

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

Spring 1925

## The Near Eastern problem in world politics

Iliya Mimovich  
*University of Iowa*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

No known copyright restrictions.

This thesis is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/6040>

---

### Recommended Citation

Mimovich, Iliya. "The Near Eastern problem in world politics." MA (Master of Arts) thesis, State University of Iowa, 1925.

<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.jb79ohx4>

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM  
IN  
WORLD POLITICS

By  
Iliya Mimovich

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate  
College of the State University  
of Iowa in Partial Fulfillment  
of the requirements for  
the Degree  
of  
MASTER OF <sup>Arts</sup> ~~SCIENCE~~

---

Iowa City, Iowa

June, 1925

### Prefatory Note

This thesis in its present form does not meet with the unqualified approval of the Committee. It was intended that the candidate should go over it thoroughly, with a view to making it conform more nearly to the standards usually adhered to in a master's thesis. However, the ill health of the candidate, and various other extenuating circumstances have influenced the committee to accept this paper in lieu of a finished thesis. This action is taken with the advice and consent of the dean of the Graduate College and the heads of the departments concerned.

#### Committee:

Kirk H. Porter

George E. Robeson

J.J. Sherman

Louis Pelzer

Miss Clara Daley

D E D I C A T E D

To those who constantly promote  
the general peace of the World  
and <sup>the</sup> universal progress of mankind.

## INTRODUCTION

If the sun <sup>should</sup> declare but one war upon the stars or the stars upon the sun there would be neither stars, nor sun, nor us, nor Universe----There would be chaos, ~~of chaos~~. If we mortals continue fighting with modern technic in armament, as we did with primitive tools, it is certain that huge Empires of Hell ~~of Hell~~ will be created all over earth. I say so on account of my six years of war experience.

Videat mundus ne quid detrimenti res humane caperat!

The purpose of these papers is to show that the Near East had never been far from international hatred, perpetual wars, general misery and universal misery. Moreover, these papers will endeavor to lay stress upon the possibility of solving the problem of the Near East.

Up to the present days the history of mankind does not throw clearer light upon those eventful moments where, when and how the first human individuals appeared on the face of mater terra. The history also covers with its veil of the incessant darkness a great deal of human actions, which,

occurred during the earliest centuries and even does not mention when the Eastern Question was neither terra incognita, nor any sort of problem. As history does not possess neither an evident corpus delicti nor a scrupulous argument in the matter concerned, we are inclined to believe and say, of course, a priori, that Eastern Question exists since those immemorial days, when the words East and West had been pronounced for the first time, when Asia and Europe were "baptized", and, especially, since inhabitants of Euro-Asian continent began to grow, move in different directions and come in touch with each other either through search for new settlements and daily means of living and existence, or through a brutal desire for the mutual struggles, conquest of "foreign" territories and subordination of "alien" peoples. Some historians had expressed the opinion that Eastern Question is even older than the appearance of the first human individuals upon the "skin" of the earth, because "when men did not fight for the conquest of the Near Eastern area, then, the giants and ancient gods have had the perpetual quarrel and struggles for the supremacy of their powers and prerogatives of rights on the Eastern territory". \*

---

\* It is, of course, very hard to find out whether those giants and gods had had secret diplomacy, treaties, alliances, great powers and large and small or weak states. It is also uncertain how they made wars, i. e., whether they had modern technique in armament or not. If they didn't have it, we certainly have it!!

In the course of times/ the Eastern Question grew and only grew towards such an extention that in the era of recent centuries was developed into one among the "fatest" and most enigmatic problems ever existing upon the globe of us mortal beings. The publicists of earlier and particularly recent times being confronted with such an extensive and complecated question had found out worthy to divide this "fat" question into the ~~three~~ "thiner" problems called the Far East, Middle East and Near East problems. Each of these three questions had been, still are and nobody knows how far they will play the three among most predominating factors on the cloudy and quite dark horizon of the international relations and world politics. A good many of those students who had been interested in~~to~~<sup>the</sup> detailed study of these questions had come to almost general and pessimistic conclusions that, perhaps these problems will be solved, entirely solved, when there will be neither East nor West, nor any of us mortals to make such univeral<sup>s</sup> problems and to try to bring about their primitive or most modern and human solution. Omores! Otempora!!--thus would Cicero exclaim again, seeing what kind of problems are these difficult questions of the Orient. But despite such a fact we are inclined to believe that since men are capable of making such hard problems they are also capable of finding out their solutions. What kind of solutions there will be we do not dare

to prophesy but we repeat the Latin proverb, *tempora mutantur et nos in illos*, and if there cannot be reached any other method of solutions, then, it seems very probable that neither Near Eastern, nor Far Eastern, nor middle East, nor hundreds and thousands of others and most significant international problems shall be ever solved by any other means save by the world-wide revolution, or by another monster of world war, which will crush down the existing regime of governments and system of the "parcelation" of peoples, which will mightily ruin the present methods of the international hatred, quarrels, disputes, wars, havocs and miseries, and, which will plant at the ruins of present and general chaos the universal renaissances of peace and progress of the entire of mankind.

As a being who firmly believes in brotherhood and sisterhood of all peoples throughout the world; who is also convinced that there is neither happiness nor any sort of a real progress of human races unless there is secured the existance of but one and a great WORLD STATE, extending its dominion all over our planet; who believes not in hundreds and thousands of states, races and nations but in only one state, one race and one nation as we scientifically, really and naturally are; who considers himself as a humble citizen of the world;\*who is, until death and after death, a faithful adherent of pacifism--such a human individual should not, by any means, mention such horrible words as wars and revolutions, but hundreds and thousands of times, *helas!* The

---

\* I am an artificial citizen of Jugo-Slavia but a natural citizen of America, China and of the other states, i.e., I am a natural citizen of the world.



peoples of the earth are neither aware of their mutual and brutal dealings nor are they sufficiently educated and experienced in what they are, what they do or where they run in performance of their accustomed and primitive acts; they are not predisposed to give up their mutual disputes to be peaceably settled by world institutions; they do not care to look to the bright light of the sun but they are getting blind by gazing at the pale light of the candle, and more than that, all over the world there are the modern masters and modern slaves. Why? Moreover, the history of all previous generations and epochs had clearly demonstrated that almost all of the greater results towards the liberty, democracy and self-existence had been reached but through springs and rivers of the human blood, and through the creation of another atmosphere of people's sighs and tears. Let it not be thus in the future; but the events of history used to be repeated and how and when the huge masses of the peoples throughout the world can be quickly emancipated from fighting and by ferocious beasts and become the peace loving, co-operative and civilized beings!?!

As had been already pointed out the Eastern Question is very comprehensive and being ~~as~~ such the following exposition will take into consideration but the Near Eastern Problem with particular attention to Balkan Peninsula. By taking a short walk through tiresome events of this question,

which has to deal primarily with politics, it would be worth-while of suggesting any scheme toward the solution of the problem concerned. And, if there will be provided sooner or later any available good or approximately better solution of this question, then, simultaneously there would be cured a living wound upon the world organisms, and will be covered by the everlasting and suffocating crater of peace and progress, not only of those people of the Near East and those of Europe but those of the whole world as well.

## C O N T E N T S

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. LOCATION AND POPULATION.....	7
II. DEFINITION, SIGNIFICANCE AND DIVISION..	11
III. THE PROGRESS OF OTTOMAN CONQUESTS.....	20
IV. FROM BATTLE OF VIENNA TO NAPOLEON'S ERA, (1683-1800).....	35
V. THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM IN NAPOLEON'S ERA.....	55
VI. FROM VIENNA TO BERLIN CONGRESS (1815-1878).....	68
VII. FROM BERLIN TO PRESENT TIMES (1878-1925).....	85
VIII. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE NEAR EAST AND POSSIBLE SOLUTION OF ITS PROBLEM.....	110

## CHAPTER I.

### LOCATION AND POPULATION

The Near East is attractive like a promised land, but alas! there perished the best ideals in everlasting struggles.

A. Pushkin.

It may approximately be estimated that the Turkish dominions in Europe and Asia Minor in the middle of the eighteenth century measured over 1,002,000 square miles and about 35,000,000 population.

It is quite difficult to make exact or approximate boundaries of the region, which had been entitled to bear the "honorable" name, the Near East, or "Debatable Land" or "hot bed" of Europe, or "Danger Zone" of ~~the~~ world politics. However, generally speaking, the area of the Near East covers that classic region of earth, which lies about the eastern basin of the Mediterranean Sea and which, according to authentic arguments of ~~the~~ history embraces the most interesting region on the surface of the globe. Accordingly, this region will comprize all South-eastern

part of Europe, taking the river Danub as the rough boundary in the north; all the islands eastward of Corfu and Crete, which themselves, are included; all of the north-eastern corner of Africa that is fit for settled human habitation, and all of south-western Asia that lies on the higher side of a truly distinctive and natural boundary. In other words, the lands, which fringe the Eastern portion of the Mediterranean Sea and which are known as Balkan Peninsula, Egypt and Asia Minor are included in the Near East Question. Almost all of this region has a favorable climate and fertile soil for cultivation. There are also different kinds of minerals but up to present days are very far from being sufficiently used and explored but since the middle of the nineteenth century there is a great tendency towards the rational cultivation of the lands and systematic exploration of minerals like iron, silver, copper, coal. In a few places there are timbers and oil wells.

Concerning communication in this region we may say that from ~~the~~ times immemorial the trade between the East and West had progressed day by day and followed well defined routes. As argumentum ad hominem of such a developed communication, there are still in existence a good many of the excellent caravan routes, which had been built in ~~the~~ ancient and medieval times. Since Vasco de Gama, in <sup>n</sup>year 1498, ~~has~~ opened a sea route to India and particularly since the Suez

Canal had been built in 1869 the trade and commerce between the Far East, Middle East, Near East and West had been greatly enlarged. The promotion of trade and commerce had begun to play a more important role since the communicative means driven by the steam power began to be developed during the second part of the past and by the dawn of the present century. Since such a means of transportation had been developed a great deal of railroads were built which had immensely extended the commerce and trade and greatly facilitated the promotion of industry and modern agriculture in certain regions of the Near East. Of these railroads it is worth while to mention the so-called "Bagdad Cahn" running from Constantinople across part of Asia Minor down to Bagdad. The construction of this railroad had developed in Turkey the very well known "railways diplomacy", as later on will be referred to.

Concerning the population of the Near East it is a known fact that the mixture of different stocks, blood and races had played the constant role since the earliest times down to the present days. In different periods of times this mixture had occurred in larger or less extent. Since the end of the sixth century there might have been distinguished the following peoples: Jugo-Slaves (Serbs, Bulgarians, Croets and Slavenes) Rumenians, Albanians, Latins\* and Greeks living in the Balkan Peninsula; the Turks, residing since

---

\* Latins do not exist now.

the middle of the fourteenth century in Balkans and Asia Minor, Syrians, Armenians, Arabians and Persians in Asia Minor and Egyptians inhabiting the north-eastern portion of Africa, known since time of "Faraons" as Egypt. Out of these peoples Jugo-Slaves, Roumenians, Bulgars, Greeks and Armenians and partly Albanians are followers of Christ and the other to the greatest extent are of the Mohamadan religion. Of these peoples will be more spoken in the following chapters.

## CHAPTER II.

### DEFINITION, SIGNIFICANCE AND DIVISION

Vivos voco, mortuos plango,  
Fulgur-a frago.

Fr. Schiller.

What did not occur and what as yet will not occur in this huge and enigmatic world? As far as history penetrates in the past it discovers that the inhabitants of the Near Eastern area had been in ceaseless quarrels, disputes and wars. Of course, they being under the influence of different races, climates, environments, religions, customs, habits, traditions, ideas, institutions as well as under an unequal and insufficient education, strong and primitive instincts of brutal fightings and desires toward subordination of other peoples--offered a good many causes and reasons for the Near East to be very far from having the longer peace of better order, or any farther steps towards the real progress and civilization. Taking all above mentioned into consideration it would be also necessary for the better understanding of this question to be thoroughly absorbed into psychology of masses of those different peoples who throughout many centuries settled these regions. As the space of this essay is quite limited the psychological causes of this pro-



blems have to be postponed for another time. Now turning to another and for the present exposition more important point we find out that, in the very dawn of authentic history, about the creation and solution of this question there had been fought long and lasting battles between the Persians and Greeks. During the East Roman period (330-717) there occurred a series of strong invasions against East Roman Empire by the wild hordes of Saracenes and Persians, and a good many struggles of greater or less importance. During the Byzantine period (717-1071) the quarrels and struggles had been renewed with the Saracene tribes and with the course of times the Byzantine empire had been enlarged to a great extent by many victories upon surrounding and foreign tribes. In the year 1071, the Byzantine emperor, Romanos IV, after a good many ~~of~~ brilliant victories, conquests of lands and subordination of the other peoples, finally was suddenly defeated by the Seljuk Turks in Asia Minor. This military disaster of Byzantine empire had as its consequence the complete loss of Asia Minor. During the Greek period (1071-1118) a long contest between crusaders and infidels began for the possession of the lands hallowed to every Christians by their association with the life of Christ on the earth. Later on, about the year 1204-1261, the struggles between the Greeks and Latins had been several times renewed. In 1353 the Turks succeeded in securing the first foothold on the European soil and a century later, 1453, they

obtained the key of Asia and Europe, they conquered Constantinople from the quarreling Bysantinean rulers and step by step, war by war, victory by victory, began to conquer and subordinate to their Asiatic yoke one by one the states of Balkan and in constant and energetic advance they reached the center of Europe in the memorial year 1529. In the same year they besieged for the first time the Austrian capital, Vienna.

From the above mentioned periods there is a possibility to understand the actual complication of the situation prevailing in the Near East since the earliest days of history. There was neither longer peace nor better order. According to such a chaos of perpetual quarrels and long lasting collisions among different peoples, a great number of prominent writers had endeavored, not one time, to describe the importance and make clear as possible: what is understood under the name of Near East question, and what kind of a satisfactory definition should be given to such a problem. Here follows but a few opinions:

The prominent Turkish historian Ali Nedgid said: "The Near Eastern Question is similar to cross roads where will never be any start to make highways towards the real civilization."

Mr. Stojan Novakwich, the known Serbian writer said: "The Near East Question is of a very difficult nature and

it does not exist because it was so created by God but as it is so inugurated by too long fingers of great powers."

Lord Morley giving a quite authoritative and satisfactory definition announced: "that shifting, intractable and interwoven tangle of conflicting interest, rival peoples, and antagonistic paths that is veiled under the easy name of the Eastern Question."

A brilliant French publicist, E. Driault, gave the two following definitions (1) "Le problem de la ruine de la puissance politic de l'Islani" and (2) "La retraite de l'Islani en Europe et en Asia donna naissance a la question d'Orient."

Dr. Miller gave a particular definition by pointing out that "the Near Eastern Question may be defined as the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire from Europe".

The noted German writer Emie Adler said "The Near Eastern question is similar to a sick man who is always dying but always lives and constantly demands the new sort of the medecines."

The eminent statesman of Greece, Mr. Venizelos, had said: "There is no doubt that the Question of Near East involves the more difficult problem than any statesman or publicist can understand and describe its scope. It cannot be solved according to egoistic aspiration of different nation-

alities residing in the Near Eastern area, but it may be favorably solved either according to mutual and unselfish understanding of all of those peoples of the Orient or according to an aggressive spirit of modern democracy and education of the peoples."

All of the above mentioned definitions can be interpreted in different ways, and according to such interpretations may be reached a satisfactory or unsatisfactory conclusion and results. But, according to our opinion, we are inclined to say that the Near Eastern Question involves such a complicated problem whose wise and tactful study and solution has to secure in the future the long or longer peace and constant prosperity to all of those peoples residing in the region of the Near East area plus taking into consideration the vital interests of the other peoples of the world, who are directly or indirectly connected with the Near Eastern situation. By saying thus, we--volens nolens--have always to bear in mind that: military power of one or many states can be temporarily or permanently crushed down; the wrong or good policy of one or many countries may take contrary or satisfactory trend, explanation and application towards one state or the entire world, but almost none of the peoples whenever or wherever they live and reside should not and cannot be fundamentally deprived of their lives and the means for the existence of their individualism. Indeed, the people or peoples can change the

form of state and government, language, territory, religion, customs and even their previous name but never the instinct for the existence. Moreover, it is absurd to believe that the present governing regime in the Near East and in the whole world will remain fully unchanged until the end of civilization. The entire system of the present world politics is similar to the relation among the smaller and larger groups of noted bandits and eminent gamblers. By telling thus, we add that neither one individual nor a whole mass of peoples, nor even the whole world are deprived of the possibility to stand forever and ever by old doctrines, traditions, theories and practice. The prerogatives of existence of life are more reasonable and stronger than the instinct of subordination, chauvinism, militarism, war, state boundaries and "golden" policy plus secret diplomacy. Who can deny it?!

In addition to "golden" policy and "secret diplomacy" we dare say that even the smallest atom in the huge and never perceivable machinery of the Universe had never been and will never be thoroughly separated of every and anything in the immeasurable space. When such an order in the vast Nature-- why human individuals at the small globe should not follow the universal and natural laws and bring about better understanding and more human co-operation among all of us mortals throughout the world. When such a dominating dogma in the enigmatic Universe--it is folly and selfishness to argue and believe that the Eastern Question involves but the down

fall of Turkish empire, or an expulsion of its criminal and tyrannic reign and policy from Europe, or division of the Turkish territory among the world powers, small and weak nations, or co-operation and mutual understanding among these nations of the Orient. The first Balkan war in 1912, the second Balkan war of 1913, and particularly the World War, 1914-1918, had demonstrated to every one that the Near Eastern Question does not involve ~~neither~~ local, ~~nor~~ of a certain state, ~~nor~~ the whole of Balkans, ~~nor~~ of entire European, but comprises world wide problem and politics. In accordance to such an evident fact, the solution of this question shall not, and must not, and can not be based upon the previous principles of jus gentium but upon most modern conception of jus mundi. Any attempt to resort this question in favor of the previous history of diplomacy based on the "Balance of powers" or on the accustomed jus gentium would lead the responsible factors from less folly to greater folly, from greater error and chaos to greatest international conflicts, and from minor comedy of a few peoples or states to universal ~~tragedy~~ comedy of entire mankind. On the other hand, if this question has to be solved on the basis of modern principles of jus mundi, which principles inaugurate even such a strange rule that peoples all over our planet can, according to modern means of transportations and communications, neither act nor even think and speak separately, then we are entering

another era--an era of not creating the new international problems and modern conflicts, but of solving those of the past, and of creating a new status quo in the world under whose auspice there will very scarcely or never blow the "old wind" of international and interstates hatreds, disputes, havocs, miseries, mysteries and wars.

Those students of international affairs, who are interested in this question and had endeavored to look into it from inside and outside point of view, would at once find themselves closed in the "labirintus" of problems, whose solution are varying from the smallest to the greatest importance. At the first sight some of these questions look so odd and of unapproachable to solution as ancient Eroglyphics and Sphink of Egypt are far from being grasped by the human mind. Being so complicated and in order to have at least an easier entrance and survey it is necessary to devide it into the following four smaller sections:

First and primarily: The role of Ottomans, otherwise called Turks, since they secured foothold in Europe circa middle of the fourteenth century until the present days;

Secondly: The position of the loosly designated Balkan States which like Albania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Roumenia had been conquered by Turks and later re-emerged; or like Macedonia which was passing from conqueror; or like Montenegro, which had never been conquered by Turks, or like Bosna and Herzegovina which had been conquered by the Turks

and later on annexed by the dualistic-Austro-Hungarian monarchy;

Thirdly: The problem of the possession of Constantinople and particularly the problem of egress from the Black Sea through the straits of Bosphorus and of Dardanelles to the Mediterranean sea as well as on free ingress of navigation from the Mediterranean through mentioned straits to the Black sea;

Fourthly: The attitude of the great powers towards all of the Near Eastern area or toward the particular zones of its region.

All of these "sections" will be discussed in the following chapters.



### CHAPTER III.

#### THE PROGRESS OF OTTOMAN CONQUESTS

In accordance with the prevailing opinion it is generally believed that modern history begins under the steeple of the Ottoman conquest. Whether this general opinion can be accepted as certain and authoritative or not it is a question. However, it is a certain fact that the Near Eastern problem would either be tabula rasa, or would take entirely another trend, or would be but an mere atopia, if the role of Turks is to be omitted. In other words, it means neither more nor less than to speak of the Near East, without taking into consideration the Turks, as to speak of a human being without taking into consideration his soul and body, or describe the vast space of the Universe without telling: there is a land of mortals and the sun, without whose existence there would be no existence of those mortals nor to the other movable and immovable beings. Indeed, in order to understand the Near Eastern question it is an utmost necessity to say a few words about the Turks, about their invasion from Asia to Europe, and their "very nice

279003

visit" to their brethren of Europe and the "politest" endeavor of their European brothers to send them "safely" back to Asia.

As far as it is known to historians and archeologists the cradle of the human race is to be found somewhere in Asia. The cradle of Turks, otherwise called Ottomas, Ottomas and Osmalis, is doubtless also over there, but it is difficult of ascertaining the date of origin of the name of their tribes, or say, of the Turkish people. History knows their name firstly by the end of the sixth century A. D. By that time their military advance began to grow rapidly in Asia Minor. In those days as well as in later times they did not have either State's organization nor any conception of race and nationality, but had been led from conquest to conquest and from victory to victory by means of their utmost unbelievable faith and fanaticism to their Mohamidan religion. Albert Sorel said about the Turks and their state: "Il n'y a point de nation turque mais seulement des conquerants camps au milieu de populations hostiles; le turks ne forment point un etat mais une armee qui ne vaut que pour la conquete et tend a se dissoudre des qu'elle est contrainte de s'arreter". Accordingly, it is an evident fact that in days they appeared in the pages of history they were but innumerable and wild hordes or bands of primitive but instinctive warriors. They offered an excellent resource of raw

material but there was no factory to manufacture goods-- i. e., to make an organized army and modern state, too. But no matter whether they were organized or not, civilized or barbarian, it is a known fact that modern problems of the Near East finds its genesis in the several collisions between Orientalism as represented by Islam and Occidentalism as represented by Christianity. Moreover, the Koran (gospel) of Mohamed of Meca and Medina, prophet of Allah, was a living spring without which the medieval and modern history of the world would be deprived of one among most dominating factors. In order to understand the political history of the Near East one must distinguish several stages that had followed the high tide and low ebb of Ottomans. These stages are: First, the original and starting conquests for the Sake of Mohamedism by the Sazacenes in the seventh century; (2) The Saracenic empires as they centered at Damascus and Bagdad until their downfall circa year 1000; (3) the great re-enforcement of Islam by the conversion of the Turanian Turks and particularly of that branch known as Ottomans, who had penetrated into Europe in the fourteenth century and reached their "High Tide" in the end of the seventeenth century-- pending their second siege of Vienna; (4) the constant decay of the Ottoman Empire since the siege of Vienna and since the practical expulsion of their policy and power from Europe in the dawn of the present century. The first and second

stages as well as the first part of the third stage, dealing with re-enforcement of Islam, are inimportant for the purpose of this essay. We shall take into consideration the second part of the third stage dealing with penetrations of the Turks into Europe, and the fourth stage, dealing with the decay of their political influence at the forum of world politics. In postponing the mentioned stages for some later times, we must, however, bear in mind that the Ottomans, prior to entering Europe had rapidly proceeded in conquests of the whole of Asia Minor, with Syria, Persia and Palestine. Moreover, they had been capable of inqurating their religion to all tribes in North Africa, which tribes, now converted to adherents of Islam, crowded into Spain and from Spain reached the present France. In the year 732 the Frankish ruler, Charles, defeated them in the famous battle of Tour. The consequence of this battle had been that faith of Islam escaped forever to take more dominions in the Western part of Europe. Frankland and Western Christendum had been saved from barbarism of Islam. But what happened on the south eastern part of Europe?

As we had already pointed out, Turkey never was an organized state, according to modern terminology of a State. It might have been said particularly prior to the tenth century but prior to that time there were a good many campus' of their hordes. One of these campus' inhabited by wild

bands similar to those of Huns, Avars and Vandales was located in the middle of the thirteenth century in the North-western corner of Asia Minor with a "metropole" at Yenishere. The ruler of these hords, which ran into wars and conquests as flies to "fly paper", was Ertogrul. He was succeeded in 1288 by his son Osman or Othman, "from whom the tribe, destined to fame as the conquerors of Constantinople and inheritors of the Bysantine Empire, took their name". He extended his power of control at the expense of others in Turkish tribes, but mainly on account of the Greek Empire in Asia Minor. About the middle of the fourteenth century he assumed the title of Sultan and won a good many victories over the Greeks. A few years later his hordes began to push in the direction of the Black Sea, conquering one by one the cities on the southern coast of the sea. He later on was crowned as a "virtual lord of the Asiatic Greeks." His son Orkham, for whom there are lots of tales as being a lover of peace and work, in reality continued the work of his father by extending the dominion of Turkish conquest. During his reign (1326-1359) the remainder of Bysantine Empire in Asia and Europe was tottering to its fall and to Orkhan's victorious knees. It also was in the era of civil wars and anarchy too. Many rulers were proclaimed of which Paleologue and Cantacuzenos had been crowned as the two emperors of one Bysantine Empire. In their mutual quarrels

both of them appealed to Sultan Orchan for help. He sent military help to Cantacusenes, and as a prize for it got for his harem Cantacusene's charming daughter, Theodora. This supposedly marriage was not only marriage of Theodora to Orchan but the beginning of a new and long era in which as a dowry to Orchan's followers went one by one of the Balkan states and chains of Asiatic tyranny and barbarism had been put on all of the Balkan peoples for more than five centuries. In 1353 Cantacusenos, now as a "father-in-law" again appealed for help against aggressive movement of Serbia Tzar Dushan, the great, who conquered Macedonia and threatened from the north Cantacuzenos's part of the empire. The "son-in-law" sent his son Solyman, who crossed at the shores of the Balkan Peninsula. Just before he and his army reached there an earthquake had thrown down the walls of Gallipoly the stratigically located fortress-town on the Hellespont. From ruined stones Solaymen made hast by making a military fortification. Cantacuzenos asked him several times to return back to Asia but his answer was made by laconica brevitate: "The will of Allah rather than your invitation or my force of arms had ruined this city to make for my conquest a new station and to open the gates of Europe to my future victories." Upon hearing such an answer Kantacuzenos appealed for help to Serbs and Bulgarians, but both of the invited parties answered: "Three years ago we

protested against your unholy alliance with the Turks. Now that the storm has broken let the Greeks weather it. If the Turks come against us we shall know how to defend ourselves." Both of these parties made a cardinal mistake in not sending the help as the Greeks had gone astray by calling Turks in Europe to settle Greek quarrels by the points of swords. Venice was also invited to save Bysantine but helas! in those days the jealousy and rivalry between Greece and Venice was mostly the same as in present days among great powers of the world, and Venetian government was very anxious to see the naval power of her rival be destroyed by the invading Turks. So Venice made a third mistake and since that time until the end of Turkish Euro-Asian Empire in 1918, the Turks fought in Europe and Asia no longer as auxiliaries but openly as primus inter pares et potentes. In 1366 they transferred their capital from Asia Minor to Adrianopole, thereby declaring to the world that Ottomans intend to become a European power. As soon as they established their throne on European soil they undertook almost a gigantic movement against different peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. In their advance towards the "heart" of Europe (so many writers used to so honor Vienna) they came in unfriendly touch with Romans, Greeks, Albanians, South Slaves and Romanian peoples. The history of Greeks and Romans Empires and civilization is quite known. However, the history of the other peoples of

the Balkan Peninsula is very little or entirely unknown, and it is worth while to say a few words about it.

The Albanians are descendents of Illirians who had established a kind of primitive state in the Epirus, in the fourth century B. C. In the thirteenth and fourteenth century they moved, as nomadic people, in north and thus inhabited the mountains called Arbanas or Albania. In accordance with the name of the region in which they lived they began to call themselves Albanians. Until the first Balkan war in 1912, they never contributed any important factor to Balkan nor to the whole Near Eastern problem.

South-Slave or Jugo-Slave people are but a part of the Slave or Slavic race. In the fifth century they lived together with the present Polish, Bohemian and Russian peoples. Their common state was the south western part of Russia. While there they lived a nomadic and patriarchal life by adoring many Gods of the earth and sky. By the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century they crossed mountains of Carpathes and the Danub river and reached the Balkan Peninsula. Upon reaching the Balkans they quickly spread all over the Peninsula. The Roman emperor Heraclius was not capable of preventing these Slave tribes from invading the Roman boundaries in Balkan. During the seventh and eighth centuries these tribes, according to location in which they lived, began to call themselves by different names as Bulgars,\* Serbs, Croets and Slavenes. Since they began to be concentrated a-

\* It is generally believed that Bulgars were not originally Slaves but there is a great controversy about such a question.



round their names they also began to endeavor to frame the separate states and to have the national feeling. Thus, for instance, Serbs began to form states in Bosna and Herzegovina, Zeta (present Montenegro) and Serbea. These states comprised the middle and western regions of Balkan Peninsula. These small states had been ruled by chieftians called "grandZhupan" who, after the tenth century, began to claim and possess the royal power and domination. Prior to the end of the ninth century the Greeks succeeded in converting Serbs and Bulgars to the Greek orthodox type of Christian religion. Croats and Slovenes, being near the Venetian dominion became Roman Catholic. Just when the Turks were pushing towards the center of Balkan, all Serbian tribes were united in a big state, whose ruler was Tsar Stephan Durhan Nemanich (1335-1353). He was crowned as the emperor of the Serbs, Bulgars and Greeks and was undeniably after coronation preparing an attack on Constantinople. His plan might have been successful and probably would force the Turks to return to Asia, but just on his way to Constantinople the sudden death ruined his life and his ambitions too. After his death, the civil war started which was an excellent help to Turks who were pushing ahead. Emperor Lazar Hrebelianovich, who was crowned after the civil war was over, tried in the battle of Kosovopolje (The Field of Black birds) to repulse the attacks of the Turks. His endeavor and that of his brave soldiers were in vain. In this struggle both emperors, Tur-

kish Morat and Serbian Lasar, had been killed but the Turks won victory on the 15th of June 1389.\* After this battle one by one of the Serbian provinces and one by one of the states were subdued to Turkish yoke. In 1469 Bosna and Hercegorina had been conquered and by such an act the last glimpse of Serbian liberty was lost except in Montenegro. After the Kosovo battle, the Serbian aristocracy moved in gigantic rocks and mountains of Montenegro (Crna Gora). They did so in order to preserve the Serbian name, customs and Christian religion. The Montenegrines had been partly twice invaded by the Turks but "Heroes of Heroes" both times gave disastrous shocks to the Turkish military forces. From 1462 to 1804 those Serbian people, who could not escape the enslavement to the Turkish yoke had been treated with unbelievable oppression, cruelty and utterest barbarisms from the side of the Turks.

The Croats and Slavenes had been settled at the western region of the Balkan Peninsula. They organized the separate states but later on were conquered by the Turks and Austro Hungarians.

The Bulgarians, in 660, captured from the Greeks the part of Varna on the Black sea. Until the end of the seventh century their territory extended from Danub to the range of Balkan. Later on Bulgaria was conquered by Bysantine empire.

---

\* The Serbian national poetry describing this battle is compared with Homer's Ilyad and Odissey. Goete, the famous German and Pushkin, famous Russian, poets learned Serbian to read in original the named poetry.

During one hundred and fifty years she remained under Bysnatine. In the last quarter of the twelfth century she won her indépendance but shortly after had been conquered by Serbia. Again she was liberated but in the year 1396 her Tzar Shishman III had been compelled to acknowledge himself as a vassal of the Turkish empire. By this fact Bulgaria also was done. Now the Turks turned their victorious arm against Hungary. Sigismude, the King of Hungary, appealed for help to whole Europe. On his appeal Pope Bonface IX proclaimed a crusade. On his call over one hundred thousand soldiers had been gathered together from France, Germany and a few number from England, Scotland and Flanders. That army called "the flower of the Christian world" was under command of Sigismude. Sigismude lead it to help Bulgaria and in the battle of Nikopolis this "flower" was quelled or drowned in the Danube or captured by the Turks. Even Sigismude scarcely escaped death by running down to the Black Sea. This battle was a gorgious triumph of the Ottomans arms not only upon Bulgaria and Hungary but as well upon all of the Christian world.

The Roumanians, at the beginning of the second century, occupied the territory between the rivers Dniester, Tissa and Danube, then known as Dacia. At this time the Romans comquered the country and imposed upon them the Latin language. Until the end of the eighth century Romania had been overrun by the wild tribes of Goths, Huns, Avars and Slavs, too. At the beginning of the ninth century Roumania entered

war with Hungary and until the last quarter of the fifteenth century she had long struggles with Hungarians, Tatars, Poles and Germans respectively. At the dawn of the sixteenth century Roumania had been conquered by the Turks and became a vassalage of the Turkish Emperors. Thus Roumania also was done as an independent state.

After the victory of Nikopolis the Ottomans overran all of Greek territory save Athens, Salonica, extreme south of Morea and Constantinople. In the year 1453 Constantinople had been conquered and by its fall the entire Balkan Peninsula except Montenegro was subordinated to the will of wild hords of the Ottomans. Thus all of the Balkan states ceased to exist as independent units, but continued to exist as Turkish provinces called "pashalueks".

During their progress of the conquests in Asia Minor and Africa they conquered in the first half of the sixteenth century Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestina, Arabia and Egypt.

The Turks, upon conquering the Balkan States, started their firm advent toward the center of Europe. In their victorious march they defeated the Hungarians in the battle of Muchacs in 1526. Thus also Hungary was crushed down below the hoofs of Turkish horses, which act went into known proverb of the Orient: "Where the Turk plants his foot the grass never grows again". Indeed, the reign of Turks over those subordinated Christians called "gehjas" or "djahurs" was ruthless and almost unbearable. They did to those con-

quered peoples all that they might have found suitable to their brutal instincts and wild wills. They used to say "what pleases to us all is prescribed by Koran". When an older Greek said to the Turks, "Is it prescribed by your Koran to take my two daughters for your harems and three little sons to be converted to Turkish faith?" "Unfortunately, those things are omitted because Mohamed, the great prophet of greatest Allah, did not have time to write all about it, but anyhow we are sure that he is happy whenever we are happy, and, you know, we can't be powerful without making big armies from your sons, nor we cannot be happy without having your daughters in our harems and for our wives" was a naive but brutal answer of a Turk.

Fama est: that pending occupation of Alexandria a pasha, Turkish general, who entered town with his soldiers and had found a huge library and asked his master, Sultan Selim I "The Inflexible" what to do with the books. "If there is anything in those books similar to Koran, we certainly don't care for them, because we have their content in Koran. But if there is nothing similar to Koran burn them at once for they are contrary to Koran". Thus ordered Master Selim I, and a few minutes later a huge flame with dark smoke covered all of the library.

In their wars against Venice and Genoa the fortune of their arms was changable until the famous naval battle in

Gulf of Lepanto in 1571. In this battle the commander of the Christian fleet, Don Juan of Austria, succeeded in drowning and capturing all of the Turkish fleet. This victory was a first and real shock inflicted ~~into~~ Turkey by the Christians "viribus unitis." Though in this battle the whole of the Turkish fleet had been annihilated anyhow the Turks did not care for it because their shrewd grand Visir\*<sup>1</sup> Sokolovich\*<sup>2</sup> said at that time to the Venetian envoy: "You said your victory, but there was no victory. You have only shaved our chin, but when we begin to shave you, be sure, there will be neither beard nor chin nor even your heads!". Accordingly, it happened so, because they renewed their offensive against all Europe and in 1683 for the second time they besieged the Austrian capital Vienna. But by that time and in that year, finally came the end to "High Tide" of the Turkish military power, and simultaneously since that time followed disaster after disaster of the Turkish armies and of their Pan-Turkish policy. Just before this second battle of Vienna took place the Austrian emperor Leopold pleaded for the help of Poland. The Polish Prince Yovan Sobieski came with 40,000 of his brave fighters, delivered an eventful battle and the Turks had been seized with an extreme panic of running away from Vienna. This battle ruined Turkish advent in Europe; this victory was a triumph

---

\*1. President of Government.

\*2. The Serb by birth but as a child taken and converted in the Turkish religion.

of the Christian over the Turkish arms; in this defeat of the Turkish army "broke the hoop to the mare of Saint Mohamed" as the Serbian poet Petrovich, Njegosh, predecessor of Darwin said. But more than that: since this battle of Vienna the Near Eastern problem entered into "cabinet" of the World Politics, and, as such will be later on treated.

## CHAPTER IV.

### FROM BATTLE OF VIENNA TO NAPOLEON'S ERA (1683-1800)

This chapter will take into consideration the further development of the Near Eastern problem from the battle of Vienna to the eventful epoch of Napoleon.

#### A: Russia and Turkey.

The rapid expansion of the Russian Empire during the last quarter of the sixteenth and particularly during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries marked a possibility that Russia had to come in touch and conflict with the rise of the Turkish Empire. This conflict was inevitable and occurred in the year 1576, near Azor, where Russian forces inflicted a serious shock to the Turkish army. Since that time nearly for a century they didn't have any conflict of importance. However, they ever since lived in a constant antagonism due to the question of boundaries on the northern and eastern shore of the Black Sea. In 1686, while the Holy League of European rulers was formed against Turkey, Russia also joined it until the treaty of Carlovita (1699) had been concluded. Since this treaty the two powers had gone



from war to war. In 1695-6 Peter the Great of Russia captured Azov and the Russian merchants were brought into relation with Turkish authorities, which occasioned the establishment of the first Russian embassy in Constantinople in 1695. According to the treaty of Carlowitz, it was arranged that Porte\* has to cede Azov to Russia. This success of Russian arms gave a great deal of hopes to the Christians under Turkish yoke who began to dream and work towards their liberty. Russia turned by and by to further extension of her empire at the expense of Turkey. She wanted the Black Sea for the purpose of opening straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles to the Mediterranean sea. No wonder, because there was a question of progress of her trade and commerce in the region of the Near East and West, too. In order to obtain the free navigation to the Mediterranean she was using even ultima ratio, either through her diplomacy or military forces. In these days England was not as yet in the era of her Colonial expansion and the Near Eastern affairs had little or no importance for her. The same case was with Austria and diplomacy of both England and Austria, supported at Porte every step of the Russian interest. It was so with Austria and England but France began systematically to reckon with the checking up of the Russian ambitions on account of the Turkish empire. Russia and Austria having the Turkey as a mutual enemy came into

---

\* The name of Turkish government.

an understanding by making an alliance in 1726. This alliance lasted for more than a century. A few years later Russia declared war, took Crimea and tried to secure free egress from the Black to the Mediterranean. Austria on account of her support to Russia demanded Novi Pazar and a further slice of Valachia. The Porte energetically refused and Austria captured Nish, the town in the center of Serbia. The French ambassador in Constantinople encouraged Turkey to undertake counter-offensive against Austria. Turkey followed the advice, recaptured Serbia and made a treaty in Belgrad, by which it was agreed that Serbia and Valachia should be returned to Turkey. Russia's army was just in the era of great progress and this treaty which humiliated her ally reached her as a great surprise. Russia also had been obliged to conclude a treaty with Turkey. This success of Turkey was but a result of a French diplomat in Constantinople, who encouraged Porte to move ahead instead of back. This skillful trick of France secured the prestige to her commerce and trade in the Near East. Simultaneously, it marked a superiority of French diplomacy upon those of Russia and Austria. At about the middle of the eighteenth century the Russian throne had been inherited by Catherine II, the ablest ruler ever seated upon any of the European Kingdoms or empires. She was very ambitious and continued the politics of Peter the Great. Her first step, upon as-

ascending the throne, was to solve the Near Eastern Question by a heavy blow upon Turkey. To do so, she was over tired by hundreds and thousands of petitions and different deputations from the enslaved, South Slave and other Christian peoples. But the main purpose was the possession of Constantinople. She had to act but before taking action was anxious to find an ally which was not interested so much either in taking territory of the Near East or in developing commerce there. Prussia was found to be the best one. However, this alliance did not work so smoothly as effected because intrigues again appeared in Poland for Katherine had put on the throne of it her lover, Stanislaw Poniatowski. This act involved many troubles in Poland which led to her partition between Prussia, Russia and Austria. While Poland was a focus of long disputes, quarrels and jealousy among the great powers of those days, the Near East was a stronger and more mysterious fomentor of hatred and wars among those big nations. The great propaganda throughout the Turkish empire and particularly among the Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula was spread. It was said and believed in accordance to old tale and prophesy that the moment has come: "when the Turkish empire would be destroyed by a fair-haired people from the north". The French diplomats in Constantinople convinced again the Porte that such a strong ferment among subject peoples meant a real insurrection and state of war, and accordingly,

forced Turkey to act against Russia as did before against Austria. Turkey did not hesitate to accept advise. An excuse for casus belli was Poland. Turkey sent ultimatum to Russia to evacuate the possessed provinces of Poland. Russia was deaf to hear and Turkey declared war in 1769. The result of war was: the first partition of Poland between Russia, Prussia and Austria, and the entrance of Russian troops in Bucharest, the capital of the enslaved Roumenia. Russia now turned her policy to the Balkans. In order to call higher attention of great sympathy toward South Slave peoples she gave the name of New Serbia to that region of South Russia, which had been liberated in recent wars against Turkey. Russian fleet was sent by Katherine, which upon passing through the Baltic and Mediterranean reached the coast of Morea. Its appearance aroused a great deal of excitement and sympathy among Greeks and Jugo-Slaves. Such sympathies and excitements gave excuse to Turkish authorities to undertake a series of new massacres upon the Christians. Russian fleet being helped by a few skillful English navy officers captured and drowned the Turkish fleet in the harbor of Tchesme. By this time the Russian fleet might have easily captured Constantinople but the order of Petrograd lacked. At any rate its victory upon the Turks created an immense sensation and a great deal of strong enthusiasm not only among the enslaved peoples of the

Turkish Empire but among all those Christians who had great antipathy toward the believers of Crescent. The Russian success at sea was potentiated by success at land. Namely, Russia conquered the whole of Moldavia and Valachia. This Russian success was not in fervor to Austrian diplomacy. In order to check further expansion of the Russian empire she signed a secret treaty with Turkey. According to this treaty Austria took obligation to send an army if Russian forces crossed the Danub. Prussian Emperor Frederick II at once protested against this Turco-Austrian alliance. He did so because the further partition of Poland would be entirely at stake if war broke out between Russia and Austria. His intervention saved Turkey from further disastrous shocks by the Russians and avoided a new tangle between Russian and Austrian empires and secured the further partition of Poland between Prussia, Russia and Austria.

Poland had drunk bitter glass of her fate due to the second partition of her territory and Russia renewed her victories against Turkey. Her further success was postponed for a while on account of riots among her best cavalry called Kossaks of Don. Due to such a riot she concluded a treaty with Turkey in 1774. In this treaty called Kutchuk-Kainardji treaty, the three main subjects had been of greatest importance for further dealing with the Near Eastern problem:

(1) Russia restored to Turkey, Besarabia, Moldavia,

Valachia and the islands of Archipelago; Russia on her side, retained Azor, Lenikala, Kertch with the adjacent district and mouth of the Dnieper. Such acquisition in territory gave her a full right to become a predominating factor upon the whole of the northern and eastern coast of the Black Sea. It was further provided by the treaty that Crimea and Tartary have to obtain independence and that Russia may establish councils, vice-councils all over Turkey in order to protect trade, commerce and other interests of Russia and Russian subjects in Turkey. Moreover, Russia became as a "most favored nation" of Turkey;

(B) Russia got a power to be a "supreme protector" of the orthodox church and Sultan took obligation "to protect constantly the Christian religion and its churches" all over his empire. England made a strong protest on Porte against this religious clause, but it was in vain;

(C) The Danubian principalities--Moldavia and Valachia, the islands of Archipelago, provinces of Georgia and Mongolia had been again restored to Turkey.

By this treaty, though not very satisfactory to Russian ambitions, was provided a great deal of jealousy on the part of Austria which seized the opportunity of securing Bukovina for her own territory.

It was already pointed out what Kainardji treaty had ac-

chieved. It must be also understood that this treaty is one among most interesting and dominating treaties ever concluded by any world power with the Ottoman Empire. Its importance will be better understood in the intercourses of Russia and other great powers with the Turkish diplomats because it will matter so much in political, economic, social, religious and in a good many other internal and external affairs of the "Sick Man" or "Attractive Woman" as Turkey obtained "epitaph or nance" by many writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\*

The acquisition of Bukovina made Russia jealous of Austria. By that time on the thrones of the most powerful empires were seated two women, Maria Theresa, ~~at that~~ of Austria, and Katherine II, ~~at that~~ of Russia. Both of them were more ambitious than ~~when~~ they were able to perform. Their ambitions were large, so large that there was not enough space even in the Universe wherein their interests would not come in conflict. Being so, there is no wonder that there could be no possibility of a real friendship between two empires, while the fate of both were in the hands of such ambitious women. One house was small for two masters. It was so until 1775, when on the Austrian throne stepped Maria Theresa's son, Joseph II. Katherine and he made a treaty. In accordance

---

\* Mr. Sorel says: "De la pour la Russie l'obligation de s'immiscer dans les affaires interieurs de la turkié, chaque fois que les interets de chretiens l'exige". Mr. Driault adds: "Stipulations vague, qui suraient la voix aux interpretations le plus entendues."

to it the Russo-Austrian alliance was created, the annihilation of the Turkish empire was provided and the partition of its territory was detailed. This scheme, however, was magnificent, and if realized it would probably cause the immediate solution of the Near Eastern problem. The scheme was but a theory and was necessary to be a practice. Accordingly Russia at once went into action by declaring war on Turkey and taking from her Orzakov, part of Tartary, two islands of Archipelago and annexed Crimea, also. Moreover, the Russian agents got busy by stirring up discontent and insurrection among the Christians in Turkey. In that direction these "mighty tools of every government" spread their influence of intrigues not only in European and Asiatic Empire of the Ottomans but in Egypt as well. Being in such a state of internal and external situation, Turkey could do nothing better than to declare war upon Russia in 1788. Russia and Austria, then, inflicted heavy losses to the Turkish army. It is quite probable that the complete annihilation of the Turkish empire might have taken place by this time had not the Swedish King, Gustave III, marched straight to Russian capitol to capture it. He saved Turkey but simultaneously saved people of the Near East from longer or shorter imperialism of Russia and Austria. Gustave returned; Russia took the great fortress of Orzakov with the surrounding district. Austria retained the northers part of Serbia



and entered Bosnia. This success of Russia and Austria caused great jealousy on the side of Great Britain, Prussia and the United Provinces. All three, with the motto of "viribus unitis" endeavored to check the ambitions of those powers, whose game was planned to be Turkey. Prussia offered military support to Turkey; England advised Austria to stop the further warfare against Turkey. The change on the Turkish throne, the waves of revolutionary movement in France, the death of Emperor Joseph compelled Austria to conclude a treaty with Austria at Sistov in 1791, by which treaty Serbia had been restored to Turkey and status quo ante was preserved. The monarchical regime of Europe, being in a great danger from rays of modern spirit of democracy involved in French revolution used all its power to stop it. Russia, being confronted with such a new internal stirring, and being deprived of her Ally, Austria, had to follow the example of her sister ally and conclude a treaty in Jassy, Roumania, in the very beginning of 1792. In accordance with this so-called "treaty of perpetual peace" (Hm! Hm!! --perpetual peace under existing order in world) it was agreed: these treaty of Kainardji, the Convention Explicative \* of 1779, and the commercial treaty of 1783, had been left untouched. On the other hand the Russian frontier had been extended further south to Dniestar. Turkey recovered Moldavia and agreed the

---

\* Defines the Turkish supremacy over the Tartars as purely Spiritual.

annexation of Cremea as fait accompli.

The treaty of Iassy was a fact of a great, French revolution of greater ~~but~~ the Napoleon advent of greatest significance for Near Eastern affairs. Since Peter the Great and his famous "Political Testament"\* the foreign policy of Russia had been primarily and perpetually directed toward the Near East. It had been pointed out what Tzarian Katherine planned to do in the Near East and it should be worth while mentioning that Tzar Alexander made another scheme in 1801 by which it was decided that the territory of Turkey had to be divided into small states united among themselves into a Federation, over which the Russian emperors would have exercise of supreme authority. In the case of Austrian dissatisfaction with such a solution of the Near Eastern problem, there was further provided to give her that part of Croatia, which was under Turkey, part of Bosnia, Valachia, Belgrad and Ragusa. Russia would obtain the city of Cattaro, as her part in the Adriatic, Moldavia, island Corfu, Constantinople, Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. If this scheme had been realized the world politics would consider such a solution of the Near Eastern problem as the worst solution. It would be so, whether such a solution might be looked from internal or external side of the Near Eastern situation. The appearance of Napoleon reversed such a plan. Moreover, in the year 1806, the Burkish

\* Provides the annihilation of Turkish Empire.

government had been induced by his diplomats to declare war upon Russia, the casus belli being the Russian intrigues in Danubian principalities--Moldavia and Valachia. We shall see later on how "great friends!" had been England and Russia, but now it is worth while mentioning that the English fleet energetically menaced Constantinople as soon as war broke out between Turkey and Russia. The result of this military campaign was the occupation of both principalities by Russian army and the continued state of war between Persian\* and Russian forces.

B: Austria and Turkey.

It was already pointed out that the battle of Vienna signified one among most favored dates on the calander of the Christian struggles against Turkey. We have also seen that after the defeat of Turkey's armies at Vienna, there occurred a series of battles (Muchat<sup>z</sup>, 1687; Belgrade 1688; Zenta 1697). These victories and a good many others of less significance compelled Turkey to make a treaty of Carlovivat<sup>z</sup> in 1699, by which Turkey gave up to Austria the whole of Hungary, Transilvania, greater part of Slavonia and Croatia. In the second and third decades of the eighteenth century they renewed wars and conquered Batolka and Banat, northern part of Serbia and Little Valachia. Austrian success might have

---

\* When war broke out between Turkey and Russia the French Ambassador advised Porte to send troops to help Persian state against Russia.

been of far reaching importance had not French and Austrian dynasties been in quarrels more than 200 years. Due to such a fact France had used all within her power to encourage Turkey to fight against Austria. Austria having an enemy on both sides, Turkey and France, found to be best for her to create an alliance with Russia. She did so in 1726. This alliance lasted more than a century. The wars of 1736-39 and 1787-91 against Turkey brought a little success to Russia and nothing to Austria. Almost in all actions of Austria against Turkey the French diplomacy was wise and able enough to make those actions futile. In the same year, when the disappearance of Venice from the Peloponese occurred, the Austrian monarchy appeared to assume her heritage on the Adriatic. The treaty of Campo-Formio in 1797, handed over the Dalmatian possession of Venice to Austria and simultaneously the mentioned treaty inaugurated Austria as a Balkan state. By such an act, instead of first Near East problem had been created also the second Austrian-Hungarian problem, both being covered by the mask of great powers diplomacy in the Near East.

#### C: England and Turkey.

Even before the foundation of her Indian empire England had been interested in the Near East owing to her large trade. But despite her commerce she, unlike Russia and Austria,

didn't see any strong reason for her interest of greater importance in Turkey. English diplomats in Constantinople bribed many times the highest Turkish official; the English fleet bombarded Constantinople, as it was already pointed out. The bribery and military intervention had been made either for purpose of Austria or Russia, because, until the end of the eighteenth century, England, or rather say her statesmen, did not understand that moscovite aggrandisement in those days would signify later on the "great danger" for her Indian Empire. In the year 1791 for the first time, an English statesman, Pitt, tried to declare war to Russia for the maintainance of the balance of power, but his project had been suddenly declared null and void by English Parliament.

#### D: France and Turkey.

France never before in her history was taking such an energetic attitude in her foreign policy as it had happened pending those days, when Austria and Russia began, on one side, to deliver shock after shock to Turkish army, and, on the other side, to make the partition of Poland. In those days French policy was anxious to protect Poland and Turkey, too. To do so there were many reasons. To account those reasons concerning Poland we are not in extensio. However, concerning the French attitude toward Turkey we say that France had been for many centuries the traditional ally of

of the Turkish empire. Francis I, at the very beginning of his reign, had made a scheme to partition Turkey, but being confronted with many troubles gave up such a plan and founded the first alliance between Turkey and France, or say between the French ruler and that of Turkey, because in those days the princess, Kings and emperors possessed the "Divine Right" upon the earth. The successors of Francis prolonged this alliance with a few intervals. The Kings of France used to be called "Padishah", because they had many times such influence in Turkish internal and external affairs as Sultans or even more powerful than Sultans and Portes. It was pointed out that for over two hundred years the French dynasty and that of Austria had been in perpetual quarrels, disputes and antagonism. These unfriendly relations had been the result of different causes, as for instance, the disputes of boundaries, balance of power, religious questions and throne inheritance, too. The first instance of military alliance was demonstrated while the French and Turkish fleet bombarded Nice. Later on, in 1535, France succeeded in making a treaty, so called Capitulation. Accordingly France received permission to trade in all the Ottoman parts. French subjects were permitted to exercise free Christian religion. The Frenchmen were very proud of becoming guardians of the Holy Places. In the beginning of the seventeenth century French influence was predominant throughout Turkish empire. The Capitulation

of 1604, were not so sublime as those of 1535. The cause was because Holland, Venice and England began to overshadow French influence at Port, and French trade in the Near East. Moreover, in 1634, the Greeks assumed to be faithful guardians of the Holy Places. In 1664, French troops assisted those of Austria to beat the Turks. This unfriendly attitude lasted until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the old friendship had been renewed. It was already pointed out, that Austria and Russia had threatened Turkey many times but she was saved by French diplomats, and the treaty of Belgrad turned Serbia to Turkey for three generations. The French military and diplomatic influence in Turkey was the dominating factor until that already mentioned treaty Kutchuk-Kainjarâji, of 1774, had been concluded, which ruined French influence and substituted for it that of Russia. It was also pointed out that the French diplomats succeeded in inducing Turkey to declare war on Russia for the sake of Poland. In the year 1740 it was France, which made a pact of defence between Sweden and Turkey. As a result of this pact Swedish army marched to capture Petrograd, while Russian armies were quelling Turkish forces at all battle fields. French influence upon Turkish empire until 1774 had been stronger than of any other power. It is a real fact and the capitulations had been renewed in 1581, 1597, 1604, 1740, but since the French revolu-

tion broke out for a few years her influence was somehow neglected, although the French civilization, by means of French emigres, had been greatly felt upon the Ottoman empire. During the era of Napoleon it was clearly noticed that the French diplomats in Constantinople had been more predisposed toward the Greeks than the Turks. Accordingly, Bonaparte was regarded as a deliverer of the Hellenic race. The French expedition in Egypt ceased cold-blooded policy between France and Turkey. This act was a just cause of war between the two traditional allies. Greeks, considering Napoleon as their "national leader", alarmed ambitions of Russia, and when later on the scheme of France showed that the policy had been made clear, then, Russia, Turkey and England declared war on France. The result was that the Ionian island which had been previously occupied by Napoleon had been taken by Turkey and Russia, and French commerce in the Levant had been entirely ruined. How French commerce had been developed in the Near East can be seen from many official reports sent out by Turkish councils to French government. These reports almost always used to point out "En matiere de commerce l'Orient nous rendait tous le services d'une vast et flourissante colony."

France had been able to see prior to England what Russian plans have to do in the Near, Middle and Far Easts. If modern means of transportation, communication and modern technic in



in armament had been developed in those as in present days, there is no doubt that many disastrous wars would be fought between France and Russia as well as between France and Austria. These wars would be principally on account of inheritance of Turkey. However, owing to primitive method of transportation and armament of those days, it has happened that neither Russia nor France, nor Austria, could roast, carve and eat meat of the turkey, nor even use sufficiently its feathers for their pillows. In other words, all of them had employed every kind of ultima ratio in order to become a real master of the Near East but later events entirely spoiled their foxy plans and ad ultimo, ruined their "vital interests" in almost the whole of the Near East.

#### **E. Germany and Turkey.**

During the conflicts of powers we spoke of, Germany was not as yet united to step in the dance with other big states against Turkey. Prussian policy was directed primarily to the internal question of Prussia and the national movement of the whole of German people. Anyhow, the great Elector tried to employ the Danubian principalities against Poland, while the same was not as yet fully partitioned. Prussia and Austria were somehow in an unfriendly relation and Prussian diplomats in Constantinople were constantly

55

giving advice to Porte from time to time, to disturb or even attack Austria. Russian success in the East and South did not have any value nor arouse jealousy of Prussia toward Russia. In 1787-91 there was formed a triple alliance among Prussia, Holand, and England whose main purpose was to check the Austro-Russian combinations and wars against Turkey. The founder of this alliance was the Prussian Emperor Frederick William II. It is a known fact that Prussia in those days, i.e., prior to the dawn of the nineteenth century did not have any aspiration in the Near East but have had a strong demand for compensation in Europe for gains, the other powers obtained in the Near, middle and far East or elsewhere outside of European territory.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century we find four great powers which had been directly or indirectly effected by the Eastern question. Italy was still in a state of provinces and Prussia was only of the second rank and almost of no importance. It was seen from the previous exposition how these four great powers; Russia, France, Austria and England, played their roles towards the Eastern question. In the following pages of these papers will be seen how these four plus two more, Italy and Germany, proceeded in complicating the Near East Problem, or tried to bring about its temporal or perpetual solution. The World Politics must not and cannot take

in good sense any of those previous dealings of world powers. Nevertheless, the World Politics must count with black as well as with white pages in order to reach midea aurea in international problems and settlements of world internal and external affairs.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM IN NAPOLEON'S ERA

From the very beginning of the nineteenth century to the end of the first quarter of the present century the general situation in the Near East as well as in the entire world had taken such a course of development, that could neither be foreseen by the greatest statesmen nor be prophesied by anyone who had endeavored to meet the future events of mankind by means of geography, history, mathematics, scholastic speculative or even experimental philosophy or by the influence of race, climate and environment. Despite the fact that a good many historians had been inclined to assert that history of human race is always turning around but one fixed point, we, contrary to their affirmations, are inclined to say that memorial events, which happened in the meantime from the dawn of XIX century to the present days had clearly demonstrated and witnessed, too, that history of mankind does not run around one point as our globe around "axle", but, due to the influence of rapid growth of population all over the earth and the extent of individual necessities from most primitive to the most modern times for self-existence and self-preservation, shows a fact that history is turning around

many points. In other words, there are not only internal causes but a good many external causes which makes modern history and rejects the old opinion of "turning around one fixed point." As a criterion of this instance we shall see in the following representation of the Near Eastern question where we go, and how history runs not only with us mortals but with the other immortals and their fate.

The appearance of military genius of Napoleon Bonaparte on the face of the earth had opened new pages of modern history and indicated entirely different trend of World Politics towards the Near East. Napoleon is a child born by the French revolution, which, in the era of the last quarter of the eighteenth century, had more frightened and convulsed the monarchical regime of Europe than the waves of Russian revolution of 1917 the existing capitalistic regime and international order of the entire world. Napoleon's ambitions were not directed to make more complications in the Near East, nor to solve its problem, but merely to humiliate the enemies of France and to put all states of the world before his victorious and imperial knees. Spain, provinces of Italy, Prussia and particularly Great Britain, Austria and Russia had become not only afraid but almost dead from new danger imposed upon them by the new conqueror, who, in order to reach his goals, did not select the means. For Austria and Russia the interests evolved in the

Near East compared with progressive conquests and ambitions of Napoleon had become as the pale light of the moon or of any other planet compared with that bright light of the sun. Napoleon Bonaparte, as general of the French Revolution, had announced to his government in 1797, that Ionian islands, are of the greatest interest to France than the whole of Italy. He said so, because he firmly believed that the possession of those islands will make France the mistress of Levant and the Adriatic, and will participate the downfall of Turkish Empire, which was considered to be at the very eve of partition. Moreover, he was at last convinced that the occupation of these islands will simultaneously signify the possession of Egypt and from Egypt the conquest of Asia and Africa. His government called in those days "Directorium" met his advise, and he without hesitation took Malta in the Mediterranean sea and from there went to Egypt which had been overrun by his army in 1798. This stroke was not directed so much against Turkey as against England, because French army occupied the Isthmus of Suez and France became a real mistress of the Red Sea. She also now was looking for further extent of her success in the Near, Middle and Far East. England had been highly disturbed by this advent of France and succeeded in inducing Turkey to enter war against France. Napoleon seized this opportunity and marched against Syria. In many battles he inflicted a crushing defeat upon Turkey but his great scheme to conquer Turkey and then

to attack his enemies in Europe from east and west completely failed down. While his army in the Near and Middle East was picking the flowers of victories, the political situation in Europe had been changed. Namely, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Naples, Portugal and Turkey had framed the Second Coalition inflicting a good many shocks to ~~arms~~ of France. Napoleon, upon hearing of the bad situation in France, suddenly and secretly returned home in 1800. His return signified not only coup d'etat, which made him almighty master of France, but it also signified that his "leading star" had appeared at the horizon of his glory and victory.\* His first duty was to return the moral in his army. Accordingly, in a few battles with Austria his army triumphed and compelled Austria to make peace in 1801. His next duty was to separate Russia from coalition and his success in this matter was assured. According to an agreement made with Russia it was provided that an expedition of the French and Russian armies had to be sent to British India, to conquer it and divide between these two powers. This plan entirely failed, because it was impossible to send an army on so long a journey and Russian Tzar Paul had been suddenly assassinated. By this time the English troops landed in Egypt and defeated the Frenchmen. According to the peace treaty of Amien, 1802, Egypt had been restored to Turkey

---

\* It is asserted by many writers that Napoleon had been very superstitious and believed in a star of his fate, which protects him and shows him the ways of happiness, greatness and victories, too.

and the Ionian Islands obtained a kind of federation under the joint protection of Turkey and Russia. France became reconciled with Turkey and the French agents had been sent to inquire after the channels of trade in Turkey. Agents returned and reported an excellent outlook for trade. They also begged Napoleon to send a few troops in order to reconquer Egypt. This report had been published. Its publication aroused a great grim from the side of England. This publication was but a skillful intrigue of Napoleon to induce England for a declaration of war, what really occurred in May 1803. Indeed, Napoleon used to sleep but a four hour night. All other times he endeavored to move all over earth as his star was moving throughout space of the Universe. Europe noticed what Napoleon was planning. England, Russia and Austria formed the Third Coalition in 1805. In the battle of Austerlitz Napoleon annihilated the army of the third coalition. Austria had been compelled to conclude for her most humiliating treaty of Pressburgh. Napoleon obtained Dalmatia and Istria minus Trieste. Venetia was forwarded to the new Kingdom of Italy. After this treaty Napoleon crushed the Prussian army and in triumph entered Berlin. His army was picking wreath after wreath of victories but his fleet had been captured and drowned by the English in the famous battle of Cape Trafalgar. From Berlin he issued his "decret blocus continental" in order to ruin the English trade at continent of Europe and Asia. His diplomats



in Constantinople induced Porte to declare war upon Russia and England in 1806. This declaration was welcomed to Russia, who at once occupied the Danubian principalities. On the other side, the English fleet threatened Constantinople in March 1807. Napoleon considered Persia, Turkey and the entire of Asia Minor as a small bridge across which was necessary to cross in order to reach the great goals in conquering Asia and expelling the English Empire from India.

a. The Liberation of Serbia and Causes of Insurrections.

A great wave drives ahead of the smaller waves. A breeze of the democracy of the French revolution and the great share of the influence of Napoleon conquests and victories had been strong causes that a good many riots, rebels and insurrections broke out all over the Turkish empire. The Turkish subjects, as it was pointed out, were of different races, religions, and nationalities. The fate of all other subjects, save those of Turkish religion, was a tragic one in every way. The Turkish religion and customs could not tolerate the others, and its national feeling could not march arm under arm with the others. The Turkish system of government was more rotten and corrupt ~~type~~ and unbearable than that of Spain in South America prior to the rise for independence in 1806. The Turkish pashas and Kadyas were the real brethern of Spanish vice-roys in South

America. Like those dozens of Kings of South America, so these pashas and Kadyas used to say and repeat: "we hear all what Sutan and Porte ordered but don't follow their orders." The state of self-preservation of all those un mohammedan peoples was moving from bad to worst. The repeated interventions of foreign policy into Turkish internal affairs did not help those subordinated peoples, but on the contrary their bad position had been made worse. Sultan Selim III (1789-1808) had done his best in order to improve general conditions of administration in his empire but, unfortunately, his efforts in that direction were like small straws among the forces of cyclones, because universal corruption was rooted all over Turkey from the smallest clerk of the community to the grand visir, who was a second head of the Turkish Empire. Not only those Christian but a good many of the Mohamedan peoples were exposed to a real tyranny of their masters. The heavy taxations, bad and corruptive system of administration, the capture of the Christian females for Turkish harems and the taking away of the Christian young males for the Turkish army had been a usual course of life of those Christian peoples. Moreover, masacare after masacre for more than five centuries had followed each other as pictures of moviess follow one after another. Turkish despotism, and tyranny whose pestiferous nest was in Constantinople had been protected by Allah's Koran and supported by bayonets of wild Asiats plus the shameful and silly intrigues, jealousy, suspicion, rivalry, antag-

onism, hatred and wars of the European "cultured"! and "civilized" and big powers. Being in such a bad condition there was a question: what to do because moments had come to be or not to be. And there is no doubt that human individuals are alike other individuals of the flora's and fauna's empires, i.e., they have to find a possibility for their existence and prosperity or they have to face even the very tragic end of their existence. This is natural and simultaneously universal law, whose dogmas remain for ever imperative, unchangeable, and whose everlasting character can neither be denied nor made artificial. Those badly treated subjects of Turkey, being under the above described conditions tried to escape the unbearable burden imposed upon their weak shoulders or to die. That was and still is *raison d'etre*, which runs around many points of the ancient, medieval, and modern history.

The Sultans of Turkey had never been the chief head of the executive, legislative nor judicial power. By the same words may be characterized his government, *Porte*. How loosely had been interpreted the orders of both the Sultan and *Porte* could be noticed in Egypt, where the sovereignty of Sultans had been kept quasi--alive only by the dangerous device of setting a poacher to watch the game. In Syria and Palestina the tyranny had been exercised in the name of Sultans, Koran, Mohamed and even Allah. In different Pashaluks, governerships of European Turkey, i.e., particularly at Balkans had been created the

Portes above Porte and tyranny of tyramies. And the fate of a house with many "celestial" masters is very known long ago.

During the first years of Napoleonic era the most dreadful position of affairs had been in Serbia. The people of Serbia had suffered more than even they could tolerate. But when their toleration went to an ultimate shame and extermination they rose against the Turkish yoke in 1804. The leader of this first insurrection was George Petrovich, often called "Kara-George".\* A few decades before the insurrection took place his family had come from Montenegro which did not see and feel the horrors of Turkish despotism and tyranny. Kara-George insurrection was crowned with success, because the Turkish garrisons and authorities in Serbia had been wiped out and Russia intervened at Porte in favor of Serbia. The insurrections were gradually spread all over Balkans; but, in the year 1813 the Turks again reconquered Serbia and her leader and national hero scarcely escaped death by running to Austria. Two years later the second insurrection, under the Duke Milosh Obrenovich, took place and a kind of quasi-independence had been secured to Serbia. In the year 1817 a national assembly met at Belgrade which elected Obrenovich dynasty as a hereditary one. In the year 1826, the Greek insurrection took place. Russia intervened by force of arms against Turkey and in favor of Greece.

---

\* Kara means Turkish "Black". The Turks gave him such a nickname not because his physiognomy was black but because his acts against the enemy were horrible. In days of insurrections he used to order: "Kill them souls, because they were killing our body and souls, too!"

As a consequence of this intervention the treaty was negotiated between Moscovite and Constantinople governments. In accordance with this treaty Serbia assumed obligation to be under protectorat of Russia. Three years later the Serbian autonomy had been completely achieved. Such an act brought in existence another Serbian State. Since this time both Serbian States, Serbia and Montenegro, slowly but constantly and energetically worked toward the creation of another Serbian empire which would be more potent and larger than that of Dushan the Great. Their mutual work united with assistance of friendly states of the world, had been crowned with complete success at the end of 1918, when Jugo-Slavia or officially called the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slavenes had been created. We also must point out that the Serbs had been and still are one among leading factors toward complication and solution of the Near East problem. Their role in good and bad sense of the world Politics can be neither neglected nor denied.

#### A. (Continued).

From Berlin Napoleon started to Russia and defeated her army in 1807. Russia appealed for peace and Napoleon anxiously accepted it because he was planning great struggles against England, which really was his real opponent at land and sea. In order to isolate England from her allies, Napoleon succeeded in meeting the Russian Emperor Alexander. At that meeting

Napoleon proposed to dismember Prussia, annihilate British Empire and partition Turkey. While they took the question of the partition of Turkey they could not reach any satisfactory result but Napoleon said to Alexander: "C'est un decret de la Providence, qui m'annonce que l'empire turk ne peut plus exister".\* His words were of a good prophet, but had been realized a century later. As a result of this meeting was the negotiation of a treaty of Tilsit by which Napoleon assumed obligation of helping Russia to expel Turkey from her European Empire if peace within three months cannot be reached with Turkey, which still was in war with Russia. However, when the question of partition of the Turkish territory appeared there had been much quarreling between the Russian and French statesmen. The Russian Emperor through his representatives at this conference announced that: "Constantinople is the key of my house." The same he said for Paphos and Dardanelles, too. For Napoleon Constantinople and Turkey was but a bridge across which it was necessary to pass over in order to obtain a bigger key, i.e., he wanted British India and the rest of Asia plus the whole of Europe and Africa. Both emperors were good and shrewd diplomats but their diplomatic mathematics always showed wrong results. Alexander was planning to have Napoleon as a mighty tool of his ambitions, but lo! Napoleon thought the same and their mutual theories entirely ended, when Russia and Turkey re-

---

\* E. Briault: La Question Orient-p. 91.

newed wars and Napoleon refused to comply according to "honest" obligations of the treaty. Moreover, Napoleon induced Turkey to prolong war and made quick and secret preparation in order to overrun Russia by uneffected attacks of his irion and victorious legions. In May 1812, the peace treaty between Russia and Turkey had been concluded. In accordance to, Russia obtained Bessarabia and Turkey had secured to hold her garrisons in a few fortresses of Serbia. This act aroused among the Serbâ quite a share of dissatisfaction and antipathy against Russia. Napoleon, in accordance with his scheme of conquests and victories invaded Russia and reached Moskva in winter 1812, Upon receiving there a disastrous blow from Russian forces, then he and his defeated army were returning back to France. The Russian army had been joined with those of Prussia, Austria, and England which armies with the "viribus unitis" ended the fate of a most ambitious conqueror. After the career of Napoleon was over the famous congress of Vienna met in 1815. In accordance to the treaty of this meeting it was agreed by Russia, Austria, Prussia and England that Austria as an heir of Venice have to obtain those provinces around the northern basin of the Adriatic sea and Dalmatia with adjacent islands. The Ionion Islands, after a long discussion, were erected into an independent state under the protection of England. The success of Austria at Vienna's congress will lead her, of course later on, to a great quarrel with the South Slaves, Italy, Russia and to the renaissance of a strong Italian and

Serbian ~~ultra~~ nationalism, which will create more complications in the problem of the Near East and inaugurate another problem of dismemberment of the Austrian Empire, what occurred at the end of the war in 1918.



## CHAPTER VI.

### FROM VIENNA TO BERLIN CONGRESS

(1815-1878)

When the Ottomans conquered the whole of the Balkan Peninsula the torch of liberty remained only in Montenegro. The light of that torch moved to Serbia and from Serbia to Greece, Bulgaria, Roumania, etc. In the previous chapter it was seen how Serbia obtained her independence. The main purpose of this chapter is to show how Greece, Bulgaria and Roumania obtained their independence, and what attitude the European powers had taken toward such an act, toward Egypt's question in particular and toward the Near Eastern problem in general.

#### A: The Liberation of Greece.

In 1821, Prince Alexander Hyspilanti started an insurrectionary movement in Moldavia and unfurled the flag of Greek independence. This movement at the north had been crushed down by the Turks in the same year. However, while this northern rising was in the eve of death the southern rising in Morea was in the very beginning. In April 1821 a general massacre of

Moslems began. This massacre of Morea had been followed by a cruel reprisals against Christians all over Turkey. Russia made protest after protest at Porte against such an act of cruelty. The war seemed inevitable but the other powers tried to avoid it by mutual pressure upon the Sultan. However, war between Russia and Turkey was avoided for awhile, but Greeks did not stop fighting. Their success at land was not so great as that at sea reached by their gallant fleet, which under the command of admiral Kanaris inflicted a crushing blow upon the Turks. On January 1, 1822 a national assembly met in a wood near Epidaurus, where the independence of the Greeks had been proclaimed, and provisional government in Morea had been established. England recognized the Greeks as belligerents in 1823, but it was due to injuries inflicted upon the English commerce by the Turks. In 1824 Sultan asked the help of his powerful vassal Mehmed Ali of Egypt, who sent help to crush down all Greek forces and invaded all Greece which just saw a light of liberty. The Greeks were in desperate position. They asked protection of England but she was deaf. Her diplomacy was just anxious to persuade Russia not to run in dangerous war against Turkey for the sake of the Greeks. Accordingly, a treaty between Russia and England had been concluded in 1826 by which both of them renounced "any augmentation of territory and any exclusive influence or any superior commercial advantages in Turkey." Greece

had to become independent State under the protectorat of Turkey and under obligation to pay tribute to Porte. This treaty was but a peace of paper. Russia despite this agreement sent ultimatum to Turkey for evacuation of Danubian principalities. Turkey yielded to the Russian demands by granting large concessions in regard to principalities and Serbia. This was achieved by the treaty of Okerman, October 7, 1826. Concerning the situation in Greece, Turkey, though in era of bad internal affairs due to the insurrections in Greece and the revolts of janissaries,\* showed no signs of accepting mediation unless backed by force. The English statesman Canning proposed to Russia for mutual mediation at Porte for the purpose of Greece. Prussian and Austrian diplomacy lead by the capable diplomat Metternich tried to oppose such steps against Turkey. However, France, England and Russia concluded the treaty of London in the month of July 1827. In accordance with the articles of this treaty an immediate armistice was to be offered to both belligerents--Turkey and Greece. In a case of not accepting their mediation it was agreed "to exert all the means which circumstances may suggest to their prudence". The mediation had been accepted by Greece but refused by the Porte. The Turkish refusal was followed by a naval battle of Gulf of Navarino in which allied fleet destroyed and drowned that of Turkey. Two months before this struggle

---

\* The military oligarchy in Turkey.

occurred Canning died. His death opened another page of English politics toward the Near Eastern Question. Namely, new English government under Wellington's guidance was anxious of preserving the independence and integrity of Turkey. This new trend of English policy encouraged Turkey to remain stubborn in her action against Greece. Moreover, Sultan Mohamad denounced any validity to Akerman Convention and on December 20, 1827 declared a Holy war upon the infidels. The fate of Greece and simultaneously of other Christians throughout Turkey was more than desperate as Russia, Volens-Nolens, had to accept the challenge of Turkey by declaring war to her in April 26, 1828. An army of Russia occupied principalities and her navy entered the Dardanelles. England and France were not fully disposed to approve the isolated action of Russia but anyhow they concluded a treaty to undertake an action against Turkey's forces in Morea. French forces compelled those of Egyptian Pasha to evacuate Morea. According to the treaty concluded in London, 1828, it was agreed that Greece should become "an autonomous but tributary state governed by a prince selected by the Powers." On the other side Russian forces finally succeeded in crushing down the Turkish resistance on all fronts. On August 14, 1829, Adrianople, the gate of Constantinople at the European side of the Turkish empire had been taken by the Russian. Exactly a month later the treaty of Adrianople was concluded. In diplomatic history of the Near East

the significance of this treaty is inferior only to those of Kainardji, Berlin, 1878 and those following the Balkan wars of 1912-14 and the great war, i. e., the treaties of Versailles, St. Germain Trianon, Neuilly and particularly of Sevres and Eausanne. According to the treaty of Adrianople all neutral vessels obtained freedom of navigation in the Black sea and on the Danube. Moldavia and Valachia obtained an autonomy under the protectorate of Russia. Russian traders and commerce in Turkey had to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of Russian councils. But the most important thing that this treaty achieved was that Turkey acknowledged the independence of Greece. It is worthwhile to mention that pending the negotiation of this treaty and especially during the London conference, February 1830, when the question of Greece had been actually settled Great Britain endeavored by all means to create Greek territory as small as possible. She did so because she was afraid that in Great ambitions of Russia towards the Near, Middle and even Far East, the stronger Greece would serve as an excellent support to such Russian policy.

#### B: The Great Powers and Egypt

L' Egypte vaut moins par elle-meme que par sa situation.

C. de Feycinat.

Mr. C. de Feycinat says that Egypt would be almost useless if it is not located where it is. In more moderate words the

same may be said for all the era of the Near East.

It was already pointed out that the Sultan called Mechmed Ali Pasha of Egypt to save the Turkish empire from the Hellenic danger and internal disorder. This Mechmed Ali was an Albanian by jus soli et sanguinis, and from 1805 to 1849 this "illiterate savage" as Napoleon "baptized" him was the real ruler of Egypt, though was bound to his Sovereign Sultans. His army was organized by French officers and conquered Arabia. Sudan and the Holy cities of Mecca and Medina were recovered to the Sultans, and, while invading Syria (1832-3), the Porte was greatly alarmed by Mechmed Ali progress, because at this moment it seemed that even Constantinople would soon be at his mercy. Mechmed Ali tried to assure the Sultan that his military expedition has no other purpose but to chastise Abdulah Pasha, "who many times insulted my beard whitened in the service of you, oh mighty Padishah." His assurance of loyalty was in vain. The Sultan declared war to Mechmed but in two heavy struggles the Sultan's forces had been quelled, and victorious army of Mehmed was marching toward Constantinople. The Sultan pleaded for help of the Powers. All other powers save Russia had been preoccupied by domestic affairs. The Russian fleet, after long hesitation of the Sultan to accept as aid the "everlasting foe", anchored before Constantinople. This earnestly alarmed France and England and asked Sultan to procure its withdrawal. Russia refused to accept the advise.

She did so because her prevailing opinion was that, if Constantinople is to be taken by Egyptians, it would be more difficult for her to obtain its possession from them than from the weak hands of the Sultan and Porte. As great powers were not able to force the Russian return, they succeeded in forcing Mehmed to conclude the treaty with the Sultan on April 8, 1833, by which Mehmed Ali obtained Syria, Aleppo and Damascus. By this act the drama was not yet played out. Namely, Russia continued to land her forces at Constantinople and succeeded in making so-called Unkiar-Skelessi treaty (July 8, 1833), which actually placed the Ottoman Empire under military protectorship of Russia. The other significance of this treaty was in free navigation of Russian merchant and military marine, through straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles to the Mediterranean, while the Black sea had been fully closed to other big powers and became but a Russian lake as in the present days the Caribbean Sea is nothing else than a great lake of the United States of America. France and England protested at Petrograd and Constantinople too. They even sent a joint fleet against Constantinople. The war would seem inevitable but was avoided on account of domestic troubles in all of these powers. However, it must be born in mind that Austria offered her mediation and as a result of it the emperors of Austria and Russia met at Munchengratz (September 18, 1833). The result of this conference was an agreement between two powers to secure the integrity of

Turkey from aspiration of Egyptian invader. From 1834-8 the diplomatic bombardment among all big powers reached its climax. By words all of these powers had been great friends of Turkey but in reality nobody knows, who was the greatest enemy. The Turkish statesmen had already foreseen what kind of a drama is going to be played at the Near East and they invited Prussian officers of the army to reorganize the Turkish army. The organization of the army just began when the Sultan declared war upon Egypt. His army was again and again defeated by forces of Mehmed Ali. Negotiation for peace began between Egypt and Turkey and the Powers again put their long fingers in action by prohibiting Turkey to enter any negotiation with Egypt without assent of the Powers. Up to this time, 1839, France and England were acting mutually in checking Russian ambitions. But now "very cordial friendship" had failed, because France was anxious to obtain Protectorship over Egypt and England was more afraid for such an act than from a possession of Constantinople by Russia. After a long exchange of diplomatic notes the Quadruple treaty of London (July 15, 1840) was concluded. In accordance to, England, Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed to force their terms upon Mehmed Ali if he does renew his attacks against Turkey. This treaty aroused profound indignation in France. Mehmed refused to agree to the submitted terms. Austria and England sent a part of their fleet to cut off communication between Egypt and Egyptian army in Palestine. Mehmed Ali applied for protection of France, but was in vain.



He gave up all conquests in Asia Minor and retained only what he had before in Egypt. Porte recovered Syria, Crete, Arabia, and Egypt remained under sovereignty of the Sultan. Then, another treaty of London was signed on July 1841. In this treaty France also took part. While negotiation was taking place, France demanded to obtain protectorate over Egypt. Russia also demanded over all of Turkey "when France over Egypt". Both demands were futile. The main point reached by mentioned treaty was that Dardanelles and Bosphorus should be closed to all foreign ships of war.

As it was pointed out, the Pashaluck of Egypt remained as a vassalage of Turkey, but its fate by it was not finally settled and even today, after nearly one century, the Egyptian question remains a "hot bed" of World Politics.

### C: The Crimean War and treaty of Paris.

The jealousy, intrigues, mistrusts, special and general interests of the European Powers in the Near East was and still is a long confused story. Day by day it was effected, since the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, that the Near Eastern question will reach solution either in good or bad sense of World Politics. Such a solution was expecting but unfortunately was not reached. On the contrary, the complication in this problem by every day was becoming more serious. That complication was manifested in the Crimean war which was

fought between Russia, on one side, and Turkey, England, France, Austria and Italian provinces of Sardinia, on the other side. The cause of war was the question of influence by the Latin monks and those of Greek orthodox church upon the Holy places in Turkey. According to previous treaties, it was pointed out, that Russia, France and England successively had obtained right to protect their churches in Turkey. Moreover, it was mentioned that Russia had obtained exclusive right of protecting all Greeks in Turkey. Russia demanded exercise of such a right in the future as in the past but the other powers under the leadership of England and France induced Porte to declare war upon Russia. It was on October 5, 1853. The other mentioned Powers came to support Turkey, early the next year. The result of war, which ended by the end of 1855, was that Russia had been defeated by her sisters, great Powers and Peace Treaty of Paris had been signed. According to the treaty, Turkey had been admitted to participate in the public law and concert of Europe; six powers, of course, with the King of Sardinia were engaged to respect and to guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of Turkey. The Sultan, on his part, promised to ameliorate conditions of all subjects "without distinction of creed and race"; the Black sea was neutralized and was open to mercantile marines of all nations; there should be no fortifications on its coasts; Kars went to Turkey and Crema to Russia; the navigation of the Danube should be open to

all nations; Moldavia and Valachia were to remain under the sovereignty of the Porte and Southern Bessarabia was to be ceded by Russia to Moldavia; the liberties of Serbia were to be guaranteed.

The chief results of the Crimean war and Paris treaty had been the continuation of life of the "sick man" and the first collision between the Great Powers of Europe. This shameful collision was but a prelude of a silly tragedy-comedy of all the civilized world, which happened a few decades later. Why those great Powers were giving medicines and caring for the "sick man"? whether it was for the purpose of beneficiating the "sick man" as a whole, or his particular parts or---or-----for the selfish interests of those powers?! But *helas!* in persuing such a direction none of those powers remembered the Latin proverb: *Quisquid agis prudenter agas et respice finem.*

#### D: The Liberation of Roumania

*Ces Italiens de Danube et des Carpathes ont conserve dans l'histoire le nome des Romains qui leur donnerent leur sang, leur langue et leur civilisation.*

--G. Lacour Gayet.

When the Ottomans conquered the Balkan states the present state of Roumania drank also her bitter glass of fate. The Turks by gaining control over Roumania began to treat her people with utterest cruelty, as, of course it was the case with the other

enslaved Christians. In the previous chapter it was many times spoken of the Danubian Principalities Valachia and Moldavia. These provinces of Roumenia were passing from conqueror to conqueror since the days they were overrun by the Ottomans. These conquerors, besides Turkey, were Russia and Austria. In 1821 an insurrection broke out in Moldavia and Valachia, or say Roumenia, which compelled the Turks to withdraw their governors and in their place substitute members of the Roumenian nobility. In accordance with the peace treaty of Paris in 1856, Roumenia obtained protectorate of the great powers and Bessarabia was backed to her. In 1857 Alexander Jon Cuza was elected to rule over the whole of Roumenia. In 1861 the first Roumenian parliament met. Prince Cuza was a man of sui generis and was anxious to make a good many excellent reforms. But, unfortunately, the paths of reforms in most cases are covered with thorns. The same case was with Cuza, because, just while endeavoring to overcome the opposition of the feudal and military parties by a coup d'etat, in May 2, 1864 it resulted that this act, two years later, compelled him to abdicate. On his place provisional government proclaimed Prince Philip of Flanders. He refused to be crowned and Prince Carol of Hohenzollern Sigmaringen was elected by plebiscite. He augmented the work of Prince Cuza. His army helped that of Russia against Turkey. As a reward for such help Roumenia received Dobrudja from Turkey but was deprived from Bessarabia, which was taken by Russia. In 1880 Roumenia obtained her long

desired independence and was recognized as a Kingdom. Since that time until the era of the World War her foreign policy had been based upon the alliance of Germany, Austro-Hungary and Italy. It was due to her deprivation of Bessarabia which was recovered at the end of the World War.

**E. In era of the New Insurrections and Wars  
(1856-1878)**

After the Crimean war Turkey took obligation to improve the general conditions of the Christians and to achieve certain reforms in her administration. The firman after firmans\*<sup>1</sup> had been issued by the Porte but antagonism, hatred, and intolerance among different nationalities were so rooted that all such orders of Turkish government remained but dead letters. Moreover, as it already had been pointed out, the system of administration was rotten, clerks corrupted and in most cases ready to deprive of liberty, property and even life of those subordinated peoples. They did so for a smallest "bakshish"\*<sup>2</sup> The Bakshish was more influential than order of Porte and Sultans; it was a new almighty gold, a new Koran or even it was a second edition of earthly Mohamed and Allah to whose most potent knees approached and respectfully bowed not only authorities of less rank but the members of Porte and Sultans as well. The "almighty bakshish" was more powerful in Turkey than Mohamed and Allah, whose reign "was spread

---

\* 1) Official Orders of the Turkish government.

\*2) The gift.

throughout the Universe"; it was more potent than "policy of gold" in the present human society. When the hammers of the bribe, dishonest, injustice, inequality, subordination, uneducation, despotism and tyranny constantly beat only one anvil, it is certain that the anvil must burst or be smashed. Such a state of chaos triumphed all over the Turkish empire. She was similar to a house, whose internal prosperity was in the hands of the utterest gamblers, e. e., of her authorities, and whose external safety was guaranteeing by the "distinguished" murders, thieves, and bandits, e. e., by the Great Powers of Europe. Is it not so? Certainly it is. Being in such a situation there is no wonder that a candle was already lighted for the soul of late Turkey. The liberation of Serbia, Greece, Roumania, the reforming movement at Constantinople and the strong Pan-Slavistic movement all over Balkans offered the new causes for new insurrections in Turkey. Thus in the summer of 1876 an insurrection broke out in Bosna and Herzegovina, which at once involved in struggles against Turkey not only Serbia and Montenegro but led Russia to another war against the Ottomans. After the insurrection took place, but before Serbia, Montenegro and Russia took their arms against the powers, tried to interfere. The Austrian chancellor, Count Andrassy sent his note to Turkey accusing her for failure of carrying out reforms. This note was but a paper, and Turkish reforms remained but the Turkish reforms and nothing else. In the month of May 1876, the Austrian and Russian foreign ministers

met at Berlin with German chancellor, Prince Von Bismarck. From there they issued the Berlin memorandum by which was provided to make more demands upon the Sultan and to stop fightings for two months. France and Italy agreed with this note which was sent to Turkey, but England did not approve the attitude of the European Concert against Turkey and the memorandum remained in vain. The insurrection continued. Serbia and Montenegro declared war upon Turkey in June 1876, and simultaneously a series of insurrections broke out in Bulgaria. War was raging between the Slaves, supported by Russian volunteers, and Turkey. England tried to intervene but in vain. Russia proposed the armed intervention of great powers against Turkey but in vain. Russia became more intolerant by seeing how her brothers of Balkan are shedding blood. Finally, Russia declared war upon Turkey on April 24, 1876. Turkey was defeated and the treaty of San-Stefano was concluded in 1878. According to this treaty Turkey lost a large part of her territory. England, being greatly interested in the Near East mostly on account of the purchase of a share of the Suez Canal and due to a new imperialistic policy in the middle and Far Easts, had made known to Russia that any treaty concluded between Moscovite and Constantinople governments without the assent of other powers must be considered null and void. Austria and Germany also were alarmed by the success of Russia, but Austria more than Germany. Austria and England on one side and Russia on the other were just at the verge of war, but on June

13, 1878 the Congress of the powers was opened at Berlin on the same day that the treaty had been signed. Russia was deprived of almost all of her acquisitions during the last war with Turkey. England occupied the island of Cyprus "because Russia retained Batoum, Azdahea and Cars"; France sought for permission to occupy Tunis; Italy hinted at claims upon Albania and Tripoli; Germany, however, asked nothing, but the "iron" chancellor Bismark did so in order to prepare the future influence of his country upon the Porte. Bulgaria was deprived by two-thirds of that territory she received by the San-Stefano treaty. Moreover, she remained under Turkish sovereignty. It was done so for England wished so.

But the greatest mistake of this famous treaty was that the Serbian provinces Bosna and Herzegovina had been taken from Turkey and handed over to Austro-Hungaria for an undefined term. This mistake was a step nearer to the great clash brought between Pan-Germans and Pan-Slavisms.

#### F: The Liberation of Bulgaria

It was pointed out what Bulgaria obtained by the Berlin Treaty of 1878. As it was the common case of the other Balkan peoples, Bulgaria also, while under Turkish yoke, was under misery and cruelty beyond expression. The "raison" of politics of European powers was preoccupied by mistrusts, jealousy, hatred, commercial and economic interest and rivalry, too. The



powers were anxious to look after their own pockets or pockets of a few capitalists and did not care to save neither Bulgarians nor millions of other peoples, who were dying out under atrocities of wild Asiats. Being so, the whole of Bulgaria remained under the Turkish yoke until 1878, when Russia liberated all of Bulgarian territory but by that time was secured one third, owing to "generous" treaty of Berlin. Why Bulgaria was left so small by the treaty of Berlin, there is possibility to understand it by judging the interest of the great powers in the Near East.

The first ruler of Bulgaria was Prince Alexander Von Battenberg. In September 1885, he proclaimed the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia. This act was not approved either by Russia or Austria. King Milan Obrenovich of Serbia, being induced by Austria, declared war to Bulgaria. Casus belli was aggrandizement of Bulgaria but more than that the influence of Austrian Court upon that of Serbia, because Serbian ruler was faithful friend of the Austrian Emperor. As the purpose of the war was not in sympathy to Serbia, a part of her army had been defeated by the Bulgarians at Slivnitsa in 1885. A year later Prince Alexander was forced to resign. Since year 1886 to 1896 Bulgaria was ruled by the president of the government, Stambuloff. He was succeeded by Prince Ferdinand of ~~Saxe~~ Coburg, the father of the present King Boris. In 1909 Bulgaria had secured her independence.

## CHAPTER VII

### FROM BERLIN TO PRESENT TIMES

(1878-1925)

Roma Veduta, fede perduta.

--Luther.

Au defaut de souverains les nations se battraient beaucoup moins.....Les nations ne se battent que pour un grand et veritable interet.

--Rousseau.

A christilized criterion of the nineteenth and first quarter of the present centuries was a rapid growth of nationalism, imperialism, militarism, irridentism, colonial expansion, overproduction of manufactured goods and over demand for a raw material of every kind. Moreover, with the inventions of steam-power, the mistrust, jealousy and rivalry among big powers was taking an entirely different trend on account of better protection of their trade and commerce and of investment of surplus capital whenever it could be satisfactorily invested. And, in accordance with the protection of commerce, acquisition of new colonies for raw material, and markets for the surplus capital

we may point out that supreme criterion of the nineteenth and first quarter of the present century is the complete control of internal and external machinery of all states throughout the world by a small number of individuals, composing so "baptized" by the common language "the capitalistic regime" or "money oligarchy". In other words, the majesty and "Divine power" of princes, Kings and emperors had been substituted by "almighty" capital, which had primarily produced hatred and jealousy among two shopkeepers of a certain state; from those two shops such a jealousy and mistrust had been transferred into two or more shops of another state and *helas!* hence in world-wide hatred, utter intolerance and huge armaments what had been finally manifested in war of wars. But, we must bear in mind that shopkeepers policy, and jewel-sore influence, and golden supremacy, though were and still are criterion of criteria of past and present centuries by producing bad felling and evils, nevertheless they had incidently "manufactured" their excellent enemy in the renaissance, or say, in birth of world wide spirit of the internationalism.

In persuance of capitalistic policy toward the Near East Count Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, returned from Berlin Congress to Vienna and said to the Emperor Francis Joseph "Majesty, Bosna and Herzegovina are parts of your Empire and the door of the Balkans is now open to you." "Die Gelegenheit konnte nicht gunstiger sein, sich eine Zukunft-

shypothek auf den Weg nach Saloniki zu sichern" says von R. Kjellein in his known work: "Die Grossmächte und die Weltkrise."

At Berlin Congress the "honest broker" as Bismark called himself secured Bosna and Herzegovina to Austro-Hungaria. This success was but a step further to Bismark's known proverb "Drang Nach Osten", or to German aspiration for the Weltpolitik. Next year, after the Berlin Congress, the Austro-German alliance was formed which was but a conspicuous proof of Bismark mastery. Since the act of handing over of Bosna and Herzegovina to Austro-Hungaria, the European powers became more interested in the Near East affairs than at any time in the past. Since that time Europe got the nick-name "Balkanized Europe". Since that day until the first Balkan war in 1912, Porte and Sultans were learning Turkish policy at the shoulder of any of those big powers! England, Germany, France, Russia, Italy and Austro-Hungary, i.e., whenever any of the mentioned powers came in any kind of disputes with Turkey, then Turkey usually said to some of these powers: "You are the most favored nation in Turkey. All you want will be secured for you; but you should silence that power which likes to subordinate us...." And, certainly, all of them, without exception, tried their best to assure Turkey of their friendship so that often neither the Porte nor Sultans knew which of these powers was the best friend of the Turkish Empire. Thus the play after play was going on, but later on the Turkish statesmen

began to realize why those big states tried to convince the Turkish leading men of their friendship. They realized that their mother country was dying slowly but constantly and that a testament should provide that a lions share of Turkey should be turned over to either of those great friends or say, great states. Indeed, the Sultans, Porte and whole of Turkish peoples knew it and might exclaim with a full reason: *Times Danaos donna ferentes!* But *helas!* After the rain is over there is no need for an umbrella; and Turkey being already in a state of worse conditions than she really was, every hope was lost forever to save her. Her ruin after the Berlin Congress had been hastened by a new and most potent factor in the Near Eastern problem. This new factor was Germany, whose foreign policy, according to the opinion of G. W. Prothero was "the attempt to dominate the East formed the keystone of German Weltpolitik". In 1882, Italy joined Germany and Austro-Hungary in the Triple Alliance. In 1887 a "Coburger" was elected to the Bulgarian throne. Both of these acts had been of great importance to strengthen German influence in Turkey and certainly, from day to day this influence overshadowed that of the other powers. As a result of this influence it happened that the Turkish army had begun to be instructed by the German military officers; the German system of education was spreading in Turkey, German capitalistic groups secured the construction of Bagdad Bahn etc. The purpose of this railroad was directed to join Berlin with Constantinople and

Constantinople with regions of the Near, Middle and Far East. It was to be a "strategic" railroad for German expansion into Asia. Certainly, the ambitions of Germany especially after Franco-Prussian war of 1871, were so "megalomaniacal" as those of other powers. In order to meet such a new "tide" of danger France and Russia formed an alliance ~~to~~ which later on England joined too. Since the Berlin Congress Austro-Hungary became but the advance-guard of the Pan-German ambitions to the East. To Otton Bismark had been attributed the cynic saying: "Austro-Hungary is a cow to be grazed on the Balkan fields; when she has grazed enough she must be killed for the profit of Germany." The same could be said for Turkey, but not only for the profit of Germany but for all of the big powers. In 1909 the influence of Germany as well as that of the other powers had been checked due to the young Turk revolution, which had for its purpose to make great reform in the Turkish Empire and by so doing save it from the further dismemberment of its territory and constant influence of great powers upon its internal and external affairs. The endeavor of the Young Turks entirely failed, because many massacres, and insurrections started all over the country as soon as new reforms began to enter in old chaos of administration and inherited hatred of different nationalities in Turkey. As a prelude of the Young Turk revolution Austro-Hungary annexed Bosna and Herzegovina in 1908. Such an act produced the highest grief in Serbia and Montenegro. The Russian grim on Germany and

Austro-Hungary was also great due to such an act. If Russia was not exhausted in the Russo-Japan's war which was over but three years ago, it is quite certain that Serbia and Montenegro would declare war upon Austria and the world war would break out, then, instead of six years later. Russian diplomats had advised those of Serbia to wait until 1917, "when Russian army will be completely prepared to defeat Germany and Austria easily".

Russian Emperor, King of Montenegro and Prime minister of Serbia\*agreed to wait the mentioned year, but started by day and night to prepare all that was necessary for modern warfare. It was done so because, fama est, after the annexation of Bosna and Herzegovina the next move of Pan-Germanism towards the East shall be Serbia and Montenegro, and by encroachment of these two the turn might easily come to Russia.

**A: The Balkan League and New Wars**

The old comedy was continuing. The same actors were taking the accustomed roles. Some of these players were more skillful than the others, but anyhow, all of them were excellently trained in their roles of the magnificent play, or say melo-drama.

Prior to the Young Turk revolution of 1908, France and England settled temporarily their disputes. Namely, England recognized predominant interests of France in Marocco. France, in return,

---

\* He is also in the present times the Prime-minister of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slavanes (Jugo-Slave).

recognized the English predominant interest in Egypt, which had been already occupied by English forces. It happened in 1904. Also, England and Russia reached a kind of agreement in the Near East by marking the spheres of influences in Persia. It happened in the year 1907. Prior to and after the revolution the question of Armenia, Crete, Macedonia, Albania, etc., had been taken many times in consideration either by a few or by all of the powers concerned. As before in the other questions of the Near, Middle and particularly the Far East, so now the old apple was to be eaten, but alas! there was but one apple and hundreds of teeth which were anxiously and nervously waiting.

After France had taken Maroco, Algire and Tunis, and after Anglo-French agreement had been reached concerning Egypt, the only possession of Turkey in north Africa was Tripoli. As far back as 1901, France, in return for the occupation of Tunis had agreed to give Italy a free hand in Tripoli. The other powers by and by consented to and Italy began to penetrate in Tripoli for the purpose of commercial and economic interest. The young Turks, upon coming at power of the Ottoman empire tried to beat the Christian interests in Tripoli as they did all over Turkey. Their endeavor did not come at the right season. On September 27, 1911, Italian government sent an ultimatum to Porte demanding an occupation of Tripoli under the sovereignty of the Sultan. The Porte was a little deaf but Italy was much anxious to have Tripoli, and on the 29th of September war broke out. The Turkish forces in Tripoli were defeated and the Italian navy oc-



cupied the islands of Rhodes, and Dodecanese Archipelago. The Young Turks hoped and tried to involve a conflict between the big powers but in vain. The treaty of Lausanne was signed on October 18, 1912 by which the cession of Tripoli was acknowledged but, of course, sub silentio. It also was agreed that Italy should withdraw from the Aegean islands. The treaty of Lou-  
sanne was not yet signed, when the Balkan League, composed of Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro declared war, known as the first Balkan war, upon Turkey. The basis of the League had been given by the King Nikolas of Montenegro in his poem: "Balkanska Carica".\* He is its founder and spiritual father. After Berlin Congress many attempts had been made to bring about its creation and practice but until the very beginning of 1912, all endeavors failed. In this year and in years past the situation of the Christians in Old Serbia and Macedonia was unbearable. The great powers were deaf as before and followed their egoistic interest as before. Mr. Venizelos, Prime minister of Greece and Mr. Milovanovich, Minister of Foreign affairs of Serbia, succeeded to convince the Bulgarian government for the necessity of mutual steps against Turkey. Success was reached. Serbo-Bulgarian treaty was signed on March 13, 1912, and the Greco-Bulgarian on May 10, 1912. These treaties provided the partition of Turkish empire in Europe among these small allied groups.

---

\* The Emperess of Balkans.

Military conventions had been concluded also in September of the same year. By this time the Albanian rising took place, what, naturally, was in favor of the Balkan League, but, by no means was in favor of great powers because they were somehow tied up by the young Turks to undertake the steps they often used to do.

In very long correspondence and in personal conversation Tzar Nikola II of Russia used to say to the King Nikolas of Montenegro: "You are only one greatest and best friend of mine." While the Balkan League was in the progress of creation the big Nikola advised the little Nikolas to declare war upon Turkey. Prior to the declaration of war on October 8, 1912, the little Nikolas, who had two daughters married for Russian grand Dukes, one for a Duke in Germany, and one for a King of Italy, had asked his best friend, the big Nikolas, what to do in the case of Turkish victory upon the Balkan League. The big Nikolas urged his government, which with that of Austro-Hungaria, in the name of six big powers handed at Cettigne, Sofia, Athens and Belgrad the notes of same content and under three main points. These points provided that whatsoever may happen between the Balkan States and the Ottoman Empire "they will not admit, at the end of the conflict, any modification in the territorial status quo in European Turkey." Thus was said, but this meant nothing more nor less than an excellent trick of Russia, because by interpreting the note literally it meant the

preservation of status quo ante, but really it signified something else. Namely, in the case of Turkish victory the status quo must remain, but in the case of the victory of the Balkan League, the status quo must become null and void. So it happened. The Balkan League presented a joint note to the Porte demanding the quick reformation in administration of Macedonia. Turkey was fully deaf. What happened?

On October 8, 1912, Prince Peter, the youngest son of King Nikolas of Montenegro fired the first canon's shot against Turkey. The echo of that shot was heard but in the small region of gigantic rocks and mountains of Montenegro. But, by and by, the echo of the same shot had been heard throughout the world. That eventfull moment signifies the new era of the most interesting and confusing actions ever performed by the mortals. The shot, fired by Prince Peter was not only a match for first and second Balkan wars but for the "starting benzin" of the World war. A few days later the other states, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece followed the example of Montenegro by declaring war upon Turkey. Dispite the expectation of Great powers and the Balkan League, the Turkish army only in a month of struggles had been completely defeated. Certainly, it was a great surprise for the Balkan League but greater disappointment for Turkey. While there had been delivered victory after victory by allies over Turkish army, Austro-Hungarian, German and in less measure Italian statesmen became much worried. They were aware that the

end of war shall result in a change of existing status quo. They also knew that Russia had been secured the strong state-back at Balkans. Accordingly they tried to save what as yet could be saved. Namely, Scutary, a town in North Albania, was not taken, by Montenegro, while all other parts of the Turkish Empire in Europe was in possession of allies. Serbia sent help to Montenegro to capture Scutary. Austro-Hungary and Germany presented an ultimatum to Serbia in March 1913. The ultimatum demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Serbian troops from Scutary, because the town had to remain to Albania, as both of these powers insisted. If Serbia did not follow the order of the ultimatum, it is certain that the world war would break by that time instead of a year later. On May 30th the treaty of London was signed between the representatives of the Balkan League and Turkey. The island of Crete and all territory of Turkish Empire in Europe being beyond the Enos Midia line had been ceded to the Balkan allies, whose arms had been so unexpectedly victorious over those of Turkey. But what happened?

"The man that once did sell the lion's skin while  
the beast lived, was killed with hunting him."

Almost none of the four members of the Balkan League believed that the lion (Turkey), could be so easily killed as it occurred. But, when it was already killed each of them tried to secure the bigger part of its skin. They might come to a favorable agreement if the big fingers of the powers did not participate.

Namely, these fingers created Albanian state. By this act Serbia was deprived of obtaining any port at the Adriatic. Serbia, Greece and Montenegro insisted that Bulgaria should give up a part of Macedonia to Serbia as a reward for the loss of Albania, which, according to previous treaty among Serbia and Bulgaria should belong to Serbia. Bulgaria, induced by the intrigues from Berlin and Vienna, refused to give any part of Macedonia to Serbia. Moreover, she did not accept a good office nor the proposed arbitration of the Russian Emperor. On the night of June 29, 1913, the rupture occurred. The Bulgarians attacked the Serbians. The Serbs and Greeks repulsed the attack by driving the Bulgarians in a great disorder. For a few days all Macedonia was restored to Greece and Serbia. Moreover, the military forces of these states crossed the old boundaries of Bulgaria. A few weeks later Turkey and Roumania declared war to Bulgaria. By the treaty of Bucharest (Aug. 10, 1913) Bulgaria ceded to Roumania a large strip of the Dobrudja with the fortress of Silistria; Serbia obtained central part of Macedonia and old Serbia, Greece got Epirus, southern Macedonia, and Montenegro was satisfied with western part of the Novi Pazar. Moreover, Bulgaria lost all of Thrace including Adrianople, which went to Turkey.

As a result of both Balkan wars was the further dismemberment of the "sick man". Such an act offered an essence in solution of the Near Eastern problem in good sense of World Politics.

However, we may point out with a great pleasure that both of these wars had fully disappointed all of the powers, because the solution of the problem concerned was taking entirely different trend from that, which was, by decades and centuries expected either by one or by all of the big powers.

Albania was created not because any of these powers wanted to be generous and humanitarian but merely, because Italy, Austro-Hungary and Germany wanted to check the waves of Pan-Slavism so that they would not reach the ports of the Blue Adriatic. As the result the Balkan wars checked the Pan-Germanism penetration to the Near East. The poor miserable people of Armenia were and still are in agony of agonies. Why those "good hearts" of great powers did not show such a mercy for lamentable fate of Armenia as they did for Albania? But no wonder! In the politics as well as in life one should not run in the utter pessimism of Shopenhauer nor in optimism of Leibnitz, but should be rather guided by conservatism of Kent or Socrates or even by the mystery of Spinoza or by the Latin *midium aureum*.

#### B: The World War\* (1914-1918)

"Vae Victis" said Galic Duke.

What a great folly of the wrong judgements! The world literature, since the very beginning of the world war in 1914 to the present days is over-flooded by constant endeavors of demonstrating by *argumentum ad hominem*, who was guilty and responsi-

ble for the world-wide conflagration, for the great tragedy of mankind. This literature, if we dare say literature, is principally divided into two huge contrary opinions: that of the central powers, and that of the allied and associated states. The publicists, statesmen, diplomats, journalists, etc., of central powers by day and night exclaim: The Allied powers, i. e., England, Russia and France are guilty for the world war and some of them add: Serbia is guilty more than any other state. The publicists, statesmen, diplomats and journalists of the Allied and associated states cry out: the Central powers are guilty and the majority of these writers echoed: Germany and only Germany is guilty and responsible. On the other hand, the gentlemen mentioned above, i. e., those of allied and central powers continue by putting forward the principle motives that should be considered as "guilty" for world-wide butchery. The chief motives according to their opinion were: Austro-Hungary and Russia, the opposition to and support of Pan-Slavic and Pan-German movements; Germany, the desire to maintain control of the route to the Turkish Empire, and possession of the whole central of Europe, Asia Minor, the whole of Asia and Africa; France, the retaliation for war of 1871 and for restoration of Elsas Lorain's provinces; Great Britain, the determination to prevent Germany from securing the hegemony of world and challenging the British sea power and her colonial possessions; Japan, the

opportunity of eliminating another European power in the Far East; Montenegro, the knowledge that her independence and prosperity would disappear with Serbian's; Belgium and Serbia, the resistance to enemy aggression, the guaranteed decision for protection of their independences and the fear that in case of triumph of the arms of the central powers the first would be sacrificed to the whim of Germany and later to Austro-Hungaria; Turkey, the self-protection and fear of losing Constantinople and a slice of her European territory in Thrace; Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria and Greece, for the purpose of securing of their irredentistic and national claims; United States of America, for the purpose of augmenting the power of capitalistic imperialism, for annihilation of the fear of German Weltpolitik in the case of German victory upon the allied powers and for the sake of humanity; China, for self-determination in accordance with Wilson's famous fourteen points; and finally the other states which later on took part in war had been mostly induced by friendship, dependence, sympathy, or antipathy towards belligerents. Almost all of the above mentioned states entered war with Shibboleths to fight until extermination for "great aims of justice, peace, equality and progress of civilization." Certainly, they boasted so, but many of them did what?

A good, aware and conscious student of international affairs and world politics must follow the paths of truth, whenever and wherever he endeavors to bring about the justified and



prevailing causes of the world war. In performing such a duty he cannot and must not be inclined to nationalistic and chauvinistic nor to religious and other narrow minded interests. The truth and only truth. But lo! that frank, scrupulous and impartial truth must be followed. The great and far reaching truth must stay before our eyes and above small and petty truths as majestic sunshine overshadows the lights of the other stars throughout the enigmatic machinery of the Universe. The truth is duty above duty and law of laws. If modern science does not follow the paths of truths which very often are covered with huge piles of thorns, there would be neither science nor any better foundation for civilization and progress of mankind. Accordingly we must, volens-nolens, follow the paths of truths in order to find out who or "what" was guilty and should be responsible to future generations for war of wars. And, in answering this question we are inclined to say that there would be no harvest if there is no seed. That seed was not that above mentioned and what a great folly of wrong judgment by "centralized" and "decentralized", or say by writers of central and allied powers in arguing about causes of the war as they did and do, such opinion must be rejected from now on. The seed of the world war as of all wars of the past and future should be searched in the cause of development of human society since even prehistoric and most primitive human individual up to the present

day. It is conditio sine qua non for an elaborated theses on this question. In persuing such research work it is doubtless necessary to discover the seed or say "starting germs" which infected small, middle-sized and big powers to wage war of wars. By following such steps we say: there would be no war if there are no peoples. But, since there are peoples there were also causes of wars. This is an old doctrine. But, according to a more modern doctrine relating to causes of wars we say that "starting germs" of war had to be found in the growth of human society from one family to many, and from many families to many states. This process had been greatly influenced by climatic and geographic conditions. That is the first seed of wars. The second class of causes of wars have to be sought in the short-sighted and primitive conception of life embodying to it the economic, political, social, legal and vital questions, either of certain individuals or groups of individuals or many states or the entire world. Further more, an artificial creation of "separate", "indipendent" and "sovereign" units or states; the artificial creation of different nationalities, religions, races and languages; the lowest rate of real education, mutual contacts and acquaintances of people of the earth plus the highest influence of wrong education of masses of these peoples; the devine power of Kings in past and almighty control of gold in the present times, the acquisition of lands by certain states, which prior to belonged to "civilized" or "savaged" community or

had been considered as *res nullius*, i.e., belonging to no body; the subordination of certain nations by the other or others; the invention of steam power, which greatly helped that industry should be thoroughly revolutionized, and in accordance with such a "revolution" the result was the over-production of manufactured goods, the search for new markets for such goods, the search for new kinds of raw material for new factories. Moreover with such a process the capital had been quickly accumulated which led from investment of surplus of capital to economic interest and from economic interest of big and strong states to political and imperialistic subordination of many weaker and poorer states. Further causes of war could be traced in the artificial creation of irridentic, nationalistic and pan-nationalistic movements; the wrong basis of almost all international treaties, particularly those concluded at the end of wars, what can be especially true with the recent treaty of Versailles, concluded between the allied and central powers at the end of the world war in 1918; and finally in the lack of good will and faith among peoples of our planet.

If there was no "seed" or "starting germs" we just mentioned, there would be no wars but would be constant evolutions and very scarce revolutions in the world. Until we remove the poisoned and artificial seed from the living organism of the human society there will be no natural harvest for us nor any greater progress of mankind. This is imperative and constant truth which must be followed by every student of world politics, by every philanthropist and every human being who is not great enemy of himself and

of his poor or rich home and family, or who is not the greatest foe to his state and world as well.

As was pointed out, the responsibility for world war must be traced way back in the past actions and development of the people of the earth. If we look in records of such actions during the recent five or six centuries plus the first quarter of recent century, we shall come to the conclusion that the Turkish advent in Europe and retreat in Asia had been good cause of the world war. But the best cause of the world war was neither central nor allied powers but absolutely both parties. And to put a finger on anyone of them without taking equally into consideration all of them, would be fundamentally unjust and wrong.

However, another question must appear in the forum of our contention concerning this matter. We may ask who started the great World War? The only reasonable and argumentative answer must be: Germany or political leaders of the people of Germany. Why Germany started the war in 1914?

Gavrilo Princip, the young student of Bosna, and faithful member of "Narodna Odbrana", the Serbian national society, assassinated Arch duke Ferdinand and his wife in Sarajevo, a small town in Bosna. Such an act took two lives on June 28, 1914, but the act of world war took more than 42,000,000 lives. Before the assassination of Sarajevo took place, the Serbian minister in Vienna had informed the Austro-Hungarian minister of Foreign Affairs that members of "Narodna Odbrana" who otherwise are citizens of Austro-Hungarian Empire, are planning the assassination of the

heir on throne. Moreover, Mr. Simich warned the minister of Foreign Affairs to postpone for a while the Arch duke's trip in Sarajevo. Such step of the warning can be found in the Protocal of Austro-Hungarian minister of Foreign Affairs which reads: "Reg. B. 28. vi. 1914. Serbische Mitheilung uber Attentats mo- glishkeit gegen den Tronfolger." Serbia also was entirely ex- hausted by two recent wars and could not even think nor wished to undertake any step against Austro-Hungaria beyond whose shoulder was staying Germany. The Russian army was just in an era of great reformation. Russia, as it was pointed out, was waiting at least until the year 1917, when her huge army should be fully reorgan- ized and made ready to meet the future events. Serbia without Russia could not do anything and France without Russia could not undertake any attack against Germany. On the other hand, it was generally believed that warfare with modern technic in armament cannot last more than four or at most six months. The military mathematics of Germany was very sure that in case of war Germany will be during four or six months, victorious. She was fully pre- pared for war and had better army and military technic than any state of the world. To wait was useless for she knew that huge capital of France was preparing a huge army and navy of Russia. The assassination took place. After such act was over, the late Emperor Karl of Austria came to Konopiste and took away all the correspondance he found in the palace of late Archduke. In that correspondance was a proof that Sophie, the wife of Arch duke

Ferdinand had plotted with the Kaiser against Serbia, i.e., after the defeat of Serbia it was to be made an Austrian province and that its throne would be given to the oldest son of Ferdinand and Sophia. France Joseph, the Emperor of Austria, asked the Kaiser of Germany what to do and how to act against Serbia after the assassination. Germany, or say the Kaiser, found out that the hour of war had struck. No waiting. The sooner the better and the Kaiser sent cart blanche to Emperor of Austro-Hungary. Vienna had not only to listen but also to obey the order of Berlin, and in accordance with cart blanche the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum was presented to Serbia on July 23, 1914. The ultimatum made disastrous effect upon the Serbian government and Serbian public opinion. It was as a thunder from a crystalized and clear sky. Forty-eight hours only were permitted for Serbia must meet all demands provided in ten points of this ultimatum which was in great contrast with the Serbian independence. Though, so ruthless to her sovereignty the Serbian government did its utmost to avert war, plainly pre-determined by the German powers. Namely, it accepted eight out of the ten principle points, and the rest of two points she was ready to submit either to the Hague Tribunal or any good office or to Great powers. All attempts were too late. The war powder was smelling so suffocating that even "dry bones" of its inventor, Shwarzenberg got restless and nervous. What to say about the world powers and what of those small states, which were just waiting the heavy and ruthless stroke of big masters. The jaws of the monster god of world war were opened to swallow

only 42,000,000 human beings, to ruin hundreds of thousands of human creations, to spend billions of money, to produce almost general misery all over the world, to degenerate entire nations. But helas! it is perfectly O.K. for the "modern" century and "civilized" nations. Hm! Hm!!

Austria declared war upon Serbia on July 28; Germany declared war on Russia on August 1, and upon France on August 3. Germany invaded Belgium on August 4, and on the same day Great Britain declared war on Germany. Montenegro stepped in defence of Serbia and declared war to Germany and Austria.

This act brought the Near Eastern Problem to its culminative point of complication, because it produced the greatest struggles of the peoples of all five continents as it was the case never before. This act made clear that the Near Eastern Question did not belong only to Near East but West, North and South, too. In other words, the Near Eastern Problem had become a world wide problem which, dwelling for many centuries on the brutal and fierce struggles brought about the greatest cataclysm in human society.

In the same year Japan joined the Allied and Turkey central powers. In year 1915, Italy declared war upon the central powers and at the end of the same year Bulgaria attacked Serbia, which was overrun by the German, Austrian and Bulgarian forces. In 1916 Roumania was induced to declare war to Austro-Hungary, and Greece had been compelled to enter war by military forces of the allied powers. In the month of March 1917 the Russian revolution broke out which ended the Tzaristic regime in Russia.

A month later the United States of America entered war against the central powers.

The allied and associated powers were victorious by the end of 1918, and armistices were concluded with Bulgaria, September 28th; with Turkey, October 20th; with Austro-Hungary, November 3rd; and with Germany, November 11th, which date actually ended the first World War, but it is quite probable that treaties made as a result of this war opened new gates of another world war. Let not it be so, but the Versaille treaty inaugurate such a situation which may be best characterized by the motto of Galic Duke: *Vae victis*; and when so, it is quite certain that it may happen *Vae Victoribus*, also.

Concerning the Near Eastern Question the world war had greatly effected and changed its existing status quo ante. First of all, the two greatest rivals, Germany and Russia, had ceased at least for a few decades to be any real factors in the Near East. In other words, the two most adversative movements, that of Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism, are checked to be dangerous one for the other. Out of the clash of these two contrary directions of politics had been born a little child, which is "baptized" "Internationalism". This "little child", The Internationalism, is pretending to become a great and powerful man, i.e., his power will be spread not only in Germany and Russia but, doubtless, all over the world. This is natural course of human evolution which can not be checked by any artificial force and not even with the tanks, poison, gas and far ranging cannons, etc., etc.



The peace conference composed of Allied powers and associated states met at Paris in January 1919. This meeting which held its sessions in the Palace of Versailles undertook among the principal tasks also to re-establish peace by imposing treaties upon Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. In accordance with such provisions the treaties of St. German, Trianon, of Neuilly of Sevres and Lausan had been concluded. According to the treaty of St. German and Trianon (1919-1922) all south Slave provinces, which formerly belonged to Austro-Hungary were restored to newly formed states of the Serbs, Croats and Slavenes, (Jugo-Slavia). These provinces are: Dalmatia, Bosna, Herzegovina, Batcka, Banat, Croatia and Slavonia. In accordance with the treaty of Neuilly (1919-1922) Bulgaria had been deprived of her conquests during the world war. Moreover, Bulgaria was deprived of her outlet to the Aegean Sea. This is the greatest shame of this treaty as the greatest shame St. German and Trianon's treaties had been the deprivation of Austria and Hungaria having any access to the Adriatic coast. The treaty of Sevres (1920-1922) made Greek territory large, deprived Turkey from all of its European territory and part of Asia Minor, but owing to French and Italian help given to Kemal Pasha, the leader of the regenerated republic of Turkey, the Greek aspiration being helped by England in Asia Minor had been checked by many victories of Turks upon Greeks. As a result of these victories was that treaty of Lausanne had been concluded in 1923. In accordance with its

provisions Greece had been deprived of all of her conquered provinces in Asia Minor. The compulsory exchange of certain portions of the Greek and Turkish populations had been effected. The very known treaties of Capitulations had been abolished. The part of eastern Thrace was restored to Turkey with Constantinople. Furthermore, it was agreed the absolute freedom of passages for ships of commerce in time of peace and in time of war through Straights of Bosphorus and Dardanelles. Also it is assured the free passage of war ships, but with the limitation on the number and size of these ships. However, if Turkey is belligerent the free passage of neutral ships of commerce is permitted with the right to visit and search reserved for Turkey. There will be no fortification on both sides of Dardanelles, Bosphorus and the sea of Marmora. A Straights Commission will be created composed of representatives of France, England, Italy, Japan, Bulgaria, Greece, Roumania, Jugo-Slavia and Russia but when conditions admit."

In accordance with all treaties concluded after the world war and concerning the Near Eastern Question we may point out that the cloudy sky upon the horizon of the Near East era had been greatly cleared but such an act had not entirely solved the Near Eastern Problem in accordance with the good point of view of world politics. The next chapter will indicate what can be done in order to bring about the longer or permanent solution of this everlasting and enigmatic Question.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE NEAR EAST AND POSSIBLE  
SOLUTION OF ITS PROBLEM

Pax, vita et progressus  
aut  
Bellum, infernus et mors mundi.

The preceding chapters have shown but a skeleton of the Near East Question. The purpose of this chapter has been previously indicated. However, as the Near East had never been without decorations of the mysticism and mystery, and, whereas it caused world-wide troubles and conflicts, it seems worth while that a few words should be added to this chapter, which would assert that. In other words, this chapter will not go directly from the very beginning to the very end to its main purpose, but will run a little bit to left and right sides of its subject. Why? Because all the Orient was and yet is the "variegated labyrinth" of peoples, religions, races, languages, customs, traditions, hatreds, wars, very often of enigmatic events and almost never of the highest conception of real human life. It was and still is the place where almost everything and anything may happen. When thus, let us reflect upon the Near Eastern events and, then, let us try to suggest any solution, which will bring about peace and prosperity to Near East and which will save the wearied world from further repetition of tragedy-comic occurrences and upheavals.

Quo vadis, o homo! Again and again! Why so! What are we, what do we, where are we, and where are we marching. How far so. Are we beasts of beasts or gods of gods. How far will rest the justice, equality and highest interests of all mankind upon the points of the swords or in powder of guns, or granates with poison gas. How far the supreme interest of all the world will be controlled by a few individuals or nations? How far the stronger nations will treat those weaker like a cat captured mouse. When will be checked the insanity of those human individuals who more strongly believe in the rotten doctrine "might makes right" than they do believe in existance of their lives. When all the world shall be like a nice house of conscious, aware and peace loving members and not like huge focus of everlasting chaos in which leading roles are performed by noted bandits and worst thieves. How far small minds of mortals will partition our globe upon which great Nature did not mark any artificial boundery. The rays of majestic sun are warming all earth and its beings, but helas! when the rays of international sun will disperse the darkness and clouds made by those chauvinists, who pretend to be potent on earth as god in Universe. When international sun will melt those short-sighted and narrow minded people, When it will declare the liberty upon all enslaved mankind and secure the real renaissance of human progress and civilization. It is the question of to be or not to be and when so, there is no doubt that the number of those who strive for bread and butter is larger than the number of those who are "perfectly happy" in the present

"paradise". Accordingly, those who constantly and fearlessly strive for daily bread and butter are devoted adherents of internationalism, brotherhood and sisterhood of all peoples throughout the world. Due to such a fact there is prevailing certainty and necessity that the rays of the sublime international sun must sooner or later overshadow those pale rays of national moon. Just now we are in the era of such international victory, tho a good many of us are not capable of perceiving such slow but constant and overwhelming process of evolution in human society. However, those who are blind enough to see the progress of the internationalism they must be aware that neither house nor family in it, nor state nor people in it, can have happiness, peace and progress while they are surrounded by noted thieves, gamblers and bandits. It means there is no inside order until we assure outside order. It logically means that spirit of internationalism must take place all over the world.

The wolves, lions and tigers do not pretend nor boast of being civilized, cultured and humanitarian. But hark! We mortals do pretend to be, and is there any difference between above mentioned beasts and men in the case of seeking the necessity for their existance. How far so!

During the world war I have lost "only" twelve relatives. Five of them starved to death during enemy occupation of my birth place. But say it is nothing. During the same war Serbia and Montenegro lost "only" one third of the entire population. But suppose it is nothing! During the same tragedy-comedy of human

race hundreds of thousands of human creations had been ruined and converted into ashes. But imagine it nothing! During the same war of wars there had been spent so much money and so much of human energy that "only" twenty-seven paved roads might have been built all around our planet. But fancy it is nothing. During the same shameful, and silly and almost achieved catastrophe of mankind "only" forty-two millions of peoples had been entirely swallowed by the monster's jaws of the God of War. But dream it is also nothing! During the same eruption of human brutality, barbarism and insanity millions of people had inherited such diseases which are absolutely incurable by modern medicine. But we must realize that certainly it means something. Namely, it means neither more nor less than degeneration of human races. Where such constant processes go it is not very hard to find out. Why so? How far so?

The present civilization of mankind is principally based upon the coarse power of materialism, technic and mechanic. The constant progress of these three branches had culminated into inventions of deadly war materials and world wide slavery under modern masters and control of materialism, technic and mechanic; and through these shrewed and disguised tools of modern democracy into creation of overwhelming imperialism. Let us give an illustration. If China is able to keep a greater army and navy and if she is able to control more people, to ruin more private and state property, to whip and kill more hundreds and thousands of people, then, there is no doubt that such chauvinistic, imperial-

istic and militaristic China would be considered as most civilized and progressive nation as it is the case today with Japan, France, Great Britain, etc. The present world Politics has for its main goal to speak about causes of materialism, technic, mechanic and dominating power of imperialism. When thus, can we dare say that existing regime of civilization of mankind is any kind of civilization at all. Can we mention that such a world Politics is a science or politics at all. How far so!

Despite the horrible consequences which had been ascribed to accountability of mistrustful and rival nations, which had caused world war, nevertheless, there is no doubt that almost achieved hell of human race had besides its bad also good sides. Namely, it had inaugurated numerous excellent benefits for future generations. Among many of these highly appreciated benefits is a great disappointment vanquished and conquerors, because recent war meant for both of them nothing else than Pyrus victory. It means that states shall not run into wars as they used to. The Genoa economic and Washington disarmament conferences are benefits of the World War. Moreover, the world war had expelled from the realm of suppression of the small nations the two of the most leading factors, Russia and Germany.\* Now, the peoples of these two states as well as with the people of the other states of the world which had been previously predisposed toward the great scope of internationalism may march towards higher ideals of the world. It is certain fact that they will find great moral and

\* Also the ruin of Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires resulted in the liberation of the millions of suppressed peoples.

material support in the people of the United States of America. These people had formed long ago a cosmopolitan world in miniature. These people had shown many magnificent examples that local and national interests must be sacrificed to those of whole mankind. Two examples of this kind are worth while mentioning: that of the civil war in 1861-5 and that of the world war 1917-18. If the people of America are not sufficiently controlled by a few capitalistic individuals it is quite probable that America would long ago unfurl the sublime flag, which would be a symbol not only of the United States of America but of the United States of the World. Such an act would signalize the start of the modern history and beginning of a new epoch of real and frank civilization. Great Britain which during many centuries had based her imperative and imperialistic veto against certain state, many states or even all the world, upon her mighty navy has clearly experienced during recent war, that due to the invention of submarines and airoplanes is obliged to cut off at least for a few inches her too long fingers which had been stretched all over the world, i.e., she has to realize that it is an impossibility to remain longer in despite of all the world, the mistress of the seas and oceans. She also had come to the conclusion that despite the world she cannot any longer exercise her hegemony in world politics. France, Italy and Japan had realized that there is no chance to wage war against all the world. It means that the joint word of the world is superior to that of a certain great power or even of two such powers. The institution of the League



of Nations and International Court of Justice had put a bridle, though a loose one, upon many chauvinistic and imperialistic ambitions. Such a fact has indicated a new era in which sooner or later there must be established such a world wide institution, which shall have compulsory decisions in all inter-state disputes. It means that fate of the world will be in the hands of the world instead of in the hands of a few individuals or states, as it was and as yet is the case. Finally the world war had created stronger influence of public opinion on international affairs.

The murder at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, was merely the spark that fired the powder magazine of Europe. A month later the world was in a huge conflagration. By the end of 1918, this world comedy was over. As a result of war, the map not only of Europe but of the greater part of the world had been thoroughly modified. This change had especially effected the Near East. It is certain fact that this change of boundaries would take an entirely different trend if England, France and Italy were not afraid from Bolshevistic doctrines and propaganda. It is also quite probable that another war following immediately the world war would break out among allied and associated powers. This war might break out for the partition of game as the case was during the second Balkan war when collision occurred among members of the Balkan League. Owing to some nations being tired and fearing Bolshevism such a cruel act had been avoided.

At the beginning of the World War it was generally believed that post-humous bell had rung to the Ottoman Empire in Asia and

in Europe as well. It was also believed that the lion's share of it will befall the central or allied powers. However, the events during the war and particularly after it had fundamentally ignored the previous opinion. Namely, owing to the old medicine of selfishness, mistrust and rivalry, Turkey though defeated and diminished in territory had received a new lease for her existence. Her victories over the Greeks in 1922 gave her new hope for rebirth of her old dominion and even modern prestige in the Near East. These victories of defeated Turkey would be entirely impossible if France and Italy did not encourage Turks by supplying them with war materials. They did so in order to annihilate or at least to lesson the English prestige on the Near East. The fear of the English prestige was principally based on the presumption of Greek territorial expansion. This extention was supported by English policy, which believed that in the case the Greek dominion in the Near East becomes larger the more influence will secure England upon that region.

It was pointed out that in accordance to the treaty of Sevre Turkey had been entirely expelled from Europe. But owing to renewed intrigues among France, Italy and England, Turkey was enabled to defeat the Greek army in Smyrna and to conclude, in June 1923, the treaty of Leusanne, which treaty again secured to her a slice of eastern Thrace running west to the river of Marica. Being deprived of her European territory the modern Turkish leaders headed by Cemal Pasha had transferred the capital of Turkey to Angora, in Asia Minor. The last Ottoman Sultan-Khalif, Wa-

hiddin Mehmed VI had been compelled to flee from Turkey in 1914, and Turkey had become the republic. The new and energetic leaders of the Turkish republic had adopted the same methods as Japan did long ago. Namely, they began to introduce modern civilization of the Western nations. Also, they worked by day and night in improving the administration all over the country. According to such actions of the leaders of modern Turkey, it is quite probable that modern Turkey will not be a focus of mystery, mysticism and everlasting intrigues as unfortunately was the case with the old Turkey. The first success of the new administration and order in Turkey had been the abolition of Capitulations, which we spoke of in previous chapters. One bad thing of modern Turkey is that her citizens of the Turkish religion or say Mohammedan religion are still great fanatics of their religion. A longer time and education may give a new conception of life to these great fanatics of the Orient. However, for the present it must be born in mind that Pan-Islamic movement numbering over 250,000,000 population may again be a new menace for world peace and order. This movement is strong not only in present Turkey but also in Marocco, Egypt, India and in the whole of the Orient.

"I am a faithful follower of Mohammed and a devoted servant of Allah and our nation is very great," is usual saying of the large majority of these Oriental people.

Besides the creation of modern Turkey we spoke of, which is situated in Asia Minor, the events of the world war had done something else. Namely, at the ruins of the Turkish empire had em-

erged many new independent or quasi-independent units. Summing up the present status of former Turkish Empire, or say of the Near East, we have to proceed as follows:

In December 1914, the English government promised to the people of Egypt a greater privilege of self administration if they remained loyal to England during the world war. In 1923, the protectorate of England over Egypt had been withdrawn and Egypt became the independent state with the King as chief executive head. By granting independence to Egypt, England had secured certain obligation of it as America did by Platt amendment in her relation to Cuba. Since day of independence down to the present moments the quarrels between England and Egypt due to the Sudan situation had lead to repeated and strong military interventions of England to the internal affairs of Egypt. The conflict is still in high "tide", and how final solution of these quarrels and unfriendly relations will be settled it is hard to prophesy. However, if Pan-Islamic movement takes more influence as it hopes to, it is quite probable that the present era of nationalistic ferment and perturbation in Egypt may bring more serious conflicts with Great Britain. Let it not be so, but it may happen so.

In Asia Minor the Arab-speaking tribes had formed an independent state during the world war. This state is called the Kingdom of Hijaz. The Paris treaty had recognized its independence and Hijaz is now the member of the League of Nations. The

foreign policy of this small state is based upon the support of Great Britain.

The article XXII of the Covenant of the League of Nations defines the principles of government for the "A", "B", and "C" mandates. In accordance to such definition the territories of the former Ottoman Empire: Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestina and Lebanon were arrayed under mandated category, "A". Nearly five years passed since such arrangement had been created but unfortunately the mandatory powers, France and England had almost nothing done to improve the general conditions in the territories mentioned.

The five Balkan states which emerged from the ruin of the Ottoman Empire are: The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slavenes, known better perhaps as Jugo-Slavia, Roumenia, Greece, Bulgaria and Albania.

Montenegro drank during the world war the same bitter glass as her sister Serbia did. Namely, at the very beginning of 1916, she was invaded by Austro-Hungary and German forces. At the end of the world war her assembly met in Podgoritza and unanimously proclaimed the union with Serbia. Also the other south Slave people, belonging prior to the world war to Austro-Hungary, proclaimed union with Serbia and Montenegro. Such an act had formed a new state, Jugo-Slavia, which embraces all south Slave tribes except that of Bulgaria. Since the union had occurred up to the present days there had been quite a strong and bitter quarrel between the peasant leader Radich of Croatia and the leader of the Radical party, Pashich of Serbia, on account of internal administration of the new state. Pashich who was playing the same role

among south Slave tribes as Otton Bismark and Camilo Cavour did while their countries were in the era of being united, had succeeded in defeating his oponent Radich, who was for federal form of government, by creating Constitution in June 1921, which secured to Jugo-Slavia the centralized form of government with particular concessions to large local self administration. Having a healthy nation, very fertile soil and great natural resources, the new state of JugoSlavia had shown since the union greater prosperity than any Balkan or even any state of "Balkanized Europe". The leaders of JugoSlavia had declared two years ago through the mouth of Mr. Vesnich: "We do not intend to take orders henceforth from anybody, not from Moscow any more than from Berlin, and not from London any more than from Paris. The powers must understand that the child has grown up." \* These words mean the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine for the Balkans.

The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slavenes has an area of over 102,000 square miles and about 14,000,000 population.

The smallest and most backward of the Balkan states is Albania, which had been created pending the London conference in 1913. Until Serbia and Montenegro had been invaded by the enemy, during the world war, Albania had secured the strict neutrality. After the invasion of the countries mentioned, she was compelled to fight on the side of the central powers. The Paris treaty had acknowledged her independence and she is now the member of the League of Nations. The poverty of the land, insufficient educa-

---

\* Mower P. "Balkanized Europe"--page 57.

tion of people as well as constant antagonism among adherents of the Mohamadan religion, Greek orthodox and Roman Catholic churches had sown the seed of many evils and perturbations in the newly created state. A few months ago she adopted the republican, unitary, representative and highly centralized form of government. Albania and Austria are only two of European states which economically are in the worst situation. Albania covers an area estimated at about 18,000 square miles and has a population of about 850,000.

Since the end of the world war Greece had passed many roads of internal and external troubles. Internal troubles had been caused by Venizelos's adherents who favored the republican form of government and King Konstantine followers, who were in favor of Monarchical regime. These troubles had been settled last year, when the monarchy was overthrown and a republic was proclaimed. In external troubles were involved those of the war with Turkey in which Greece had been not only defeated but also humiliated, being deprived of the conquered territories in Asia Minor and Thrace, too. Her external troubles with Italy were two-fold. Primarily, she was deprived of many of the islands in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean which islands are populated by "pure" Greek people and which went to Italy as a result of Turko-Italian war of 1911-12. Secondly, on account of assassination of a few Italians, who were members of the International Boundary Commission and who were killed in Epyrus, the northern part of Greece, the Italian forces were landed at Corfu, and the Italian govern-

ment exacted payment from Greece amounting to 50,000,000 Italian liras.

Greece covers an area of 60,000 square miles and over 7,000,000 population.

The result of the world war was more unfortunate for Bulgaria than for any other of the Balkan States. Besides being deprived of part of her pre-war territory she also was compelled to pay a big amount of war indemnity to allied and associated powers. But more than that, she is fully deprived of her egress to Aegean coast. It is also one point among hundreds and thousands of the shameful paragraphs of post-world war treaties. As before war, so now, Bulgaria is a constitutional monarchy with highly centralized system of administration. As Greece, so Bulgaria, since the world war was very unfortunate in her internal and external affairs. Internal troubles had been caused by the constant quarrels between adherents of military oligarchy and those of peasant and communist parties. These troubles had reached a climax just in present days, when civil war rages all over Bulgaria. What will the result be of these riots and ferments it is hard to fortell but it is quite probable that the peasant party will not sleep until the institution of republican form of government. External troubles were due to repeated intervention of allied and associated powers.

Bulgaria covers an area of over 45,000 square miles and has about 5,300,000 population.

The Kingdom of Roumenia took the lion's share as a result of her participation in the world war. Her territory, covering



area of about 50,000 square miles and over 7,500,000 population, prior to the world war had been greatly enlarged by the result of the same war. This result was that Roumenian territory cover now an area of about 110,000 square miles and over 16,000,000 population. Roumenia, having fertile soil and a great amount of natural resources had shown since the war great economic prosperity, but also good many of the internal troubles due chiefly to quarrels among progressive and conservative parties. In her foreign policy, Roumenia had shown, since the war, the same attitude towards Russia, Hungary and Bulgaria as Poland did towards Germany and Russia by taking away the entire regions which historically and ethnically are German and Russian. Namely, Roumenia had taken from Hungary in the region of Transilvania some sections of territory, which are fully populated by Hungarian people. But the greater crime that Roumenia had committed against the world Politics is because she took away the Russian province Bessurabia. There is no doubt, that such and similar acts sow such a seed which sooner or later may bring very bitter fruits to Roumenia. Accordingly too, it is not very late to exclaim again and again: Videant Consules..... Roumenia is a constitutional monarchy with a democratic representative form of government.

Many publicists endeavored to show that by the expulsion of Turkey from Europe the Near East problem will be solved. Such opinion was a false one. Europe, prior to the world war had many "Sore spots" but helas! after the war hundreds of times more. The world before the great war had many international problems

but after the war thousand times more. The same rule can be applied on the Near East. Namely, the more "independent" states the more sore spots, problems, quarrels and even wars. Before the world war the solution of the Near East seemed very simple, but now very enigmatic and more complicated than at any time past. To illustrate the above said, here follows but a few proofs, showing new sore spots in the near East.

The Adriatic Question involving Fiume, Gorica, Istza, with Sadar and a few islands off the Dalmatian coast are taken by Italy. Such an act had created sore spots between Jugo-Slavia and Italy. The city of Scutari which belongs to Albania and Kosovo Polje which belongs to Jugo-Slavia are disputed places among these two states. North Apyrus is a sore spot between Greece and Albania. Albania is a sore spot between Greece, Jugo-Slavia and Italy; Macedonia among Jugo-Slavia, Greece and Bulgaria; Thrace among Greece, Turkey and Bulgaria; Transylvania between Hungary and Roumenia; Besserabia between Russia and Roumenia; Dobrudja between Bulgaria and Roumenia; many islands of the eastern Mediterranean, particularly those of the Ionian Sea, between Greece, Italy, France, England, Turkey; the whole present Turkey among England, France, Italy and even the United States of America which tried to secure oil wells in Turkey but was backed by English companies; Sudan between Egypt and England, etc. In one word, the present equilibrium of the Near East is very sensitive and exposed in the future to more troubles than in any time past. It is a new sore spot for the entire world, though in the present

days there is no danger for world peace. And in order to secure such a peace many states of the Near East had created defensive alliance. For instance Roumenia, Jugo-Slavia and Checkoslovakia had formed the so-called, Little Entente; Greece and Jugo-Slavia had formed a few weeks ago a military alliance. But despite all such alliances there is no hope for the longer peace in the Orient, unless there is provided something more stable to guarantee the present status quo of the Near East. The first direction in this way should be that all sore spots should be corrected by the method of plebiscite, which would take place under strict supervision of the League of Nations. It is one solution of the Near East Problem according to the point of view of the World Politics. Another solution is in creating the Federal States of Asia Minor and, on the other hand, the creation of a Federation or Confederation of Balkan States. All above mentioned solutions would be good but doubtless unstable and very sensitive. But most stable and best solution of this everlasting and of hundred and thousands of other international problems would be in the creation of a Federation or Confederation of the World. Such Confederation of the world would have its Superstates Parliament composed of the members chosen by direct vote out from among all nations with the ratio one member on every three or five million peoples. It would have its Super States Senate, whose members would be chosen out among members of the house of representatives with the ratio two members from each state. The decisions of the Supernational Parliament should be approved by the Supernational Senate. More-

over, such a Confederation would have its Superstate or Supernational Courts of Justice with compulsory jurisdiction in all interstates disputes. The judges for such a Court would be selected as they are now for the permanent Court of International Justice, or by secret votes of the Supernational Senate our among those proposed by the majority vote of the World Parliament. Such a new World would have also the superstates departments of imigration, colonization, transportation, agriculture and work, traãe, militia or international police, poverty, science and arts, education, hygiene, the mutual contace and acquaintance, and particularly a department of finances in whose power would be put that huge capital which is now in the hands of a few individuals instead of all the world.

There is no doubt that besides many things of international of let us say of world wide scope would be also the adoption of Esperanto or of some other language as best means for the progress of international intercourse. There are also many other suggestions for solution of the Near East problem according to the best point of view of the World Politics, but looking into the present reality of the world affairs and situation it seems to me that the best solution for the present would be this I just pointed out.

If the world has to live and progress its fate must be controlled by ones of world opinion and world democracy. If we are anxious to secure better opportunity and happiness for certain individuals, states and entire mankind we must rapidly, fearlessly,

and energetically march towards the Federation of the World, and when later on we reach such a stage, then, the dreams of the greatest philanthropers, of many poets, writers and lovers of brotherhood, and sisterhood will be realized. In those sublime days the world will be ruled by men not by beasts as is the case today. In those magnificent moments the new progress of civilization would appear which will be entirely different of the present. Let us march under the flag of the world, or let us commit suicide. There is no third alternative. If we select the first then Victor Hugo's words: "Is the human race created merely for that purpose to annihilate itself" will not be repeated any more. If we select the first and reach the first world wide goal, I would at once commit suicide on account of being too happy; if we select first and create the World Federation or Confederation, then, the famous verses of Victor Hugo would be completely justified:

Quoi! peuple contre peuple, o nations trompees,  
De quel droit avez-vous le mains pleines d'epes?;

or those verses of Fr. Shiller:

Der geist lebt in uns allen  
Und unsere Burg ist Gott;

or those of La Martin:

Ce ne sont plus de mers, des degres, des riviers  
Qui bornent l'heritage entre l'humanite;  
Le bornes des esprits sont leurs seules frontieres,  
Le monde en s'eclairant- s'eleve a l'unite:

or those known English verses:

Every tiger madness muzzled, every passion killed,  
Every grim raven a garden, every blazing desert killed,

Robed in universal harvest up to either pole she smiles-  
Universal ocean softly washing all her warless isles;

or the following proverbs in Latin:

Ibi patria ubi bene!

Videat mundus ne quid detrimenti res humana caperet!

-----FINIS-----

## B i b l i o g r a p h y

**Nota Bene:** In writing this little essay of the Near Eastern Problem I have used, beside numerous brochures, pamphlets, magazines and newspapers on Serbian (Yugoslave), French, German, English and Russian language, also the following books:

- "
- Die Rechtsnature des Volkerbundes - By Korlin.
- The World Crisis - By Churchill.
- Réponse au Kaiser - By Viviani.
- "
- Die Kriegsschuldfrage - By Wager.
- The Eastern Question - By Marriot I.
- Secrets of the Balkans - By Vopica Ch.
- The European Concert in the Eastern Question - By Holland
- The Religions and Social Problems of the Orient - By  
Aneski M.
- A Short History of the Near East - By Davis W.
- Un Francais a Constantinople - By Divoire F.
- The Secret Treaties of Austro-Hungary - By Pribram A.
- At The Ruins of Mankind - By Ostroszki \*
- Balkanized Europe - By Mowrer P.
- The Ottoman Empire - By Miller W.
- 

\*Anome duplums that I often use in writing.

Near Eastern Affairs and Conditions - By Panaretoff St.

The Eastern Question - By Duggan St.

La Question d'Orient - By Driault E.

Comparative History - By Ex-Kaiser.

The Question of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles - By

Boxton & Phillipson.

The Western Question in Greece and Turkey - By Toynbee A.

An Introduction to World Politics - By Gibbens A.

The Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic Question -By

Seton-Watson R.

The Near East - By Hogarth D.

The Blood of Slave People - By Ksunin A.

The New Life and Age - By Yovanovich.

Die Grossmächte and die Weltkrise - By Von Kjellen.

International Tribunals - By Evans W.

Un Cour de Justice International - By Scott.

Der Dauerfriede - By Shuking.

La Cause de la Paix - By Pillet.

The Problem of and International Court - By Wehberg.

The Near East - By Smythe H. R.

The Near East - By Alfred R.

The Near East from Within - By Dulton.

The Rebirth of Turkey - By Price Ch.

L' Europe et la jeune Turquie - By Pinon R.



The Revolutions in Turkey - By Ramsay S. W.  
South Eastern Europe - By Savich V.  
History of the Balkan Peninsula - By Shevill F.  
The Balkans - By Sloan W.  
The Danger Zone of Europe - By Woods Ch.  
Military Council in Turkey - By Townshed A.  
Turkey in Europe - By Odysseus.  
Modern Turkey - By Nears.  
Italy's War for a Desert - By McCullach F.  
La Ruins d' un Empire - By Gaulis G.  
The Turks and Europe - By Callard G.  
Memoirs of a Turkish Statesman - By Djemal Pasha.  
Eastern Problems - By Dennis.  
The Aspirations of Bulgaria - By Balkanicus.  
The Serbs Guardians of the Gate of Europe - By Laffan R.  
The Birth of Yugoslavia - By Baerlein H.  
Greater Roumenia - By Clark.  
The Occident and the Orient - By Chirol.  
The League of Nations Treaties.  
The Peace Conferance Day by Day - By Thompson.  
The Treaties of Peace (1919-1923) - By Martin L.  
The Federation of World - By Treublood.  
L' Islam et les Races - By Andre P.  
Turkey, The Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway - By

Eurle E. M.

Russia in Asia - By Crausse A. S.

England and Russia in the East - By Rawlinson S.

Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers - By Abbott G.

Diplomatic History of Europe - By Anderson & Hershey

Albania Past and Present - By Chekrezi C.

Eastern Problems at the close of the XVIII century -

By Dennis A.

Les Albanais et les grande puissances - By Djordjevich V.

L' Europe avant la guerre - By Gauvain Aug.

Greatest Experiments in History - By Grigg E.

Memoirs of A Balkan Diplomats - By Miyalovich Ch.

La Petite Entente - By Mousset A.

The Origin of the War - By Rose J.

Die Politische Geschichte Des Deutschen Volkes - By

Gerdes H.

Bosna and Herzegovina - By Asboth.

L' Europe et la Resurrection de la Serbie - By Yakshich.

Cent Projets de Paratags de la Turquie - By Duvara T.

The Balkan League - By Gushoff I. E.

L' Hellenisme de l' Asia Mineure - By Hibben P.

Macedonia - By Brailsford H. N.

La Question d' Egypte - By Freycinet.

Le Sort de l' Empe Ottoman - By Mandelstam A.

The War and the Bagdad Railway - By Yastrow M.