



ISSN: 1309 4173 (Online) 1309 - 4688 (Print)

Volume 5 Issue 6, Special Issue on Balkan Wars, p. 59-69, November 2013

## Turkey and Romania at the Crossroads: The Balkans Divided (1944-1947)

*Türkiye ve Romanya Yol Ayrımında: Bölünmüş Balkanlar (1944-1947)*

Dr.Ömer Metin

*Abant İzzet Baysal University - Bolu*

Liliana Boscan Altın

*University of Bucharest Bucharest*

**Abstract:** *The present study explores the diplomatic relations between Romania and Turkey in the last phase of the Second World War from 1944 to 1947. Although Turkey remained neutral during the war, Romania joined the axis countries. Toward 1944, as it is understood that Germany would be defeated soon, Romania was pushed to search for new possibilities. Especially, the chance that Russia would expand over the Balkan territory had worried both Romania and Turkey. This study also covers the policies developed by the Balkan Pact Allies, Turkey and Romania against the emerging Soviet threat. The paper is based on unpublished documents found in the Romanian diplomatic and national archives, and articles in the Romanian and the Turkish press.*

**Keywords:** *Turkey, Romania, Second World War, The Balkans*

**Öz:** *Bu çalışma İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın son aşamasında 1944-1947 yılları arasında Romanya-Türkiye arasındaki diplomatik ilişkileri ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır. İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye tarafsızlığını korumasına rağmen Romanya, Mihver Devletlerinin safına katılmıştır. 1944 yılına gelindiğinde savaşı Almanya'nın kaybedeceğinin anlaşılması, Romanya'yı yeni arayışlara yöneltmiştir. Özellikle Rusya'nın İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonunda Balkanlara yayılma ihtimali Romanya ve Türkiye'yi tedirgin edecektir. Bu çalışmada Balkan Paktı müttefikleri Türkiye ile Romanya'nın Sovyet tehlikesine karşı geliştirdikleri politikalara da vurgu yapılmaktadır. Makale, Romanya Diplomatik ve Ulusal Arşivlerinin yayınlanmamış belgeleri ile Romen ve Türk basınına dayandırılarak hazırlanmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Türkiye, Romanya, İkinci Dünya Savaşı, Balkanlar*

The Normandy landing, which started on 6 June 1944, marked the beginning of a major turning point in relations between Turkey and Romania. While they had not been formal allies during the early years of the Second World War—Romania had allied with the Axis nations while Turkey had maintained neutrality—the relationship between the two nations remained cordial. Following the Allied invasion, however, diplomatic and military maneuvering among interested parties, particularly the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, drove a wedge between them, leading to a much colder relationship after 1947 as they found themselves drawn into opposite sides in an evolving global Cold War.

Prior to the Normandy invasion, Turkey's position in European affairs was very uncertain. In the first stage, between October 1939 and June 1940, the Turks were part of the Anglo-Franco-Turkish agreement, concluded in Ankara on 19 October 1939, which was designed to help them modernize their army, but the Turks were disappointed by how poorly their European allies fulfilled this request. With the fall of France, their only concern was their own salvation; the alliance with Great Britain remained as a backup. In the second stage of the

war, from July 1940 to September 1941, Germany pressured Turkey into entering the war, but the only result was a treaty of non-aggression. In the third stage, from 1941 to the end of 1942, Turkey was in an awkward position between the two alliances. After Germany was defeated at Stalingrad, Turkish policy took another turn: they were determined to stay neutral, and the British attempts to draw them into the conflict were unsuccessful.

Successes on the part of the Allied Powers following the Normandy invasion announced that the end of the war in Europe was close. During the second half of 1944 Turkey began to court the Allies, banning pro-German activities and taking some measures to remove pro-German people from official positions to appease the Soviet Union. Firstly, Fevzi Çakmak was forced by President İsmet İnönü to step down from the position of Chief of General Staff and Numan Menemencioğlu, Minister of Foreign Affairs, suffered the same fate. Then, in May 1944, two letters published by a Pan-Turkish leader, Nihal Atsız, accusing Şükrü Saracoğlu's government of corruption, gave the government the opportunity to arrest all prominent Pan-Turkish officials. Simultaneously, the nationalist *Varlık Vergisi* law was abolished on 15 March 1944 along with all the sanctions which pertained to it. The Americans and the British asked Turkey to put an end to all commercial and diplomatic relations with Nazi Germany, which happened on 2 August.

Immediately after the 1943 Cairo Conference, Menemencioğlu, had declared to the press that "Turkey keeps the alliance with Great Britain", the newspapers announced that "if Turkey received a great amount of war material, most probably it would declare war against the Axis".<sup>1</sup> But Turkey's appetite for arms "will be considered insatiable by the Allies".<sup>2</sup> However, the arms supply offered by the USA through *Lend-Lease* expired on 1 April and the Allies announced that they would no longer consider countries that engaged in trade with Germany as neutrals. On 20 April, Saracoğlu announced that he would "stop chrome delivery to Germany, and according to the pact with England we are not neutral, we support the Allies".<sup>3</sup> Still the Allies continued to put pressure on Turkey: in June Great Britain became annoyed that Turkey allowed German ships to pass freely through the Straits, though later British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin admitted that "Turkey understood Annex II from the Montreux Convention in a different way as there was a vague difference between war and the peace vessels".<sup>4</sup> Then, on 15 June, Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Menemencioğlu, considered pro-German by both the Allied and the Turkish press, resigned and Saracoğlu again became Minister of Foreign Affairs. Finally, after the Turkish government had stopped the chrome supply to Germany, Hitler decided to keep Sevastopol, considering that by losing it "Turkey risked sliding towards the opposite side",<sup>5</sup> but the Soviets' powerful attack led to the evacuation of Crimea. A call record from 4 July mentioned that "Romanian soldiers from Sevastopol had been repatriated".<sup>6</sup>

On 13 May 1944 Alexandru Cretzianu,<sup>7</sup> Romanian Ambassador in Turkey, presented the situation of Turkey as follows: "British and American circles believe that Turkey has lost ground, Soviet ambitions in the Balkans grow each time they advance, Germany does not

<sup>1</sup> Arh. MAE (The Romanian Ministry of the Foreign Affairs Archives), 71/Turkey, vol. 64, 59.

<sup>2</sup> R. Vere-Hodge, *Turkish Foreign Policy (1918-1948)*, Geneva: 1950, 159.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 160.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>5</sup> A. Hillgruber, *Hitler, Regele Carol și Mareșalul Antonescu. Relații iile româno-germane (1938-1944)*, (București: Humanitas: 1994), 227.

<sup>6</sup> The Ministry of the Foreign Affairs Archives, 71/Turkey, vol. 64, 272.

<sup>7</sup> Romanian Ambassador in Turkey (1943-1946).

receive chrome any more, and Romania had its vessels immobilised in Istanbul". The Romanian minister concluded that "Turkish politics was at a crossroads, the country's situation was one of isolation".<sup>8</sup>

After the opening of the second front, Turkey no doubt regarded the victory of the Allies as assured, however Romania realised that the opportunity of opening a new front in the Balkans was lost. Towards the end of July and during the first weeks of August 1944, Romania was not the Eastern and South-Eastern European country which drew the Allies' attention the most. In Central-Eastern Europe, Poland was becoming one of the key problems in the relations between the Allies as it was the object of the majority of exchanges between the leaders of the three Great Powers. In South-Eastern Europe, especially after Turkey ended relations with Germany on 2 August, the centre of attention for the Allies, especially the western powers, was Bulgaria. Bulgaria, among others, was at war with Great Britain and the USA but not with the Soviet Union. At the same time, Bulgaria, which was flanking Greece—the centre of British interests in the area—concerned mostly London and even Washington from a strategic point of view.<sup>9</sup>

On 1 August 1944, Turkish vessels from "Bulgaria and from Romanian ports were ordered to return home and on the next day diplomatic relations with Germany were ended".<sup>10</sup> The fact that Turkey ended diplomatic relations with Germany was a delicate issue in Romanian-Turkish relations as Romania was supporting the Axis and Turkey had now joined the Allies. Turkey's business attaché, Shefgati declared on 1 August to a Swiss diplomat that "Turkey will only break diplomatic ties with Germany, maintaining relations with Germany's allies and especially with Romania, it will be difficult to maintain normal relations with Romania but it will invoke the Finnish precedent with the Allies and the Bulgarian precedent with Germany".<sup>11</sup>

On 5 August, Marshal Ion Antonescu visited Hitler for the last time. To Hitler's direct question, if the Marshal would go along with Germany until the end, Antonescu answered that he would take a stand when he learned the answers to several specific questions. One of the questions referred to Turkey:

what measures will Germany take if Turkey opens the Straits for the Western Allies? In this case, the landing of Soviet forces on the Romanian Black Sea coast was something to be expected, under the cover of the former Italian war vessels which the Western powers had given over to the Soviet Union. Besides this, the air attacks will be intensified by using Turkish airfields. Romania would be facing an inevitable catastrophe.<sup>12</sup>

Just like the other questions, this one received no answer. On 20 August 1944 the Soviets attacked the Chişinău-Iaşi front and occupied Iasi, Vaslui and Roman. On the morning of 23 August 1944 Antonescu called a meeting of the Council of Ministers in Snagov where they decided to withdraw the army to behind the fortified line of the Eastern Carpathians-Nămoloasa-Galaţi-Maritime Danube and to evacuate the government and the main institutions in the Haţeg region.

<sup>8</sup> The Ministry of the Foreign Affairs Archives, 71/Turkey, vol. 12, 330.

<sup>9</sup> Ioan Chiper, "The circumstances surrounding the signing of the Moscow armistice", *The Historical Magazine*, vol. V, 1944, Nr.9-10 (September-October), 894.

<sup>10</sup> E. R. Vere-Hodge, *op. cit.*, 161.

<sup>11</sup> The Ministry of the Foreign Affairs Archives, 71/Turkey, vol. 62, 275.

<sup>12</sup> A. Hillgruber, *op. cit.*, 250.

The signatories of the National Democratic Block, I. Maniu, C. T. Petrescu and C. I. C.Brătianu (Lucreţ iu Pătrăş canu, from the Romanian Communist Party was not found) decided to take new steps to convince the Marshal to call an armistice and the mission of transmitting the message was given to Gh. Brătianu. Ion Antonescu asked for the written agreement of the leaders of the opposition to conclude the armistice. On the afternoon of 23 August, Marshal Antonescu accompanied by Mihai Antonescu<sup>13</sup> visited the Royal Palace to inform the king about the situation. Facing Ion Antonescu's refusal to declare "immediately without letting Germany know"<sup>14</sup> that he accepted the armistice with the conditions stated by the Allies, King Michael had them arrested. Making use of his Royal Prerogative, King Michael appointed general Sănătescu President of the Council of Ministers by royal decree.

On the morning of 24 August, a representative of the Romanian government left for Ankara to inform the governments of the USSR, USA. and Great Britain about the political and military situation in Romania. On 25 August, the Romanian minister in Ankara gave the Soviet minister in Turkey, S. Vinogradov, a note which announced that Antonescu's dictatorship was brought down and that the new government of national unity "decided to sign the armistice immediately and to use all forces to banish all Germans from the country's territory." Vinogradov answered the Romanian minister that on this occasion: "we promised solemnly to respect your independence and sovereignty if you break away from the Axis".<sup>15</sup>

The consequences of the events of 23 August 1944 were that the Wehrmacht was forced to evacuate Bulgaria, Greece (including Crete and the islands of the Aegean Sea), Macedonia, Albania, Serbia and part of Bosnia-Herzegovina in approximately nine weeks; the duration of the war was shortened since the oil supplies coming from Romania were interrupted; and between twelve and fourteen Romanian divisions joined the Red Army in the final stage of the war in Europe.

Ömer Rıza Doğrul published in the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper on 25 August 1944 the article "The Second Disintegration" in which he showed the consequences of Romanian events:

The political consequence of the event is obvious. If Romania's neighbours have not taken a decision they will be forced to take one favourable to the Allies and that will help the surrounding of Germany without any chance of escape and the recovery of the Balkan nations, destroyed by Germany. The economic consequence of the event is also important. Germany used to get 3 million tons of oil annually from Romania, representing a fifth of its demands. At this moment, when the Allies are targeting the oil resources of the Axis, lacking the Romanian oil represents an important loss for Germany. The military importance of the event is even greater. The Germans, given the fact that Romania and Bulgaria have left the Axis and joined the Allies, will be forced to leave the Balkans and thus the latter will have open access to the centre of Europe, and Hungary will not be able to stay on Germany's side. And if Hungary exits the war, nothing can hinder the reconstruction of Czechoslovakia. Thus, Romania exiting the war has great consequences and it will accelerate the end of the war. It is worth mentioning the manner in which the last war ended. When Bulgaria surrendered to the Allies the war (1914-1918) came to a halt and the same happened to Germany,

<sup>13</sup> Romanian Foreign Minister.

<sup>14</sup> A. Simion, *Preliminarii politico-diplomatice ale insurecţiei române din august 1944*, (Cluj Napoca: Dacia, 1979), 480.

<sup>15</sup> A. Cretzianu, *Ocazia pierduta*, Institutul European, 1998, 162.

which finally signed the armistice. Is the end of the war coming from the Balkans this time too?<sup>16</sup>

The events on 23 August 1944 had a considerable influence on Bulgaria and the other states in the region. In the *Vakit* newspaper Asım Us published the article “Romania joining the Allies” on 25 August 1944 in which he mentioned that

after Turkey had interrupted the political and economic relations with Germany, the Axis strategy in the Balkans totally lost its balance. But even though one could have hope that Bulgaria would fall first, Romania, acting much earlier, distanced itself from Germany and joined the Allies, causing an unexpected event. In any case, after the new position adopted by Romania, Bulgaria needs to stop hesitating. The warnings that the English radio sent to Bulgaria remind it about the dangers that the country will have to face in case that it continues to hesitate. This being said, the immediate development of the events could bring significant changes in the general situation of Germany and the Balkans. The general direction of these events could indicate that the end of the war in Europe is near.<sup>17</sup>

Indeed, Romania acted much earlier than the Allies had expected and its decision took everybody by surprise. Romania was in a difficult situation because it exited the war without signing an armistice and without political guarantees, something Marshal Antonescu had insisted upon in negotiations with Allies from 1941.

In the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper the retired general H. Emir Erkilet mentioned the situation of Germany after the events in Romania and Bulgaria:

in the last article I considered that change would not happen in Romania. Because, as in the eastern front that lays from the Central Carpathians, from Bucovina to the south of Bassarabia and the Black Sea there are still German divisions and Romanian soldiers as there were German army near Ploieşti for defence. That’s why the Romanian army, not being in control, will have to fight along with the Russians against the German troops and to defeat them. In any case, for the Germans, the situation in Romania has become extremely difficult. Until now, given the fact the Romanians have joined the Russians, the Germans are forced to fight the Russians and the Romanians. One cannot predict how many times and what form these battles will take. The fact that Romania stopped fighting the Allies and started to fight the Germans will influence Bulgaria.<sup>18</sup>

As one can understand from the cited articles, the Romanian events from 23 August precipitated things for Bulgaria. The situation after the break off of the political and economic relations between Turkey and Germany and also the victories of the Allies in France determined Bulgaria to overcome its dead end by starting to negotiate with the Allies through the Russian ambassador in Ankara. Starting in September 1944, the USSR, advancing rapidly to the south through the liberated territory, declared war on Bulgaria (5 September), which surrendered on 9 September 1944.

The armistice convention was signed in Moscow on 12-13 September 1944, its terms being much harder than had been promised. In fact, by this convention, Romania had become a country occupied by the Russians, an Allied Committee of Control in Bucharest had a decisive role in implementing any measures taken by the Romanian officials in all the areas of activity.

<sup>16</sup> 23<sup>rd</sup> August 1944 Documents, The Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, vol. 2, (Bucharest: 1984), 516-517.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 522.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 591.

The main instrument through which the Russian government acted in Romania was the Red Army. The Soviets showed no hesitation in treating Romania in any way other than as a defeated enemy state, and Sănătescu and his ministers proved themselves incapable of managing the challenges facing Romania: the country was at war but also occupied; supporting its combat army, the occupation forces, massive reparations and requisitions; and attempting to form a viable and coherent government and facing constant foreign interference, both directly by Soviet commanders and indirectly through communist ministers loyal to Soviet influences.

Encouraged and helped by the Russian occupation, the remaining forces, led by the Romanian Communist Party, tried to gain power. On 12 October 1944, the National Democratic Front was created (the Romanian Communist Party, the Democratic Socialist Party and the Peasants' Front) and after six days its members retired from the Sănătescu administration. On 14 November 1944 a new government, led by Sănătescu, was formed, and on 6 December a cabinet was formed under general Rădescu.

The success of the Russian army from the summer of 1944, the result of which was its penetration of Central Europe and the Balkan region, alarmed British prime-minister Winston Churchill. As the Russian army got into Romanian, Bulgarian and Polish territories; the British prime-minister was concerned that Eastern Europe was "on the verge of communism" and, while the fate of Romania and Bulgaria was of less interest to him, the fate of Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Poland, which occupied particularly strategic locations, was of significant interest to Churchill.<sup>19</sup> Regarding Turkey, the situation seemed clear. On 15 July Stalin told the British prime-minister that he should not make any pressure against it, given its evasive position towards Germany. This meant that any claims Turkey might make to special rights after the war should be dismissed in that Turkey had successfully avoided direct participation in the war against Germany.<sup>20</sup>

On 9 October, the British prime-minister visited Moscow and on the same evening discussions about the Balkan problems began. Churchill told Stalin that they should "fix the problems in the Balkans. Your armies are in Romania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions and agents in these countries. We should not fight about unimportant issues." As a result of this agreement, England was prevalent in Greece and Russia in Romania.<sup>21</sup>

This agreement concerning the division of the power sphere in the south-east of Europe would be consolidated at the Yalta Conference in February 1945 which, even before the end of the war and the organisation of the Peace Conference, divided Europe, with the Soviets getting the eastern region. In "The Declaration regarding liberated Europe" it was mentioned that "the three great powers claim that the re-establishment of order in Europe and the reconstruction of political and economic life should be realised according to a procedure that would allow the liberated countries to rebuild their lives, to create democratic institutions elected by the people."<sup>22</sup>

"The Declaration regarding liberated Europe" was welcomed by democratic forces, but the left, especially the communists, understood it in a particular way: Yalta proved to be a signal to start the fight for power. The government of Nicolae Rădescu, installed on 6 December, was welcomed by the Soviets until general Rădescu began to exercise his independence and oppose the communist takeover, particularly in the military. By February 1945 Rădescu was accused of being a "fascist" criminal. Then in March, Andrei Vyshinsky

---

<sup>19</sup> L. Loghin, *Mari conferințe internaționale (1939-1945)*, (București: Politica, 1989), 390.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> W. Churchill, *Al doilea război mondial*, vol. I-II, Ed. Saeculum I.O., (București: 1998), 381.

<sup>22</sup> L. Loghin, *op. cit.*, 431.

delivered his famous ultimatum that unless King Michael accepted a government under Petru Groza by the afternoon of the following day, he would not be responsible for the continuance of Romania as an independent state. Under the pressure exerted from Moscow, the Petru Groza government was created on 6 March 1945. The Groza government was essentially Soviet-controlled and the opposition lost ground quickly once Groza and the communists were in charge.

As noted, one of the consequences of the agreement of 23 August 1944 was that the Wehrmacht was forced to leave Bulgaria, Greece, Macedonia, Albania, Serbia and part of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Turkey was not pleased with the defeat of the German army since they believed the German propaganda which glorified the unity of the civilised world against the Bolsheviks. They were starting to worry. Nonetheless, on 23 February 1945, Turkey declared war on Germany and Japan. In the official press release, the declaration was justified as follows: "it is necessary that Turkey should declare war on the Axis so that it could be a constructive force during the peace." But from the spring of 1945 it became clear that "the western allies do not plan to stop the Russian advancement."<sup>23</sup>

The Turkish position now finally became clear. Turkey was dangerously isolated, public opinion was extremely nervous and this was obvious in İnönü's speech at the opening of the Great National Assembly:

1. Turkey remains faithful to the alliance with Great Britain, but it stays neutral in the Anglo-French conflict in Syria; 2. The pact with Germany was made in a difficult moment; 3. the assembly of troops was not against Russia; 4. Turkey proved itself to be a good guardian of the Straits; the president concluded that "they will not give up any territories; they will die or live as honourable people".<sup>24</sup>

Russia's advantage, especially its presence in the Balkans, raised emotions in Bulgaria, also fearful of possible Russian territorial claims or the revision of the Montreux Convention. These rumours were persistent and they were accompanied by unfriendly comments sent by Russian radio. The question of the Straits was raised again in Potsdam (17 July-2 August 1945). Molotov presented a memorandum in which he claimed that the structure of the convention was obsolete and proposed that the problem should be solved by Russia and Turkey.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, President Truman suggested that "the Straits should be free for all the ships of the world."<sup>26</sup>

The Russian campaign against Turkey had begun on 19 March 1945; in a note it was said that Russia refuses to prolong the non-aggression agreement from 1925. Even though Turkey was ready to discuss the details of the new agreement, in June 1945 Molotov imposed two conditions "the re-evaluation of the Russian-Turkish borders (the re-appropriation of the Kars-Ardahan district) and the establishment of a Russian military base in the Straits."<sup>27</sup>

The 1946 elections were won by the People's Party with İsmet İnönü as president, and Recep Peker as prime-minister. The new prime-minister considered Russia's actions as a "war of nerves". On 7 August 1946, Moscow sent Turkey a message in which it proposed "to modify the Montreux agreement: the free passing of commercial ships, a project that allowed only the powers from the Black Sea to pass war ships through the Straits."<sup>28</sup> In fact, what

<sup>23</sup> Vere-Hodge, *op. cit.*, 160.

<sup>24</sup> Vere-Hodge, *op. cit.*, 161.

<sup>25</sup> L. Leoghin, *op. cit.*, 514.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 516.

<sup>27</sup> Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge across the Bosphorus. The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, (London: 1971), 34.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

Russia wanted was that the Black Sea should be available only for the powers from the Black Sea, with Turkey having only one vote.

At this point, the American attitude changed; in March 1947 President Truman successfully asked the Congress to support Greece and Turkey economically and militarily since these countries were threatened by communism. The effect of this initiative clearly indicated Turkey's alliance with the Western powers. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Necmeddin Sadak, declared that "foreign policy stays the same and it is dependent on the American support and the British friendship."<sup>29</sup> Thus starting in 1947, a balance was reached in the Straits with Turkey obtaining American support to counter Russian claims. Turkish luck kept changing ironically. In a short period of time, it stopped being "the sick people of Europe" and became "the backbone of the Near East", they stopped being the "terrible Turks" and became "the guardians of democracy".

All of these events influenced the relations between Romania and Turkey in the big game of Great Power. Between 1945 and 1948 relations were "almost" normal. The Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Gh. Tătărescu, sent a telegram on 10 July 1945 in which he said that "the basis of our foreign policy continues to be the permanent collaboration with Russia, the development of relations with the western powers and with all our neighbours. It is necessary to clarify on any occasion the great sacrifices made on 23 of August by the Romanian army together with the glorious Red Army and to emphasize the democratic nature of the Petru Groza government, which represent the expression of the Romanians' will and these are the instructions upon which your activity should rely."<sup>30</sup>

In August, the Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs called back Ambassador A. Cretzianu from Ankara, but since King Michael was on strike to protest the Communist takeover and was refusing to sign any official documents, he simply ignored the orders coming from Petru Groza's administration.<sup>31</sup> Cretzianu continued his job in Ankara for a couple of months—Saraçoğlu noted ironically that "he asked to see the letters for recall from the King's part, but apparently they did not get here yet"<sup>32</sup>, an allusion to the fact that the King was on strike.

After the king was forced to accept the agreement reached at the conference between Russia, USA and Great Britain, Ambassador Cretzianu gave up his position in Turkey. By the 652 decree from 27 February 1946 Gh. Moisil was named minister in Ankara and he presented his credentials on 29 April 1946.<sup>33</sup> On 1 March 1946 the diplomatic relations between Romania and Turkey materialized into an embassy.<sup>34</sup> The new Turkish ambassador in Bucharest, Fuat Tugay, presented his credentials on 6 of July 1947.<sup>35</sup>

While little information is available from the archive of the legation in Ankara<sup>36</sup> from the end of 1944 until 1946—the consul in Istanbul noted that "the rest of the archive and the

---

<sup>29</sup> Vere-Hodge, *op. cit.*, 180.

<sup>30</sup> *Arh. MAE* (The Romanian Ministry of the Foreign Affairs Archives), 71/Turkey, Political Dossier (1944-1950): Telegram no. 3128 from 10 July 1945.

<sup>31</sup> A. Cretzianu, *op. cit.*, 172.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 173.

<sup>33</sup> *Romania's Diplomatic Relations (1945-1975)*, Bucharest: 1977, 13.

<sup>34</sup> Ion Calafeteanu-Cristian Popisteanu, *The External Policy of Romania*, (Bucharest: The Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1986), 250.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> Part of archives was taken by ambassador Alexandru Cretzianu and was left to Hoover Institution Archives and will be open in 2020.

furniture were entirely taken without any acceptance register...the ex vice-consul Bibescu did not leave any instruction to that effect"<sup>37</sup>—unpublished documents in the Romanian Foreign Affairs Ministry Archives give some sense of relations between Romania and Turkey from 1944 to 1947.

On 3 November 1944, the General Secretary of Romanian Foreign Affairs, E. Filloti, mentioned to the Turkish Charge d'Affaires Istignelly, that: "the Romanian government wants to maintain relations with Turkey and to re-establish economical exchanges as soon as possible. In the present situation, Romania cannot take political initiative".<sup>38</sup> One year later, the Romanian Secretary at the Romanian Embassy, C. Dimitriu noted that "Turkey's expectations are normal because Romania must take a decision one way or the other... Turkey wants to maintain relations with Romania as it did in the past".<sup>39</sup> In another diplomatical report made by the Romanian Minister, it was stated that

Turkey wished to maintain the friendship and the collaboration with Romania, as it did before the war, when it has found advantages in the political, economical and strategic fields. If the political relations did not improve, in the economical one it was mentioned that the Turks would not act friendly with Romania as long as they had the impression that Romania was making deals with the Soviet Company, know also by the terms "sovrom" or "the Romanian-Soviet" terms that have suffered long-term discrimination.<sup>40</sup>

In a diplomat report in April 1947, I. Magheru noted that "the relations with Turkey do not seem to get normal as a newspaper has published an article which stated that the Soviet Army will remain in Romania after the period established in the peace treaty".<sup>41</sup> In the next month, Magheru also mentioned that "relations with Romania continue to be cold just as do the ones to other countries considered by the Turks to belong in the Soviet influence area".<sup>42</sup>

The measure taken by Turkey against the communist organization determined a Romanian communist newspaper to respond very badly and soon, headlines like: *The Turkish Home Affair have banned democratic parties and the trade union in Turkey*<sup>43</sup>, *Turkish government proclaims anti-trade union law*<sup>44</sup>, *Leader of the Labor Party was arrested in Turkey*, *Turkey kept mobilized one million soldiers*, it is only country who does not try to demobilize after a war in which it did not participate,<sup>45</sup> can be noted. The reaction of Turkish newspaper to this campaign was like this: "*The Romanian's communist press attacks us; The delirium of the communist newspaper in Romania, Moscow's servant learns to write*". The Secretary of the Romanian Embassy, C. Dimitriu, mentions that "The Romanian articles have changed the situation. The Turkish newspapers and the public opinion reacted vehemently".<sup>46</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., File n. 20, Telegram n. 67 from 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 1948.

<sup>38</sup> Arh. MAE, *Turkey/Dossier of Foreign Policy: 1945-1946*.

<sup>39</sup> Arh. MAE, *Turkey/Dossier of Foreign Policy: 1945-1946*. Diplomatical Report by C. Dimitriu from the 11 of July 1946, no.1/P.C., 14.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., *Turkey/Dossier of Foreign Policy from 1947*. Diplomatical Report of Romanian Charge d'affaires I. Magheru on July, no. 48 874.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., Diplomatical Report on April, no. 35 070/ the 28 of May, 3.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, Diplomatical Report on May, no. 40 738 / the 17 of June, 2.

<sup>43</sup> Romanian communist newspaper "*Scântea*", seria III, year XVI, no. 707, the 21 of December 1946.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Romanian communist newspaper, *Scântea*, series III, year XVI, no. 711, the 24 of December 1946.

<sup>46</sup> Arh. MAE, *Turkey/Dossier of Romanian-Turkish Relations (1947: January-July)*. Diplomatical Report of C. Dimitriu, no. 2002/ January 1947.

As a conclusion, during the Second World War, Romania experienced neutrality, territorial losses and alliance with Germany, and changing the coalition and sovietization of country. Turkey did not directly experience the tragedy of the war and kept its neutrality, but after the war the economic situation became worse and it had to resist Soviet pressure. While Romania emerged as a communist regime, in March 1947, after President Truman's initiative, the alignment of the Turks with the Western powers was obvious.

The Normandy landings which started on 6 June 1944 ruined Romania's plans to open the second front in the Balkans. The negotiations led by both Antonescu's government and the Romanian opposition did not stop after this day and there was continued desire for political guarantees from the Allies because of the Soviet threat. Negotiations were facilitated by Ambassador Tanrıöver, who was a communication channel with the Allies, however the coup, resulting in the arrest of Marshal Antonescu, the appointment of a new government by the King, and the shift away from the alliance with the Germans, not only took Germany by surprise but also the Allies.

The Soviets delayed signing the armistice, which Marshal Antonescu had anticipated, and occupied Romania up to Turkish border. As a consequence of the event of 23 August 1944 in Romania, Germany had to evacuate the Balkans. Now the troubled relations between Romania and the Soviet Union became Turkey's problem as well.

While Romania was heading towards a communist regime, Turkey was turning towards the Western Allies. It was becoming clear that the new world order would be a bipolar one. Therefore, between 1945-1947 Turkey's attitude was reserved due to the presence of the Red Army in Romania, waiting for the future development of relations between the two countries similar to the ones they had in the past. However, compared to the strong bonds in the inter-war period and the good relations during the Second World War, at the end of year 1947 relations between Romania and Turkey were considered "cold" mostly because of the Soviet interference.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY****1. Arhivele Ministerul Afacerilor Extene/ Foreign Ministry Archive – unpublished materials**

fond 71/ Turcia, vol. 6-12, 17, 36-37, 42, 43, 43 bis, 60, 59-67, vol. 58-65, 67  
fond 71/Turcia (1946-1950)

**2. Arhivele National Istorice Centrale/ The Romanian National Archives**

fond *Ministerul Propagandei Naționale*: Presă externă (External Press)  
fond *Președenția Consilului de Miniștri*

**3. Books and Articles**

Calafeteanu, Ion, Cristian Popisteanu. *The External Policy of Romania*. Bucharest: The Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1986.

Chiper, Ioan. "The circumstances surrounding the signing of the Moscow armistice", *The Historical Magazine* V, Nr. 9-10 (September-October) (1944).

Churchill, W. *Al doilea razboi mondial*, vol. I-II, Ed. Saeculum I.O., Bucuresti, 1998.

Cretzianu, A. *Ocazia pierduta*, Institutul European, 1998.

Hillgruber, A. *Hitler, Regele Carol și Mareșalul Antonescu. Relațiile româno-germane (1938-1944)*. Humanitas, Bucuresti, 1994.

Hodge, R. Vere. *Turkish Foreign Policy (1918-1948)*. Geneva: 1950.

Loghin, L. *Mari conferințe internaționale (1939-1945)*, Politica, București, 1989.

*Romania's Diplomatic Relations (1945-1975)*. Bucharest, 1977.

Romanian communist newspaper "Scântea", seria III, year XVI, no. 707-711.

Simion, A. *Preliminarii politico-diplomatice ale insurecției române din august 1944*. Dacia, Cluj Napoca, 1979.

Vali, Ferenc A. *Bridge across the Bosphor. The Foreign Policy of Turkey*. London, 1971.

*23<sup>rd</sup> August 1944 Documents*, vol. 2. Bucharest: The Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1984.