

Alliances and Power Distribution during the Balkan Quagmire (1912-1913)

Zeynep KAYA

e-mail: zeynepkaya81@msn.com

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to manifest the changing alliance systems at the onset and during the Balkan Wars, as well as to discuss, how the alliance system system contributed to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. In order to achieve that goal, a brief introduction to international political system will be provided. It will be noted that the most fertile environment for establishing and maintaining alliances are the bi-polar and multi-polar political systems. The tight alliance systems just before World War I created a multi-polar international system. The multipolar system will be defined and its actors during the time period will be examined.

After establishing the theoretical framework of the paper, the second part will provide a brief historical background for the Balkan Wars. The international setting, power structures and the political arena will be dealt with. The next part of the paper will concentrate on interacting alliance structures and their outcomes on the Ottoman Empire. The reason why certain states allied with each other will be discussed. The paper will discuss how alliance formations resulted in first crippling and then eradicating the Ottoman Empire. It is obvious that the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire is a comprehensive and multi-causal process and the Balkan Wars are not the only cause. This paper, will however attempt, to establish the Balkan Wars contributed to the disintegration process and the First World War finalized it.

The final part will analyze the outcomes of the alliances and the multipolar international political system. It will be concluded that the Balkan Wars despite their duration and causes were a major prerequisite in both the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the outbreak of World War I. Due to these two essential functions, the Balkan Wars on its 100th anniversary deserve to be reanalyzed and reconsidered.

I. Conceptual Framework
a. Theories of a Alliance Formation

Forming an alliance is a foreign policy tool. If a state is unable to attain its objectives on its own, it will usually move towards building alliances. Stephen Walt¹ in his infamous work asks the crucial question of why alliances are formed. He also tries to answer such questions as what causes states to support one other's foreign policy and territorial integrity. How do states decide to accept external support when there is a threat? How do great powers choose to protect the weaker states and how do weaker states accept the offer of protection. Walt offers three propositions.

He first discusses how states react to threatening situations. Do they seek allies to balance² the greater power or do they bandwagon³ with it?⁴ He concludes by stating that states usually balance rather than bandwagon. His conceptual framework can be said to be dyadic. A state can either ally against or ally with a potential threat. Balancing is usually done with a weak state whereas bandwagoning occurs with the powerful state. Walt summarizes his hypothesis with conditions favoring balancing or bandwagoning.⁵ Balancing is more common than bandwagoning. The stronger the state is, the greater its tendency to balance. The greater the probability of allied support the greater is the tendency to balance. The more aggressive a state is perceived to be the more other states will ally against it. In wartime, the closer to one to victory, the more likely that others will bandwagon with it.⁶ Alliances most certainly follow power structures.

His second proposition is on the idea that similar internal characteristics are likely to ally with one another.⁷ He concludes that ideology may not be as important as it may be thought. His final proposition is that policy instruments cause other states to alter alliance preferences.⁸

¹ Stephen Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1964), p.1

² Walt defines balancing as allying with others against the source of danger. p.17

³ Walt defines bandwagoning as alignment with the source of danger.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.2

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.33

⁶ For greater detail on comparison between alliance formation and bandwagoning refer to Walt's work. p. 17-33.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p.4

⁸ *Ibid.*, p.5

Walt defines alliances as “formal or informal relationship of security cooperation between two or more sovereign states”⁹ and concludes that neither foreign aid nor political penetration, as policy tools are effective in altering alliance preferences.

Building on the same argument of balancing versus bandwagoning, Randall Schweller¹⁰, proposes the question whether or not states ally with the weaker or stronger? Schweller is highly critical of Walt and his hypothesis that states tend to balance rather than bandwagon. According to him, Walt builds on capabilities rather than threat determinants as alliance determinant.¹¹ Bandwagoning is more profitable than balancing for states. Schweller points out that bandwagoning is profit oriented¹². It can be driven by the opportunity for gain and profits. If a state believes that by bandwagoning it will be rewarded by political or economic benefits, it will act accordingly. His second point is that revisionist states (states that can pose threats) tend to bandwagon. He points out that Walt explained bandwagoning as a response to an external threat but bandwagoning does not need an external threat to operate. Schweller’s “balance of interest”, theory rests on the premise that “the important determinant of alignment decisions is the compatibility of political goals, not imbalances of threat or power”.¹³ Schweller adds that there are two types of states ones that are pro status quo and ones that are revisionist. A status quo state will join a status quo coalition whereas “dissatisfied powers motivated by profit more than security, will bandwagon with an ascending revisionist state.”¹⁴

Dan Reiter¹⁵ proposes another view on making alliances. He defines alliance as a formal commitment to contribute assistance in the event that an alliance partner is attacked.¹⁶ Reiter points out that one state can enter an alliance or has the option of staying neutral. If a state chooses to make an alliance it must consider the benefits of alliance; deterrence in peacetime, assistance in wartime. Neutrality may decrease the chance of being involved

⁹Ibid., p.1 For further reference please read note 1.

¹⁰ Randall L. Schweller, “Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In,” *International Security* 19 (1994), pp.72-107.

¹¹Ibid., p.75.

¹² Ibid., p.76

¹³Ibid., p.77.

¹⁴Ibid., p.80.

¹⁵ Dan Reiter, “Learning, Realism, and Alliances: The Weight of the Shadow of the Past,” *World Politics* 46 (1994), pp.490-526.

¹⁶ Ibid. , p.490.

in wars but it also minimizes the attempts of support when attacked. The decision to stay neutral or join an alliance usually depends on whether an alliance poses a great risk of involvement or if it's necessary that international cooperation is vital for its security.¹⁷He suggests that the decision is usually dependent on learning and that learning is based on experiences. The criticism against this proposition is that it may rely on simple experience rather than on historical details that may guide states into wrong policy making decisions.

Robert Rothstein suggests that alliances are designed to facilitate the attainment of goals.¹⁸ Robert E Osgood defines an alliance as “a latent war community, based on general cooperation that goes beyond formal provisions and that the signatories must continually estimate in order to preserve mutual confidence in each other's fidelity to specified obligations”.¹⁹He adds to the proposition that alliances in international settings are formed in conflict or threat of conflict.

George Liska and William Riker have formed theories of alliance behavior. They both agree that an alliance is usually formed as a result of a common objective. Once that objective is achieved the alliance usually disintegrates. Alliances are formed “against and only derivatively for, someone or something”.²⁰Decision makers usually evaluate costs and benefits of forming an alliance. If rewards exceed costs the state will choose to join an alliance rather than go to war. It's a rational choice for survival. Liska furthers his theory by advocating that nations join an alliance for security, stability and status.²¹ He also adds that there needs to be an “alliance ideology”. This ideology is the justification for creating the alliance. What is the cause for forming this particular alliance? Is it a mutual threat, is it an oppressor state? Periodic meetings between leader and its followers in the alliance, tests the credibility and up to datedness of ideology.²²

This article will mainly use Liska and Riker's terminology. The alliances that were built at the onset of Balkan Wars had common objectives.

¹⁷ Ibid. , p.495.

¹⁸ Robert Rothstein, *Alliances and Small Powers*, (New York: Columbia University Press,1964), p.55

¹⁹ Robert E. Osgood, *Alliances and American Foreign Policy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press,1968), p.19

²⁰ George F. Liska, *Nations in Alliance: The Limits of Interdependence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1962), p.12

²¹ Ibid., p.175.

²² Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff. , p.450.

Instead of going to war the states chose to join alliances, most of the time, costs outweighed benefits. There was never a guiding ideology to join alliances. The guiding principle was always political interest.

b. Theories of Bi-polarity and Multi-polarity

Polarity refers to how distribution of power is managed in an international system. Bipolarity refers to distribution of power in which two major powers have the advantage of economic, political and cultural influence over others. The western states grouped around the US whereas the Communist states preferred the Soviet Union. The colonial era also experienced a bipolar system between France and Great Britain. There are many views on how polarity contributes to peace or facilitate conflict.

Multi-polarity on the other hand, proposes a distribution of power in which more than two states have equal amount of economic, political and cultural influence. The period starting from the Westphalia treaty to the onset of World War I and the current international system can be defined as being multi-polar.

Morton Kaplan²³ has produced a model that explains how the international system is formed. He introduced six international systems model in accordance with the organizing principle and the number of states taking part in this system. For the purposes of this paper, I will discuss only the balance of power and loose bi-polar systems since these interconnect with alliance formation and international stability ideas discussed previously. His balance of power model appears to resemble to the multi-polar system. The balance of power system must have at least five states that have similar or equal power within the international system. No one state should have the capacity or the will to destruct or dominate the system.²⁴ Since there is a fragile balancing system, no state will be dominant and others will regulate one another in such aspirations. Balance of power system differs from building alliances. According to Kaplan²⁵ alliances are built upon temporary interests or

²³ Morton A. Kaplan, *System and Process in International Politics*, (New York: Wiley, 1962), p.5

²⁴ Tayyar Arı, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri: Çatışma, Hegomanya, İşbirliği*, (İstanbul, Alfa Basım Yayın, 2004), p.518

²⁵ Ibid., Kaplan, p. 520

objectives. Once the objective is attained the alliance disintegrates. The balance of power system is also more permissive towards different ideologies. The primary assumption is that interest and ideologies can change but the international system that is based upon balance of power endures these changes and adaptations. Kaplan also notes that having a five state system is essential. If the number of states decreases to three, two states can easily come together and outnumber the remaining one state. He also notes that there can be an equilibrating state that checks the system's maintenance. That state rarely becomes part of the balance of power. Great Britain between the 18th and 20th century can be presented as the equilibrating state.²⁶

The loose bi-polar system is a system that concentrates itself on two influential powers. Two blocs are usually formed and the remaining states within the system organize around the two states. There is no equilibrating state; instead, there is a mediator, a role pursued by either the non-aligned or international organizations. Since bi-polar system does not permit one bloc to dominate the other from a military perspective, second strike capability becomes important.²⁷ If the blocs are not comprised by a hierarchy the bi-polar system will not be different from a balance of power system. The bloc that is organized by hierarchy will have the convenience of controlling its members. Relations will be tight with fewer options. The bloc that is not organized by hierarchy will have the difficulty of keeping its members in order. Since relations within the bloc are loose, members have the option to exit from the bloc and may join the non-aligned group. If both groups are organized around hierarchy no conflict will arise. Blocs will be clear cut and no transformations will take place. If there is a hybrid organizational system, the two blocs may not have the ability to stay as a bloc or maintain the stability in balancing the other bloc. Alliances are formed not on temporary short-term interests, but on long range goals. Ideology is one of the catalyzers of the formation of blocs.

Deutsch and Singer²⁸ record that as the system moves from bi-polarity to multi polarity the chances of war diminish. They record that once blocs are removed from the freedom to form alternative alliances, the interaction between and across blocs are limited therefore the fertile environment towards a conflict is created. It is contradictory whether or not every interaction outside the bloc will result in cooperation, it may as well be competitive.

²⁶Ibid., p.522.

²⁷ Ari, p. 522

²⁸ Karl W. Deutsch and J. David Singer, "Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability," *World Politics*, XVI(April 1964), p.360.

Deutsch and Singer assume that²⁹ “one of the greatest threats to stability of any impersonal social system is the shortage of alternative partners”. Alternative partners bolsters achieving peaceful relationships. Both of the authors have a pluralist model for the international system. As long as the international system stays plural rather than being divided into blocs the stability of the system can be achieved.

Kenneth Waltz on the other hand, puts forward the idea that a bi-polar system is more stabilizing than a multipolar one³⁰. His rationale is based on the idea that the unavoidable disparity between the superpowers and the other states forbids them from becoming uncontrollable. The superpowers monitor and control the system as they control the use of force and the spillover effects on such usage. According to Waltz, since both of the superpowers will seek self-preservation and therefore they will strive to keep the status quo.³¹ The status quo will be achieved by maintaining balance of power in military, political and technological capabilities. Waltz also recorded that since the superpowers are “supreme in their power that they use less of it”³² the two superpowers will control and monitor their blocs and each other and this alone will guarantee the stability in the international system. No superpower will be able to act alone or selfishly, knowing that it will encounter its adversary.

Richard N. Rosecrance is critical of both Deutsch-Singer and Waltz. He proposes a different international system, a system that is neither bi-polar nor multi-polar but bimultipolar.³³ His criticism of a bipolar international system concentrates on, a bipolar system contending to a zero sum system³⁴. Conflict is unavoidable; one’s gain is other superpower’s loss. Rosecrance also notes that a multipolar system may appear to be more stable but since there is a greater variety of interest and options, the states will not have homogenous policies. He also adds that a bipolar system’s worst-case scenario can be calculated as total destruction whereas instability in a multi polar system

²⁹ James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Theories: A Comprehensive Survey*, (New York: Harper and Collins, 1990), p.158

³⁰ Kenneth N. Waltz, “International Structure, National Force and the Balance of World Power,” *Journal of International Affairs*, XXI, No.2 (1967), 220.

³¹ *Ibid.*, .

³² *Ibid.*, p. 223.

³³ Richard N. Rosecrance, “Bipolarity, Multipolarity and the Future,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, X (September 1966), p.318

³⁴ A zero sum system contends to one’s gain is another states loss. There is no winner out of the outcome. It is a war prone system.

cannot be calculated as distinctly.³⁵Rosecrance's new model of bi-multi-polarity, brings together better qualities of both systems. In this system, two major powers would be the regulator for conflicts in the international system. If the two major powers have a conflict, than the multi-polar states will interfere to solve it. The bi-polar states will restrain themselves from having conflicts; the multipolar states will also refrain from having conflicts. If they have conflicts they will know that the bi-polar states will react. He also insists that "increase of multi-polarity will enhance détente between the superpowers and that will insure the stability in the international system."³⁶

II. The Ottoman Empire: The Need to Reform and Change

By the end of the 19th century, most parts of the world had been colonized. The only un-colonized place that was left was the Balkans.³⁷ Bosnia Herzegovina being the heartland of the Balkan Peninsula became an attraction point to many great powers of the time. The only problem with Bosnia Herzegovina was that it still was part of the Ottoman Empire. The Bosnia Herzegovina crisis can be called rehearsal of World War I.

The 19th Century for the Ottoman Empire is a preparation period for redesigning the Balkans, the Middle East with more than 20 new states and the creation of the Turkish Republic.³⁸ The highly ranked officers in the empire supported by the Western allies went into a long period of reforms. The urge to follow Europe on its modernity became a primary goal. If some sort of a reform could be achieved in the army then Europe could be taken as a model of advancement. Once this goal was achieved political, cultural and executive reforms could be introduced. Reforms in the government such as creating a new class of bureaucracy and the employment of many bureaucrats with substantial powers created some unrest in the society. Since Europe was to be taken as a model, European powers had more influence over the Sultan than over his subjects.

³⁵James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, op.cit.,161.

³⁶Ibid. , p. 319.

³⁷Oral Sander, *Siyasi Tarih: İlkçağlardan-1918'e*, (Ankara, İmge, 1994), p.234.

³⁸Kemal Karpat, *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi 1800-2012*, (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2012), p.13

Two significant reforms were undertaken around this time. The Tanzimat Declaration was unique in the sense that it promised to abolish the “so called” differences between the people who were members of different religious minorities. Despite the fact that the minorities were neither suppressed nor discriminated, the complaints of the minorities were taken seriously.³⁹ The second reform movement was the Islahat Declaration. This declaration gave utmost importance to minority rights that prepared the ground for an intensive period of missionary activity. These activities resulted in the establishment of missionary schools, hospitals and other premises. The second important result of the Islahat Declaration was that it evoked nationalistic feelings. These feelings resulted in the Young Ottomans movement. Their premise was that the Muslim majority was nearly reduced to a minority status. They saw the political environment as being volatile and the empire as under attack. The only response could be resistance and this resistance would stem from the ideology of national Turkish-Islamic Cooperation.⁴⁰ This movement turned itself into the organization of Jeune Turks, which contributed to domestic instabilities within the empire. The 19th century ushered in political turmoil and economically drained the Ottoman landscape. The declarations resulted in interference from the great powers.

Russia after 1870 started to pursue a Pan-Slavic⁴¹ policy, Russia's ambitions and the bankruptcy of the Ottoman government created a fragile environment for both nationalistic movements and uprisings. Since the Balkan Peninsula was susceptible to almost any change. Bosnia Herzegovinians started a revolt over some disputes about taxation. Taking this revolt as a starting point, Russia, Germany and Austria started to put pressure on the Ottoman Empire. In 1872, the first Three Emperors' League has been formed.⁴² The collective initially disbanded in 1875 over territorial disputes in

³⁹Ibid., p.25.

⁴⁰Ibid., p.55.

⁴¹ According to Merriam Webster the definition of Pan Slavic/Pan Slavism is a political and cultural movement originally emphasizing the cultural ties between the Slavic peoples but later associated with Russian expansionism <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pan-slavism> (Accessed on 05 April 2013). The Pan Slavic movement not only acted as a catalyzer in the disintegration process of the Ottoman Empire but also, it was to act as a balancing move towards the Pan Germanic idea that became a strong after the German Unification.

⁴²The alliance sought to resurrect the Holy Alliance of 1815 and act as a bulwark against radical sentiments. .Robert Gildea., *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2003), p. 237

the Balkans as Austria-Hungary feared that the Russian support for Serbia might ultimately ignite irredentist passions in its tenuously grasped Slav populations.⁴³ The body's first conclusion in 1879 gave way to the defensive Dual Alliance between Austria-Hungary and Germany to counter potential Russian aggression. In 1882 Italy joined this agreement to form the Triple Alliance.⁴⁴

a. Road to the San Stefano Treaty

Sander points out that "in 1877, Russia and Austria reached an agreement Russia gave a free hand to Austria in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Austria allowed Russia free movement in the Balkans."⁴⁵ Right after the alliance the Russo-Ottoman war started.

The war ended with the San Stefano Peace Treaty which on March 3, 1878 created a new Bulgarian Principality at the heart of the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁶ The Ottoman troops were to pull out from the autonomous principality whereas the Russian troops were to remain for another two years.⁴⁷

Montenegro⁴⁸ doubled its territory and Serbia became independent.⁴⁹ In disputes concerning the Ottoman Empire and Montenegro, Russia and Austria Hungary was to arbitrate.⁵⁰ Bosnia Herzegovina became independent.⁵¹ Romania also became independent.⁵² Russian ecclesiastics and

⁴³ Gildea, 2003 p.240.

⁴⁴ Henig, Ruth Beatrice (2002). *The Origins of the First World War*, (New York: Routledge, 2000). p. 3.

⁴⁵ Sander, p.229.

⁴⁶ Article VI of San Stefano Treaty states that "Bulgaria is constituted an autonomous tributary Principality, with a Christian Government and a national militia" For the complete text of the agreement please refer to <http://pages.uoregon.edu/kimball/1878mr17.SanStef.trt.htm>.,

⁴⁷ Ibid., San Stefano Treaty, Article VII.

⁴⁸ Ibid., Article II.

⁴⁹ Ibid., Article III.

⁵⁰ Ibid., Article II

⁵¹ Ibid., Article XIV

⁵² Ibid., Article V.

pilgrims would enjoy the same rights, advantages and privileges as the foreign ecclesiastics of any other nationality.⁵³ This would make Russians more visible in almost all of the Balkan Peninsula. Armenia was to be restored to the Ottoman Empire with the guarantee for their security from Kurds and Circassians.⁵⁴ The Straits of Bosphorous and Dardanelles were to remain open in time of war as in time of peace.⁵⁵ Ardahan, Kars, Batumi, Bayezet⁵⁶ were to be handed over to Russia and Russian Troops were to pull out of European territory with the exception of Bulgaria.⁵⁷

When the treaty is examined as a whole, it can be seen that the overall winners are Russia and Bulgaria. Russia's ascending influence in the Ottoman Empire, began on the base of international agreements. Serbia was also extremely disturbed by the size of Bulgarian territory and the fear of losing Russia as a partner to Bulgaria. The Great Powers led by Great Britain who were unhappy with expansion of Russian power, urged for a reconvening of the conference, which resulted in the Congress of Berlin.⁵⁸

b. The Congress Convenes

The aim that the congress sought to achieve was to balance the interests of Russia, Great Britain, and Austria-Hungary. A more active Russia in the Balkans and a big Bulgaria had to be avoided. At the end of the conference it was decided that Bulgaria was to be a Principality but not as large as it was stated in the Treaty of San Stefano.⁵⁹ Bosnia Herzegovina was to be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary with the exception of Sanjak of Novi Pazar, which was to stay under the Ottoman rule.⁶⁰ Austria-Hungary reserved the right to hold garrisons and having military and commercial roads in order to secure communication lines even in Novi

⁵³Ibid., Article XXII.

⁵⁴Ibid., Article XVI.

⁵⁵ Ibid., Article XXIV

⁵⁶ Ibid., Article XIX

⁵⁷Ibid., Article XXV.

⁵⁸To restore some order in the Balkans, Bismarck, the German Chancellor, was host to a Congress in 1878. It was decided that Serbia, like Rumania and Greece, would be independent

⁵⁹The Treaty of Berlin Article I <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1878berlin.asp>.

⁶⁰Ibid., Article XXV.

Pazar.⁶¹Ecclesiastics, pilgrims and monks of all nationalities were to enjoy the same rights, advantages and privileges.⁶²Working on the rights obtained by the Russian ecclesiastics in the Berlin Conference, the San Stefano treaty extended the rights and privileges to all nationalities. In addition was that rights possessed by France were expressively reserved and that no alterations could be made in the status quo in the Holy Places.⁶³Finally Bulgaria was constituted an autonomous and tributary Principality under the supreme rule of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.⁶⁴ Bulgaria was to be Princedom but under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire.⁶⁵ The precarious balance of power was to be achieved by Russia and Bulgaria being curtailed. As long as Russia's influence did not outbid Great Britain's no changes were to be made. Another point was to curb Bulgaria. If Bulgaria was to be as big as it was proposed in the San Stefano Treaty, it would again disturb the balance in the Balkans. Serbia and other newly independent territories would object. Austria Hungary would also protest against the growing Slavic influence in the region.

From this period onwards, Great Britain started to pursue a policy of disintegrating the Ottoman Empire into small states that are loyal to Great Britain.⁶⁶It invaded Cyprus on the basis that Austria Hungary also neglected the policy of keeping Ottoman Empire's territorial integrity. The Ottoman Empire had to find another ally in defending its territorial integrity. That ally was to be Germany.⁶⁷Since Russia could not form a strong Slavic nation, Austria could not annex Bosnia Herzegovina completely whereas Serbia took extreme measures once the region was handed over to Austria Hungary.

c. Alliances and Leagues

On 7 October 1879, an alliance between Austria Hungary and Germany was formed against Russia. Both parties were to help one another in

⁶¹ Ibid.,

⁶²Ibid., Article LXII.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid. , Article I.

⁶⁵Bulgaria would become a state, but still officially remain in the Ottoman Empire.

Similarly, Bosnia would become a state, but pass under Austrian rule. Russia acquired some Rumanian lands to keep it satisfied. For further information please refer to book by Henig.

⁶⁶Sander .,p. 230.

⁶⁷Ibid.

case of an attack, and conclude a mutually agreeable peace.⁶⁸ If one of the parties was attacked by a power other than Russia, the other was to remain neutral.⁶⁹ The dual alliance endured up until 1914.⁷⁰

The Three Emperors League was formed between Austria-Hungary, Germany and Russia on 18 June 1881. If there was a war waged by a fourth power, the two contracting powers would put an effort into being neutral and localizing the conflict.⁷¹ It also declared it was to abide by the rules that was established by the Treaty of Berlin⁷² previously. In that sense, the contracting parties were to take into account the respective interest of each other concerning the Balkan Peninsula. If there were to be further modifications in the territory of the Ottoman Empire, signatories were to reach a common agreement.⁷³ The Straits of Bosphorous and Dardanelles was to be closed according to the Treaty of Berlin and if in any way the Ottoman Empire was to infringe upon the agreement she would inflict a war against the signatories.⁷⁴ In a further protocol, which was attached to the original document, Bosnia Herzegovina was to be annexed by Austria Hungary at anytime.⁷⁵

The Triple Alliance⁷⁶ which was formed by Italy, Austria Hungary and Germany on 20 May 1882 lasted up until 1914. Each signatory pledged support to the others in the event of an attack by another power.⁷⁷ A particular importance was given to France, on accounts of Germany and Italy being

⁶⁸ The Dual Alliance Between Austria Hungary and Germany, Article 1
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Dual_Alliance_Between_Austria-Hungary_and_Germany

⁶⁹ Ibid., Article 2

⁷⁰ Bismarck formed many alliances to ensure the security of newly unified Germany.

⁷¹ The Three Emperors' League., Article 1.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Three_Emperors%27_League .

⁷² Please check note footnote #60

⁷³ Ibid., Article 2. Since the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire was no longer important, its disintegration was to be done on equal terms.

⁷⁴ Ibid. , Article 3.

⁷⁵ Ibid. , Separate Protocol on the same date to the Convention Article 1.

⁷⁶ The Triple Alliance was concluded on 18 June 1881. It lasted for three years; it was renewed in 1884 but lapsed in 1887. Both alliances ended because of conflicts of interest between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans.

⁷⁷ The Triple Alliance Article 1.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Triple_Alliance_%28The_English_Translation.

attacked by it.⁷⁸ In an annexed declaration, Italy⁷⁹ specified that its inclusion in the treaty was in no way directed against Great Britain.⁸⁰ Austria Hungary and Italy also agreed that the status quo in the Balkan Area would not change without a consultation between the signatories.

The Three Emperor League collapsed in 1887 and Otto von Bismarck brokered a secret agreement, the Reinsurance Treaty between Russia and Germany the same year. The treaty provided that each party was to remain neutral if the other became involved in a war.⁸¹ This would not apply if Germany attacked France or if Russia attacked Austria.⁸² Resulting from this newly formed relationship, Germany paid respect to growing Russian influence in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia.⁸³ It also supported Russia in securing the Black Sea basin for its own security.⁸⁴ The Treaty failed to be renewed in three years.

The Franco-Russian Military Convention was signed between France and Russia on 18 August 1892. With Great Britain's inclusion, they formed the Triple Entente. Since The Three Emperors' League collapsed, Russia's future alliance lay with France and Britain, instead of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. If France or Russia was attacked or a Triple Alliance member mobilized against the signatories, the other power would provide military assistance.⁸⁵ None of the signatories could sign a peace treaty separately.

In 1904, an Anglo French entente was reached between Great Britain and France, which settled old colonial disputes. France recognized British control over Egypt⁸⁶, whereas Great Britain recognized the French influence in Morocco.⁸⁷ France gave up its fishing rights in Newfoundland and received an indemnity and territory in Gambia and Nigeria. Britain dropped complaints

⁷⁸ Ibid. , Article 2.

⁷⁹ In 1902, Italy extended a similar guarantee to France also.

⁸⁰ Ibid. , Ministerial Declaration.

⁸¹ The Reinsurance Treaty, Article 1.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid. , Article 2. Eastern Rumelia was an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire. Now it's part of Bulgaria.

⁸⁴ Ibid. , The Additional Protocol, 2.

⁸⁵ The Franco-Russian Alliance Military Convention, Article 1 and Article 2

⁸⁶ The Franco British Declaration, Article 1,

<http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/ententecordiale1904.htm>

⁸⁷ Ibid. , Article 2.

regarding the French customs régime in Madagascar. The respective spheres of influence were defined in Siam.⁸⁸

In 1907, The Anglo Russian Entente was signed right after the Anglo-French entente. It was aimed at settling colonial disputes between Great Britain and Russia over Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet.⁸⁹ Neither country was to interfere in Tibet's internal affairs.⁹⁰ It also proposed spheres of influence in Persia.⁹¹

On October 1908, after consultation with Germany, Austria Hungary determined that The Treaty of Berlin it had the right to annex Bosnia Herzegovina.⁹² After the annexation of Bosnia Herzegovina, a secret patriotic society the *Narodna Odrabana*(Defense of the People),was founded in Serbia to strengthen the spirit of nationalism.⁹³ This society viewed the annexation as a “blow” by the enemies of Serbia. Work and preparation had to be done to avoid further blows, so that Serbia was not to be caught off guard.⁹⁴In order to countersuch an attack “every Serbian, from child to greybeard, is a rifleman”.⁹⁵ It calls for Serbians not only in Serbia but around the world to unite against one common enemy, Austria.⁹⁶ The preparations to punish Austria Hungary for annexing Bosnia Herzegovina started in 1908 and the preparations for the World War I were complete. All it needed was a spark. The spark was not the invasion of Tripoli nor the Balkan Wars but

⁸⁸Ibid. , In a secret addendum to the agreement, Great Britain received a free hand in introducing reforms in Egypt and alterations in its legislation system to integrate it into the civilized World. This condescending attitude was not to be opposed by France (Article 2)

⁸⁹The Anglo Russian Entente, Article I, II and III,
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Anglo-Russian_Entente,

⁹⁰ Ibid. , Article III .

⁹¹ Ibid. ,

⁹² The Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria Hungary,
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_annexation_of_Bosniaand_Herzegovina_by_Austria-Hungary

⁹³ The group also consisted of volunteer cells that were prepared to undertake special and independent military action. It is also suggested that GavriloPrincip, the Serbian that gave the onset of World War I by assassinating the Archduke of Austria Hungary, was a member of this society. The NarodnaOdrbrana-World War I Document Archive,
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Narodna_Odrbrana.

⁹⁴ Ibid. ,

⁹⁵ Ibid. ,

⁹⁶ Ibid. ,

The annexation of Bosnia Herzegovina disturbed almost every nation in Europe. Russia and Italy came together and formed a Racconigi Agreement in 1909, in which, Italy recognized the Russian interest over the Ottoman Straits⁹⁷ and Russia recognized the Italian interest in Tripoli.⁹⁸ Two years after the bilateral agreement Russia started to put pressure on the Ottoman Empire over the Straits and Tripoli was attacked by Italy. The Ottoman army showed resistance as the Italians invaded the twelve islands that had belonged to the Ottoman Empire.⁹⁹ Just as the resistance was continuing, the Balkan Wars started and the Ottoman army had to withdraw from Tripoli to defend the Balkan lands. The Ottoman Empire reluctantly signed the Ouchy Peace Treaty in 1912. The island that was invaded by Italy was given to its protection and Tripoli was handed over to Italy.¹⁰⁰

When the onset of the Balkan Wars is examined, it can be said that a dissatisfied Bulgaria and Serbia counseled by Russia were joined by Greece and Montenegro. These allies waged war against the Ottoman Empire. The war was finalized by the London Peace Agreement. The agreement that was signed in 1913 provided that Albania was to become independent.¹⁰¹ Second, the disputed island of Crete was to be handed over to Greece.¹⁰² Finally, Edirne¹⁰³ was to left out of Ottoman Empire, meaning that the Ottoman Empire's borders were being reorganized.¹⁰⁴

The Balkan wars did not end with the London agreement. Bulgaria that was once again dissatisfied with the post war settlements and attacked Serbia and Greece, which was joined by Romania. The Ottoman Empire recaptured Edirne as the second Balkan Wars continued. Bulgaria admitted defeat in 1913 in an agreement that was signed in Bucharest.

III. Alliance Formations and The Balkan Wars: A Reassessment

⁹⁷The Dardanelles and Bosphorous Straits

⁹⁸Sander, p. 236.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. ,

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p.237.

¹⁰² Ibid.,

¹⁰³ A city in the Turkish Republic

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

It is obvious that regardless of what the actual cause of the Balkan Wars was the tight alliance structures contributed to both the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the onset of the wars. The first reason why the alliances were formed after 1870 was to counter the growing German influence. The Pan-Germanic ideal had terrified the Europeans. Russia was more disturbed than any other nation. The antidote against the German influence would be a unification of the Slavic people under one rule. Russia's persistence in both resisting the German influence and taking part in the disintegration process of the Ottoman Empire made forming alliances a viable rational choice. Just as Walt had stated, Russia formed an alliance in order to balance a growing threat. Russia also fits in with Schwellers theory of "balance of interest" that states "the important determinant of alignment decisions is the compatibility of political goals, not imbalances of threat or power. Russia also fits with Rothstein's theory of, as being, designed to facilitate the attainment of goals. Russian pan-Slavic movement also meets the "alliance ideology" theory that was introduced by Liska, which is the justification for creating an alliance. The San Stefano Agreement was signed between Austria Hungary and Russia in an indirect attempt to curb German influence.

The second reason for forming an alliance was that as Russia was balancing Germany, empires like Great Britain and Austria Hungary were being left out. After the San Stefano treaty, a dissatisfied Great Britain and Austria Hungary in an appeasing attempt by Germany, gathered to reevaluate the San Stefano Treaty. Now the growing threat seemed to be Russia rather than Germany. The treaty provided that each party was to remain neutral.

The third reason for forming an alliance was that empires were disturbed by the territorial changes that were occurring in Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Any nation with ambitious goals may not retain any gains resulting from the changes and may wage war against other European nations. Following Reiter's view, an alliance is formed as to provide a formal commitment in case a partner is attacked. The dual alliance between Austria Hungary and Germany was prepared on this presumption. The furthering of the alliance included Russia in the dual alliance whereas Great Britain was left out.

The fourth reason for forming an alliance was the changing of interest. If an empire or a nation saw its interest in some other territory, it easily changed partners. After the collapse of the Three Emperors League, Russia

made an alliance with France and Great Britain rather than Austria Hungary, Germany and Italy. Ideology and threat did not apply rather it was political interest that designed the alliance.

The fifth reason for forming an alliance was that nations could form different alliances regarding different issues. Russia appeared to be in alliance with Great Britain and France on certain matters such as countering a possible attack from Austria Hungary, Germany or Italy but it also signed an agreement with Italy on the subject of the authority over the Ottoman Straits. Russia knew that it would not receive a *carte blanche* from Great Britain over this issue therefore it signed a deal with Italy.

Finally, two different alliance systems can work in accordance against a common threat. One can secure the survival of the other. Germany made two different pacts with two different groups over the same objective.¹⁰⁵ Rather than integrating the two groups into one it chose to broker the two separately in case one fell apart.

A multipolar world may appear to be a more stable international setting than a bi-polar one, but almost all of the devastating wars have occurred under multipolar systems. Forming an alliance is a foreign policy tool. It is used in our present time as well. It may not present itself in military alliance agreements as it did in the past, but it continues in other sorts and forms as a tool. Foreign policy may be formed by many contributing elements but among the factors that are most influential is still political interest. It was in the past, still is in the present, and will probably be in the future.

¹⁰⁵ Three Emperors League and Triple Alliance was all directed against Great Britain. As the Three Emperors League collapsed, the triple alliance endured.

Bibliography

- Arı, Tayyar. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri: Çatışma, Hegomanya, İşbirliği*. İstanbul, 2004.
- Deutsch, Karl and Singer David. «Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability.» *World Politics*, 1964: 390.
- Dougherty, James and Robert Pfaltzgraff. *Contending Theories of International Theories: A Comprehensive Survey*. New York, 1990.
- Henig, Ruth Beatrice. *The Origins of the First World War*. Routledge, 2002.
- Kaplan, Morton. *System and Process in International Politics*. New York, 1962.
- Karpat, kemal. *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi 1800-2012*. İstanbul, 2012.
- Liska, george. *Nations in Alliance: The Limits of Interdependence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins press , 1962.
- Merriam Webster Dictionary*. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pan-slavism> (accessed on March 30, 2012)
- Osgood, Robert E. *Alliances and American Foreign Policy*. Baltimore, 1968.
- «Primary Documents-Entente Cordiale,8 april 1904 .» *First World War* . <http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/ententecordiale1904.htm> (accessed on March 22, 2012)
- Reiter, Dan. «Learning, Realism, and Alliances: The Weight of the Shadow of the Past.» *World Politics*, 1994: 490-526.
- Robert, Gildea. *Barricades and Borders: Europe 1800-1914*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Rosecrance, Richard. «Bipolarity, Multipolarity and the Future.» *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1966: 318.

Rothstein, Robert. *Alliances and Small Powers*. New York, 1968.

Sander, Oral. *Siyasi Tarih: İlkçağlardan-1918'e*. Ankara, 1994.

Schweller, Randall L. «Bandwagoning for Profit:Bringing the Revisionist State Back In.» *International Security*, 1994: 72-107.

«The Anglo Russian Entente.» *World War I Document Archive*.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Anglo-Russian_Entente,
(accessed on April16, 2012)

«The Annexation of bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria and Hungary.» *World war I document Archive*.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_annexaqtion_of_Bosniaand_Herzegovina_by_Austria-Hungary (accessed on April30, 2012)

«The Dual Alliance Between Austria-Hungary and Germany .»
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Dual_Alliance_Between_Austria-hungary_and_Germany.(accessed on March 20, 2012)

«The Narodna Odbrana-World War I Document Archive.»
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Narodna_Odbrana (accessed on February 22, 2012)

«The Three Emperors' League.»
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Three_Emperors%27_League
(accessed on April 16, 2012)

«The Treaty of Berlin»

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1878berlin.asp>. (accessed on March 5, 2012)

The Triple Alliance.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Triple_Alliance_%28The_English_Translation.(accessed on April23, 2012)

The Reinsurance Treaty. http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Reinsurance_Treaty (accessed on April1, 2012)

Alliances and Power Distribution during the Balkan Quagmire (1912-1913)

The Franco-Russian Alliance Military Convention.
http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/The_Franco-Russian_Alliance_Military_Convention (accessed on March 22, 2012)

University of Oregon.
<http://pages.uoregon.edu/kimball/1878mr17.SanStef.trt.htm> (accessed on February 22, 2012)

University of Oregon.
<http://pages.uoregon.edu/kimball/1878mr17.SanStef.trt.htm> (accessed on March 22, 2012)

Walt, Stephen. *The Origins of Alliances*. New York, 1964.

Waltz, Kenneth L. "International Structure, National Force and the Balance of World Power ." *Jornal of International Affairs*, 1967: 220.

