



**ORIGINAL PAPER**

**Forecasting Recognition and Independence: An Intellectual Trait Analysis of di Vergano Diplomacy Effectiveness**

**Ionuț Virgil Șerban\***

**Abstract**

After proclaiming its State Independence on May 9<sup>th</sup> 1877 and after its consecration on the battlefield in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, the Romanian diplomacy concentrated its efforts towards its international recognition. One of the most important features that gave a national state the international recognitions of its Independence was appointing a Resident Minister or an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary by the Great Powers (Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia and the Ottoman Empire) in the newly independent country. Italy was one of the first Great Power to recognize Romania's State Independence by sending Count Giuseppe Tornielli-Brusati di Vergano as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bucharest. The diplomatic activity of Count Tornielli in Bucharest was very important for Romania, as he was a sustainer of our independence in a very difficult period, as Germany managed to convince France and Great Britain to delay the international recognitions of Romania's independence until our country has resolved the railway problem with the German constructor company Stroussberg. As Austria-Hungary refused to mediate the conflict between Romania and Germany, the Italian diplomat in Bucharest was the one who tried to intervene in order to remediate the situation as he was facing the matter of delaying his official letters presentation to King Carol I because of the threatening attitude of Germany. On December 19<sup>th</sup> 1879, the Italian diplomat Giuseppe Tornielli presented his official letters as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bucharest regardless Germany's attitude and pressures.

**Keywords:** diplomacy, Italy, Romania, count Giuseppe Tornielli-Brusati di Vergano, international relations.

---

\* Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, International Relations and History Specialization, Phone: 004 0720 285595, E-mail: johnutzserban@yahoo.com.

### **Foreign Policy Approaches and Bounds**

The changes occurring at international level due to the course of the new German foreign policy imposed by Emperor Wilhelm II and Russian-French rapprochement led to closer ties between Vienna and Berlin. Austria-Hungary, torn by internal problems, needed the support of Germany regarding the Balkan policy, and the latter, in turn, considered the control of Central and Southeastern Europe a required platform of its worldwide policy. In addition, both German and the Austro-Hungarian diplomacy, believed that the new international context was appropriate to extend the Triple Alliance Treaty, without waiting for the expiration of the one in effect.

Italy being under customs war with France, uneasy by the rapprochement between the latter and Russia also being engaged in a colonial policy in Africa also agreed to renew the Triple Alliance, despite pressure from Paris and differences with Austria-Hungary, due to the problem of Italians in the Dual Monarchy and also because of the Balkans issue (Stieve, 1929: 44). The government in Rome considered maintaining the Triple Alliance, “a necessary evil” – as first minister Rudini stated in a discussion he had with Giers at Monza in 1891, as still useful to Italy in providing security and support of its policy in the Mediterranean (De Stieglitz, 1906: 15). The unification of Italy and the establishment of the capital in Rome, recognition of Romanian independence and direct support of Italy contributed to the intensification of friendly relations of the two Latin countries (Șerban, 2006: 121-127). Although signing a trade agreement, whose negotiations started as early as the spring of 1876, or the Romanian diplomatic agency advancement to the rank of legation (December 5<sup>th</sup>, 1879) encountered problems mainly due to the need to comply with Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin, which involved the review of Article 7 of the Constitution, which was supported by the Hebrew community in Italy, which due to censitary suffrage had a tenth of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies and could have decisively influenced the fate of the governments of Italy, though the two countries had common interests, especially after both became States of the Triple Alliance (HDAFMB, file no. 71D3 Roma/1877-1878, folio 110).

Count Tornielli alongside Augustino Depretis wanted to recognize the independence of Romania's State considering that the latter was conditioned by The Jewish Question and the Stroussberg issue. Italy was not in solidarity with Berlin, London and Paris and wanted to make this step unilaterally. On 4 April 1879 the Italian Ambassador in Berlin informed by a note the German Foreign Minister von Bülow that Italy is ready to recognize the independence of Romania (Bulei, 2003: 406).

After the resignation of the Depretis Government, Count Tornielli was appointed by decree envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary minister of Italy in Bucharest, but between September 7<sup>th</sup> and December 5<sup>th</sup>, until clarifying the issue of Romania's independence he was transferred in Belgrade (Bulei, 2003: 406).

Count Giuseppe Tornielli Brusati di Vergano was part of a particularly well seen family in Italy, his father being a close friend of King Victor Emanuel II. Entered as a volunteer in the Foreign Ministry, he fulfilled various administrative tasks, so, that in 1863 received the first assignments outside Italy in Saint Petersburg and in 1867 in Athens. Along Maffei di Boglio was considered one of the promoters of Italian politics during the Oriental crisis. On May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1877 Mihail Obedenaru, knowing Tornielli as the secretary general of the Foreign Ministry, told about him that he was the one who took care of contacts with agencies of powers accredited in Rome (Bulei, 2003: 398-399).

## **Forecasting Recognition and Independence**

His misunderstandings with Luigi Corti, the new foreign minister, determined him to wish to go on a mission abroad. As shown in the diplomatic correspondence of Obedenaru, he wanted to get to the important post in Constantinople, but because the opposition had to settle in choosing between Belgrade and Bucharest (Catană, 2009: 107). Apparently he preferred Bucharest due to its key position between Saint Petersburg and Vienna, but also because larger budget in Bucharest than in Belgrade (in Bucharest 50 000 pounds and 35 000 in Belgrade) (Bulei, 2003: 400).

Considered by some difficult, by others an excellent ambassador, Tornielli arrived in Bucharest presenting his credentials on September 18, 1879, as the first representative of Italy in independent Romania. Married to a Russian woman, he drew attention at the time being considered an incurable pro-Russian. Romania's diplomatic agent in Rome, Mihail Obedenaru, noted that Tornielli was pro-Russian largely because he was obsessively anti-Austrian (Dinu, 2007: 218-219).

As Camillo Cavour, he also was a supporter of the principle of nationalities that had made to triumph the unity of the Italian state. Thus, in the summer of 1878, in a discussion with Romania's agent in Rome said that the destruction of this principle was as impossible as had been viewed one year before the issue of independence of Romania (Bulei, 2003: 402).

During this period Italy did not have an appropriate strategy because of the weakness of character of foreign affairs portfolio holder, Cairoli, and the Secretary General Maffei di Boglio. Tornielli's recommendations, considered the true foreign minister during the government of Depretis, represented the basis of the actions of Italy in various problems such as the dedicated monasteries, the issue of Arab Tabia (1879-1880), the proclamation of Kingdom of Romania, March 14, 1881 and the Danube issue (1880-1881) (Bulei, 2003: 418).

### **Historical and diplomatical developments**

The first two years after the Peace Treaty of Berlin, represented the period in which Romania tried to impose its independence to the European powers, conditioned by the provisions in 1878 which represented interference in the internal political life. Once these conditions were met in February 1880, Romania's independence was an accomplished fact for all European countries (Damean, 2005: 108). Romania's new political status imposed its presence in a system of alliances. To this was also added the discriminatory treatment that Romania was subject during talks on its status in Danube European Commission.

Despite the Romanian political class affinity for France, Romania could not hope for an alliance with it. This was due to the deterioration of French prestige in Europe since 1871, but also because of the attitude of France against Romania's independence and economic disinterest. French financial circles preferred to be the auxiliary of the German ones, especially after the discussion on amending Article 7 of the Constitution of 1866. With Russia, Romania could not have close relation, since in January 1879 the Romanian Army was practically on the verge of facing the tsarist army for the control of Arab-Tabia height, strategic point in the vicinity of Silistra. If Austria-Hungary supported Romania, from the desire to prevent the dominance of Russia in Bulgaria, Germany sided with Russia, because the latter to have no opportunity to get closer to France (Dinu, 2007: 221).

Regarding Austria-Hungary, Romania was in conflict because of its status in the Danube Commission, because of the economic boycott of the dual monarchy markets, but mostly over the issue of Romanians in Transylvania. Italy, which had a permanent attitude

of sympathy for Romania, was interested in obtaining economic concessions for its commercial products, being ready to join the signatory States of conventions with Romania, even before the conquest of state independence and its internationally recognition (Bușe, 2009: 123).

Despite the dynastic bond, Germany did not enjoy a favorable attitude in Bucharest albeit only because of the attitude of Otto von Bismarck at the Congress of Berlin, plus a number of his claims against Romanians. In addition, there was an anti-monarchical current, but they were not insurmountable difficulties (Dinu, 2007: 222).

Thus, we can consider that Romania had an interest towards an alliance, but also the European states themselves. Thus, Austro-German alliance from 1879 had to be strengthened. Whether in 1881, Serbia signed a treaty with Austria-Hungary, and in 1882, Italy became an ally, turning Dual Alliance in Triple Alliance, Austro-Hungary needed a certainty on the border of south and south-east, and it was provided by a treaty with Romania. Germany, whose orientation was toward the West, aimed cessation off any close French-Russian tendencies, was interested in having secured a surplus of Austrian troops in the West, in case Romania had become an ally with Austria-Hungary (Căzan and Zoner, 1979: 28).

The 1866 Constitution in Article 93 provided that the president was responsible for foreign policy, in the treaties of commerce and navigation and others. Omission of international treaties seemed justified until 1880, as Romania was not independent, but amending the Constitution in 1883, the situation remained the same. We believe that the sovereign wanted to take the initiative of foreign policy, avoiding the debate in Parliament. Regarding the validity of the document signed the head of state, in accordance with Article 92, it was assured by the Foreign Minister signature. As long as there was a unity of views between the two, the situation was good, complications coming only in case of disputes. Chance of a treaty with the Central Powers was assured that there were supporters in both parties that replaced each other, usually in government: liberals and conservatives (Platon, 2003: 237).

Not only Romanians were interested in an alliance with the Central Powers, but also with Austria-Hungary and Germany. At least so we can interpret Bismarck's interest. He was aware that in an eventual competition for signature of Romania, Russia could win because it could promise Transylvania.

In this context, strengthening relations between Austria-Hungary and Russia in 1881, without creating the impression that it feels affected by the problem of the Danube, Romania was proclaimed Kingdom. Romania hoped that if it accepted the role of President of Austria-Hungary could gain control of the European Commission on the Joint Committee, but French representative, Barrère, made a proposal that continued to keep secret control of Austria-Hungary, which remained permanent president under the formal control of European Commission exercised by a President elected every 6 months, and through Serbia which had an alliance with since 1881 (Platon, 2003: 238).

The message of the throne of 15<sup>th</sup>/27<sup>th</sup> of November 1881 criticized the abusive tendencies of Austria-Hungary on the issue of the Danube, attracting the hostility of Austria-Hungary that caused a diplomatic conflict (Alecsandri, 2001: 116).

Baron Nicolics mission started in Bucharest on 26<sup>th</sup> of March 1881 aimed integration of Romania into an alliance with Austria-Hungary. Although political circles in Bucharest refused the desired formula of Vienna, but they understood that they must give up, because Russia was unable to express an opinion and France sided with Austria-Hungary that practically meant the isolation of Romania. On 21<sup>th</sup> of May / June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1882

## Forecasting Recognition and Independence

the Danube European Commission presented the fluvial navigation and police regulations (applicable on the section Porțile de Fier – Galați) and adopted the Barrère's proposal (Platon, 2003: 239).

Between 8<sup>th</sup> February to 20<sup>nd</sup> and of 10<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 1883 the Conference of the 7 powers was held in London that granted authority to Russia as far as Galați, eliminating the Chilia brace under the authority of Danube European Commission. However its mandate was extended by 21 years. Romania protested, while the London Conference could not apply coercive measures. The only constant of time was reaching the peak of the Austro-Hungarian-Romanian dispute whose central point was the question of the Romanians in Transylvania (Platon, 2003: 240). Romania's diplomatic isolation was now complete. Ignoring the wishes of France that Romania to accede to the Treaty of London in conjunction with the rise of Russia in Bulgaria and frictions between Romania and Russia, Romania had no choice but to join the Triple Alliance. On May 20<sup>nd</sup>, 1882 in order to ensure the southern border of Austria-Hungary, Italy became a founding member of the Triple Alliance. Although strategic movement was masterfully conceived by Bismarck, lack of national support from Member States made it fragile (Pavel, 2000: 200). This view is reinforced by the fact that Romania and Italy had irreconcilable disputes at territorial level with Austria-Hungary.

So, in the first half of 1883, we can say that an alliance with Romania initiative was made by Germany, being also taken by Vienna, before having an echo in Bucharest. D. A. Sturdza, the holder of the foreign affairs portfolio in Bucharest was little influential, compared with the Prime Minister Ion C. Brătianu, he was the one thought by the diplomacy in Wilhelmstrasse, as being the one who could provide the necessary support to Carol I to perfect the agreement. The summer of 1883 represented a maximum rate of tension of Austro-Hungarian-Romanian relations due to the incident caused at the inauguration of the statue of Stephen the Great in Iasi by Senator Petre Grădișteanu; he spoke of the crown ornaments missing, immediately perceived as offensive speech by the Cabinet in Vienna, that passed to veiled threats, by Transylvanian border inspections conducted by General Beck, Chief of Staff of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Pavel, 2000: 224).

Disagreements between Prince Battemberg and Russian generals in Bulgaria created a new conflict situation that was likely to hasten actions of Allies on 26<sup>th</sup> of August / September 7<sup>th</sup>, 1883. Two meetings between Bismarck and Ion. C. Brătianu were held at Gastein. Romanian Prime Minister called into question the friction with Austria-Hungary the German Chancellor trying to allay irritation caused by the Cabinet of Vienna, to which persist for the same purpose. The fact is that both statesmen were aware that the Romanian-German alliance could not be viable unless through alliance with Austria-Hungary. Thus, German Chancellor refused to accept the Romanian party wishes to negotiate directly with Germany (bilateral treaty) and officially join the Triple Alliance (Alliance quadruple transformation), proposing a treaty between Vienna and Bucharest to which Germany would join (Platon, 2003: 243).

A less discussed problem of historiography was that of the absence of a treaty between Romania and Austria-Hungary during October 18<sup>th</sup>/28<sup>th</sup> 1891 and July 13<sup>th</sup>/25<sup>th</sup> 1892. In 1881, Italy was the first state to officially recognize the quality of Kingdom of the state proposing the exempt the existence of an agreement between the states recognizing the kingdom, as it was stipulated in the Treaty of Aachen on October 11<sup>th</sup>, 1818 (Boicu, Cristian and Platon, 1980: 347).

## Ionuț Virgil ȘERBAN

With the Mancini government, Count Torielli's ability to intervene in the political life decreased considerably. Torielli offered the chance for Italy to have a worthy place for the Italian Embassy in Bucharest, when only the Russian Embassy and the General Consulate of Greece had such facilities (Bulei, 2003: 398).

During his diplomatic mission, Torielli noted himself by an excessive detailing of the Romanian realities. Torielli's most important work is *Relazione del Regalo Ministro d'Italia in Romania per il biennio 1882-1883* with 532 pages, considered by historiography as a comprehensive treatise on the constitution of the independent Romanian state, which led to its publication in Italy in 1885 "for its outstanding value" (Bulei, 2003: 398). His mission ended on December 25<sup>th</sup> 1887 finally becoming ambassador in Spain. The period between the recognition of Romania's state independence by Italy and the signing of the Treaty of 1888 can be divided into several stages depending on the level of intensity. Thus, between 1879 and 1881, during the government of Benedetto Cairoli, who was also temporary foreign minister, Italy rushed to recognize Romania's independence, dissociating from Germany. In this regard, on December 15<sup>th</sup> 1879, the Italian envoy in Berlin, De Launay, was sending a report in which he stated that Romania had become much bolder after Italy recognized its independence (DDI, II: 580).

The Government of Rome, which had no particular interests in Romania and did not want a strategy in the Balkans, has the task of mediating between Germany and Romania. On January 26<sup>th</sup> 1880 the law regarding the railway redemption was voted, which ended the dispute with Germany. On January 28<sup>th</sup> 1880, Cairoli wrote to De Launay that the Romanian agent in Rome, Constantin Esarcu, following the orders of his government, communicated to Cairoli that "this satisfactory solution for Germany is largely due to the good offices of Italy" (DDI, II: 580).

Italy was the first country to recognize the quality of the Kingdom of Romania on April 3<sup>rd</sup> 1881 (Dinu and Bulei, 2001: 10). Since 1882 the attitude changed when negotiating the status of navigation on the Danube (1881-1883). This can be explained by the signing of the Triple Alliance agreement in 1882. This alliance was formed as a result of the changes in the Balkans (Austria won protection over Bosnia and Herzegovina) and in the Mediterranean (France attached Tunisia in 1881 and Great Britain in Egypt in 1882). This explains Italy's support to the Austrian proposal regarding the status of the Danube, coldly regarded by the government and public opinion in Romania. Documentary sources show that Italy's attitude has led, at least indirectly, to Romania's closeness to Austria-Hungary (Dinu, 2007: 221).

Since October 1882, Ion Bălăceanu was accredited in Rome as extraordinary envoy and plenipotentiary minister. Its mission in Rome had two important moments. The first was related to the issue of Italy's supporting Romania at the Danube Conference in London. Foreign Minister Mancini decidedly expressed himself to support Romania in the Italian Senate, but at the conference did nothing for Romania. Dimitrie Sturdza, the Romanian and Minister of Foreign Affairs, protested against Mancini's attitude before Count Torielli, who reported the case of Mancini. He said he hadn't promised any official support, which prompted Bălăceanu to resign. Afterwards, Mancini went back on its previous statement, confirming the correctness of the report sent to Bucharest by Bălăceanu (Bulei, 2003: 400).

The second issue was related to sovereign Carol I's visit to Italy, with Queen Elizabeth at Sestri. King Umberto wanted to see the king in Rome, but Cardinal Giacobini asked Bălăceanu to tell Carol that the Pope did not agree that a Catholic king visited a

## Forecasting Recognition and Independence

state unrecognized by the Pope, even though the King was leading a non-Catholic state (Bălăceanu, 2002: 240-246). Tornielli, on vacation in Rome, asked Bălăceanu to convince his king that he had to honor King Umberto with a visit to Rome.

King Carol, not wanting to cause a diplomatic scandal between the Pope and the King of Italy sent king Umberto via Bălăceanu a letter expressing his regret for not being able to go to Rome due to personal reasons, among which was that of the need to return to Romania for the general election. King Umberto did not comment this reason in front of Bălăceanu, showing indifference (Bălăceanu, 2002: 240-246).

On July 26<sup>th</sup> 1883, Ion Bălăceanu, Romanian envoy in Rome was sending a secret report directly to King Carol concerning Romania's external situation, which required his presence in a system of alliances if he that did not want to be like before the recognition of independence, a transaction topic: "Top secret conversations took place at this time between Vienna, Berlin, Rome and London, about placing Romania under the collective guarantee of the great powers. This project, if it is not Austrian - might be of Italian origin, is presented in the best colors for us: of course, it is about what is good for us, to ensure us against our own tendencies, to prevent us to deviate from the civilizing and peaceful mission, which is reserved for us in the East etc., etc." (Bălăceanu, 2002: 246-249).

The project's authors, considered Bălăceanu, considered sparing Romania's economy which would have suffered if it complied with the specific military needs of joining an alliance. Under the mask of ensuring neutrality there cannot be hidden yet the Austrian intention to deprive Romania of military means indispensable in any claim of the Romanian territories under the administration of the dual monarchy: "It is equally about to evade, once again, the needs and concerns of an alliance, concerns which lead us to ruinous armaments paralyzing our economic development. At the same time, it would create, on the Danube, a new Belgium, no less prosperous, not less useful than the other, for the balance and peace of Europe" (Bălăceanu, 2002: 246-249).

Amid all this, there is a wish to be placed under guardianship as a son of the family whom they want to prevent contract an unhappy union... Austria convinced, wrongly or rightly, that we will not be with it, the day a war would break out between it and Russia, wants to make impossible an alliance against it. It was able to group together and make merits in the eyes of the friend powers, all the facts that can give us the appearance of a new Piedmont, attached to its flank. Count Kalnoky has made known, here and everywhere, that "Austria would know how to prevent this conflict when and how its security's interest would dictate it, without making the error, as before, to expect to be attacked in its own ground" (Bălăceanu, 2002: 246-249).

Bălăceanu had received through diplomatic ways all this information, which causes him to pay all the necessary attention to because he corroborated it with the assertion expressed by Mancini that Austria showed a special attention in the context of Romania's building defense works at the border with Austria-Hungary, because he was afraid of any conflict that would break out in Europe: "The idea of our neutralization found, in the four capitals, which we named, a favorable reception, there is a serious study. Here stops the letter I have received and that I summary for Your Majesty. But to this news I attach a statement that Mr. Mancini told me a few days ago, I find it timely to report it to the King: it was about General Brialmont's mission, and the Italian Minister was reported about it – he said – "this business that may not have gravity, by itself, would lend with this occasion a very particular importance" (Bălăceanu, 2002: 246-249).

Not being prepared in this regard, and, not knowing the Belgian general's mission, what the newspapers had said on this, I have summarized to His Excellency the

observation that, a priori, it would seem inconceivable that the defense works we have undertaken at our borders, can inspire anxiety to Austria: “I do not think at all that Austria is afraid of Romania” – responded Mr. Mancini, “but it must fear anything that can burn Europe” (Bălăceanu, 2002: 246-249).

A report written in Sinaia, on August 3<sup>rd</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> 1883 (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8), presented Europe’s uncertain situation as a fact apparent to the careful observers of the evolution of international relations. Regarding Romania, the report provides five benchmarks: 1. The conversation of Prince Bismarck with D. A. Sturdza in November 1882. From this discussion we distinguish three fundamental ideas: a. Germany’s definitive distance from Russia, in the context of an increasingly strong opposition to Bismarck loans to Russia (Townson, 1994: 321); b. Germany’s alliance with Austria-Hungary and Italy against Russia, especially by the fact that Russia was on anti-Italian positions on the issue of colonial competition; c. Germany could not influence Austria-Hungary on the Danube issue 2. The London Conference where, except for Russia, all the powers eliminated the disagreements on unresolved issues and the disputes with Russia were felt several times by the existence of a state of irritation, which influenced the attenuated writing of protocols; 3. Germany’s attitude before, during and after the conference was felt in Bucharest only through reconciliation advice between Romania and Austria-Hungary, supporting the dual monarchy in everything it undertook; 4. Count Hatzfeldt’s words to Liteanu, which could infer the imminence of a European war, as well as the efforts of the Triple Alliance to stop it (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8); 5. The Emperor of Germany’s letter to the Prince of Hohenzollern indicating a serious and dangerous situation for Romania.

In the report it transpires idea of approaching the Triple Alliance, perceived as the necessity of letting “a drift in the opposite direction of our interests to avoid the isolation indicated in an incisive manner by the letter from the Emperor of Germany”, from which emerged the idea that “any future situation for Romania is based solely on the Danube issue” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8). The fact that King Carol personally went to Berlin (Damean, 2000: 109), it was stressed in the report, further boosted the need for Romania’s entry into the Triple Alliance: “This trip is a political event. Under normal conditions and in a normal situation in Europe this trip would have had only a courtesy and politeness character: we would in vain seek to give now that impression. No one admits – no country or government. If the sovereigns avoid explaining the immediate business it is to keep intact the situation accurately creating the international disputes. By the force of things a decision has been taken in a manner contrary to the Austro-German alliance” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8).

A settling of the Danube issue was seen as necessary both for Romania as well as for Austria-Hungary. To the latter and Germany, the alliance with Romania was far from being a marginal issue. For Romania, the entry into the Triple Alliance – “the Central European league” – was seen as a matter of vital importance, “for thrown into the vortex of the Slavic action, it will not be able to get out of here except losing at least its political European basic situation” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8). A first finding of the report was that Romania’s European future as an independent state would be ensured only by joining the Triple Alliance: “Before the Turks one could go with the Russians. Before the West one could only go with them” (CHANAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8).



## Forecasting Recognition and Independence

The most important problem at the time was related to resolving “the Danube issue”. Although it was admitted that Romania was entitled to settle in its favor to solve this issue: “How to reach an arrangement in the Danube issue? There is no doubt that in terms of the right of peoples and treaties Romania is not right. It is impossible not to realize that, of how complicated the very Danube issue due to the poor state of Europe is” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8).

However, Romania had an interest to ensure itself a good international future: “we cannot therefore ignore it, because there were sacrificed first order interests on which the very existence of Romania depends for an important issue, however, less considerable that time and events as well as Romania’s development and strengthening can always change to its advantage. Has it gone unnoticed that for 25 years we have gone through the greatest difficulties to establish a fact, impossible to make by directly opposing the obstacles we have encountered in our way? Is it not true that all the states have acted when insurmountable difficulties arose before them and became threatening? This is the most important thing, to create reserves for the future” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8).

### Conclusions

The report’s conclusion was that Romania had to have an important position in the Danube issue, despite differences that might occur in the future: “in summary, we desire and possibly for our country’s future interest to reach an arrangement that would be recognized that no change should be done to the Danubian in the future without Romania’s effective participation, that the exercise of river police to belong to the residents which is exposed in Romanian project – that only resident states participate in the commission’s expenses that would receive the title of Supervisory Commission, that no expenditure may be imposed on the residents without their consent. On the other hand it would grant Austro-Hungary the entry into the Supervisory Commission as it is formulated in the Treaty of London is still causing great confusion if the Presidency should go to Romania or Austria-Hungary” (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8).

The final form of the future arrangement would have been an adherence act of Romania to regulate the aspects of understanding, act that would have been accepted by the powers through and that would become an annex to the treaty, signed by all the interested powers. (CHSNAR, Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883, folio 1-8). Baron Saverio Fava knew Romania’s wishes to get out of isolation orienting itself towards Germany since 1879. In his turn, Torielli, in March 1880, noted Romania’s position in the following words “Facilitating Romania’s access to anti-Russian alliance combinations. The complete lack of training to exercise in this country a counteraction that would have balanced the means available to Austria-Hungary” (ASDMAE, *Moscatti VI - Rapporti in arrivo* Found, file no. 1396/1880).

### Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/159/1.5/S/133255, Project ID 133255 (2014), co-financed by the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development 2007-2013.

References:

- Academia Română (2003). *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VII, tom II, *De la Independență la Marea Unire (1878-1918)*. In Acad. Gheorghe Platon (coord.), Bucharest: Enciclopedică Publishing.
- Alecsandri, V. (2001). *Misiile mele politice*, Bucharest: 100+1 Gramar Publishing.
- Archivio Storico Diplomatico dello Ministero degli Affari Esteri-Roma (ASDMAE), *Moscatti VI - Rapporti in arrivo* Found, file no. 1396/1880.
- Bălăceanu, I. (2002). *Amintiri politice și diplomatice, 1848-1903*, traducere din limba franceză, introducere, note și comentarii de Georgeta Filitti, Bucharest: Cavallioti Publishing.
- Boicu, L., Cristian, V., Platon, G. (1980) (coord.). *România în relațiile internaționale, 1699-1939*, Iași: Junimea Publishing.
- Bulei, I. (2003). Giuseppe Tornielli-Brusati di Vergano. Notes regarding his Diplomatic Mission în Romania, 1879-1887. *Annuario dell'Istituto Romeno di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica di Venezia*, anno V.
- Bușe, C. (2009). *Din Istoria Relațiilor Internaționale. Studii și articole*, Bucharest: Enciclopedică Publishing.
- Catană, B. (2009). *Relații diplomatice româno-sârbe 1880-1913*, Craiova: Universitaria Publishing.
- Căzan, G. N., Rădulescu-Zoner, Ș. (1979). *România și Tripla Alianță. 1878-1914*, Bucharest: Științifică și Enciclopedică Publishing.
- Central Historical Service of National Archive of Romania (CHSNAR), Royal House Found, file no. 18/1883.
- Damean, S. L. (2000). *Carol I al României 1866-1881*, Bucharest: Paideia Publishing.
- Damean, S. L. (2005). *România și Congresul de Pace de la Berlin (1878)*, Bucharest: Mica Valahie Publishing.
- De Stieglitz, A. (1906). *L' Italie et la Triple Alliance*, Paris, Dujarrie et C<sup>ie</sup>.
- Dinu, R. (2007). *Studi Italo-Romeni. Diplomazia e societă, 1879-1914*, Bucharest: Military Publishing.
- Dinu, R., Bulei, I. (2001). *35 anni di relazioni Italo-Romene, 1879-1914. Documenti diplomatici italiani*, Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic Publishing.
- Documenti Diplomatici Italiani* (D.D.I.), seria II, vol.12, doc. 580.
- Historical-Diplomatic Archive of the Foreign Ministry-Bucharest (HDAFMB), Historical Archive found, vol. 262, file no. 71D3 Roma/1877-1878.
- Pavel, T. (2000). *Între Berlin și Sankt Petersburg*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Stieve, F. (1929). *L' Allemagne et la politique européenne 1890-1914*, Paris, Les Éditions Rieder.
- Șerban, I. (2006). Le mouvement de la capitale de l'État de Rome. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Istorie*, 10: 121-127.
- Townson, D. (1994). *Dictionary of modern history 1789-1945*, Penguin Books, London.

---

Article Info

Received: January 15 2015

Accepted: February 23 2015

---