

*Sanja Šuljagić**
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

ON THE SUBORDINATION OF THE POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE TO A WESTERN COLONIAL CAMPAIGN IN THE BALKANS IN THE 19TH CENTURY**

Abstract

In this paper, the subject of research is the cause of insufficient support of the Russian Empire to Serbian and other Balkan insurgents during the establishment of the modern geopolitical constellation in the Balkan Peninsula in the nineteenth century. The objective of the research is to prove that the cause of the insufficient support of the Russian Empire to the Balkan insurgents in that period was the ideological and geopolitical subordination of the foreign policy of the Russian Empire to the Western colonial campaign on the Balkan Peninsula in the same period. By applying analytical-synthetic and comparative methods, it is shown that the ideological and geopolitical subordination of the policy of the Russian Empire to Western political and economic interests became noticeable in the period after the Russian Empire had begun to represent an obstacle to commercial aspirations of European trading companies towards India and the Far East. From that time onwards, anti-Russian propaganda began in England and European states, and later also military and non-military campaigns by representatives of European states against the Russian Empire. As a consequence of the Western agenda of "penetration to the East," in 1815, after the Congress of Vienna, the influence of the Russian

* E-mail: sanja.suljagic@ips.ac.rs

** This paper was written within the research activity of the Institute for Political Studies, funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia.

Empire on the geopolitical constellation of the Balkan Peninsula was overshadowed by European political interests.

Keywords: Karl Nesselrode, Karadorde, Ioannis Kapodistrias, modern Serbia, modern Greece

In the geopolitical context, a process of subordinating Russian foreign policy to “Western” colonial project in the nineteenth century was linked to three colonial projects of Western historians, philologists, and politicians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this sense historians and political scientists mention a project of a German historian August von Schlözer to “expand Austria to the Black Sea and make Vienna the center of Slavic studies,” a joint British-German project to form a modern Greek state as “an extended Bavarian state all the way to the Aegean Sea” and a plan of British Prime Minister John Palmerston to prevent Russian access to the Bosphorus (Vidmar 2009, 275–276; 306; 307; 309; Gourgouris 1996; Athanassoglou-Kallmyer 2008; Milich 2000, 32; 33; 35–37; 39–40; Chisholm 1911, 647). These projects provided the creation of modern pseudo-states in the Balkan peninsula in the latter half of the 19th century, resulted in a joint British-German project to create modern pseudo-states² in the Balkan Peninsula in the second half of the nineteenth century by foreign ministers of Austria and Austria-Hungary Agenor Golukhovsky and Jules Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian general Friedrich Beck, and the Venetian-British diplomat Edmund Grimaldi Hornby (Šuljagić 2024, 95–96). In line with these projects, Bavarian philologists and historians Friedrich Wilhelm von Tirsch and Jakob Fallmerayer wrote a new grammar of Greek language and historiography of Greek people and members of the Welf-Hanover dynasty and its lateral branches and dynasties of Saxeburg-Gotha, Wittelsbach, and Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen were enthroned as rulers of

¹ By the term “West,” the author means a historical genesis of political development of “Old/New Rome” in the transatlantic area of the world.

² The creation of such Balkan states in the latter half of the 19th century was planned by ministers of foreign affairs of Austria and Austria-Hungary Agenor Goluhovsky and Julia Andrasi, Austro-Hungarian general Friedrich Beck and Venetian-British diplomat Edmund Hornby, which gave the ground for the thesis of a political scientist and politician Strobe Talbott regarding the history of “the fragmentation of the Balkan Peninsula into a series of pseudo-states” (Talbott 2009, 320; Šuljagić 2024, 95–96).

modern Balkan-Black Sea states (Benes 2008, 181; Thiersch 1833, i–xx; Leeb 1996, 113–114; Danforth 1984, 53–85). Thus, the German-British or European support for the survival of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Peninsula under the control of the members of the Welf-Hanover dynasty and its lateral branches was further formalized in order to prevent the presence of Russia in the Balkan Peninsula (Ingle 1976, 27; 40–41).

ON THE GEOPOLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL BASIS FOR PREVENTING THE RENOVATION OF THE SLAV-EASTERN ROMAN ORTHODOX UNION

When it became clear that the power of the Ottoman Turkish Empire had begun to weaken in the Balkan Peninsula, some European politicians and intellectuals became involved in preventing the restoration of pre-Ottoman theodulia states³ of the Orthodox peoples in the Balkan-Black Sea region. Even before the formation of modern post-Ottoman states in this region with Western and pro-Western rulers, the transformation of medieval identities of the Balkan peoples became obvious. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there became obvious imposition of Western philosophy, legal sciences, politics, theology, letters, calendar, and new forms of state administration and historiography into educational programs of modern Balkan and Black Sea states under the patronage of the British, Habsburg, Bavarian, and Prussian rulers and their foreign and state employees – agents (Vidmar 2009, 237–239).⁴ The Western “reformist” policies, which began to destroy traditional national identities in the Balkans during this period as part of the European powers’ push eastward toward Russia and the markets of the Middle East and India, were supported by historiographical and archaeological schools from major European states in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and even by North American Protestant missionaries operating in the Balkans during this period (Athanasoglou-Kallmyer 2008; Brooks 2015, 25–28;

³ Theodulia (gr. “Theodul” – God’s servant) implied the unity of spiritual (sacral) and state government. Emperor Justinian was called the emperor who obeys God’s Commandments who is just and fair, as stated by Novellae VI in the emperor Justinian’s law (*Corpus Iuris Civilis*) (Šuljagić 2014b, 1; Šuljagić 2020, 289; 416).

⁴ As early as the late eighteenth century, various French, British, and German artists and intellectuals, acting in accordance with the plans of politicians from their own states, contributed to the concept of creating a neo-pagan Hellenic identity in the Balkan Peninsula that was later applied in political practice in the nineteenth century (Ricks and Magdalino 1998; Gourgouris 1996).

Marchand 1996, 92; Kaplan 2006, 101–103; Kienholz 2008). The dominant ideology of Western Europe in this process was based on the ideas of the British philosopher John Locke on the secularization of the state and Venetian Republic councilor Paolo Sarpi⁵ on keeping the people in the colony ignorant and poor.

Due to the need for trade across the Balkan Peninsula, as well as the Ottoman Turks' fear of Central European and Balkan Slavic peoples getting united into a kind of "Orthodox Slavic bloc" in the struggle between the Habsburgs in the west and the Ottoman Turks in the south, and after Serbs with their Patriarchs massively emigrate from Old Serbia to the north of the Balkan Peninsula during turbulent war events in 1690 and 1737, representatives of the Ottoman Porte sent so-called "Phanariote" priests as "representatives of the Greeks" to Orthodox Christian churches in the Balkan-Black Sea region. Serbian clergy in Serbia was replaced by the "Phanariote" priests who, through the process of "Hellenization," began to change the sacred liturgy and local from the Church Slavonic language to Greek. The financial dealings of the Phanariots, their unchristian behavior, and their attempt to impose the "Greekization" of the Slavic Christian Orthodox churches caused strong resistance among the local Slavic population towards the "Greek priests" (Temperley 1919, 163; McKay and Scott 2014, 176).⁶ Aided by the Ottoman Porte, the Phanariotes attempted to change the canonical status of the early Christian Orthodox Church, and they even influenced the abolition of the Serbian Patriarchate of Peć in 1766 and Ohrid Archbishopric in 1767 (Slijepčević 1938, 250–307). In this way, the Phanariots severely damaged the spiritual and cultural identity of the Serbs in this area until 1920, when the Patriarchate of Peć was officially restored (Jovičić 1867, 357–359). The Phanariots were financially connected with certain

⁵ Venetian diplomat and theologian Paolo Sarpi, who largely influenced Northern American politicians with his ideas of republicanism and colonialism, used to claim that Venetia succeeded in keeping local people in Dalmatia colonized "by keeping them ignorant" (Hendrickson 2013; Baerlein 2022).

⁶ The resistance of the local Balkan-Black Sea population to the Phanariots was so strong that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, during the uprisings against Ottoman rule, the Wallachian-Moldavian rebels considered themselves occupied not only by the Ottoman Turks but also by the Phanariots. However, the aforementioned Phanariots were not members of the ethnic Greek elite but mostly ethnically diverse representatives of the "cultural capital" of the Ottoman Turkish Empire on the Balkan Peninsula in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Philliou 2008, 665).

merchants from Greece who traded with the employees of the British trading company “Levant”⁷ and who established trade relations with representatives of the City of London, forming their branches/agencies from Odessa on the Black Sea, through the Mediterranean ports, to London in the second decade of the nineteenth century. It was also the British diplomat David Urquhart who was connected to these merchants as well as to the bankers from London City (Andrews 1964; Chatziioannou and Harlaftis 2007, 27). Through his cooperation with the Serbian prince Miloš Obrenović during the nineteenth century, the diplomat Urquhart managed to distance Serbia from, in his words, “Asian Pan-Slavism of St. Petersburg” and to include her in a cultural circle of England and France (Batakovic 1994, 157–183; Chatziioannou and Harlaftis 2007, 26–27). At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Phanariots had their agents in the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In this regard, during the First Serbian Uprising, a leader of Serbian insurgents Đorđe Petrović “Karađorđe,” complained that the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs was sending to Serbia “only the Tsintsari-Grkovlachs, associated with the Phanariots, as their envoys” (Novaković 2018, 24–29). One such envoy of the Russian Empire to the Balkan Peninsula was Konstantin Rodofinikin, who, according to the testimony of the then reformer of traditional Serbian language and letters Vuk Karadžić during his stay in Serbia, openly announced the disappearance of the Serbian people from the world political scene (Karadžić 1969, 76).

During the uprisings of the Balkan peoples against Ottoman Turkish rule, the Congress of Vienna was held in 1815. After the Congress of Vienna, it became noticeable that Russia was taking actions in the eastern Mediterranean under British command and also that the politicians who gathered at this congress ignored the non-European world when deciding on various global geopolitical issues, including the resolution regarding the so-called “Eastern Question” (Osterhammel 2015, 473).⁸

⁷ *The Levant Company's* officers were prominent members of commercial and financial nomenclature, such as Nathan Rothschild or John and Robert Gladstone. Their representatives to the Ottoman Turks were British consular representatives such as David Urquhart, who were involved in the diplomatic resolution of the “Eastern Question” (Wood 1964, 195; Prousis 2008).

⁸ Political scientist Lyndon Larouche (2018) believes that “from the Congress of Vienna in 1815 up to present day, decisions of all significant world congresses have been made by members of the Welf-Hanover dynasty and descendants of the owners of medieval slave-owning and trading companies from Venice, Genoa and Padua, as well as by the members of family financial trusts from London and

In the period before the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the director of the Vienna Library, Bartholomäus Kopitar, and industrialist Sigmund Zois Freiherr von Edelstein from Trieste agreed to create a common “Serbo-Croatian” language on the Balkan Peninsula and “modify and approximate the Cyrillic script to the Latin script,” and the purpose of such a reform was an “Austro-Slavic vision of unifying Slavic peoples through the letters and language, in accordance with Austria’s foreign policy and for the purpose of transferring the Balkan Orthodox peoples, who had until then been exposed to the influence of Russian and Ottoman Turkish culture, to European Roman Catholic culture and under the patronage of the Habsburg monarchy” (Ivić 1926, 262–263; Dobrašinović 1980; Vidmar 2009, 233; 237).⁹ The director of the Vienna Court Library, Bartolomej Kopitar, expressed satisfaction with the Congress of Vienna, which, in his words, “provided a good precondition for the implementation of Slavic Latin alphabet in the Balkan Peninsula” (Vidmar 2009, 237; 270; 275).¹⁰ According to the project of Bartolomej Kopitar in the nineteenth century, the linguistic reform of the Serbian letters and language in

Rotterdam as the ‘winners’ of the Congress of Vienna in 1815.” According to Lyndon Larouche, the “winners” of the Congress of Vienna managed to impose imperial hegemony of British empiricism in historiography, legal sciences, and political economy in modern academic institutions around the world and so since then the advocacy of “free markets and natural rights” by British philosophers radicals and liberals Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham, by the members of later London School of Economics and the Tavistock Institute as “nursery schools for the world politicians” have been uncritically accepted and applied in the politics and academic institutions around the world (Larouche 2018, 43; 52–63).

⁹ The basis for such a project was provided by a historian August von Schlezer, who advocated the “expansion of Austria to the Black Sea” and who in 1771, in his work *Allgemeine nordische Geschichte* (“General Nordic History”) was among the first historians to use the term “South Slavs” and put forward the theory of “great migrations of Slavs to the Balkan Peninsula in the sixth century” (Sotirović 2007, 9). Realization of Schlezer’s project of expanding Austria to the Black Sea was supported by geopolitical situation in the Balkan Peninsula at the time of the uprisings of the Balkan-Black Sea peoples against the Ottoman Turkish rule – although Russian troops were stationed in Kotor on the Adriatic coast and on the Ionian Islands, according to *the Treaty of Tilsit* made with Napoleon in 1807, Russian troops had to leave the area and hand it over to the French ones.

¹⁰ The long-term planned objective of such philological reform project was aligned with a British project of preventing a newly established Greek state from becoming a “protégé of Russia,” as well as with the plans of German historians and philologists August von Schleizer and Friedrich Tirsch to extend Austria and Bavaria to the Black and Aegean Seas (Milich 2000, 32–33; Chisholm 1911, 647; Vidmar 2009, 275–276; 305–309; Benes 2008, 181).

Serbia was carried out by his representative Vuk Karadžić, and with this reform, the traditional letters “Љ, Њ Ъ Ѓ Ђ Я Ю Ї Ѓ Ѣ Ѣ Ѣ Ѣ” which important Serbian state documents and literature contained and which the Serbs shared with the Russians and Greeks before the reform, were removed from the Serbian traditional script (Zlatković 2018, 392; Šuljagić 2020, 360–370; Šuljagić 2012a, 348). The most important document that formed Serbian identity was the Canon of Saint Sava (Krmčija), which was also adopted in the Russian Empire as a compilation of the Eastern Roman and Slavic Orthodox Christian legal and cultural heritage and has remained in force as the church canon of the Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian Orthodox Churches to this day (Franklin 2002, 117–119; Šuljagić 2012b, 198–199; 212).

Being left without their ally Russia, whose emperors and people had traditionally helped the Serbs to survive and retain their spiritual and cultural heritage during the rule of the Ottoman Turkish Empire in the Balkan Peninsula, the Serbs were forced to ask the Turkish allies – Napoleon’s French and also Austrians to help them in the fight for liberation from the Turks.¹¹ However, the leader of the Serbian insurgents Đorđe Petrović “Karadžić” still hoped for help from the Russians as the strongest allies of the Slavic peoples on the Balkan Peninsula, since in 1810, at a public church people’s council in Serbia, the Russian General-Count Kamensky, on behalf of the Russian Tsar Alexander, publicly read the Letter of the Russian Tsar to the Serbian People in front of all people gathered, in which the Russian Tsar had promised aid to the Serbs as “a people of the same blood and faith” (Каменский 1810; Войнович 2002, 189). Also two years later in Serbia, at the Vračevšnica Monastery, symbolically near the relics of Serbian King Stefan the First-Crowned Nemanjić, the envoy of the Russian Tsar, Count Marko Ivelić presented Karadžić with the Russian Order of the Ribbon of Saint Ana of the First Order, and also he presented the members of the Serbian Parliament with the Grand Cross of the same order (Stevanović 2017, 59). However, it turned out that the fact that the French, whom the Turks

¹¹ In return, Napoleon liberated some German territories belonging to German relatives of the Russian Tsar Alexander I, and because of the *Treaty of Tilsit*, the Turks signed a *Peace Treaty* with the English at the Dardanelles in January 1809. After Napoleon prepared to attack Russia, Russia had to conclude a peace treaty with Turkey (Richmond 2013, 34). After the representatives of Russia and Turkey signed the *Unkyar-Iskelesi Treaty* in 1833, Russia gained political power in the Dardanelles, and British politicians saw this as a threat to their interests in the Mediterranean basin (Kostić 2006, 240).

“traditionally considered their best friends among Christians,” were the allies to the Ottoman Turks in the Balkan Peninsula proved to be unfavorable for the Serbian insurgents against the Ottoman Turkish rule (Faroghi *et al.* 1997). Due to the possibility of Napoleon attacking Russia, the Russians had to conclude the Treaty of Bucharest with the Ottoman Turks in 1812, with unfavorable clauses for Serbia,¹² so that Karađorđe and his rebels, faced with cooperation between the French and Ottoman Turks on several levels, had to obey the decisions of the Treaty of Bucharest (Savić 1996, 82–85). In addition to the factor of the Franco-Turkish cooperation, the subordination of the Russian Empire’s foreign policy to the interests of European politics in the Balkan Peninsula was also influenced by the Russian Foreign Minister Karl von Nesselrode-Eresoven.¹³ After the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Minister Karl Nesselrode, together with Austrian Foreign Minister Klemens von Metternich, managed to persuade the Russian Tsar Alexander to direct Russian policy “against Russian and Slavic nationalism and to officially treat the Eastern Question,” i.e., the question of the survival of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, as “a general European question, above the interests of Russia.” One of the reasons for that was a tendency of Russia and other state members of the so-called “Holly Alliance” to perceive nationalism as a revolutionary ideology that was opposed to the conservative attitudes of the representatives of this alliance (Ingle 1976, 27; 40–41). In this sense, the Russian Minister Karl Nesselrode worked in accordance with the policy of the Austrian Minister Clemens Metternich, who had formed an alliance with France with the objective of distancing Russia from the left bank of the Danube.¹⁴ It was the continuation of the agreement of the Russian Empress Catherine II

¹² Under the *Bucarest Treaty* of 1812, the Serbs had to return to the Turks some castles that they had conquered before that and also to annulate all moves that posed a threat to the reign of Ottoman Turkey in the Balkans.

¹³ At the Congress of Vienna held in 1815, the head of the Russian delegation, along with the Russian Tsar Alexander, was a diplomat of Baltic-German origin, Karl Nesselrode, who became the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia a year after the Congress of Vienna. The Minister Karl Nesselrode, who did not even speak Russian fluently, was a holder of the Order of the Hanoverian Welf dynasty and simultaneously expressing his support for political penetration of the West into the Balkan Peninsula, he also advocated supranational control of the Russian economy (Elliot 1834, 286; Ingle 1976, 19–21).

¹⁴ According to the memoirs of an Austrian general Joseph Radetzky in March 1810, General Joseph Radetzky considered the Danube as “the foundation of the military and political system of Austria” and believed that “an alliance between

with the Austrian Emperor Joseph II that in the eighteenth century, the Russian Empire under her rule would border and cooperate with the Austrian Empire, which, according to the idea of the Emperor Joseph II, was supposed to dominate the Balkan Peninsula (Bronza 2010, 61–62; Pantelić 1933, 145–148). Therefore, after the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Habsburg and British “cultural representatives” managed to replace the ancient Old Church Slavonic alphabet in the newly formed state of Serbia with a simplified version of the Serbian language and script without resistance or objections from the Russian Empire.¹⁵

PRO-WESTERN REFORMS IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

Pro-Western reforms that emperor Petar “the Great” imposed in the Russian Empire were, in particular, continued in the periods of the reign of Russified empress Ecatherine Second and her son Paul. They also influenced the subordination of foreign politics of the Russian Empire to the interests of the Welf-Hanover dynasty. Such reforms from the inside changed the Russian theodulia/state in the direction of building the Russian state as a secularized Russian empire. The government of Empress Catherine II did not plan to establish a Russian Empire that was to be an active ally of the Serbs and other Balkan peoples, but rather, she planned for the Russian Empire to be a new version of a secularized Russian Empire that would border and cooperate with the Habsburg Monarchy, which, under the leadership of Emperor Joseph II, would dominate the Balkan Peninsula (Bronza 2010, 61–62; Pantelić 1933, 145–148; Faggionato 2006, 17–30; Murdoch 2006). The empress Catherine Second also cooperated with philosophers of European secular Enlightenment and British brethren politician Jeremy and engineer Samuel Bentham, who were connected with French revolutionaries (Werret 1999, 1–25). The British

Austria and France would help Austria to conquer Bosnia, Serbia, Wallachia and Moldavia” (Popović 1940, 54–57).

¹⁵ At the same time, the representatives of Great Britain were interested in gaining concessions for Serbian copper mines, so the protégé of the Vienna Court in Serbia, anthropologist and philologist Vuk Karadžić, represented in Serbia the interests of a company from Wales to obtain a concession for a copper mine. Such fact was followed by a request from the British for further concessions for raw metal mines in Serbia, for navigation on the Danube River, and, after the construction of the railway between Belgrade and Thessaloniki was built, the British requested a status of a privileged nation in Serbia regarding the land ownership in Serbia, the collection of customs duties, taxes, etc. (Karličić 2021, 50).

politician Jeremy Bentham was known in the early nineteenth century for his promotion of philosophies of utilitarianism, Epicureanism, and hedonism and was a prominent politician in a financial center of British trade, the City of London, as well as in the organizing committee of the Greek uprisings against Ottoman Turkish rule. During such uprisings of local Balkan peoples, Russian Orthodox Christian farmers massively expressed support for Serbian and other Balkan insurgents against Ottoman Turkish rule, fought on their side, and organized humanitarian aid to the Greek insurgents (Ingle 1976, 43; Prousis 1985). However, during the Russo-Turkish War of 1828, when the Russians, thanks to their victories, received a historic opportunity to take control of the Balkan-Black Sea region, the Russian Foreign Minister Karl Nesselrode decided to subordinate the interests of Russian foreign policy to the will of European politicians. After military forces of the Russian Cossacks, led by the Russian army general Hans Diebitsch, defeated the military forces of the Ottoman Turks at Edirne (Adrianople) in the territory of present-day Bulgaria, the Russian military troops continued towards the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea and conquered a large territory in Anatolia all the way to Trebizond. However, due to the intervention of English, Prussian, and French diplomats, General Hans Diebich stopped the Russian army's march towards Constantinople after that, the Russian and Turkish representatives signed the Treaty of Adrianople in September 1829, and the Russian troops went back to their state (Burke 1830, 215–217).¹⁶ In that period, Russian nationalists accused General Hans Diebich of working for the interests of foreigners in Russia since he himself was of foreign origin (Ingle 1976, 27–28). In response to such remarks, Minister Karl Nesselrode commented that “although Russia had conquered Turkey, the Russian Tsar decided to ‘follow the noble demands of his own generosity and to allow the continued existence of the Turkish government in Europe, in the hope that the West would appreciate his attitude.’” (Ingle 1976, 30–31). However, as a combined attack of European and Turkish military forces on Russia in the Crimean War showed a little less than two decades later, Minister Karl Nesselrode was mistaken in such hopes. After the Crimean War and the Paris

¹⁶ By this agreement, the Russians helped Serbia and Greece gain the status of internationally recognized states, but simultaneously, the Russians had to return the conquered Balkan-Black Sea and Asian territories to Turkey, while the Turks had to provide free trade to Russian merchants in Turkey (Burke 1830, 219–221; Vinogradov 1981, 33).

Conference (1856–1859), the victors of the Crimean War, Napoleon III, Otto von Bismarck, and Sardinian Count Camillo Cavour created a modern state of Romania as a geopolitical neo-Latin state project and in this way contributed to the process of ecclesiastical separation of Vlachs and Moldovans from Serbs from 1810 to 1884.¹⁷

In connection with the massive support that the Russians were showing for the Serbs at that time, in 1836, Minister Karl Nesselrode confided to French ambassador Amable de Barante that he considered the massive support of the Russians for the Serbs to be “more than those Serbian bandits deserved” and that he “did not know what Russia could gain if the Serbs gained independence from Turkey” (Ingle 1976, 43). Also in 1848, despite the Balkan peoples’ pleas to Russia for help, Minister Karl Nesselrode thwarted the Russian Tsar Nicholas’ plan to send Russian infantry to the Balkan Peninsula and the Russian Navy to the Bosphorus, explaining that such his decision was “necessary to preserve peace in Europe” and so at that time the Russian Tsar Nicholas withdrew several thousand Russian soldiers from the Balkans (Ingle 1976, 41, 43). On the other hand, in the following 1849 year, the Russian Tsar Nicholas sent 200,000 Russian soldiers and 80,000 members of their support staff to help the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph suppress the Hungarian revolt against the Habsburg monarchy (Hunt *et al.* 2008, 683–684; Schroeder 1962, 173).¹⁸

After the secret Budapest Convention of 1877, according to which Russian representatives agreed to create small sovereign states in the Balkan Peninsula in the event of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, instead of one strong Slavic state that could threaten the “balance of power in Europe” (Europäische Gleichgewicht), the subordination of Russian diplomacy to political interests of Europe in the Balkan peninsula was also exhibited in the periods of San Stefan Agreement and Berlin Congress of 1878. In this period, there emerged opinions among the Russian public that the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prince Alexander Gorchakov, was even more subservient to interests of

¹⁷ This project was implemented by a local revolutionary, Joan Cuza, through the Latinization of traditional local Slavic culture (Tambora 2007; Boia 2001, 83–87; Djuvara 1995, 332; Andrejić i Ilić 2014, 201–202).

¹⁸ Acting on the advice of the ministers Nesselrod and Metternich, the Russian emperor Nicholas did similar political acts in Middle Europe. Such moves provoked turbulences in Middle Europe, and as a consequence, they added new allies to the plan of historian August von Schlotzer of expanding the Austrian monarchy up to the Black Sea (Vidmar 2009, 275–276; 306–307; 309).

Western politics than the Russian Minister Nesselrode had been before him (Ingle 1976, 50–51; Kellogg 1995, 146).

On the other hand, until 1830 in the Eastern Mediterranean, modern Western colonialism was based on joint interventions of Western states against Berber pirates in the sea of North Africa and on general Western political perception of the need for security of their own interests, imperial conquests and fusion of old and new forms of monarchies (Zwierlein 2020, 365–366). Therefore, European politicians, by connecting with local merchants from Greece and the eastern Mediterranean region, managed events in the Balkan Peninsula and throughout the eastern Mediterranean.¹⁹

However, significant influence of Western policy in the south of the Balkan Peninsula in 1818 was evidenced by a request of a Phanariotes-associated Greek politician Alexandros Mavrokordatos (*Ἀλέξανδρος Μανροκορδάτος*) to Austrian government to help him “prevent Russian expansion towards the Balkans and to create one Greek state which could be used as a bulwark against Russian expansion towards the south” (Patrinelis 2001, 186). Then in March 1821, a leader of Greek insurgents and president of the Greek Senate, Petros Mavromichalis, published a Manifesto to the Governments and Public of Europe (Vogli 2010, 193). Two months later, in May 1821, Petros Mavromichalis sent an Appeal to the Citizens of the United States of America in which he praised the human traits of Americans and claimed that the Greek insurgents felt that “the Americans were closer to them than the peoples who were neighbors to the Greeks” (Cline 1930, 33–34). Unlike the majority of local populations, the leaders of the Balkan insurgents, such as Petros Mavromichalis, Alexandros Mavrocordatos, and later some other local Balkan politicians, wanted to establish a system in the Balkan states that would separate these states from both traditional Orthodox Christianity and the rule of the Ottoman Turkish Empire (Brooks 2015, 25–28). In contrast to their views, the opinion of their contemporary Greek Patriarch George V was that revolutionary ideas of the Enlightenment were not good for ordinary people (Kitromilides 2006). Similar to the opinion of Greek Patriarch George V, also the Russian Tsar Alexander in 1825 confided

¹⁹ In the first decades of the nineteenth century, when the Serbs and Greeks in the continental part and Greeks in the Egeian islands fought against Ottoman Turks in the waters of the Eastern Mediterranean, English and Northern Americans intervened against the Berber pirates because of their robberies of Western merchant ships (Zwierlein 2020, 365–366).

to British diplomat Stratford Canning in St. Petersburg that “although he himself felt sympathy for the Greeks who had risen up because of their suffering under the rule of the Ottoman Turks, he did not approve of revolutionary principles which were mixed with the causes of their struggle” (Seton-Watson 1955, 103).

According to historians Bernard Ducret and Alexis Krauss (Ducret and Krauss, 2020), under the influence of Venice and later France, some of the first Masonic lodges were established on the Greek island of Corfu²⁰ and in Thessaly, and were also founded in Budapest, Belgrade²¹ and Bucharest by European and Greek [Rigas Feraios] intellectuals.²² Historians Ducre and Kraus claim that the Filiki Eteria was a Masonic organization founded in Odessa in 1814 as a branch of a Moscow Masonic Lodge (Ducret and Krauss, 2020).²³ Some authors claim that Ioannis

²⁰ Corfu was an island where Orthodox Greeks, Roman Catholics, and Jews who had escaped the medieval Inquisition lived together. Since the island alternated between French, British, and Russian rule over time, leading Freemasons on Corfu belonged to secret organizations from those countries.

²¹ The influence of Freemasons in the political life of Serbia is evidenced by the fact that a radical and, according to the revolutionary Leon Trotsky, “an uncrowned king of Serbia” Nikola Pašić (Троцкий 1926, 6) was economically connected with an influential German Freemason and member of the “Yugoslavia” lodge in Serbia George Weifert, who at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was the owner of almost all important mines in Serbia (Bucalo 1998).

²² If we consider the request of the leader of Greek insurgents, Petros Mavromichalis, to Americans to help the insurgents in Greece in their fight against the Ottoman Turkish Empire, as well as the fact that in 1924, according to the Constitution of Turkey, Turkish citizenship was defined as “a constitutive supranational identity for the inhabitants of Turkey,” that is, that “being a Turk meant belonging to a single political community – the mixture of ‘ethnic’ and ‘territorial’” (Şeker 2005, 64), it is clear that the ideas of North American politicians Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson about the state system as a supranational “marketplace” of peoples and religions were present in the Balkan-Black Sea-Anatolian empires and republics from the nineteenth century up to present time. Secret societies such as the Carbonari in Italy and the Filiki Eteria in the Balkan-Black Sea region were very similar to Masonic associations, and also a secret society, “Unity and Progress of the Ottoman Empire” (*İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*), was founded on a similar model (Arslan and Ozen 2005, 93–115).

²³ Some of its founders, such as Nikolaos Skoufas and Rigas Velestinlis, wanted to launch a revolution in the Ottoman Empire similar to the French Revolution and to establish a Balkan-Anatolian Confederation. In the Ottoman Empire, Panagiotis Panas from Cephalonia and Joseph Naci, who was given the title of Prince of the Island of Naxos by Sultan Selim II, and then Mithat Pasha, who founded the *New Ottoman Society*, participated in the organization of secret societies in the

Kapodistrias, a member of the Filiki Etereia society and diplomat in the service of Russia, founded the Phoenix Masonic Lodge in Moscow in 1811 and that he was a member of the Modesti Lodge in Zurich (Rimikis 2017, 83–84). After working for some time as a Russian ambassador to Italy, Ioannis Kapodistrias began working for the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in 1816, during the reign of the Russian Tsar Alexander I, until 1822, he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia together with Karl Nesselrode.²⁴ The diplomat Ioannis Kapodistrias, in the service of the Russian court, disregarding the foreign policy of the British, claimed in his letters to future Russian Tsar Nicholas that “a long-term experience had convinced the Greeks that only God and the Russians could ensure the Greeks’ national existence” (Vinogradov 1981, 25). The Minister Karl Nesselrode, who collaborated with British diplomacy and felt animosity towards the pro-Greek policy of Ioannis Kapodistrias, was angered by the cooperation of the Russian consul Grigory Strogonov in Constantinople with Ioannis Kapodistrias and so the Minister Nesselrode ordered the withdrawal of consul Strogonov and other Russian diplomats from Constantinople (Ingle 1976, 24; 28).²⁵ The victory of the Russian army in the Russo-Turkish War and the earlier Kuchuk Khanraj Peace Treaty of 1774 allowed Russia to assume direct responsibility for the protection of Orthodox Christians and churches in the Ottoman Empire, including the settlement of Crimea and the coast of the Sea of Azov by thousands of Greeks (Konstantinova and Lyman 2020, 69–70). However, a British diplomat, George Canning, although openly supporting the Ottoman Turks, with his diplomatic skills, managed to obtain a promise from the Russian Tsar Nicholas to preserve the status quo. in the Ottoman-Greek conflict and succeeded in imposing

Balkan-Anatolian region, whose goal was to establish a republican order in Turkey “on the principles of equality and justice” (O’Donnell 2014, 165–175; O’Donnell 2016, 145–160).

²⁴ Tsar Alexander I in Russia, Thomas Jefferson in the United States, and military leader Napoleon Bonaparte, who was proclaimed Emperor of the French in the Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris in 1804, appeared on the world political scene before the beginning of the uprisings of the Balkan peoples against the Ottoman Turkish rule on the Balkan Peninsula.

²⁵ On April 4, 1826, Minister Karl Nesselrode and British diplomats drafted the *St. Petersburg Protocol*, which was intended to prevent new battles between Greece and Turkey and maintain the *status quo* in the Balkan administrative units. This was in accordance with *The Ackermann Convention* by which Russia recognized the right of Ottoman Turkey to rule the Balkan-Black Sea regions administrative units (Ingle 1976, 28).

himself as the arbiter of the fate of the Greeks and the Ottoman Turks (Vinogradov 1981, 7–8). Since the leaders of the Greek insurgents were dissatisfied with the Russian Memorandum of January 1824, despite the indecisive attitude of British politicians regarding their uprising they decided to cooperate with the British diplomatic representative George Canning (Dakin 1971, 52).²⁶ After Ioannis Kapodistrias had been elected the President-Governor of Greece, he met with Tsar Nicholas I in Saint Petersburg in June 1827, and they exchanged letters that laid out the basis for the internal system of Greece and reiterated the provisions of the Protocol of 1826 and the Convention of 1827 (Vinogradov 1981, 25). However, although the representatives of the Greek people at the Third National Assembly in Troezen in 1827 voted Ioannis Kapodistrias as the ruler of the modern state of Greece, the representatives of great European powers decided that a Bavarian nobleman Otto von Wittelsbach would become the king of the modern Greek state. The royal candidate Otto von Wittelsbach accepted the offer on condition that Greece take a large international loan. Therefore, through European politicians, including the Jesuit-educated freemason and former British agent Carlo Pozzo di Borgo, who was employed at the Russian legation in Paris at the time, the Rothschild and d'Echtal family clans became involved in organizing the financial affairs of the newly created state of Greece (Schönhärl 2019, 6–12; Beaudry and Beaudry 1997, 37–38). Then, after the assassination of Ioannis Kapodistrias by members of the Mavromichalis family in Greece, representatives of the Great Powers installed the Bavarian nobleman Otto von Wittelsbach as King of Greece.

During the uprisings of the Balkan peoples against Ottoman Turkish rule in the early nineteenth century, the Greek diplomat Ioannis Kapodistrias and the Serbian military leader Đorđe Petrović “Karadorđe” were two individuals with the greatest potential for unifying and liberating the Balkan peoples from the Ottoman Turkish rule. Even before the official First Serbian Uprising under the leadership of Karadorđe, the Serbs had been raising uprisings against the Ottoman Turkish rule, but due to the lack of opportunity to connect themselves with geopolitical allies, their

²⁶ The British diplomat George Canning was believed in Russia to have been connected to Polish secret societies fighting for Polish independence before the Greek uprising against the Ottoman Turks (Mazour 1937, 139–142). These secret societies were associated with the *Society of United Slavs* and other secret societies that sprang up in Russia, some of which were founded by Russian officers who returned from France to Russia after the war against Napoleon (Mohrenschildt 1981; Plokhy 2012, 80).

uprisings could not last long. The memory of the pre-Ottoman Serbian Empire was maintained among the people through institutions, customs, and manners from the pre-Ottoman period, but the Serbs did not have independent political power in relation to the Ottoman Porte (Šuljagić 2011, 221). A letter written by the leader of the First Serbian Uprising, Karađorđe, to the Russian Tsar Alexander during his stay in Russia on July 4, 1816, reveals that Karađorđe was unaware of international conspiracy and conspiracy within Serbia in preparation for his assassination upon his return to Serbia (Drašković 2019, 342–343). Karađorđe planned to synchronize the uprising against the Turks in Serbia with the uprisings of the insurgents in Morea and Bulgaria, and in July 1817, he returned from Russia to Serbia. However, one of the leaders of the Serbian uprising Miloš Obrenović arranged the assassination of Karađorđe in collusion with Turkish Sultan Ali Pasha Marašlija, and after Karađorđe had been killed upon his return to Serbia, Miloš Obrenović received the title of Serbian Duke from the Turks (Dakin 1971, 31; Nenadović 1883, 456; 460–461). The murder of Karađorđe simultaneously desecrated the sanctity of the traditional institution of godfatherhood in moral canons of Saint Sava's taught Christian tradition in Serbia (Stevanović 2017, 55). Karađorđe's intention to continue the uprising against the Turks did not fit into the provisions of the Treaty of Bucharest.²⁷ The policy of the newly proclaimed Duke Miloš Obrenović was not to join with other Balkan and Russian soldiers against the Ottoman Turks. Duke Miloš, in agreement with the British diplomat David Urquhart, redirected Serbia's previously pro-Russian policy in the direction of a Western political circle and established direct trade relations between Serbia and England, allowing diplomat Urquhart to take control of political events in Serbia (Mijatović 1892, 42; Dakin 1971, 36).²⁸

²⁷ Thanks to the concessions that Turkey had to make to Russia in *the Ackermann Convention* of 1826, as well as in *the Treaty of Adrianople* of 1829, the Turkish Sultan in 1830 issued the *Hatırcı Law*, which granted autonomy to the Serbs in the judiciary, administration, army, and education. Duke Miloš was granted authority to become a hereditary ruler, and in 1831, the Serbian Orthodox Church was also granted autonomy.

²⁸ Although during the Russo-Turkish War, Duke Miloš supplied food to the Ottoman Turks, after the Russian victory in the Russo-Turkish War and *the Treaty of Adrianople*, Duke Miloš, having become the main salt buyer in Wallachia and having enriched himself by trading cattle with the Austrians, at the same time was maintaining good relations with the Russians, Turks, and Germans (Petrović 1897, 218–220; 641–642).

The assassinations of Ioannis Kapodistrias and Karađorđe Petrović marked a major change in the previously traditional identities of the Balkan peoples. In the case of the newly formed Kingdom of Greece with King Otto von Wittelsbach at its head, this change implied the creation of a Hellenic national heterotopia (Hamilakis 2007, 108). As the Prime Minister of Greece Ioannis Koletis explained this heterotopia in 1844, the idea of a “Great Greece” meant “the purification of the language of the Greek population and the rejection of traditions of the Eastern Roman Empire, Russophilia, and Balkan Orthodox Slavic brothers” (Gounaris 2021, 245).

Within imperialist political ideology of the Western European hemisphere ideas of Young Hegelians and John Stuart Mill about the need to colonize and annex “barbarians” were dominant ones, regardless of the Habsburg-Prussian rivalry between the Welf-Hanover – Hohenzollern dynasties in the Old/New Roman Empire (Mill 1989, 13; Clark 2006, 1–2; 41; 233; 435; 483–484; 687). In that period, in order to justify an introduction of legal administration of the new government in Greece and “re-establishment of order” against the Greek insurgents who resisted both the troops of King Otto von Wittelsbach and regular Greek troops, officials of foreign administration generously distributed the Greek loan (Scott 1854, 404–407).²⁹

As it turned out, the Russians paid for their missed opportunity to drive the Ottoman Empire out of the Balkan Peninsula at Adrianople in 1829 by their defeat in the Crimean War in 1856. Then the winners of the Crimean War – representatives of France, Great Britain, Sardinia, and the Ottoman Empire – managed to further expand their influence in the Balkan-Black Sea region by forming a new state of Romania as a barrier between Russia and Slavic Orthodox peoples of the Balkan Peninsula (Boia 2001a, 87; Boia 2001b, 83–86; Stoica 1919, 29).

²⁹ The cruel treatment of the Greek insurgents and ordinary citizens by foreign troops in the newly formed state of Greece is recorded in a collection of painter and lieutenant Ludwig Köllnberger and other artists of the period in question (Athanassoglou-Kallmyer 2008). The ambivalent position of the newly established post-Ottoman Greece was illustrated by an example of the Crimean War (1853–1856) when eyewitnesses noted that during that war, in cafes and restaurants in Athens, people hung posters of the Russian Tsar Nicholas on the walls and sang *Parisienne* songs and *Marseillaise* in the Greek language, while at the same time, the British Navy in Greek ports prevented the possible actions of Greek insurgents and regular Greek army against the troops of the Ottoman Turkish Empire (Dodd 1856, 146–149).

On the other hand, since the second half of the nineteenth century the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian foreign ministers Agenor Golukhovsky and Gyula Andrásy planned firstly an autonomy and then a creation of a modern state of Albania “so that Russia would be prevented from having influence in that part of the Balkan Peninsula through Serbia, Bulgaria or Montenegro” (Hrabak 1979, 167–168; Толева 2012, 2; 28).³⁰ The British diplomat, politician, and judge Edmund Hornby also joined the Western planners of the creation of the modern kingdoms of Greece, Albania and future kingdom of Yugoslavia with his concept of creating a modern Bulgarian state, which was realized when the nobleman Ferdinand from the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha branch of the Welf-Hanover dynasty was enthroned as the king of modern Bulgaria (Šuljagić 2024, 95–96).³¹ After the Berlin Congress of 1878, the military forces of the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Turkish Empire created a joint corridor in the territory of Novopazarski sandzak in Serbia and Montenegro, thus preventing Serbia’s access to the Adriatic Sea (Kostić 1940, 93–94).³² In addition, political reforms in Serbia were carried out under the influence

³⁰ Those plans were realized in 1912 with the formation of the modern state of Albania by the Habsburg court and the appointment of the Prussian officer Prince William Friedrich Heinrich Wied as the king of the newly formed state of Albania (Heaton-Armstrong 2005; Pearson 2006; Mitrović 2011, 66–75; Толева 2012, 28).

³¹ According to historian Jürgen Osterhamel (Osterhammel 2015), during this period in question, a significant reason for British politicians’ continued support for the Ottoman Empire was “the assumption that action against the Turkish Sultan (who also claimed the religious title of Caliph) would cause an unrest among the millions of Muslim population of India” (Osterhammel 2015, 472). Since the diplomat Edmund Hornby was active in British foreign policy from the Ottoman Empire to India, he had British foreign policy plans ready both in case of the survival of Ottoman rule in the Balkan Peninsula and in case of the necessity for the creation of a new geopolitical constellation in the Balkan Peninsula in the event of the withdrawal of Ottoman troops from the Balkan Peninsula. Thus in 1878 the diplomat Edmund Hornby in his draft *The Eastern Question: a Scheme for the Future Government of Bulgaria*, outlined a plan for a modern Bulgarian state as territorially large as possible, which was to be “connected with the commercial interests of England through its ports on the Black Sea” and “with its cosmopolitan bureaucracy to be a barrier on the Balkan Peninsula to a possible Pan-Slavic union of Orthodox states under the influence of Russia so that the “Eastern Question” would not be replaced by the so-called ‘Slavic question’” (Hornby 1878, 7; 11; 18–19; 20; 23). The prevention of the “Slavic Question” was also linked to a British geopolitical project of maintaining the presence of Austria-Hungary and Turkey on the Balkan Peninsula after the Congress of Berlin (Denton [1862] 2013; Seton-Watson 1971, 75; Vinogradov 1981, 7–8).

³² In addition, in 1881, Serbian Duke Milan Obrenović had to sign a *Secret Convention* with representatives of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, according to which Serbia

of the political philosophy of British Prime Minister John Palmerston, North American politician Thomas Jefferson, European politicians and bankers, and members of Masonic lodges. Such a process caused the collapse of Serbia village and family-oriented communities, not having contributed to the rise of the living standard of broad masses of the people (Trotsky 1980, 87; Đorđević 2004, 71; Đorđević 2008, 66; Dimitrijević 2010, 10–11).

The subordination of Russian politicians to Western politicians' geopolitical interests was further exhibited after the Serb victory in the Balkan Wars in the twentieth century when Russian diplomat Sergei Sazonov agreed to British diplomatic proposals that the Serbian army withdraw from the territory of the present-day state of Albania (Kondis 1989, 342; Rastović 2012, 16; 163–164).

During World War I, the Serbian army was attacked by the Bulgarian army, which was subordinated to the geopolitical interests of Germany and Austria-Hungary, i.e., the Central Powers (Subašić 2014).³³ When, in the twentieth century, the Russian Empire had been abolished and the ideology of Bolshevism, Marxism, and socialism was introduced into the public discourse of Russian political life, there followed the annulment of traditional Christian religion and spirituality and simultaneous insistence on technological progress in science.³⁴

became a satellite state of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (Vojvodić 2007, 20–21; Kalabić 2009).

³³ Also, although in March 1915, the British government agreed that the Russians should occupy Istanbul, the Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles so that the Russian Tsar Nicholas II would not sign a separate peace treaty with the Germans and so that the *Treaty of London* would be concluded shortly thereafter, the Russian army withdrew from the Anatolian region, although in December 1916 it defeated the Turkish army and established a new government with the Greek Metropolitan Chrysanthemum in that territory (Akarca 2002, 3–4; Repe 2019, 1019). In order to prevent the Russians from re-establishing the former Eastern Roman Empire with a Slavic ruler at the head of Orthodox Christians, as had happened in the Empire's past, members of Western political, economic, and military lobbies financed a revolutionary overthrow of the Tsarist government in Russia in 1917. This revolutionary overthrow of the Tsarist government ended with the assassination of the Russian Tsar Nicholas II and his family, the dissolution of the Russian Empire, and the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by a new Bolshevik government (Ackerman 2016, 320–321; Pipes 1996, 16; Fischer [1927] 2016, 42–44).

³⁴ This not only distanced generations of people in Russia from the memory of the former past of the Russian Empire and the medieval alliance of Orthodox states but also influenced the atmosphere of feelings of meaninglessness, nihilism, and

In memory of the diplomatic and military assistance that the Russian Tsar Nicholas II provided to the Serbs during the First World War, a monument to Tsar Nicholas II was erected in Belgrade in 2014 (Wikipedia 2015; Šuljagić 2022, 18–19). However, despite such an example of a reminder of the connection between Serbian and Russian peoples in history, in the modern Republic of Serbia, monuments, documents, and locations that prove a centuries-long traditional connection of Serbian and Russian peoples are neglected in the educational system of the Republic of Serbia (Savić 2014; Šuljagić 2014a, 357–363).

There are some other examples of military and spiritual ties between Russia and Serbia during the twentieth century and at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, which demonstrate an intertwining of supranational geopolitical interests in the contemporary Russian state. They are a continuation and are built on a little more than three centuries of military and non-military factors that have visibly influenced the subordination of the policy of the Russian state to the Western colonial campaign to the East.

However, the subordination of the foreign politics of the Russian Empire to the Western political interests in the Balkan Peninsula in the nineteenth century shows that it was not only the nineteenth century in question when political fate of local peoples in the Balkan Peninsula was determined, but that extremely important ideological and military conflicts, economic interests, educational systems and decisions of international congresses that have occurred in the nineteenth century have determined the political fate of these peoples for much more prolonged time period in future of the people in question.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, Kenneth. 2016. *Trotsky in New York, 1917: A Radical on the Eve of Revolution*. Berkeley: Counterpoint Press.
- Akarca, Halit. 2002. "The Russian Administration of the Occupied Ottoman Territories During the First World War: 1915–1917." Master Thesis. Bilkent University: The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences, The Department of International Relations.

resistance to technocracy in the form of popular novels by Soviet and post-Soviet writers such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn or Viktor Pelevin.

- Andrejić, Živojin i Violeta Ilić. 2014. „Multikulturalna i etnička prožimanja Srba i Vlaha u Srbiji na razmeđi između Jugoslavije i Rumunije.” *Mitološki zbornik* 32: 199–226.
- Andrews, Kenneth. 1964. *Elizabethan Privateering 1583–1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arslan, Ozan, and Cinar Ozen. 2005. “The Rebirth of the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress in Macedonia through the Italian Freemasonry.” *Oriente Moderno* 24 (1): 93–115.
- Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Nina. 2008. “Excavating Greece: Classicism between Empire and Nation in Nineteenth-Century Europe.” *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*. Last accessed in December 2024. <https://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn08/excavating-greece-classicism-between-empire-and-nation-in-nineteenth-century-europe>
- Baerlein, Henry. 2022. *The Birth of Yugoslavia*. London: L. Parsons.
- Bataković, Dusan. 1994. “Ilija Garasanin’s Nacertanije: A Reassessment.” *Balkanica*. Vol. 25–1. Belgrade: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Beaudry, Pierre, and Irene Beaudry. 1997. “The Venetian agents deployed against France.” *Executive Intelligence Review* 24 (26): 36–38.
- Benes, Tuska. 2008. *In Babel’s Shadow: Language, Philology, and the Nation in Nineteenth Century*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Boia, Lucian. 2001a. *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Boia, Lucian. 2001b *Romania – the Borderland of Europe*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Bronza, Boro. 2010. “The Habsburg Monarchy and the Projects for Division of the Ottoman Balkans 1771–1778.” In *Empires and Peninsulas: Southeastern Europe Between Carlowitz and the Peace of Adrianople, 1699–1829*, eds. Plamen Mitev and Ivan Parvev, Maria Baramova, Vania Racheva, 61–62. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Brooks, Julian. 2015. “The Education Race for Macedonia 1878–1903.” *The Journal of Modern Hellenism* 31: 23–58.
- Burke, Edmund. 1830. *The Annual Register or a view of the history, politics and literature of the year 1829*. London: Baldwin and Cradock, Rivington.
- Bucalo, Velimir. 1998. „Dinar od srebra.” *Srpsko nasleđe – Istorijske sveske* 7. Beograd: NIP Glas.
- Chatziioannou, Maria-Christina, and Gelina Harlaftis. 2007. “From the Levant to the City of London: Mercantile Credit in the Greek International Commercial Networks of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth

- Centuries.” In *Centres and peripheries in banking*, ed. Philip Cotrell, 29–56. London: Routledge.
- Chisholm, Hugh, ed. 1911. “Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. 20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Cristopher. 2006. *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600–1947*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cline, Myrtle. 1930. *American Attitude Toward the Greek War of Independence 1821–1828*. New York: Columbia University.
- Dakin, Douglas. 1971. *The Unification of Greece 1770–1923*. New York: St. Louis. Martin’s Press.
- Danforth, Loring. 1984. “The Ideological Context of the Search for Continuities in Greek Culture.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1): 53–85. DOI: 10.1353/mgs.2010.0012
- Denton, Vilijem. [1862] 2013. *Srbija i Srbi*, M. Nikolajević, prev. London: Ben and Daldy. Reprint, Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Dimitrijević, Laza. 2010. *Kako živi naš narod*. Beograd: Infinitas.
- Djuvara, Neagu. 1995. *Între Orient și Occident*. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Dodd, George. 1856. *Pictorial History of the Russian War 1854–56: With Maps, Plans, and Wood Engravings*. Edinburgh and London: W. & R. Chambers.
- Dobrašinović, Golub, ur. 1980. *Kopitar i Vuk*. Beograd: Vukov sabor Tršić-Rad.
- Drašković, Bojan. 2019. „Srpska revolucija u devetnaestom veku.” U *Politička istorija Slovena od mita do stvarnosti*, ur. Sanja Šuljagić, 323–352. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Ducet, Bernard, and Alexis Krauss. 2020. “Freemasonry and the foundation of Greece.” *Academia.edu*. Last accessed in May 2024. https://www.academia.edu/49394816/Freemasonry_and_the_foundation_of_Greece
- Elliot, Jonathan. 1834. *The American Diplomatic Code Embracing a Collection of Treaties and Conventions between the United States and Foreign Powers; from 1778 to 1834*. Washington DC: Jonathan Elliot Junior.
- Faggionato, Raffaella. 2006. *A Rosicrucian Utopia in Eighteenth-Century Russia The Masonic Circle of N.I. Novikov*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media.

- Faroghi, Suraiya, Bruce McGowan, Donald Quataert, and Sevkett Pamuk [Faroghi et al.]. 1997. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Louis. [1927] 2016. *Oil Imperialism: The International Struggle for Petroleum*. London: by George Allen & Unwin Ltd. Reprint, London: Routledge.
- Franklin, Simon. 2002. *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950–1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gounaris, Basil. 2021. “Does Greece belong to the West? Reassessing Greek Anti-westernism in the Twentieth Century.” *Balkan Studies* 54: 243–277.
- Gourgouris, Stathis. 1996. *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hamilakis, Yannis. 2007. *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heaton-Armstrong, Duncan. 2005. *The Six Month Kingdom: Albania 1914*. London: IB Tauris.
- Hendrickson, David. 2013. “Venice and the Liberty of States.” *IR and All That*. Last accessed in January 2024. <http://irandallthat.blogspot.com/2013/12/venice-and-liberty-of-states.html>.
- Hornby, Edmund. 1878. *The Eastern question: a scheme for the future government of Bulgaria*. London: Eastern Question Association.
- Hrabak, Bogumil. 1979. „Ideje o arbanaškoj autonomiji i nezavisnosti 1876–1880. godine.” *Istorijski časopis* 25–26. Beograd: Istorijski institut, Prosveta.
- Hunt, Lynn et al. 2008. *Gramoty russkogo*. Bedford: St. Martin's.
- Ingle, Harold. 1976. *Nesselrode and the Russian Rapprochement with Britain: 1836–1844*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Ivić, Aleksa. 1926. „Arhivska građa o srpskim i hrvatskim književnim i kulturnim radnicima 1740–1880.” *Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda* 3. Beograd: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija.
- Jovićić, Živko. 1867. „Pismo pisano mitropolitom crnogorskom Savom mitropolitu moskovskom Platonu 1776.” *Glasnik SUD* 22. Beograd: Srpsko Učeno Društvo.
- Kalabić, Radovan. 2009. *Grofovska vremena*. Beograd: Grafiks.
- Kaplan, Herbert. 2006. *Nathan Mayer Rothschild and the Creation of a Dynasty: The Critical Years 1806–1816*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Karadžić, Vuk. 1969. *Istorijski spisi II. Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića*. XVI. ur. Radovan Samardžić. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Karličić, Miljkan. 2021. „Osvrt na istorijat srpsko-britanskih odnosa.” *Bezbednost* (2): 45–68. DOI: 10.5937/bezbednost2102057K
- Kellogg, Frederick. 1995. *The Road to Romanian Independence*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.
- Kienholz, Mary. 2008. *Opium Traders and Their Worlds*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, iUniverse.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis. 2006. “Orthodoxy and the West: Reformation to Enlightenment.” In *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, ed. by Michael Angold, 187–209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kondis, Basil. 1989. “The Northern Epirus Question during the First World War.” *Balkan Studies* 30 (2): 333–349.
- Konstantinova, Victoria, and Igor Lyman. 2020. “From the Azov to Batoum: evolution of the port-cities in the Russian frontier land. Politics and administration.” In *Black Sea History Working Papers 3 Centre of Maritime History*, eds. G. Harlaftis *et al.*, 61–105. Crete, Rethymnon: Institute for Mediterranean Studies – FORTH.
- Kostić, Mita. 1940. „Iz istorije Srba u Novopazarskom sandžaku posle Berlinskog kongresa 1878.” *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva* knj. 21, 93–108. Skoplje: Srpsko naučno društvo.
- Kostić, Veselin. 2006. „David Urkart – pisac prve engleske istorije Srbije.” *Istorijski časopis* (53): 235–262.
- Larouche, Lyndon. 2018. “The Science of Physical economy as The Platonic epistemological basis for all branches of Human Knowledge.” *Executive Intelligence Review*. Last accessed in January 2024. https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2018/eirv45n48-20181130/30-66_4548-lar.pdf.
- Leeb, Thomas. 1996. *Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer: Publicist and politician between revolution and reaction*. Munich: Beck.
- Marchand, Suzanne. 1996. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mazour, Anatole. 1937. *The First Russian Revolution 1825, The Decembrist Movement, Its Origins, Development, Significance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- McKay, D., and H. Scott. 2014. *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648 – 1815*. London: Routledge.

- Milich, Peter. 2000. "Slavic Ethnogenesis and Great Power Diplomacy: Recurring Themes." *Journal of the North American Society for Serbian Studies* 14 (1): 29–40.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1989. *J. S. Mill: 'On Liberty' and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mijatović, Čedomilj. 1892. "Knez Miloš i pukovnik Hodžes. Građa za istoriju prve vladavine kneza Miloša." *Spomenik SKA* 17: 41–116.
- Mitrović, Andrej. 2011. *Prodor na Balkan i Srbija u planovima Austrougarske i Nemačke 1908–1918*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.
- Mohrenschildt, Dimitri von. 1981. *Toward a United States of Russia: Plans and Projects of Federal Reconstruction of Russia in the Nineteenth Century*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Murdoch, Steve. 2006. *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial And Covert Associations in Northern Europe 1603–1746*. Brill.
- Nenadović, Konstantin. 1883. *Život i dela velikog Đorđa Petrovića Kara-Đorđa*. Beč: Štamparija Jovana N. Vernaja.
- Novaković, Srđan. 2018. „Vlaška, Karavlaška, Cincari i nastanak masonske Srbije.” U *Rumuni i ruminizam*. ur. Zoran Milošević, 216–264. Šabac: Centar akademske reči.
- O'Donnell, Kathleen A. 2014. "Nineteenth-Century Cycladic Warriors: Celtic Heroes." In *Studies on Mediterranean Culture and History: From the Middle Ages through the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Stiven M. Oberhelman, 167–175. Athens: Athens Institute for Education and Research.
- O'Donnell, Kathleen A. 2016. "The Disintegration of the Democratic Eastern Federation and the Demise of its Supporters 1885–1896 and the Poems of Ossian." *Athens Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 2 (2):145–160. DOI: 10.30958/ajms.2-2-2
- Osterhammel, Jürgen. 2015. *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pantelić, Dušan. 1933. „Uhodenje Srbije pred Kočinu krajinu.” *Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije* 153: 105–163.
- Patrinelis, Christos. 2001. "The Phanariots before 1821." *Balkan Studies* 42 (2): 177–198.
- Pearson, Owen. 2006. *Albania in the Twentieth Century: a history*. London: IB Tauris.
- Petrović, Mita. 1897. *Finansije i ustanove obnovljene Srbije do 1842*. Beograd: Državna Štamparija Kraljevine Srbije.

- Philliou, Christine. 2008. "The Paradox of Perceptions: Interpreting the Ottoman Past through the National Present." *Middle Eastern Studies* 44 (5): 661–675. DOI: 10.1080/00263200802285385
- Pipes, Richard. 1996. *The Unknown Lenin: From the Secret Archives*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Plokhyy, Serhii. 2012. *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Popović, Vasilj. 1940. *Evropa i srpsko pitanje u periodu oslobođenja (1804–1914)*. Beograd: Geca Kon A. D.
- Prousis, Theophilus. 1985. "Russian Philorthodox Relief during the Greek War of Independence." *History Faculty Publications*. University of North Florida.
- Prousis, Theophilus. 2008. *British Consular Reports from the Ottoman Levant in an Age of Upheaval, 1815–1830*. Istanbul: Isis Press.
- Rastović, Aleksandar. 2012. "Edward Grey And The First Balkan War." *Journal of Social Sciences: Special Issue on Balkans* (2): 161–168.
- Repe, Božo. 2019. "Winston Churchill and the Slovenes." U *Zbornik Drage Roksandica*, ur. Damir Agičić, Hrvoje Petrić i Filip Šimetin Ševgić, 1009–1020. Zagreb: FF press.
- Richmond, John. 2013. *Egypt, 1798–1952 (RLE Egypt): Her Advance Towards a Modern Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Ricks, David and Paul Magdalino. 1998. *Byzantium and The Modern Greek Identity*. London: Ashgate, King's College London, Centre for Hellenic Studies.
- Rimikis, Nicholas Michael. 2017. "Filiki Etaireia: The rise of a secret society in the making of the Greek revolution." Bard College. Last accessed in September 2023. https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2017/317
- Savić, Milisav. 2014. *Dolina srpskih kraljeva: Prolećno putovanje 2013*. Beograd: Društvo Raška škola.
- Savić, Velimir. 1996. „Napoleon i Velika Srbija." U *Glasnik istorijskog arhiva* 30, ur. Milča Madić, 83–97. Valjevo: Istorijski arhiv Valjeva.
- Schroeder, Paul. 1962. *Metternich's Diplomacy at its Zenith, 1820–1823: Austria and the Congresses of Troppau, Laibach, and Verona*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Schönhärl, Korinna. 2019. "Why does a prestigious emission house emit a loan for a peripheral state? The house of Rothschild and the Greek guaranteed loan of 1833." *Business History* 63 (4): 1–17. DOI: 10.1080/00076791.2019.1593373

- Scott, Leonard. 1854. "King Otto and his Classic Kingdom." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 76.
- Şeker, Nesim. 2005. "Identity Formation and the Political Power in the Late Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic." *Historia Actual Online* (8): 59–67.
- Seton-Watson, Robert. 1955. *Britain in Europe 1789–1914, a Survey of Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. 1971. "Robert William Seton-Watson i jugoslavensko pitanje." *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 2 (2): 75–96.
- Slijepčević, Đoko. 1938. „Ukidanje Pečke patrijaršije 1766.” *Bogoslovlje* 13: 250–307.
- Sotirović, Vladimir. 2007. *Creation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 1914–1918*. Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- Stevanović, Mileva. 2017. „Ubistvo Vožda Karađorđa.” U *Mitološki zbornik 37: Dva veka od smrti srpskog vožda Đorđa Petrovića Karađorđa*, ur. Miodrag Stojanović, 49–80 Rača: Centar za mitološke studije Srbije.
- Stoica, Vasile. 1919. *The Roumanian Question*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Printing Company.
- Subašić, Boris. 2014. „Čerčil izazvao pad Rusije i Srbije 1914.” *Novosti*. 30. novembar 2014. <http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/naslovna/reportaze/aktuelno.293.html:522043-Cercil-izazvao-pad-Rusije-i-Srbije-1914>
- Talbot, Strobe. 2009. *The Great Experiment: The Story of Ancient Empires, Modern States, and the Quest for a Global Nation*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Tambora, Andelo. 2007. *Kavur i Balkan*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.
- Temperley, Harold. 1919. *History of Serbia*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
- Thiersch, Wilhelm von. 1833. *De l'état actuel de la Grèce et des moyens d'arriver à sa restauration*. Leipzig: FA Brockhouse.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1980. *The Balkan wars: 1912–13: the war correspondence of Leon Trotsky*. Broadway NSW: Resistance Books.
- Vidmar, Luka. 2009. „Struktura in funkcija pisem iz literarnoprrodne korespodence Žige Zoisa.” Doktorska disertacija. Nova Gorica: Univerza v Novoj Gorici.
- Vinogradov, V. 1981. "George Canning, Russia and the Emancipation of Greece." *Balkan Studies* 22 (1): 3–33.
- Vogli, Elpida. 2010. "The Greek War of Independence and the emergence of a modern nation-state in Southeastern Europe (1821–1827)." In *Empires and Peninsulas: Southeastern Europe Between Karlowitz and the Peace of Adrianople*, ed. Plamen Mitev, 1699–1829. Berlin: Lit.

- Vojvodić, Mihailo. 2007. „Stojan Novaković i kralj Milan.” U *Novovekovne srpske dinastije u memoaristici*, ur. Petar Krestić, 17–42. Beograd: Istorijski institut.
- Zlatković, Branko. 2018. „Vukov Srpski rječnik kao literarna tema.” U *Srpska slavistika: kolektivna monografija 2. Književnost, kultura, folklor, pitanja slavistike*. ur. Boško Suvajdžić, Petar Bunjak, Dušan Ivanić, 389–401. Beograd: Savez Slavističkih društava Srbije, Čigoja štampa.
- Zwierlein, Cornel. 2020. “Mediterranean transformations: From the security of mercantilist trading empires to a modern security regime.” *Pedralbes. Revista d'Història Moderna* (40): 323–366. DOI: 10.1344/PEDRALBES.40.12.
- Werret, Simon. 1999. “Potemkin and the Panopticon: Samuel Bentham and the Architecture of Absolutism in Eighteenth Century Russia.” *UCL Bentham Project Journal of Bentham Studies* 2: 1–25. Last Accessed in July 2024. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/648/2/002__1999__S.Werret_1999.pdf
- Wikipedia. 2015. „Spomenik caru Nikolaju II.” Wikipedia.org. Poslednji pristup oktobar 2024. https://sr.wikipedia.org/sr-ec/Споменик_цару_Николају_II
- Wood, Alfred. 1964. *A History of the Levant Company*. London: Frank Cass & Co., Psychology Press.
- Dorđević, Miroslav. 2004. *Uvod u građansko pravo*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Dorđević, Miroslav. 2008. “Pravni transplant i Srbijanski građanski zakonik iz 1844.” *Strani pravni život* (1): 62–84.
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2011. „Uloga institucija u kulturnom i ekonomskom razvoju ruralnih područja Srbije.” *Srpska politička misao* 31 (1): 209–246. DOI: 10.22182/spm.3112011.9
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2012a. „Uticaj razvoja vinčanskog pisma na zasnivanje srpskog identiteta.” *Srpska politička misao* 38 (4): 319–352. DOI: 10.22182/spm.3842012.15
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2012b. *Zasnivanje srpskog nacionalnog identiteta: politički i kulturni aspekti razvoja sela u Srbiji*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2014a. „Prikaz knjige: Milisav Savić, Dolina srpskih kraljeva: Prolećno putovanje 2013. Društvo Raška škola, Beograd, 2014.” *Srpska politička misao* (4): 355–363. DOI: 10.22182/spm.4642014.21

- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2014b. „Srpski nacionalni identitet od srednjovekovne teodulije do razgradnje moderne države Srbije.” *Politička revija* (1): 1–24. DOI: 10.22182/pr.3912014.1
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2020. *Raspoznavanje izvorišta srpskog identiteta u drevnoj istoriji*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2022. „O savremenim pokušajima poništavanja srpskog identiteta na teritoriji Kosova i Metohije.” *Nacionalni interes* 43 (3): 9–49. DOI: 10.22182/ni.4332022.1
- Šuljagić, Sanja. 2024. „O zanemarenosti dodirnih odrednica u srpskom i bugarskom identitetu.” *Srpsko-bugarski odnosi – pitanja saradnje i perspektiva*, prir. Zoran Milošević, 85–104. Beograd: Institut za političke studije. DOI: 10.18485/ips_srbg.2024.ch3
- Каменский, Н. 1810. *Донесение Н. М. Каменского Н. П. Румйнцеву о готовности оказать сербам помощь после переправы русской армии за Дунаи № 37*. 08.04.1810. Букарешт: АВПР, ф. Канцелярия приступ јануар 2020. http://www.vostlit.info/Texts/Dokumenty/Serbien/XIX/1800-1820/Perv_serb_vosst_2/141-160/141.phtml?id=8758
- Толева, Теодора. 2012. *Влиянието на Австро – Унгарија за създаването на албанската нация 1896–1908*. Софија: Сiela.
- Троцкий, Леон. 1926. «Балканы и Балканская война» у Сочинения 1924-1927. Москва–Ленинград Государственное издательство.
- Войнович, Д. 2002. «История сербского народа. История Зеты и Черногории» у Сборник *История Югославии*. ур. Сергей Шумов и А. Андреев. Москва: Монолит-Евролинц-Традиция.

Сања Шуљагић*

Институт за политичке студије, Београд

О ПОДРЕЂЕНОСТИ ПОЛИТИКЕ РУСКОГ ЦАРСТВА ЗАПАДНОМ КОЛОНИЈАЛНОМ ПОХОДУ НА БАЛКАН У 19. ВЕКУ**

Резиме

У овом научном раду предмет истраживања је узрок недовољне подршке Руског царства српским и осталим балканским устаницима током успостављања модерне геополитичке констелације на Балканском полуострву у деветнаестом веку. Циљ истраживања је доказати да је узрок недовољне подршке Руског царства балканским устаницима у том периоду била идеолошка и геополитичка подређеност политике Руског царства западном колонијалном походу на Балканско полуострво у истом периоду. Применом аналитичко-синтетичке и компаративне методе приказано је да је идеолошка и геополитичка подређеност политике Руског царства западним политичким и економским интересима постала уочљива у периоду након што је Руско царство почело да представља препреку трговачким аспирацијама европских трговачких компанија према Индији и Далеком истоку. Од тог времена је почела антируска пропаганда у Енглеској и европским државама и касније војни и невојни походи представника европских држава на Руско царство. Као последица западне агенде „продора на исток” показало се да је након Бечког конгреса, 1815. године, утицај Руског царства на геополитичку констелацију на Балканском полуострву био у сенци европских политичких интереса.

Кључне речи: Карл Неселрод, Карађорђе, Јоанис Каподистриас, модерна Србија, модерна Грчка

* Имејл адреса: sanja.suljagic@ips.ac.rs

** Овај рад је настао у оквиру научноистраживачке делатности Института за политичке студије, коју финансира Министарство науке, технолошког развоја и иновација Републике Србије.

* This manuscript was submitted on December 10, 2024, and accepted by the Editorial Board for publishing on April 14, 2025.