

UDC 930.85(4-12)

YU ISSN 0350-7653

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS  
INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

# BALCANICA

## XXXIX (2008)

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

Editor

DUŠAN T. BATAKOVIĆ

Editorial Board

FRANCIS CONTE (Paris), DIMITRIJE DJORDJEVIĆ (Santa Barbara),  
DJORDJE S. KOSTIĆ, LJUBOMIR MAKSIMOVIĆ, DANICA POPOVIĆ,  
GABRIELLA SCHUBERT (Jena), BILJANA SIKIMIĆ, ANTHONY-EMIL  
TACHIAOS (Thessaloniki), NIKOLA TASIĆ (Director of the Institute for Balkan  
Studies), SVETLANA M. TOLSTAJA (Moscow)

BELGRADE  
2009



**Radoš Ljušić**

*School of Philosophy  
University of Belgrade*

## **Ilija Garašanin on Serbia's Statehood**

**Abstract:** A subject usually neglected in the historical work on Ilija Garašanin's role as a statesman has been discussed. Attention has been drawn to the legal status of Serbia at the moment Garašanin entered civil service and how it changed during the thirty years of his political career (1837–67). The first part of the paper looks at his views against the background of three vitally important issues for Serbia's legal status at the time: the constitutional issue, the issue of hereditary succession and the issue of internal independence. His views on the three issues reflect his understanding of the existing status of the Principality of Serbia. The second part of the paper looks at how he envisaged a future Serbian state. Its largest portion is naturally devoted to the ideas put forth in the *Načertanije* (1844), the first programme of nineteenth-century Serbia's national and foreign policy. It also looks at Garašanin's attempt, made through the Serbian representative at the Porte in the revolutionary year 1848, to achieve the reorganization of the Ottoman Empire into a dual monarchy with the Serbian United States (or a Serbian vice-kingdom) as a constituent state. Finally, attention has been paid to the creation of a Balkan alliance through agreements concluded by Balkan states.

**Keywords:** Ilija Garašanin, Principality of Serbia, statehood, Ottoman Empire, *Načertanije*, foreign and national policy programme

### *The legal status of Serbia during Garašanin's political career*

The statehood of the Principality of Serbia was founded upon three types of legal documents: 1) international agreements; 2) Ottoman documents (*fir-mans, berats* and *batt-i sherifs*); and 3) Serbia's acts passed after she achieved internationally guaranteed autonomy within the Ottoman Empire in 1830, such as constitutions, laws, agreements, etc.<sup>1</sup> Legal documents of the second type stemmed from the obligations the Ottoman Empire undertook under Russia's pressure to protect Serbia. International agreements concerning the autonomy of Serbia will only be listed: the Treaty of Bucharest (1812), the Akkerman Convention with its Separate Act (1826), and the Treaty of Adrianople (1829). They paved the way to the restoration of Serbia's statehood as a principality as much as the resulting Ottoman legal acts. It should be pointed out that Russia, through these agreements, had coerced

---

<sup>1</sup> As a newly-created political entity Serbia had also been founded on the results of the uprisings of 1804 and 1815. For more, see R. Ljušić, *Istorija srpske državnosti* [History of Serbian Statehood], vol. II: *Srbija i Crna Gora, novovekovne srpske države* [Serbia and Montenegro, Serb States of the Modern Age] (Novi Sad 2001).

Ottoman Turkey into solving the Serbian question raised by the Serbian Revolution of 1804. Russia, from 1830 a guarantor of the internationally protected autonomy of the Serbian Principality, was instrumental in establishing modern Serbia's institutions.

The Ottoman Empire established Serbia as a vassal principality under the following legal acts: the so-called Eight *firmans* of 1815/6; the *hatt-i sherifs* of 1829, 1830 and 1833; the *berat* of 1830; the *firman* on free salt trade of 1835; the *firman* on the Prince's release from Constantinople of 1835; the *fermans* on the flag and coat of arms of 1835 and 1839; the *firman* on establishing the Serbian Agency in Bucharest of 1835; the *firman* on trade of 1837; and the Concordat with the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople of 1831 with an appendage added in 1836. Towards the end of the first reign of Prince Miloš Obrenović (1815–1839), the Sublime Porte issued yet another *hatt-i sherif* to Serbia, which is known as the "Turkish Constitution" (1838). Under these acts, Serbia was granted the status of an autonomous principality under Ottoman suzerainty. The Principality had its territory, its own administration from the highest (prince) to the lowest (village mayor) level, as well as some elements of statehood (flag, coat of arms, diplomatic representative at the Sublime Porte, agencies, consuls). To be added here are the acts issued by institutions of the Principality of Serbia bolstering Serbian statehood, such as decrees, decisions, regulations and the short-lived 1835 Presentation-Day (or Candlemas) Constitution (*Sretenjski Ustav*).<sup>2</sup>

The early process of statehood restoration culminated with the enactment of the Constitution of the Principality of Serbia in 1835, an action undertaken on the grounds of the rights obtained by the *hatt-i sherifs* on internal autonomy. By 1835 Serbia had obtained all rights of an autonomous state, with the exception of some further minor amendments that were effected by the end of Prince Miloš's first reign. But only a month after the 1835 Constitution was adopted Serbia was forced by both Russians and Ottomans to suspend it as too liberal. This was the first case that Serbia was unable to defend one of her basic rights conferred under the acts on autonomous self-government. Later that year, the Sublime Porte degraded yet another of the Principality's vital rights: the *firman* on the Prince's visit to the Sultan termed the Serbian ruler *baş-knez*, reducing him to the first among

<sup>2</sup> *Pregled međunarodnih ugovora i drugih akata od međunarodnopravnog značaja za Srbiju od 1800 do 1918* [Overview of international agreements and other acts of international legal importance to Serbia from 1800 to 1918] (Belgrade 1953); M. Gavrilović, *Miloš Obrenović*, vols. I–III (Belgrade 1908, 1909, 1912); R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)* [Principality of Serbia 1830–1839] (Belgrade: Serban Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1986).

his peers. That was the reason why this *firman* was not made available to the public and remained hidden amongst Prince Miloš's confidential papers.<sup>3</sup>

Those were the results of the twenty years of Prince Miloš's policies towards the Ottoman Empire aimed at obtaining autonomy, if not independence, for Serbia. Therefore, it was in an autonomous but still dependent Serbia that Ilija Garašanin, a member of the next generation of Serbian notables, entered civil service. In the next thirty years (1837–1867) Garašanin grew into one of the most prominent Serbian politicians and statesmen. During the thirty years of his active political career, the obtained legal status of the Principality of Serbia at first was reduced, and then gradually re-established. The autonomous rights of Serbia were reduced under the Constitutionalist regime (1838–1858), with Garašanin as one of its pillars. The beginning of that process may be traced back to the last years of Prince Miloš's first reign, when an oligarchic opposition, which was to become known as Constitutionalists, sought to undermine the autocratic rule of Miloš Obrenović. Serbia's autonomy was narrowed by the following acts: *berats* issued to Serbian Princes (Milan Obrenović in 1839; Mihailo Obrenović in 1839 and 1860; Aleksandar Karadjordjević in 1842 and 1843; Miloš Obrenović in 1859); *firmans*: on the approval of the First Regency (1839); on sending a imperial commission to Serbia (1840); on the deposition of Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević (1843); on the appointment of the Prince of Serbia (1843); on the Supreme Court (1844); and on regulating customs revenues (1845). The Sultan's *hatt-i sherif* of 1853 neither impaired nor improved the legal status of the Principality. There were only three acts that strengthened the Principality's legal status: the Treaty of Paris (1856), the *firman* on implementation of the Kanlidja Conference Protocol, and the *firman* on transferring six fortresses to Serbian control (1867). Under the first of these acts, Russian patronage was replaced with the "joint guarantee" of six Great Powers and any Ottoman armed intervention in Serbia without their consent was banned; under the second, the Ottoman Muslim population living within the walls of the six fortresses was to withdraw with the Ottoman garrisons, and the fortresses of Soko and Užice were to be demolished; under the third act, the fortified towns were to be eventually handed over to the Principality of Serbia.<sup>4</sup>

If two phases of the history of nineteenth-century Serbia are compared, that of 1815–1835, and that of 1837–1867 — during which Ilija Garašanin's pursued his political career — it becomes clear that the former

---

<sup>3</sup> Archives of Serbia (hereafter: AS), Belgrade, Mita Petrović Collection (hereafter: MPC), 2343.

<sup>4</sup> Other acts, such as trade and other agreements of the Sublime Porte, as well as acts passed by the Principality of Serbia, have not been taken into consideration.

was a period of success in struggling for and obtaining autonomous rights, while the latter was marked by a laborious and often unsuccessful defence of those rights, which were consolidated, and not fully, only towards the end of that period. The first period was, therefore, the one of re-establishing the state and its institutions; the second was for the most part limited to its preservation. The first period may be described as the concluding stage of the Serbian Revolution started by the first uprising in 1804; the second, despite some stagnation, paved the way for a new foreign policy towards the Ottoman Empire, leading to full independence in 1878. Garašanin's role in shaping that policy was of major importance.

The period in which Garašanin was engaged in state affairs could be divided into two — the Constitutionalist (1838–1858) and the Obrenović second reign (1859–1867). The former was characterized by violations of the rights conferred upon the Principality of Serbia (with the exception of the 1856 Treaty of Paris), while the main characteristic of the latter was the exercise and further extension of those rights.

Garašanin's views on Serbia's statehood in both periods will be looked at and an attempt will be made to answer the following questions: What was his judgement of the autonomy created by Prince Miloš? What were his ideas for furthering Serbia's statehood status? What did he, as a prominent Serbian statesman, accomplish in that regard?

Under constant pressure to find solutions to numerous problems in Serbo-Ottoman relations, Garašanin obviously had to examine all legal documents that formed the basis of modern Serbian statehood. He left no writings specifically addressing these issues, but wrote about them while dealing with a particular problem in Serbia's relations with the Sublime Porte. In order to be able to make viable proposals to the Ottoman side, Garašanin had to refer to various Ottoman *firmands*, *hatt-ı şerif*s, *berats* or the Russo-Ottoman peace treaties. While studying these documents, Garašanin used to make notes and analyze their contents, without making general assessments either of a particular document or of the corpus of documents relevant to Serbia's autonomy. Garašanin's writings only rarely, if ever, describe Serbia as a modern nation-state of revolutionary origin. Only once, in a draft text, did he make a remark that the obtainment of these documents was backed by Serbian weapons, meaning that modern Serbia originated in a national revolution.<sup>5</sup>

Garašanin often invoked different legal documents or their particular provisions when he considered them as necessary during direct negotiations with the Sublime Porte.

---

<sup>5</sup> AS, Belgrade, Ilija Garašanin's Papers (hereafter: IGP), 855, 930.

*The constitutional issue*

The Principality of Serbia's constitutional situation provides a solid background for looking at her legal status. Serbia had been granted powers of self-government under the Sultan's *hatt-i sherifs* of 1830 and 1833. When a rebellion (*Miletina buna*) against the autocratic rule of Prince Miloš broke out in January 1835, the Prince's enlightened secretary, Dimitrije Davidović, assured the ruler that the autonomous rights conferred upon Serbia under the *hatt-i sherifs* included the right to proclaim her own constitution.<sup>6</sup> Given that no major step had theretofore been taken in Serbia without the assent both of the Porte as the suzerain power and of Russia as the guarantor of Serbia's autonomy, the passing of a constitution was bound to provoke a reaction both in Constantinople and in St. Petersburg. Promulgation in 1835 of the Presentation-Day Constitution (*Sretenjski Ustav*),<sup>7</sup> without Russia's and Ottoman Turkey's consent, was the last step towards Serbia's full internal self-government and a step further in strengthening her semi-independent position. The Constitution, however, was promptly suspended under the joint pressure of Russia, Austria and Ottoman Turkey. Although the Constitution did not suit his autocratic style, Prince Miloš stood up for it in order to thwart further Russian and Ottoman involvement in Serbia's internal self-government.<sup>8</sup>

Unable to find common ground on the constitutional issue between 1835 and 1838, Prince Miloš and the Constitutionalist opposition eventually agreed, at the suggestion of the British consul and with Ottoman approval, that a new Serbian constitution would be drafted in Constantinople. That turned out to be a significant error, which could not be rectified until 1869. Pursuant to the agreement reached between Russia, Ottoman Turkey and the Serbian deputation, in 1838 the Sublime Porte issued a fourth *hatt-i sherif* to Serbia, which is better known as the "Turkish Constitution". This decree reduced some of the previously granted rights, such as designating Serbia a *province* instead of a *principality*, and authorizing the Porte to intervene in her internal affairs, in particular in the event of conflict between the Prince and the seventeen oligarchs appointed life members of the newly-created Council.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Živanović, "Nekoliko primečanja na knjigu Slaveni u Turskoj od Kiprijana Roberta" [A Few Notes on the book *Slavs in Turkey* by Cyprian Robert], *Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije* (1890), 63.

<sup>7</sup> The text of the Constitution was drawn up by Dimitrije Davidović.

<sup>8</sup> For more, see R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, 148.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 190–191.

The members of the Council, known as Constitutionals, including the young and not yet very influential Ilija Garašanin, sacrificed some clearly defined autonomous rights in order to curb the autocratic rule of Prince Miloš. If they wanted their struggle against the Prince to succeed, and they resolutely did, they needed support from both Russia and Ottoman Turkey, who in turn skilfully manipulated the growing discord among high-ranking Serbian politicians. While Prince Miloš kept defending all the powers conferred upon Serbia and her ruler until his deposition in 1839, the Constitutionals tended to criticize them even when there was no particular political justification for the criticism.<sup>10</sup>

The 1838 “Turkish” Constitution was formally in force for thirty years, coinciding with the thirty years of Garašanin’s active role in Serbian politics. Disputed even before its official proclamation in February 1839, the Constitution remained a source of misinterpretations and rivalries until it was replaced by the Regency Constitution in 1869. Not even the Constitutionals under the First Regency (1839–1840) were satisfied with some its provisions and sought to negotiate their modification with the Sublime Porte. Apparently, their intention was to ensure modifications to the constitutional provisions that contradicted the Council Organization Act (1839) in order to enhance the powers of this body in relation to the powers vested in the Prince.<sup>11</sup>

The Constitutionals were in particular criticized for their sympathetic attitude towards the Ottomans, but, as it has been noted, they acted “out of purely political necessity, not out of conviction”.<sup>12</sup> Having left Serbia in the wake of a conflict with young Prince Mihailo Obrenović (first reign 1839–1842), the Constitutionals actively lobbied in Constantinople for firming up the powers of the Council as defined by the 1838 Constitution. Garašanin’s opinion on the constitutional issue is obvious from his correspondence with leading Constitutionals. In his letter to another Constitutionalist Stojan Simić of 17 April 1841, he underlines that a new Council “will bind the Prince to honour the Constitution sacredly and it will make sure that others honour it as well”. Two years later, the Constitutionalist regime was established but not yet firmly, and Garašanin informs Stevan Knićanin: “Reports on the position of Serbia coming from all quarters cannot be more desirable than they are. They all say that we govern the people

---

<sup>10</sup> For details, see *ibid.*, 219–220.

<sup>11</sup> R. Ljušić, “Pitanje dinastije u vreme Prvog namesništva 1839–1840” [The dynastic issue during the First Regency 1839–1840], *Zbornik Istorijskog muzeja Srbije* 19 (1982), 139.

<sup>12</sup> V. J. Vučković, *Srpska kriza u istočnom pitanju (1842–1843)* [*Serbian Crisis in the Eastern Question 1842–1843*] (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka, 1957), 43.

well and by the Constitution, so we can be cock-a-hoop about it.”<sup>13</sup> As a representative of a political group that sought to consolidate its power, he had to advocate abidance by his country's fundamental law as the source of basic political rights.

In his major text on the foreign policy of Serbia, written in 1844 (*Načertanije*), Garašanin made no reference whatsoever to the legal documents on which modern Serbian statehood was founded. He merely noticed that restored Serbia had made “a fortunate start” and then referred to the firm foundations of the medieval Serbian empire, thereby completely disregarding the achievements of the previous generation (Karageorge and Miloš Obrenović). Garašanin saw the future Serbian state as being founded on the sacred historic right and its citizens as true heirs of “our great [founding] fathers”. The founding fathers he had in mind were those of medieval times. The heroes of the modern age were not eligible for his list because they were involved in a state-building process based on the natural right — a national revolution. On the other hand, he believed that Serbs would fare better if their medieval empire were restored, with the Principality of Serbia as its core. He doubted that it could have a stable future unless it contained “a seed of a future Serbian empire”.

Being a draft of Serbia's foreign and national policy, the *Načertanije* made no mention of a constitution either. Obviously, the system of government of the future state that was supposed to grow into a renewed Serbian Empire was not an issue Garašanin considered as being of essential importance.

Once firmly-seated in power, the Constitutionalsists were not particularly interested in constitutional issues until the final years of their rule. From a period before Garašanin himself took interest in these issues comes a draft text on the “Turkish Constitution” he wrote in 1848. In the revolutionary year 1848, Garašanin was reluctant to consider any modification to the Constitution, which “practically until yesterday was presented to the people as their holy of holies by all ministers”. Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević, in his turn, at the National Assembly held on St Peter's Day (*Petrovska skupština*) in July 1848, stated that he would not allow any violation of the Constitution “even if I have to relinquish princedom”. As the relations between the Prince and the Council grew tense, mostly as a result of contradictions between the Constitution and the Council Organization Act, Garašanin addressed this topical question as well: although Serbs were entitled to pass a constitution of their own, the 1838 Constitution was granted by Ottoman Turkey backed by Imperial Russia. The involvement of the two

---

<sup>13</sup> *Prepiska Ilije Garašanina* [Correspondence of Ilija Garašanin], ed. G. Jakšić, vol. I: 1839–1849 (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka, 1950), 20.



great powers in this matter was the consequence of the Constitutionalists' impatient striving to limit the power of the Prince. Garašanin admitted that it had been "a very critical political mistake and [that] its rectification must be a matter of utmost priority". Such a "huge mistake made out of necessity", he believed, must never be made again. Should it prove necessary, however, to modify the Council Organization Act and those provisions of the Constitution that hindered progress, Garašanin advised a gradual ("bit by bit") process of rectifying past mistakes; and if that could not be done using the usual procedure, then the general assent of the people, who "have the right to enact their own laws and regulations", would be required. The bottom line was not to allow Ottoman Turkey and Russia to interfere in the autonomous Principality of Serbia's internal affairs.<sup>14</sup> Garašanin's political shift was obvious. He was not an unconditional defender of the "Turkish Constitution" any more. Now firmly in power, the Constitutionalists did not find strict abidance by the 1838 Constitution as indispensable as they had in the early 1840s.

Garašanin became increasingly concerned with constitutional issues in the 1850s, especially between his fall from power in 1853 and the Assembly held in December 1858 on St Andrew's Day (*Svetoandrejska skupština*). Garašanin's papers include three constitution drafts — two written by his hand and one by the hand of Jovan Marinović, Garašanin's influential, Paris-educated assistant. Garašanin's correspondence sheds light on this concern of his. In a letter to Marinović of 1855 he wrote about the ongoing wrangle between the Prince and the Council over the Constitution and the Council's organization. Garašanin's advice to Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević (1842–1858) was that political activities should not focus on bringing the two documents into agreement because the time was not right for that. Focusing on that particular issue would be like "trying to find a cure for a corpse that we are about to bury". Garašanin once more expressed his concern over foreign involvement in Serbian politics and explicitly warned the Prince that both the Constitution and the Council Organization Act "have endured through the years of practice" and that the Prince should be careful not to "transgress the law" in any way.<sup>15</sup> Only two years later, now as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Garašanin resolutely stood up for a modified and amended Council Organization Act, thereby defending the Constitutionalists' powers from the Prince.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> AS, IGP, 302.

<sup>15</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću* [Ilija Garašanin's Letters to Jovan Marinović], ed. St. Lovčević (Belgrade: Srpska kraljevska akademija, 1931), vol. I, 277.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 408.

Two of the three abovementioned documents preserved among Garašanin's papers are certainly constitution drafts. The form of the third, however, rather suggests the draft of a *hatt-i sherif* regulating the relationship between the Principality of Serbia and the Ottoman Empire, and, as such, is a quite valuable source for our analysis. It is quite unlikely that its provisions could have been included in a constitution promulgated by the Principality's National Assembly or, even less, by the Sublime Porte. Here is what it envisioned, in eleven points, for the Principality of Serbia: 1) Serbia remains a tributary principality paying tribute to the Porte as decreed by the *Hatt-i sherif*; 2) Principality of Serbia enjoys "*perfectly independent internal self-government*"<sup>17</sup> in matters of law-making, religion, trade and river faring; 3) Serbia has her national coat of arms and flag;<sup>18</sup> 4) "The existing form of government, constitutional monarchy, is to be preserved"; 5) Principality has the right to a sufficient number of national soldiers to maintain internal security and defend the borders of the country from "any attack"; 6) "In case of war between the Sublime Porte and any other state, no armies are permitted to enter or cross Serbia";<sup>19</sup> 7) To forestall the above-stated, the Ottoman garrisons should be moved out and the fortifications destroyed; 8) "All Turks" (Ottoman Muslim population) should move out, according to the "*Hatt-i sherif* of 1830", except for those who should choose to stay and submit themselves to Serbian rule, thereby becoming equal in rights to Serbs and enjoying the freedom of religion; 9) The Serbian government has the right to establish relations with foreign governments and to conclude customs and other agreements relevant to the wellbeing and further development of the country; 10) All previous agreements concluded by the Sublime Porte should be examined and rectified if in disagreement with international law or if violating Serbia's autonomy; 11) All areas defined by the "*Hatt-i sherif* of 1833" should be incorporated into Serbia if they remained within Ottoman Turkey through abuse in border demarcation.<sup>20</sup>

This source quotes the rights Serbia was granted by the Sultan's decrees during the first reign of Prince Miloš, but in a somewhat expanded form. The only controversial issue would be that of succession to the Serbian throne, as it was not explicitly addressed. The document not only envis-

---

<sup>17</sup> Underlined in the original text kept in Archives of Serbia (AS), Varia, 782.

<sup>18</sup> The further text reads: "according to the *hatt-i sherifs* of 1835 and 1838". These in fact were the *firmans* of 1835 and 1839. See R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, 291–295.

<sup>19</sup> This suggests that the document may be dated to the time of the Crimean War.

<sup>20</sup> See R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, 40–43. Three copies of this document have survived: AS, IGP, 862; V, 782; Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (hereafter ASANU), Belgrade, no. 14233/g.

aged the removal of Ottoman garrisons but also the demolition of the forts. According to it, the Principality would further enhance its autonomy by declaring void all agreements concluded by the Ottoman Empire if harmful to her autonomous status, by effecting minor territorial enlargement, by precluding the entry of foreign troops into her territory and by partially modifying the scope of the acquired rights, especially in relation to Ottoman Turkey.<sup>21</sup> Serbia was supposed to remain a tributary principality, but with a more complete and improved internal self-government. The question of the Porte's privilege to intervene as regards the Council members was not addressed, which left room for undermining the powers of self-government.

Garašanin's constitution draft was not made until after the Treaty of Paris was concluded in 1856. The draft had no title and was divided into three sections: 1) Political rights of the Principality of Serbia (11 articles); 2) Civil rights of Serbs (10 articles); 3) Central government (one article): a) On the authority of the Prince (19 articles); b) On the State Senate (19 articles); and c) On the Principality Council (8 articles). The draft consists of sixty-eight articles, is undiversified and quite conservative. The following articles of the first section deal with Serbia's relationship with Ottoman Turkey. — Serbia is a "Principality dependent on the Sublime Porte", paying an annual tribute of 2,400,000 grossi. — It enjoys "independent national self-government" reflected in the freedom of religion, law-making, trade and river faring, in accordance with the previously issued imperial decree. — The princely title is hereditary in the Karadjordjević family and based on the principle of primogeniture. Should the Prince be without male heirs, he can adopt a son from either male or female sides of the family. Only if even this option fails are the people allowed to elect another princely family. — Serbia has the right to have a representative in Constantinople and agents at "guaranteeing courts". With the Porte's assent, she can establish trading agencies in the Empire and beyond. — The Serbian Orthodox Church remains under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Ecumenical patriarch and is autonomously administered by the Metropolitan of Belgrade. — Serbs are free to trade and travel with their passports throughout the world. — Where there are no Serbian agents, Serbian merchants are represented by the Ottoman consul and, where there is no Ottoman consul, by the consul of a guarantor state [reference to the Treaty of Paris]. — Free use of the coat of arms and flag. — The Serbian government may post a "national guard" at the border on the Sava and Danube rivers, which will prevent "the enemy of the suzerain [Ottoman] court" from crossing into her

---

<sup>21</sup> Serbia had been granted a limited right to establish foreign relations even under the Constitution of 1838.

territory. — National Assembly will not convene except for the purpose of electing the ruling family.<sup>22</sup>

The outlined legal status of Serbia is considerably more reduced than the one envisaged in the previous document. Nonetheless, the draft fully conforms to the basic ideas of the Constitutionalist movement, as best evidenced by the article precluding the National Assembly's convening. Sessions of the National Assembly had not been provided for by the 1838 Constitution either, but Prince Miloš swiftly rectified the blunder by issuing in 1839 a decree providing for its regular convening in accordance with customary law.<sup>23</sup> There is no mention of resettling the Turkish population from Serbia or of some other points contained in the previous document. On the other hand, an attempt is observable to ensure the renewal of the right to the hereditary princely title and its transfer to the new ruling House of Karadjordjević. Whatever Garašanin's reference points in drawing up this draft were, his attitude towards the Porte was obviously moderate and cautious. It is difficult to see from the available documentary material whether Garašanin meant for this new constitution to be promulgated at home, with or without the knowledge of Constantinople, or "granted" to the people of Serbia by the Porte.

The next draft contained in Garašanin's archives, handwritten by Jovan Marinović, conceded to the Sublime Porte the privilege of granting a constitution to Serbia.<sup>24</sup> It is known that in late 1858 Marinović asked Garašanin for copies of the Council Organization Act and of the 1835 Constitution. Given that Marinović's draft, unlike Garašanin's, makes no mention of the Karadjordjevićs, it may be assumed that it was drawn up in 1859. Sending the requested copies, Garašanin wondered: "But then, is it possible to maintain a constitution which has already sustained so much damage that, judging by the current situation, it will only survive on paper? I have an opinion about that but dare not express it, and I am even more

---

<sup>22</sup> AS, IGP, 656, handwritten by I. Garašanin.

<sup>23</sup> R. Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, 186.

<sup>24</sup> It is more elaborate and contains ten sections: 1) Political rights of the Principality of Serbia; 2) Civil rights; 3) On the government of Serbia; 4) On the Prince; 5) On the State Council; 6) On the ministers; 7) On the Administrative Council; 8) On courts; 9) On administration; and 10) Conclusion, with a total of 92 articles. The title of the first section and most articles are the same as in the previous draft, which indicates the identical views of the two Serbian politicians and, possibly, their working together. The draft is kept in AS, IGP, 1682. For a reference to this draft as Garašanin's creation, see D. Popović "Garašaninov ustavni nacrt iz 1858. godine" [Garašanin's constitution draft of 1858], in *Ilija Garašanin 1812–1874*, ed. V. Stojančević (Belgrade: Naučni skupovi, vol. 54, Odeljenje istorijskih nauka, vol. 16, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1991), 167–178.

unwilling to express it as I hope that my role in these affairs of state will end soon.”<sup>25</sup> Garašanin’s predictions that Prince Miloš would not abide by the Constitution of 1838 — which is the main reason why he had been forced to give up the throne and leave Serbia in 1839 — soon proved justified. Miloš reassumed the throne in 1858 and Garašanin resigned soon afterwards, thus putting an end to his work on constitutional issues.

A short note of Garašanin’s on the constitutional issue might have been written at about that time. Similarly to what he wrote in the letter to Marinović quoted above, Garašanin had his doubts: “How can it be that the Porte imposes a constitution, which is the source of all laws in Serbia, when Serbia enjoys independent self-government? Turkey gives with one hand but snatches away with the other. Serbia will not be able to have a good legislature until she obviates that influence.” The following quotation is quite characteristic: “Both Russia and the Porte made a mistake by imposing this [1838] constitution on Serbia, but Serbia too made a mistake by accepting it, and it is now up to the Guarantor powers to rectify it.”<sup>26</sup>

Prior to St Andrew’s Day Assembly, which deposed Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević, Garašanin had actively worked towards dethroning the Prince, while defending other achievements of the Constitutionalist regime.<sup>27</sup> On his return to the throne in 1858, Prince Miloš rejected the “Turkish Constitution”, but he sent a delegation to Constantinople trying to ensure that Serbia could promulgate her constitution independently of the Sublime Porte. As the delegation failed, both he and his successor, Prince Mihailo, resorted to issuing separate laws, whereby the Constitution of 1838 was practically suppressed. In 1860 Prince Miloš raised the issue of succession to the throne at the Porte, an opportunity Garašanin used to draft a “confidential document” to revisit constitutional issues. According to him: “This Constitution is either completely derogated or, to put it mildly, it has been interpreted as the Prince and the people have believed to be for the better, in every respect contrary to the way it has heretofore been understood and interpreted. I am not a supporter of the Constitution as it is now.” He believed that neither the European powers nor the Serbian people would oppose changing it provided that the change was carried out in a way that would not be “defiant towards the Porte”; the old Constitution should be honoured until the required change was made; the Porte would defend the old Constitution because its suppression violated the Porte’s basic right in relation to Serbia; the Powers would be on the side of Ottomans, and

<sup>25</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću II*, 17.

<sup>26</sup> AS, IGP, 1153.

<sup>27</sup> S. Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila 1858–1868* [The Second Reign of Miloš and Mihailo 1858–1868] (Belgrade: Geca Kon, 1923), 6.

had the matter been handled differently, they now would be on the side of Serbia. "Someone might say that I, being so sceptical, have little faith in our rights," Garašanin stressed, but added that the only thing he was sceptical about was "our strength to carry it through". Believing that "law alone helps little in politics and a convoluted one not at all", Garašanin suggested reliance on the guarantor powers for resolving the whole issue.<sup>28</sup>

For a few years the constitutional issue seems to have remained outside the scope of Garašanin's interest. It was only the Constitution of 1869 that motivated him, already retired and aged, into writing "My Reflections", a text in which he took a critical look at this important document for Serbia's nineteenth-century statehood building. Garašanin made an overview of Serbia's entire constitutional development. The first thing he wanted to challenge was the appropriated right to promulgate a constitution: "It is not at all the merit of the Pentecost Assembly that the new constitution ended the Porte's privileges that the latter had included in the old constitution," but stressed that the Porte's privileges had already been effectively derogated by Prince Mihailo's laws of 1861. He recognized the merits of Prince Miloš in restoration of Serbia, but he also emphasized the benefits the Principality had gained from the "Turkish Constitution". Still, Garašanin dared point to its greatest weakness — a Council member's responsibility had to be proved at the Porte — and described it as "entirely unpopular". He admitted that it was on the grounds of that privilege that Edhem Pasha had been able to come to Serbia and save Stefan Tenka Stefanović, the instigator of a failed attempt to overthrow the Obrenović dynasty in 1857. After all, had the Prince not ousted him, Garašanin, from office at Russia's behest? Garašanin tried to find a justification for his own political party by stating that the Constitutionals had not requested that such a provision on Council members be included in the Constitution of 1838. The provision had been included in the Sultan's decree of 1830, which Prince Miloš had accepted without being denounced as traitor for that. Garašanin consciously chose not to mention the difference in the provisions on the responsibility of Council members between the two decrees. Besides, Prince Miloš had not been willing to establish the Council until Mileta's Rebellion (*Miletina buna*), not even according to the much more favourable provision contained in the Decree of 1830. Garašanin also took a look at the 1835 Constitution and emphasized that the Constitutionals had been instrumental in its promulgation, trying to prove that the 1835 Constitution had been suspended due to "certain" circumstances rather than due to the Constitutionals' "longing for a foreign constitution".<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> AS, IGP, 1133, dated February 1860.

<sup>29</sup> AS, IGP, 1702.

In his letter to Marinović dated August 1869 Garašanin repeated some of these views by criticizing the regents for being satisfied with form, while the content of the Constitution brought no novelty. However, the way the Constitution was adopted and presented to Ottoman Turkey was a significant step towards independence, and there is no doubt that it contained novelties: "The wellbeing of the people depends on those who govern, and progress could and can be achieved both ways, under the old and under the new constitution alike. Honest intention is the best constitution and no other form can compare with it." The way Garašanin treated Serbia's fundamental law on equal terms with "honest intentions" lacking tangible guarantees were obviously the views of an aging conservative bureaucrat.<sup>30</sup>

*The issue of hereditary succession*

Hereditary succession to the princely title was an important ingredient of the constitutional issue and played an important role in the legal relationship between the Principality of Serbia and the Ottoman Empire. What was Ilija Garašanin's stance towards the issue? He changed his stance at least twice in the course of his long political career. In the 1830s, as a young Constitutionalist and especially as a Council member and the highest ranking military official, he supported this significant accomplishment of Prince Miloš. When in 1839 the Porte changed its position and deprived the Obrenović family of hereditary right, the Constitutionalist complied with the decision of the suzerain court. They were unable to exert any influence on the Porte as regards the contents of the *berat* on succession issued to Milan, the oldest son of Prince Miloš.<sup>31</sup> However, at the moment the Porte showed willingness to recognize the right of hereditary succession to Prince Milan, the Constitutionalist, through their leaders Toma Vučić Perišić and Avram Petronijević, managed to persuade the Porte into limiting the right to his heir. Since Milan never married and had no children, the right expired with his death. This interpretation of the right of succession suited the Porte and was fully in accordance with the *Berat* of 1830. Under the *berats* issued to all succeeding princes (Milan and Mihailo Obrenović, Aleksandar Karadjordjević, and anew Miloš and Mihailo Obrenović during their second reigns), the princely title was non-hereditary. It should be noted that under the Constitution of 1838 the *Berat* of 1830 was kept in force, and thus the right of succession as stated therein.

<sup>30</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću II*, 256–257.

<sup>31</sup> Milan Obrenović was severely ill and died only a few weeks after being officially appointed prince in 1839. He was succeeded by his younger brother Mihailo (1839–1842).

Serbia's vulnerability stemming from her no longer being a hereditary principality was noticed by Polish émigrés as well.<sup>32</sup> Thus, Prince Adam Czartoryski's advice was that Serbia should regain hereditary right from the Porte, avoiding foreign mediation in the process. Czartoryski's suggestion was accepted and additionally underscored both by his representative in Belgrade, Franz Zach, and by Ilija Garašanin: "*But it must be represented and established as an essential and fundamental law of the state that the princely title is hereditary*" (emphasis R. LJ.). "Without this principle, through which unity becomes embodied in the dignity of the highest office, a permanent and stable union between Serbia and her Serbian neighbours cannot even be imagined." Garašanin only slightly, but essentially, modified Zach's project. Namely, Zach had in mind the Karadjordjević family as the hereditary dynasty. Garašanin's version, on the other hand, omitted this specification and extended the concept into a general principle. Having witnessed the frequent change of rulers, he deemed it best not to link the principle of hereditary succession to any particular dynasty.<sup>33</sup> Yet another fact is important in analyzing Garašanin's view on this issue. In the 1844 *Načertanije* he advocated Serbian support for autonomy to Bosnia, which would make it possible for Serbia and Bosnia to become "more closely associated". The autonomous rights thus obtained were not supposed to include the right of hereditary succession, as that could be an obstacle to a union between Serbia and Bosnia.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Zach wrote to Croatian leader Ljudevit Gaj in January 1844: "So we accept Serbia as a starting point, but Bosnia should act on her own; Serbia and Croatia should only give advice and moral support; Austrian intervention must be forestalled. Since Bosnia has to be assimilated into Serbia, Serbia being the centre for all Slavs to gather together one day, no new centre should be established in Bosnia, that is, a separate principality with a dynastic family should be avoided there. They should be content with a council headed by someone elected for a term of several years. Should succession be established there, there would be power struggle between two dynastic families, from Bosnia and from Serbia." See V. Žaček, "Češko i poljsko učešće u postanku 'Načertanija'" [Czech and Polish Roles in Creating the "Načertanije"], *Historijski zbornik XV/1-4* (1963), 43.

<sup>33</sup> This may support the assumption that Garašanin did not present Zach's *Plan* and his own *Načertanije* simultaneously to Prince Aleksandar as the Prince would have noticed the difference easily. In all probability Prince Aleksandar had no knowledge of Zach's *Plan*. Cf. D. Stranjaković, "Kako je postalo Garašaninovo 'Načertanije'" [The Origin of Garašanin's *Načertanije*], *Spomenik SAN XVI/87*, 106. See also D. Mackenzie, *Ilija Garašanin. Državnik i diplomata* (Belgrade: Prosveta 1982), 75. The original monograph was published in English: D. MacKenzie, *Ilija Garašanin. Balkan Bismarck* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

<sup>34</sup> Stranjaković, "Garašaninovo 'Načertanije'", 88. Prior to the influence of the Polish emigration, Garašanin's views on succession to the throne were quite different. Zach or Tschaikovsky referred to that in a letter to Czartoryski: "He hasn't fully grasped the sig-



Garašanin informed Prince Aleksandar about Czartoryski's *Counsels* in 1845. It was probably this that encouraged the Prince's friend and influential Council member, Stefan Petrović Knićanin, to raise the issue of succession to the throne of Aleksandar Karadjordjević, at first before the National Assembly and then at the Porte. Knićanin suggested the method used by Prince Miloš. Minister of the Interior at the time, Garašanin did not accept the suggestion: "Prince Miloš obtained hereditary right or, to be more precise, Serbia obtained it for her ruler, in a much better and firmer way than the one you suggest, and yet it was later lost in specific circumstances as if it had never been." Aware of the importance of this privilege, he added: "Without being confirmed by the Suzerain Court, hereditary succession ... would have no validity at all." A proposal submitted to the Porte through Avram Petronijević was rejected in early 1848, one of the stated reasons for the rejection being Garašanin's disapproval of it.<sup>35</sup> This shows that Garašanin was well aware of the importance of the right of hereditary succession for Serbia. This right, however, was hardly reconcilable with the Constitutionalists' pro-Ottoman policy pursued at the time, whose interest was a feeble ruler, such as the one bearing a non-hereditary title.

It was only once more that Garašanin took interest in the issue during the reign of Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević — in his already discussed constitution draft. Although the draft envisaged the Karadjordjevićs as hereditary dynasty, it appears obvious that the issue was of secondary importance to the Constitutionalists, and therefore to him. To clarify, the Constitutionalists sacrificed a state right to their political goals, the foremost being to strengthen the powers of the Council in relation to the ruler. It should be noted here that Jovan Ristić was aware of the divisions within the Constitutionalist leadership over the succession issue: Knićanin sided with Avram Petronijević, whereas Garašanin "objected, arguing that the best way for a prince to ensure succession for his offspring is to bring them up properly".<sup>36</sup> There seems to have been a direct link between this view of Garašanin's and the accusations that he harboured the ambition of becoming a prince himself.<sup>37</sup>

The succession issue became particularly important after the Obrenovićs reassumed the throne in 1858. In his capacity as Prime Min-

---

nificance of Slavs yet or the need [of Serbia] for a [hereditary] dynasty, but he is capable of figuring it out." In Mackenzie, *Garašanin*, 75.

<sup>35</sup> AS, IGP, 250, 255; *Prepiska*, 134–136; Ljušić, "Pitanje dinastije", 118–119.

<sup>36</sup> J. Ristić, *Spoljašnji odnošaji Srbije novijeg vremena 1848–1860* [Foreign Relations of Serbia in Recent Times 1848–1860] (Belgrade 1887), vol. I, 106–107.

<sup>37</sup> See D. Stranjaković, "Ilija Garašanin", unpublished biography, ASANU, 99–107; Mackenzie, *Garašanin*, 245 and *passim*.

ister (1861–1867) during the second reign of Prince Mihailo, Garašanin must have dealt with it, but there is little evidence in the surviving documentary material. In one of his letters to Marinović, Garašanin reported that the Prince wanted him “to discuss the issue of succession with you and to submit an opinion on what should be ordered and how”.<sup>38</sup> A law passed in 1859 ensured succession to the throne for the Obrenovići, whereby the formal aspect of the issue was resolved, and therefore this question was not raised at the Porte during Garašanin’s mission to Constantinople in 1861. In reality, however, the issue was irresolvable because Prince Mihailo had no offspring. Towards the end of Prince’s Mihailo reign Garašanin brought up the issue before the cabinet: “Serbia is intent on becoming the leader of a Yugoslav state in the east and on keeping that position for good.” He believed that the goal was unattainable “without a practically secured dynasty”, an issue that should be resolved promptly if Serbia intended to preserve the prestige she had acquired among the South Slavs. Garašanin believed, then, that a strengthened and firmly established dynasty meant better prospects for Serbia to accomplish “South-Slavic unification”.<sup>39</sup>

Never before in his political career had Garašanin been as resolute to resolve a problem as he was about the succession issue. But only two days after he divulged his proposal, and partly as a result of it, Garašanin was ousted as both Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. It should be noted that he deemed feeble and non-hereditary rulers more suitable for his political purposes than powerful and hereditary. At any rate, Garašanin’s attitude towards Serbian rulers remains a most controversial and little studied topic.<sup>40</sup>

### *Internal independence*

The constitutional and succession issues were closely linked to that of preservation of internal independence. In his capacity as long-time head of the Interior, Garašanin must have been concerned with this important issue. A threat to internal independence could come not only from Ottoman Turkey

---

<sup>38</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću II*, 116.

<sup>39</sup> AS, IGP, 1623; V. J. Vučković, *Politička akcija Srbije u južnoslovenskim pokrajinama Habsburške monarhije 1859–1874* [Political Actions of Serbia in the South-Slavic Provinces of the Habsburg Monarchy 1859–1874] (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1965), 317–319; Mackenzie, *Garašanin*, 433; G. Jakšić and V. J. Vučković, *Spoljna politika Srbije za vlade kneza Mihaila. Prvi balkanski savez* [Foreign Policy of Serbia during the Reign of Prince Mihailo. The First Balkan Alliance] (Belgrade: Istorijski institut, 1963), 430–436.

<sup>40</sup> See Stranjaković, “Ilija Garašanin”, 108–144.

but also from other states, most of all the Habsburg and Russian empires. He saw Austrian and Russian influences as potentially the most dangerous for Serbia's national autonomy. It was quite early in his career that he (in the *Načertanije* of 1844) put forward his assessment that Austria "will be a permanent enemy of a Serbian state". His refusal to accept an Austrian medal was in keeping with Serbia's foreign policy, and was meant to demonstrate that it was not the Habsburgs but the Serbian cause that he had supported during the 1848 revolutions.<sup>41</sup> Garašanin repeated many times in his correspondence that "Austria means to use her power to endanger the small and weak Serbia". Frustrated at Austria's repeated meddling in Serbia's internal affairs, carried out via the Austrian consul and the domestic pro-Austrian supporters, among whom he occasionally included Prince Aleksandar himself, Garašanin refused in 1854 to become engaged in state affairs just because "Austria has assented" thereto.<sup>42</sup> The Austrian influence on Serbia's affairs after the 1856 Treaty of Paris he saw as the greatest evil that could befall the Principality.<sup>43</sup>

While proving beneficial to Serbia's foreign affairs, Russian patronage stifled her internal independence; as if Russia sought to turn the Principality of Serbia into just another Russian province.<sup>44</sup> Garašanin particularly emphasized this point in the *Načertanije*: "The more autonomously Serbia is governed, the less confidence Russia will have in her." Russia would seek to change that and "to disparage Serbia's independent policy".<sup>45</sup> One of Garašanin's notes betrays his anger at Russia for not respecting the right of the Serbs to travel with "the Prince's passport", a right granted by the Sultan's Decree of 1830. Russian consuls were the only who took away the Prince's passports from Serbian travellers, even from distinguished politicians, replacing them with Russian ones, thereby violating a major right in the area of international relations.<sup>46</sup>

Although Garašanin was inclined to cooperation with Western Powers, he soon became disappointed with them as well. "One particular event made me never trust Russians, and I did not trust them and was right not to trust them. This now is enough to make me distrustful of others as well", he wrote to Marinović in June 1854 upon hearing the unconfirmed news

<sup>41</sup> S. Jovanović, "Spoljašnja politika Ilije Garašanina" [Foreign Policy of Ilija Garašanin], *Političke i pravne rasprave* [Political and Legal Treatises] (Belgrade 1932), vol. II, 347.

<sup>42</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću* I, 182, 192–193, 201, 227.

<sup>43</sup> Jovanović, "Spoljašnja politika", 349.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 345.

<sup>45</sup> Stranjaković, "Garašaninovo 'Načertanije'", 82–83.

<sup>46</sup> AS, IGP, 1401.

that a secret agreement between the Western Powers and the Ottomans had given the green light to Austria to enter Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Albania and Serbia. However, the final disappointment came after the Treaty of Paris. "Europe acts the same as Russians have been acting, but sometimes some good can come out of a great evil ... Thanks to Europe for acknowledging our achievements, it is nice and fair of her; she could just as well have taken away something", he wrote to Marinović sarcastically. Apparently, Garašanin had expected a more significant Western support for the strengthening of Serbian statehood in the Paris Treaty process. In an outline text analyzing the provisions of the Treaty, Garašanin reasserted his gratitude to Europe for taking upon herself to guarantee the acquired rights of the Principality of Serbia. He considered the statehood of Serbia as being the result of negotiations between the Serbian side and Ottoman Turkey and Russia. "These negotiations and agreements had, when necessary, been accompanied by arms until the present rights of the Serbian People were established." Few Serbian politicians had as serious reservations about the Treaty of Paris as he did.<sup>47</sup>

Garašanin emphasized that Serbia was not a "children's ball" for others to play with: "Serbia shall not obey the unconditional orders of any power, nor shall she acquiesce in anything under duress, because it would mean depriving her of all merit, and that would be understood here as a humiliation to the nation and could entail difficulties unprovoked by Serbia in any way." Should the Principality prove unable to resist pressure from the powers: "If there has to be a master to rule over Serbia, all Serbs favour [Ottoman] Turks and nobody else." In Garašanin's view, the politics aimed at defending Serbian statehood faced many a danger.<sup>48</sup>

During his long political career Garašanin was in a position to promote Serbian statehood by furthering internal self-government. At the beginning of the Constitutionalist regime he was convinced that Serbian citizens "believe they enjoy the best possible rights". In the revolutionary 1848, however, he suggested to Prince Aleksandar to act accordingly and launch a "more effective" policy towards the Porte. Without the Prince's knowledge, he began working towards the establishment of a Serbian vice-kingdom within the Ottoman Empire through the Serbian representative at Constantinople Konstantin Nikolajević. The Grand Vizier's criticism aimed later that year at the National Assembly's convening elicited his bitter response in a letter to Acika Nenadović: "We have found ourselves standing on thin ice more than once because of their [Ottoman] lame politics and we have had trouble getting rid of it; they should at least let us run our in-

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 1011; *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću I*, 215–217, 303–304.

<sup>48</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću I*, 118, 196, 203, 307.

ternal affairs the way we know best.” He took this move of the Porte as the greatest insult to Serbia, because it violated the ancient custom-based right to convene a popular assembly. Yet, Garašanin only stood up for this right in relation to Ottoman Turkey. Whenever this issue was not in the focus of Serbo-Ottoman relations, he ignored it completely. Before the National Assembly Act was passed in 1860, Garašanin stood up for the Assembly’s right to convene only twice (1848, 1858), on the two occasions the Assembly did convene.<sup>49</sup>

In the first phase of their regime the Constitutionals were unwilling to spoil relations with the Porte by raising the issue of Ottoman withdrawal from Serbia. They raised it only in 1846 by invoking the stipulations contained in the *hatt-i sherifs*. In the summer of 1848, they were expecting a favourable decision from the Porte and a new Sultan’s decree, planning to announce it at St Peter’s Day Assembly.<sup>50</sup> It was this issue that most burdened Serbo-Ottoman relations in the following years, and it was paid special attention during the second reigns of Prince Miloš (1858–1860) and Prince Mihailo (1860–1868), when it was Ilija Garašanin’s responsibility.

Until the end of the Constitutionalist period, there was no significant shift in Garašanin’s attitude towards the Porte as regards securing the Principality’s state rights. Serbia was granted yet another *hatt-i sherif* (1853), which simply confirmed the existing arrangement. Prince Miloš rejected it, as he occasionally did with legal acts that were to no betterment to the statehood of Serbia. Threatened by Austria the following year, the Constitutionals, Garašanin included, drew up a memorandum requesting protection from the Porte.<sup>51</sup>

Garašanin was generally opposed to any direct involvement of the Porte in Serbia’s internal affairs. In a letter to Marinović from Vienna (1853), he asked: “For God’s sake, what is Shekib Effendi doing down there again?” In Garašanin’s opinion, national rights were jeopardized whenever the Porte wanted to exercise its privileges inside Serbia.<sup>52</sup> A few years later, the Porte for the first time exercised the right it had under Article 17 of the “Turkish Constitution” to intervene in a conflict between the Council and the Prince. There is no evidence that Garašanin, who held the office of Minister of the Interior, was against the visit of an Ottoman pasha to Serbia. After all, Edhem Pasha was coming to the Constitutionals’ aid. In the

<sup>49</sup> The sessions of the Assembly that elected Aleksandar Karadjordjević Prince of Serbia have not been taken into account.

<sup>50</sup> Matica Srpska, Novi Sad, Rukopisno odeljenje [Department of Manuscripts], No. 25276; *Prepiska*, 35, 37, 98, 104, 133, 197, 372–374.

<sup>51</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću I*, 163, 167, 190, 245.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 139, 401.

eyes of many, the representatives of the Constitutionalist party, headed by Garašanin, did not take a very dignified stand. They received Edhem Pasha in front of the city walls with fezzes on their heads, and Garašanin kept the fez on while riding with the pasha about the town in the princely carriage. The guest was accommodated in the inn called "The Serbian Crown", but the signboard was removed. It made a bad impression on the younger generation who believed that the Treaty of Paris had strengthened Serbia's autonomous rights. Jovan Ristić pointed out: "These fezzes signal the political course for the Opposition better than any flag."<sup>53</sup>

The stand taken by the Constitutionlists may be justified by the necessity of resolving the conflict between the Prince and the Council, but their performance undoubtedly undermined Serbia's statehood. Garašanin must have been aware of that because it was as early as then that he suggested a change to the article of the 1839 Council Organization Act stipulating that a Council member could not be ousted without the Porte's knowledge. His suggestion was accepted. Not much later he defended, also before the Porte, the right of Serbia to convene a session of the National Assembly (the one held on St Andrew's Day). In doing so, however, he did not invoke the right that the Principality had been granted in 1839 in accordance with customary law, but claimed that the right had not been denied by the Constitution. Garašanin was instrumental in dethroning Prince Aleksandar Karadjordjević in 1858, but this time, in order to avoid further Ottoman involvement in Serbian affairs, he sought no aid from the Porte in the form of a *firman*.<sup>54</sup> Even so, the fact remains that Garašanin, guided by the current political agenda and obviously inconsistently with his *Načertanije*, handed the Serbian ruler over to the Ottoman garrison in the Belgrade fortress. When the Obrenović dynasty reassumed the throne in 1858, Serbia's policy towards the Porte completely changed. The Constitutionlists, as their representatives, had not ensured any additional privilege for Serbia, except for the patronage of the guarantor powers, and they had lost her right to the hereditary princely title.

It was not easy for Garašanin to cast off deeply rooted Constitutionalist ideas. When the Porte and Prince Miloš appointed a temporary government until the ruler's return to the country, he stood up against it as a violation of the people's privilege. He complained to Marinović that no one had ever considered Stevča Mihailović's acceptance of the office of *kaymakam* a major transgression, but had he, Garašanin, taken the office (and he was accused of harbouring such an ambition), everyone would have

---

<sup>53</sup> J. Ristić, *Spoljašnji odnošaji Srbije* [Foreign relations of Serbia] (Belgrade 1882), vol. I, 253–259.

<sup>54</sup> Stranjaković, "Ilija Garašanin", 89.

considered it a “major transgression”. Ottomans thought of him as their greatest foe, and he, in turn, named a “Turk” every person who should “violate Serbia’s rights”.<sup>55</sup> There was nothing left to Garašanin but to resign as Minister of the Interior.

Prince Mihailo knew how to put Garašanin’s political skills to a good use. Already in 1861 he entrusted him with a mission to Constantinople in order to resolve the issue of Ottoman withdrawal from Serbia. Garašanin tried to give the issue a more modern form. The instructions he received insisted on basing his position in negotiations on the clear stipulations of the Sultan’s Decree of 1830. The new way of enforcing this unexercised right was to be as follows: “The Turks in Serbia living out of towns would submit themselves to the Serbian authorities and would have equal rights and duties to Serbs,” while the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Empire would be limited to towns. According to this compromise solution, Serbia would give up resettling Turks from Serbia and the Porte would surrender control over the Ottoman-held part of Belgrade. Following his instructions, Garašanin submitted a memorandum to the Porte, and notified foreign representatives in Constantinople of its contents. The memorandum was written in a moderate tone.

Garašanin must have thoroughly studied both *hatt-i sherifs*. Some of his notes show how much effort he had put into finding the most appropriate solution to the problem. The Decree of 1830 was more favourable to Serbia than the one of 1833. Garašanin claimed that the unfavourable clauses of the latter should be contested on the grounds of the former being the result of an agreement between the Porte and the Serbian representatives. However, both decrees came as a result of the same process and in both cases Russia mediated, with the difference that in 1833 she supported a solution that was more favourable to the Ottoman side.

Garašanin was told by the Ottoman Grand Vizier and the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the Serbian proposal was moderate, but his mission failed nonetheless, and due to a number of reasons, to mention but the insufficient support of the Great Powers, the change on the throne and a freer approach of Belgrade’s press. Moreover, the Porte was unwilling to give up control over the fortress of Belgrade, and that was the most controversial point in negotiations, apart from the issue of compensation to the Muslim population who had already left Serbia and the issue of boroughs. In Garašanin’s opinion, previously made concessions had not helped resolve the problem.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>55</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinović II*, 1–2, 27–28, 31.

<sup>56</sup> AS, IGP, 1147, 1161, 1177, 1183, 1192, 1204, 1213; *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću II*, 87, 91; Jakšić and Vučković, *Spoljna politika*, 66–71.

The issue of Ottoman withdrawal from Serbia was addressed more resolutely after the bombardment of Belgrade in 1862. Garašanin was not satisfied with the resulting Kanlidja Conference Protocol (1862), as evidenced by the outline of a text preserved in his archives.<sup>57</sup> The Serbs insisted on the *hatt-i sherif* of 1830, the Ottomans on the one of 1833. Garašanin wrote about that in 1863: "And besides, Serbia has law on her side. The *hatt-i sherif* of 1830 proves it most clearly. If the Porte invokes a later decree, it just repeats its earlier injustice towards Serbia because it had no right to abolish an already acquired Serbian right without Serbia's consent, and since Serbia did not consent and she never will under any conditions or urging, the relevant clause of the *firman* can have no validity to Serbia."<sup>58</sup>

Such a resolute stance, taken not only by Garašanin but by Prince Mihailo as well, was bound to bear fruit. A Serbian representative in Constantinople, Jovan Ristić informed Garašanin about his talks with the British ambassador to the Porte (Bulwer), who suggested that the Prince should come to Constantinople, and promised him he would get everything except towns. Garašanin made a comment about the British diplomat's suggestion in a letter to Marinović: "Can this advice be taken as anything but derision? The Prince, having read the cable, laughed wholeheartedly and said in jest: 'Cable to Ristić that the Prince is ready to go to Constantinople any time and that he asks for nothing but the towns'." The shift in the Principality's stance on the issue is obvious. Serbia went a step further from her initial request for assuming legal authority over her Muslim population, and requested control over the towns, which was not envisaged under the *hatt-i sherif*. Ristić submitted an official document to the Porte and it was the first time that Serbia voiced an extension of her autonomous rights. By surrendering the Ottoman-held fortresses, the Porte was supposed, according to Garašanin, to repay Serbia a "debt of thirty odd years with no interest charged". This policy soon bore fruit and in 1867 the Ottoman garrisons withdrew from six towns they still held. According to the *firman*, the towns were entrusted to the Prince for safeguarding, and Ottoman suzerainty was represented by Ottoman flags flied next to Serbian.<sup>59</sup> That was the greatest success of Serbian diplomacy during the second reign of Prince Mihailo and Garašanin's last triumph. After Miloš's achievements in the 1830s, that was the most significant step towards re-establishing Serbia's statehood.

As Garašanin is known to have been "more a man of great ideas than of great deeds,"<sup>60</sup> his vision of a future Serbian state deserves a more elabo-

<sup>57</sup> AS, IGP, 1245.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 1163.

<sup>59</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću II*, 115, 147, 173, 190.

<sup>60</sup> Jovanović, "Spoljašnja politika", 352.



rate approach. That Ilija Garašanin showed a constant concern for the future and unification of the Serb nation is illustrated by his letter to Jovan Marinović of 21 May 1860: "I shall be concerned with the destiny of our areas as long as I live, you know that."<sup>61</sup> What were Garašanin's ideas for the future? The best evidence can be found in the *Načertanije*.

#### *Notions of the state in the Načertanije*

It is a fact that the Constitutionalists came to power showing a sympathetic attitude towards the Ottomans. Garašanin's pro-Ottoman stance is quite obvious at the time he drew up the *Načertanije*. The same year (1844) he wrote to Toma Vučić Perišić: "The present government is quite enthusiastic about the Porte."<sup>62</sup> Over time the sympathy faded. After all, it had stemmed from the Constitutionalists' political interest to depose the Obrenović dynasty and establish their regime rather than from a distinct political belief. Garašanin's *Načertanije*, then, appeared at a time the Constitutionalist regime had not yet been established firmly enough and Garašanin's sympathetic attitude may in fact be interpreted as a cover for his national strivings.

Garašanin wrote the *Načertanije*, a programme of Serbian national policy, while holding the office of Minister of the Interior, which is not an irrelevant fact. The *Načertanije* would probably not have been drawn up at all had it not been for the involvement in Serbian affairs of the Polish emigration. Preparing a conspiracy against Russia, Polish patriots, led by Prince Adam Czartoryski, reached the Principality of Serbia as well. The moment was right given that relations between the Constitutionalists and Russia were quite strained. Even so, Garašanin was reluctant to join the conspiracy and sought not to let Polish agents draw Serbia into an open conflict with Russia. Although quite young — he was thirty-two in 1844 — Garašanin was perceptive enough to realize that the adversary of his people was Ottoman Turkey rather than Russia. The Poles felt quite differently.

Ilija Garašanin's *Načertanije* has received varied interpretations in Serbian, Yugoslav and international historiography. Most of the time it has been seen either as a pro-Yugoslav — Dj. Jelenić, F. Šišić, D. Stranjaković, Lj. Aleksić, V. J. Vučković and V. Žaček, or as a pro-Greater Serbian project — J. D. Mitrović, P. Šimunić, M. Valentić, J. Šidak, V. Čubrilović, Ch. Jelavich, N. Stančić, P. Hehn, S. Murgić, D. Poll, O. Kronsteiner, W. Petrich,

<sup>61</sup> *Pisma Ilije Garašanina Jovanu Marinoviću* II, 64.

<sup>62</sup> *Prepiska Ilije Garašanina*, 104.

and D. Mackenzie.<sup>63</sup> Only R. Perović and J. Milićević see the *Načertanije* as a Serbian programme, though with “some Greater-Serbian elements”, as well as D. T. Bataković,<sup>64</sup> but without the latter remark. More recent work of Croatian and other foreign historians and politicians has added to the “Greater-Serbian” interpretation of the *Načertanije* by alleging that it was the source of the civil war in the former Yugoslavia, the purported cause of Serbian expansion and ethnic cleansing in the late twentieth century. Arguing for one interpretation of Garašanin’s *Načertanije* or another authors often disagree on many essential points, but not all are exclusive-minded. For example, Mackenzie claims that Garašanin was at once an advocate of Greater Serbia and “the spiritual father of the Yugoslavia of 1918”.<sup>65</sup> Characteristically, all but one Croatian historian interpret the *Načertanije* as a basis for an alleged Greater-Serbia policy, moreover, as a basis for Serbian

<sup>63</sup> See e.g., Dj. Jelenić, *Nova Srbija i Jugoslavija. Istorija nacionalnog oslobođenja i ujedinjenja Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca od Kočine krajine do Vidovdanskoj ustava (1788–1921)* (Belgrade 1923); F. Šišić, *Jugoslovenska misao* (Belgrade 1937); D. Stranjaković, *Jugoslovenski nacionalni i državni program Kneževine Srbije 1844* (Srem. Karlovci 1931); idem, “Garašaninovo ‘Načertanije’”; V. J. Vučković, “Knez Miloš i osnovna politička misao sadržana u Garašaninovom ‘Načertaniju’”, *Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo* I/3 (1954), 44–58; idem, “Prilog proučavanju postanka ‘Načertanija’ (1844) i ‘Osnovnih misli’ (1847)”, *Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo* VIII (1961), 49–79; Lj. Aleksić, “Šta je dovelo do stvaranja ‘Načertanija’”, *Historijski pregled* I/2 (1954); Žaček, “Češko i poljsko učešće”; J. D. Mitrović, “Dr. Dragoslav Stranjaković: Srbija od 1833 do 1858 god.”, *Glasnik Jugoslovenskog profesorskog društva* XIX (1938–39); P. Šimunić, *Načertanije: Tajni spis srbske nacionalne i vanjske politike* (Zagreb 1944); M. Valentić “Konceptija Garašaninovog ‘Načertanija’ (1844)”, *Historijski pregled* VII (1961); J. Šidak, “Hrvatsko pitanje u Habsburškoj monarhiji” I, *Historijski pregled* IX (1963); V. Čubrilović, *Istorija političke misli u Srbiji XIX veka* (Belgrade 1958); Ch. Jelavich, “Garašanin’s Načertanije und das grosserbsische Programm”, *Südostforschungen* XXVIII (1968); N. Stančić, “Problem ‘Načertanija’ Ilije Garašanina u našoj historiografiji”, *Historijski zbornik* XXII–XXIII (1968–69); P. Hehn, “The Origins of Modern pan-Serbism: The 1844 Načertanije of Ilija Garašanin”, *East European Quarterly* 2 (1975); S. Murgić, T. Bogdanić, S. Budimir, *Kontrapunkt slobodi. Kritika ‘Načertanija’ Ilije Garašanina* (Zagreb 1997); D. Poll, in *Die slawische Sprachen* 29 (1992), 55–156; O. Kronsteiner, “Die geheime Programmwurf Ilija Garašanins für eine serbische Politik”, *Die slawische Sprachen* 31 (1993), 39–89; W. Petrich, Karl Kaser, Robert Pichler, *Kosovo, Kosova, Myten, Daten, Fakten* (Klagenfurt, Vienna, Ljubljana, Tuzla, Sarajevo 1999); Mackenzie, *Garašanin*, passim.

<sup>64</sup> J. Milićević, in *Istorija srpskog naroda* V–1 (Belgrade: SKZ, 1981), 269–273; R. Perović, “Oko ‘Načertanija’ iz 1844. godine”, *Istorijski glasnik* I (1963); D. T. Bataković, “Načertanije: baština ili hipoteza”, preface to *Načertanije Ilije Garašanina*, ed. M. Josić-Višnjic (Belgrade 1991) and idem, in *Nova istorija srpskog naroda* (Belgrade 2000). Cf. also D. T. Bataković, “Ilija Garašanin’s Načertanije: A Reassessment”, *Balkanica* XXV–1 (Belgrade 1994), 157–183.

<sup>65</sup> Mackenzie, *Garašanin*, 83.

expansionism in the last decade of the twentieth century. There also are historians who have not attempted to define what the main objective of the *Načertanije* was (Vladimir Ćorović, Vasilj Popović, Milorad Ekmečić).<sup>66</sup> Indicatively, between the two world wars the *Načertanije* was seen as a Yugoslav project and after the Second World War it has been increasingly seen as Greater-Serbian and invasive. Historiography has obviously been under the sway of shifting politics, notably during the civil war in the former Yugoslavia. Of course, this does not go for all researchers, especially not foreign, but it is a fact that most have been unable to detach themselves from the political needs of the regimes in power. The age-old Austro-Hungarian claim that the Principality, and later Kingdom, of Serbia pursued a Greater-Serbia policy, a claim subsequently adopted by the Comintern — though, of course, in a changed, interwar, setting — has been influencing historical thinking about Garašanin's *Načertanije* until this day.

In analyzing the *Načertanije* it is important to determine what kind of a Serbian state Garašanin envisaged, and to identify what elements of this at once disputed and praised document may be described as Serbian, Greater-Serbian and Yugoslav.

The *Načertanije* was preceded by two documents: Czartoryski's *Counsels* and Zach's *Plan*. The *Načertanije* was an elaborate draft of Serbian national policy. It consists of an introductory part and two chapters: "Politics of Serbia" and "On the means to achieve the Serbian cause" (divided into five subchapters). The introduction and the first chapter are the core of the document as they contain Garašanin's ideas on a future Serbian state. The rest of the document offers guidelines for Serbian propaganda policy.

Garašanin's motivation was that Serbia needed "*a plan for her future*" (emphasis R. Lj.), that is that she needed to set her foreign policy on a course that should be pursued "over a longer period". As Garašanin set no deadline for the realization of the goal, it remains uncertain what his estimations were. Given that he envisaged preparations for accomplishing the goal to unfold "while Serbia is under Turkish rule", it may be assumed that he did not expect its realization until the cessation of Serbia's vassal status at the earliest. Whatever his expectations may have been, he insisted that faith in the future had to be kept. It was only four years after Garašanin's death that the Principality became fully independent (1878), but that country was nowhere near his vision.

---

<sup>66</sup> V. Ćorović, *Istorija Jugoslavije* (Belgrade 1933) and *Istorija Srba* (Belgrade 1992); V. Popović, *Politika Francuske i Austrije na Balkanu u vreme Napoleona III* (Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija 1923) and *Evropa i srpsko pitanje u periodu oslobodjenja 1804–1918* (Belgrade: Geca Kon 1940); M. Ekmečić, *Stvaranje Jugoslavije 1790–1918*, vol. I (Belgrade: Prosveta 1989).

Garašanin's starting point in creating his foreign policy strategy was the fact that Serbia was a small country and that it was dependent on Ottoman Turkey. Such a position of Serbia directed her foreign policy towards the idea of expanding her territory by "*embracing all Serbian peoples that surround her*" (emphasis R. Lj.). Unless she expanded by unifying the Serbian nation, Garašanin believed, Serbia as it was would have no future and the first European storm would push it onto a rock and it would break as a derelict boat.

The title of the first chapter of the *Načertanije* is subtitled "Remarks on the partitioning of the [Ottoman] Empire". It contains two important points — an assumption about the imminent collapse of Ottoman Turkey and the restoration of the Serbian state. Garašanin believed that the Ottoman Empire would inevitably disintegrate, and with either of two outcomes: it would be partitioned between Austria and Russia, or Christian states would be established in its former territory. It hardly seemed likely to him that the two interested powers would allow a "Christian empire" to be built on the ruins of the Ottoman one, but the Western Powers might support such an outcome. This seems to be a general and simplified framework for the fate of Ottoman Turkey in which Garašanin was seeking the space for a future Serbian state.

The core of Ilija Garašanin's *Načertanije* relates to establishing a new Serbian state "in the south". What state did he have in mind? He did not specify its territory, but it can be identified. Its core area was supposed to be the *Principality of Serbia*, subsequently united with *Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro* and *Old Serbia (Northern Albania* in his text); in other words, the predominantly Serb-inhabited areas of the Ottoman Empire. Such a state, in his view, not only had "its basis and firm foundations in the Serbian Empire" of the fourteenth century but also in a more remote glorious past. The Principality of Serbia was entitled to invoke its historic rights and come before Europe as the rightful heir to "our great fathers, doing nothing more than restoring its patrimony". This idea, that "the Serbian people, its nationality and statehood are protected under the aegis of the sacred historic right", required a link to the past. The Serbian people, he believed, had good roots, whose branches were cut off by the Turks, but the roots survived and would send forth a new blossom of Serbian statehood. Some of the great European powers — he dared not specify which — envisaging a great future for Serbia was one more reason why the Principality should not remain within its current borders as that would kill the seed of a modern Serbian empire.

The second part of the *Načertanije* is concerned with the accomplishment of the goal set in the first. Modern Serbia as envisaged by Garašanin was supposed to be restored on the grounds of historic legitimacy. What

Garašanin wanted to demonstrate by invoking historic rights was that the Serbs were not asking for anything new or unfounded, that they only claimed what once had been theirs, and without resorting to a coup or a revolution. What means did Garašanin propose to terminate a declining empire and build a new one in its European part? “To put it briefly — Serbia must seek to chip away at the edifice of the Turkish state, *stone by stone*, in order to use this good material to rebuild *a new great Serbian state* upon the good old foundations of the ancient Serbian empire” (emphasis R. Lj.). Garašanin obviously was cautious and his idea of how to unite Serb-inhabited lands obviously was conservative. On the other hand, he made no reference to the results of the Serbian revolution. There are only two indirect references to the revolution as an event that could play a role in the collapse of the Ottoman Empire: his remark that the restoration of Serbia’s statehood made a “fortunate start”, and his statement that only Serbs of all South Slavs “fought for their freedom with their own resources and strength”. As many other nineteenth-century Serbian politicians, he was unaware that the modern Serbian state originated from revolution. A revolutionary state, such as the Principality of Serbia had been at its founding, and the restoration of Stefan Dušan’s Empire on the grounds of historic right, were two completely irreconcilable concepts. It is difficult to conclude whether Garašanin took both options into account; if he did, he eventually gave precedence to Dušan’s Empire over the revolutionary Serbia of Karageorge and Miloš. Such a choice of his was influenced by the conservative Poles and his own pro-Ottoman stance. A plan such as he drew up could hardly have originated at the time of Karageorge or Prince Miloš. One of the probable reasons why it could come into being in the Constitutionalist age is the fact that the influence of the revolution was fading as was the memory of the uprisings in which Garašanin’s own father had taken part. The existing political circumstances, the Constitutionalist regime’s pro-Ottoman stance in particular, the suggestions of the Polish emigration and the living tradition of the medieval empire, provided powerful enough reference points for Garašanin to embrace the idea of founding the claim to restoring statehood on the historic right.

In the second and much more extensive part of the *Načertanije*, Garašanin set guidelines for national propaganda in South-Slavic areas. He handled the matter so efficiently that it alone would suffice to secure him a prominent place in Serbian history. Propaganda was to be organized on the territories of both empires, Ottoman and Habsburg, and in the following provinces: Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, Old Serbia, Slavonia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Srem, Banat, Bačka, and Bulgaria (Bulgaria was omitted in this part of the text but was given a special sub-chapter later on). One of the tasks of agents of the Serbian government in these areas would be to

find out “what the people expect from Serbia”. His proposal to the heavily enslaved Bulgarians was Serbia’s support in the field of education for students and priests, book printing and *liberation*. It is important to emphasize that Garašanin was advocating freedom for Bulgaria, not her union with Serbia. He then described in detail what propaganda actions should be undertaken in the areas that were supposed to unite with the Principality of Serbia (Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Old Serbia). It should be noted that Garašanin envisaged the policy of opening Serbia’s borders to the enslaved co-nationals, as well as the freedom of religion, education and autonomous rights for all immigrants. In his view, an important factor in achieving union (*sojuz*) was a Serbian dynasty. He showed his farsightedness by accepting Czartoryski and Zach’s concept of hereditary princely title but, unlike them, without linking it to any particular Serbian dynasty. Garašanin obviously gave precedence to Serbian unification over dynastic rivalries. Garašanin believed that a new trade road between Belgrade and Ulcinj (Dulcigno) on Adriatic coast would economically tie Serb-inhabited areas more firmly together.

The propaganda effort discussed in the *Načertanije* did not include Croatia, while Srem, the Banat and Bačka were just cursorily mentioned. Garašanin devoted only a few words to “union with the Czech Slavs”, but described it as “impractical” and thus ended his text without adding any particular conclusion.

The analysis of the document clearly shows that Ilija Garašanin was drafting a future *Serbian state*. That state was supposed to comprise the Principality of Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and North Albania (*Old Serbia*). It was supposed to be a monarchy with the prospect of becoming an empire under certain historical circumstances. Stefan Dušan’s medieval empire would be renewed, then, but this new empire would be different in territorial terms.

The second part of the *Načertanije* is somewhat confusing. Garašanin referred to Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia as areas where Serbian propaganda should also be conducted, but did not elaborate it anywhere in the text. He had omitted that portion of Zach’s *Plan* and kept the subchapters relating to the Serbs in Southern Hungary, Bulgarians, Czechs and Slovaks. Although he did not specify it, it may be assumed that those areas were also meant to be united with Serbia under favourable historical circumstances. Otherwise it would be impossible to explain the reason for undertaking the propaganda effort in those provinces.

The first step, then, was supposed to be the unification of the Serbs in Ottoman Turkey, followed by the Serbs in Habsburg-held Southern Hungary. The state thus created would still be a Serbian state. Through union with Croatia-Slavonia and Dalmatia it would lose its Serbian distinctiveness

and gain a South-Slavic (Yugoslav) one instead. Should Bulgaria join in as well, it would truly become a South-Slavic state. (It was of lesser importance whether Croatia or Bulgaria would unite with Serbia first.) This second step in the unification process was not Garašanin's explicitly expressed option, but it cannot be ruled out. What may be taken as certain is that he had plans for a new Serbian state, leaving room for a South-Slavic one (Serbian-Croatian-Bulgarian). Garašanin was clear and specific about the former, and imprecise and vague about the latter. The first state was something that the Serbs had to fight for and win if they wanted to survive; the second was a matter of favourable political circumstances. In any case, with its focus on the unification of the Serbs in the Ottoman Empire, Garašanin's *Načertanije* was a programme of Serbian national and state politics. Once achieved, it would be followed by union with the Serbs in Austria, Croats and Bulgarians. A South-Slavic state, if it were created, would also be the result of Serbia's foreign policy means and goals.

Should the plan of Serbia's national policy be termed Serbian or Greater-Serbian, in other words, did Garašanin advocate the creation of Serbia or Greater Serbia? It has been established long ago that Garašanin changed some terms contained in Zach's *Plan*. Thus the words Slavic, South-Slavic and South Slavs were replaced with Christian, Serbian and Serbs respectively. Here are some examples, the first being from Zach's *Plan*, the second from Garašanin's *Načertanije*: "to other South Slavs"—"to other surrounding peoples" (twice); "Slavic politics of Serbia"—"politics of Serbia"; "an independent and self-reliant Slavic state"—"an independent Christian state"; "a new South-Slavic, Serbian state"—"a new Serbian state in the south"; "On the means to achieve the unification of all South Slavs"—"On the means to achieve the Serbian cause"; "to build a great new Slavic state"—"to build a great new Serbian state"; "to the South Slavs"—"to this people". This shows that not even Zach had a perfectly clear idea about the things he wrote about: his thinking sways between a Slavic and a South-Slavic state. At one point he stated that Serbia should pursue a "*South-Slavic*" policy, and at another that a "Slavic empire" should arise from Ottoman Turkey. This deserves attention because the Czech-born Polish agent Franz Zach devoted an entire subchapter to an "association with Czech Slavs". It may be assumed therefore that Zach advocated the idea of a South-Slavic state which would need to show consideration for other Slavs as well, primarily Czechs and Slovaks, who would then join an unspecified association. Relevant historiography research has confirmed that Zach's ambitious *Plan* was quite unrealistic for the vassal Principality of Serbia to achieve. Well-aware of that, Garašanin made modifications to it, quite often by changing a single word, but effecting essential change.

It has been shown that what Garašanin opted for was a united Serbian state. He used the attribute "great" only once and not even then in a Greater-Serbia context but in the context of "a great new Serbian state" to be rebuilt on the foundations of the medieval Nemanjić Empire. Rather than that, what might support the interpretation of his programme as Greater Serbian is his emphasis on the future state as an empire and, partly, his reference to Stefan Dušan's Empire. The modern Serbia as Garašanin saw it was supposed to encompass other peoples as well. In his times, however, these ethnic groups were still far from having well-developed identities as modern nations. The question may be posed as to whether this state created by the unification of Serbs would have been achievable at all without having other ethnic groups within its borders. Should such a state be qualified as "Greater Serbian", especially in the light of the fact that the majority of Serbs living inside the Habsburg Monarchy were supposed to remain outside its borders? A state that could rightfully be termed "Greater Serbia" (and the policy of the Principality of Serbia as "Great Serbian") would have had to encompass a vast majority of the Serbs, both from Ottoman Turkey and from Habsburg Austria, as well as the minorities who lived amongst them. A Serbia comprising all Serb-inhabited areas in Ottoman Turkey cannot be described simply as Greater Serbia. Consequently, Garašanin's programme should be defined as Serbian rather than purported Greater Serbian.

According to Garašanin, a state encompassing the Serbs from Turkey-in-Europe was to be the first phase in uniting the Serb nation. The second phase was to include the Serbs from Austria (Habsburg Monarchy), but he neither elaborated it nor set a time limit. Garašanin was aware that such a union would entail the inclusion of other peoples and that such a state would not be entirely Serbian. In order to achieve unification with Serbs from Austria, he was willing to allow for *a big step from a Serbian to a South-Slavic state* precisely because such a state would include Croats as well. Rather than proposing a Greater Serbia, Garašanin was thinking of a new "South Slavia" that would encompass Serbs, Bulgarians and Croats. Moreover, Garašanin was willing to sacrifice a freshly restored Serbia to a future South-Slavic union of Serbs, Croats and Bulgarians. Should more be expected from a young Serbian statesman, especially when we know that statehood ideas were still in their initial phase among both Croats and Bulgarians?

Garašanin's foreign policy strategy set two objectives: 1) unification of the Serbs from the Ottoman Empire into an independent Serbia; 2) unification with the Serbs from the Habsburg Empire, along with the Croats, and with the Bulgarians from Ottoman Turkey, into a larger South-Slavic



(i.e. Serbian-Croatian-Bulgarian) state. Garašanin gave precedence to the first objective and thought of the second as an untimely possibility.

Garašanin's *Načertanije* has been assessed as more realistic than Zach's *Plan*. One can pose the question as to how realistic it really was. Garašanin based his plans on the impending dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. As it turned out, however, his belief that "Turkish power is broken and destroyed" was rash. The mid-nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire was still a resilient power. Where his predictions proved to be nearer to reality was the case of Austria, which, in his view, "will be a permanent enemy of a Serbian state". Garašanin went far beyond the Polish emigration and their Czech representative in Belgrade, F. Zach, when he modified their stance on relations between Russia and the South Slavs, notably Serbs. His position was quite unambiguous: "There is no easier way for Serbia to achieve her cause than in accord with Russia." He took a step further by claiming that it was in the interest of the Western Powers, as a result of their rivalries with Russia and Austria, to support the establishment of a new independent state in the Balkans. This is not to say that Garašanin meant to ally with France or England, rather that he left his options open for asking for their support to the state-building process in the future. Prince Miloš, though only briefly (1837–1839), had also relied on the Western Powers for support, which cost him the throne. Fully aware of that fact Garašanin chose to proceed with caution.

Garašanin obviously articulated demands that were feasible at some point in the future. Yet, the unification of the Serbs followed a different path from the one defined by the *Načertanije*: 1) Modern Serbia was not re-established on historic rights grounds nor was it further built upon them; 2) The further state-building process, in terms of both unification and independence, was not based on the renewal of Stefan Dušan's Empire, an idea taken into account before Garašanin both by Kargeorge and by Miloš; 3) Serbia, independent since 1878 and enlarged as a result of the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, did not reach the territorial extent envisaged by the *Načertanije*; 4) the Yugoslav state created in 1918 did not coincide with Garašanin's "South Slavia"; it was the common state of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, while Garašanin had had in mind a union of Serbs, Croats and Bulgarians.

It appears therefore that Garašanin's ideas did not materialize. Historical circumstances tied the Serbs, and other South-Slavic nations, into a different union from the one envisaged by the *Načertanije*. Garašanin's contemporary critics denounce his path to Serbian unification. His expressions such as "to adjoin", "to annex", "to chip off", however, form part of the typical wording of the period, but he obviously did not eschew a different option either. That option explicitly referred to Bosnia, but did not exclude

other provinces. Serbia was supposed to support the autonomous rights for Bosnia upon which Bosnia “could associate with Serbia more closely”. For that reason he, quite foresightedly, believed that the obtainment of the right of hereditary succession for Serbia should be delayed until after this association materialized seeing it as a potential obstacle. He also emphasized that the upbringing of the young people in Turkey should imbue them with the “*life-saving idea of all-embracing union and progress*” (emphasis R. Lj.). As such a position is not contained in Zach’s *Plan*, it seems reasonable to assume that Garašanin did not favour the simple act of annexation through military force over peaceful unification through association.

Garašanin’s *Načertanije* was a secret document, and it remained unknown to European politicians until the late nineteenth century and to the Serbian public until the early twentieth century. Little is known about the extent to which the successive Serbian rulers were informed of its contents, even less about what their stance as regards its central ideas might have been. Many unknowns surround this document. It is unknown which Serbian politicians were acquainted with its contents, and it remained hidden for too long to be able to influence a wider public. It may be said, therefore, that the overall influence of the *Načertanije* was not significant, moreover, that Ilija Garašanin was practically the only political actor who pursued the agenda proposed in this plan. That line of his political activity was quite significant, especially in 1848/49 and in 1861–1867. In a way, the second part of the *Načertanije* may be said to have been more effective than the first, given that the guidelines for the Principality of Serbia’s propaganda effort among the South Slavs laid out in it were put into practice. Garašanin’s *Načertanije* was not a conservative document, although some conservative ideas, such as the historic rights concept, ran through it. Nor was it revolutionary. What seems to be its closest definition is that the *Načertanije* was a modern programme of Serbian foreign policy whose main goal was the creation of a Serbian state first, and then of a South Slavic one. The fact that the *Načertanije* was the first articulation of nineteenth-century Serbia’s foreign policy and that Garašanin was the first to become aware that such an articulation was needed should be taken into account in assessing the significance of his role for the Serbs and South Slavs.<sup>67</sup>

Four years after the *Načertanije* was drafted Garašanin got the opportunity to start working along its lines. The revolutions of 1848–1849 created a propitious setting. Garašanin’s attention was focused on the Serbian and South-Slavic communities in the Ottoman and Habsburg empires alike. The Austrian Serbs got involved in the European revolution, while their co-nationals in Ottoman Turkey were suffering under much worse econom-

---

<sup>67</sup> All quotations from Stranjaković, “Garašaninovo ‘Načertanije’”.

ic and political conditions. That situation strongly influenced Garašanin's stance on supporting the Serbs in both empires. He backed the Habsburg Serbs in Southern Hungary in establishing an autonomous Serbian Duchy (*Srbska Vojvodina*, *Vojvodstvo Srbije* or, abbreviated, *Vojvodina*), and continued diplomatic efforts for an autonomous province for the Serbs in Ottoman Turkey.

The idea of a Serbian vice-kingdom, a brainchild of the Serbian representative in Constantinople Konstantin Nikolajević, arose at an early stage of the 1848 Revolution. Nikolajević and Jovan Marinović, the latter serving as an informal Serbian representative in Paris at the time, kept warning Garašanin that Serbia could not afford to stay away from the revolutionary movements in Europe because “she might die from inactivity”.<sup>68</sup> In mid-March 1848, Nikolajević drew up “a political draft ... just to kill loneliness”: “Although I haven't had the time to do it a little better, I am taking the liberty of submitting it to you [Garašanin] for consideration, if nothing else than as a theory to think about now that all of a sudden many a theory is being put into practice.”<sup>69</sup> In his letter of 7 May, Nikolajević expressed his belief that the developments in Europe “give us hope that we shall be able to restore our fatherland”.<sup>70</sup> Garašanin gave his opinion about Nikolajević's idea in his letter of 22 May: “We all like your ideas for the Slavs in Turkey very much and it seems to us that it is only through such a policy and its successful outcome that our fatherland can be honoured and the old glory of the Serbian people restored, but we now need to work on it diligently and only from here, and in a way chosen as the most appropriate for it.” He complained that the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Avram Petronijević, “has neither the energy nor the ways needed for overseeing such a serious effort”, but nevertheless instructed Nikolajević to find a way for his ideas to reach the Porte without being taken as an official proposal of the Serbian government: “Think it through carefully, talk it over with your friends if you find it fit, and then take a step, with reasonable caution, of course, so that we might at least find out where we stand with the Porte ... Besides, and above all, keep me posted about your ideas on the matter, and I shall be able to put them to good use. I have to make yet another remark here — on her own, without the Porte, Serbia can hardly put this policy through.” Serbia was peaceful, Garašanin added, but there was a vague sense of discontent over the government's passive attitude towards the compatriots in Ottoman

---

<sup>68</sup> AS, IGP, 340.

<sup>69</sup> A draft of a Serbian vice-kingdom was enclosed with his letter of 24 March: AS, IGP, 350.

<sup>70</sup> Archives of the Historical Institute, Belgrade (hereafter: AII), Konstantin Nikolajević Fund (KNF), V/5.

Turkey. He ended the letter with a promise that he would send Nikolajević "some drafts [of his] relating to the Porte and the Christian population in Turkey".<sup>71</sup>

In the spring and summer of 1848, the exchange of letters between Garašanin and Nikolajević intensified. In a letter dated 5 June, Garašanin discussed the political situation in the Ottoman Empire in detail, stating his belief that the Porte was about to face "a great danger" which could only be removed if its "Christian peoples were granted the rights that match today's mores and outlooks"; that the Porte's simple *firman*s were no longer enough to deceive its peoples; that the Slavs across the Sava and Danube rivers [in Habsburg Monarchy] were "on the threshold of a beautiful future", and that therefore the Porte should promptly make concessions in order to win over its Christian subjects. "Your project seems to be our only hope; anything else is just a stopgap and of no use. With that, we would be safe from any storm that might befall us, but can we hope for that?" He emphasized again that the proposal should reach the Porte in a roundabout way, through "friends". Garašanin enclosed with this letter a project drawn up by Jovan Marinović, suggesting that it also should "be proposed to the Porte indirectly, not so much in order that it may be accepted, as it would not be very helpful right now, but rather in order not to let the Porte think that, just because we keep quiet and make no proposals, we are engaged in something more important".

Garašanin did not fail to take a look at the position of Serbia in the context of the events unfolding in Europe. Insisting that Serbia should think of her future, especially in the light of "this battle fought by kindred peoples", he stated that she should neither hesitate nor expect charity. "It is unbecoming to the spirit of the Serbian people and to the memory of their former historical life to accept charity extended by others out of mercy." Serbia should "define her role", especially as regards her union with other South Slavs. "Serbia does not find a perfect guarantee of her nationality in a union of all [South] Slavs, but, if there is no other way, she will have to accept it, and many thus-minded spirits have already been arising among the people."<sup>72</sup>

In a letter dated 3 July, Nikolajević informed Garašanin about having been told by "a friend" that the vice-kingdom project "would find its way to the Sultan".<sup>73</sup> Even though this "friend", either an Ottoman official or one of the Polish émigrés in Constantinople, failed to accomplish the

---

<sup>71</sup> AII, KNF, I/17.

<sup>72</sup> AII, KNF, I/17. A larger part of this letter was published in J. Miličević, "O Bosni" [On Bosnia], *Istorijski glasnik* 1 (1973), 102–105.

<sup>73</sup> Miličević, "O Bosni", 109.

mission, Garašanin did not throw in the towel. Well-aware of the widespread discontent over the government's inactivity, on 14 September he addressed a letter to Prince Aleksandar: "The Porte knows what we are after ... and we shall never give it up".<sup>74</sup> On 9 October, Nikolajević finally informed Garašanin that things were going from bad to worse, and that they "should not count on the Porte in any way anymore, or practically on anyone else".<sup>75</sup> Thus the diplomatic effort of Nikolajević and Garašanin towards creating a Serbian vice-kingdom ended with no tangible result. The correspondence between Garašanin and Nikolajević reveals that there were in fact two different projects: Nikolajević's project for a Serbian vice-kingdom and Marinović's project of civil reforms in Turkey-in-Europe. Marinović's project, which Garašanin forwarded to Nikolajević on 5 June, consisted of a lengthy introduction and only two points, suggesting reforms that would improve the position of the Christians in Turkey by granting them the right to elect their own local (*nahiye*) administrators (*oborknez*) who then would be confirmed by the Ottomans. Marinović also suggested some improvements to the church organization, primarily the appointment of Serbs instead of Greeks as bishops and metropolitans.<sup>76</sup>

What were the central ideas of Nikolajević's memorandum? Convinced that the Empire's half-measures gave it no prospect of pulling out of the crisis, he suggested the following: 1) Serbia's union with Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Upper Albania (i.e. Old Serbia); 2) Together they constitute "a Serbian state" within Ottoman Turkey; 3) That state has its "ruler and independent internal administration", while the Porte remains the suzerain power; 4) The united provinces enjoy the same political rights as those currently enjoyed by the Principality of Serbia; 5) The new state enacts the constitution and laws without interference from the Porte or any other power; 6) It has the right to establish its own army to defend its borders but also the borders of the Ottoman Empire; 7) The Serbian and Turkish states within the Ottoman Empire each meets the costs of its "internal and independent administration" from its own revenues. Only tariff revenues go to the Sultan; 8) The "Serbian united states" have a diplomatic office in Constantinople through which the Serbian ruler maintains contact with the Sultan; 9) Turkey cannot conclude any agreement with a foreign power without the consent of the Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople except when "the necessity forces the Sultan to do so

<sup>74</sup> AII, KNF, L/17; *Prepiska*, 286.

<sup>75</sup> Miličević, "O Bosni", 109.

<sup>76</sup> R. Ljušić, "Marinovićev memoar o hrišćanima u Turskom carstvu iz 1848. godine" [Marinović's Memorandum of 1848 on Christians in the Ottoman Empire], *Istorijski glasnik* 1-2 (1976), 161-170.

to save his states from peril"; 10) Muslims and Orthodox Christians have equal rights in the Serbian united states; 11) Religious freedom for both Orthodox and Muslims, the latter being under the spiritual jurisdiction of Turkey; 12) the Bulgarians that remain in the Turkish state become equal to the Muslims; 13) They become entitled to enter public service; 14) Trade is free within "both united states in the Ottoman Empire". No tariffs are paid on their common border except duties on transit goods; 15) The Serbian state has the right to open consulates in Turkey and foreign countries, and their jurisdiction must not be political, only commercial.<sup>77</sup>

The underlying idea of the memorandum was that of restructuring the Ottoman Empire into a dual monarchy. The Empire was supposed to consist of two states — "Asian Turkey" and "Serbian United States" — each with its own ruler, government, administration and territory. Foreign policy was the only area where the Serbian United States was to have limited independence. The draft was imprecise in many points, but obviously the two states within the Ottoman Empire were not to be completely equal, the Turkish state remaining the "suzerain power", and, accordingly, the Sultan remaining the nominal head of the Empire, in other words, of both states. The document's many ambiguities make it difficult to infer exactly what the legal position of the new Serbian state was supposed to be. Undoubtedly, it would have been more favourable than the vassal position of the Principality of Serbia.

The plan was obviously unrealistic, especially given that the powers that were supposed to make it happen did not have the strength. Ottoman

---

<sup>77</sup> AS, IGP, 227, 465; published in M. Ekmečić, "Garašanin, Čartoriski i Mađari 1848–1849. godine" [Garašanin, Czartoryski and Hungarians 1848–1849], *Srpsko-mađarski odnosi i saradnja 1848–1867*, ed. V. Krestić (Belgrade: Naučni skupovi, vol. 34. Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1987), 29–31. D. Stranjaković, who was the first to point to this plan in his paper "The first political agreement between Serbs and Croats in 1860" (published in Belgrade in 1941, but only partially due to the breakout of the war), either had a different version of the plan or a different plan. Since he did not publish it as a whole, we are unable to discuss the differences. Only its first point is known, which reads: "Restoration of a Serbian vice-kingdom within the borders it had in the mid fourteenth century, towards the end of Dušan's reign, when the Ottomans first began to break it, that is, comprising the following provinces of present-day European Turkey: Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Albania (South Serbia and Old Serbia), Roumelia (up to the river Maritza from its confluence to Edirne, and from Edirne, by land, to Burgos on the Black Sea), and Bulgaria." Based on these data, Ekmečić has been convinced that there were two plans for a Serbian vice-kingdom, one with and the other without Bulgaria (p. 32). Since the manuscript of the plan used by Stranjaković has not survived and no other sources have so far provided a clue, this remains an open question. Apparently, the text quoted in Stranjaković's paper is not authentic. – My gratitude to Prof. Vasilije Krestić for making Stranjaković's manuscript available to me.

Turkey would not have agreed to it even in the worst crisis, and the revolutions of 1848/9 did not affect her to the point of producing such a crisis. Nikolajević acquainted the Polish emigration, French diplomats and the Porte with the memorandum, and Garašanin believed in the full backing of France.<sup>78</sup> But such an ambitious project, which would have diminished the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire, needed much stronger support than the one that could have been provided by the Polish emigration and France. Not only did Garašanin and Nikolajević not expect support from Russia, they sought to suppress her influence in the Ottoman Empire and even explicitly renounced Russia's patronage.

They did not stop on the idea of restructuring the Ottoman Empire, but made further plans, as evidenced by a letter of Nikolajević to Garašanin dated 9 October: "The Slavic future presupposes the disintegration of the Habsburg monarchy. All German provinces should be united into the German Confederation, and the Czech, Moravian, Slovak and Polish Slavs into another confederation." The South Slavs, together with the Magyars and Wallachians, should create "a federal state union which then should unite with European Turkey, thus forming a complete and purely Yugoslav [South-Slavic] empire". This empire should either be united with the "Asian-Turkish" one or "become completely independent of it under a new native dynasty. It is only through such an all-Slavic idea that Serbian feeling can be stirred and the ideal of Serbian patriotism fulfilled; anything short of it would be just Russian or alien affair." He then linked this idea with the idea of a Serbian vice-kingdom. "In this respect, I have [sent] you my previous draft on the restoration of a Serbian vice-kingdom in Turkey-in-Europe, and if we were able to grab that much from the weak Porte and from the diplomacy that can still support it, I would be less doubtful about the triumph of *that greater idea and that greater ideal*" (emphasis R.LJ.). This greater ideal would be the union of all South Slavs. The steps required, in his view, were the secession of Hungary and Corniola from Austria and their union under either the Hungarian or the Croatian crown. All South-Slavic provinces of the Habsburg Empire should form a separate vice-kingdom — "South Slavonia". This vice-kingdom was not supposed to include the Magyars and Wallachians, but Nikolajević did not rule out the possibility either. He expected that when Serbia's plan of reorganizing the Ottoman Turkey would materialize, "the two vice-kingdoms would naturally come to a point where they would make an agreement about their final union and, guided by their own best interests, choose the ruling dynasty, be it Habsburg, Ottoman or native". Without elaborating any further, Nikolajević merely stated

---

<sup>78</sup> Garašanin to Acika Nenadović, 3 September 1848: "I can see that the French agree with what I've been stirring up", in *Prepiska*, 272.

that for the time being the establishment of a Serbian vice-kingdom should be given precedence.

Although some of the concepts Nikolajević used are vague, even contradictory, his plan may be summed up as follows: Serbia succeeds in bringing about the restructuring of the Ottoman Empire into two states, an Asian Turkish and a European Turkish (or Serbian United States or Serbian Vice-Kingdom). She then works towards the disintegration of the Habsburg Empire, on whose territory a new vice-kingdom, South Slavonia, becomes established.<sup>79</sup> Serbian United States and South Slavonia then become united into “a complete and purely Yugoslav empire”. Then the ruling dynasty becomes agreed upon, the Habsburg, the Ottoman or a native one. It is not explicitly stated, but this Yugoslav empire would have obviously been independent and sovereign. The reference to the Habsburg and Ottoman dynasties may be taken as implying moderation, but a “native” dynasty was clearly preferred.

Nikolajević's plan is a very general one. It leaves many important points in obscurity, especially the way of carrying it through. Given Serbia's geographic position, statehood and political role, however, he saw her as the champion of the unification process and the core of a future Yugoslav empire. Nikolajević's idea of a future South-Slavic state may now be described almost as visionary. His Yugoslav empire and the 1918 Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes are quite similar. Both, one virtual, the other real, rested on the ruins of the Austrian and Ottoman empires, had almost the same territorial extent and were monarchies.

It should be noted that a similar idea of a Yugoslav empire centred on Serbs and Croats was promoted by members of the so-called “Democratic Pan-Slavic Club”, especially by Stevan Hrkalović. The Club was overseen by Garašanin, as indicated by his letter to Stojan Simić dated 2 June 1848: “The goal of both of them down there [Ljudevit Gaj and Hrkalović] is to unite with all South Slavs and create a common empire. I have given him [Hrkalović] an interim approval for the idea.”<sup>80</sup>

There are a number of similarities between the plan for a Serbian vice-kingdom and the *Načertanije*: both Nikolajević and Garašanin base their claim on historic rights; hope for the restoration of Stefan Dušan's Empire; delineate the same territorial extent; have the same stance on Bulgaria and, to some extent, on the possibility of creating a South-Slavic state

---

<sup>79</sup> In one place he states that the vice-kingdom should encompass Magyars and Wallachians (Romanians), but does not mention them again. On the other hand, the name of the vice-kingdom, South Slavonia, would imply their being left out. This issue, therefore, remains open.

<sup>80</sup> *Prepiska*, 165.



(South Slavia or a Yugoslav empire); argue for two-phased unification of the Serbian people (at first within the Ottoman Empire, then in a Yugoslav state); support the preservation of Ottoman Turkey during the first phase of unification. The skeletons of the two drafts are nearly the same. The available sources do not provide explicit clues as to whether Nikolajević was familiar with the *Načertanije* and with the Polish émigrés' projects submitted to Garašanin, or this project was entirely his own. While there is no evidence to support the former possibility, there are two pieces of evidence for the latter. 1) Sending his project to Garašanin, Nikolajević wrote: "I have taken the risk of enclosing [with this letter] one of my *political drafts* which I *outlined for myself* a few days ago, just to kill loneliness."<sup>81</sup> 2) According to what Tchaikovsky wrote to Czartoryski, Nikolajević "had shown him a project for uniting Serbia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia and Illyria into a vice-kingdom".<sup>82</sup> Lacking any other reliable information, we may only assume that the idea of a Serbian vice-kingdom or Serbian United States is Nikolajević's. That would be a second national and state-building plan of the Principality of Serbia. It was based on the same fundamental premises as the *Načertanije*, but was more elaborate and diversified.

At the heart of both projects lay the restoration of Dušan's Empire, an idea already harboured by Prince Miloš Obrenović during his first reign.<sup>83</sup> Over time, it increasingly took root and was kept secret neither from foreign diplomats nor from Ottoman pashas. Garašanin complained to Knićanin about a Serbian politician "drinking toasts, at the Russian Consulate in front of the pasha and all European consuls, to the creation of a Russian empire and of a grand Serbian empire and so forth. Not that I would mind the latter empire..."<sup>84</sup>

A lengthy manuscript of Garašanin's, which was written in the mid-1850s but has not been preserved in its entirety, contains some of his quite characteristic views on the state in general, and shows that he was familiar with the modern concept and meaning of the "rule-of-the-law state", with Montesquieu's *L'Esprit des lois* and Rousseau's *Contrat social*: "The state is

<sup>81</sup> AS, IGP, 350 (emphasis R. Lj).

<sup>82</sup> Lj. Durković Jakšić, *Srbijansko-crnogorska saradnja (1830–1851)* [Serbo-Montenegrin Cooperation 1830–1851] (Belgrade: Istorijski institut, 1957), 88. See also, Ekmečić, "Garašanin, Čartoriski i Mađari", 2, note 2.

<sup>83</sup> "Srbija u godini 1834. Pisma grofa Boa-le-Konta de Rinji ministru inostranih dela u Parizu o tadašnjem stanju u Srbiji" [Serbia in 1834. Letters of Count Bois Le Comte de Rigny to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Paris on the situation in Serbia], ed. S. Novaković, *Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije XXIV* (1894), 37–40; Ljušić, *Kneževina Srbija (1830–1839)*, 383–385.

<sup>84</sup> ASANU, No 7051/1901.

a naturally necessitated condition for the historical existence of a people; beyond a state man can have neither life nor history: therefore any human action only begins with the state”.

Garašanin's next writing, discussing the situation in the Ottoman Empire and the position of its Christian population, was predicated on the same premise as the *Načertanije*, namely, that the disintegration of the Empire was imminent and that therefore a new and solid state should be built on its ruins. He emphasized twice that Montenegro, by then being an “independent state for 150 years”, had through continuous warfare with the Ottoman Turks begun to harbour “the insolent belief” in its being the bearer of the “Christian and Slavic [i.e. Serbian] state idea [...] since the fall of the [fourteenth-century] Serbian Empire”. Garašanin strongly suggested that Serbia and Montenegro should connect with one another via the area of Novi Pazar, Peć and Priština: “A single glance at the map of [Ottoman] Turkey reveals how important it is that this should happen.” Discussing the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, he pointed to a religious rather than ethnic division: “Bosnian Turks or, more correctly, Muslim Serbs are a quite distinctive phenomenon in the Slavic world”, but he believed that neither the common people nor the nobility in that province should be isolated, “if only because it is impossible to renounce a shared consciousness of the Serbs”. He devoted a lot of space to Bulgarians, describing them as the most peaceful people in Turkey-in-Europe.

Of relevance to our further considerations is how Garašanin understood the role of Serbia in the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the construction of a new state in its wake. He believed that the semi-sovereign status of the Principality of Serbia and its position entitled the Serbs to play the leading role in Turkey-in-Europe. The Serbs had been the first to start the struggle for liberation, whereby “they proved to be the mightiest and the most promising Slavic branch.” He saw the Serbs in general and the Principality of Serbia in particular as “the pivot of the South-Slavic world” round which others would gather. This was the first time that he seriously took the legacy of the Serbian revolution into account, though without giving up the historic right argument and the tradition of Dušan's Empire. “Serbia is the product of a revolution of the Slavic element against the Turkish state; — she is a recognized crystallization of fundamental Christian-Slavic interests in the Turkish Empire and basis for their furthering.” Thence came Serbia's moral strength and her potential for making an impact on Slavs far beyond her borders. He believed that all Serbs saw the Principality of Serbia as the cornerstone of “their historical being”, that Serbia was the mainstay of all Yugoslavs in Turkey, and more than that: she should gather “all Yugoslavs into one state or at least into a union of several states”. The Yugoslavs Garašanin had in mind most of all were “Yugoslavs

Serbs” or, in other words, the Serbs in the South-Slavic-inhabited areas of Ottoman Turkey and Austria. Apparently he advocated a state that would encompass all Serbs.

Garašanin also considered the issue of Serbian national integration. “Serbs who are *reaya* in Bosnia and Serbs in the Principality of Serbia or in Montenegro, Serbs in the Croatian and Slavonian Military Frontiers [*Vojna Krajina*] and those in Vojvodina, they all consider themselves as belonging to one people and each part is concerned with that which concerns the whole.” What he saw as particularly helpful for the process of national integration was: the existence of Serbian states — Serbia and Montenegro, the activity of the “people’s” church, language and folk poetry.

Garašanin did not try to conceal the hostile attitude of the Serbian people towards Ottoman rule. In his plans for undermining the Ottoman Empire he went so far as to expect to see a Serbian flag with the cross flying over Hagia Sophia in Constantinople after the final Ottoman defeat. In his expansionist plans Constantinople figured as “the pearl of the Slavic east ... the first city of that Orthodox Serbian empire.”<sup>85</sup> Although he now used the term Yugoslavs more frequently than before, here he returned to the idea of a Serbian state once again. This time two points are controversial: claims to Constantinople as the future capital of a Serbian empire on the one hand, and the undefined role of the Austrian Serbs in the future state on the other. The Serbs beyond the Military Frontier and the Duchy of Serbia (*Vojvodstvo Srbije – Vojvodina*) were not even mentioned. In neither case such a state would have been simply Serbian. Historic and natural rights were brought into confrontation here, and although Garašanin gave precedence to historic rights (reconstruction of the Serbian Empire), this was the first time that he acknowledged the revolutionary origin of the modern Serbian state. Even so, he was far from including the revolution as the source of legitimacy for the future Serbian state.

### *A Balkan alliance*

The political career of Ilija Garašanin reached its peak during the second reign of Prince Mihailo. It was a most dynamic period of Serbian foreign policy which was steered jointly by Prince Mihailo and Garašanin. Their guiding idea was Serbian unification and the establishment of a Balkan alliance.

On a mission to Constantinople in 1861, Garašanin held secret negotiations with the Greeks. According to the agreed Serbo-Greek draft

---

<sup>85</sup> AS, IGP, 855. In this writing, Garašanin wrote about his activities in 1848 as well, but without explicitly referring to Nikolajević’s plan.

convention, the “Kingdom of Serbia” was supposed to encompass: Principality of Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Upper Albania (or Old Serbia) and Montenegro provided that the latter “does not staunchly hold onto being a separate and independent principality”. This was the territorial extent already delineated in the *Načertanije*. As for Bulgaria, two options were envisaged: 1) to become an independent state like the Serbian and Hellenic kingdoms; 2) to remain within the Ottoman Empire. Garašanin did not rule out a “confederation of several states”, or a “Serbian-Bulgarian-Albanian union”, but he did not really believe it would be acceptable to European diplomacy. His priority obviously was a state that would encompass the entire Serbian community in Ottoman Turkey, and he was clear and precise on that point. He had several political options for whatever might come next, the central one being the formation of a Balkan alliance as a tool for bringing the Ottoman Empire down. Historiography has claimed that the draft of Serbo-Greek convention was “just a new edition” of the *Načertanije*. Garašanin accepted the revolutionary principle in resolving the national issue there. A draft agreement on an alliance among Greece, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro was drawn up the same year.<sup>86</sup>

During the last two years of Garašanin's engagement in state affairs (1866 and 1867), much effort was put into building a Balkan alliance. The first such agreement was concluded between Serbia and Montenegro (5 October 1866), and it was hoped that other Balkan peoples would gather round it. It brought nothing new compared to Garašanin's previously articulated ideas: the Serbian people in Ottoman Turkey should be liberated and united in a “future great Serbia” to which Montenegro would join. The rest of the secret agreement was about the internal organization of this future Serbian state. It should be noted that therein the term Great Serbia was used for the first time, and referring to a state that would unite the Serbs in Ottoman Turkey, but not the Serbs in Habsburg Austria.<sup>87</sup>

In terms of ideas the secret agreement between Serbia and Montenegro is very similar to the first part of Garašanin's *Načertanije*, just as the Programme of Yugoslav policy Garašanin proposed to the Croatian bishop and politician Strossmayer in March 1867 is similar to the second part of *Načertanije*. Its proclaimed goal was to unite the “Yugoslav tribes into one federal state”, with Belgrade and Zagreb as pivotal points in pursuing the Yugoslav cause. Religion was not to be a hindrance to Yugoslav unification, because the only principle the state should be based on was that of “ethnic-

---

<sup>86</sup> Jakšić and Vučković, *Spoljna politika*, 66, 471–478.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 486–489; *Srbija i oslobodilački pokreti na Balkanu 1856–1878* [Serbia and Liberation Movements in the Balkans 1856–1878], vol. I, eds. V. Krestić and R. Ljušić (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1983), 489–493.

ity”, and “Croatian and Serbian ethnicity is one, Yugoslav (Slav)”. The burden of Yugoslav liberation was supposed to be equally shared by all Yugoslav tribes. Although Garašanin obviously considered an uprising in Bosnia and Herzegovina to be more urgent than such a state, he clearly believed it possible for the Austrian South Slavs (Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) to gather together at a suitable moment in a common state or in an association of South-Slavic states.<sup>88</sup>

It should also be noted that the Bulgarian proposal of April 1867 envisaged a Yugoslav empire as the state of Serbs and Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire. In August 1867 alliance with Greece was concluded, and a military convention followed in 1868, when the Balkan Alliance was joined by Romania.<sup>89</sup>

Garašanin pursued his basic idea of a future Serbian state originally proposed in the *Načertanije*, through the first Balkan Alliance, but he now enriched it with new elements. By building a Balkan alliance he was also seeking a key to Serbia's future. One road to it could be a newly-formulated policy, which had already been the basic guideline of Serbian diplomacy under Garašanin: *The Balkans to the Balkan peoples*. What was new was an equal distribution of the burden of liberation from Ottoman rule among all Yugoslav and Balkan peoples.

UDC 929:32 *Garašanin I*  
32.8:342.4](497.11)“18”

<sup>88</sup> Jakšić and Vučković, *Spoljna politika*, 494–504. For more, see V. Krestić, *Hrvatsko-ugarska nagodba 1868* [Croatian-Hungarian Compromise of 1868] (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1969), 348–366, as well as his *Srpsko-hrvatski odnosi i jugoslovenska ideja* [Serbo-Croatian Relations and the Yugoslav Idea] (Belgrade 1983), 9–82.

<sup>89</sup> Jakšić and Vučković, *Spoljna politika*, 505–521.