

Dalibor JOVANOVSKI

УДК: 327(497)

## THE GREAT POWERS AND THE CREATION OF THE BALKAN STATES IN 19TH CENTURY

*The role of the Great European powers in the process of creation of the modern Balkan states in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was indisputable. However we can not neglect the reason for their interference in the region and the establishing of the new states. Nonetheless the fact that European powers were not inclined to weaken Ottoman Empire with ceasing parts of its territory, the situation in the region induced them to interfere. Serbian uprisings at the beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> century were the first signs that some European powers would be induced or interested to intervene in the ottoman internal affairs. Although Serbian were the first who rised against Ottoman rule, the interest of the Powers enabled Greeks to had first independent Christian state in 19<sup>th</sup> century Balkan. The Bulgarian case was much interested. It is impossible to compare Bulgarian armed struggle against Ottoman rule with the Serbian and Greek uprisings. Bulgarian struggle was belated and very weak, but the Russian interest for Bulgarian lands was very strong. That was the main reason for creating modern Bulgarian State.*

The 19 Balkan's century was characteristic with the uprisings in the region that had as an object-creation of independent states. Also one of the most important feature was the interference of the Great powers in the region.

The common fact for the creating of independent or autonomous states in the Balkans was the foreign support.

The creating of Serbian, Greek and Bulgarian state came after the military intervention by the Great powers, but it could not be pass in silence that the interference was preceded by a period of futile attempts to convince the ottoman Empire to conform with the demands of the Powers.

The undeniable fact was that the foreign interventions were, also, preceded, sorry, but I have to use, bloody uprisings. Balkan's national liberation movements and uprisings without any doubt provoked external military interventions. The determination for freedom, which was shown by the Balkan's people, was a fact, which could not be ignored by the Powers. We could say that the involvement of the Powers in the region was imposed by the activities of the liberation movement and uprisings. Also we can not disremember the weakness of the Ottoman Empire. Perhaps the ottoman army was too strong to

lose a war with the rebels, but, frequently, was unable to crash the uprisings in their very beginning.

The leaders of the Balkan's liberation movements and uprisings were entirely aware that they were not able to achieve freedom by their forces. They required support from the Powers or by some of them. That was the main reason for sending delegations to seek support, guaranties or protections.

The intervention of the Powers in the favor of the Balkans liberation movements did not mean that they were completely inclined toward subjugated people in the region, although the existence of some compassion was obvious. First and above all the Powers pursued their interests. Very often their interests were in collision with those of the local people we could not neglect the different interests amongst the Powers in the Balkan which had impact over their decisions. As a result of this the borders of the new states did not correspond with the wishes of the people. They did not want to let each other to have preponderated influence or dominance in some of the already prospected independence or autonomous states. The different and conflicted interests of the Powers in the world, occasionally, had some impact over their attitude in the region.

At the beginning of the uprisings the Powers were very suspicious towards the movements. Even more they did show hostility attitudes. One of the main reason for such behavior of the Powers was the issue: What should happen to the Balkans if Ottoman Empire disappeared as the fundamental political fact in the region<sup>1</sup>. But step by step the Powers accepted the only possible solution-formation of the independent or autonomous states in the region, of course, which would not be in the collision with their interests.

First Serbian uprising marked a beginning of the Balkan's liberation wars in 19<sup>th</sup> century. At its very beginning these uprisings did not provoke almost any interest amongst the Powers. Not because the Serbs did not deserve attention or support. The political situation in Europe was very strained. Also, in that time, almost no one of the Powers did have some interest in the restless area except for Austria as a neighbor and Russia as an only one orthodox power.

Serbian leaders, since the beginning of the uprising, had not have illusions that they could gain some concessions from the Ottomans without external support. Serbs, like the rest of Balkan's people, had a very negative experience with the ottoman's promises and especially with the implementation of the previously accorded agreement. That was the main reason for the, already in 1804, had demanded support from Austria and Russia. Karadjordje, the leader of the uprising, in April 1804 had asked for Austrian protection. He asked for

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html](http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html)

Serbia a status of Austrian province<sup>2</sup>. The Austrian government had a very great problem on the west borders. That was one of the main reason for its refusing of the Serb proposal. Likewise Austria was very suspicious to the insurrection on its borders, having in mind that many Austrian subjects, Serbs by descent, took part in the Serbian revolt.

The next destination for Serbian, not only demands, but also wish was Russia. The very influent priest prota Matija Nenadović was sent to Sanct Petersburg. Serbian envoys did not get frank support even in Russian capital. First they had to wait almost one month to be received by the Russian foreign minister, Adam Czartorisky. He wanted to see what Russia could gain from the Serbian demands. The Emperor Alexander I also received the Serbian envoys. Taking into account the situation in Europe he was very prudent not to jeopardize Russian relations with the Ottoman Empire. But, also, he feared that if he rejected the Serbs altogether they might turn to France or Austria. This explains the equivocal advice that Serbian received<sup>3</sup>. As we have seen at the very beginning of their revolt, Serbs did not gain any support by some of the Great European powers, chiefly because of the international situation in Europe, which was very inconvenient for the Serbian interest.

In 1806 the relations between Russia and the Ottoman Empire became very strained. The war between them was almost inevitable. As a result of such development of the situation Serbs became very interesting for Russians. The main reason for the increasing of the Russian interest for Serbia was the necessity for Serbian participation in the almost certain war with the Ottomans. Serbian military victory in the previous period, doubtless, attracted some attention by the Russians. Simultaneously with the increasing of the tensions in the russo-ottoman relations, Serbs were negotiating with the Ottomans to achieve some understanding. The Porte, expecting farther troubles with the Russians, was prepared to yield to some of the Serbian demands. Thus the famous Ičko's peace was concluded. It is worth to mention that the Powers often had used the Balkan's revolts for their purposes. That was the case and with the First Serbian uprising. Russian achieved to persuade Serbian leader to withdraw from the concluded agreement with the central ottoman authority. Although some historians thought that this agreement would fail even without Serbian abandoning<sup>4</sup>, the fact remains that Serbs were those who renounced the mentioned accord with the Porte. This Serbian move would prove faulty. „Their final fate would obviously depend on the evolution of the world affairs“<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Мирослав Ђорђевић, Политичка историја Србије у XIX веку, Београд, 1956, с.

<sup>3</sup> L. S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453*, New York, 1958, p. 246.

<sup>4</sup> Милорад Екмичић, *Стварање Југославије*, 1, Београд, 1989, с. 132.

<sup>5</sup> Charles and Barbara Jelavich, *The establishment of the Balkan national states 1804-1920*, p. 33.

Russian involvement within the Serbian external and internal affairs was very deep. The Serbian leader, Karadjordje, at first, thought that he could use such Russian involvement. In 1807 Serbs, for the very first time, concluded a convention with Russians so called Karadjordje-Paulucci convention. However very soon Karadjordje comprehended that he did not have the Russian support as he had expected. He turned to Austrians and French. Austria, for his regret, was not in position to give almost any kind of support after the series of military defeats, although had an interest to limit Russian influence in Serbia<sup>6</sup>. France showed an antagonistic attitude towards Serbian demand. Napoleon did not read the letter, which Karadjordje had sent to him. Even more, he declared that the Serbs had no significance on the chessboard<sup>7</sup>. Probably, the Napoleon's attitude was arrogant, but it revealed that he did not count on the Serbs in the region.

Karadjordje had problems with the internal Serbian opposition, which had Russian backing. Russia intended to limit his power. But the greatest shock would come very soon. Faced with the French imperilment, Russia signed in 1812 in Bucharest an agreement which contained an article which dealt with the Serbs, but they as could be expected were not consulted about the negotiations. Even more they were not informed that some negotiations had taken place. Serbs would learn about the Bucharest agreement after Ottoman demand for its implementation. The only advice, which Serbs got from Russian, was to negotiate with the Porte<sup>8</sup>. The central government in Istanbul had not been disposed to have a negotiation with the rebels. Russia was engaged in defending of its territory against Napoleon's invasion. Thus the possibility for Russian interference in Serbia was unrealizable. Serbs were left alone. In 1813 Ottoman launched fierce and successful military campaign against Serbian rebels who were not able to give well organized resistance. Very swiftly the Ottoman army occupied the greatest rebels' centers and thus reestablished the sultan's government in Serbia. Serbs, it is fair to say, could not defend themselves without Russian support. Mark Mazover was entirely correct when he said that the First Serbian uprising ended with defeat, mainly, as a consequence of the struggle amongst the Great powers in Europe<sup>9</sup>.

The fate of the Second Serbian uprising was quite opposite with that of the first one. In 1815 when Serbs, again, rose against the Ottoman, the political situation in Europe was totally different with those one in 1813. Napoleon was definitely and irretrievably defeated. Thus Serbs could count on some foreign support. The main proof for this opinion was the Ottoman behavior. It is

<sup>6</sup> М. Ђорђевић, *Политичка...*, с. 162.

<sup>7</sup> Жорж Кастелан, *Историја на Балканот*, Софија, 1999, с. 254.

<sup>8</sup> Ch. and V. Jelavich, *The establishment...*, p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> Марк Мазовер, *Балканот-кратка историја*, Скопје, 2003, с. 114

beyond any doubt that the Porte could use its army, but Ottomans assessed that the most favorable for their interests was to negotiate with the Serbs and to make to them some concession. Russia was not engaged in the West, anymore, and was free to turn to the Balkans. Therefore the Ottoman preferred swift compromise with Serbs to a protracted war that might end in Russian intervention<sup>10</sup>. Obviously they learnt something from the First uprising. Finally the attitude of Russian ambassador in Istanbul, Italinski, reminded the Porte that it was possible to face Russian interference. The leader of the second uprising Miloš Obrenović and Ottoman representatives reached understanding which was confirmed by the sultan.

Despite the concluded agreement, Serbia had not been completely autonomous. For such achievement Serbs need external support. It was more than clear that they were not capable to exert such pressure on the Porte. This fact was known to Miloš. He was illiterate, but was a skillful and shrewd diplomat. He learnt that it was impossible to get support from Austria, where the most important person was Metternich. So the only one address for seeking aid was Russia. He was in permanent correspondence with the Russian ambassador in Istanbul, but also took some independent step in the Porte. Such his behavior had not been sympathized by the Russians. Their policy, as Sowards points out, toward the orthodox Christians of the Balkans involved mixed elements of compassion and selfinterest<sup>11</sup>. They wished, as was the case with the Karadjordje, to have strong influence in Serbia. The Emperor Alexander I very clearly declared that his support to Serbs was not unconditional<sup>12</sup>. He wanted to put some limits on the power of Miloš Obrenović. Alexander was conscious that Miloš needed his aid. On the other hand Russians did not want to lose an opportunity for establishing an autonomous Serbian state which should be under their protectorate.

It would be very impolite to negate further Miloš's attempts for getting an autonomous status for Serbia, but it is undeniable fact that it were the Russians who induced Ottoman to agree for more concessions for the Serbs. As a direct Russian pressure Ottoman signed Ackerman's convention (October 7 1826). That was, as Radoš Ljusić underlined, „a large step toward building of Serbian autonomy“<sup>13</sup>. The article 5 from this convention dealt with Serbia.

Probably the most significant event in the direction of completing the Serbian autonomy was the Russian-Ottoman war 1828/29, which ended with the Andrianople peace agreement of 14<sup>th</sup> September 1829. This peace agreement also contained article, which was related to Serbia.

---

<sup>10</sup> L. S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans...*, p. 249.

<sup>11</sup> [www.Lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html](http://www.Lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html).

<sup>12</sup> Г. Достян, *Россия и балканский вопрос в первой трети XIX века*, Москва, 1972.

<sup>13</sup> Радос Лјушић, *Кнежевина Србија 1830-1839*, Београд, 1986, с. 2.

In 1830 Serbia got full autonomous status, but beyond all dispute that was a result of the Russian-Ottoman war.

Serbia was an autonomous state within the framework of the Ottoman Empire, but there was another problem between Serbs and Ottomans. The question of so called six districts still existed. I have said before that Miloš was a skillful diplomat. He also had a sense, of course not always, for the international political situation. He knew very well that the Ottomans were in deep trouble in Bosnia, Northern Albania and Near East. He estimated that Serbia had a favorable situation to solve the question of the disputed areas. Thus under his instigation Serbs rose in the disputed areas which was followed by the entering of Serbian forces. It could be accept that Milos with his activities placed the Ottomans and Russians before an accomplished fact. Nonetheless the Sultan issued an hatisherif for bringing back the dispute area to Serbia came after Russian intervention, although the mentioned Ottoman difficulties certainly had influence over the final Porte's decision. Whether by accident or design, the issuing of Hatisherif coincided with Hunkiar Iskellesi agreement between Russia and Ottoman Empire. The Russians also, in a way, were involved in the demarcation of Serbian-ottoman border. The decision about the border was brought in 1834 after the work of common Serb – ottoman commission, but its work was preceded by the work of similar Russian – ottoman commission<sup>14</sup>.

Serbia gained full autonomy. Serbs, without any doubt, achieved their freedom with struggle and diplomacy. However, it would very hard to accomplish autonomy without Russian support, although there was not direct military intervention in favor of Serbs. Of course the Russians would try to have, in the next period, preponderated influence in Serbia.

The next step was to gain complete independence and territorial extension or unification of the lands, which were, considers as Serbian. The most proper moment was the Great Eastern crisis, which began in 1875. Likewise the previous period they needed foreign support. The Serbian attempt to lessen the position of the rebels in Bosnia and Herzegovina resulted with severe disaster. The ottoman army, although had failed to smash the revolt in Bosnia and Herzegovina, defeated serbian forces in the war in 1876 and only the Russian interference hindered complete collapse of the Serbian autonomous Principality. Serbs became aware that they could not achieve something more without external support.

In 1877 another war broke out in the region. Russia declared a war to the Ottoman Empire. This event gave a chance to the Serbs to use the new created situation for accomplishing of their desires. They took participation in the war,

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, s. 40.

although after the falling of Plevna, at the end of 1877 and freed some areas which were considered as Serbian. Their military victories were obvious, but also were lessened with the fact that large ottoman army forces were engaged in Bulgaria against Russian advance.

Serbian independence was a reality, but it should be recognize by the Powers. Serbian government at the beginning of 1878 had defined its territorial aspirations, but they were not valid for the Powers. Russia, which had played a significant role in the period of the creating of Serbian autonomous state, turned its interest to Bulgaria. According the decisions of the San Stefano preliminary peace agreement, in spite of the recognition of Serbian independence, some of the regions which Serbian army had freed, were incorporated within the framework of the new Great Bulgarian state. Such decisions could not leave Serbs indifferent. They were very disappointed and surprised with the Russian move.

The reaction of the western government about the San Stefano preliminary peace agreement was unanimously hostile. They could not accept not only the creation of the Great Bulgarian state, but also any Great Slav state in the region, which could be under Russian influence. The most ardent opponents of the San Stefano's agreement were Great Britain and Austria-Hungary, consequently, that were the addresses where Serbs could ask support.

The British attitude toward Serbs was far from the amiable, because of its interests in the region. The British diplomacy had interest to put Serbia in the Austro-Hungarian sphere of interests<sup>15</sup>. Serbia was not in the forefront of the British interest during the holding of Berlin Congress.

Consequently, Austria-Hungary was the only one European power, which could support some of the Serbia demands. Of course the support would be limited. Vienna had a special interest in the region. After the military defeats in 1859 and 1866, The Balkans remained the only European area where Vienna could play important role. Besides that Austria-Hungary was the only one Great European power without colony or territories outside Europe. In such condition it was not difficult to anticipate the policy of Vienna's government.

Andrassy, the Austrian minister of foreign affairs, in January 1878, had announced that the Austrian interests extended up to the r. Lim<sup>16</sup>. Also, in April 1878 in the Memorandum, which was sent to London, Austrian imperial government stressed that any connection between Serbia and Montenegro would endanger Austrian border provinces<sup>17</sup>. Those Austrian declarations were very clear indications that Vienna had aspiration toward Bosnia and Herzegovina.

---

<sup>15</sup> Александар Раствоић, Велика Британија и Србија 1878-1889, Београд, 2000, с. 36.

<sup>16</sup> Србија 1878, Београд, 1978, с. 13.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, s. 284.

Regardless Austrian interests, which were in conflict with the Serbian one, the government in Belgrade was induced to seek Austria's support for its aspirations. Even more, the Serbian diplomats in Berlin were advised by the Russians to turn to Austria<sup>18</sup>. In such circumstances Mihajlo Vojvodic, precisely concluded that the Serbian political leaders looked at Austria-Hungary as the only one protector of their interest and, not asking about the price, they sought its aid<sup>19</sup>.

Such position of the Serbian politician was not illogical. As I have already said, the British policy was disinclined for the Serbian interests. Salisbury even disputed Serbian military victories in the war. During the Berlin's congress, on some occasions, British delegates were more disposed to meet ottoman demands about the border line, rather than serbian one<sup>20</sup>. Also they did not hide their interest for Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, although they did not, publicly, declare the reason for their position-prevention of the possible unification of Serbia and Montenegro and creating of great Slav state in the region<sup>21</sup>. The Russians, former Serbian protector, were not so ardently inclined toward Serbian interests, as they had been in the past. In the case of the demarcation of Serbian-bulgarian border, during the Congress, Russians were more inclined to the Bulgarian interest.

Serbian politician had asked for Austrian support, particularly, about the extension of Serbian borders. The recognition of Serbian independence was a matter of time. Austro-Hungarian diplomacy, on the other hand, had an interest to support, some of, but not the all, Serbian demands. Certainly, the Austrian support was not without conditions. And-rassy, during the meeting with the Serbian Prime Minister, Ristic, without any hesitation, laid down the Austrian conditions for giving a support. (Railway line and commercial agreement). It was out of question that Serbs could refuse the Austrian demands. On that way they got Austrian support for some of their demands. It must be admitted that Serbia without Austrian support would be in very difficult position on the Congress.

Serbia, at the Berlin congress, was recognized as an independent principality (art. 34) with some territorial extensions. In spite of Serbian sacrifices it could not be concealed the fact that the Powers had, again, the main role in the making of the final decisions. They were those who recognized Serbian independence. Also they decided which territory would be assign to Serbia. Serbian

<sup>18</sup> Записи Јеврема Грујића, 3, Београд, 193.

<sup>19</sup> Михајло Војводић, Путеви српске дипломатије, Београд, 1999, с. 17.

<sup>20</sup> Драгољуб Живојиновић, Велика Британија и Србија на Берлинском конгресу 1878; Живот и рад Јована Ристића, Београд; 1985, с. 95.

<sup>21</sup> А. Растовић, Велика Британија..., с 40-41.



forces were induced to withdraw from some of the territories, which they occupied during the war.

The case of Greek was different that the Serbian one, although one could find some similarities. Geostrategic position of the Greek lands had more significance for the Powers. The Philhellenic factor, also, could not be pass in silence. Thus it was not a surprise that, unlike the Serbian revolt, the Greek one caused much more compassion and interest. Nonetheless at its very beginning no one could suppose that this uprising would provoke great tension and deep involvement of the Powers.

Greek insurgents, at the commencement of their rebellion, had not gained any support by the Powers. Instead of that the European Powers condemned the rebels. Their reaction was, uniformly, hostile toward the Greek insurrection. The ambassadors of Great Britain, Austria, France and Prussia addressed to the Greek with the appeal not to revolt against their legitimate government, because it was against the principle of the Gospel and Christian morale<sup>22</sup>. The attitude of the Powers was in accordance with the decisions of Vienna's Congress and the principle of the Holy Alliance. British government in May 1821 sent a naval squadron to protect the ottoman ships by the Greek raids<sup>23</sup>. Metternich called the Greek rebels as brigands. His animosity toward Greek insurgent's movements was easy to explain. Their movement and struggle were in deep collision with Metternich's system for preserving of status quo in the region. He feared that such movements could appear in Austria<sup>24</sup>.

The Greek, like the other orthodox people in the region, looked at Russia as a protector and possible supporter. There was a large Greek community in Russia, also Greek vessels had delivered Russian commodities and, not to omit, Ioannis Capodistrias, a Russian foreign minister, was a Greek from island of Corfu. But the greatest disappointment for the Greek came, just from Russia. The emperor Alexander I saw in Greek revolt signs of revolution. So in the accordance with the principle of Holy Alliance he could not give a support to the revolutionaries. Russian emperor, on very candid way, informed Capodistrias that he was not prepared to sacrifice his interests for those who were against the order<sup>25</sup>. Alexander's position was very delicate. The ottoman reprisals toward Greek were very severe and vice versa. Jannissaries even hanged the patriarch Gregorios V. The murder of patriarch introduced an entirely new element into the Russian attitude toward the Greek revolt<sup>26</sup>. It was quite

---

<sup>22</sup> В. Н. Виноградов, Герцог Веллингтон в Петербурге, Балканские народы и европейские правительства в XVIII-начале XX в., Москва, 1982, с. 120.

<sup>23</sup> А. В. Фадеев, Россия и Восточный кризис 20-тих годов XIX века, Москва, 1958, с.

<sup>24</sup> Хенри Кисинджер, Дипломатията, София, 1997, с. 78.

<sup>25</sup> А.В. Фадеев, Россия..., с. 60.

<sup>26</sup> Barbara Jelavich, Russia and Greece during the Regency of king Oton 1832-1835, Thessaloniki, 1962, 20.

expectable that the murder of the patriarch would incite profound emotions in Russia. Russian demanded that Ottoman had to make a clear distinction between guilty revolutionaries and innocent persons. Russian, also, faced another problem. After the commencement of the Greek revolt, the ottoman authorities ordered ban for sailing of the Greek vessels, which were one of the greatest suppliers of the Russian market<sup>27</sup>. However the Emperor did not show great interest in the Greek affairs during the period 1821-1822. He was more inclined to conform his interests to those one of Holly Alliance.

On the ground the Greek rebels achieved remarkable successes. The ottoman incapability to crash Balkans uprisings at their very beginning had been proved again. Of course, the Greek position was eased with the engagement of the Ottoman army against Ali Pasha Tepeleni But, also, soon the Sultan's forces would not have successful operations against the Greek rebels. The Greek resistance would prove as very significant for further development.

Similar to the Serbs, the Greeks were well aware that they had to get support from the Powers. Metaxas had been sent to Verona, where he was to persuade the representatives of the Powers that the Greek revolt was quite different with that one in Italy and Spain<sup>28</sup>. His attempt was useless. He faced the Serbian experience during the Vienna's Congress. He was a representative of the rebels who fought against legitimate govern-government.

Nonetheless, the situation had begun to develop into direction of Greek interests. The inactive policy of the Russian toward the Greek question would prove entirely wrong. Many of the Greeks would lose their hopes in the Russia. Such situation presented a good opportunity for Great Britain. In august 1822 George Canning followed Robert Castelreagh as a Prime Minister. British policy still called for the maintenance of the power and prestige of the Ottoman Empire as a check against Russia<sup>29</sup>. Canning was flexible in his behavior. He understood that the ottoman forces were not able to destroy Greek mutiny, which was upsetting British commerce in the region. In 1823 Canning's government recognizing the Greek insurgents as a belligerent, made very surprising move for the other Powers. That was a very pragmatic move. The recognition of Greeks as belligerent allowed to Canning to make a pressure over the Greek rebel's authorities about the British commercial interests. However, probably, a much more important fact than above mentioned was the British necessity to avoid creating of an independent Greek state under Russian embrace<sup>30</sup>. „Canning's fear was, indeed, that Russia would gobble Greece in one

<sup>27</sup> Достян, Россия..., с. 202.

<sup>28</sup> А.В. Фадеев, Россия..., с. 64.

<sup>29</sup> Ch and B. Jelavich, The establishment..., s.

<sup>30</sup> Ж. Кастелан, История..., с. 270.

mouthful and the Turkey of the next<sup>431</sup>. Having in mind such Canning's fear, the recognition of the Greek, as belligerents could not be treat as a surprise. Anyway, the Greek question had been internationalized.

The very strong pro-Greek feelings in Great Britain and Philhellenic movement, doubtless, had some impact on the policy of the government. British philhellens in 1823 formed so called Greek Committee. Some of its members were influential persons in the British public life. Probably we could accept the influence of the London's Greek committee over some moves of the British government<sup>32</sup>. However some of the members of the mentioned committee were successful merchants who assessed that the new Greek state being predestined to become most influential maritime power in the region, so the support of Greek was reasonable business investment<sup>33</sup>. Notwithstanding their influence on the British public opinion and politician, the role of the Philhellens should not be overestimated. At last, the governments were those which brought the final decisions.

After the recognition of the Greek as belligerent, the representatives of the FO made contacts with Mavrokordatos, who was known as probritish politician. Also, according Fadeev, the British government sent military officers in Greece<sup>34</sup>. Nonetheless that Canning had recognized the Greek as belligerent; he refused to meet the Greek rebel's delegation. Probably he did not intend more to irritate the Ottomans. Anyway the Greek very soon would received their first international loan<sup>35</sup>.

The Canning's recognition of Greek, in any case, did not mean that the British government had a plan or was prepared to recognize Greece as a completely independent state. As a matter of fact no one of the Powers, in that time, had such intentions. Even more, Canning in 1824 did reject the Greek appeal for intervention saying that Britain could intervene only if both Greeks and Turks requested mediation<sup>36</sup>.

Canning's attitude toward Greek question, quite expectable, begun to bother and concern Russia. The Emperor Alexander I, probably, realized that his policy of non-intervention in Greece proved as very harmful for Russian interests. Therefor at the beginning of 1824 Alexander I presented a plan which proposed creation of three autonomous Greek principalities. Greek did refute the plan. Regardless the Greek refusal, Russia signaled that the Greek question could not be solved without her participation.

---

<sup>31</sup> J. A. Marriot, A history of Europe, London, 1956, p. 61.

<sup>32</sup> Miša Gleni, Balkan 1804-1999, I, Beograd, 2001, s. 50.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, s. 51.

<sup>34</sup> А.В. Фадеев, Россия..., с. 88.

<sup>35</sup> В. Н. Виноградов, Великобритания и Балканы от Виенского конгресса до Крымской войны, Москва, 1985, с.

<sup>36</sup> Douglas Dakin, The unification of Greece, London, 1971, p. 52.

Serbian historian Dimitrije Djordjević gave a correct and precise assessment for the Greek uprising when he concluded that owing to the geopolitical position of the country the Greek revolt had deeply cut the economical and politic interest of the Great European powers<sup>37</sup>. The attitude of Great Britain and Russia was to be best proof.

In 1825 the Greek and Ottoman forces faced a stalemate. The Porte was not able to crush the Greek rebels, who on the other hand, had not enlarged their areas of control moreover were deeply involved in internal quarrel and fighting<sup>38</sup>. Muhammad II decided to call for support. That was a great mistake. This action was to change the entire situation and lead to foreign intervention.

Despaired and imperiled, Greeks were induced to ask help from the Powers to find solution for the calamity which was taking place to them<sup>39</sup> and begun to send demands for the protection. In 1825 the most outstanding leaders from Pelopones demanded British protection. That was the famous Act of submission. Canning, the politician who recognized the Greeks as belligerent, refused their demand. Pro-French circles within the Greek revolutionary society, also, did not stay inactive. They sent an address to the Count of Orleans asking him to accept Greek crown for his son<sup>40</sup>. The Pro-Russian signed an act of submission to Russia<sup>41</sup>. It was more than obvious that the Greeks were profoundly divided on their inclination toward some of the Powers. That division would be very characteristic during the first decades of development of the independent Greek kingdom. Such situation was very convenient for the Powers. Thus they could to make some influence in Greece.

On the ground the Greek position was permanently being exasperated by the activities of the joint Ottoman-Egyptian forces. The only what the Greeks could do was to resist as long as they could and to wait for foreign intervention. Without external interference in that moment, as Mazover emphasizes, the history would have noted another unsuccessful revolt<sup>42</sup>. At the end of 1825 the foreign intervention became possible. The pretext could be find in the atrocities, which were being committed by the Ottomans and Egyptians.

At the end of 1825 Alexander I died. His successor was Nikolaj I, who was totally opposite to his predecessor. The new Russian ruler was very ambitious. He would conduct more aggressive foreign policy. Greece, without any doubt, could not stay aside his interest. Canning, apparently, was well aware of

<sup>37</sup> Димитрије Ђорђевић, Националне револуције балканских народа 1804-1914, Београд, 1995, с.

<sup>38</sup> Ch and B. Jelavich, *The establishment...*, p. 46.

<sup>39</sup> Ричард Клог, Историја Грчке новог доба, Београд, 2000, с. 44.

<sup>40</sup> D. Dakin, *The unification of...*, p. 53.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> М. Мазовер, Балканот, с. 119.

the new situation. He knew that Britain had to make a compromise with Russia regarding Greece. At the beginning of 1826 he bespoke to the Russians that he had an intention to send an envoy in St. Petersburg. Very soon Wellington was chosen as a British envoy in Russian capital on the crowning of the new Emperor. In March 1826 he arrived in St. Petersburg to achieve some understanding with Russians regarding the Greek question. Since the beginning of his visit it was more than clear that the compromise would be almost inevitable. The agreement, which Wellington concluded with his Russians interlocutors, was a compromise. The Russo-british protocol of March 23/ April 4, 1826 provided Greece with an autonomous status, but no boundaries were indicated. Also mediation was to be offered, but not forced upon Ottoman<sup>43</sup>. If they refused, the two powers would be free to proceed their intervention either jointly or separately. Thus, for the very first time since the beginning of the revolt, the Greek question was a part of some agreement, in this case, between two Great European powers. Seemingly it was a positive step for the Greeks, but also since then they could not, anymore, make some stronger influence over the Great powers for the questions, which concern Greek interests.

The signing of the abovementioned protocol did not soothe the diversities among the Powers about the Greek question. The development of the events in the region had been very annoying for the British government. The signing of the Ackerman's convention had provoked a great commotion in London. The British needed help. Canning was persuading the French monarch Charles X to take participation in the Greek affairs<sup>44</sup>. The French monarch was known as a hellenophil. Thus the Canning's task was lessened. Of course there were another, most important, things which were favorable for inducing the French to take participation. They wanted to restore their influence amongst the European powers, which was lost in 1815. Also they wanted to protect their commercial interest and to prevent a russo-british condominium<sup>45</sup>. Finally, France could not stand aside and allow a major Mediterranean crisis to be mediated without hers participation<sup>46</sup>. In that way the base for the solving of the Greek question was posed.

Nikos Svoronas was entirely right when he said that the success of the Greek uprising during the period 1821-1824 and the resistance in the period 1825-1827 had an influence for the Power's involvement<sup>47</sup>. The Powers, however, would pay a little attention to the Greek wishes. Anyway the main European Powers were convinced that the Greek question should not be unsolved.

---

<sup>43</sup> D. Dakin, *The unification of...*, p. 55.

<sup>44</sup> Ж. Кастелан, *История...*, с. 270.

<sup>45</sup> [www.lbi.edu/sowards/balkan/lect10.htm](http://www.lbi.edu/sowards/balkan/lect10.htm)

<sup>46</sup> Ch and B. Jelavich, *The establishment...*, s. 49.

<sup>47</sup> Никос Зваронас, *Кратка история на нова Гърция*, София, 1993, с. 54.

Great Britain, Russia and France at 6<sup>th</sup> of July 1827 signed the treaty of London, which was a first meaningful step towards Greek independence, although this word was not mentioned within the signed document. Russia and Great Britain, had not been disposed in 1827 to support complete Greek independence, but facts remain that after the concluding of London's treaty it was very clear that the Porte would lose a control to some of hers Greek territories. Such solution was bespoken by Canning in his letter to the British ambassador in Istanbul, when he emphasized that it was impossible to bring Greek back in the previous position<sup>48</sup>. Although the Powers in the London's Treaty, as well in the St. Petersburg protocol, mentioned the question of the Greek borders, they were not defined. Surprisingly, Metternich, the most ardent opponent of the Greek rebels was the first politician who proposes to give full independence to Pelopones and Cyklades<sup>49</sup>. Thus for the very first time since the beginning of the revolt the possible extension of the new Greek state was mentioned, notwithstanding that the real intention of Metternich was to mine the fragile accord that existed between London and St. Petersburg.

The Greeks, on the other hand, had not even been consulted about the decisions of the London's treaty. Perhaps that the Greeks, contrary to the Serbs, had not a leader who could represent and, which was more important, unified their stances, lessened the position of the Powers. The Greeks attempted to unify their positions. In 1827 the Greek rebel's Assembly elected Count Capodistrias for the first president. However he would face a strong opposition in the country which would be back by the British. They were very suspicious toward the new elected Greek president and regarded him as a proponent of Russian interests in Greece. Having in mind that he, finally, left the Russian diplomatic service in 1827<sup>50</sup>, the British accusation did not seem exaggerated. Of course, beside the fear from Russian influence there was another reason for British mistrust of Capodistria. He originated from the island of Corfu, which was under British rule. Therefore they looked at him as possible danger for their Ionian interests<sup>51</sup>.

The Powers, according to the Treaty of London, had offered their mediation both to the Ottoman and to the Greek. In august 1827 Greek accepted the offer, but the Ottoman refused it. That was a great error. The Ottoman, probably, counted on the apparent diversities amongst the Powers. However in Octo-

<sup>48</sup> В. Виноградов, Великобритания..., с. 62.

<sup>49</sup> Стойчо Грънчаров, Балканският свят, София, 2001, с. 162-163.

<sup>50</sup> V. G. Filatov, *La Russie et l'accession de la Grece a l'indépendance dans les annees 1827-1830; Les relations entre les peuples de l'URSS et les Grecs – fin du XVIIIeme-debut du Xxeme*, Thessaloniki, 1992, p. 30; After abandoning of the russian diplomatic service Capodistria proceeded to maintain a close links with his former colleague, the russian minister for foreign affairs, Nesselrode.

<sup>51</sup> W. David Wrigley, *Fourteen secret british documents concerning Count John Capodistrias (February-march 1828); Südost-Forschungen*, b.XLV, München, 1986, p. 90.

ber 1827 in the Bay of Navarino a combined Russian – British – French naval squadron destroyed the ottoman-egyptian fleet. Notwithstanding the later condemnation of the action by the new British Prime Minister Wellington, the road for the Greek liberty was paved, but not by the Greek. The Powers did it. Frankly speaking the Greeks did not have capability to perform such action against the joint ottoman-egyptian fleet. Very soon French military expedition landed in Pelopones to monitor the withdrawal of Egyptian troops. Although the Russians and British previously approved this French move, one could not to neglect the possibility that Paris sent its troops to enhance French influence in Greece<sup>52</sup>.

Very similar to the Serbian case, perhaps the most decisive event that led toward Greek freedom was Russian-ottoman war 1828/29. As it has been already mentioned this war finished with the signing of Adrianople peace agreement. According the decisions of this agreement the Ottoman government had to recognize the Greek autonomy. Thus the Greek freedom was connected with the Russian military victory. Of course that such possibility was completely unacceptable for British. They did not want to see any strong Russian influence in Greece. Utilizing that Russia had not proposed, on official level, creating of independent states in the Balkans, British government proposed complete independence of Greece<sup>53</sup>. Russians did not oppose British's proposal. Thus, at last, with the London protocol of February 3 1830, Greece was proclaimed for independent kingdom. It was the powers who proclaimed Greek independence. There was no signature of some Greek representative on this protocol.

The proclamation of the independence, in any case, did not mean that the Greek question was solved. The borders of the new kingdom were not defined. The problem of the Greek borders was the issue on which the diversities amongst the Powers came to the fore during the period before the recognition of the independence. Russians were disposed to support the extension of the Greek borders as far as the line Arta-Volos. However the British objected this line, although they agreed on the mentioned line at the Conference of Poros, December 1828. The British Prime Minister Wellington pointed out to the British representative in Poros, Stratford Canning, that the original object of the treaty was to pacify the Levant and not to create a power capable of making war on Ottoman Empire<sup>54</sup>. Maria Todorova had completely accurate assertion when she wrote that neither Greece nor some other state in the Balkan could substitute the Ottoman Empire as an anti-Russian barrier<sup>55</sup>. Wellington, against,

---

<sup>52</sup> Симеон Дамянов, *Френската политика на Балканите 1829-1853*, София, 1977.

<sup>53</sup> Никос Зваронас, *Кратка история...*, с. 54.

<sup>54</sup> D. Dakin, *The unification of...*, p. 60.

<sup>55</sup> Мария Тодорова, *Англия, Русия и Танзиматът*, София, 1980, с. 77.

in a protocol of 22 March 1829, agreed on the proposed line, not as a settlement to be imposed, but as a basis for negotiating with the Ottomans<sup>56</sup>. The Greeks, quite normal, had been deeply concerned about the border issue. Capodistria, in 1828, sent to the Russian his famous project for division of the Ottoman Empire. The Russian who advocated the broader line for the Greek border rejected this project, without hesitation. In other words they considered this project, especially, the idea for establishing Constantinople as free city, entirely opposite to their interest<sup>57</sup>. That was another proof that Powers pursue their interests. The Greeks objected the Protocol of 22 March 1829 because of the borders demanded the line from the Conference of Poros plus Candia (Crete) and Samos<sup>58</sup>. They refused the London Protocol in 1830, because of the frontier issue<sup>59</sup>. According to Pavlovic, Capodistria even agreed to accept the candidature of Leopold von Saxe Coburg, with the aim to persuade Great Britain to agree on wider Greek borders<sup>60</sup>. The Greek resentments about the borderline were not without basis. According to the article III of the London Treaty of 1827 they had to be consulted about the borders. However the Greeks were very weak and divided to exert some influence over the Powers. Finally the Greek-ottoman frontier line was settled with the signing of the Constantinople Convention at 21 July 1832 which defined the line Arta-Volos as a border between Greece and Ottoman Empire. Representatives of Great Britain, Russia, France and the Ottoman Empire signed the Convention. The Greek did not sign a convention, which regulated the borderline of their country. That was a price for the Powers involvement, although we could not ignore the truth that it was very hard task to find someone in Greece who would represent the unified position of all groups in the country.

Greece, according the London's protocol of 1830, was defined as a constitutional monarchy. The Powers brought that decision. Russians were the first who put a proposal to establish Greece as a strong monarchy<sup>61</sup>. Britain and France, in principle, supported the Russian proposal. The next step was to find someone who would be offered with the Greek crown. There were six candidates, who had some support by the Powers. At last, the Greek throne had been offered to Leopold von Saxe Coburg<sup>62</sup>, who had very close links with British royal family. However, Leopold refused the offer under pretext that he was dis-

<sup>56</sup> D. Dakin, *The unification of...*, p. 60.

<sup>57</sup> А.В. Фадеев, *Россия...*, с. 328; Vladimir Dedijer, *Interesne sfere*, beograd, 1980, s. 70

<sup>58</sup> C.W. Crawley, *John Capodistrias*, Unpublished documents, Thessaloniki, 1970, p. 37

<sup>59</sup> L.S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans...*, p. 291.

<sup>60</sup> С. Павловић, *Историја...*, с. 61.

<sup>61</sup> С. Грњчаров, *Балканският...*, с. 161.

<sup>62</sup> Although the Powers offered Leopold with the greek crown, there were some greek circle who had considered him as a most appropriate candidate for the throne, during the time of the revolt. (C.W. Crawley, *John Capodistrias...*, p.15, f. 2).



satisfied with the extension of Greek border and bad economical situation. Thus the Powers had to find the other solution for the Greek throne. The Greek almost did not take participation in the election of their Monarch. The Powers had a very good reason for the excluding Greeks from the process. The extremely chaotic internal conditions within Greece after the assassination of the first president, Capodistrias, resulted in the assumption of full jurisdiction over the state by the three Powers who had supported Greek independence<sup>63</sup>. Also, the three powers were interested in securing the establishment of stable regime in Greece and one that would not seek further acquisition of territory<sup>64</sup>. Finally in 1832 the Powers named Othon as a first ruler of Greece. Even more they determined his title – the King of Greece, but not the king of Greeks, which could irritate the Ottoman government, having in mind that a great Greek community stayed within the framework the Ottoman Empire.

The Bulgarian case could not be compared with the Serbian and Greek one. The Bulgarian liberation movement had not been so strong as the Greek one. Bulgarians did not rise in such massive revolt as Serbs and Greeks did. Also the formation of the modern Bulgarian state was a result of most direct foreign intervention.

One could agree with B. Jelavich's conclusion that April's uprising completely failed as revolution, because the majority of the population did not participate in the revolt<sup>65</sup>. But, we could not put aside some facts. First, the April uprising, perhaps, was not the main, but without any doubt the Ottoman atrocities, which followed the revolt, were one of the main causes for the beginning of the Russian-ottoman war in 1877. Second, according some data, the Bulgarian did not have any illusions that they would manage to free themselves only with their forces. Probably the words of Georgi Benkovski and Todor Kobleshkov were the best proof<sup>66</sup>. They expected a foreign i.e. Russian intervention.

Like the Serbs and Greeks, the Bulgarians were deeply aware that they had to make the Powers acquainted with their position and demands. Dr. Cankov and M. Balbanov were sent to visit the capital cities of the European Powers<sup>67</sup>. They had visited London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome and St. Petersburg. They were meeting not only with politicians, but also with journalists and intellectuals. They attempted to use the positive attitude of the European public opinion after the April's uprising. It was not a surprise that the most ardent support they received in Russia.

---

<sup>63</sup> Barbara Jelavich, *Balkan nations under European protectorship; Actes du premier congress international des Etudes Balkaniques et sud-est europeennes*, t. IV, Sofia, 1969, p. 399.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 400.

<sup>65</sup> Барбара Јелавич, *Историја на Балканот*, 1, Скопје, 1999, с. 411.

<sup>66</sup> И. Божилов, В. Мутафчиева и др., *История на България*, София, 1993, с. 373.

<sup>67</sup> Крумка Шарова, *Българските външнополитически акции пред Европа през XIX век*, *Исторически преглед*, 1996/4, София, 1996, с. 34-72.

The modern Bulgarian state established in 1878 was the direct result of the war of Russia with the Ottoman Empire on 1877/1878<sup>68</sup>. The Russian predominating influence on the formation of the new state was shown already in the San Stefano's preliminary peace agreement. The Porte, as a direct consequence of the lost war, agreed to the establishment of an autonomous and tributary state.

The creation of the great Bulgarian state provoked deep dissatisfaction, both in the region and in West Europe. The agreement of San Stefano was assessed as Pan-Slav. Even in the fifth decade of the last century, some western historians considered this agreement as „strong Pan-Slav document“<sup>69</sup>. However, the fact remains that Serbs deeply resented this agreement. Serbs were Slavs, too. Of course, no one could negate the existence of certain groups, connected with the Pan-Slavists, in the Russian ruling circles, which had some influence in the creating of the foreign policy. However the vicinity of Constantinople and the Straits could be consider as the primary factor for the creating of the great Bulgarian state which, doubtless, were to be under Russian influence.

As I have already said, Great Britain and Austria-Hungary were the most fervent opponent of the San Stefano's agreement. This fact would have the most decisive impact over the further fate of the mentioned agreement and, consequently, to the destiny of the Bulgarian state. The British considered the creation of great Bulgarian state as very detrimental for their interests. In his circular letter of 1 April 1878, Salisbury, plainly, stressed that the inclusion of the Bulgaria within the Russian political system endangers the basic British interests<sup>70</sup>. Although Russians denied that the Bulgaria was included within their political system, the acting of the so-called Russian provisional administration in Bulgaria was sufficient proof for such British accusations. The British were concerned that the creation of the great Bulgarian state, under the apparent Russian influence, would present a permanent detriment to their interests, not only in the region, but also in the Near East. Logically to their fears, they could not allow existence of Great Bulgarian state.

The Austrians were also concerned by the creation of the great Bulgarian state. I have mentioned the reasons for the great Austrian interest in the region. They did not object only the possible extension of the Serbian borders, but also were worried with the possibility of the existence of another great Slav state, in this case, Bulgarian one. Austrians were angry about the creating of the

<sup>68</sup> B. Jelavich, *Balkan nations..*, p. 405.

<sup>69</sup> Robert Lee Wolf, *The Balkans in our time*, Harvard university press, 1956, p. 84.

<sup>70</sup> И. Козменко, *Англо-австријска дипломатија и ослобождение Болгарии (декабра 1877-июнь 1878)*- Българската държава през вековете, 1. София, 1982, 42.

great Bulgarian state. They had a reason for their complaints. Creating of the large Slav state was in opposition with the previous settled and concluded conventions in Reichstadt and Budapest. Austrians, very plainly, told to Russians that they could not accept the creation of the Great Bulgarian state.

The increasing of the tensions in the region and Russian exhaust from the war with the Ottomans were a signal that San Stefano's peace agreement should to be revised. The negotiations started amongst the Powers. It was more than clear that great Bulgarian state would be diminished. The Bulgarians had not been asked about their wishes and demands. They were in weaker position then Serbs and Greeks were in the previous period. They, even, did not have a leader. They gained their freedom, because of the direct Russian military intervention.

Finally, in May 1878 in London, Russia and Great Britain signed a Protocol, which was a first meaningful step toward complete revision of S. Stefano peace agreement<sup>71</sup>. The Bulgarian borders and the division of projected in S. Stefano, great Bulgarian state, were regulated with this Protocol.

The next step was to confirm the revision of the S. Stefano peace agreement. With the decisions of the Berlin's congress, San Stefano's Bulgaria was divided on the Principalities- Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. The borders of the new Bulgarian vassal Principality would be settled, but the Bulgarian participation would be very minor. The primary role would have the representatives of the Great Powers. That was the price for the limited freedom.

The creation of the Bulgarian constitution was regulated with the decisions of the Congress in Berlin. The Russians could not miss an opportunity to make an influence in the process of the creating of the first Bulgarian constitution. Count Dondukov, presented a draft constitution to the Assembly with the explanation that it was designed only to facilitate their work. The final decision belongs to Bulgarians<sup>72</sup>. That was a truth. However there was another truth. The Bulgarian constitution of 1879 was a deed of the Bulgarian liberals and Russians counselors<sup>73</sup>, as well.

The election of the Bulgarian Prince was the issue on which the Russians would have a primary role. The Bulgarians were disposed to see Count Igantiev or Count Dondukov on their throne<sup>74</sup>. It was obvious that the creator of S. Stefano's peace agreement, Ignatiev, was the most desired person for Bulgarian Prince, but he was, also, the most hatred person in Constantinople. Thus he was not acceptable for the Ottomans. Russians were well aware of this fact.

---

<sup>71</sup> Србија 1878, с. 363.

<sup>72</sup> L.S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans...*, p. 427.

<sup>73</sup> С. Павловић, *Историја...*, с. 203.

<sup>74</sup> Освобождение Болгарии от турецкого ига, т. 3, Москва, 1967, с. 402.

Even in the S. Stefano's peace agreement they settled an article which excludes any possibility that some member of the European ruling families could ascent on the Bulgarian throne. Russians did not want to see anyone on the Bulgarian throne who could not comply with their interests, but it was a very hard task to find a person who would not be objected by the other Powers. There were six candidates on the Bulgarian throne, but under Russian recommendations Alexander von batenberg was elected for the first Bulgarian Prince. Perhaps the best proof for Russian involvement in the Prince's election was the speech of the Bishop of Trnovo, Clement, during the Assembly session which dealt with the election of the new Bulgarian Prince. He, although had said some words for the other two candidates, spoke for the Alexander on the most exalted way, not forgetting to mention Batenberg's familiar relations with the Russian imperial family<sup>75</sup>. Although the Bulgarian Assembly did the election of the new Prince, the fact remains that Russian influenced such decisions.

We could conclude that Balkan's independent and autonomous states were created with direct involvement of the Great Powers. The Balkan's peoples were weak to achieve a freedom with their forces. They needed foreign support to get freedom. It is worth to mention that the Powers were induced to involve in the Balkan's affairs. Most of them were proponent of preserving the status quo. They did not want to see dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Even more, except for Russia, they did not have plans for creating of new independent states in the region in lieu of the Ottoman Empire.

The events on the ground induced the Powers to intervene, in the most occasion, in the favor of the local peoples. Of course such help was not being given for reasons of philanthropy. As I have mentioned in the introduction, they had interests in the region. Their interests did not correspond with those of the Balkans peoples. Even more they did not pay much attention about the interests and wishes of the local peoples. Diplomats from the Great Powers, as Sowards noted, did not take into account the wishes of their citizens, so why listen to Balkan peasants?<sup>76</sup> Also, most probably, they did not understand the region, but no one could oppose the fact that they had the main role in the creation of the final decisions. The Powers decided the extensions of the borders of the new Balkan's states. Of course, it was done according their interests. As a result of such decisions many of Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians remained within the framework of the Ottoman Empire. But it is true that they could not gain their freedom without the support of the Powers. Also, as we have seen, they had the primary role in the processes of the choosing the Balkan's rulers.

---

<sup>75</sup> *ibid.*, c. 574.

<sup>76</sup> [www. Lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html](http://www.Lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect.10.html)

The Powers had not intention to create so strong independent or autonomous states in the region. The new created states were small in territory with disputable economical capacities. Such situation was very favorable for the evolving of the Balkan's nationalism which would challenge the Powers in the future. Also, in the future the Powers would convince themselves that they could not control the small Balkan's states.

However, it was indisputable that the involvement of the Powers in the Balkan's affairs had also a positive side. Their involvement brought a freedom.

*(Doc. dr Vanchp Gjorgjiev)*

Далибор ЈОВАНОВСКИ

**ГОЛЕМИТЕ СИЛИ И СОЗДАВАЊЕТО  
НА БАЛКАНСКИТЕ ДРЖАВИ  
ВО XIX ВЕК**

**Резиме**

*Улогата на Големите европски сили во создавањето на современите балкански држави е голема. Сепак, постоела една голема причина за нивното вмешување во регионот. Без никаков сомнеж тоа биле воспоставувањата на балканските народи против османлиската власт. Иако големите сили не сакале да ја ослабнат Османлиската држава со одвојување на делови од нејзината територија и превземање на испратените во независни или автономни држави состојби на теренот едноставно то неле наложувале тоа. Неспособноста на османлиските сили брзо и ефикасно да се справат со бунтовниците била една од причините за вмешување на Големите сили во судирите. Иако Србиите први ќе кренат воспоставувањата против османлиската власт, заради интересите на европските сили, Грците први ќе добијат независна држава во 1830 г. Србија ќе мора да чека на тој случај до 1878 година. Кога пак е во прашање создавањето на бугарската држава, мора да се нагласи дека бугарската вооружена борба во никој случај не може да се спореди со онаа на Србиите и Грците. Меѓутоа, интересот на Русија овозможил, и покрај целосно неуспешното Априлското востание од 1876 г., да се создаде автономна бугарска држава.*