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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This thesis is a study and evaluation of Russian foreign policy in the Balkan Wars, 1912-13. Its primary purpose is to seek out and define the goals and aspirations of Russian diplomacy at this time and evaluate them in terms of success or failure. Recent books and articles in professional publications have shown a renewed interest in the causes of World War I. An understanding of Russian diplomacy in the Balkan Wars serves as a useful contribution to a further re-evaluation of the complex series of causes and events which came to a climax in 1914. Russian Near Eastern foreign policy before World War I had one general goal, revision of the Straits question, and three secondary considerations, Pan-Slavism, Balkan nationalism, and Russian competition with Austria-Hungary in the Balkans.

For many years the major aim of Russian foreign policy had been to re-open the Straits question for a settlement more favorable to

---

Russian interests than the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1856), which had prohibited warships from passing through the Straits. Without egress for her navy, Russia could not protect a large merchant fleet on the world's oceans. Russian merchants could not compete successfully on the international market without a fleet to distribute their products. Besides protecting the fleet, the Russian navy could be more effective as a diplomatic tool if the Straits were opened to Russia. Russian diplomacy needed a navy in the Mediterranean Sea to compete effectively with Austria-Hungary, both diplomatically and economically.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the Straits had begun to be more important to Russian economic life than the Baltic Sea. Russia's most valuable export was now grain, and the nation required outlets closer to the grain producing areas in the Ukraine. In 1841, Russia, along with Britain, Austria, Prussia, and France, signed the Straits Convention, which agreed to the Turkish Sultan's intention to forbid foreign warships from passing through the Straits while Turkey was at peace. Russian activities and religious demands on the Ottoman Empire


in 1853-4 eventually led to the Crimean War. The Treaty of Paris (1856) signed at the end of the war contained the "Black Sea Clauses" which in effect neutralized the Black Sea. Naval arsenals, dockyards, and all warships were forbidden, but the sea was left open to all merchant ships. The "Black Sea Clauses" prevented Russia from making a "Russian Lake" of the Black Sea.

In 1870 Russia used the Franco-Prussian War as an opportunity to abrogate the Black Sea Clauses of the Treaty of Paris, therefore coming into conflict with Great Britain. Because Czar Alexander II had supported the King of Prussia during the war, Bismarck smoothed the way by calling a conference to discuss the English objections to Russia's abrupt changes. The British desired recognition of the principle that international treaties could be revised only by the interested powers and not on the initiative of a single power. Russia finally agreed to this principle, and the English agreed to dispense with the limitations on naval armaments in the Black Sea as provided in the Treaty of Paris, although the provision that only merchant ships could pass the Straits was left unaltered.

Even with the advantages inherent in the changes in the Treaty of Paris, Russian naval strength in the Black Sea did not increase appreciably by the time of the Russo-Turkish War in 1876-8. Russia and her Balkan allies defeated the Turks and imposed on them the Treaty of

---

4Taylor, Struggle, pp. 50-62.

5Anderson, Question, p. 143; Taylor, Struggle, p. 85.

San Stefano (1878). The salient features of the San Stefano Treaty were the independence granted to Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania, and the promised reforms in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The most important point of the San Stefano Treaty was the establishment of a large, independent Bulgaria.  

The only modification concerning the Straits provided that merchantmen could pass through even in times of war.

The Russian independent treaty with the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent changes in European Turkey were opposed by Great Britain, which had interests in the Near East. At this time, the Eastern question was considered to be an exclusive concern of the Great Powers of Europe, and, therefore, the terms of the peace could not be decided by Russia alone. The Russian Foreign Minister reluctantly agreed that the European interests in the San Stefano Treaty could be examined and revised by the Great Powers. Those parts of the treaty outside general European interests were to be left to the discretion of the Russians. Britain, however, wanted all terms of the peace to be placed before the Great Powers, along the lines of the principle of international treaties established in 1870. Russia challenged the British principle but finally capitulated to the British demands because of British ships entering the Straits, internal weakness in Russia, and Russian isolation.

All of the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano came under the scrutiny of the Great Powers at the Congress of Berlin, 1878. The resulting

---

Treaty of Berlin stands as evidence of the gradual decline in Russian diplomatic leadership from the days of Czar Alexander and the "Holy Alliance." Militarily, Russia had defeated the armies of the Ottoman Empire, but the English collaborated with the Austrians to restrict Russian gains in the Balkans. The final treaty provided for the division of the San Stefano Bulgaria into three parts. One part was returned to the Ottoman Empire, and the other two, Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, received their independence. The division of Bulgaria represented the most important aspect of the Russian diplomatic defeat at Berlin. The treaty also provided for Austrian protection of Bosnia-Herzegovina, insured the independence of the restricted Bulgaria and tiny Montenegro, and at the same time insured the continued existence of European Turkey. Much to the chagrin of the Russians, the Turks were left in complete control of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus Straits.

After the Congress of Berlin, Russian ambitions in the Near East were checked.

Russian foreign policy slowly shifted and began to concentrate on the Far East, but by 1905, Russian Far Eastern policy received a severe setback in the disastrous war against Japan. In the treaty with Japan made at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Russia, opposed by a British-Japanese

---

\[11 \] Ibid., pp. 216-217; Langer, Alliances, pp. 162-163; Taylor, Struggle, p. 252.

\[12 \] Langer, Alliances, pp. 157-158.

combination, lost Port Arthur, her strong point in southern Manchuria.\textsuperscript{14}

The several military catastrophies of the Russo-Japanese War touched off an internal revolt in Russia that further increased the pressure for a diplomatic success to distract attention from internal dissension.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1906, Count Alexander Isvolsky took over as Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, and he made the Balkans and the Near East the most important fields of Russian diplomatic activity. Isvolsky, reaching for personal honor as well as for Russian aggrandizement, began to press for the re-opening of the Straits question. He offered to support Austria-Hungary in the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in return for Austrian diplomatic support in reconsidering the Straits settlement. Isvolsky and Aehenthal, the Austrian Foreign Minister, discussed the proposal at Buchlau in September of 1908.\textsuperscript{16} The following October Austria annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina while Isvolsky traveled to the European capitals to secure agreement of the Great Powers to re-open the Straits question.

Russian diplomacy suddenly faced a major crisis. Isvolsky claimed, and


Aerenthal denied, that a verbal agreement had been reached at Buchlau, but no stenographic record had been made. Isvolsky maintained that after the other Powers had consented to reconsidering the Straits question, Austria would annex Bosnia-Herzegovina with Russian support, and, in turn, Austria would support Russian interests at the conference on the Straits question. While Isvolsky was completing his canvass of the other Powers, Austria suddenly annexed the contended areas, and, at the same time, King Ferdinand of Bulgaria used the opportunity to declare Bulgaria's total independence.\footnote{Anatolii V. Nekludoff, Diplomatic Reminiscences Before and During the World War, 1911-1917 (New York, 1920), translated by Alexandra Paget, p. 14.}

Isvolsky tried in vain to re-open the Straits question after the annexation by withholding Russian recognition of the move; he hoped thereby to force Aerenthal to carry out his part of the "bargain." Germany, acting in favor of her alliance with Austria, presented an ultimatum to the Russian Government demanding, in as amiable terms as possible, that formal recognition be given to the annexation. The weakness of the Russian military machine, not yet rebuilt from the 1905 disaster, prevented a European war and by forcing the Russians to accept the \textit{fait accompli}, handed Isvolsky and Russian diplomacy another bitter defeat.\footnote{Karl Max Lichnowsky, Heading for the Abyss: Reminiscences (New York, 1928), translated by Sefton Delmer, p. 19; Austen Chamberlain, Down the Years (London, 1935), pp. 62, 64.}

Other than Austria's diplomatic victory over Russia,\footnote{Luigi Albertini, The Origins of the War of 1914, 3 vols. (London, 1952), translated by Isabella M. Massey, I, 210.} the results of the annexation crisis were many. Perhaps the most important result
was that the period of Russian-Austrian willingness to compromise in Balkan affairs ended. German support of Austria reinforced the division of Europe into two factions, the German-dominated Triple Alliance and the Russo-Franco-British Triple Entente. Although Russian-Austrian relations were permanently damaged, England and Russia drew closer. Russo-Bulgarian relations were furthered by the formal recognition of Bulgarian independence.

With the Russian diplomatic defeat, Isvolsky's position as the Minister of Foreign Affairs became untenable. He sought support by appointing Serge Sazonov as Vice-Minister. Sazonov had been Isvolsky's secretary at the Holy See in Rome, but more important, Sazonov was married to the sister of Mme. Stolypin, wife of the President of the Ministerial Council. Stolypin was at the height of his power in Russia, and Isvolsky hoped to gain favor with him by appointing his brother-in-law to the Foreign Office. Despite this ploy, Isvolsky resigned as Foreign Minister in 1910 to accept the post of Ambassador to France. His assistant, Sazonov, replaced him in the Foreign Ministry. With Isvolsky, Russian foreign policy had returned to the Near East and cast off from the German wharf to swim "...openly in British Waters. The Anglo-Franco-Russo Entente took the place of the old Tri-Emperor Alliance."

---

20 Nekludoff, Reminiscences, p. 22; Lichnowsky, Abyss, pp. 53, 142; Taylor, Struggle, pp. 334-346.
22 de Schelking, Recollections, p. 185.
23 Ibid., p. 184.
suspicion by his colleagues in the Paris diplomatic corps. In St. Petersburg, Sazonov inherited and continued Isvolsky's foreign policy.

From the constantly recurring failures of Russian diplomacy to gain a revision of the Straits question over the past century, one major lesson was learned by the Foreign Office. Revision of the Straits agreements could not be accomplished by direct diplomatic approaches. More subtle methods had to be discovered and tried. By the time Sazonov took office, Russian diplomats had come to realize that their goal in the Near East could be accomplished only after Austria-Hungary was effectively eliminated as a competitor in the Balkan peninsula. Austria-Hungary sought to extend her territory and power eastward at the expense of the Ottoman Empire. Russia's interest in the Straits caused a natural competition between the two powers, but it was negligible until the mid-nineteenth century. As the Balkan states sought their complete independence from Turkey during the latter part of the nineteenth century, both Russia and Austria-Hungary sought to extend their influence in the Balkans by exploiting the nationalistic aspirations of the re-emerging states.

Nationalism in the Balkans contributed to the survival of the Balkan states. With the subjection of the Balkan peninsula to the Turks in 1453, the Sultan's domination submerged the national identities of the Balkan states. The practice of the Greek Orthodox religion, however, was allowed to continue and was used by the Turks to control the Balkan peoples.

---


National identity slowly re-emerged first in Greece. Greek literature and language had virtually disappeared. Not until the latter part of the eighteenth century, under the influence of Adamantios Korais (1748-1833), Greek scholar and linguist, did Greek nationalism revive.26 The resurrection of Greek national ideals received aid in the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-74. The Greeks gained commercial advantages from the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji (1774), which helped to expand their commercial independence of the Turkish government.27 In 1829, under the Treaty of Adrianople, Greece gained independence, but many Greek persons were outside the boundaries of the new state.28 Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth, Greek foreign policy aimed at the incorporation of the irredentist territory.29

Russian Balkan interest worked together with Serbian nationalism to start the chain of events which led to Serbian independence. In 1804, Kara George led revolts against the Turk Janissaries and, with Russian assistance, won some of Serbia's nationalistic goals. With Napoleon's attack on Russia, the Czar quickly signed the Treaty of Bucharest (1812) with Turkey. No longer distracted by Russia, the Turks turned their attention to domestic troubles in Serbia.30 Kara George fled, and Milosh


28Gewehr, Nationalism, p. 28.

29For a short history of Greece from the 1830's to 1900, see, ibid., pp. 49-61; for Graecian irredentism, see, Stavrianos, Balkans, pp. 467-482.

Obrenovich established a tacit peace until Russia freed herself from the Napoleonic threat. Obrenovich resumed the bid for nationalism and succeeded with the aid of the Russo-Turk War of 1828-9. By the terms of the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), Obrenovich became hereditary prince, and Serbia received internal autonomy under a Russian protectorate. Domestic tensions occupied Serbian politics for the rest of the nineteenth century.

Because they were more dominated by the Greek influence than the other Balkan states, the Bulgarians were the last nationality to arise and assume national identity. Eighteenth century Bulgarian histories and a school founded in 1835 to teach the Bulgar language gave impetus to the rise of national identity. Turk atrocities in suppressing Bulgarian nationalism attracted the attention of Europe and, in part, led to the Russo-Turk War of 1877. The Treaty of San Stefano (1878), negotiated under Russian patronage, provided for a large Bulgaria. The Treaty of Berlin (1878) reduced the Bulgarian land mass but recognized the independence of Bulgaria. Alexander of Battenberg, nephew of the Czar, received the crown as Prince of Bulgaria. His German heritage and dislike of Russia contributed greatly to an alienation between Russia and Bulgaria that lasted from 1883 to 1896, during which time Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia were joined. After Alexander was forced

31 Stavrianos, Balkans, p. 250.
32 For a review of these problems, see, Gewehr, Nationalism, pp. 41-49.
33 Stavrianos, Balkans, pp. 370-371, Gewehr, Nationalism, pp. 33-34.
34 Ibid., pp. 36-39; cf., Langer, Alliances, p. 138ff.
35 Anderson, Question, pp. 277-279.
to abdicate, the two Slav countries were reconciled when Nicholas II recognized Ferdinand as Prince of Bulgaria after Ferdinand's son was baptized into the Orthodox Church. 36

Montenegro was different from the other Balkan states in that the Turks never conquered the small state. Montenegro was ruled by a Prince-Bishop until 1851, when he married and threw off the religious responsibility. Nikola I received the throne in 1860, and Montenegro's independence was recognized in the Treaty of Berlin (1878), from which she also received the port of Antivari on the Adriatic Sea. The Montenegrin government became a constitutional monarchy in 1905, and Nikola assumed the title of King in 1910. 37 Although Russia did not figure prominently in the development of modern Montenegro, the two countries had strong ties of Slavic kinship.

An important factor which influenced Russian foreign policy in the Balkans was the religious, linguistic, and racial identifications between the Russian and Balkan Slav peoples, known as Pan-slavism. Pan-slavism has been defined as "... the historic tendency of the Slavic peoples to manifest in any tangible way, whether cultural or political, their consciousness of ethnic kinship." 38 Russia, as the largest Slavic state, considered herself to be the natural leader of Slavdom. The idea of Pan-slavism, however, is fairly modern, having been formulated in the

36 Tcharykow, Glimpses, p. 228; Gewehr, Nationalism, pp. 71-78.
38 Michael B. Petrovich, The Emergence of Russian Panславism, 1856-1870 (New York, 1956), p. 3.
mid-nineteenth century. Russian statesmen began using Pan-slav sympathies in the latter quarter of the nineteenth century to further Russian aims in diplomacy.

Soon after the turn of the century, Russian diplomats had come to realize that the arrangement at the Straits could be revised and Austria-Hungary checked at the same time if they could unite the Slavic peoples of the Balkans under Russian patronage. With Pan-slav sympathy, and by playing upon the national aspirations of the Balkan states, Russia could influence and control events in the peninsula in such a way as to present Austria-Hungary with a solid front. With the drang nach osten stopped, Russia, with the support of her Balkan allies, could then work to re-open the Straits question at the most convenient time.

The goals of this policy, to unite the Balkans, stop Austria-Hungary, and revise the Straits agreement, were neither clearly defined nor carefully planned. The four diplomats active in this period, Sazonov, Isvolsky, A. N. Nekludoff, Russian representative to Bulgaria, and N. Hartwig, Russian representative to Serbia, often failed to fully co-operate with each other, although in the final analysis they sought the same goals.

Each of the diplomats followed a policy of expediency designed to win their respective points. Isvolsky, who bore heavily the responsibility for the Bosnian humiliation, sought revenge against Austria-

---

39 Ibid., pp. 61-103; Kohn, Pan-Slavism, pp. 114-119, 157, 167-174; Russian interest in the Pan-Slav movement did not have much basis in economic factors, other than the need for a southern-east port for cereal exports from the Ukraine; Russian trade in the Balkans before World War I was negligible; her limited and strained capital prevented and reduced financial support to the Balkan governments. See Ivo J. Lederer, "Russia and the Balkans," Russian Foreign Policy: Essays in Historical Perspective, edited by Ivo J. Lederer (New Haven, London, 1962), pp. 425-426.
Hungary. Hartwig and Nekludoff, in varying degrees, were Pan-slavists who sought to promote the realization of Slavic unity and aspirations generally, and specifically championed the countries of their respective assignment as the best friend of Russia. Looming behind the thoughts and actions of all of these men was the silent hope of re-opening the Straits question. Sazonov's problem at the foreign office was more complicated. Hindered by ill health and lack of experience, and unduly influenced by Isvolsky, Sazonov was sympathetic to the Pan-slav voices. He tried to keep a precarious balance between the rival factions in the Russian diplomatic corps while not antagonizing the Great Powers.

Sazonov proved to be inadequate for the task of directing Russian foreign affairs. His co-worker, Baron Taube described him as

Sickly by nature, finely sensitive and a little sentimental, nervy to the point of neurasthenia, Sazonov was the type of the 'Slav feminine spirit' par excellence, open-handed and generous, but soft and vague, unceasingly variable in his impressions and 'intuitions,' refractory to all sustained effort of thought, incapable of pursuing a train of reasoning to its logical conclusion. . . . Moreover, after Iswolsky, Sazonov struck the observer by his lack of experience and preparation for his task. . . . His capacity for work was mediocre and, at the same time his aplomb and self-confidence manifestly excessive.40

Other impressions of Sazonov found in memoirs generally agree with Taube's assessment.41

---

40 Taube, M., La politique russe d'avant-guerre (Paris, 1928) or Der grosse Katastrophe entgegen (Leipzig, 1937), cited in Albertini, Origins, I, 367. The author or the translator does not give an exact reference for the quotation; Edward C. Thaden, Russia and the Balkan Alliance of 1912 (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1965), p. 82, disagrees with Albertini over Sazonov's competency.

The first international incident of importance after Sazonov took office was the Italo-Turk War. Italy had long expressed an interest in Tripoli and Cyrenaica, territories belonging to the Ottoman Empire. By the Racconigi agreement signed between Italy and Russia during Isvolsky's tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1909, Italy and Russia promised to "regard with benevolence" Russia's interests in the question of the Straits and Italy's interests in Cyrenaica and Tripoli. By previous agreements with France, Britain, and Austria-Hungary, Italy had been promised a free hand in Tripoli after Morocco became a French protectorate, which it did in September, 1911.

Relations between Italy and Turkey were gradually becoming strained as Italy desired "compensations" in Tripoli for the French gains in Morocco. Giovanni Giolitti, the Italian premier, later rationalized that "... the only way to re-establish friendship between Turkey and ourselves and to render a harmonious policy of the Triple Alliance possible in the Balkans, was for us to occupy Tripoli." When Italy informed Russia of her Tripolitan intentions, around the end of September, Isvolsky, who spoke with Tittoni, Italian Ambassador to France, cautioned them not to disrupt peace in the Balkans. Austria and Germany also cautioned Italy against Balkan disturbances.

42Sazonov to Benckendorf, 28 November, 1912, Friedrich Stieve, Der Diplomatische Schriftwechsel Iswolskis, 1911-1914, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1924), II, 363-364 (hereafter cited as Isvolsky); Fay, Origins, I, 407; Taylor, Struggle, p. 463. All dates are given in New Style.
43Anderson, Question, p. 287; Taylor, Struggle, p. 472.
45Giolitti, Memoirs, p. 265; Isvolsky to Neratov, 26 September 1911, Isvolsky, I, 134.
The apprehensions shared by the Great Powers over the possibility that the Italo-Turk War might engender Balkan uprisings against the Ottomans were not without foundation. Russia held limited influence in the Balkans and could make a major contribution to keeping them calm after Italy attacked Turkey. Nekludoff expected Serbia to follow the Russian lead unless Bulgaria moved into Macedonia, or rebellion broke out in Kossovo, a town in the Sanjak of Novibazar—in which case Austria would likely move in troops. On the other hand, any form of Austrian aggression in the Sanjak of Novibazar would be met with a Serbian retaliation. If the war went badly for the Turks, the Christians of Kossovo might rebel against the Moslem officials there, or the Turks might seek vengeance against Kossovo's Christians. In either case, Austria would move into the Sanjak of Novibazar to protect the Roman Catholics, and Serbia would then be forced to protect the Orthodox Catholics there as well as her territorial interests in the area. If Bulgaria used the Italo-Turk War as a pretext for occupying the Bulgar sections of Macedonia, Serbia could likewise be expected to take the Serbian areas of Macedonia. Since some of the areas were mixed nationally, quarrels over right of possession could lead to a war between the Serbs and Bulgars. Bulgaria, however, considered "the Tripoli question as lying outside her interests, and that in the relations between Bulgaria and Turkey they entertained no change." Greece could be expected to remain neutral unless Turkey

47 Hartwig to Foreign Office, 1 October 1911, Krassny Archiv, VIII, 17, as cited in Milos Boghitschewitsch, Die Auswärtige Politik Serbiens, 1903-1914, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1929), II, 133-134 (hereafter cited as APS).

provoked trouble or Bulgaria became involved in Macedonia, in which case, Greece, like Serbia, would have to protect her interests there. Rumania was apprehensive about Bulgarian aspirations on their common frontier. Almost all of the Balkan states carried chips on their shoulders that the Great Powers expected to see knocked off by some pretext generated by the Italo-Turkish War.

The Powers did not expect Montenegro to cause trouble in the Balkans, since Russia had already demonstrated her nominal control over the tiny kingdom. In the military convention concluded in December, 1910, between Russia and Montenegro, Russia had promised King Nikola a yearly subsidy of 600,000 rubles, Russian officers to train his army, and arms and ammunition. Montenegro, in exchange, promised not to make other alliances or wage war against a third power without the consent of the Russian Monarchy. Russian control over the kingdom had been successfully demonstrated when, late in 1910 and early 1911, the Malissori tribes in Northern Albania revolted against the Turkish administration.


50Czernin to Foreign Office, 1 October 1911, ibid., p. 375.

King Nikola offered asylum to the rebels forced to flee from Albania. The Porte wished to pursue the refugees into Montenegro, and Nikola replied that such action would lead to armed conflict. Turkey then requested Russian influence to pressure Montenegro. Russia complied, threatening to withhold all financial support provided in the alliance of 1910 unless Nikola co-operated with the Turks. After Nikola complied, the Malissori were returned to Albania and "relative calm" returned to the Balkans. If Montenegro tried to use the Italo-Turk War as a pretext to cause trouble in Albania, Russia could be expected to again assert pressure by threatening to withdraw financial support.

With the start of the Tripolitan War, 29 September 1911, Russian diplomats were in a position to pursue the policy which had been developing for more than a half-century. Constantinople and the open Straits had been denied to the leaders of Slavdom since 1841. Small gains had been made by the Russian compromise with England in 1870, but Russia had not been able to utilize her new freedom to build a fleet in the Black Sea by the time of the Russo-Turk War (1876-8). After the Congress of Berlin (1878), Russia had not made any significant progress in revising the Straits provisions in twenty-two years. Russian foreign policy slowly turned to the Far East to find aggrandizement.

After the debacle with Japan in 1905, Russian diplomats returned the focus of diplomatic activity to the Straits question. Isvolsky's


53 Ibid., pp. 117-118; M. Edith Durham, The Struggle for Scutari (Turk, Slav, and Albanian) (London, 1914), pp. 15-40; after the 1911 Turk argument Nikola played off Russia against Austria-Hungary to get money and political support; see Thaden, "Montenegro," pp. 119-120; The Spectator, CVIII (February 3, 1912), 178.
bitter humiliation in the Bosnia-Herzegovina crisis served to convince Russian leaders that the provisions governing the Straits could not be changed by a frontal revision. They realized that Austria-Hungary opposed Russian expansion to the Mediterranean and that she must be stopped in her own moves towards Constantinople. By capitalizing upon Russian activities in the Balkans during the nineteenth century, and exploiting Balkan nationalistic aspirations through ties of Slav brotherhood, Russian diplomacy could set up a wall of allies between Austria-Hungary and Constantinople. With the Dual Monarchy effectively eliminated as a competitor in the Balkans and European Turkey in the Russian camp, a revision of the Straits settlement would be more than just a dream, it would be a possibility.

The Russian-Montenegrin military convention of 1910 was a first step along the path of the new policy. The Italo-Turk War now presented an opportunity to the foreign office at St. Petersburg. By adroitly working on Balkan nationalistic ambitions and the threat of a Turk reaction in the Balkans to an Italian victory, Russian diplomats could hope to unite the Balkan states under Russian patronage. Once the Balkans were allied and under Russia's leadership, Austria-Hungary would be checked, and the Straits question could then be revised at the most propitious moment.

From January, 1912 until July, 1913, Russian diplomacy followed the new policy. In the short period, the policy, by turns, succeeded in uniting the Balkans, and then it failed to maintain control. The rising nationalism of the Balkan states moved beyond the expectations and abilities to control of the Russian foreign office. By July, 1913,
Russian diplomacy had failed on all counts to maintain the influence in the peninsula so necessary to the success of the new policy.
CHAPTER II

RUSSIA AND THE FORMATION OF THE BALKAN ALLIANCE

In the first five months of 1912, Russian diplomats encouraged Serbia and Bulgaria in their efforts to form alliances against a third power, as yet unnamed. Before the major instrument had been signed, Bulgaria and Greece were also moving to form an alliance like the one being negotiated between Serbia and Bulgaria, although in this final Graeco-Bulgarian treaty, Russia did not play as important a role as in the Serbo-Bulgarian pact. Continued unrest and Turkish atrocities in the Balkans contributed to the inclusion of Montenegro into the alliance system contrary to Russian wishes and desires. The intent of the alliance then changed from defensive to offensive with provisions for commencing hostilities.

The Great Powers, meanwhile, were active. Austria, in what appeared to be an attempt to counter the recent Russian gains in Balkan influence, made a vague proposal with the object of maintaining the status quo in the Balkans. The proposal failed to produce results, and the Powers moved directly to prevent the seemingly inevitable Balkan war. Russia, unable to exert decisive influence among the Balkan allies, joined the Great Powers in attempts to prevent the war, but representations by the Powers failed to dissuade the Balkan states from their determination against Turkey. With the events leading up to the opening shots, Russia fully
demonstrated her inability to exercise the control she thought she had so recently established in the formation of the Balkan alliances.

A Balkan alliance between Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro against Turkey had been considered in 1891 to adjust their respective claims in Macedonia. The idea was not carried to completion, and as late as 1908, a Balkan confederation was considered unlikely. Before the Italo-Turk War, in the spring of 1911, the Bulgarian Foreign Office under the leadership of Gueshoff, the new Foreign Minister, made an attempt at a Bulgarian-Turkish agreement. Thinly veiled threats from Bulgaria and woeful inaction by the Porte doomed the move from the first. The anti-Christian and anti-Bulgar activities of the young Turks in Macedonia and Thrace forced Bulgaria to turn to the other Balkan states for allies, after the failure to come to an understanding with the Porte. Early in September, 1911, Gueshoff, the Bulgarian minister, and Milovanovitch, the Serbian minister, arranged to meet and discuss preliminary steps for a Serbian-Bulgarian alliance.

At the meeting held on October 11, 1911, Gueshoff and Milovanovitch spoke about a defensive alliance against the Ottoman Empire and a

---


3Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 3-4; text of letter sent to Naby Bey by Assim Bey on Gueshoff's proposal for Turko-Bulgaro understanding, see ibid., pp. 6-7.


5Gueshoff, Balkan League, p. 10.
subsequent partition of Macedonia, Old Serbia, the reduction of European Turkey, and they also speculated on the simultaneous crumbling of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire in the case of an Allied victory. "Serbia will get Bosnia and Herzegovina, while Roumania receives Transylvania, and we shall then have no reasons for apprehending a Roumanian intervention in our war against Turkey." Both parties agreed that Russia should arbitrate any disputed areas.

The following November a committee on the establishment of understanding between the two countries met in Sofia, Bulgaria. Because of the mutual mistrust that had long existed between Serbia and Bulgaria, the other powers did not expect a successful alliance. Their forecast seemed justified when by mid-January, 1912, the talks were deadlocked, with Bulgaria seemingly leaning towards Austria. After a meeting of the royalty of the two Balkan powers in Sofia, late in February, the talks progressed faster.

6 Ibid., pp. 15, 17.
7 Ibid., p. 17.
8 Bax-Ironside to Grey, 14 November 1911, BD, IX, i, 515; Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 23-33.
9 Bax-Ironside to Grey, 14 November 1911, BD, IX, i, 515; see the minute added to Lampson to Grey, 12 December 1911, ibid., p. 521.
10 Barclay to Grey, 16 January 1912, ibid., pp. 533-534; Bax-Ironside to Arthur Nicolson, 31 January 1912, reports on Aerenthal's suspicion of a Serbo-Bulgaro "rapprochement" in the works which is not sufficient grounds for Milovanovitch's assertion to Barclay that "Bulgaria seemed to be in Austria's pocket..." ibid., pp. 537-538.
Two other factors may have influenced the progress of the talks. The Italians, who had declared war against Turkey in September, 1911, were bogged down in Libya without any sign of an immediate victory. If Italy grew tired of the long war and sued for peace with Turkey, the opportunity would be lost to form a Balkan confederation while the Porte was busy elsewhere. The other factor which influenced the progress of the Serb-Bulgarian talks was the Charykov "Kite." When the Italo-Turkish war erupted in 1911, Sazonov, too sick to attend his duties, turned the foreign office over to his assistant, Neratov. Charykov, Russian representative at Constantinople, was encouraged by Isvolsky and Neratov to open talks with the Porte concerning, among other things, passage of neutral ships through the Straits during the war, a concession highly desirable to Russian Black Sea trade. Charykov then moved on his own, but with tacit support from Isvolsky, to expand the scope of the talks to a virtual re-opening of the Straits question. Charykov's plan was that Russia would become the guarantor of European Turkey and maintain the status quo in the Balkans, in return for the Straits being opened to Russian warships.

Turkey, not willing to accept de facto dependence on Russia for territorial integrity, rejected Charykov's plan. When Sazonov heard of Charykov's unauthorized proposals, he recalled him and thus repudiated

12 von Below-Saleske to the Foreign Office, 30 September 1911, GP, XXXIII, 3-4.
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the initiative of his errant ambassador. The failure of Charykov's "Kite" affected the Serbo-Bulgarian negotiations and the conclusion of their treaty to frustrate a possible Russian agreement with Turkey. If Russia agreed to guarantee the status quo in the Balkans, the nationalist aspirations of the Balkan states would be hindered.

The Russian ambassadors, Nicholas G. Hartwig in Belgrade and Anatolii V. Nekludoff in Sofia, by their sympathetic efforts with Sazonov's approval, helped reduce the conflicts delaying the conclusion of the Serbo-Bulgarian alliance. Hartwig's advice to and influence on the Serbians helped smooth over difficulties between the two countries. Hartwig was well liked and respected by the Serbs. "Every morning his study was besieged by Serbian statesmen who came to get advice from him. . . ." Hartwig expressed two goals in his concept of Russian Balkan policy—Russia should aid the Balkan states in their nationalist ambitions and then get a firm foothold on the shores of the Bosporous at the entrance to the "Russian Lake." In order for the Balkan peoples to gain independence from Turkey, they would first have to cooperate with each other.

15 Buchanan to Grey, 21 March 1912, BD, IX, i, 559-561; for Charykov's somewhat different account of his activities, see Tcharykow, Glimpses, pp. 239, 276; Poincaré, Memoirs, p. 158.

16 Gueshoff, Balkan League, p. 34.

17 Ibid., pp. 33-34; for longer biographical sketches of Hartwig and Nekludoff, see Thaden, Balkan Alliance, pp. 65-70, 70-72, respectively.


Nekludoff, whose effectiveness in Bulgaria was eventually restricted by a tacit feud with King Ferdinand, presented the Bulgarian view to St. Petersburg. The Ambassador at Sofia was aware that because of the Russo-Japanese War Russia did not have the military strength to act in the Balkans should the Ottoman Empire finally crumble. He gave encouragement to the conversations which had resumed in February for a Serbo-Bulgarian alliance which the Russian foreign office conceived to be aimed at the third power but under the auspices and direction of the Russian foreign office. He felt that Russia could control the Balkan states sufficiently to prevent a premature breakup of the Turkish holdings before Russia was strong enough to profit by it.

By late February, the conversations were bogged down over minor points of border settlements in spheres of influence. Nekludoff says in his memoirs

The demarcation of the boundary-line gave rise to endless discussions; each elevation, each village, each stream was bitterly disputed, and to solve the question they sought now the interposition of the Russian Ministers, now the topographical authority of our military agents.

The role of the two Russian ministers, as well as that of Colonel Romanovsky, Russian Military Attache to Sofia, as arbitrators cannot be

---
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underestimated. On March 4, 1912, Nekludoff telegraphed that the Serbo-
Bulgar alliance was on the point of conclusion, and indeed a copy of the
treaty was signed by King Peter of Serbia and his foreign minister, Milo-
vanovitch, with King Ferdinand of Bulgaria to sign later. On the follow-
ing March 14, Nekludoff happily telegraphed St. Petersburg the good news
that

Yesterday Czar Ferdinand signed the Serbo-Bulgarian agree-
ment and the secret arrangement observing the Macedonian
sphere of influences and the mutual intention of concluding
a Serbian-Bulgarian military convention. So the important
work begun by von Sementovsky and Hartwig happily becomes
completed.

Although the negotiations were carried on in secret because such a treaty
against Turkey and Austria-Hungary "... did most certainly present cer-
tain dangers," as Nekludoff remarked, Bax-Ironside, the British repre-
sentative in Sofia, reported Ferdinand's signature the same day that Neklu-
doff and the French Foreign Minister Poincaré learned of the treaty.

The agreements, subsequent annexes, and military conventions provided
for the usual diplomatic friendship between the two countries. Provisions

24 Ibid., p. 52; Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 33-34; Sazonov, Fate-
ful Years, pp. 52-53.

25 Nekludoff to Foreign Office, 4 March 1912, Krassny Archiv, IX,
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22, cited in ibid., pp. 172-173.

27 Nekludoff, Reminiscences, p. 54.
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Benckendorff to Foreign Office, 1 April 1912, Benno von Siebert, Graf
Benckendorffs Diplomatischer Schriftwechsel, 3 vols. (Berlin and Leip-
zig, 1928), II, 338 (hereafter cited as Benckendorff), cited in APS, II,
174.
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Sazonov, Fateful Years, p. 53.
were made for mutual defense against any move by Austria into the Sanjak of Novibazar. The most important part of the alliance provided that Russia would act as arbitrator, with both countries accepting the Russian decision, if relations between one of the signatories and the Ottoman Empire became impossible and the two Balkan states could not reach an agreement on what if any, action should be taken. In any case, if agreement were reached, Russia was to be notified before any action was taken.30

Russian participation in the Serbo-Bulgarian alliance was not in conflict with the new policy adopted by the Foreign Office. Bulgaria and Greece, however, had begun negotiations for an alliance similar to the Serbo-Bulgarian agreement without Russian encouragement. The conversations began with the encouragement of the Times' (London) Balkan correspondent and mutual friend of Bulgaria and Greece, Mr. J. D. Bouchier.31 In a letter to the Bulgarian minister in spring 1911, Bourchier mentioned the Greek interest in an agreement.32 In September of the same year, Bourchier received verbal authority to proceed from King Ferdinand and Gueshoff. Panas, the Greek Minister at Sofia, negotiated with the Bulgarians.33 The Greeks asked for a mutual alliance to counter the possibility

30For texts of the Serbo-Bulgarian Alliance, see Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 112-127, Milos Bogitshevich, Causes of the War: An Examination into the Causes of the European War, with Special Reference to Russia and Serbia (London, 1920), pp. 100-107; Ernst Christian Helmreich, The Diplomacy of the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913 (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 54-56.


32Ibid.

33Grogan, Bourchier, pp. 135-136.
of Turkish aggression against either of the two countries. After discussing the Greek offer with the King and Ministerial Council, Gueshoff received permission to proceed towards a defensive treaty. Because Russia was interested in the Serbo-Bulgarian talks which were proceeding at the same time, Gueshoff sought the Russian position concerning the prospective agreement. At this point, Nekludoff exerted the only real influence Russia exercised in the Graeco-Bulgarian treaty. Because of the importance attached to the Bulgaro-Serbian negotiations by the Russian Foreign Office, Nekludoff convinced the Bulgars that the talks with Greece should be delayed until the completion of the alliance with Serbia.

After being discontinued in November, 1911, negotiations resumed in February, 1912, and a first draft was presented the following April. The Greek draft did not mention Macedonian and Thracian autonomy, a touchy problem between the two countries because of racial mixing in the areas. Neither did it mention "... those privileges which had been granted to the Christian provinces of European Turkey by various international acts, particularly Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin." The reforms promised in Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin (1878) would greatly encourage national aspirations of the Balkan states, but the countries had not been able to enact the reforms because of dilatory evasions by the Porte.

34 Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 37-38.
36 Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 74-75; Thaden, Balkan Alliance, pp. 100-101.
37 Gueshoff, Balkan League, p. 38; Medlicott, Congress of Berlin, p. 413.
The preliminary treaty signed by Panas and Gueshoff on May 29, 1912, did contain provisions for respecting Christian rights, but the Balkan War started before an agreement could be reached on Macedonia and Thrace. The treaty provided for mutual defense in case Turkey attacked either of the signatories, except if the Greek claims in Crete provoked the Turks. Significantly, the Graeco-Bulgarian treaty did not provide arrangements for Russian arbitration or notification of any planned action of the allies to the Russian government. Thus, by the time of the Graeco-Bulgarian treaty, Russia was already losing some measure of control established in the Serbo-Bulgarian agreement and the Russian-Montenegrin convention of 1910.

At the time that the Graeco-Bulgarian alliance had been concluded, Montenegro had not been included. Although Russia expected to control the small kingdom, Sazonov had urged that Montenegro not be included in the alliances because her views on attacking Turkey were well known. As early as June, 1911, the Russian minister to Montenegro, Arsenieiev, reported that King Nikola seemed to be only waiting for a pretext to start

---

39 Ibid., pp. 137-140; Helmreich, Diplomacy, p. 76; Albertini, Origins, I, 355-356.
a war with Turkey. While the Serbo-Bulgarian talks had been in progress in February, 1912, King Nikola had expressed his opinion to the Czar that if the Turks did not make the desired reforms in the Balkans, Russia might unavoidably be drawn into a serious conflict by Pan-slav sympathies in Russia.

After the signing of the Graeco-Bulgarian alliance in May, 1912, several minor incidents occurred which drew Montenegro into the alliance system and pushed the Balkans closer to war. Early in July, unfounded rumors of possible Bulgarian action against Turkey caused some consternation in diplomatic circles. Nekludoff had sent an "alarmist" telegram to St. Petersburg on 8 July to warn of fresh movements in Bulgarian favoring military action against the Sultan because of the uprising of Albanian tribes and a suspected Turkish military conspiracy. Nekludoff's telegram, based on rumors, implied more of an emergency than what he later agreed the situation warranted. A few days after Nekludoff's telegram, Austrian plans for mobilization maneuvers on the Serbian frontier caused uneasiness and fear among the Balkan allies. The independent tribes in Northern Albania had again revolted against the Turkish rule. Austria used the threat of Balkan trouble to increase fortifications in the Sanjak.

---
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of Novibazar and along the Serbian frontier. The Sanjak of Novibazar was a strip of territory separating Serbia and Montenegro. Austria considered the area important because its continued existence prevented the unification of Serbia and Montenegro into a Greater Serbia to hamper Austrian eastward expansion. The Serbs suspected that Austria planned to annex the Sanjak of Novibazar and that the military maneuvers planned for the fall of 1912 along the Serb frontier were an indirect threat to Serbian existence. Austria, as believed in the British Foreign Office, could safely occupy the Sanjak only after defeating Serbia.47

The danger of war with Turkey, however, took precedence in the Balkans during the late summer. On 1 August 1912, two bombs exploded in the market of Kochana in Macedonia, killing twelve people. After calm had been restored, Turkish soldiers and police stormed into the market, and in the ensuing riot, 112 people were killed and more than 200 wounded, most of whom were Bulgars.48 The massacre incited Bulgarian opinion, and Gueshoff requested the Porte to make an investigation, punish those responsible, and take steps to prevent future occurrences.49 By mid-August the Porte had promised to "give satisfaction" to the Bulgarian demands.50

47 Paget to Grey, 27 July 1912, ibid., p. 597.

48 Reports vary as to the number of killed and wounded. See Barclay to Grey, 10 August 1912, ibid., p. 603, Marling to Grey, 10 August 1912, ibid., pp. 604-605, Colonel Lamouche, Quinze ans d'histoire balkanique (Paris, 1928), p. 109, cited in Helmreich, Diplomacy, p. 37.

49 The Serb attitude was similar to the Bulgarians. See Emmerich von Pflügl (Belgrade) to the Foreign Office, 11 August 1912, Ö-UA, IV, 331; Barclay to Grey, 10 August 1912, BD, IX, i, 603.

50 Barclay to Grey, 14 August 1912, ibid., pp. 609-610.
Three days after the Kochana incident, Montenegrin and Turkish troops reportedly clashed on the border over haying rights on the frontier. Turk forces crossed the frontier, attacked the peasants cutting hay in the disputed area and built entrenchments on Montenegrin soil. Montenegrin soldiers counterattacked, drove the Turks back, destroyed a fortress across the border, and pursued the fleeing troops into Turkish territory for two hours. Moslems ransacked the village of Urzhanitza on 14-15 August. The next day twenty people were massacred near Treptshi in Montenegro. The events of July and August, Serbo-Austrian tension in the Sanjak of Novibazar, and the various border incidents contributed to pushing the Balkan states into an offensive attitude towards Turkey, and out of the control of Russian policy.

To include Montenegro in the system of alliances would necessarily give the alliances an offensive character, a prospect not pleasing to St. Petersburg. Montenegro's belligerent attitude toward Turkey had caused Sazonov to discourage Serbia and Bulgaria from extending the Balkan alliances to include Montenegro. If Montenegro joined the Balkan League, the more or less peaceful character of the treaties supported by Russian diplomacy would disappear, and war with Turkey would be almost inevitable. In early June of 1912, Bulgarian and Montenegrin officials secretly met in Vienna to discuss the possibility of including Montenegro in the alliance system with a definite commitment to war with the Ottoman Empire. The

51 de Salis to Grey, 9 August 1912, ibid., pp. 600-601.
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talks were delayed by the Bulgarians until after the conclusion of the Serbo-Bulgarian military convention in October.  

The border incidents in August returned the Balkan states to negotiating alliances with Montenegro as the deepening crisis moved further out of Russian control. In September, Montenegro concluded agreements with Serbia and Bulgaria to begin a war against Turkey. By mid-September, the Montenegrin-Bulgarian talks which had begun in June at Vienna reached a final statement of policy. Montenegro agreed to begin hostilities against the Ottoman Empire before 1 October. Bulgaria would join the war within a month of Montenegro's action and would subsidize the effort with a payment of 700,000 francs. The purpose of the Bulgaro-Montenegro agreement was to be communicated to Serbia. While Bulgaria and Montenegro worked on the final draft, Nekludoff spoke with Gueshoff on 20 September. When asked about the existence of a Bulgarian-Montenegrin military convention, Gueshoff gave evasive answers. Nekludoff, however, believed that an agreement existed but could not say if it had been signed. Because of the secret nature of the negotiations, the Russian Foreign Office could not successfully counter the inclusion of Montenegro into the alliance or prevent the war by withholding financial support as in earlier years.

Montenegrin and Serbian representatives met in Lucerne, Switzerland, late in September and by 3 October had concluded a military convention.

---
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which moved the date of attack up two weeks. A simultaneous attack against Turkey, operational areas for each army, and a mutual obligation to face Austria if the contingency arose were parts of the agreement. Article IV provided that hostilities should commence by 14 October with provision for only one postponement.  

As the summer continued and tensions in the Balkans increased, intervention by Russia and the Great Powers to maintain peace in the Balkans was considered inevitable. The Austrians set up artillery batteries to command the entrance to the Morava River in Serbia. By the end of July, large troop concentrations on the Serbian frontier, news of Austrian maneuvers planned for the fall near Serbia, information that the Serbs on the Save River in Austria had been disarmed and Hungarian railways had been ordered to keep rolling stock available for troop movements during the harvest season made the Serbs tense and suspicious of Austrian designs against Serbia.  

The first "official" news of Austrian knowledge of the Serbo-Bulgarian alliance came on 11 August in an article in the Neue Freie Presse of Vienna. The article softly criticized Russian involvement in the Balkans because Austrian interests had not been consulted during negotiations. 

---
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Five days later, the sixteenth, articles appeared in Vienna newspapers about the expectation that Count Berchtold would call a conference of the Great Powers to discuss and exchange views on Balkan problems.  

The "Berchtold Initiative," in part, had already been taken on 13 August when telegrams to St. Petersburg, Berlin, London, Paris, Rome, Constantinople, and Bucharest had been sent with instructions to communicate the proposal to the respective foreign ministries. The terms of the proposal were vague. Berchtold stated that the Vienna cabinet wished to pursue a policy of peace and calm for the Balkans. If the other powers were of the same disposition, they should meet to exchange ideas on how to influence the Porte to extend the policy of decentralization in the Balkans. Berchtold also suggested that the Powers should impress upon the Balkan states how it would be in their favor to leave the desired reforms in the hands of the Porte and avoid endangering peace in the Balkans.

The Russian reaction to the "Berchtold Initiative" was mixed. The Russian Ambassador at Vienna, Krupenski, expressed conviction that the Austrian interest in preserving peace in the Balkans was an honest one. A disturbance there might bring on a general war for which Austria was not yet ready. Krupenski was convinced that Austria harbored no aggressive goals in the Balkans. He was not as sure, however, that if Austrian

61 Spalajkovitch to Pašić, 30 July 1912, APS, I, 221-222; Cartwright to Grey, 15 August 1912, BD, IX, i, 618-619.

62 Berchtold's proposal can be found in Š-UA, IV, 339-340, and in APS, II, 202-203, with some minor changes in the text.
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interests there were threatened, she would reject the temptation to protect those interests in spite of her military weakness.  

In St. Petersburg Sazonov did not appear to be pleased by Berchtold's initiative.

He said that he would have no objection to entering into an exchange of views with the Powers, though he doubted whether anything would come of it. . . . Anything, moreover, in the shape of collective representations would be resented at Constantinople. Much, also, would depend on what was meant by decentralisation. . . . If the Austrian proposal contained nothing objectionable, he would be prepared to instruct the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople to give friendly counsels in the name of his Government, but not to take collective action.  

Other reactions were equally non-committal. Bertie, the English Ambassador at Paris, reported the French press comments were "of a guarded nature" as the real significance of Berchtold's proposal was not fully understood. Marling, British Ambassador at Constantinople reported that in Turkey the Austrian initiative met with a vague amount of suspicion. In general, the powers agreed to exchange views, but they withheld further comment on the rest of the proposal until Berchtold suggested specific measures for maintaining the status quo.

In a note dated 29 August 1912 and read at the respective ministeries by 3 September, Berchtold expounded on his proposal. The second note called for maintaining the status quo, free elections in the Balkans, and encouraging the Porte to consider extending privileges and reforms to all
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Balkan states. The new proposal did not call for a formal conference between the powers since they had objected to such a meeting in their answers to the first proposal. In short, Berchtold's second communication was no more definite than the first. After making the usual diplomatic but noncommittal answers, England, France, and Russia informally agreed to discontinue further discussions of the Berchtold proposals.

The significance of the "Berchtold Initiative" is twofold. The first is that by making the proposals Berchtold threw a direct challenge to Russian influence in the Balkans. Sazonov resented the Austrian move because he feared Austria might be wooing the Balkan states in an effort to diminish the prestige Russia had won in the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty. Maioresco, the Rumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs called Berchtold's move "clever and astute," and he implied that Austria lately had not been in the forefront of European affairs. Since the death of Aehrenthal, Berchtold had done little to show strong leadership for Austrian foreign policy. The "Initiative" succeeded in returning Austria to the spotlight and put "Berchtold's name on everyone's lips."

---
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The second significance of the Berchtold Initiative goes beyond the earning of superficial status. Berchtold's step was important in relation to Austrian future policies towards the Balkan states and the growing tensions of the summer of 1912. Since nothing constructive resulted from the proposal, The Spectator commented:

Austria-Hungary, having put forward a proposal which is probably too vague for any general agreement among the Powers. . . will be able to say, if the Powers do fail to agree, that she has done her best for the amenities of Europe, and that now she is compelled by circumstances to step alone into Turkey and do whatever she wishes.71

Turkey also feared that if the Great Powers did not act together along the lines of the Berchtold proposal, Austria would act alone to protect her interests.72 Independent action by Austria against a Balkan state might bring an equal answer from Russia that would bring on the dreaded general war.

Russia, England, France, and Germany had not remained idle as the war drew nearer. Late in August, during the Berchtold proposal incident, Sazonov had expressed an interest in exchanging views on the Balkan situation among the Entente Powers alone in an effort to keep Austria from acting alone.73 Overtures were made, but the British were against excluding Austria-Hungary and Germany from any talks.74 The Powers, led by France and England, began to seek a common ground whereby presenting
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an united front, they could pressure the allies into preserving peace.
In mid-September Sazonov expressed his opinion that unless the Powers
intervened to gain some concessions from Turkey in line with the provi-
sions of Article XXIII of the Treaty of Berlin, formal hostilities would
begin in the Balkans in the near future.75

As tensions mounted in the Balkans, the French Minister of Foreign
Affairs, Poincaré, made a proposal for a collective representation to be
made by the Powers at the Balkan capitals if the situation worsened.
The French proposal was more definite than the Berchtold Initiative a
month earlier. The collective powers were to ask the Balkans not to dis-
turb the status quo; to press the Porte for further concessions to the
Balkan demands; in case of war, the Balkan states could not expect to
retain any territorial gains. Included in the proposal was a suggestion
for a naval demonstration by the Powers if none of the conditions were
met by the belligerents.76

By the end of September, only the Russian and English ambassadors
had received instructions to present the French ultimatum although the
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other Powers had agreed to follow the French lead. Since Poincaré's proposal needed the cooperation of all the Powers and since some of them had demonstrated reluctance to state such a definite position, he suggested on 2 October that Russia and Austria-Hungary, as the two most interested Powers, put the proposals before Serbia and Bulgaria as mandatories. A text for the Russo-Austrian demarche was written and agreed upon by 6 October. The Balkan capitals received the note two days later, the same day Montenegro declared war against the Ottoman Empire.

Rumors of a Russian partial mobilization appeared in the Times (London), of 1 October. The rumor was confirmed two days later, but at that time the Russians categorically denied that the "test mobilization" in Poland was in any way connected with the Balkan situation. Turkey, convinced of an agreement between the Balkan states because of the simultaneous mobilizations, declared general mobilization on 1 October. A serious incident occurred between Turk and Montenegrin troops on the
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frontier on 5 October.\footnote{Mary E. Durham, Twenty Years of Balkan Tangle (London, 1920), 226-227; \textit{The Times} (London), 7 October 1912, p. 5.} Two days later, the Montenegrin representative left Constantinople, the Turkish representative at Cetinje received his passport, and Montenegro declared war, 8 October 1912.\footnote{Ibid., 9 October 1912, p. 5; Albertini, \textit{Origins}, I, 377.}

The events leading up to the declaration of war illustrate the confusion in Russian Balkan policy during August and September. During the Montenegrin-Turkish border crises of August and while the Powers pondered the "Berchtold Initiative," Russia had counseled restraint at Cetinje, but Russian soldiers were still in Montenegro, ostensibly to teach at the cadet school which happened to be closed for summer vacation.\footnote{Daily report on a visit of the Russian representative, 9 August 1912, \textit{O-UA}, IV, 326; Durham, \textit{Struggle}, p. 165; the possibility that Russian encouragement in the Balkans might get out of control received notice at the British Foreign Office, Barclay to Grey, 30 August 1912, \textit{BD}, IX, 1, 657-658.} The Bulgarians showed impatience over the delayed prosecution of the Turkish army officers and men responsible for the Kochana massacre, and Grey counseled patience in Sofia,\footnote{Grey to Barclay, 31 August 1912; \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 661-662.} but the Balkan states began talks with Montenegro. The Russian government also warned Bulgaria that if a war resulted over the Kochana incident, Russia would give neither diplomatic nor military support but, on the contrary, Serbia and Bulgaria would be left alone to face Austria and Roumania.\footnote{Personal note of Pasic on a representation made to him by Hartwig, 20 September 1912, \textit{APS}, I, 232; Buchanan to Grey, 3 September 1912, \textit{BD}, IX, 1, 670.} This step by Russia was obviously more
in the interest of world peace than the Balkan interest of full national status. Gueshoff pointed out the anomaly that if Russia interfered on
the side of Turkey, it would be the "death-knell" of Russian influence in
the Balkans.\footnote{von Eckardt to Foreign Office, 16 September 1912, GP, XXXIII, 105, the German representative thought that Russia could delay the war by holding back the Montenegrin army subsidy; Barclay to Grey, 18 September 1912, BD, IX, i, 696.} Russia had used her influence to unite the Balkan states, and now she seemed to be trying to undo her successful efforts.

In the Northwest area of Albania, close to the Montenegrin border, the Malissori tribes re-opened their revolt against Turkey in mid-
September, 1912.\footnote{The Times (London), 19 September 1912, p. 5.} On 21-22 September, Greek frontier forces were reinforced by heavy artillery, and the Bulgarian Army called off maneuvers earlier than had been planned.\footnote{Ibid., 23 September 1912, p. 4.} Two days later the Turks stopped a shipment of ammunition bound for Serbia because of unfriendly Serbian speeches calling for war against the Ottoman Empire.\footnote{Paget to Grey, 24 September 1912, BD, IX, i, 707-708.} When presented with a Serb protest, the Porte again used dilatory tactics by asking that the protest be presented in writing. The Serbian representative did not have authorization to make the protest in writing.\footnote{Giers to Neratov, 30 September 1912, Benckendorff, II, 449, cited in APS, II, 226; the Turk actions and delays only contributed to the increasing bitterness in the Balkans, Giers to Sazonov, 30 September 1912, Benckendorff, II, 448, cited in ibid., II, 227.} Before the issue could be settled, the war broke out.
The Serbian protest also demanded an explanation for the calling out of Turkish reserves in the Uskub and Mitrowitza districts. The Turks had also moved troops to the Bulgarian border, an action which caused considerable apprehension in Sofia, especially when the Porte explained that the troops were there to help the Bulgarian government calm agitation. Another bloody incident occurred on the Montenegrin frontier on 28 September. No reason was given for the engagement, in which three Turks and fifteen Montenegrins were killed. Turkish maneuvers in the Adrianople district was thought to have influenced the mobilization declaration given to the Bulgarian army on 30 September. Serbia ordered general mobilization the same day, and Montenegro, after King Nikola had given "assurances that he would be the last of the Balkan Sovereigns to mobilize," followed suit on 1 October and declared war a week later.

Spurred on by the Italo-Turk War and Russian encouragement, Bulgaria and Serbia had allied themselves against a common enemy under the auspices of the Czar. The alliance had been extended to include Greece, but Russia
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had been able to exert only indirect influence, and Bulgaria and Greece
did not provide for Russian arbitration. The summer of 1912 brought on
border incidents between the Balkan states and Turkey. Montenegro was
included into the Balkan League against the advice of the Russian Foreign
Office. With the kingdom of the Black Mountain's adherence to the al-
liances, the intent of the pacts were changed from defensive to offensive,
with the Ottoman Empire named as the enemy.

In August and September, Russia and the Great Powers moved to pre-
vent a Balkan war. The Austrian proposal of August, because of its
vague stipulation, failed to bring about effective results. When war
seemed imminent, Russia joined the Great Powers and acting with her Bal-
kan rival, Austria-Hungary, as mandatories, failed to dissuade the allies
from fulfilling their commitments for war against Turkey.

Over the years Russian policy in the Balkans had changed from the
idea of a frontal revision of the Straits question to a more subtle ap-
proach. By uniting the Balkan states and gaining other allies, Russia
hoped to some day revise the Straits agreement in a way more favorable to
her position as a great power. The Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of March, 1912,
brought the two former competitors together under Russian patronage. The
new policy seemed to be well on its way to realization until the independ-
ent actions of the Balkan states showed that Russian influence in the
Balkans was illusory. Russia obviously could not restrain the impatient
Balkan states, and if she did not support their claims, she ran the risk
of losing all semblance of influence. If the Russian statesmen gave full
diplomatic support to the Balkan demand, they would find themselves in a
predicament similar to Isvolsky in 1909, and a general European war might
ensue.
In the months following the declaration of war, the Russian diplomats desperately tried to resolve the dilemma of how to gain influence over the Balkans and at the same time to retain the confidence of the other Great Powers.
CHAPTER III

RUSSIA AND THE EARLY MONTHS OF THE FIRST BALKAN WAR

The opening of hostilities on 8 October 1912 by Montenegro signalled the beginning of the Balkan Wars and the demise of Russian influence in the Balkans. Russian diplomats had encouraged a non-aggressive alliance of the Balkan states under Russian patronage. The four small kingdoms of the Balkan peninsula had moved outside the limits of Russian policy to attempt on their own a redress of wrongs, both real and imagined, inflicted on them by the Ottoman Empire through unfulfilled reform measures provided for in the Treaty of Berlin, 1878. With the irrevocable allied decision to begin war against the Turks, Russian diplomacy faced a clearly defined problem: should the Balkan states be supported in their struggle against Turkey and have Russia thereby risk incurring the displeasure of the other Great Powers who wished to see the maintenance of the status quo; or should Russia give full and undivided support to the Great Powers, thereby losing all pretense of leadership over the peoples of the Balkans and wrecking future possibilities of Balkan support to revise the Straits question?

In the months following the declaration of war, the allies unaided by Russia won unexpected victories against the Turks and captured territory in excess of even their own optimistic plans of September. Since Russia and the Powers had to face a fait accompli revision of the territorial status quo, they agreed to call a conference to re-arrange the
boundaries of European Turkey and, in essence, limit the annexations of the victorious Balkan states.

Russian diplomacy, between the opening of the first Balkan War, October, 1912, and February, 1913, vacillated between support of the Powers and support of the Balkan states. Sazonov tried to preserve the confidence of the Powers by urging the Balkan allies to accept concessions and the will of the Powers. At the same time he supported all claims of the victors and tried to maintain Russian influence by pushing those claims to realization as the patron of the Balkans. As Sazonov swung between the allies and the Powers, he failed to gain any significant aims of the allies. Once again the allies took matters into their own hands and on 3 February 1913 broke the armistice in order to complete their conquest of the Balkan Peninsula.

Serge Sazonov had heard the news of the declaration of war in October while in Berlin. To the German Foreign Minister, Kiderlen-Wächter, the Russian minister appeared visibly depressed at the news.¹ Earlier that day Sazonov had expressed his hope for peace in the Balkans. When he had been criticized for the danger of Russian activities in the Balkans, he replied that Russia had made it explicitly clear that any Balkan alliance would not have aggressive purposes.² The beginning of the war, in spite of Balkan assurances, was not a total surprise to Sazonov and the Russian Foreign Office. In mid-September, he expressed apprehension as to the immediate situation in the Balkans. War, he thought, was only

¹Note of Kiderlen-Wächter, 9 October 1912, GP, XXXIII, p. 190.
²Ibid.
deferred, and the Balkan rulers could not continue to go against the will of their subjects. The Powers could only hope to "localize" the war.\textsuperscript{3} The same view appeared in the \textit{Times} (London) of 4 October.\textsuperscript{4} The British Foreign Office had received a note on 3 October from Buchanan in St. Petersburg explaining the views of Neratov, acting Foreign Minister while Sazonov was on a trip. Neratov expected Bulgaria and Serbia "would be ready to move in five [sic] days time."\textsuperscript{5} Buchanan's note was dated 3 October 1912, five days before Montenegro declared war. Whether Neratov made an accurate guess or actually knew the correct day the allies would commence hostilities is unknown. Sazonov probably did not know of the exact date because he had been making diplomatic courtesy calls at European capitals, and he had not been in direct personal contact with his Balkan representatives.\textsuperscript{6}

During September, however, Sazonov had expressed his apprehensions about the inevitability of the worsening situation, but he did not make positive moves to ask the other Powers to join him in putting further pressure on the Porte and the Balkan states.\textsuperscript{7} In the early days of October during the consideration of the Poincaré proposal, Russia had been one of the first to send instructions to her representative to join the
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collective demarche at Cettinje and Belgrade. Russia acted in good faith with Austria as mandatories at Cettinje and Belgrade on 8 October. Nera-tov, however, had charge of the Foreign Office at this time. With the information at his disposal, it is not outside the bounds of reason to say that he knew of the inevitability of the war, if not the actual date on which hostilities would commence. Russia could safely join a collective representation in the Balkan capitals. If the war was inevitable, then the allies would not be able to say that Russia had prevented them from seeking their reforms from Turkey since France had suggested the step. By joining the other Powers, Russia preserved their confidence. Russia could also join Austria as a mandatory of the other Powers because she would appear as a better representative for protecting Balkan interests than Austria whose hostility to Balkan expansion was well known. Neratov had very little to lose by acting with the Powers to prevent the war.

Yet Sazonov and Russian diplomacy have been accused of duplicity in the activities prior to 8 October. The chief criticism is that the Russian government did not think a Balkan war at that time was the most favorable to all the Slavic nations. For example, if the Allies should lose the war it would certainly have an adverse effect on long-range Russian plans to revise the Straits agreements.

Sazonov appeared to be more concerned with what Austria might do than he was with the whole of Balkan policy. At the Berlin meeting of 8 Oc-tober, Sazonov expressed fears that Austria would move against Serbia should there be a violation of territory in the Sanjak of Novibazar. In such a

---

8 Bogitshevich, Causes, pp. 38-39.
case, the Russian government could not withstand public opinion and would have to move in support of her Slavic brothers.9

By the end of the evening, 8 October, Sazonov had illustrated the ambivalence and confusion of the Russian policy in the Balkans. The note presented to the Balkan states that day by the Austrian and Russian emmissaries, acting as mandatories of the six Powers, showed the Russians in league with the Powers, contrary to Balkan interests, and at the same time acting as friend and protector of Slavic ambitions in the Balkans. On the same day, Sazonov in person contradicted both implications of the mandate note by his statements to Kiderlen-Wächter. Other instances of the confusion in Russian policy and the dilemma of having to chose between the Powers and the Balkan allies occurred during the early months of the war and the early peace negotiations at London.

Ten days after Montenegro began hostilities against the Ottoman Empire, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece joined Montenegro as co-belligerents.10 The declarations of the Powers, made by Russia and Austria after the failure to unite in early October, showed that they were not likely to make positive steps to prevent or stop the Balkan states from waging war. The Turkish army, in any case, would defeat the smaller Balkan allies. Germany

9Note of Kiderlen-Wächter, 9 October 1912, GP, XXXIII, p. 190.

10Albertini, I, p. 377, gives the impression that Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece declared war first; Helmreich, p. 137, shows that the Turks handed over passports and declared a state of war between Bulgaria, Serbia and Turkey before the Serb and Bulgar representatives could present their own declarations. Helmreich's account gives some credence to the statement in Nationalism and War in the Near East, by a diplomatist, George Young, ed. (Oxford, 1915), p. 186, that the Turks ordered the Bulgarian and Serbian legations to leave Turkey, and the statement in D. J. Cassavetti, Hellas and the Balkan Wars (London, 1914), p. 11, that Turkey actually was "also thirsting for the fray."
and Austria would then be on the side of the victors in any negotiations, while Russia, the only Entente power with major interests in the peninsula, would be alone in her support of the defeated allies. Germany did nothing to demand firm concessions in Constantinople, and the Porte seemed encouraged by the continued presence of the German army cadre in the Turk army.

The Balkan allies surprised Russia and the European capitals with unexpected victories. By the early part of November, the allies had, in effect, driven the Turkish army out of European Turkey. The Montenegrins were stopped at the fortress of Scutari, where they set up siege operations. The Greek army laid siege to the Jania fortress. The Serbians, who began to push to the Adriatic across Albania, had occupied the Sanjak of Novibazar with Montenegro and part of Macedonia with the Bulgarian army. Greece and Bulgaria captured Salonika and the rest of Macedonia. Adrianople, Jania, and Scutari were completely cut off from rescue by the Turkish army. The Serbian and Bulgarian army pursued the fleeing Turks to the Chatalja lines, the defense perimeter west of Constantinople, where they were bogged down by unusually heavy autumn rains. By mid-November the Balkan allies had changed the territorial status quo.

---


12 Ibid., p. 127.

13 Albertini, Origins, I, 377-379, has a brief account of the early part of the war; Sazonov, Fateful Years, p. 70; Nekludoff, Reminiscences, pp. 111-112.

14 Ibid., pp. 120, 114-115.
Soon after hostilities commenced, Sazonov outlined a "prohibited" zone beyond which the allies were not to be allowed to stay. The area included the city of Adrianople, which was considered the key to the defense of Constantinople. If Adrianople fell to the allies, Sazonov feared they would then have an unobstructed march into Constantinople. Since that city had been the key to Russian diplomacy for nearly three centuries, Sazonov could not allow any other state to have possession of the Straits.

After the Balkan victory at Kirk-Kilise, 24 October, the Turks retreated beyond Adrianople deep into the Russian prohibited zone. When asked to remind the Bulgarian government of the restricted area, Nekludoff protested because of conflicts he anticipated with Bulgarian aspirations. He saw the fall of Adrianople as a serious injury to German influence in Turkey and counselled rescinding the prohibitions. With the Bulgarian army already within the area, Sazonov accepted the advice of his minister and withdrew his objections. The Bulgars, meanwhile, had pushed the Turks back to the Chatalja fortifications. With Constantinople again threatened, Sazonov declared that Russia would not remain idle if Bulgaria took the city. After several bloody attempts to storm the defenses failed, Bulgaria, with her communications dangerously extended, settled down to a holding action outside Constantinople. When

---


17 Sazonov to Isvolsky, 4 November 1912, Isvolsky, II, p. 331.
Constantinople appeared to be safe from the Bulgarians, Sazonov agreed that the new eastern frontier of Bulgaria would be a line Midia-Enos, from the Black Sea across the peninsula to the Aegean.\textsuperscript{18}

After the allies bogged down in siege operations in mid-November, they accepted a Turkish plea for an armistice, which was signed on 3 December. Greece refrained from signing the armistice in order to be free to prosecute the active siege of Jania; moreover, she hoped to win a victory at sea against Turkey.\textsuperscript{19} By the time of the armistice the allies had made large gains in European Turkey, but the fortresses of Adrianople, Scutari, and Jania had repelled all allied assaults.

Before the cease-fire had been signed, a serious problem developed over the Serbian conquest and demands for a littoral on the Adriatic Sea. The idea of a Serb port on the Adriatic received support from Russia and definite opposition from Austria. In a long decree issued on 30 October, Berchtold formally recognized that the status quo in the Balkans had been disturbed, and the Triple Alliance powers should accept the change but limit its extent along lines he suggested.\textsuperscript{20} Among the Austrian suggestions was one which totally denied Serbia the Adriatic outlet she desired.\textsuperscript{21} Instead the Austrians proposed the creation of an independent and "viable" Albania when peace negotiations began.\textsuperscript{22} The independence of Albania
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would be impossible if Serbia received an outlet to the sea. Any Serb corridor would provide a temptation to the Serbs to expand their holdings and create another Balkan crisis.

While Austria was firming up her new position on territorial changes in the Balkans, Sazonov moved his support to the side of the victorious allies. By 1 November, just two days after Berchtold's statement to Berlin, Sazonov advocated changes in the Balkans in agreement with the desires of the allies. The next day he made known the changes he would support. Turkey must keep Constantinople but Bulgaria might be allowed Adrianople if the fortifications were demolished. Sazonov stated that Serbia should be given access to the Adriatic and Albania become an autonomous Turkish province.

Sazonov had placed his government almost in direct opposition to the Austrian policy of 30 October. Berchtold's independent Albania could not be secure if Serbia had an Adriatic port. Serbia, the Austrians suspected, would probably seek to expand her littoral at Albania's expense. An Albania without a major port would, in the Austrian opinion, be economically crippled. Sazonov's autonomous Albania would remain dependent on the Ottoman Empire for protection from the danger of Serbian expansion of her littoral. Austria's real worry was not another probable crisis if Serbia got a port. The Austrians suspected that a Serb port would become a Russian port, and the fear existed that Italy and Serbia or Russia and Serbia would work together to shut the Adriatic to Austria.
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25For a discussion of the Austrian opposition to a Serb port, see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 209-212.
Berchtold communicated his proposal of 30 October to the other Powers on 5 November. Two days later, Serbia made a strong protest at Berlin against the Austrian position. Serbia argued that she needed the outlet for her economic survival, and the partition of the Albanian part of European Turkey to which the Balkan allies had agreed and which Serbia assumed Russia had sanctioned provided that Serbia should receive the contested littoral. Serbia claimed the support of Bulgaria and Russia. Serbia wanted to know if Austria opposed the partition of Albania, would Germany support Austria if France remained neutral? Both Serbia and Bulgaria acted as if, in spite of all the warnings before the war, Russia would not desert her Slav brothers. Russian warnings refuted announced Pan-slav sympathies, and the Serbs and Bulgars would not accept Russian neutrality at face value. The independent Serbian representations to the German government illustrate that Russian encouragement during the alliance negotiations had been misinterpreted by Serbia and had sent that state outside the control of Russian statesmen.

The German answer to the Serbian demand announced complete support of the Austrian program in the Balkans. If Russia supported Serbia,
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Germany would support Austria. The Russian Foreign Office resented the Serbian assumptions made in Berlin. A verbal reprimand was sent to Belgrade. Sazonov informed Serbia not to count on Russian support, but privately he thought Russia would have to come to the aid of Serbia in a war with Austria. Sazonov toned down his advice to Belgrade and even suggested that she would be wise to accept an Austrian proposal for a commercial outlet instead of continuing to demand a littoral. The new conciliatory attitude from St. Petersburg may have been influenced by the solidarity of the Triple Alliance behind the Austrian position, the rash, independent actions of Serbia in the Berlin interview of 7 November, and the opening of the "Consular Affair" a few days later. The "Consular Affair" appeared to be a deliberate Serbian provocation of Austria. Adding to Sazonov's difficulties in the Serbian question, the
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34 The Serbs presented formal complaints against Prochaska, the Austrian Legate at Prizren, stating that he was involved in encouraging the Turks, and the Consulate had been used for sniper firing, and requested his recall. Berchtold was unable to confirm the charge since the Serbs were dilatory in re-opening communications until late November. The Serb delays aroused suspicion in the press and a war-scare resulted (Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 213-215). The Serbian claim proved to be false, and Austria demanded apologies and a full Serb military honor guard to honor the Austrian flag. Serbia fulfilled the request and by mid-January, 1913, the affair was closed (ibid., pp. 228-230).
Czar had instructed the Foreign Office, in late October, to use Russia's full aid for all Balkan programs, short of war.\textsuperscript{35}

On 17 November, Buchanan reported that Sazonov had again taken up the Serbian claims to a littoral.\textsuperscript{36} The new position St. Petersburg advocated was a modification of old demands. Sazonov, after having thought it over, apparently decided to try for a compromise. The old proposal called for a Serb port at Valone. If Serbia received Valone, Albania would be split in half. The new proposal that Serbia receive the northern port of San Giovanni di Medua would not divide Albania and would leave that country essentially united so that an autonomous or an independent government could preserve the nationalistic ambitions supported by Austria. Sazonov's new position was, in effect a compromise of his earlier position and a refutation of his advice to Serbia expressed on 14 November. Sazonov's changed views were influenced by the "whole of the nationalistic press," Rasputin's return to court, and the military clique around the Czar.\textsuperscript{37}

On 22 November Sazonov seemed to be softening again on his support for Serbia.\textsuperscript{38} An evasive answer by Grey to Benckendorff's request for England's position should Austria attack Serbia had been communicated to Sazonov on 14 November 1912.\textsuperscript{39} The slow buildup of Austrian troops
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had added to the general tensions. In October Russia had stopped de-
mo-bilizing troops whose terms of enlistment had expired during a trial
mobilization in Poland. The result was an increase in the number of
Russian troops along the Austrian-Polish frontier and an increase in
the military expenditures.\textsuperscript{40} To meet the new threat, Austria called
out her reserves and moved troops to the Russian frontier.\textsuperscript{41} By the end
of November, Sazonov once again seemed to be waning in his support of the
Serbian claims.\textsuperscript{42} On 29 November Serbia slightly reduced her demands.\textsuperscript{43}
The next day Sazonov was again working in agreement with the powers to
device a commercial egress for Serbia other than a littoral on the Ad-
riatic.\textsuperscript{44} As of the first of December, the Serbian claim for a littoral
no longer threatened war. Sazonov had backed out of a potentially dan-
gerous situation, if not gracefully, at least not with the dishonor of
Isvolsky in 1909.

The real reasons for Sazonov's ambivalent attitude in the Serb lit-
toral crisis remain unknown. In his memoirs, Sazonov explains

\begin{quote}
In the beginning of November it became absolutely clear
that Serbia could be established in any port whatsoever
on the Adriatic only by force of arms--that is to say,
\end{quote}
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at the cost of a European war. . . , any idea of a European war for the sake of a Serbian port on the Adriatic was out of the question—neither we nor our Allies and friends entertained it.\(^45\)

Sazonov finally dropped the demand for a Serb littoral to prevent a general war.

The most significant result of the Russian failure to support the Serbian claim in the face of Austrian opposition was the harm done to Russian influence in the Balkans. From the early part of November, when Sazonov realized the true cost of supporting Serbia and began backing off, Russian influence in the Balkans became negligible. On the other hand, by supporting Serbia and then backing down, Sazonov had decreased Russian influence over the Great Powers. Austria, having held out in this one instance for a viable Albania, could now make more stringent demands on the Balkan allies. If she did not demand too much, that is—return to the status quo—Russia probably could not oppose her actions with any hope for success, especially since England had expressed reluctance about being drawn into a Balkan conflict. While Sazonov was beginning to realize the futility and danger of supporting Serbia, the Balkan armies were making their victory almost complete.

By the end of November, the allies had defeated the once mighty Ottoman Empire. The Turks asked for and received an armistice which was signed on 3 December. The terms of the armistice provided that the combatants would hold their present positions, besieged forts would not be re-supplied, Turkey would lift all blockades and trade restrictions

\(^45\)Sazonov, Fateful Years, p. 82.
hindering the provisioning of Bulgarian troops, and peace negotiations would begin in London by 13 December.\footnote{The terms of the armistice can be found in Helmreich, \textit{Diplomacy}, p. 203.}

By November the Powers generally realized that a change of the status quo was inevitable in the Balkans. In early December they agreed to hold a conference in London for the purpose of mediating the conflicts of interests between Powers over changes demanded by the Balkan allies who would re-arrange the conquered territory.\footnote{For the various diplomatic maneuvering related to calling the Conference, see, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 221-224.} The ambassadors in London were designated as representatives to the conference. They were Benckendorff of Russia, Mensdorff of Austria, Lichnowsky of Germany, Cambon of France, Imperiali of Italy, and the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Grey. The ambassadors were entrusted with the responsibility of mediating Austrian and Russian differences and arriving at a durable peace for the Balkans. The armistice provided that the belligerents would begin talks on 13 December, but the allies and Turkey agreed to begin their peace negotiations the same day as the Powers.

The two most important problems for the conference were the related Serbian commercial access to the Adriatic and the creation of an autonomous Albania. At their first meeting, 17 December, the Ambassadors agreed to discuss the Albanian question first.\footnote{Grey to Cartwright, 17 December 1912, \textit{BD}, IX, ii, pp. 292-293.} They quickly agreed that Albania would be autonomous, neutral, and under the sovereignty of the Sultan. Albania would be bordered on the north by Montenegro and on the south by Greece. The general borders agreed upon automatically...
excluded a Serbian littoral. Austria, however, insisted that the Albanian and Montenegrin borders must remain as they were at the time of the conference.\footnote{Ibid., p. 293.} By the time the conference had opened, Montenegro had not yet captured Scutari, and under the Austrian conditions, the city would remain in the new Albania even if the Montenegrin siege succeeded. Benckendorff raised a general objection to the Austrian demand, and the subject was left to private discussion. The Ambassadors quickly agreed to find a means for Serbia to have commercial access to the Adriatic, and the meeting ended. In the first meeting of the Ambassadors' conference, the two problems which had seemed most likely to disrupt European peace only a month before, autonomous Albania and a Serbian littoral, were amicably resolved by the Great Powers and not by the nations most concerned. Ironically, from the same meeting a problem arose which in the next five months would be even more dangerous to continental peace—the Scutari question.

The city of Scutari, at the southern end of Lake Scutari, had been part of European Turkey before the outbreak of the First Balkan War. Although the population was principally Moslem-Albanian, Montenegro desired the city for the fertile land around the lake. If Montenegro incorporated Scutari into the kingdom, the fertile land would greatly increase Montenegro's economy. From the first day of the war Scutari was Montenegro's most important military objective.\footnote{The Times (London), 9 October 1912, p. 6.} By the time the armistice had been signed, Montenegro had not been successful at Scutari.
By the terms of the armistice, her troops could remain around the city, while the garrison inside could neither be relieved nor re-provisioned. Although Montenegro was fighting for possession of Scutari, Austria demanded that the city should be in the new Albania. Montenegro looked to her Russian friends to oppose the Austrians.

Austria based her opposition to Montenegro receiving Scutari on the grounds of the Albanian-Moslem population. The loss of Scutari would also be a serious blow to the Albanian economy. At the first meeting of the Ambassadors' conference, it became obvious that Austria firmly objected to the Montenegrin claim and that "Russia would support the Montenegrin claim in this respect."

At the second meeting on 18 December, the Scutari question was not formally discussed. Two days later the Ambassadors met again, and as they had not received further instructions, they agreed to adjourn the conference over the holiday season until 2 January.

From 20 December until the conference reconvened, Sazonov tried to enlist support for the Montenegrin claims for Scutari and to convince Austria to give in. The day after the adjournment Sazonov sought English support. He argued that "it had not been easy for Russia to abandon Serbia's claim for a port of her own, and now Austria was coming forward with a fresh and unexpected demand." Grey agreed and expressed his
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opinion to Germany, Austria, and Italy that since Russia had given way on the Serbian littoral, it seemed only fair that Austria relinquish her support of Scutari for Albania. Sazonov, of course, welcomed the British support.

Even with British support the Russian minister was unable to gain any concessions from Austria, not even a reduction of the mobilized Austrian troops. When the ambassadors met again, 2 January 1913, no agreement had been reached on Scutari, and Albania was not discussed. The conference agreed on the disposition of certain islands in the Aegean, but the Montenegrin claims for Scutari remained unsatisfied.

During the rest of January, the representatives of the Powers carried on private conversations in which various compromises were suggested and rejected. Fertile lands along the banks of the Boyana River, a navigable stream which drains Lake Scutari, and other compensations were discussed, but no agreement was reached before the armistice ended and the war resumed on 3 February.

---
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While these talks among the representative of the Great Powers were going on, the peace talks between the Turks and Balkan allies had become deadlocked over the possession of Adrianople. Bulgaria claimed it, and the Powers advised Turkey to cede the city; but the Porte refused to comply because the siege had not yet been successful. The Balkan allies suspended peace talks on 6 January. The Ambassadors' Conference drew up a collective note urging the Turks to surrender Adrianople and conclude the peace treaty. After a coup d'état on 23 January, a strong nationalist group gained control of the Turkish government and firmly rejected the Powers' note. The conference received that negative answer on 30 January, and four days later hostilities resumed. 60

From the beginning of the war in October, 1912, until the resumption of hostilities after the armistice in February, 1913, Russian foreign policy in the Balkans suffered setbacks. Unable to stop the allies from proceeding with the war, the Russian Minister then tried to represent the claims of the Balkan states after their victories made the maintenance of the status quo impossible. While advocating the Serbian littoral, Sazonov showed indecision and ambivalence. After bowing to the Austrian determination to oppose the Serb littoral, even to the point of war, Sazonov had lost the initiative in representing the Balkan states.

In the question of Scutari during the early days of the Ambassadors' conference in London, Sazonov once again found himself facing Austrian opposition. After having deserted Serbia, the Russian Minister felt that he had to stand firm in his support of the Montenegrin claim to Scutari.

60 For a discussion of the Turkish-Balkan allies' peace talks, see, Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 259-263, 267-269, 276-277.
Austria, encouraged by the diplomatic gain in November and the argument that Scutari was Albanian, again refused to move from a clearly defined position. Austria and Russia could not agree on a compromise. Sazonov seemed again to be backing into a corner from which only a general war would provide an exit without dishonor. With the deadlock and end of the peace negotiations, Montenegro began to put pressure on Scutari and defy the demands of the Great Powers.
CHAPTER IV

RUSSIA AND THE SCUTARI QUESTION

The allies renewed their efforts to capture the cities of Adrianople, Scutari, and Jania when the armistice ended on 3 February 1913. They hoped that further defeats inflicted on the Ottoman Empire would make the Porte more receptive to allied demands. The allies thought that if they actually captured the cities the Powers would be forced to award them their prizes, rather than start a universal conflict.

By the time hostilities resumed, Serge Sazonov had lost all vestiges of Russian influence over the actions of the Balkan states. Participation in the formation of the Balkan Alliances was the peak of Russian influence. The 8 October 1912 joint declaration to the allies, the prohibited zone, Russian failure to support successfully the bid for the Serbian littoral, and, now, its uncertain support for the Albanian border questions contributed to further diminishing of Russian influence. The allies, on the other hand, had seen that when Russia attempted or joined in attempts to frustrate Balkan aspirations, they had been able to advance their cause by independent action. Each success, the beginning of the war in spite of Great Power demands, the victorious prosecution of the war against Turkey, Great Power agreement to accept alterations to the status quo, and Serbian possession of Durazzo on the Adriatic pushed the allies to greater acts of arrogance and at the same time further away from the sobering sounds of Russian influence.
In the months following the resumption of hostilities, the Scutari question became a critical test of Great Power effectiveness, and it revealed the negative extent of Russian influence in the Balkans. As Montenegro continued the siege of Scutari in defiance of the Great Power demands, tension mounted between the Entente powers and the Triple Alliance. The uncertain factor was the Russian attitude should Austria carry out her threats to forcibly remove the Montenegrins from the Scutari area assigned to the future autonomous Albania. With the fall of Scutari, Sazonov made one more futile effort to reinstate Russia as patron of the Balkans. His moderate support for the fait accompli--Montenegrin possession of Scutari--met with solid resistance from the Powers. In the face of a general war, Sazonov did not push the Montenegrin claims. King Nikola of Montenegro finally turned the disputed city over to an occupation force of the Great Powers.

While the Balkan allies pursued their military objectives against the Ottoman Empire, the Ambassadors' Conference continued meeting in London. The most important question before the conference was the delimitation of the northern Albanian border. After the November agreement to reject the Serbian claim for an Adriatic port, the definite border between Montenegro and Albania had been opened to negotiation. Montenegro, still carrying out the siege against Scutari, demanded that the border should be south of the disputed city. Austria remained adamant that Scutari would be included in the future Albania.

Serbia claimed Djakova, Dibra, Ipek and Prizrend, towns along the proposed general line between Serbia and Albania. Austria had already given in on Ipek and Prizrend, but she had steadily refused to allow
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Djakova or Dibra to go to Serbia. Sazonov had given in on the Adriatic port for Serbia and had, for the time being, only held reservations about Scutari belonging to Albania. He could not consider further concessions to Austria until the allies received more compensation. Berchtold, on the other hand, felt that the concessions to Montenegro and Serbia in the Sanjak of Novibazar prevented further surrender of Albanian territory. With the two powers seemingly deadlocked, Grey made the first suggestion for an international commission to establish ethnographical and religious lines to aid the powers in deciding the border. Since Austria and Russia were only bargaining, the suggestion did not receive favorable attention until a final deadlock a few weeks later.

On 9 February, Sazonov had counseled the Serbs to be satisfied with Ipek and Prizrend. He did not think Serbia could expect to receive Dibra and Djakova because the two cities had Albanian populations. While despairing of Dibra and Djakova ever becoming Serbian, and Scutari Montenegrin, Sazonov still had hoped the land between Scutari and the lake would go to Montenegro.

During the early part of February, Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria sent a personal letter to Czar Nicholas of Russia in an effort to ease Austrian-Russian relations. Prince Hohenlohe carried the letter to St. Petersburg and held informal talks with Russian statesmen. Because

---
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of the Prince's unofficial position as courier and the lack of concessions in the Emperor's letter, the mission did not directly influence the Russian position.\footnote{For a discussion of the Hohenlohe mission, see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 280, 282-284; the text of Francis Joseph's letter can be found in Francis Joseph I to Czar Nicholas II, 1 February 1913, Ú-UA, V, 620-621; for an assessment of Hohenlohe's mission, see Buchanan to Grey, 19 February 1913, BD, IX, ii, 508-509.}

After the Austrian move, Sazonov, at the suggestion of the German Foreign Office and the German Ambassador at St. Petersburg, put forward new proposals for the Albanian border.\footnote{von Jagow to Pourtales, 8 February 1913, CP, XXXIV, 330; Pourtales to the Foreign Office, 10 February 1913, ibid., p. 351; George Macaulay, Grey of Fallodon (Boston, 1937), 265; Buchanan to Grey, 8 February 1913, BD, IX, ii, 483.}

Sazonov's change in his support of Serbian claims was not wholly due to the influence of the German Foreign Office. In an interview with the Serbian representative in St. Petersburg, 9 February, Sazonov had warned Serbia not to reject the boundary proposed by the Conference if it did not contain Djakova and Dibra. Serbia, he said, would be left facing Austria alone unless she accepted the will of the powers.\footnote{Popovich to Pašić, 9 February 1913, APS, I, 294.}

On the other hand, Pašić, Serbian Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, saw the problem of the two towns as a trial of strength between Russia and her friends, and Austria and Germany.\footnote{Pašić to Popovich, 9 February 1913, ibid., 294-295.} He instructed Popovich to reply "that there is no geographical border between Serbia and Albania if Djakova and Dibra go to Albania, and that in the future no peace could exist between the two states."\footnote{Ibid.} This threat had very little influence at St. Petersburg. Sazonov placed most of the blame for Serbian
problems on Pašić's actions. If the Serbian minister were dismissed, he reasoned, Austria might be pleased and negotiations might begin to show favorable results. On 14 February, Popovich cautioned Pašić that further insistence on Djakova and Dibra at St. Petersburg might hinder Serbian aspirations, but the Prime Minister remained obstinate. The next day, Sazonov made his new proposal for delimitation of the Albanian border.

Sazonov's new line proposed on 15 February, put Djakova, Dibra, and the land between Montenegro and Scutari outside Albania, whereas before he had insisted that Scutari be Montenegrin. Scutari was definitely within the Albania proposed by the Russian Minister. With the new Russian proposals, Grey felt that if Austria would concede Djakova and Dibra to Serbia, Russia would allow Tarabosh, the mountain overlooking Scutari, and the plain of Luma around Scutari to be in Albania. In short, Russia was offering a compromise, and Grey thought Austria should make a counter-offer. If the two powers could not arrive at a workable agreement on the basis of this new proposal, Grey again suggested an international commission to investigate the disputed regions.

The Russian suggestion of 15 February provoked further concessions from Austria. On 10 March, Count Mensdorff asked Grey to speak to the

11 Popovich to Pašić, 13 February 1913, ibid., 298-299.
12 Popovich to Pašić, 14 February 1913, ibid., 299-300.
13 Paget to Grey, 18 February 1913, BD, IX, ii, 507; Paget to Grey, 20 February 1913, ibid., 513.
14 Grey to Goschen, 15 February 1913, ibid., 499; Grey to Buchanan, 15 February 1913, ibid., 501.
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Russians and inquire if they would agree to allow an international commission to decide the fate of Djakova in return for economic considerations if the area was not assigned to Albania, and if Russia would give firm support to keep Montenegro out of Scutari. The Russians replied two days later.

Sazonov replied that if Djakova did not go to Albania, Russia would consent to "energetic" pressure at Cettinje and Belgrade. He remained vague when asked if Russia would insist that Scutari would remain Albanian even if it fell to the Montenegrin army. The Russian minister had already agreed in principle that Scutari should be included in the new Albanian state. By early March, even the Balkan allies knew they could not expect Russian support in the Scutari question. Sazonov's vague official position on the Scutari question in answer to the Austrian counter-proposal can be partially explained by the consideration that the new Austrian conditions did not settle the Djakova problem in full favor of the allies. Since Djakova had not been fully ceded, Sazonov held out his full support against Scutari going to Montenegro.
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Count Mensdorff expressed official disappointment to Grey that the Russian reply did not go further in committing Russia to a more definite position on the Scutari and Djakova problems. The Austrians appeared to be suspicious "that things were being deliberately delayed in order to confront Austria with the 'fait accompli' of the fall of Scutari." Dissatisfied with the Russian reaction and pressed by Serbian troops being moved to join Montenegro at Scutari, the Austrian Foreign Office passed on what was considered to be a final proposal. Austria would not go any further than to accept an international commission on Djakova. If Scutari fell before the border was agreed upon, independent Austrian action might start a general war. Before Russia could make a reply to the Austrian offer, Count Berchtold gave a startling resolution to the crisis by rescinding Austrian demands that Djakova be Albanian.

Austria capitulated to the Russians for their own reasons and not because of superior diplomacy by Sazonov and his ambassadors. Austria had wanted Djakova and Scutari to be in Albania, while Russia could not allow both cities to be kept from the allies. Russia had surrendered the Serbian littoral and, for the time being, Scutari. Now it appeared
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that Austria had definitely given in on a disputed point under the steady pressure of Russian opposition, but the concession was a diplomatic victory for Austria and not for Russia. With the resumption of the Montenegrin siege, the prospect of Serbian troops reaching Scutari, and the general apprehension that the city might fall at any time, Berchtold considered it more important that the Powers come to a final agreement on the northern Albanian border. If Scutari fell before the powers reached agreement, the Balkan allies, probably supported by Russia, would be in a position to demand further territorial concessions. By making a dramatic concession at Djakova, Austria could force Russia to show her true position.

If Russia accepted the Austrian line, she would be forced to join the other Powers to prevent Montenegro from keeping Scutari. On the other hand, a Russian refusal would appear to Russia's friends to be in bad faith since Berchtold had surrendered in full to the Russian demand; therefore, Sazonov could not expect to find any support for additional claims if Scutari fell. If Russia rejected the Austrian offer, Austria could easily justify independent action in the Balkans since diplomatic means to solve the problem had been exhausted. Sazonov, however, accepted the Austrian proposal that Djakova would belong to Serbia. On the other hand, he did not readily agree to the steps mentioned in the proposal as to how the Powers should force Montenegro from Scutari. 27

The Powers immediately began discussions on steps available to them whereby they might compel Montenegro to discontinue the siege, and if

27 Buchanan to Grey, 22 March 1913, BD, IX, ii, 610-611.
the city fell, force King Nikola to respect their wishes on the fate of Scutari. The Ambassadors agreed to a collective démarche at Cettinje and Belgrade. Serbia and Montenegro were to be informed that the Powers reserved the right to arrange the delimitation of the Albanian border. Any action by the two states would not affect decisions. The note of the Powers was delivered on 28 March.

At the Ambassadors' Conference meeting the same day, before the Montenegrin reply had been received, the ambassadors began preliminary discussions for an international naval demonstration as the next step in coercing Montenegro. That same day, King Nikola formally rejected the Powers' suggestion regarding Scutari. Three days later, the Ambassadors' Conference agreed to the international naval demonstration, and issued orders for their ships to assemble at Corfu. The French government balked at joining such a naval demonstration against a Balkan state unless Russia participated, but they sent a ship to Corfu. The French ship would be ordered to participate if all the powers took part in the demonstration or if Russia did not join but authorized France to
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act for her. Russia did not maintain a full fleet in the Mediterranean at this time, and the passage of war ships through the Straits was prohibited by international treaty. If Russia could not and, for reasons of Balkan policy, would not participate, France would decline out of loyalty to her ally. If Russia did not give the required authorization, Great Britain would naturally hesitate in joining the naval demonstration.

Grey explained the English position to Buchanan:

> If we send ships alone with the Triple Alliance without the participation of either France or Russia, while France the ally of Russia with a ship already alongside ours at Corfu refuses to proceed nothing will make public opinion in France and Russia believe that we are working with France and Russia and not with the Triple Alliance.  

The success of the naval demonstration therefore depended entirely on Russian actions.

While the French and English hesitated to commit themselves to full participation, the Austrians had dispatched a ship to the Adriatic immediately after the Conference had decided on a naval demonstration. Sazonov had expressed, through diplomatic channels, a desire that France and England participate on behalf of Russia. France, however, desired a public announcement, and it was not until 3 April that Sazonov gave the
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desired authorization to the Russian press. By the next day, when the Ambassadors met again, instructions had been sent by all governments except the Russians.

On 5 April, Admiral Burney, commander of the British naval forces participating in the demonstration, reported that ships of the international fleet had assembled and a conference of the commanders had prepared a message to the Montenegrin government notifying them of the purpose of the demonstration and advising them to accept the Powers' wish. The Montenegrin answer on April 6 rejected the Naval note and accused the Powers of violating their own principle of neutrality by interfering. The Powers then agreed to a blockade of the Montenegrin coast as the next step, and after postponements caused by French delays in sending instructions to her naval officer-in-command, the international fleet blockaded the Port of Antivari on 10 April.

The importance of the foregoing incident does not directly involve evidences of Russian hesitancy, but it does cast doubt upon French actions in behalf of her Russian ally. Sir Edward Grey and Arthur Nicolson held France to be wholly responsible for the delays, while Berchtold accused
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the French of "hiding behind Russia." While the Powers organized the blockade, a suspicious incident occurred that reflects unfavorably on Russian actions in the diplomatic negotiations prior to April. On 5 April Buchanan reported to Grey:

I asked what truth there was in the story that Montenegro had just received a supply of Russian arms and ammunition. His Excellency said that they were given as a present when King Nicholas was here in the spring of last year, and that, as when the war broke out they could not pass the Dardanelles, the King had sent an agent to bring them overland to Salonica. This had been done months ago, but they had only now been dispatched from that port.

Although the Russian ship had started unloading on 1 April, it is practically impossible to say that Russia, through France, had stalled the blockade until the supplies could be landed. The timely arrival of the arms is certainly not above suspicion, especially since the allies had held Salonica since 8 November. The supplies delivered to Montenegro did not materially affect the siege at Scutari, but the blockade gave Serbia an opportunity to withdraw her active support from Montenegro.

As early as 23 March, Sazonov had told Popovich that Serbia would have to remove her troops from Scutari if the city fell. He warned the Serbs not to follow Montenegro's foolhardy leadership into Scutari because her actions did not represent the true interests of Slavdom.
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With the naval demonstration at Antivari, Serbia had a ready-made excuse to gracefully withdraw further support from Montenegro.48 On 9 April, Serbia decided to send no more men to Scutari,49 and the next day Serb troops already at Scutari were ordered not to participate in operations until further notice.50 The withdrawal of Serbian support did not significantly alter the Montenegrin determination to capture Scutari, and neither did the attempt by the Ambassadors' Conference to offer Nikola a financial "loan" in return for stopping the siege.

Pecuniary compensation for Montenegro had been proposed by the Italian ambassadors to Vienna and London on 4 April.51 Grey did not think Parliament would vote the British part of the money, nor did he think Berchtold should be asked to make further concessions to Montenegro.52 Berchtold expressed a negative attitude towards the Italian proposal but kept an open mind for discussion.53 At the Conference meeting of 11 April, the question of a loan to Montenegro was formally discussed. Italy and France were asked to formulate a proposition in case the issue of a loan would ever arise.54 Before the Powers could
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organize financial compensation for Montenegro, news of the move leaked out. If Nikola knew of the proposed loan, he could not accept it without appearing to submit to a bribe.\textsuperscript{55} At the Ambassadors' meeting of 17 April, the Montenegrin position was restated with the added statement that Montenegro declined any financial or monetary compensation from the Powers. The Ambassadors did not take the declaration at face value and proceeded to try to float a £1,200,000 note for Montenegro.\textsuperscript{56} A violent article in the newspapers of Cettinje called the idea of the loan an insult, to the King and Montenegro.\textsuperscript{57} The Powers agreed to offer the loan on 21 April,\textsuperscript{58} but before any answer came from Montenegro, Scutari fell to the Montenegrin army.

The fortress commanded by Essad Pasha surrendered without a fight on 23 April 1913, following a bargain between King Nikola and the fort's commander. In return for Scutari, Essad Pasha could withdraw with his troops, guns, colors, and supplies. He would then proclaim himself Prince of Albania, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and recognize the Montenegrin claims to Scutari. In return, Montenegro would recognize his claims to the throne in Albania. This double agreement was designed to give both rulers claim to legitimacy and give them a stronger hand to win concessions from the Powers.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{55}Cartwright to Grey, 14 April 1913, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 687-688.

\textsuperscript{56}Lichnowsky to the Foreign Office, 17 April 1913, \textit{GP}, XXXIV, ii, 700-701.

\textsuperscript{57}de Salis to Grey, 20 April 1913, \textit{BD}, IX, ii, 704.

\textsuperscript{58}Grey to de Salis, 21 April 1913, \textit{ibid.}, p. 706; Grey to Bertie, 21 April 1913, \textit{ibid.}, p. 707.

\textsuperscript{59}See the editor's note, \textit{ibid.}, p. 734; "The fall of Scutari had a mixed effect on the Foreign Legations at Cettinge. France and Russia,
With the fall of Scutari, the Ambassadors' Conference met and quickly sent instructions to Cettinje that the Montenegrin government should be informed that the fall of the city did not in any way affect the decision of the Powers regarding the Northern delimitation of Albania, and Montenegro should turn the city over to the Naval representatives of the Powers. The Powers required a prompt reply to their note.\textsuperscript{60}

The new situation at Scutari prompted Sazonov to make new proposals for compensation for Montenegro. More territory added to that already prescribed by the Ambassadors' Conference might induce King Nikola to desert Scutari. To consider further compensation of territory to Montenegro in return for Scutari would reopen the already delimited North and Northeastern Albanian border. This would lead to further bickering; the diplomats in the British Foreign Office would not consider reopening the discussions.\textsuperscript{61} Sazonov wisely did not carry his request for further compensation or Scutari becoming Montenegrin beyond 23 April. The same day, Austria proposed that the Great Powers should, without delay, carry out positive steps to impress on Montenegro the full extent of the Powers' decision. Austria proposed that international detachments could occupy the Montenegrin seaport (Antivari) or the navy could make a bombardment of the city. If the Powers could not come to an agreement on what steps to take, Austria felt obligated to assume the responsibility of carrying

to whose willful retarding of events, King Nikola's coup was undoubtedly due, rejoiced openly," Durham, \textit{Struggle}, p. 279.
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out the international agreement and removing Montenegro from Scutari. Sazonov then faced a solid wall of resistance to further Montenegrin gains: Britain would not consider new discussions, France would not cooperate, and Austria did not even recognize the possibility. Austria-Hungary was, at this time, clearly the power in control.

Sazonov's apprehension of Austria's independent action, expressed on 23 April, was no idle fear. Cartwright at Vienna did not think Austria was bluffing, and Grey advised quick action by the Powers to prevent Austria from acting alone. Sazonov agreed that all pacific measures should be exhausted to induce Montenegro to surrender Scutari. By additional territory or a financial compensation, Montenegro might be persuaded to abandon Scutari. If compensations were rejected by King Nikola and force became necessary, Sazonov hoped that more Powers than just Austria-Hungary would participate in the action.

From 23 April until the Conference's collective note was delivered at Cettinje, the Powers discussed possible coercive measures that would probably be needed against Montenegro. Grey did not think that British
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public opinion would allow their participation in military actions. Italy, likewise, could not join Austria without British or French participation. France would not join without a Russian mandate, which for reasons of public opinion, Russia could not give. While Austria fumed at the indecision exhibited by the other Great Powers and moved closer to active independent intervention, Montenegro gave a negative reply to the Powers' demand that she abandon Scutari. For the next few days, a European war over Scutari seemed inevitable. Austria was about to act alone, and Russia could not be expected to remain idle in the event of an Austrian invasion of Montenegro.

On 1 May the Montenegrin delegate in London transmitted an inquiry from his government asking the British whether Montenegro would receive territorial and financial compensation if she withdrew from Scutari. Grey presented the Montenegrin offer to the Conference, and the Ambassadors agreed to answer the Montenegrin government on 3 May that

if the Montenegrin Government evacuate Scutari, as demanded by the Powers they will receive the financial help which has already been under the consideration of the Powers . . . But if they do not evacuate Scutari they will certainly be expelled, by one method or another, and Montenegro must abandon the hope of subsequent help from the Powers.

---

67 Grey to Buchanan, 28 April 1913, BD, IX, ii, 725-726.
68 Rodd to Grey, 28 April 1913, ibid., p. 726.
69 Ibid., see the attached minutes; Buchanan to Grey, 28 April 1913, ibid., p. 725.
70 de Salis to Grey, 30 April 1913, ibid., pp. 740-741.
71 Grey to Cartwright, 1 May 1913, ibid., pp. 749-750; Grey to Goschen, 1 May 1913, ibid., p. 746.
72 Ibid.; Grey to de Salis, 3 May 1913, ibid., p. 759.
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The next day, Count de Salis reported from Cettinje that King Nikola surrendered the fate of Scutari to the Powers, and ten days later, Scutari was turned over to them.

Soon after the Montenegrin capitulation, the Preliminaries of London were signed on 30 May 1913. Turkey ceded all of Europe east of the line Enos-Midia, and the delimitation of Albania was left to the Powers. These actions were the two most important points of the Preliminaries. By the Enos-Midia line, Bulgaria gained Adrianople and surrounding territory. The Powers had already agreed to the delimitation of Albania.

The Scutari crisis had showed the ineffectiveness of Russian diplomacy in Balkan affairs in conjunction with the other powers. In the struggle with Austria over Djakova, Sazonov won a superficial diplomatic victory. By what appears to be clever maneuvering on the part of Berchtold, Sazonov was forced to accept Djakova and close the Albanian delimitation question. The full import of the Austrian move became obvious when Scutari fell and Sazonov made requests for reconsideration. England would not consider further discussion, and Austria all but ignored the Russian proposal.

Before and after the fall of Scutari, Russia failed to help the Balkan Slavs and also damaged her prestige with the Powers. Before the capitulation, the suspicious incident of Russian arms arriving at Antivari

---

73 de Salis to Grey, 4 May 1913, ibid., p. 766; King Nikola has been accused of using the Scutari crisis to influence the price fluctuations on the Vienna Bourse and, by trading, to have made a private fortune in stock speculation, Durham, Struggle, p. 272, Bogitshevich, Causes, p. 37, Rebecca West, Black Lamb and Grey Falcon, A Journey Through Yugoslavia, (New York, 1944), p. 1052.

74 See the editor's note, BD, IX, ii, p. 786.
while France seemed to be "hiding behind Russia," certainly could not have a favorable effect on the Powers' opinion of Russian sincerity. It might have helped Balkan opinion at this time, but not much. After the fall of Scutari, Sazonov's renewed efforts to get more compensation for Scutari met with displeasure towards Russian diplomacy. With Russian diplomacy no longer able to help the Slavs, Montenegro abandoned the need for a Great Power's patronage and dealt with the Conference by herself. By the end of the First Balkan War, Russian diplomacy had demonstrated complete inadequacy to pursue a policy to a successful conclusion. In the following summer of 1913, during the Second Balkan War, Russia played a role of even less importance.
CHAPTER V

THE DENOUEMENT: THE SECOND BALKAN WAR

AND CONCLUSIONS

The Treaty of London, 30 May 1913, officially ended the First Balkan War. By the steady Austrian opposition and threats, the last obstacle to the end of the war, the Scutari crisis, had been resolved. Resolute action by Sir Edward Grey on 17 May forced the reluctant delegates to quit pointless quibbling and sign the preliminaries.\(^1\) English and Austrian diplomacy had been instrumental in bringing the conflict to a close, while Russian diplomacy consistently failed to serve either the interests of the Balkans or the Great Powers' interests in general peace. Since October, Russian diplomats had shown a steady decline in effectiveness in Balkan affairs. After having been successful in uniting Serbia and Bulgaria early in 1912, Russia had been unable to prevent them from extending their defensive alliances to Greece and Montenegro and changing them to offensive conventions and attacking Turkey. Later at the London Conference Russian diplomats were singularly unsuccessful in representing the allies at the conference table.

In the months following the Preliminaries of London, and during the Second Balkan War, Russian diplomacy fully illustrated the bankruptcy of its influence in Balkan affairs. The Russians tried to prevent a new

\(^{1}\)Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 330-331.
outbreak of war and when those efforts failed, they tried to bring about an armistice but were unsuccessful. Russian failures were in part re-
sponsible for the fall of the Bulgarian cabinet and the pro-Austrian bias of the new cabinet. When Turkey invaded Bulgaria and violated the terms of the Treaty of London by re-capturing Adrianople from the Bulgars, Russia was unable to summon the Great Powers to a decisive intervention and return the city to Bulgaria. In the Second Balkan War, Russian diplomacy further illustrated the ineffectiveness in Balkan concerns that had characterized its efforts in the First Balkan War.

After the Preliminaries of London had been signed, the Balkan allies began in earnest to quarrel over the spoils of their victory. The dispute began when Serbia finally accepted the loss of the Adriatic littoral. Bulgaria had not sent the military aid she promised to Serbia in Macedonia by the alliance treaty of 1912, while the Serbs had sent troops to aid in the siege of Adrianople. When Bulgaria requested more help at Adrianople, Serbia consented and sent the needed artillery on 13 February 1913. In return, Serbia asked that she receive indemnities other than pecuniary. The British representative in Belgrade rightly suspected that Serbia would make claims in Macedonia beyond the limits defined in the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of 1912. Bulgaria, of course, was not willing to relinquish any of her gains to compensate Serbia for her contributions or her losses.

---

2Ibid., p. 534-535.

3Ibid., p. 535.

4Ibid., p. 534.
On 22 February, Serbia made formal demands on Bulgaria for compensations in Macedonia for her losses in the littoral question and her additional contributions to the war effort in excess of treaty provisions. Bulgaria refused to answer the claims, and the dispute continued quietly for the next few months. In April, Sazonov reminded the two countries of the alliance provision for Russian arbitration in case of deadlock over territorial questions. The Bulgarian and Serbian answers re-affirmed the principle of arbitration, but evaded any direct commitment to accept the Russian offer if they could not settle their differences without force. Another quarrel, that between the Greeks and the Bulgarians over the possession of Salonica, was not under the protection of prospective Russian arbitration.

Because of the Salonica dispute, the Greek and Serbian diplomats began talks for an alliance against Bulgaria early in May. After the London Treaty had been signed, the Serb and Greek governments concluded the anti-Bulgar alliances and conventions. As conditions between the allies were obviously becoming strained, Czar Nicholas, on 8 June, personally intervened by sending telegrams to the Serbian and Bulgarian

---

5 Pašić to Spalajkovitsch, 22 February 1913, APS, I, 303.

6 Gueshoff, Balkan League, p. 77; Buchanan to Grey, 1 May 1913, BD, IX, ii, 747.

7 Gueshoff, Balkan League, pp. 78-79.

8 Nekludoff, Reminiscences, pp. 162-163; for details of the Serb-Greece alliances and conventions see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 347-349.
Kings urging them to seek Russian arbitration as provided in the alliance.9 Both Kings replied politely that they remained firm; Serbia sought treaty revisions, and Bulgaria wanted all of Macedonia, but both recognized the provisions for arbitration.10 Finding a faint glimmer of hope in the answers, Sazonov then proposed that the Prime Ministers of the Balkan states meet in St. Petersburg to begin settling the differences between them.11 Bulgaria, however, did not wish to negotiate until the allies had demobilized, and then she wished to negotiate only within the limits of the 1912 alliances. Serbia, on the other hand, would not agree to demobilization until all claims were settled.12 Sazonov then made an attempt to influence the Serbs by ordering Hartwig to get Serbia to make concessions to the Bulgarian demands and at least reduce the number of troops still with the colors.13

Bulgaria moved on her own volition to counter Serbian demands to revise the alliances. Gueshoff resigned on 30 May 1913 and was replaced by the more militant S. Danev.14 The new minister firmly rejected the

---


10 King Peter of Serbia to Czar Nicholas of Russia, 11 June 1913, APS, I, 337-339; Bax-Ironside to Grey, 11 June 1913, BD, IX, ii, 843; Balkanicus, Aspirations, pp. 45-46; Sazonov, Fateful Years, p. 96; Nekludoff, Reminiscences, pp. 170-171.

11 Isvolsky, III, 175-176.

12 For a short discussion of the Serbo-Bulgarian demobilization problems, see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 357-358.

13 Paget to Grey, 22 June 1913, BD, IX, ii, 859-860; Helmreich, Diplomacy, p. 358.

14 Gueshoff, Balkan League, p. 91; Balkanicus, Aspirations, pp. 38-40.
idea of treaty revision and, for that reason, was thought to consider war with Serbia as inevitable. At a crown council, held 22 June, the Bulgars rashly demanded that Russia, if she planned to arbitrate, make her decision within seven days. The time limit was made because the Bulgarian army was massed on the Serbian frontier and would be ready to strike within ten days. Sazonov's answer ignored the Bulgar ultimatum, and, when Danev responded with further threats, the Russian minister formally deserted Bulgaria for the time being. Five days later, Bulgaria attacked Serbia and Greece, and the Second Balkan War had begun.

Bulgaria was at war with her former allies, but with one important difference. In October, 1912, Rumanian neutrality had been bought by Bulgaria for minor territorial compensations. After the Treaty of London, but before Bulgaria attacked Serbia and Greece, Rumania had declared that if Serbia were attacked, she would move against Bulgaria. Rumania could not allow Bulgaria to reduce Serbia because a larger Bulgaria

15 Ibid., pp. 42-43.

16 Danev to Bobchev (St. Petersburg), 22 June 1913, as cited in ibid., p. 57.

17 For General Savov's estimates on the readiness of the Bulgarian army see ibid., pp. 49-51.

18 For the Russian reaction to the Bulgarian demands for arbitration within seven days, see ibid., pp. 61-62, and Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 360-361.

19 For a discussion of the events immediately preceeding the Second Balkan War, see ibid., pp. 359-367.


21 Fürstenberg to Berchtold, 27 June 1913, Ü-UA, VI, 750; Barclay to Grey, 19 June 1913, BD, LX, ii, 855.
would be a threat to Rumania. Austrian efforts failed to prevent a Rumanian-Bulgarian conflict, and on 3 July, Rumania mobilized. By the time Rumania declared war, 10 August 1913, Bulgaria had already suffered severe losses of men and territory to the Greek and Serb armies. Pummeled on several fronts, Bulgaria could only accept her defeat and try to salvage what she could by appealing to the Powers for succor.

Less than ten days after she attacked Greece and Serbia, Bulgaria appealed to Russia to act as mediator. The next day, 9 July, Sazonov had representations made at the Balkan capitals which stated that Russia invited the Balkan governments to cease hostilities immediately and sign an armistice. The belligerents were to send representatives to St. Petersburg to negotiate the final treaty with Russia serving as mediator. Bulgaria immediately accepted the Russian invitation. Greece, suspecting that Bulgaria would use the armistice to re-group her defenses, refused the mediation offer. Serbia, for essentially the same reasons, would not go to St. Petersburg. Instead, Serbia insisted that Bulgaria must sign the armistice and the final treaties on the battlefield. Rumania asked for Bulgarian territory up to the

22 For a discussion of Austrian efforts, see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 374-376.

23 Barclay to Grey, 4 July 1913, BD, IX, ii, 885.

24 Communication from Count Benckendorff, 10 July 1913, ibid., pp. 902-903.

25 See the minute in ibid., p. 903.

26 Elliot to Grey, 11 July 1913, ibid., p. 903.

27 Answer of the Serbian government to the Russian government on their proposal for the conclusion of an armistice with Bulgaria, 20 July 1913, APS, I, 363.
line Turtukaia-Balchik before she would stop her advances into Bulgaria. The Bulgarian government quickly authorized the concession, but Rumania decided to continue the war until Serbia made peace with Bulgaria.\(^{28}\) With most of the combatants not willing to negotiate under Russian patronage, Sazonov's intervention attempt failed to produce results.

Because Russia could not effect an armistice, Danev, who had sought Russian mediation, resigned along with his cabinet on 15 July. Radoslavov became the new Bulgarian prime minister and Genadiev became foreign minister. The new cabinet turned to Austria for help.\(^{29}\) In the days that followed, Austria played an important role in bringing about a cease-fire, 30 July, and the Treaty of Bucharest, 10 August 1913.

Bulgaria as yet had one other problem in which Russian diplomacy would play a small role. After the second conflict began Bulgaria agreed to pull her troops back to the line Enos-Midia to answer Turkish demands for that part of the peninsula left to her by the Treaty of London. When the Turk army followed the retreating Bulgars, it did not stop at the treaty line but continued west until it recaptured Adrianople. Ignoring the insistent attitude adopted by the Powers, the Porte refused to return the city to Bulgaria.\(^{30}\) The Powers made a collective \textit{démarche} in Constantinople on 7 August 1913 demanding that the Sultan respect

\(^{28}\) Paget to Grey, 12 July 1913, ED, IX, ii, 906; Barclay to Grey, 15 July 1913, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 910-911; Helmreich, \textit{Diplomacy}, p. 382.

\(^{29}\) For the details of the Danev cabinet resignation and the turn to Austria, see \textit{ibid.}, footnote 13, p. 383, and pp. 383-386.

\(^{30}\) Wangenheim to the Foreign Office, 5 August 1913, GP, XXXVI, i, 5.
the line of Enos-Midia as the western boundary of Turkey. The Turks positively refused to evacuate the territory. Bulgaria, meanwhile, demobilized her army under the terms of the Treaty of Bucharest and left the Adrianople question in the hands of the Powers.

With Bulgaria surrendering her fate to the Powers, Sazonov sought a way to enhance Russian diplomacy and help Bulgaria. He even flirted with the idea of acting with Austria to force Turkey to abandon Adrianople. But continued Turkish advances across the Maritza River caused Sazonov, on 18 August, to informally request that the Entente Powers act together, since the conference of Great Powers could not be effective at Constantinople. He suggested that the three friends, England, France, and Russia, might recall their ambassadors from the Turkish capital. The Russian minister even went so far as to get permission from the Czar to recall the Russian ambassador if necessary. Buchanan reported to the British Foreign Office that Sazonov had received an explanation from the Grand Vizer in the afternoon of 20 August. The Porte explained that the entire incident was a misunderstanding and that Turkish troops would be withdrawn across the Maritza. Sazonov accepted the explanation.

---

31 For the general question of the Turkish recapture of Adrianople, see Helmreich, Diplomacy, pp. 400-403.

32 Wangenheim to the Foreign Office, 7 August 1913, GP, XXXVI, i, 13.

33 Zimmerman to Lichnowsky, 12 August 1913, ibid., pp. 21-22.

34 Bax-Ironsode to Grey, 7 August 1913, BD, IX, ii, 963.

35 Buchanan to Grey, 18 August 1913, ibid., pp. 987-988.

36 See the Post Script of Buchanan to Grey, 19 August 1913, ibid., p. 991.
and did not exercise the Czar's permission to break diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{37}

Bulgaria was advised to accept the loss of Adrianople and immediately begin negotiations with her enemies for a peace treaty. The Balkan states concluded a series of treaties with Bulgaria in which much of the territory she conquered in the first was was lost as a result of the second conflict.\textsuperscript{38}

In the Second Balkan War, Russian diplomacy completely demonstrated its ineffectiveness. Sazonov's efforts in April to invoke the provisions for Russian mediation in the Serbo-Bulgarian alliance (1912) failed to bring the two states together at the bargaining table. Czar Nicholas' personal intervention of 8 June offering Russian arbitration failed to do more than show the very limited degree of influence Russia exercised in the Balkans. The arrogant Bulgarian demand that Russia make an arbitration decision within seven days also shows the vacuity of Russian influence. After the war started and Bulgaria asked Russia to intervene, the other Balkan states, Serbia, Rumania, and Greece refused the Russian representation. The new Bulgarian cabinet, headed by Radoslavov turned to Austria for support. Finally, when Turkey drove Bulgaria out of Adrianople, Russia and the Great Powers were unable to force the Porte to return the city to Bulgaria by diplomatic means, and the Powers did not have the unity necessary to exert a more positive form of coercion.

\textsuperscript{37}Buchanan to Grey, 20 August 1913, \textit{ibid.}, p. 992; the Turk intention to withdraw troops across the Maritza was repeated to Grey by the Turk Ambassador in London, Grey to Marling, 21 August 1913, \textit{ibid.}, p. 994.

Sazonov's action of 20 August was a gesture of frustration. Whereas, before the weak results of the Powers' first démarche, he had wanted Turkey to return Adrianople outright to Bulgaria, his threat to break diplomatic relations at Constantinople was designed solely to get the Turk army to stop their advances further into Bulgarian territory. Russian diplomacy had failed in the Second Balkan War to meet the goals of her foreign policy. Not only had Russia been unable to prevent the fratricidal war, influence its cessation, or protect Bulgaria from being stripped of her recent gains, Russia had lost her influence in Bulgaria and prestige in the Balkans. The Second Balkan War illustrated the final stage of Russia's failure in the Balkans.

For many years prior to the Balkan Wars, Russia's foreign policy had one major aim, which was to re-open the Straits question for a settlement more favorable than the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1856). Russia needed egress for her navy so she could fully participate in world affairs as was her right as a Great Power. The Straits became more important to Russia in the last half of the nineteenth century, but by 1880, she had made very small gains in the quest for revision of the Straits question. After an unsuccessful foray in the Far East, Russian diplomacy returned to active concern for the Dardanelles in the first decade of the twentieth century.

Alexander Isvolsky attempted, in 1908, another frontal revision of the Straits provisions. Not only was he rebuffed by the Powers, he suffered a bitter humiliation for Russian diplomacy by the Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. With Isvolsky's replacement by Sazonov, his former secretary, Russian foreign policy began moving in a different
direction. The lessons of Berlin (1878) and Buchlau (1908) had shown Russian diplomats that open attempts to revise the Straits question were pre-ordained to failure. Austro-Hungarian interests in Constantinople conflicted with the similar Russian goal, and any Russian success would come only after the Dual Monarchy had been eliminated as a competitor.

Soon after the turn of the century, Russian diplomats had come to realize that the Straits settlement could be revised and Austria's drang nach osten checked if they could utilize Pan-slavic sympathy in the Balkans to unite the Balkan states under Russian patronage. With Pan-slavism, and by capitalizing on the impatient nationalism in the Balkans, Russia could influence and control events in the peninsula to prevent Austrian expansion. Russia, with the support of her Balkan allies, could then revise the Straits settlement at an advantageous time.

The immediate goals of this more subtle approach were neither clearly defined nor carefully planned. The Russian diplomatic corps often failed to fully co-operate with each other, although they pursued the same goals.

The outbreak of the Tripolitan War in autumn, 1911, threatened to upset the status quo in the Balkans. The Great Powers feared that the Balkan states might use the war as a pretext to start their own war with Turkey. Explosive situations in Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece could easily provide justification, at least in the minds of the Balkan peoples, for a war against the Ottoman Empire. Montenegro was under Russia's control by the terms of an earlier military convention and not expected to cause trouble, although the Montenegrins seemed as eager for war as the other Balkan states.
The Balkans remained calm the first few months of the Tripolitan War, and Russian diplomacy pursued the new policy to unite the Balkan Slavs under the patronage of the Czar. Spurred on by the Italo-Turk War and Russian sympathy, Bulgaria and Serbia allied themselves against a common enemy under the auspices of Russian mediation. The new policy seemed well on its way to realization until the independent actions of the Balkan states showed the real measure of Russian influence. The alliance was extended to include Greece, but Russia was able to exert only indirect influence. The Graeco-Bulgarian alliance did not provide for Russian arbitration as did the Serbo-Bulgarian pact.

In the summer of 1912, border incidents occurred between the Balkan states and Turkey. Montenegro was included into the Balkan League contrary to the advice of the Russian Foreign Office. With Montenegro's adherence to the alliances, the Balkan allies named the Ottoman Empire as the enemy and changed the treaties from defensive to offensive agreements.

As tensions in the Balkans mounted during August and September, Russia, realizing the dangers inherent in further encouragement to the allies, joined the Great Powers' efforts to prevent a Balkan war. The Austrian proposal of August, the Berchtold Initiative, because of its vague meanings, failed to bring results. Russia joined her Balkan rival, Austria-Hungary, to act as the Powers' mandatories to dissuade the allies from fulfilling their commitments for war against Turkey. The mandatories' representations failed, and with the opening of hostilities, the new Russian policy to control the Balkans was well on its way to failure. In the months following the declaration of war, the Russian
diplomats tried to resolve the dilemma of regaining influence over the Balkan states and retaining the confidence of the Great Powers.

The four small kingdoms of the Balkans had moved outside the limits of Russian policy by declaring war against Turkey to redress wrongs. The allies, unaided by Russia, won unexpected victories in excess of their own expectations. Russia and the Powers agreed to revise the territorial status quo because of the Turk losses. Russian diplomacy in the next five months vacillated between support of the Powers' attempts at concessions and support of the allies' claims.

In the Serbian claim to an Adriatic littoral, Russia changed sides several times until finally she agreed to join the Powers and deny Serbia a port. In the Serbian question and in the Scutari problem that followed, Russian aspirations in the Balkans once again came up against the rival hopes of the Austrians. The Scutari question was deadlocked when the allies renewed their efforts against the Turks. The Russian failure to successfully support the Serbian littoral, and now the uncertain support she had been showing at the Conference on the Northern Albanian question prompted Montenegro to move on her own to settle the Scutari question.

In the months following 3 February 1913, the Scutari problem became a test of Great Power effectiveness and demonstrated the negative extent of Russian influence in the Balkans. As the Powers negotiated in London, Austria was able to get Russia to agree to a final delimitation of territory. Since Russia had agreed to the border, she could not easily ask for reconsideration if Scutari fell to Montenegro. Russian participation in steps to aid Montenegro before the fall of Scutari did not
have the desired results on Balkan opinion and only negative influence among the Great Powers. With the fall of Scutari, Russia did make one more futile attempt to reinstate Russia as patron of the Balkans. Moderate support for Montenegro's continued possession of Scutari was met with a solid wall of resistance from the Powers.

Since Russia had agreed to the delimitation of Scutari within Albania and since the Powers were adamantly against reconsideration, she had to join the Powers in removing the victorious army from the city. The King of Montenegro, unaided by Russian patronage, dealt successfully with the Powers and evacuated the city for other compensations. By the end of the First Balkan War, Russian diplomacy had shown itself completely inadequate in pursuing a policy to a successful conclusion.

In the months following the Treaty of London, 30 May 1913, and during the Second Balkan War, Russian diplomacy further testified to the bankruptcy of its influence in Balkan affairs. The Russians failed to prevent a new outbreak of war and could not bring about a quick armistice. Russian failures were in part responsible for the fall of the Bulgarian cabinet and the pro-Austrian bias of the new ministry. When Turkey re-captured Adrianople, Russia proved powerless to preserve the city for Bulgaria. In the Second Balkan War, Russia further demonstrated the extent of the failure of the new policy.

The new policy needed Balkan friendship. Russia sought that friendship through her patronage in the Balkan League. But the members of the League had their own foreign policies, and when they tried to fulfill their ambitions, they did so without Russia's aid or permission. Russian diplomacy failed to regain the friendship of the Balkan states by her
failures to successfully represent the Balkan demands to the Great Powers. From the First Balkan War until the end of the Second, each crisis that arose brought a further diminishment of Russian prestige in the Balkans. By the end of the Second Balkan War, Russian influence in Balkan affairs was almost non-existent. Without Balkan influence, the new foreign policy, unite the Balkans under Russian patronage, stop Austria-Hungary's eastward expansion, and then revise the Straits question, was a failure. The key to the success of the new approach was Balkan friendship, and in September, 1913, Russia did not have the confidence of the Balkan states.
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