

Translations

HISTORY OF STATES, HISTORY OF INDIVIDUALS. EMINESCU ON AUSTRIA AND THE ROMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES

Daniel CITIRIGĂ

Ovidius University, Constanța

e-mail: citiriga.daniel@univ-ovidius.ro

Cătălin PAVEL

Ovidius University, Constanța

e-mail: catalin.pavel@univ-ovidius.ro

Abstract: *The present article aims to offer excerpts of an essential article by the Romanian “national poet” Mihai Eminescu in the English translation, with a historical commentary. The translation aims to make Eminescu’s text available to an international audience of scholars, helping to write a more accurate social and cultural history of 19th century Europe. In turn, the commentary aims to show that Eminescu’s political vision, although substantially conservative, incorporated a number of tenets that were to become an inspiration for a number of politicians of highly diverse backgrounds, from the Iron Guard nationalists to the Socialists and Communists. Eminescu’s work was used, in ways he could no longer control, in order to legitimize their varied, and at times downright contradictory, claims.*

The article discussed here, on “The Austrian influence on the Romanians in the Principalities” (1876) offered Eminescu the opportunity to cast a critical eye on the state organization of the Romanians. His conclusion is exceedingly pessimistic: their state organization is presented as a failure, with the main sources of this failure being the personal interests of the Romanians themselves, compounded by the influence of foreigners. Hence the society based on corruption, rather than on principles, a society where having a job meant ruling, and not having one, being in opposition. In this gloomy picture, the author singled out a class on whose back the whole people lived: the Romanian peasants. The future of this class could not possibly be bright, as Eminescu expected that it be crushed from within, and “along with it, the state and the nation”. Did he also envisage a solution? In order to escape the situation in which “the proximity of Austria is devastating for us, unless we wake up soon”, Eminescu pinpointed three redeeming elements: stability, labour and economy. In other words, hereditary monarchy, the revocation of privileges for the “proletariat of the pen” and the careful spending of public budgets. The

alternatives were the Austrian rule, or the Russian rule, none of which comes across to Eminescu as a solution.

Keywords: Eminescu; Austria; Romanian Principalities; classes; foreigners.

I. Historical introduction ⁸⁹

Most discussions and analyses revolving around Mihai Eminescu focus on his poetic oeuvre. This is perfectly understandable, given that, in Romania, there are no second thoughts about deeming him “the national bard”. And in this label, more often than not, in the words of Ioana Bot, “the adjective has become, in the eyes of his mythologizing posterity, more important than the noun it supposedly qualified” (Bot, 2012: 226). While the “national bard” has fascinated literary critics, his works have not all been of equal interest to scholars, and not during all time periods. His publications in periodicals have first come into the limelight in the 1930s, while Communist Romania seemed, up till 1980, uninterested in Eminescu as a journalist affiliated with the literary society Junimea. In the 1990s, however, a team from the Museum of Romanian Literature pursued the publication of his Complete Works, adding to it five more volumes. These were pivotal in the dawn of a new perspective on Eminescu, specifically, in the rediscovery of Eminescu the journalist, who had been for too long, and for no good reason, in the shadow of the poet (Gregori, 2009: 272).

The interpretation of Eminescu’s writings has often given in to the temptation of assuming a natural overlap between his literary oeuvre and his political columns:

“his poetic brilliancy and his tragic death have both served the operation of turning him into a myth, and this mythologizing has considerably extended to the political writer. To the generations after him, *the writer* and *the scriptor* have become inseparable”, as pointed out by Ioan Stanomir (Stanomir, 2003: 15).

Bearing in mind these observations and steering clear of the passion that still surrounds Eminescu studies in Romania, we shall endeavor to discuss below one of the seminal texts he published in periodicals. “The Austrian influence on the Romanians in the Principalities” came out in August 1876 in *Convorbiri literare*, and a substantial selection of the most important passages therein (slightly more than half of the original Romanian text) is offered in English translation, following this introduction. They were written, it will be recalled, in a time when the wars with the Ottoman Empire wreaked havoc in the Balkans, the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia

⁸⁹ Part I (Historical introduction) was authored by Daniel Citirigă.

were still, at least formally, under Ottoman suzerainty, Bukovina was under Austrian administration, and Transylvania belonged to Hungary, as part of the Dual Monarchy. At that point, Eminescu had concluded his studies in Berlin and Vienna and had a good knowledge of what was being published in the two Central European Empires, which gave him a certain authority on that subject. In fact, Eminescu published five more articles in *Convorbiri literare* and *Curierul de Iași* under the heading “Romania and Austria-Hungary”. Last, but not least, it is worth mentioning that the text discussed below is based on a conference given by Eminescu on March 16, 1876, as part of the public lectures offered by “Junimea”. In those years, the Junimea “Addresses” had become a tradition and were hailed as genuine scientific events in Jassy. This public address, it must be emphasized, was the first and last to be delivered by Eminescu (Bot, & Cioabă, 2015: 24).

Before tackling the subject, the 26-year-old member of *Junimea* resorted to a provocative introduction, in tone with the poetic wit for which he was already well-known. Eminescu deemed the Austrian influence to be ubiquitous, both in a very concrete manner and in the collective imagination of Romanians – “It is akin to a fairy tale demon that one sees wherever one turns, to the effect that one begins to imagine it to be even there where it’s not” (Eminescu, 1980: 137)⁹⁰. Austria’s incontestable strong point was that its spiritual basis lay in the “cultivated Germany”, and this strong point was backed by proper justice and administration, by trade and industry, “and even a rather vigorous scientific movement” (137). All of this made it possible for the Austro-Hungarian Empire to rule over a variety of peoples coming from different backgrounds, despite its not fulfilling “the main requirement for being a state, namely national unity” (137). Why did Eminescu construe its relationship with Romania as particularly important? From his point of view, Romanians were a small people, whose “vital functions are, for the most part, performed by foreigners” (137), and the most aggressive “parasitic element” was in his view the Austrian system. The reasons this system worked so well could only be discovered and understood by probing into its past, by perusing its history. Thus, Catholicism, the equivalent of the universal empire of Christianity, was described as the main Habsburg weapon in the fight for European domination, and the dynasty felt that under its dome any kind of conquest could be legitimately pursued: “supposedly, it was out of love for

⁹⁰ This and all further citations stem from Eminescu’s “The Austrian influence on the Romanians in the Principalities” and are retrieved from the English version by C. Pavel, presented below, which follows the Romanian text in Eminescu, M. (1980). *Opere IX. Publicistică 1870-1877, Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași. / Complete Works IX. Articles in periodicals 1870-1877. Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași*. București: Editura Republicii Socialiste România. 137-143.

Christianity that Austria tried to occupy Wallachia in the times of Constantin Brâncoveanu, just as it later seized Bukovina” (138). Besides, the embodiment of the universal Christian Empire was none other than the Catholic priest, “the pure man *per excellentiam*” (138).

Based on these ideas, Eminescu issued a clarion call to realistic analysis – given that “the patriot chosen to straighten up his people must boast a warm heart and a very cold mind” (138) – and warned that the greatest danger was to come from domestic weaknesses, as the Romanian people was “always divided”. Influenced by German philosophy, particularly by Leibniz, Kant, Schopenhauer, and Hegel (Pavel, 2020: 242-243), Eminescu resorted to analytical devices that prove his deterministic approach: “Peoples are not products of intelligence, but of nature” (Eminescu, 1980: 138), while the state is “an institution of nature, rather than of reason” (138). Accordingly, the end result is that “the history of a people’s internal affairs is a fight opposing the concept of state to individualism” (138), with the predictable conclusion that individualism was the cause of all prosperity and decadence, of good and evil. All things considered, the picture Eminescu paints may seem Hobbesian through and through, and this is confirmed by his multiple uses of the phrase *bellum omnium contra omnes*. However, where Thomas Hobbes’s *homo homini lupus* described the “natural state” of man, a state of incessant war, which can only be controlled by an almighty state – the Leviathan –, Mihai Eminescu put forward the idea that destructive temptations can be resisted insofar as individual interests are harmonizable. And this would boil down to the very concept of state: *the idea of a harmony of interests*. Such harmony could be brought into being by the monarch, by a dynasty, while Republicans would be the opposition. “A Republic is any state wherein a party, representing one or several classes (but not *all* classes), can get to rule.” (139).

Such an approach, casting aspersions on certain Western Republics, could not pass unnoticed during the years of Communist rule in Romania. Indeed, when a new volume of Eminescu’s articles in periodicals was edited, it featured as an introduction a study by Al. Oprea, citing the *Austrian Influence...* no fewer than seven times. Oprea praised it as a “ruthless diagnostic of the much exalted democracy of Western states, tearing down the masks with a polemic acerbity only shown by Socialists” (Oprea, 1980: 29). The phrase that had so enraptured the commentator was one concerning the Republican exploitation of the class system:

“Ancient Republics were based on the supremacy of classes as castes, the modern Republic is based on the supremacy of the said classes in a non-rigid form [...] They endure through either the inhuman exploitation of one class by the other, or the exploitation of slaves and

enslaved peasants (ancient ones), or indeed through the exploitation of one country by another – and often through all of these concomitantly” (Eminescu, 1980: 139).

And Eminescu’s argument presses on, with formulas attesting to the author’s poetical inclinations. For example, the caste of Polish or German citizens, when asking the king for freedom, were actually only asking for the freedom “to strip down their peasants and hang them as they saw fit” (139). Consequently, Eminescu issued an unambiguous verdict: “Freedom is freedom to exploit, equality is equality to become a tyrant just like my neighbour, fraternity – a whim illustrated by the guillotine” (139).

Under such circumstances, Romanians did not stand good chances of developing a healthy state. To Eminescu, their state’s organization was “rotten”, and the fact that they had developed under the influence of the Polish public law – *respublica Poloniae* – only compounded the harm. That Poland invoked by Eminescu in fact no longer existed at the time, and the very possibility of the division at the end of the 18th century of such a strong medieval kingdom between neighbouring powers, was attributed by him largely to the *liberum veto* system. Any member of the *Szlachta* could veto any legislative decision, and this custom, coupled with the elective monarchy, dealt, in his view, the final blows to this “tragic, yet noble, nation” (139). Eminescu turns out, once more, to be loyal to the concept of monarchy, be it even in the guise of absolutism, rather than to the elective system.

In his view, the “unfortunate” elective rule, “this right, so praised by most of our journalists, is the least praiseworthy of all” (139). It is this, he argues, the root of the frequent changes of princes in Wallachia and Moldavia, while these short reigns were themselves, clearly, the root of instability. A simple calculation gave proof of this: six princes had ruled within a 50-year span, for an average of 8 years per prince. That was “too few for a state at its beginnings” (139). Only with Alexander the Good – who ruled for 33 years – does Eminescu argue that stability bears fruit, while the ensuing reigns of the Phanariotes were tantamount to heavy taxation, “for which the nation received no compensation, the taxes being meant to help those princes get rich fast” (140).

Even more than the partition of Poland, a moment of crucial significance in the rise of Austrian influence was the seizure of Bukovina by Austria in 1775. These events, which had taken place some 100 years before the publication of Eminescu’s article, led the author to conclude that the states with a stable monarchy grew stronger, while the Romanian Principalities grew ever more vulnerable, and the culprit for this was the boyar class: “the rule of just one class brought about the complete lack of

rights for the middle class” (140). It was this that led to the demise of the classes of yeomen and craftsmen, and implicitly, of the class of boyars. Thus, what at the time was acknowledged to be “the years of national regeneration”, that is, the half century that preceded the publication of the article, was deemed by Eminescu to have been “the history of the destruction of yeomen and of craftsmen” (141). This had engendered a society which, instead of being based on labour, was built on privileges. And at this point, Eminescu describes a decadent society, where many tasks are not accomplished by the local people, but by “a foreign element – the Jews” (141) instead. The way Eminescu sees it, Romanian peasants worked and drank brandy, while the profit ended up “in the hands of a stateless element, with neither language, nor nation” (142), which, once more, advanced the Austrian influence. When criticizing the Romanians’ inabilities, Eminescu fell back on the motif of the “invasion” of foreigners, a recurring topic in his writings, and one that was later to develop into a type of antisemitism with occasional violent touches, eventually becoming in the 20th century a model and an argument for nationalists and Iron Guard members.

At the end of the text, Eminescu discloses the key of his historical thinking: debating the Austrian influence in the Romanian Principalities offered the opportunity to cast a critical eye on the state organization of Romanians. His conclusion is exceedingly pessimistic: their state organization is presented as a failure, with the main sources of this failure being the personal interests of the Romanians themselves, compounded by the influence of foreigners. Hence the society based on corruption, rather than on principles, a society where having a job meant ruling, and not having one meant being in the opposition. In this gloomy picture, the author singled out a class on whose back the whole people lived: the Romanian peasants. The future of this class could not possibly be bright, as Eminescu expected that it be crushed from within, and “along with it, the state and the nation” (142). Did he also envisage a solution? In order to escape the situation in which “the proximity of Austria is devastating for us, unless we wake up soon” (143), Eminescu identified three redeeming elements: *stability*, *labour* and *economy*. To be more precise, these elements can be understood namely as hereditary monarchy, the revocation of privileges for the “proletariat of the pen” and the careful spending of public budgets. The alternatives were the Austrian rule, or the Russian rule, none of which appeared to Eminescu as a solution.

Mihai Eminescu’s publications in periodicals, no more than the text we analyzed above, cannot be labeled as mere expression of one specific school of thought, whereas that is in fact the case with certain of the intellectuals of his time. His image as a genius, elevated to the rank of national poet – a thinker most often on a conservative footing, but

occasionally radical, and at any rate devoid of any ideological homogeneity – haunted the following decades. Eminescu was thus to be appropriated as a source of inspiration by a whole array of political ideologists. The father of Romanian interwar antisemitism, A.C. Cuza, drew heavily on Eminescu’s articles in order to justify his own extremist nationalism. By the same token, the Communists were enthusiastically reading and quoting Eminescu in order to legitimize their own attacks against the great landowners and the old regime. Similarly, after December 1989, verses from Eminescu’s poem „Doina” („Lament”) were not infrequently referenced in xenophobic discourses – „whoever held foreigners dear/ may the mongrels eat their heart” or in connection to issues such as Romania’s „injust” boundaries- „from the Dniester to the Tisza” (Eminescu, 2021: 254-255). Eminescu’s lack of a lucid political vision, perceptible in his works over time, matters little to those keen on embracing the national poet as an ally, be they monarchists or Republicans, Democrats or radicals. At the same time, for those studying the history of political thought, Eminescu remains one of the most interesting public intellectuals – and an inexhaustible source of reinterpretations.

II. Translation of Eminescu’s text⁹¹

<p>M. Eminescu</p> <p>INFLUENȚA AUSTRIACĂ ASUPRA ROMÂNILOR DIN PRINCIPATE</p> <p>Influența aceasta, fiind mai cu samă actuală, are dezavantajul de a nu sta înaintea noastră ca un șir de fapte complinite, ca ceva rotunzit, ci ne încunjură din toate părțile, trăim sub presiunea ei, e asemenea unui demon din povești pe care îl zărești oriîncotro te-ai întoarce, din care cauză începe a ți se năzări și acolo unde nu e.</p> <p>Pentru a cunoaște mai bine raportul în care aceste două elemente, cel românesc și cel austriac, au trebuit să</p>	<p>M. Eminescu</p> <p>THE AUSTRIAN INFLUENCE ON THE ROMANIANS IN THE PRINCIPALITIES</p> <p>This influence, for being more manifest than ever, has the drawback of not presenting itself to us as a series of full-fledged facts, something well-rounded, but rather it surrounds us on all sides so that we live under its strain. It is akin to a fairy tale demon that one sees wherever one turns, to the effect that one begins to imagine it to be even where it’s not.</p> <p>To better understand the relationship that Romanians and Austrians had to enter, we shall have to characterize them as a chemist does, by</p>
--	---

⁹¹ Part II (Translation of Eminescu’s text) was written by Cătălin Pavel.

<p>intre, vom trebui să le caracterizăm asemenea unui chimist și să stabilim proporția puterilor în joc, avantajele unuia din elemente, dezavantajul celuilalt. Ce vedem dar la cea întâi privire? Pe de-o parte un stat mare, având razimul său spiritual în culta Germanie, stăpânind sub un sceptru popoare foarte deosebite, nemulțămite cu supremația a două elemente numeric mici, un stat căruia îi lipsește condiția principală a unui stat, unitatea națională, și cu toate acestea are justiția și administrația cum se cade, negoț, industrie, ba chiar o mișcare științifică destul de însemnată.</p> <p>Pe de altă parte întâlnim un popor mic a cărui populație agricolă, a cărui inteligență consistă dintr-un element omogen, dar a cărui funcții vitale sunt în mare parte împlinite de străini.</p> <p>În adevăr, negoțul de import și export, cel din lăuntru țării, drumuri de fier, manufactură, c-un cuvânt circulația sângelui social e împlinită de străini, și dacă întrebăm care element parazit au intrat cu sistemul său de arterii în organismul vieții noastre naționale, vom trebui să răspundem: în cea mai mare parte <i>cel austrielesc</i>. [...]</p> <p>Austria există prin discordia popoarelor sale. Pentru a le ține vecinic lipite și vecinic în discordie are nevoie de un <i>element internațional</i>, fără patrie proprie, fără naționalitate, fără limbă, de un element care să fie acasă în Tirol ca</p>	<p>establishing the balance of forces brought into play, the advantages of one element, the disadvantage of the other. What do we see then, at a first glance? On the one hand, a great state, with the cultivated Germany as its spiritual foundation. This state rules under one crown over vastly different peoples, who are dissatisfied of being ruled by two peoples, comparatively less numerous, and it does not fulfill the main requirement for being a state, namely national unity. However, it enjoys proper laws and administration, as well as trade, industry, and even a rather vigorous scientific movement. On the other hand, we are dealing with a small nation, whose people of agriculturalists and whose elite consists of one homogeneous element, but whose vital functions are, for the most part, performed by foreigners.</p> <p>Indeed, import, export, and domestic trade, as well as railways and manufacturing, in one word, the flow of social blood, is accomplished by foreigners. If we were to ask what parasitic element has entered, with its own arterial system, the body of our national life, we shall have to respond: for the most part, <i>the Austrian one</i>. [...]</p> <p>Austria endures as a result of the discord between its peoples. In order to keep them forever conjoined and forever antagonistic, it needs an <i>international element</i>, without a fatherland of its own, with neither nationality nor language, an element which should feel at home in the</p>
--	--

<p>și în Boemia, în Galiția ca și-n Transilvania. Acest om pur cosmopolit <i>per excellentiam</i> a fost pentru această ambițioasă Casă preotul catolic. Neavând familie, căci era neînsurat; neavând limbă, căci limba sa era o limbă moartă (cea latină); neavând patrie, căci patria sa este unde-l trimite ecclesia; neavând rege, căci regele său este Pontifex maximus, acest element încerca să unifice Austria prin religie. Pe lângă acest element s-au mai format încă unul, hibrid și stângaci, cu o fizionomie fatală: <i>beamterul austrielesc</i>. [...]</p>	<p>Tyrol just as well as in Bohemia, in Galicia, just as well as in Transylvania. This pure man, cosmopolitan <i>per excellentiam</i>, turned out to be the Catholic priest. Lacking a family, as he was not married, lacking a language, for his language was a dead one (Latin), lacking a fatherland, for his fatherland is wherever the ecclesia details him, lacking a king, for his king is the Pontifex maximus, this element was attempting to unify Austria through religion. Along with it, yet another took shape, hybrid and awkward, with a fatal physiognomy : <i>the Austrian Beamte</i>. [...]</p>
<p>Din punct de vedere austrielesc ar fi nedrept însă de a pretinde ca Austria să ne cruțe pe noi. Pentru orice patriot austrielesc e o datorie de a deschide porțile Orientului pentru colonizarea prisosului copiilor săi și desfacerea mărfurilor sale, c-un cuvânt pentru pionirii cuceririi sale. Ar fi absurd din punct de vedere austrielesc de a pretinde ca ea s-o facă aceasta cu arma în mână, când are înainte-i o cale pacinică, nebătătoare la ochi și care nimicește pe contrariu în mod atomistic, atacând prin agenți economici nu forma statului, ci pe fiecare membru al statului în parte, care nici știe nici voiește să se sustragă de la această influență.</p>	<p>From an Austrian point of view, however, it would be unfair to ask that Austria spare us. For any Austrian patriot, it is a duty to fling wide the gates to the Orient, so that its supernumerary offspring – pioneers of the conquest – can colonize it and market their commodities. It would be preposterous, from an Austrian point of view, to ask that it see to all this by dint of the military, when it can resort to a peaceful and inconspicuous means, one that destroys the enemy on an atomic level, by striking through economic agents not against the structure of the state, but against each and every member of that state individually, for they know not how to escape such influence - nor do they want to.[...]</p>
<p>[...][S]ă ne întrebăm fără părtinire cum întâlnim pe poporul nostru în istorie din momentul în care ea devine mai străvezie, adică de pe la</p>	<p>[L]et us ask ourselves, without bias, how do we encounter our people in history, starting with the moment when its history becomes more</p>

<p>începutul secolului al 14[-lea]. Îl găsim <i>totdeauna dezbinat înlăuntru, dezbinat în politica sa față cu vecinii</i>.</p> <p>O teorie filozofică a istoriei nu ne pare de prisos aicea. Popoarele nu sunt produse ale inteligenței, ci ale naturei, —aceasta trebuie stabilit. În începutul dezvoltării lor ele au nevoie de un punct stabil împrejurul căruia să se cristalizeze lucrarea lor comună, statul lor, precum roiul are nevoie de o matcă. Dacă albinele ar avea jurnale, acestea ar fi foarte <i>legitimiste</i>. Când mersul liniștit și regulat al afacerilor este lovit în centrul, în regulatorul său, treaba nu poate merge bine. Și cu toate aceste noi românii de sute de ani n-am avut altă plăcere mai mare decât a ne răsturna principii.</p> <p>Alături cu această teorie fundamentală, despre stat ca așezământ al naturei și nu al rațiunii, vom trebui să-l caracterizăm răpede.</p> <p>1) Istoria dinlăuntru a popoarelor este o luptă între ideea statului și individualism. Ce este individualismul? Fiecare ființă organică e pentru sine lucrul principal, semenul său lucru secundar. Dorințele și aspirațiile oricărui individ omenesc sânt nemărginite, încât funcțiunea principală a vieții, a inimei sale este nu realizarea unei dorinți, ci dorința, voința ca atare. De acolo proverbul: toată lumea să piară, numai Manea să trăiască. Acest element e și</p>	<p>fathomable, that is around the dawn of the 14th century. We <i>always</i> find this people <i>divided in its internal affairs, divided in its policy towards its neighbours</i>.</p> <p>A philosophical theory of history does not seem out of place here. Peoples are not products of intelligence, but of nature – this ought to be established. In the early stages of their development, they need a stable point around which to crystallize their common creation, their state, just as a honey bee colony needs a queen bee. If honey bees had newspapers, they would be <i>legitimist</i> newspapers. When the smooth and regular course of affairs is struck in its core, in its pacemaker, things cannot go well. And still, for hundreds of years, we, Romanians have never had a bigger pleasure than deposing our rulers. Now, beyond this fundamental theory on the state as an institution of nature, rather than of reason, we should also offer its brief characterization.</p> <p>1. The history of a people’s internal affairs is a fight opposing the concept of state to individualism. What is individualism? Any organic being sets itself as its prime concern, while its neighbour is a secondary matter. The wishes and aspirations of any human being are boundless, so that the prime function of its life and of its heart is not the fulfillment of desire, but the desire, the will as such. Hence the saying: may the world perish, as long as I flourish. This element is both dangerous and useful.</p>
---	---

periculos și folositor. Periculos, dacă o putere mai mare nu-i pune margini; folositor, dacă în margini legiuite el caută a-și realiza prin muncă aspirațiile sale și, precum soarele este tatăl luminei și al umbrei, tot așa individualismul este tatăl înfloririi și al decăderii, justiției și a in justiției, binelui și răului. Față cu această iluzie a inteligenței și a inimei individuale, care e cauza ca om pe om se exploatează, om pe om se nimicește, față cu acest *bellum omnium contra omnes*, un ochi mai limpede zice: Stăi! Nimicind pe vecinul tău, tu lovești în tine, căci pute-rile care exploatează natura brută s-au împuținat, *tu* ești mai sărac cu o sumă oarecare de puteri.

Deci vecinul să trăiască. El produce grâu, el are trebuință de mine, eu de el, nimicirea sa ar fi o pierdere vădită pentru mine, care nu mă pot ocupa cu toate celea. Va să zică interesele individuale sânt *armonizabile*. Iată dar ideea statului: *ideea armoniei intereselor*. Dar producătorii de grâu au o țință comună, interese comune, iată *clasa*; identitatea de interese naște o identitate de păreri: iată *principiile*.; se cere realizarea acestor păreri în stat: iată *partida*. Tot așa fac breslașii. Formează o clasă, au principii, sânt o partidă. în locul individualismului personal vine cel de clasă. Pentru a-și asigura cercul de exploatare ele încremenesc câteodată: iată *castele*. Nimic nu va schimba natura societății. Ea va rămânea un *bellum omnium contra omnes*, sub orice formă pacinică s-ar

Dangerous, if not reined in by a higher power; useful, if, within the realm of the law, it seeks to achieve its aspirations through work. Just as the sun engenders light and shade, individualism engenders prosperity and decadence, justice and injustice, good and evil. Confronted with this illusion of individual intelligence and soul, which is at the root of the exploitation of man by man and of the destruction of man at the hands of man, confronted with this *bellum omnium contra omnes*, a sharper wit commands: Halt! By ruining your neighbour, you undermine yourself, for when the powers tapping nature's resources diminish, it is your own power that is correspondingly impoverished.

Let, then, my neighbour live. He harvests his grains, he needs me, I need him, his death would be an obvious loss for myself, for I cannot cope on my own with it all. In other words, individual interests are *harmonizable*. And that's the notion of state right there: the *notion of the harmony of interests*. Furthermore, the cultivators of wheat have a common goal and common interests, so a *class* is born. The identity of interests begets an identity of opinions, so *principles* are born. Such opinions must be materialized within the state, and thereby a *party* is born. Same goes for all craftsmen. They create a class, they uphold principles, they are a party. Instead of personal individualism, we witness class individualism. Sometimes, in order to safeguard their catchment area, they

<p>prezenta.</p> <p>Puterile în luptă se comasează, în locul indivizilor avem clase, forme superioare a aceluiaș princip, carile se luptă pentru supremație.</p> <p>Statul însă, ca o formă și mai înaltă a aceluiași princip, nu vede în clase indivizi deosebiți, ci un complex de organe sociale, un individ: națiunea. Toate clasele sunt înaintea sa egal de importante, menirea sa este de a stabili armonia între ele, de a opri ca una să nu fie exploatată prea mult prin alta, căci toate trăiesc și înfloresc una de la alta și pieirea uneia condiționează pieirea mai curândă sau mai târzie a celeilalte.</p> <p>2) Statul mai are și un scop <i>moral</i>. Drept va rămânea totdeauna că societatea există prin exploatarea unei clase prin alta — afară de clasa, după părerea noastră cea mai <i>importantă</i>, care exploatează de-a dreptul <i>natura</i>, care produce materiile brute. Deci pe lângă aceea că statul va îngriji ca această clasă, acești hamali ai omenirii să stea cât se poate de bine, el va căuta a deprinde și clasele superioare la o muncă folositoare, care să compenseze pe deplin sacrificiile celor inferioare. De aceea el va fi, prin o aspră organizare, contra semidoctismului, contra spoieiei, contra tendinței egoistice a acestor clase de a câștiga mult prin muncă puțină, de a nu se întreba în socoteala</p>	<p>freeze: a <i>caste</i> is born. Nothing shall ever change the nature of society. It will remain a <i>bellum omnium contra omnes</i>, regardless of the peaceful form it may assume.</p> <p>Belligerent forces merge, classes are born out of individuals as superior conformations of the same principle, fighting for supremacy.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the state, as an even higher form of the same principle, does not perceive classes as distinct individuals, but as an ensemble of social organs, as one individual: the nation. All classes are equally important before it, its mission being to establish harmony amongst them, to prevent excessive exploitation of one by the other. For they all live and thrive through one another, and the extinction of one brings about, sooner or later, the demise of the other.</p> <p>2) The state also has a <i>moral</i> goal. It will always stand to reason that society exists through the exploitation of one class by another – save for one class, which in our view is <i>paramount</i>, the class which directly exploits <i>nature</i> and extracts raw materials. So, besides seeing to it that this class, these porters of mankind, fare as good as possible, it shall seek to accustom upper classes with productive work, thus fully compensating for the sacrifices of the lower classes. Therefore, through the strictest management the state will stand against fake learning, against shallowness, against the selfish tendency of said classes to earn much through little labour, to not question</p>
---	--

<p><i>cui trăiesc.</i></p> <p>Deci societatea e câmpul schimbărilor vecinice, a luptelor pentru existență și supremație, un <i>bellum omnium contra omnes</i>, statul este regulatorul acestei lupte, el oprește ca aceste puteri egal de folositoare să nu se nimicească una pe alta. Societatea e <i>mișcarea</i>, statul <i>stabilitatea</i>. De aceea, pentru ca lupta să poată fi purtată în margini, trebuiește o familie ale cărei interese să fie acelea ale armoniei societății, care să fie bogată când <i>toate</i> clasele sunt bogate, puternică când <i>toate</i> sunt puternice. Aceasta e dinastia — monarhul. Tot pentru că individualismul este principiul vital al naturei omenești, preferăm în privirea moștenirii legea salică și nu maioratul.</p> <p>Cu totul opus acestei serii de idei este <i>republicanismul</i>. Nu vorbim de republicanismul în sens diplomatic, ci în sens social. Republica este orice stat în care o partidă, reprezentanta unei sau mai multor clase (însă nu a <i>tuturor</i>), poate să ajungă la stăpânire. [...]</p> <p>[D]e aceea se vor vedea în toată omenirea două mari serii de idei, două tabere, aceea a individualismului, sistemul liberal, și aceea a armoniei intereselor, a statului ca o unitate absolută, a monarhiei juridice. Libertatea e libertatea de a esploata, egalitatea e egalitate de a deveni tiran ca și vecinul meu, fraternitatea — un moft ilustrat prin guilotină. Să cercetăm în zigzag ideea libertății. [...]</p>	<p>on <i>whose</i> expense they secure their livelihood.</p> <p>To sum up, society is the province of perpetual change, of the fight for life and supremacy, that struggle of each against all. The state is the regulator of such fighting, it prevents these equally useful powers from wiping one another out. Society is <i>movement</i>, state is <i>stability</i>. Therefore, so that the fighting can be done within limits, a family is needed, whose aim should be societal harmony, a family that is rich when <i>all</i> classes are rich, strong when all are strong. This is the dynasty — the monarch. Also on grounds that individualism is the vital principle of human nature, we prefer, with respect to inheritance rights, the Salic Law, rather than the primogeniture.</p> <p>Nothing could be farther from this series of notions than <i>republicanism</i>. It is not meant here republicanism in a diplomatic sense, but in a social sense. A Republic is any state wherein a party, representing one or several classes (but not <i>all</i> classes), can get to rule. [...]</p> <p>[T]wo great schools of thought are discernible throughout history: the side of individualism, that is the liberal system, and the side of the harmony of interests, of the state as absolute unity and of the juridical monarchy. Freedom is freedom to exploit, equality is equality to become a tyrant just like my neighbour, fraternity — a whim illustrated by the guillotine. Let us quickly probe into the idea of freedom. [...]</p> <p>Coming now to the Romanian</p>
---	--

Să venim la republicele române care, ca și cele antice, trăiau prin exploatarea sclavilor și a țăranilor, unde Domnul era cu mâinele legate și cel întâi între egali — *primus inter pares* — unde o clasă stăpânea totul. Vodă, adică statul, putea să zică da, Hîncu zicea ba și pe-a lui Hîncu rămânea. Să vedem cum libertatea, când nu pornește din armonia intereselor, ci din individualism, nimicește clasele sociale și în urmă și statul; cum, prin înmulțirea neamului lui Hîncu, influența economică a Austriei devine distructivă și cum sub ea abia Hîncul își deschide ochii, se sparie de câte vede și nu știe de unde vin relele, nu știe că vin din *ba* al lui.

De aceea să privim împrejurimile în care s-au dezvoltat românii, ca să pricepem și mai bine organizarea lor putredă de stat. Noi am trăit sub influența dreptului public a unui popor republican, în sensul antic al cuvântului — *respublica Poloniae*. Cetățenii acestui stat era egali; fiecare din ei era statul polon în persoană. [...]

Să facem oarecum o sumă a acestor stări de lucruri și să vedem cum se dezvoltă din ea suma de astăzi. Ce era în țară la 1820? Boierii mari. Boierii mici slujbași. Țăranii iobagi, cari stau sub ocrotirea acestora, fiind oamenii lor. Clerul laic și monastic. Aceștia nu stăteau sub autoritatea

Republics, they, just as the ancient ones, lived through the exploitation of slaves and peasants. There, the Prince had his hands tied and was the first among equals — *primus inter pares* — and one class ruled everything. The ruler, that is, the state, could say yea, [boyar] Hîncu said nay, and nay it was. Let us see how freedom such as does not derive from the harmony of interests, but from individualism, dismantles social classes and, ultimately, the state itself. How, as Hîncu's breed filled the earth, Austria's economic influence became destructive, and how only then these Hîncus open their eyes, are scared by what they see, and do not know where the evil comes from, not realizing that it all comes from that *nay* of theirs.

Therefore let us take a look at the circumstances in which the Romanian state developed, to grasp even better its rotten organization. We lived under the influence of the public law of a Republican people, in the ancient sense of the word — *respublica Poloniae*. The citizens of this state were equals: each of them was the Polish state itself. [...]

Let us attempt to summarize the past situation and see how the present situation is an outcome thereof. Who was in this country back in 1820? Grand boyars. Lesser boyars. Serfs, which were under their protection, since they belong to them. Secular clergy and hieromonks. These were not under the authority of the state. They were classes of the Middle Ages and were self-administered. The

<p>statului. Erau clase ale evului mediu, administrate de ele înșile. Boierul era aproape autocrat pe moșia sa. Numai în grave cazuri penale — și nici atunci nu tocmai — intervenea justiția statului.</p> <p>Cine rămânea să fie administrat de stat? Două elemente neatârinate: 1) răzășul, 2) negustorul și breslele. Deci vedem că existau două clase neatârinate, una <i>țăărănească, ieșită din războiniciei împroprietăriți, alta burgeză.</i></p> <p>Aceștia nu erau oamenii nimănu. Istoria celor din urmă 50 de ani, pe care mulți o numesc a regenerării naționale, mai cu drept cuvânt s-ar putea numi istoria nimicirii răzeșilor și breslașilor.</p> <p>Nimicindu - se însă talpa țarei, era neapărat ca și stâlpul să cadă. Au căzut și boierii. O clasă este într-un popor un factor al armoniei societății, de aceea rău este c-au căzut răzășii, rău c-au căzut breslele, rău c-au căzut boierii. Căci se vor vedea urmările. Se va vedea cum influințele străine găsesc în falangele naționale goluri din ce în ce mai simțitoare, cum funcțiile vieții economice degenerază, cum arterii străine intră în corpul nostru social, cum dispar clasele pozitive ale Moldovei, om cu om, clasă cu clasă, cum pământul românesc devine un teren de exploatare pentru industria străină și proletariatul indigen. [...]</p>	<p>boyar was almost an autocrat on his estate.</p> <p>Solely in serious criminal cases – and not even then fully – could state justice intervene.</p> <p>Who was left to be administered by the state? Two autonomous elements: 1) the yeomen 2) the merchants and the guilds. We realize, then, that there were two autonomous classes, one being <i>the peasantry, issued of the soldiers with bounty land</i>, the other being <i>the bourgeoisie</i>.</p> <p>All these were their own men. The history of the past 50 years, which many call the history of national regeneration, could be more adequately labeled the history of the destruction of yeomen and of craftsmen.</p> <p>But with the destruction of the country's foundation, its pillars could not but fall. Boyars fell, too. A class is, within a people, a factor of societal harmony, and therefore it is bad that the yeomen collapsed, that the guilds collapsed, that the boyars collapsed. Consequences will indeed make themselves felt. It will be felt how foreign influences find within the defenses of the nation ever wider entry points, how the functions of economic life deteriorate, how foreign arteries infiltrate our social body, how Moldavia's positive classes disappear, person by person, class by class, how Romanian soil becomes a land to be exploited by the foreign industry and the indigenous proletariat. [...]</p> <p>Generally speaking, the entire society</p>
---	--

În genere toată societatea secolului al XVI și al XVII se poate caracteriza scurt: *Datoria se preface în drept*. Noi la începutul veacului acestuia am fost încă în veacul al XVII. Datoria de a fi slujbaş al țării — o datorie foarte grea și periculoasă sub domniile vechi — devine un *drept* de a sluji țara, dacă vrea ea sau dacă nu vrea. Și acești îndreptățiți de a o sluji se înmulțesc din zi în zi, căci toate izvoarele de puteri ale societății curg spre un singur punct, spre acest privilegiu, părăsind vechea și neatârnată lor albie. Negustorul vrea să fie boier, țăranul — fecior boieresc, boierul mic — boier mare, boierul mare — domn. [...]

Dar prin această grămădire la porțile privilegiilor și ale slujbelor rămân goluri economice pe care le umple un element străin — *evreii*. [...]

Pe când în statele vecine domnea un binefăcător absolutism, care deprindea popoarele la o muncă regulată, la noi Vodă era cu mâinile legate, temându-se vecinic de plângeri la Poartă și de răsturnare. Să vorbim drept — se poate pretinde de la un om să fie mai mult decât om? Când domnul nu e pus afară de orice controversă, ce devine el decât o simplă persoană care își căuta de interesele sale. într-o țară unde fiecare zice: „chacun pour soi” și „après moi le déluge” — ce să zică domnul decât tot atâta... Și pe când puterea statului român scădea — se urca ce? — *puterea consulatelor*. Casa unui consul devenise o

of the 16th and the 17th centuries can be briefly characterized as follows: *Duty becomes a right*. At the beginning of this century we still found ourselves in the 17th century. The duty to serve the country – a very burdensome and dangerous duty under previous rulers – becomes the *right* to serve the country, whether the country wants it or not. And those entitled to serve multiply by the day, for all streams of strength in the society, relinquishing their old, independent beds, now flow towards just one haven, towards privilege. The merchant wants to be a boyar, the peasant, a boyar’s foreman, the petty boyar – a grand boyar, the grand boyar – a prince. [...]

But by swarming around the gates of privileges and positions, they left behind economic gaps, filled by an alien element: *Jews*. [...]

While neighbouring states were ruled in a beneficial absolutist manner, accustoming peoples to regular work, our Prince had his hands tied by the permanent dread of complaints lodged with the Sublime Porte and of being deposed. Let us be frank: can it be asked of a man to be more than a man? Unless the Prince is placed outside the reach of any controversy, what becomes of him if not an average individual looking out for his own interest? In a country where everyone says “chacun pour soi” and “après moi le déluge” – how can the ruler say any different... And as the power of the Romanian state waned, what increased? *The power of the consulates*. The house of a consul had

adevărată cetate.

De aici înainte într-o societate a nestabilității se va vedea cum orice lege organică a țării introduce elemente de nestabilitate. Regulamentul organic, mult lăudat și cu drept cuvânt pentru unele părți ale sale, cuprinde o mică dispoziție, nebăgată în samă și totuși distructivă; boierul are voia de-a alunga oricând de pe moșiile sale și din vatra strămoșească pe țăranul iobag. Invaziile rusești aduc jocul de cărți. Într-o societate în care munca ar fi fost lucrul principal jocul de cărți n-ar fi fost nimic — într-o societate de privilegiați, fără nici o treabă, care căuta să-și omoare vremea, jocul de cărți a trebuit să fie distructiv — un element de nestabilitate în averea oamenilor.

După ocupația rusască vine un domn foarte inteligent, cu un rar simț istoric, dar care, pus în această societate nestabilă ca năsipul pustiilor, caută să-și asigure poziția personală. În locul boierilor mari, care-i cereau scaunul, el deschide o poartă mare boierilor mici, foștilor comiși, foștilor vătăji de moșie sau fiilor lor. Grămădirea la porțile privilegiului devine din ce în ce mai mare, aspirații la posturi se înmulțesc într-una — oamenii care nu știau decât arta scrierii și a cetirii, pe care în țările civilizate le știe fiecare, acești oameni se înmulțesc pe zi ce merge, cancelariile gem de practicanți fără plată, și în schimbul vechei clase boierești avem o nouă

become a whole city. From now on, in a society of instability, we shall see how any of the country's organic laws introduces elements of instability. The Organic Regulation, much praised— and where certain parts of it are concerned, rightly so — includes a certain stipulation, tiny and inconspicuous, yet harmful: the boyar was permitted at any time to chase serfs from his estates and from their hearth and home. The Russian invasions brought with them the card games. In a society where labour were paramount, card games would have been of no consequence — but in a society of the privileged, untroubled by labour, seeking to kill time, card games were going to be nothing if not destructive — a factor of instability for people's wealth.

After the Russian occupation, there came a very astute Prince, with an uncanny historical sense. But he, faced with a society as erratic as the desert sand, chose to only tend to his personal position. He opened wide the gates not to grand boyars, who demanded his resignation, but to petty boyars instead, to former equerries, former bailiffs, and their sons. Those aspiring to positions multiplied constantly, crowding ever more the gates to privilege — people whose only claim to fame was that they could read and write, something that in a civilized country would apply to any man on the street. These people become more numerous by the day, chanceries are chock-full of unpaid interns, and where we once had the old boyar class, now there's a new

clasă, care n-o compensează de fel pe cea veche, clasa *scribilor*. Această clasă se îmflă rânduri, rânduri, recrutându - și membrii din fiii clerului laic, din slugile foștilor boieri și fiii acestor slugi, din negustorii retrași și din fiii acestor negustori, mișcarea merge crescând, clasa de mijloc a pierit, ea s-a schimbat într-o clasă de proletari ai condeiului, fără nici o însemnătate pozitivă în stat, fără nici o însemnătate pentru nație, o clasă de turburători de meserie.

Tot în această vreme se exterminază prin procese nedrepte clasa răzășească, tot în această vreme răzeșiile vechi devin moșii de privilegiați mici și, pe când un boier care avea 10.000 de fălci apăsa foarte ușor asupra supușilor săi, unul care are 300 apasă foarte greu asupra satului. Desfacerea parțială a latifundiilor înmulțește numărul clasei feudale, apăsarea devine atomistică, țăranul începe a sărăci și a da înapoi. Aceasta merge crescând și disoluțiunea claselor pozitive crește, crește — crește și azi.

E greu de a espune o idee fundamentală cu ramificațiile ei așa încât să deie un tablou unitar. Ideea există toată implicate în cap, dar spre a o espune ne servim de cuvinte, de șiruri ce au început, au un sfârșit. De aceea voi ilustra prin fapte aceste teorii. [...]

class, in no way compensating for the old one: the class of *scribes*. This class swells like a wave, recruiting its members from amongst the sons of the secular clergy, the valets of former boyars, and the sons of these valets, the retired merchants and their sons. This gathers momentum, while the middle class is defunct. Or rather, it changed suddenly into a class with no positive significance within the state, with no significance for the nation, a proletariat of the pen, tantamount to a class of professional agitators.

Also during this time the yeomen class was liquidated through rigged trials, while ancient yeoman land turned into landed estates for those granted small privileges. And, where a boyar with 40,000 acres put only a light pressure on each of his subjects, one with 1,000 almost crushes the village. The partial fragmentation of latifundia leads to the proliferation of the feudal class, the pressure becomes atomistic, the peasant class, gradually impoverished, declines. The process accelerates and the dissolution of positive classes increases, increases – increases to this day.

It is hard to expound a fundamental idea in its ramifications while maintaining the unity of the picture. The idea in implicit form exists as a whole in the mind, but in order to present it we resort to words, strings bounded by an incipit and a finis. For this reason I will illustrate these theories through facts. [...]

A tiny snowball rolling down from the top of a mountain will become

Un mic bulgăr de omăt căzând din vârful unui munte se face din ce în ce mai mare, rupe cu el copacii codrilor, strică ogoarele, astupă un sat. Un mic sâmbure greșit în organizația societății, în viața economică crește și îngroapă o națiune. Ne mirăm cu toții de mulțimea crâșmelor în țara noastră, de mulțimea judanilor, cauza e mulțimea rachiului, mulțimea velnițelor, dar oare această mulțime de unde vine? Sub domnia turcească au existat micul sâmbure, o dispoziție de export. Exportul grânelor era oprit. Prin urmare grânele neconsumate trebuiau prefăcute în obiect exportabil — în vite. S-au combinat lucrurile. Velnița consuma prisosul și da hrană vitelor. Velnița producea rachiul, rachiul trebuia consumat și era mult. S-au făcut multe crâșme. Pentru acestea trebuiau crâșmari. S-au adus *mulți evrei* și proprietarul impunea fiecărui din supușii săi de a lua atâta rachiul pe an. Unele plăți pentru muncă se făceau în rachiul.

S-au introdus exportul într-adevar, însă velnițele au rămas; în locul grânelor s-au luat cartofii, căci rachiul devenise o trebuință și această trebuință cerea împlinire. Care a fost rezultatele ei? O populație nesănătoasă, fără energie de caracter, fără energie economică, care își vinde munca pe băutura, o populație în care mortalitatea crește în mod înspăimântător, iar sudoarea mânelor ei se capitalizează în mânilor

larger and larger, uprooting the trees, destroying the crops, covering up a village. A tiny rotten kernel in the fabric of society, in its economy, will grow and bury a nation. We are all astounded that taverns are legion in our country, that the Jews are so many. The cause is the abundance of brandy, the abundance of stills. But how do we account for such abundance? The Turkish rule saw appear that tiny kernel under the guise of a provision concerning exports. The export of grain was prohibited. Unused grain had therefore to be turned into something exportable – cattle. Things got sorted out. The still used up the surplus and fed the cattle. The still produced brandy, the brandy needed to be imbibed, and there was a lot of it. Lots of taverns opened. They needed tavern keepers. *Lots of Jews* were brought in and the landowner forced each and all of his subjects to purchase a specific amount of brandy annually. Certain payments for labour were made in brandy.

Exportation did resume eventually, but the stills remained. Instead of grain, potatoes were used, for brandy had become a need and this need had to be fulfilled. What were the results? An unhealthy population, with no grit in its personality, with no economic vitality, selling its labour for booze, a population whose mortality increases alarmingly, while the sweat of its brow is capitalized in the hands of a stateless element with neither language nor nation... No wonder the Austrian influence looms large. [...]

<p>unui element fără patrie, fără limbă, fără naționalitate... Nu e de mirat că influența austriacă e mare. [...]</p> <p>De toate dezastrele vecinilor noștri noi nu ne-am folosit decât spre a ne răsturna domnii. [...] Cu cât deveneau mai mulți aspiranții la privilegiu și posturi, cu atât cereau lărgirea privilegiilor, lărgirea libertății pe conta puterii statului, până ce am ajuns la constituție, care dă într-adevăr tuturor acestor aspiranți și numai acestora, precum voi arăta, o egalitate de drepturi fără datorii și proletarii de scribi au pus mâna pe țările românești. Fiecare constituție, ca legea fundamentală a unui stat, are drept corelat o clasă mai cu samă, pe care se întemeiază.</p> <p>Corelatul constituțiilor statelor apusene este o clasă de mijloc, bogată, cultă, o clasă de pătriciani, de fabricanți, industriași care văd în constituție mijlocul de a-și reprezenta interesele în mod adecuat cu însemnătatea lor, — la noi legea fundamentală nu însemnează decât egalitatea pentru toți scribii de a ajunge la funcțiile cele mai nalte ale statului.</p> <p>De aceea partidele noastre nu le numesc conservatoare sau liberale, ci—oameni cu slujbă: <i>gubernamentali</i>, oameni fără slujbă: <i>opozitie</i>. De acolo vecinica plângere că partidele la noi nu sunt partide de principii, ci de interese personale; și principiile sunt interese — dar interesele unei clase pozitive, clasa pozitivă a proprietății teritoriale, <i>tory</i> conservativ; clasa negustorilor și-a industrialilor, <i>wygs</i>; clasa</p>	<p>We only used our neighbours' debacles as an opportunity to depose our rulers. [...]</p> <p>As those aspiring for privileges and positions became more numerous, they increasingly demanded the extension of their liberties and clout to the detriment of the state's might. This is how ultimately the Constitution permitted indeed to all these wannabes, and to others, as will be shown below, equal rights sans the duties, and how the proletariat of scribes seized in its grasp the Romanian Principalities.</p> <p>All constitution, as the fundamental law of the state, has as its correlative a certain class, more than any other, to use as foundation. The correlative of Western states' constitutions is a middle class that is rich and cultivated, a class of patricians, manufacturers, and industrialists who regard the constitution as a means to promote their interests in a manner commensurate with their importance. But to us the fundamental law only codifies equality for all scribes to rise through the ranks to the highest positions in the state. For this reason, we do not label our parties <i>conservative</i> or <i>liberal</i>, we label people with a post, <i>government's men</i> and people without a post, <i>the opposition</i>. Hence the permanent complaint that our parties are not parties of principles, but of personal interests. Principles, too, could be interests, but the interests of a positive class: the positive class of landed property, the conservative <i>Tories</i>; the class of merchants and</p>
---	--

<p>lucrătorilor, <i>socialiștii</i>.</p> <p>Unde sunt la noi aceste clase pozitive ?</p> <p>Aristocrația istorică — și ea trebuie să fie totdeauna istorică pentru a fi importantă — au dispărut aproape, clasa de mijloc pozitivă nu există, golurile sunt împlinite de străini, clasa țăranilor e prea necultă și, deși singura clasă pozitivă, nimeni n-o pricepe, nimeni n-o reprezintă, nimănui nu-i pasă de ea.</p> <p>Ne mai rămâne o singură clasă pozitivă, pe al cărui spate trăim cu toții — țăranul român. Să vedem acum cum ne silim din răspuțuri de a o nimici și pe aceasta cum am nimicit pe celelalte și, împreună cu ea, statul și națiunea.</p> <p>Să nu uităm un lucru — toată activitatea unei societăți omenești e mai mult ori mai puțin o activitate de lux, numai una nu: producerea brută care reprezintă trebuințele fundamentale ale omului. Omul, în starea sa firească, are trebuințe de puține lucruri: mâncarea, locuința, îmbrăcămintea. Aceste pentru existența personală. De aceea o nație trebuie să îngrijească de clasele care produc obiectele ce corespund acestor trebuințe. Românul care mânca limbi de privighetoare se putea hrăni și cu pâine, dar fără aceasta nu putea; el purta purpura, dar îi trebuia postav; locuia în palat, dar îi trebuia casă. Oricât de modificate prin lux ar fi aceste trebuințe, ele sunt în fond aceleași. Producătorul materiei brute pentru aceste trebuințe este țăranul. De</p>	<p>industrialists, <i>Whigs</i>; the working class, socialists. Can we boast such positive classes? Our historical aristocracy – and it must always be historical in order for it to be of importance – has almost disappeared, a positive middle class is lacking, the gaps are filled by foreigners, the peasantry is too uncultivated, and, despite being our one positive class, nobody understands it, nobody represents it, nobody cares about it. The only positive class, then, that we are left with – the one on whose back we all live – is the Romanian peasantry. Let us see now how we strive to dismantle at all costs this class as we dismantled all others, and, with it, the state and the nation. We should not forget one thing – all activities in a human society are more or less a luxury, except for one: the production of raw materials to satisfy man’s basic needs. For man, in its natural state, only needs a few things: food, shelter, clothing. Wherewithal for a personal existence. That is why a nation must look after the classes which produce the objects fulfilling those needs. The Romanian who used to eat nightingale tongues could also eat bread, and it is bread he could not do without; he wore purple, but could not do without broadcloth; he lived in a palace, but could not do without a house. No matter how much luxury alters such needs, they remain fundamentally the same. The suppliers of raw materials for these needs are the peasants. Hence the French saying: <i>Pauvre paysan, pauvre pays — pauvre pays, pauvre</i></p>
--	---

acolo proverbul francez: *Pauvre paysan, pauvre pays — pauvre pays, pauvre roy*. Aceasta este într-o țară clasa cea mai pozitivă din toate, cea mai conservatoare în limbă, port, obiceiuri, purtătorul istoriei unui popor, nația în înțelesul cel mai adevărat al cuvântului.

Cum am tratat noi pe acești țărani? Am clădit un aparat greoi și netrebnic pe spatele sale, aparat reprezentativ cum îl numim, și care nu-i decât pretextul de a crea din ce în ce în mai multe posturi, plătite tot din punga lui, direct sau indirect. Într-o țară care n-are export industrial țăranul muncește pentru toți: sigur și necontestabil. Dantela de Bruxelles, galonul de pe chipiul generalului, condeiul de fier cu care scriem, chibritul cu care ne aprindem țigara, toate ne vin în schimbul grâului nostru și acest grâu îl produce numai țăranul; grâul e produsul muncii *sale*.

Cu cât mai mulți indivizi se sustrag de la producerea brută, cu atât mai mulți trăiesc pe sama aceleiași sume de oameni. Ce este consecuența? Este că acel om sau nu va mai fi în stare să ne susție, sau va trebui ca, cu același timp și cu aceleași puteri, să producă mai mult. Va trebui sau să piară sau să se cultiveze și să lucreze cu mașina. Care-i cazul nostru? El nu s-a cultivat. Țăranul nostru e acelaș ca și înainte de cincizeci de ani, dar sarcina ce o poartă e înzecită. El

roi. Their class is the most beneficial of all, the most conservative in language, garb, and customs, it is the bearer of a people's history, the very nation in the truest sense of the word. How did we treat these peasants? We built a clumsy and vile apparatus at their expense, a representative apparatus as we call it, which is only a ploy for opening up ever more offices, paid for out of their pocket, directly or indirectly. In a country with no industrial export, the peasants work for everybody: an incontrovertible fact. The Brussels lace, the bar on the general's kepi, the steel nib we write with, the matches we light our cigarettes with, all come in exchange for our wheat, and this wheat is produced solely by peasants. The wheat is the product of *their* labour.

The more numerous the people dodging productive work, the more numerous those living at the expense of just one category of people. What obtains from this? That one category will either grow unable to sustain us, or will be forced to produce more with the same time and resources. It will have to either perish or to invest in education and resort to mechanization. Does this apply to us? Our peasant did not invest in education. He is the same as he was half a century ago, but the burden he bears has increased tenfold. Piggybacking on him are several thousand landowners (at the beginning of the century, a few dozens), thousands of employees (at the beginning of the century, a few

poartă în spatele lui: câteva mii de proprietari (la începutul secolului câteva zeci), mii de angajați (în începutul secolului câteva zeci), sute de mii de evrei (în începutul secolului câteva mii), zeci de mii de alți supuși străini (în începutul secolului câteva sute).

Pe atunci țăranul nostru creștea mai cu samă vite, era păstor. Această muncă ușoară se potrivea cu regimul aspru, cu posturile sale lungi, cu traiul său simplu. Azi muncește toată vara ca să-și plătească dările, trăiește mult mai rău decât atunci și se stinge. Mor o sută și se nasc în locul lor 60. Și aceasta nu e o veste de senzație — ci adevărul. Față c-o asemenea stare de lucruri, față cu o țară care se despopulează se înțelege că influența austriacă economică va trebui să propășească răpede și să umple golurile noastre cu prisosul populației sale. Meserie și negoț, parte din arendași, parte din proprietari, proprietatea fonciară orășenească e străină. În orașul Iași abia a treia parte a populației sunt supuși românești. Și asta merge crescând.

Vecinătatea Austriei e omorătoare pentru noi dacă nu ne vom trezi de cu vreme și nu vom arunca la naiba toți receptorii, subreceptorii, sub - sub - receptorii , dacă nu vom descărca pe țăran și nu-i vom asigura o dezvoltare liniștită, dacă nu ne vom hotărâ să nu purtăm nici un product

dozens), hundreds of thousands of Jews (at the beginning of the century, a few hundreds), tens of thousands of other foreign subjects (at the beginning of the century, a few hundreds). Back in the day, our peasants mainly used to farm livestock, they were shepherds. This easy work matched their harsh regimen, their prolonged fasting, their simple way of life. Nowadays they work all summer to pay their taxes, their life is much worse off, and they wane away. A hundred die and sixty are born to take their place. This is not sensational headlines, just the truth. Faced with this state of affairs, faced with a country whose population is depleting, it is self-understood that Austria will have to increase its economic influence rapidly and fill up our voids with the surplus of its population. Our craftsmen, our merchants, some of the leaseholders, some of the landowners, the owners of urban real estate are all foreigners. In the city of Jassy, a mere third of the population are Romanian nationals. And the situation worsens. The proximity of Austria is devastating for us, unless we wake up soon and send to hell all tax collectors, their assistants and those assisting them, unless we unburden the peasants and ensure their unhindered development, unless we decide to not wear anything manufactured abroad, the way the Hungarians did under the absolutist rule. The evil is, therefore, within. The instability is the cause for the demise of the large estates, their

străin pe noi, precum au făcut ungurii în vremea absolutismului. Răul deci e înlăuntru. Nestabilitatea este cauza căderii proprietății mari teritoriale, căderea acesteia e strâns combinată cu căderea breslelor, și aceste clase au format în disoluțiune o clasă de proletari care trebuiește deprinsă la muncă. Nu dreptul public, ci păstrarea naționalității noastre e lucrul de căpetenie pentru noi și ar fi mai bine să nu alegem deputați decât să piară nația românească. Dacă n-am avea vecinic influențe străine precum le avem, dacă am fi în Spania, atuncea ne-am sparge capetele unul altuia până s-ar așeza lucrurile. Dar acest lux de revoluțiuni sociale nu ni este permis nouă, a căror stat e vecinic o cestiune. De aceea ne trebuiesc trei lucruri: *Stabilitatea*, adică guvern monarhic, ereditar, mai mult ori mai puțin absolut; *Muncă*, adică escluderea proletarilor condeiului de la viața publică a statului și prin asta silirea lor la o muncă productivă. *Economia*, adică dreapta cumpănire între foloasele aduse de cutare cheltuială și sacrificiile făcute pentru ea; aceasta atât în economia generală a statului cât și în cea individuală. Altfel am avea a alege între domnia austriacă și cea rusească. Sub cea dintâi evreii ar intra în sate în număr mai mare decât astăzi, țăranii ar deveni servii lor, moșiile ar fi cumpărate de societăți de capitaliști, colonizate cu nemți, iar nația redusă la proletariat. — În cazul al doilea un ucaz ar șterge limba din biserică și stat, țăranul ar trăi mai bine, însă sub

demise being directly related to the demise the guilds. These classes formed, upon shattering, a class of the proletariat which needs to be accustomed to labour. Not public law, but safeguarding our nation is paramount to us and it would be best to not elect deputies, than for the Romanian nation to perish. If we hadn't always suffered from foreign influences, as we had, if we were in Spain, then we would crack one another's skulls open until everything would be settled. But we cannot afford the luxury of social revolutions, since our state is always in question. Therefore what we need are three things. *Stability*, that is a monarchic and hereditary government, more or less absolutistic. *Labour*, that is, the exclusion of the proletariat of the pen from the state's public life, and their obligation to engage into productive labour. *Economy*, that is, a proper weighing of the benefits brought by a particular expenditure against the sacrifices that it entails; and this both in the general economy of the state and in the individual economy. Otherwise, we would have to choose between the Austrian rule and the Russian rule. Under the former, Jews would enter the villages in larger numbers than today, peasants would become their serfs, estates would be purchased by associations of capital owners and colonized by Germans, while the nation would be reduced to proletariat. Under the latter rule, an ukase would wipe away the language from Church and state alike, peasants

<p>condiția ca să se rusifice; care din noi cum ar scrie, acolo i-ar îngheța mucu condeiului; iară cei mai curajoși ar mări pohodul na Sibir, fără judecată, prin ordin administrativ — administiwnym poriadkom.</p>	<p>would fare better, but under the condition that they Russify; should any of us dare to write, their pen would freeze on the spot; while the braver amongst us would be sent marching to Siberia, without a trial, pursuant to an administrative order – administiwnym poriadkom.</p>
--	---

Acknowledgments: Eminescu’s article has been translated during Cătălin Pavel’s research stage as a Fellow of *Memorialul Ipotești*, to whose director, Ala Sainenco, he owes a debt of gratitude. The translator would also like to thank Iuliana Petrescu (University of Bucharest) for her helpful comments on a draft of this translation.

References:

- Bot, I. (2012). *Eminescu explicat fratelui meu/ Eminescu explained to my brother*. București: Art.
- Bot, I., & Cioabă, C. (eds.) (2015). *Eminescu. Versuri din manuscrise/ Eminescu. Verses from manuscripts*. București: Humanitas.
- Eminescu, M. (1980). *Opere IX. Publicistică 1870-1877, Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași/ Complete Works IX. Articles in periodicals 1870-1877. Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași*. București: Editura Republicii Socialiste România.
- Eminescu, M. (2021). *Poezii/ Poems*, Edition supervised by Ilie Barangă. (5th ed.). București: Cartex.
- Gregori, I. (2009). *Știm noi cine a fost Eminescu? Fapte, enigme, ipoteze/ Do we know who Eminescu was? Facts, enigmas, hypotheses*. (2nd ed.). București: Art.
- Pavel, C. (2020). On Eminescu’s Philosophy of History: Towards an English Anthology of Relevant Texts. In *Swedish Journal of Romanian Studies*, 3 (1). 241-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35824/sjrs.v3i1.21360>
- Oprea, Al. (1980). *Publicistica lui M. Eminescu/ M. Eminescu’s articles in periodicals*, in Eminescu, M. (1980). *Opere IX. Publicistică 1870-1877, Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași/ Complete Works IX. Articles in periodicals 1870-1877. Albina, Familia, Federațiunea, Convorbiri literare, Curierul de Iași*. București: Editura Republicii Socialiste România. 3-47.
- Stanomir, I. (2003). „Bătrâni și tineri”. Câteva note asupra conservatorismului eminescian/ “The old and the young”. A few notes on Eminescu’s conservatism. In *Annals of the University of Bucharest/ Political Science, Series, 5*. 15-25.