

PROTEST MOVEMENTS IN OLTENIA IN 1848–1866

Florin NACU*

Abstract: The period 1848-1866 is the most important one for the accomplishment of Romanians' national ideal, the union, the creation of the modern Romanian unitary state, and the creation of the basis for obtaining the state independence of Romania. Yet, a characteristic of the Romanian society was represented by the perpetuation of the precarious situation, in which a significant part of the population was, namely the peasantry, from which the working class gradually emerged. The progressive political factors had to take action, burdened by a double constraint, that of militating for union, independence, and also of solving the stringent question of the peasants' appropriation. The studied period illustrates completely this problem of contradiction between the necessity for modernisation, social reform, and that of collaboration for the fulfilment of the national and political desiderate.

Keywords: Oltenia, social revolts, uprisings, social categories, military occupation, political modernisation.

The historic interval from the 13th of September 1848, the date of the battle at Dealul Spirii, between the company of firefighters of captain Pavel Zăgănescu and the ottoman troops that were coming to stop the Revolution, having a previous agreement with the Tsarist troops, to October 1866, when monarch Carol I, the new prince of Romania was receiving the ruling firman from the Sultan, was regarded from the historiographical point of view in connection to the internal and external actions that would accomplish the Union, the international acknowledgement, the reforms for solving the foreign prince issue, after the dethronement of Alexandru Ioan Cuza.

There is naturally brought forward a question: Why did Oltenia experience social uprisings in the first half of the 19th century, and even in the second half of it, continuing up to the last peasants' rebellion from Europe, that from 1907?

The answer can be found only if there are analysed the facts, the events of the era, the confessions, yet, above all, there can be provided a solution if we start from the social context. In Oltenia, a relatively unitary territory in terms of relief, between Cerna, Dunăre, Carpathians and Olt, with five counties, Mehedinți, Gorj, Vâlcea, Dolj and Romanați, the population was occupied with two major activities: agriculture and animal husbandry. Besides them, there was the commerce and the

* 3rd Degree Scientific Researcher, PhD., "C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor" Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova, of the Romanian Academy; E-mail: florin_nacu@yahoo.com

trade, along with the primary exploitation of the subsoil resources. The owning of the main source of income, the farming land, by a slight share of the population, was similar to the status of the citizens with political rights, and the entitlement to influence the economic life. Until the 19th century, the Romanian legislation had maintained the feudal serfdom, the political power being of the landlords, while the largest part of the population was enslaved, with limited degrees of freedom.

The revolution from 1848 placed on a relatively superior level, as confronted to that from 1821, the most challenging issue from the social history of Romania: the question of appropriation. Nonetheless, the contradictions from 1921 were continuing to tear apart the political category of the progressive boyars, a limited political force anyway, if compared to the conservative category of the great landlords, when addressing the finding of a solution. The Commission of Appropriation, founded in July 1848, was self-dissolved after just a month of sterile debates. Practically, the serf peasants could become free and land owners through indemnification, but the opposition against the expropriation of the great properties was a continuously fierce fight. The conservatives, due to the vote based on qualification, had the political majority in the legislative body of Wallachia, and their opposition was expressed even against the Union with Moldova, which determined the progressive to put the question of property on the second position.

For any person who would grant attention to the archives and local history, there is a chance to discover social and political events, related to the functionality of administration, policy, justice and economy. If Oltenia, as a political entity, ceased to exist after the Organic Regulations, it did not mean that, in the collective opinion, the idea of the union of Oltenia did not exist.

There are undoubtedly taken into consideration few tensioned moments, in which the people from Oltenia rose against the political and administrative authorities, being dissatisfied with certain decisions.

In 1849, there was installed the ruling of Barbu Știrbei, according to the constitutional act called the Convention of Balta Liman. Barbu Știrbei was no other than the brother of the dethroned ruler from 1848, Gheorghe Bibescu (1843–18148). Barbu Știrbeiu had been adopted, ever since his childhood, by his grandfather, who had had only daughters, in order to maintain his name line, and inherit his fortune. The two also had had another brother, Iancu Bibescu, prefect of Dolj County, and main character in the reaction, and the opposition against the reforms from 1848. The ottoman troops stationed in the Principalities, in the period of 1848–1851.

The international status of the Principalities had plummeted so crucially, that the rulers of Wallachia and Moldova had become “high officials of the Ottoman Empire”, their position being similar to that of a second rank pasha (having two Turkish flags, used as a distinctive mark). The Tsarist Russia had saved Austria and the Ottoman Empire, and it consequently did not allow the infringement of the Protectorate. The Turkish and Russian Convention was generating serious

prejudices on the autonomy. Thus, in 1853, considering that the “sick man” of Europe, the Ottoman Empire, needed to be eliminated, Russia declared war, without the agreement of France and England, which became allies of the Ottoman Empire. The War of Crimea was commenced.

In 1853, Russia was waging the War of Crimea, attacking the Ottoman Empire and occupying the Principalities. The rulers from Bucharest and Iași were driven away, being installed, for the second time during a half of a century, the Russian military authority, in the interval 1853–1854. Surprisingly, Austria joined France and England, against Russia, and the Russian troops were sent away, Moldova and Wallachia were occupied by Austrian troops, from 1854 to 1857.

Thus, the period 1851–1853 was the only time without military occupation. For the others, the Romanians knew they had to face requisitions of mobile and immobile goods, fodder, food for the needs of the army, a situation that only accentuated the poverty of the peasants. The people from the superior classes used to seek refuge, or to deposit their wealth in money, especially in the safes of the Austrian banks, the war affecting them to a smaller extent.

The winter of 1853–1854 was to bring a less known action, that of the frontier guards, on the Danube. The situation could be investigated due to the presence, in the State Archives, an institution founded through a stipulation of the Organic Regulations, of some trying documents against people accused and found guilty of acts of rebellion. Initially, in 1855, the law of the archives allowed the renouncing to those acts that were referring to the investigated people, who were not alive anymore, because they no longer served the interests of the state. This idea was a retrograde one, and was causing prejudices for the future, which the historians ought to express their opinion on. Only the chance of some educated and patriotic people helped the preserving of these documents. The frontier guards, many of them, were the descendents of the pandours from Oltenia, and even former members of the army from “Câmpul lui Troian”, Vâlcea, commanded by Gheorghe Magheru. Thus, there appears the legitimate temptation that the uprising from the winter of 1853-1854¹ to be considered a late epilogue of the revolution from 1848, which was demonstrating that the soldiers who had remained in the country still remembered the excitement of general Magheru². Yet, there was a major impediment in spreading the movement and the attempt to revive the revolution: the remarkable leaders of the revolution from Wallachia and Moldova were, with few exceptions, exiled, returning only after 1875. Moreover, the symbol of the revolution, Nicolae Bălcescu, had died in November 1852, at Palermo.

On the 30th of March 1856, the Peace Congress from Paris was clearing the path for the union of Moldova and Wallachia. The Romanian issue would become

¹ Paul Barbu, *Documente inedite din Oltenia privind răscoala grănicerilor și țăranilor din 1853–1854*, in “Arhivele Olteniei”, New Series, no. 1/1981, pp. 183–188.

² More information, Corneliu Mihail Lungu, *Răscoala grănicerilor și țăranilor din Oltenia în anii 1853–1854*, in “Revista de istorie”, volume 38, no. 1, 1975, *passim*.

a European one, the Tsarist Protectorate and the Ottoman suzerainty was being replaced with the collective guarantee of the seven European powers. The defeated Russia, which would also lose three counties from the south of Bessarabia that belonged to Moldova and were constituting the exit to the Danube of Russia, had to accept the peace. Austria and Turkey, although winners, did not agree with England and France on addressing the union of the Principalities. France was ably oscillating between Austria and the German states, supporting the unification of Italy, whose adversary was represented by Austria. In all this geopolitical context, the revolutionists from 1848 were taking actions in the exile, for the unionist idea, later managing to return home, in order to prepare the union. Nonetheless, the social movements would not stop, but they were to be supported by the political elite, as it had happened in 1821 and 1848.

Neither during the ruling of Alexandru Ioan Cuza was the situation calmer. As regarding the Camp from Florești, organised in the summer of 1859, in Prahova County, the government led by Kretzulescu had difficulties in efficiently managing the building and maintaining in good conditions the camp, a fact that created the premises for a future rebellion.

We are convinced that the people from Oltenia (descendants of the pandours, the army of Magheru and the frontier guards from 1853-1854) were this time armed too, at the need of the country³.

Nevertheless, Nicolae Filimon, in “Nenorocirile unui slujnicar” (The misfortunes of a servant) was saying that the responsible factors, especially the liberals, adepts of Cuza, “*most of them were smoking their cigarettes and sipping their tea at Minerva hotel, in an undisturbed state of calmness*”.

At Craiova, on the 6th of November 1860, a year after the historical visit of the Ruler, who made the Union possible, in the City of the Bans, there occurred the revolt of the “patent bearers”, especially the traders and the craftsmen, dissatisfied with the obligation to carry on their activity only after the obtaining of an authorisation, which was called a “patent”. The prefect, Gheorghe Marghiloman, arrested the leaders of the movements, on the 6th of November 1860. On the 7th of November, the traders were again on the street, protesting, and called the numerous paupers from the slums, situated on the outskirts of Craiova, to join the uprising. The Prefect’s Office manage to draw on its side the representatives of the paupers – the people who communicated the decisions – a fact that made most of the poor dwellers become even more persistent. The insurgents used rocks, stones and bricks to break the windows of the Prefect’s Office, the Town-Hall, the Tribunal, and physically punished the adversaries that they could catch. There were fired guns, the army using their riffles. The dead were buried that night secretly, without the authorities to know. On the 8th of November, the celebration of Saints Michael and Gabriel, an important day of fest, the rebels managed to unbury the dead and

³ Dan Berindei, *Frământările grănicerilor și dorobanților în jurul formării taberei de la Florești – vara anului 1859*, in “Studii”, X (1957), no. 3, pp. 113–133.

bring them in front of the Prefect's Office. This time, the insurgents brought even firearms, probably kept since the 1848 revolution, or the military occupation from 1853–1855. That moment, the authorities decided to bring an artillery battery with five cannons. The insurgents attacked the Prefect's Office, for releasing their people. Unofficially, there is said there were 200 dead rebels, 30 soldiers, while the authorities were declaring that 13 people died, and 40 were wounded.

General Magheru, who, in 1859, was the responsible with the reorganisation of the National Army (the camp from Florești, Prahova, created in the summer of 1859), came, on the 8th of November 1860, to Craiova, and imposed the state of emergency, which was maintained for 4 months, since that moment. The well-known name of Magheru helped making peace, and promising to solve the problems of the traders and craftsmen, and ending a possible civil war⁴.

In the locality of Fierbinți, from the actual county of Ialomița, in January 1862, the peasant Ion Mircea Mălăieru (born in Dridu-Sărindarele, he came in Bucharest, on the 24th of January 1859 with peasants from Ilfov, Ialomița and Călărași, to support the double election of Alexandru Ioan Cuza), leader and deputy of the peasants in the Ad-Hoc Assembly from 1857⁵, instigated on rebellion, under the considerations that the conservatives were against the agrarian reform, proposed by Kogălniceanu government. Many of the villages from the present counties of Ialomița and Ilfov revolted, wishing to head towards Bucharest, from “Maia, Dridu, Sărindaru, Fierbinți, Coșereni, Moldoveni, Roșiori, and other localities, for the day they will be called to defend their rights”⁶. Two hundred peasants were arrested⁷. We have chosen to relate this incident, because the state of tension, among the peasants, was manifesting in Oltenia too, where, later, in 1865, Mihail Kogălniceanu was coming to properly explain the peasants the mechanism of the reform⁸.

It should not be forgotten how fierce the opposition against the agrarian reform had been, in the Deputies Assembly. It had imposed a government led by the conservative Barbu Catargiu, who was proposing a reform reduced through indemnification, against the wishes expressed by the progressive boyars, who were expecting an extensive or indemnity reform, but for a longer interval of time, than that proposed by the conservatives. The contradictions were referring to the amount of money and the quantum of the surfaces that were to be received by the peasants.

⁴ For details, see https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istoria_Craiovei#1860_R.C4.83scoala_bresla.C8.99ilor.C8.99icalicilor, accessed on 11th of January 2018.

⁵ For details, see http://www.primariadridu.ro/pdf/monografia_comunei_dridu_Constantin_Dedu.pdf, accessed on 12th of January 2018.

⁶ For details, see <http://www.primariafierbinti.ro/istoric.php>, accessed on 11th of January 2018.

⁷ Mircea Dumitriu, *Rolul lui Mircea Mălăeru în evenimentele premergătoare Unirii Principatelor și după alegerea lui Alexandru Ion Cuza ca domnitor*, in vol. *Ilfov file de istorie*, Centre for Culture and Education of Ilfov County Publishing, Bucharest, 1978, p. 290.

⁸ N. Iorga, *Mișcarea țărănească din 1862 – acte ale Poliției din București*, in “Revista Istorică”, year XXIII, no. 7-9 July, September 1937, p. 210.

It also ought to be remembered that there were freeholders, or young people who would get married subsequently, and the new land owners who could not transfer the land, not only through inheritance. Thus, there was a need for legislative provisions inclusively, which would regard the possibility that the state to sell land from its possession or to prescribe the expropriation of some private estates that remained without an owner. It was understandable that the good lands were difficult to be sold, or at all, which made the barren land be sold expensively and unprofitably for the peasants who could not obtain the equivalent value of the indemnities from just cultivating it.

The agrarian reform could be made by Cuza only after a set of preliminary measures. In the summer of 1862, there occurred the attempt upon the prime-minister, Barbu Catargiu, considered the main impediment in finding a solution. There was also mentioned the involvement of Alexandru Ioan Cuza into the conspiracy, but there still is no evidence on addressing the effective and moral guilty person.

There followed the controversial law on the secularization of monastic estates, from the 25th of December 1863, which generated great emotions to the ruler, because the guaranteeing powers had to face the protests from the Ottoman Empire, alerted by the monks of the subdued monasteries, from the Holy Place and the autochthonous ones.

Nevertheless, the most controversial event was the coup d'état from the 2nd/14th of May 1864, through which the ruler Cuza and the prime minister, Mihail Kogălniceanu, who had followed after doctor Kretzulescu, were dismissing the conservative dominated Assembly, who had given them the vote of censure in the question of the agrarian reform. Cuza introduced, in the summer of 1864, the Rural Law, which was annulling the corvee and the peasants were given land, after paying indemnities. The law had its drawbacks, the means of land surveying were rather rudimentary, generating a lot of dissatisfactions. Yet, the reforms remained, their merit being incontestable, especially after the tacit acknowledgment of Cuza's Status, as Additional Act of Paris Convention. Owing to it, Cuza became known as "the ruler of the peasants, of the many and unfortunate", but his ruling, as seen after 1864 too, was not exempt from the social peace that moment either.

In the summer of 1865, on the 3rd/15th of August, at Bucharest, there was the riot of the traders from the markets, dissatisfied with the fact that they were allowed to sell their merchandise only in booths, for which they needed to pay huge amounts of money as rent. Many of them were the children of the peasants from Oltenia, apprentices and shop assistants of the traders from Bucharest. The ruler, who had gone to a bathing place in Ems, Germany, in July 1865, returned urgently, when finding about the violent repression of the movement, probably secretly conducted by the "monstrous coalition"⁹. Alexandru Ioan Cuza, on his

⁹ For details, see http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/general/articol/mineriada-lui-cuza-preludiul-unei-abdic-ri-anun-ate, accessed on 11th of January 2018.

anniversary, on the 30th of August, amnestied the 150 investigated people. The protest movement ended, according to the official statistics, with at least 6 dead people.

An important movement of the era was that represented by the second revolt of the frontier guards from the Danube, when some of them were required to shift to Bucharest, for a special mission. Prince Carol had already started the journey to Romania, by ship, on the Danube, and he was to disembark in the first Romanian harbour, Turnu Severin. At Bucharest the Ad-interim Rulers proclaimed him the ruler.

The order for the shifting of the frontier guards was given on the 4th of May 1866. In Dăbuleni, today one of the localities from Dolj county, but then part of the former Romanați county, the guard soldiers declared dissatisfied with the situation that the ruler Cuza had been dethroned and that a new one was to be brought, without exactly knowing who he was. Many of them had been on duty since 1853–1854, others were the descendents of the frontier guards from that period, so the news made them start a riot. Moreover, the economic situation of the country was not a satisfying one, the frontier guards from the Danube had not received their pay since January (they had not got their pays for the months of February, March and April). The situation was similar in the case of the firefighters from Craiova Fire-station, founded in 1865.

The frontier guards from Dăbuleni were afraid of the fact that the agrarian reform, made by Cuza and through which many of them had received land, would be stopped (Cuza was aware of the fact that the reform needed to be extended to other categories too) or, even worse, the old landlords, dissatisfied with the reform (although it had been applied with indemnities, that is the peasants were to buy back the received land), would ally to request the new ruler the annulment of Cuza's reform. There had been circulated the rumour that this reform, which had made Cuza beloved by the peasants, would be the main reason in his dethroning.

When hearing that, at Bucharest, Prince Carol de Hohenzollern Sigmaringen was to come, on the 7th of May 1866, the frontier guards from Calafat, Cetate, Maglavit, Pisc, Poiana Mare revolted too. The leaders of the defensive and order structures from Craiova shifted to the Danube, in order to settle the conflict, but they were chased away, both them and their officers.

The mayor of Calafat was noticing the Prefect's Office from Dolj that the frontier guards said that: "*We shall not go! We swore faith to Cuza, we demand to be ruled by Ioan I, not Carol, who was enthroned by the exploiters*". The Prefect of Romanați County, in his turn, announced the Ad-interim Rulers that the "*frontier guards from Dăbuleni answered that they had sworn faith to the former ruler, and they recognised no other*".

On the 8th of May 1866, Prince Carol disembarked at Turnu Severin, leaving for Bucharest, on the route Balota-Strehaia-Filiași-Craiova-Slatina-Pitești-Golești-Bucharest, spending a night in Severin (8th–9th of May 1866) and another one in Golești (9th–10th of May 1866). On May 10th 1866, Prince Carol of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen would become the ruler of Romania, and in 1881, the King of Romania.

The moment Prince Carol travelled through Craiova, on the 9th of May 1866, there was taking place, as everywhere in the country, a plebiscite on his election as a ruler.

Famous names, as that of Barbu Știrbei, former ruler, and Eugeniu Carada, the intelligence that would later rule the National Bank of Romania, were among the supporters of the complot from the night of 10th-11th/22nd-23rd of February 1866. Alexandru Macedonski, in his book called “Cartea de Aur” (The Golden Book), from 1902, describes the moment of the plebiscite from Craiova, with the supporters of the new ruler, the contesters of Alexandru Ioan Cuza, the adversaries of the new ruler: *“At Cazin, in the square that separates the building from the lane, a table, covered with a crimson cloth, with inkpots and all the necessary for writing on, could be easily spotted by the passers-by, and was flocking the crowds around, announcing – as scarlet as it was, the same colour as that of the great event, the fulfilment of the aspirations the 1848 generation had had – a foreign ruler and a dynasty related to a ruling house.*

The people from Craiova – boyars, traders or craftsmen – most of them still wearing their winter coats – were pressing against one another to sign, and, hairy as bears, were muttering, releasing their anger onto the native ruler, and foreseeing future happiness. Further downwards from Cazin, and backwards to the house of “Barbă-rasă”, the fashion shop of madam Kati Riedl was being decorated on the outside, for the expected lit fairy show in the evening ahead, with paper lanterns and different candles.

Ștanghelmann the tailor was displaying in his shop window “Bismark” waistcoats, in the colour of roasted grey pea. The name would not remain specific for only a waistcoat. It would be a further surprise for Europe; it would soon be spat out, over the entire Latin world, by Krupp cannons.

The Don-Juans, from the garden of the high-school, would stop in front of Ștanghelmann’s shop, with sparkling eyes watching the Prussian waistcoats, and, distancing away, they would leave behind only the fashionable squeaking of their “Hula” boots.

The open-air plebiscite was nonetheless following its stormy course, beneath the sunny day of spring. At Cazin especially, in front of the table covered by the crimson cloth, the noise became deafening: an old-school boyar, who had refused to sign for the election of a foreign ruler, was trying to find shelter, curving his body under the pouring shower of lemons and oranges thrown by the people around the table and, picking the best oranges and lemons, he filled his pockets with them, for the mockery and amusement of all.

The roar of the crowd was increasing. A regiment was returning from the field, while the enthusiasm of the mob was overwhelming. The cheers were shaking the windows of the houses, and, among them, the name of Hohenzollern, together with that of Sigmaringen, was noticeable, scattered around, amongst the noisy ovations...

But the commoners – that is, the folks – when hearing these names, were mispronouncing it in a manner that the great-grandson of Frederic-the-Great would be recognised, in the City of the Bans, by the nickname “Sic-Marine”¹⁰.

Nonetheless, there were dwellers of Craiova who asserted their dissatisfaction regarding the new ruler, throwing rotten tomatoes and rocks at the Prince’s carriage. It was rumoured that the frontier guards and some adepts of the former leader had revolted, and observing that their number had decreased, they had tried a sort of symbolic resistance.

The revolt of the frontier guards continued for several weeks, the insurgents refusing to shift to Bucharest¹¹. At the end of May 1866, after the situation had settled, the new ruler, enthroned at Bucharest on the 10th of May 1866, took the necessary measures to inform them that the reforms were to be continued, their left pays were to be given, and that there would not be any further delays, which led to the restoration of order¹².

On the 12th/24th of May 1886, King Carol I arrived on “Ștefan cel Mare” ship, in the harbour of Corabia, at 9 a.m., a fact registered in his memoirs¹³. After visiting the city of Corabia, the king continued to shift towards west, thus, at 1.30 p.m. his ship reached the harbour of Bechet. The king wrote down that, before reaching Bechet, being next to the locality of Dăbuleni, he received the suggestion that the ship to cast the anchor at Dăbuleni too, in order to visit the locality.

King Carol I, who had before been received with enthusiasm, refused the landing, asking, to his suit’s surprise: “What about the people from Dăbuleni, what do they say?”.

Thus, even if the Romanian soldiers, led by Prince Carol fought heroically during the independence war from 1877-1878, many of them frontier guards from the Danube, including from Dăbuleni, the sovereign alluded to the two decades before revolt, from May 1866, not wishing to land there.

There can hence be concluded that, during the period 1848–1866, there were two types of social movements. A social movement with profound national political reverberations was the Revolution from 1848.

The movements from 1853–1854, 1859, 1860, 1862, 1865, 1866 took place either during the periods of war, or the periods when the progressionists who were leading Romania tried to find solutions to the need of reform. Moreover, there were external menaces coming from the abroad, on addressing the young Romania. The

¹⁰ For details, see https://ro.wikisource.org/wiki/Cartea_de_aur:_Dram%C4%83banal%C4%83, accessed on 10th of January 2018.

¹¹ For more information, see V. Mihordea, *Răscoala grănicerilor de la 1866*, Bucharest, Academy Publishing House, 1958.

¹² Ioan Scurtu, *Istoria românilor în timpul celor patru regi (1866–1947)*, 2nd Edition, revised and completed, Vol. I *Carol I*, Bucharest, Enciclopedic Publishing, 2004, p. 90.

¹³ Constantin C. Giurescu, *Cuvântările regelui Carol I, vol. I, 1866–1886*, Bucharest, King Carol II Publishing for Literature and Art, 1939, p. 6.

misunderstandings between the political currents, the imperfection of institutions as regarding their functioning, the qualification based participation to the political life, accelerate the resort to ample protest actions, as those from 1853–1854, 1859, 1860, 1862, 1865, 1866.

Oltenia constituted, for most of the historians, the so-called “Small Wallachia”, a compact territory, bordered at west and south by Timiș-Cerna Corridor and the Danube, at north by the Meridional Carpathians, and, at east, by river Olt. Its mountainy relief, the sub-mountainous regions, the tableland areas, the fields, the meadows, crossed by the rivers Jiu or Olteț, always created an economic individuality for Oltenia, after it had lost its political one, during the Organic Regulations era. The extensive farming, the animal husbandry, the commerce, land and water transport, revitalised after 1829 the disappearance of the Turkish rayas and the introduction of economic provisions from the Organic Regulations determined the apparition and the consolidation of the progressive political elite, more numerous than the reactionary one, but also more capable to legally activate on the political plan.

The fight between the progressive and the conservative, in Oltenia, was won by the first ones. The poor categories of farmers and shepherds, the small traders and craftsmen were reluctant on addressing the young people from the middle class of the boyars who had done their studies abroad, had made contacts outside the borders, attending violent revolutionary actions, governed by a certain policy.

From the pandours of 1821, to the trained militaries from the national Romanian army, provisioned in the Organic Regulations, the frontier guards of 1853 and 1866, all the people included in these categories, along the peasants, craftsmen and traders tried to find their justice independently, when the political forces, eager to consolidate the political and juridical internal and international situation of the state, were refusing to satisfy all their socially justified wishes, yet harmful on the political plan.

As it will be later seen in 1866, the insufficient regulation of the regime of property, the emerging of laws, the so-called agricultural agreements, imposed a confusing social situation that, in 1910, Constantin Dobrogeanu Gherea would call it the “new-serfdom”.

Between the rightful owner, the boyar, and the worker, the peasant, there appeared a new category, the leaseholder. This new emerged employee, wishing to honour the money agreement with the landowner, and to increase his investment, would behave randomly, exploring the work of the producers, including the imposing of difficult to achieve norms, if considering the rudimentary tools they had. The interest for mechanisation and scientific experiments was minimal, the leaseholder finding goodwill at authorities, in order to make the peasant achieve the arbitrary norms, including the introduction, in the internal legislation, of the famous “manu militari” clause, which meant the suppression of the revolts with the help of the army.

The horizontal industrialisation and development of the urban centres, oriented a significant share of the peasantry towards the cities, where there was created a new class, the working class, also subjected to the judgement and arbitrary spirit of the Romanian and foreign patronage. The state would allow to the employer the freedom to not observe the rights of the workers especially, if the employers had declared they had been investing in the endowment of the workshops, factories, even if it had been done fictively.

The creation of the relations between the renown politicians and the landowners, the workshop, manufactory, factory owners, the leaseholders, the traders, the militaries, the freelancers, the magistrates, the people who would work with assets, representatives of the interests who would manage the foreign and autochthonous great capital, led to actions of regulation, for the interest of the limited circles, a fact that generated the dissatisfaction of workers and peasants, which, more often than not, degenerated into riots or strikes.

Thus, Oltenia remains the historical region of Romania that was most involved into the internal revolts, along with ample revolutionary movements.