing 2.2 % of the active population.(4) According to 1913 statistics, industry and trades on the whole employed 8.8 % of the active population, transport 1.8 %, commerce and the banks 2.7 %. In contrast, 80.2 % of the active population was still engaged in agriculture.(5)

In the six decades which followed after the union of 1859, the cultivated area in Romania increased 2.5 times (from an annual average of 2.1 million hectares in 1862-1866 to 5.3 million hectares in 1911-1915).(6) In agriculture, grain farming prevailed. At the beginning of the XXth century Romania was the European country with the highest proportion of grain farmed land as compared to all cultivated land. In 1866-1910 over 45 % of the grain production was exported (without mentioning the flour production).

In 1909-1914, Romania was the second corn exporting country in the world (after Argentina but before the United States and Russia), the fifth wheat exporting country (after Russia, USA, Canada, Argentina), and the second barley exporting country (after Russia).(7) The reverse side of this export was a relatively reduced per capita consumption at home.

The 1864 land reform abolished the corvée system and put the former "clacas" (clacas = peasant obliged to effect the corvée for a landlord) in the possession of a small plot; less than 30 % of the area of the estates was expropriated. The landlords received a good indemnification. Nevertheless, in 1905, the estates of over 50 hectares continued to represent 49,59 % of the farming land.

After the 1864 land reform the wage-labour was extended in Romanian agriculture. Shortly before World War I about 1/3 of the tillable land of the large estates was farmed with wage-labour. The rest of it was still farmed in the so-called sharecropping system. Within this latter system, the land was leased to the petty farmer who tilled it with his own implements and live stock. In most cases, the peasant payed his lease in kind and labour with his own implements and live stock on the landowner's land - and, (especially in the North-East) partially in cash. If we include wage-labour on the farms of the well-to-do peasants, we can estimate that the total area tilled with wage-labour exceeded the land tilled in the sharecropping system.

The maintenance of great landed property left its mark on the recruiting of the political elite in 1866-1916. The ruling role in state in Wallachia and Moldavia until their union was held by the nobility, since the boyars had the monopoly of the more important public positions. This is not the place to discuss the evolution of this class during the preceding centuries. We mention only three aspects. The great landowners were or became boyars. In 1831-1858, during the application of the new Organic Regulations, the extension of public offices, the assimilation of some public positions with boyar ranks and the selling of boyar diplomas made it possible for many persons who were not landowners (employees, merchants etc.) to be admitted among the boyars especially of inferior ranks. By 1859 the number of boyars had become more than three times greater in Wallachia(8) and more than four times greater in Moldavia(9) than in 1829.

In 1858 the ranks and privileges of boyars were abolished. The abolition of the boyar ranks and of their monopoly of the leading positions in state was confirmed by the Constitution of 1866. Accordingly Romania was now a monarchy with a government which was responsible before the Parliament. This Parliament was based on a plural suffrage. The electoral system divided the voters into electoral bodies, according to revenue, urban or rural residence, taxes paid, profession etc. and granted rural landowners the right to elect the majority of the deputies and half of the senators. In 1883 the Constitution was revised lowering the electoral qualification based on the rural land revenue and increasing the number of parliamentaries elected by those who were not landowners. Nevertheless, after 1883 the electoral system still favoured the rural landowners with large incomes in Parliament and therefore in government. The landowners with an income of over 1200 "lei" (the average income of a landed property of 40 hectares in 1905) elected 75 of the 183 Chamber deputies. The landowners with a landed revenue of 800-2000 "lei", together with tradesmen, craftsmen and manufacturers with large incomes and with some categories exempted from qualification, elected half of the 110 senators; the other half was exclusively elected by the rural landowners, that is by those with a landed revenue of over 2000 "lei" which in 1905 represented the average revenue of an estate of 600 hectares.(10)

Between 1866 and 1916 the representatives of two political currents - the liberal and the conservative - alternated at the helm of the state. In 1875 liberal groups organized themselves into the national-liberal party and in 1880 conservative groups fused into the conservative party. From time to time, dissident factions separated themselves from the conservative as well as from the liberal party and after a period returned to their original party or joined the other party. In 1881 the "Junimist" (Youth) political club was set up; it functioned in some periods (also under the name of "Constitutional Party") along side the conservative party and in other periods is coalesced with it. In 1908 the conservative-democratic party separated itself from the conservative party. The "Junimists" as well as the conservative-democratic party governed in coalition with the conservative party.

During the second half of the 19th century, Romania was governed by the liberals for 27 years, by the conservatives for 20 years and by liberal-conservative coalitions for three years. The dividing line between the liberals and the conservatives fluctuated and in the present paper we can fit it only very roughly.

The liberals declared themselves for the extension of the right to vote and of other public rights. But this sentiment did not prevent them from repressive measures against the socialists, the workers' trade unions, the peasants' uprisings.

The liberals adopted measures in support of industry (encouraging laws, protective tariffs), of railway construction, of banking development, including "popular" banks (which grouped together mainly well-to-do sections of the rural population). Within the liberal party there were different groups, e.g. rightists and radical-democrats. After repressing the great peasants' uprising in 1907, the liberals declared themselves in 1913 for the introduction of equal voting rights for the literates and for a new limited expropriation of the great estates, with indemnification for the landowners. Generally, the liberals favoured the modernization of Romania.

The conservatives were against the democratic liberties and especially against the extension of the suffrage. They defended the electoral privileges of the landowners. They supported the founding of banks for the land-

owners and a customs policy in their favour. Trying to get other strata to support the landowners, they suggested and executed some measures in favour of the artisans and the well-to-do peasants. The conservatives accused the liberals of importing artificial forms from the West, alien to the traditions trends and realities of the country.

In contemporary Romanian historiography, the opinion prevails that the liberal party was first of all (not exclusively) attached to the bourgeoisie and the landowners who were involved in capitalist agriculture, in banking and industrial affairs, while the conservative party was first of all (not exclusively) attached to the great landlords. While we share this view, we think that the political representatives of a class or of a social group do not necessarily belong precisely to that class or social group because of their material and social situation.

A political party represents a class to the degree that the practical consequences of its politics correspond to the interests, the aims, the tendencies of that class. If, and to what extent, the leaders of a political party belong to the class whose interests are promoted by that party depends on the concrete historical circumstances.

We intended to use our data set to define the proportion of the landowners among the liberal ministers on one hand and among the conservatives on the other hand. In order to do this we have to take into account the changes which appeared in the structure of the landowners' class after the 1864 land reform. Already in the past century much has been written about the changes which took place within "the social and political elite" through the ruination of the old boyar families after 1864 and the buying up of their estates by persons who came from outside the circles of the old landlords namely from the tenants and bailiffs or rich peasants and rich townspeople. But in the studies which were published until now, the size of these changes could not be established.

In order to fill this gap, we created a number of tables:

1. A table containing the names and personal data of the boyars in 1857 aged over 30 who owned at least 142 hectares. This data was derived from the electoral lists for the 1857 "Ad hoc" Assemblies, which were charged with the discussion of the future organization of the Romanian provinces. The lists were published in the Official Gazette.
2. A table containing the names and some other data for all landowners at the moment of the 1864 land reform. This data was derived from the wholly kept records of the 1864 land reform at the Bucharest State Archives. Tables containing the landowners aggregated according to the number of their "clacasi" were constructed.
3. A table containing the names and some personal data of all the landowners in 1905. This data was derived from the informations contained in the General Yearbook of Romania published in 1905.

The computer comparison of these tables showed that only 65.6 % (925) of the 1409 boyars who owned 142 hectares in 1857, had the same family name as the landowners of 1905. In some cases, persons who had the same family name were no relatives. Consequently, at least 34 % of the landowners of large estates in 1857 were in one of the following situations: 1. they themselves or their offspring had lost their estates till 1905; 2. they had no male or female not-married offspring alive in 1905; 3. their female married offspring who

was alive in 1905 was married to members of the families who in 1857 had no large estates.

In 1905 only 42 % of the large landed properties was owned by persons who had the same family name as the boyar landowners of large estates on the 1857 list. This meant that at least 57 % of the large landed properties were owned in 1905 by men who were neither boyar landowners of large estates and at least 30 years old in 1857, nor offspring of such boyars, nor women married to such men. At least 57 % of the large properties were owned by persons who were "new-comers" to the class of the great landed proprietors, or descendants of "new-comers" or women of "new-comers". A comparison of the table of the 1905 great landowners with the table containing the landowners of 1864 yielded similar conclusions.(11)

Beginning with May 1866 (when Charles I ascended the throne) until Romania entered World War I, over 140 ministers succeeded in the government of Romania. The lists of these ministers were published.(12) How did the composition of these governments evolve in terms of the affiliation of the ministers to the class of the landowners.

Between February 1866 and March 1871 there was a period of governmental instability during which liberal governments alternated with coalition governments between liberals and conservatives. From March 1871 to April 1876, a conservative government was in office. We will first analyze the structure of the governments during this period. The persons who during the same period switched from one party to another and were both liberal ministers and conservative ones were taken into consideration twice. Since we could not establish the political affiliation of three ministers of war in the coalition governments of the 1866-1871 period (general Gr. Ghica, general Tobias Gherghel, colonel A. Duca), we did not take them into consideration in our calculations.

12 of 30 liberal ministers from the period between February 1866 - March 1871, that is 40 %, appeared on the list of the 1864 landowners with 20 "clacasi" or more. Three of the latter, that is 10 % out of the total number of the liberal ministers during this period, were also found on the list of the landowners with over 142 hectares in 1857 (see table 1). The absence of some landowners with over 20 "clacasi" in 1864 from the 1857 list of the owners of large estates could have different causes (they were under 30 in 1857, had not inherited yet, or their estates were smaller than 142 hectares etc.). Three other ministers who were not masters of "clacasi" in 1864 appeared on the 1857 list of owners of above 142 hectares. We can conclude that half (15) of the liberal ministers of the 1866-1876 period were proprietors of large estates in the pre-reform period - either owners of at least 142 hectares in 1857 or masters of over 20 "clacasi" in 1864.

Five liberal ministers of the years 1866-1871 were not found either on the 1857 list of landowners or on the 1864 list of masters of 20 "clacasi" or more. But they had the same family names as some persons who appeared on those lists; therefore they could have been descendants of owners of large estates from before 1864 (which can be positively state for four of them).

This leads to another significant fact. The surname of ten liberal ministers from the period to which we refer now, did not appear on either of the two lists of 1857 and 1864 landowners. One third of the 1866-1871 liberal ministers of the pre-reform period were neither landowners of the pre-reform period, nor offsprings of masculine line of such landowners.(13) The penetration of newcomers into Romania's "political elite", originating from

TABLE 1

Party Affiliation	Years	Ministers	Owners of large estates of 1857 or 1864	% (4) out of (3)	NLSS *	% (6) out of (3)	WSS**	% (8) out of (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Liberals	1866-1871	30	15	50	5	16	10	33
Conservatives	1866-1876	26	18	69	4	15	4	15
Liberals	1876-1888	34	13	38	8	23	13	38
Conservatives	1888-1895	29	9	31	13	44	7	24
Liberals	1895-1899	19	2	10	10	52	7	36
Conservatives	1899-1907	18	3	16	12	66	3	16
Conservatives	1910-1914	17	2	11	9	52	6	35
Liberals	1901-1916	25	1	4	11	44	13	52

The tables in this paper were not designed to add up to 100 %.

* NLSS - Persons who were not landowners in 1857 or 1864 but had the same surname as such a landowner.

** WSS - Persons without the same surname as a landowner of 1857 or 1864.

other social strata than the proprietors of large states who furnished the state leaders before 1859, was thus manifest.

18 of 25 conservative ministers of the years 1866-1876, that is 69 %, were owners of large estates; in 1864 they possessed estates with 20 "clacasi" or more. 10 of these conservative ministers were in 1857 owners of estates of at least 142 hectares. Four other conservative ministers had the same family names as some landowners who appeared on the lists of 1857 and/or 1864, being probably their relatives; one of these four ministers had 15 "clacasi" in 1864.

Only four of the 1866-1876 conservative ministers, that is 15 %, had family names which could not be found on the lists of owners of large estates from 1857 and 1864 and consequently were neither landowners of the pre-reform period nor offspring of masculine line of such landowners. One of these last ministers had four "clacasi" in 1864.

In order to have a more comprehensive view of the role played by the landowners of large estates in the governments of 1866-1871 we have to mention that all prime ministers from the period, both liberals and conservatives, were owners of large estates. The prime minister of this period who in 1864 had the most "clacasi" with 805 was the moderate conservative Dimitrie Ghica, followed by the liberal C.A. Cretulescu with 449 "clacasi".

The proportion of those who in 1857 and 1864 were landowners was greater among the conservative ministers from 1866-1876 than among the liberal ministers from the same period. The share of the landowners from 1864 with 20 "clacasi" or more was 40 % among the liberal ministers and of 69 % among the conservative ministers. The percentage of the 1866-1876 ministers who appeared on the 1857 list of the boyars as owners of at least 142 hectares, was of 20 % for the liberal ministers and of 38 % for their conservative colleagues. The percentage of the persons who could be seen on at least one of the lists of landowners from 1857 or 1864 was of 69 % among the conservative ministers from 1866-1876 and only 50 % among the liberal ministers.

Moreover, the conservative ministers were greater masters of "clacasi" than the liberal ministers. On the average, at the moment of land reform, the liberal ministers from 1866-1871 had 150 "clacasi" and the conservative ministers from 1866-1876 had 270 "clacasi".

Let us compare the number of "clacasi" belonging to each of the 12 liberal ministers who had "clacasi" in 1864, with the number of "clacasi" of each of the 20 conservative ministers who had "clacasi" in 1864 (including the two conservative ministers with less than 20 "clacasi"). We obtain $12 \times 20 = 240$ pairs of numbers. In each pair the first number is that of the "clacasi" belonging to a liberal minister and the second number is that of the "clacasi" belonging to a conservative minister. In 142 out of the 240 pairs, therefore in 58 % of the cases, the number of "clacasi" belonging to a conservative minister is greater than the number of "clacasi" belonging to a liberal minister.(14)

The ministers' relations with the landowners' social environment must be considered also from the point of view of their family relationships. If we add those ministers who had the same family names as persons appearing on the above mentioned 1857 and 1864 tables, we find that in 1866-1876 67 % of the liberal ministers and 85 % of the conservative ones were either landowners of large estates in 1857 or 1864 or had family ties with them.

At the same time, this also means, that among the 1866-1876 ministers 33 % of the liberals and 15 % of the conservatives did not have the same family name as one of the owners of large estates. In our opinion this points to the fact that among the liberals the percentage of the elements coming from other social strata than the class of the owners of large estates was greater than among the conservative.

How did the composition of the governments evolve after 1876? In order to study this evolution we divided the ministers of this epoch in six groups:

1. The ministers of the liberal governments who ruled for nearly 12 years between 1876 and 1888; we included in this group the liberal ministers of the April-July 1876 coalition government which included a single conservative minister (listed in the group of the 1866-1876 conservative ministers).
2. The ministers of the conservative governments who ruled for over seven years, between March 1888 and October 1895.
3. Ministers of the liberal governments between October 1895 and April 1899.
4. Ministers of the conservative governments between April 1899 and March 1907 (interrupted by a liberal government between 1901-1904).
5. Ministers of the conservative government between December 1910 and January 1914.
6. Ministers of the liberal governments from 1901 to 1916 (till the entrance of Romania in the First World War in August 27, 1916).

We did not group together the conservative governments from the beginning of the XXth century into a single group, as we did the liberal ones, because we wished to examine whether the conservative-democratic party in 1908 had any influence on the development of the phenomena we were interested in.

After 1876 the percentage of the landowners of the pre-reform period among the liberal ministers on one hand and among the conservative ministers on the other hand decreased continually from one period to the other. In table 1, the percentage of the landowners of the pre-reform period among the conservative ministers decreased from over two thirds in 1866-1876 to almost one third during 1888-1907 and to about one tenth during the last conservative government before Romania's entry into World War I.

During the liberal government of 1876 the percentage of the ministers who were landowners of large estates before the 1864 reform decreased to 38 %, became only 10 % in 1895-1899 and 4 % in the first decades of our century till the entry of Romania in the First World War.

The owners of large estates of the pre-reform period had become a small minority among the Romanian ministers of even less importance in the case of the liberals than in that of the conservatives. The small proportion of the 1857 or 1864 great landed proprietors among the ministers of the beginning of our century was to a large extent the result of the ageing process of the 1864 generation. But this generation continued to furnish the XXth century conservative prime ministers as well as one of the two liberal prime ministers of the 1901-1916 period.

In the same time the penetration into the government elite of persons from others families than those of the pre-reform landowners accelerated. There certainly is a positive correlation between the number of these persons and the number of those who had not the same family names as the 1857 and 1864 landowners of large estates.

Among the conservative ministers, the percentage of those who had not the same family names as any 1857 or 1864 landowners of large estates oscilated in the 1866-1907 period between 15 % and 24 %, being always lower than the corresponding percentage among the liberals (33-38 % in 1866-1899). In 1899-1907 the percentage of conservative ministers of this category decreased significantly to 16 %, but in the following 1910-1914 period it increased abruptly to 35 %. This recovery was due to some extent to the "old conservative" and to the "Junimist" ministers and to a greater extent to the democratic-conservative ministers. It was the result of the penetration into the

leadership of the conservative party of persons who were not landed proprietors and who were coming from the circles of leading professionals (intellectuals, military men) as well as of landowners who got their estates after 1864.

Within the liberal governments of the 1895-1899 period the percentage of ministers with other family names than those of the 1857 or 1864 landowners decreased slightly in comparison with the 1876-1888 period (from 38 % to 36 %), but it remained higher than the 33 % of the 1866-1871 period. None the less, within the 1895-1899 liberal governments the percentage of the persons who had not the same family name as the 1857 or 1864 landowners of large estates remained greater than their percentage within the XIXth century conservative governments.

Within the liberal governments of the XXth century, the percentage of the "new names"⁽¹⁶⁾ increased again and therefore continued to be greater than among the conservative government of 1910-1914. Moreover, the persons who had not the same surname as the pre-reform landowners constituted the majority (52 %) of the liberal governments of the beginning of our century.

Because of the specific character of the landowners' surname in Romania, the percentage of the ministers who had not the same surname as one of the pre-reform great landed proprietors indicates the minimum share of those members of the cabinet who were not descendants on masculine line of such proprietors. With the exception of the liberal 1901-1916 governments the majority of the ministers in the second half of the 19th century had the same surnames as one of the pre-reform owners of great estates. These ministers might have been kindred on masculine descendants of one of the pre-reform landowners and might originate from the landowners social environment. The exact extent of the family relationship of both ministers with and without landowners surnames with the members of the landowner class could only be elucidated by further genealogical studies.

We must also keep in mind that some of the ministers who had the same family name as the great landowners of the pre-reform period possessed no estates in 1857 or 1864. The proportion of the persons belonging to this category increased among the liberal ministers until 1899 and among the conservative ones until 1907 but it decreased afterwards.

This development was influenced, among other factors, by two processes:

1. Some younger persons who became owners of great estates after 1864 were admitted into the government. Therefore some of the ministers who had the same family name as a great landowner of 1857 or 1864 but were not themselves landed proprietors in those years became landlords till 1905. Table 2 shows that the percentage of those ministers who appear on the 1905 list of landlords without prior landed property is strongly increasing from period to period among the conservative ministers as well as among the liberal ones. However, the increase was much greater with the conservatives and reached 100 % in the 1910-1914 period. Among the liberal ministers of the 1901-1916 period this percentage remained considerably lower at 44 %. This was also a symptom of the stronger conservative penetration into the landlord milieu.

2. Politicians who came from other families than those of the 1857-1864 landowners were also admitted into the government. This process developed in the XXth century, reducing both for conservative as well as liberal governments the percentage of the persons who, without owning estates in 1857 or 1864, had the same surname as one of the landowners of those years.

TABLE 2

Party Affiliation	Years	NLSFN *	NLSFN proprietors of large estates in 1905	% (4) out of (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Liberals	1866-1876	5	0	0
Conservatives	1866-1876	4	1	25
Liberals	1876-1888	8	1	12
Conservatives	1888-1895	13	5	38
Liberals	1895-1899	10	4	40
Conservatives	1899-1907	12	8	66
Conservatives	1910-1914	9	9	100
Liberals	1901-1916	11	5	45

* NLSFN - Persons who were not landowners of large estates in 1857 or 1864 but had the same family name as such a landowner.

The decrease in the number of pre-reform landowners was partially counter-balanced by the admission of persons who became landowners of large estates after the 1864 land reform.

The data in table 3 enable us to compare the percentage of the 1857 or 1864 landowners within the 1866-1876 governments with the percentage of the 1905 owners of large estates within the 1901-1916 governments.

In comparison to the years 1866-1876 an important decrease of the percentage of landowners among the liberal as well as among the conservative ministers took place. In the XXth century the percentage of landowners remained greater among the conservative ministers, among whom the owners of great estates continued to form the majority. But in 1910-1914 this majority hardly exceeded 50 %. Among the 1901-1916 liberal ministers the 1905 landowners represented only a minority, though an important one constituting 42 (45?) %.

TABLE 3

Party Affiliation	Years	Minis- ters	Owners of large estates in 1857 or 1864	% (4) out of (3)	Owners of large estates in 1905	% (6) out of (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Liberals	1866- 1871	31	16	51		
Conservatives	1866- 1876	26	18	69		
Conservatives	1899- 1907	18			11	61
Conservatives	1910- 1914	17			9	52
Liberals	1901- 1916	25			11* (10)	44* (40)

* We could not ascertain the status of one minister.

The general decrease of the percentage of the landowners within the governments of the beginning of the XXth century reflected nevertheless the modernization of the Romania society, the admittance within the ruling political circles of persons who came from other classes than the landowners who monopolized the leadership of the state before 1858.

The more accentuated increase within the liberal governments of the proportion of the ministers who were not landlord helps explain the agreement of liberal leaders to a new land reform in 1913. Because over 90 % of the liberal ministers of the 1901-1916 period had not experienced a previous expropriation it was, perhaps, easier for them to accept a new one.

The structure of the governments also reflected to a certain extent the changes within the landowners. Some government members of the beginning of the XXth century were landowners who came from other families than those of the 1857-1864 landowners. Fewer had been owners of large estates between 1857-1864, but lost them afterwards. Table 4 synthesizes the informations on this problem.

None of the 1899-1914 conservative ministers was a landowners bearing a family name not found also on the list of the pre-reform landowner. Therefore all the conservative ministers who were landowners were probably relatives of the pre-reform landowners. Probably no one of those ministers was a "newcomer" to the landlords milieu.

Among the 1901-1916 liberal ministers, there were some 1905 landowners who had other surnames than those of the pre-reform landowners. The percentage of these newcomers to the landlords class reached about one fifth of the liberal ministers of the 1901-1916 period. The liberal leadership seemed therefore to be more attached to the new landowners who came from other

TABLE 4

Party Affiliation	Years	Ministers	Landowners in 1905 without SFNL*	% (4) out of (3)	Landowners in 1857 or 1864 without estates in 1905	% (6) out of (3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Conservatives	1899-1907	18	0	0	0	0
Conservatives	1910-1914	17	0	0	1	5
Liberals	1901-1916	26	6 ** (5)	23(19)	0	0

* SFNL - Same family name as a landowner of 1857 or 1864.

** We could not ascertain the status of one minister.

families than those of the landowners of the pre-reform period. Precisely these landowners were forming the majority in their class in 1905. The changes within the class of landowners were better reflected in the recruitment of liberal ministers than in the recruitment of the conservative.

On the other hand, only one minister of the 1899-1916 governments - and this was a conservative minister of the 1910-1914 period - was a pre-reform landowner who seems to have lost his landowner status before 1905. This situation suggests that the ruined landowners were poorly represented within the central state leadership.

Until now we have examined the presence of the large landowners among the government members, therefore among the top layer of the political elite. But among other categories of members of the "political elite", the representation of the landowners of large estates had different characteristics. Since we have not the necessary space to communicate the first results of our research, we mention only some aspects.

Between 1866-1899, among the prefects who were local political and administrative leaders, the number of persons who had the same family names as some landowners of 1864 was greater with the conservatives than with the liberals. It was 63.2 % among the conservative prefects of 1871-1876, 56.8 % among the conservative ones of 1888-1895, and 49 % among the liberal prefects of 1876-1899.

Previous researches shows that between 1899-1909 the deputies who were landowners of large estates were a minority in the Chamber. Surprisingly, the percentage of the landowners of large estates was greater among the liberal deputies than among the conservative ones (perhaps because the liberals nominated landowners in order to calm the apprehensions of the electorally privileged landowners). It is important to keep in mind that the majority of the deputies was formed at the beginning of the XXth century by persons who came from other social categories than landowners.

Our quantitative analysis shows that the landowners of large estates formed a small minority also among the magistrates of the higher instances, the superior officers and the generals.

Although our data-set stops in 1916, we have to mention the change which occurred because of the legislation passed in 1917-1921. Another land reform was decided and universal and equal male suffrage was introduced. Therefore the landowners' economic power, political influence and direct participation in the state leadership diminished considerably. The conservative party ceased to exist.

A more complete analysis of the ministers' social origin should define their boyar or not boyar backgrounds, the origin of those who were not landowners of large estates and especially the extent to which large landowning ministers were also involved in industry, commerce, banks. It should also include other aspects such as the education level, the place of study (in Romania or abroad), their regional origin etc. It would be preferable to refer to the social situation of each minister not at a fixed date but at the moment of his inclusion in the government. In the present paper we did not intend to perform such a multidimensional quantitative analysis but we wished only to present some research results concerning the special problem of the evolution of the landowners class. Even if future studies will correct some details in our findings, they should not affect their more general conclusions.

In Romania, like in other European countries, the struggle between the liberals and the conservatives was not only a conflict between representatives of different social classes and strata but at the same time also a struggle within the same classes.

Not only the conservatives but also the liberals had connections in the landowners class. The conservatives' links to the landowners class were stronger than those of the liberals. On the other hand, the conservatives had also connections to other classes than the landowners, but they were much weaker than those of the liberals.

The fact that the struggle between the liberals and the conservatives was in a certain extent a struggle within the class of great landed proprietors also explains its limits. It renders intelligible the cooperation of the liberals and the conservatives in suppressing the peasants' uprisings, the agreement for half of a century of the majority of the liberal leaders to the maintenance of the electoral privileges of the landowners, the preservation of the large landed properties in the liberal drafts for a land reform in 1913 (as well as in the land reform legislation after 1917).

Actually, the struggle between the liberals and the conservatives was a fight over the manner, scope and speed of Romanias' modernization. Different fractions of the landlords' class suggested different solutions to this topical problem. The necessity of modernizing in order to face the exigences of the market economy, of participating in the international exchange of material and spiritual values, of consolidating the state against the expansionist policy of the neighbouring great powers was understood also by the landowners. But the options for one form or another of modernization differed among the landowners, were influenced by different factors, including ideology. The liberal landowners took a political and ideological stand nearer to the majority of the bourgeoisie and the social strata which followed it than to that of the conservative landowners.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Dan Berindei, Mutations dans le sein de la classe dirigeante valaque au cours du deuxième quart du XIX siècle, in *Genealogica E Heraldica. Reports of the 14 International Congress of Genealogical and Heraldic Sciences in Copenhagen 25-29 August 1980, Copenhagen 1982*; Dan Berindei, Irina Gavrila, Mutatii în sînul clasei dominante din Tara Româneasca în perioada de destramare a orînduirii feudale, in: *Revista de istorie*, 34 (1981), nr. 11; Dan Berindei, Irina Gavrila, Amaliza situatiei clasei dominante din Tara Româneasca în temeiul catagrafiei din 1829, in: *Revista de istorie*, 36 (1983) nr. 4; Dan Berindei, Irina Gavrila, Analyse de la composition de l'ensemble des familles des grands dignitaires de la Valachie au XVIIIème siècle, in: *Comunicaciones al XV Congreso Internacional de las Ciencias Genealogica y Heraldica Madrid 19-26 IX, 1982, Madrid 1983*; Gheorghe Platon, Consideratii privind situatia numerica si structura boierimii din Moldova în preajma revolutiei de la 1848, in: *Populatie si societate. Studii de demografie istorica*, 2, Cluj-Napoca 1977.
- 2 Dan Berindei, Mutatii în sînul paturilor conducatoare românesti în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-les în lumina genealogiei, in: *Documente noi descoperite si informatii arheologice*, Bucuresti 1981.
- 3 Matei Digan, Analiza statistica a democratiei parlamentare din România, Bucuresti 1946.
- 4 V. Liveanu, The problem of industrialisation in Romanian Social Thinking and Social Practice, in: *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XXX, 1978, nr. 4.
- 5 Statistica profesiunilor din România, Bucuresti 1923.
- 6 I. Adam, N. Marcu, Studii desore dezvoltarea capitalismului în agricultura României, vol. I, II, Bucuresti 1956, 1959.
- 7 Institut International d'Agriculture Rome, Bulletin de Statistique Agricole et Commerciale, VII, 1916, nr. 4.
- 8 Paul Cernovodeanu, La structure sociale de la classe des boyards roumains pendant sa derniere étape d'existence institutionnelle (1831-1858), in: *Comunicaciones al XV Congreso Internacional de las Ciencias Genealogica y Heraldica Madrid, 19-16. IX. 1982, Madrid 1983*.
- 9 Gheorghe Platon, Consideratii ...
- 10 We computed the average revenue of the landed properties on the basis of the 1905 fiscal census, the results of which are published in N.G. Capitaneanu, Raport prezentat domnului ministru de finante asupra recensamîntului fiscal din 1905, Bucuresti 1906.
- 11 V. Liveanu, Irina Gavrila, On the evolution of the great landed property in Romania. Computer and non-numerical historical information, in: *Nouvelles études d'histoire*, Bucuresti 1985 (in print).
- 12 Costescu Dan, Fazele ministeriale în România, Bucuresti 1936; M. Tudorica, I. Burlacu, Guvernele României între 1866-1945. Liste de ministri, in: *Revista Arhivelor*, XLVII 1970, nr. 2.
- 13 In the period under study it was not impossible for the legal sons of the same parents to bear different family names. But the members of the Romania landed aristocracy, of the social and political elite, were attached to their family names and defended them against intruders.
- 14 V. Liveanu, Irina Gavrila, Mathematics and History. The Study of Historical Time Sequences with missing data, in: *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XIX (1980).
- 15 We understand by "new names" other family names than those of the 1857 or 1864 landowners.