ROMANIAN DIPLOMACY DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Cristinel I. MURZEA[1]

Abstract: *The influence of international relations after the 1815 Vienna Congress has defined the relation and equilibrium of forces in Europe; at the same time, it would cause the „oriental crisis" to become a general issue, much like the issue of the Romanian principates which started to state their legitimate claims regarding the right to social and national emancipation, all converging towards the diplomatic effort necessary for the creation of a national, independent state, in accordance with the objectives stated in the Dacian-Roman ideology.*

Key words: *state, natural law, ideology, collective freedoms, sovereignty*

1. Introduction

Once society entered a new era, the modern one, whose main landmarks were set by the ideology promoted as a standard of political fight by the French Revolution of 1789, the entire European continent faced a "long line of demographic, agricultural, industrial and political" revolutions (Jaques Goudechot , 1971, p.238).

All these substantial transformations would later reflect in the European relations which occurred between European states in the new geopolitical context, confronted with a specific set of problems regarding national conscience and the integration in a national state, whose ideological basis would be conclusively stated by the philosopher Hegel.

This spirit was however intertwined with the one that promoted solidarity and state-political European interdependence, something about which the French doctrinarian Montesquieu stated that „the Europe of his time represents a state formed of several provinces,, (xxx, 1980, p.68) an idea which led the historian Robertson to state that ,,the states of the continent form a single vast system and to write the history of one means to write about the history of the entire European continent,, (Denis de Rougemont , 1961, p.129-132).

The ruler of the Romanian Country Gr. Ghica referenced the interference and interdependence of the European diplomatic relations by showing that „the powers of Europe form an inseparable family and no issue can be discussed in Europe without attracting the general attention" (Georgescu V., 1962, p.126-129).

---

[1] *Transilvania* University of Brasov, cristinel.murzea @unitbv.ro,

2. About Romanian Diplomacy

In this context, the constant efforts of Romanian diplomats in the first half of the 19th century attempted to align Romanian national interests with the European diplomatic context by searching those solutions and endeavors meant to create a European issue out of the „Romanian problem", thus confirming the ideals of justice, freedom, solidarity and equality in the thinking and actions of European diplomacy.

The pro-European feelings of Romanian politicians were organically intertwined with the national project of creating a unified, national, sovereign and independent state, according to the regulated principles of international law, as stated at the Vienna Congress of 1815, a congress which regulated several principles, such as legitimacy and European equilibrium.

By manifesting a conservative vision with obvious revengeful tendencies, the powers which won the Napoleonian wars ignored the objective tendency of small and middle states, which by debating the „principle of nationalities" aimed to justify their main political and national objective, namely that of creating new states, new subjects of international public law, which were all equal in the European diplomatic machinery.

By attempting to legitimize the feudal absolutism and dictatorial practices, European diplomats who sealed the historical decision of the 1815 Vienna Congress, opened the way for a true social and national insurrection of European people, an insurrection which would erupt in 1848, the year of the great European social and national revolutions which will forever strengthen the role and importance of the nation as a subject of international law in the modern age.

As a result, between the Vienna Congress of 1815 and the beginning of the Crimea war in 1853, European diplomacy had to take act of the normal desire of European nations to create independent statal-political structures, which would represent the background in which a new European social and political life would develop, in agreement with the new principles developed by the European revolutions.

Defeating Napoleon's France and isolating it from England and especially from Russia would make all the Romanian diplomacy efforts much more difficult, as they would be placed in the situation of finding a breech in the many diplomatic liaisons between England and Russia, to make their legitimate request for emancipation heard from under the dominance of the Ottoman Empire, threatened more and more by the hegemonic tendencies of Russia in his area of Europe.

At the begging of the 19th century, the rivalry between the great powers became more acute, as their tendencies for economic and territorial expansion took aim at the fate of the Ottoman Empire, which was supported by England and Austria, as a certain equilibrium in this area was desired, to the detriment of the aggressive politics of the Russian tsar who wanted an increased influence in this European area.

Based on these coordinates, specialty literature has justly shown that, within this hostile and unpredictable diplomatic climate „the responsible factors of the Romanian national movement have used all possible means in order to organize the inside movement and to form and educate the national conscience; at the same time, they

have searched and obtained outside support so as to bring to Europe's attention the Romanian realities and legitimacy of national wishes,, (xxx, 1980, p.81).

However, it is easily noticed that, during the times of crises which occur in international relations, the influence of Romanian political and diplomatic factors was felt, as they have managed to turn the „Romanian issue" into a European issue, thus fully valorizing the international tense climate in order to bring the international public opinion's attention to the wish of the Romanian people to emancipate in this century of great political and national resets socially and nationally.

Not only did the Romanians use these times of crisis to make their national objective known, but we can also state that sometimes they even provoked tense moments meant to bring the „Romanian issue" to the spotlight, as was the case in 1821 or 1848.

In this context, it was conclusively stated that the „Romanian issue" became international, meaning the Romanian nation was accepted as a viable entity in the Europe of nations" (xxx, 1980, p.81).

The 1821 revolution would represent the first moment in which the Romanian issue would become international, along with the issue of the Greek people.

The significant economic potential, as well as the geostrategic position of the principates, led them to become a space of dispute between European powers; at the same time, the fate of the Ottoman Empire was again made into an important issue, as the Ottoman Empire was „the sick man of Europe". Both England and Russia had divergent interests in this area, but we must state that their political and diplomatic intervention, especially regarding the Ottoman Empire, directly affected the fate of the Principates.

Both Austria and England demanded that the Russian tsar guarantee the border of the Ottoman Empire; however, this was in direct contradiction with Russia's vision and diplomatic actions, as it aimed to become a decisive player in continental Europe.

The Romanian decision factors, politicians, diplomats, patriots made the Romanian issue an international issue at the beginning of the 19th century, as they filed over 209 memoirs and reform projects in the time between 1769 and 1830, all converging in the same direction set by the national program, to make the Romanian nation known on the international stage and, on the other hand, to fulfill its objectives of social and political emancipation.

The Romanians have joined the fight led by the Greek people believing that Russia would intervene on their behalf and would force the Ottoman Empire to acknowledge the autonomy of the Principates; furthermore, Tudor Vladimirescu strongly believed that the great powers in the area would all intervene to ensure a new political and judicial statute for the oppressed people of the Ottoman Empire, because of Turkey's surrender.

As after the Kuciuk Kainargi peace of 1784, Russia wanted to intervene as a protective power in the Principates, thus depriving Turkey of their statute of sovereign power, both England and Austria tied peace in the area to solve the global problem.

Metternich also believed that peace in the Principates equaled peace with the Ottoman Empire, actions without which „Europe's peace can't be ensured,, (Meternich, 1881, p.35).

In fact, the diplomats of those times stated that if Russia was to occupy the Principates „the entire system established in Europe will be overturned,, (De Gents, 1825, p.31-32). After the Akermon Convention, Austria also admitted that „in case Russia were to occupy Moldova, Austria would occupy Muntenia,, (Meternich, 1881, p.378-379), an action which caused concern and aversion in Romanian circles, as stated in a note of the French consul Hugot, who deemed both sides as „unscrupulous,, (xxx, 1980, p.89).

The importance of the Principates in solving the oriental problem was a major preoccupation for both English and Prussian diplomacy, as both repeatedly stated that any dispute in regard to the relations between Russia and Turkey was inevitably tied to solving the problem of the principates; furthermore, all diplomatic correspondence of those times granted special attention to strengthening the personal, amicable relations with Romanian politicians by German and Austrian diplomats.

Even English diplomacy acknowledged that „the issue of the Principates represented the most tense matter in English-Russian relations and this issue would lead to an antagonism which would later result in the 1853-1856 war ended with the Peace of Paris in 1856,, (xxx, 1980, p.89).

The time between the two revolutions, that of 1821 and that of 1848, is characterized by significant internal conflicts, profound transformations regarding social-economic structures in Romanian society, by the crystallization and maturity of the Romanian nation, by stating the national objectives regarding the formation of the Romanian national state, independent from any foreign power, all these converging towards a collective effort of all political and diplomatic Romanian officials.

Within this background, the memoirs and programs, the plans and diplomatic actions had, as a final objective, the reform of the Principates and their unification in a national state.

The representatives of the national party of the Principates followed the evolution of the international situation by valorizing each moment and creating opportunities to attract attention to the Romanian matter and to condemn the political actions which defined the Ottoman domination and the conquering tendencies of Russia and Austria.

It is certain that Romanian politicians demanded the unification of Moldova with the Romanian Country in one unified state, even under the authority of a foreign Principe; this confirms the fact that the Romanian issue was a significant part of the international diplomatic agenda.

In decades three and four of the 19th century, we notice an increased role of French diplomacy in the Principates in order to counteract the influence of the political representatives of Russia, Austria or Prussia who, by speculating the internal and the international situation of the High Port, aimed to expand significantly.

In this endeavor, France was tacitly supported by England considering its increasing rivalry with Russia.

The regulatory time of the Principates was an aggravating time for Romanian national policy, thus making numerous diplomatic endeavors in signaling the more and more obvious influence of the Protective Power exercised by Tsarist Russia. In this context, it was shown that "political-legal or conspirative fight will become a component of the

national movement while the forms of manifestation of the ideology – militant by excellence – give expression to the idea and national wishes" (xxx, 1980, p.95).

After the Adrianople Treaty, the nationalist circles of the Principates, by seeing the unequivocal annex plans of Russia, attempted to stop all these actions by the statements and actions of Pavel Kisselef, thus promoting an active diplomacy in Europe and attracting French diplomacy on its side.

The increased interest of foreign diplomats in the Principates around 1848 proves the efficiency of Romanian representatives in their political and diplomatic efforts, thus changing the agenda of European chancelleries by including the Romanian issue as an essential matter in solving „the oriental crisis". The Romanian politicians of the Principates undergo significant efforts with the consul of England and France, by filing numerous memoirs and petitions. Thus, between the years 1831 and 1848 „96 such documents,, (Georgescu V., 1973, p.3) are filed.

By attempting to diplomatically counteract the more and more aggressive efforts of Russia in the Principates, the leading Romanian circles insisted to Austria and England on creating an international political context which would ensure "a system of collective guarantees".

3. Instead of conclusions

We must note the remarkable diplomatic efforts of Ion Câmpineanu with the chancelleries of Constantinople, Paris and London demanding the need to unify the principates in one kingdom protected by the collective guarantees, as this „was the only solution which would ensure the national existence by removing the future danger generated the strengthening of the protectorate and the transformation of sovereignty in a purely formal connection for the Principates,, (Hanes V., 1929, p.120) (xxx, 1980, p.113).

The endeavors of Ion Câmpineanu, although failed, managed to elevate the national conscience of the Romanian people, expressed on a political level and attracted Europe's attention on the Romanian matter, by also creating a strong echo in the international political life.

The year 1848 represented a time of maximal affirmation of the national fight of the Romanians from the Principates to promote the program of the national party which demanded unification and independence.

The European revolution of 1848 caused "the Romanian issue to be brought to the public opinion of Europe, thus becoming a matter of maximum importance on which the entire Orient depended. The diplomats of those times unequivocally stated that „the Romanian issue is considered as the problem of the Orient itself" (Hanes V., 1929, p.120).

Even Turkey considered that "the unification of the two Principates in one kingdom with a neutralized territory will determine independence from the insignificant tribute of the two Principates, but in exchange will ensure security of the empire, thus maintaining peace in the Orient" (Cretzoianu, 1933, p.126).

At the same time, Romanian politicians and diplomats organized an intense publicity campaign, thus bringing the Romanian issue to Europe's spotlight by also maintaining the close personal relations with and seeking support from influential political representatives in Europe.

The revolution of 1848 in the Romanian Countries would reflect the unified status of development and affirmation of the national conscience, as well as the objective endeavor of translating „the national program" which entailed the public rights and liberties, as well as political objectives, namely unity and public independence.

The 1848 revolution is the moment of origin of modern Romanian diplomacy which would express the wishes of „the national party" created in centuries of existence, namely those of social justice and national freedom in an area defined by the future unified and independent Romanian state.

References

De Gents. (1825*). DEpeches*. Paris: Tome III.

de Rougemont, D. (1961). *Vingt-huit siecles d'Europe. La conscience europeenne a travers les textes d'Hesiod a nos jours*. Paris: Payot.

Georgescu, V. (1962). *Extracts from the diplomatic correspondence of the Romanian Country*. Bucharest: The Romanian – Russian Museum.

Georgescu, V. (1973). *Memoires et projects de reforme dans les Principates Roumaines 1831-1848 avec un supliment pour les annees 1769-1830*. Bucharest: Academica.

Goudechot, J. (1971). *Les revolutions de 1848 – Le Memorial des siècles établi par Gerard Walter*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Hanes, V. (1929). *The formation of the French opinion over Romania in the 19th century*, volumes I-II. Craiova: Romanian Writing.

*** Metternich (1881). *Memoires,* Tome 3, Paris: Payot.

*** (1980) *Romania in international relations 1699 – 1939*. Iaşi: Junimea Publishing House.