

THE INDEPENDENCE OF ROMANIA - A GLANCE AT THE POLITICAL IDEAS OF THE TIME THROUGH POLITICAL SPEECHES

Sabin Drăgulin^{*},

dragulinsabin@yahoo.com

Ancuța Brașoveanu^{**}

antoanetaancuta@gmail.com

Abstract: *The moment of declaring Romania's state independence is one of the historical reference events. During this short study, the authors intended to present five speeches that reflected the most important ideas of the moment and how the national political elites had positioned themselves within the Orient-West paradigm. Throughout the texts, the arguments that under-pinned the declaration of the country's independence from the Ottoman Empire were firmly resolved. The symbolic value of the arguments used demonstrated that from an ideological point of view, the Romanian political class was integrated into the system of Western European values.*

These elements demonstrated that the rupture of this reference space had largely been eliminated. The autochthonous political elite began this process half a century ago, but now the westernization modernization model has been referenced, which shows us that the values of the past, specific to the Eastern model paradigm, were progressively replaced by the Western modernizing ones.

Keywords: *independence, Turkey, liberals, Carol I, Romania, Great Powers*

Introduction

The statement of State Independence of Romania took place at the Chamber of Deputies Meeting of May 9, 1877. This historical moment, particularly important for the history of the state and of the Romanian nation, was not an unexpected act. From the moment the Ottomans entered the Balkan Peninsula (14th century) until May 9, 1877, the bilateral relations were tumultuous. The Romanian countries had come into the sphere of influence of the Ottoman Empire, the native boyar elites alternating moments in which they refused Ottoman suzerainty with those in which they accepted it. The Ottoman pressure had intensified, especially

^{*} Prof. PhD., The Faculty of Political Science and Administration, „Petre Andrei”, Iasi.

^{**} PhD. Student, Philology, „Ovidius” University, Constanta.

since the 17th century, the relations between the empire and the Romanian and Turkish countries becoming a form of direct domination.

The existence of Ottoman power in Asia Minor and the creation of a power system designed to control the ties between the West and the Orient had major implications for the geopolitics of the time. The Romanian countries, by the geographic and geopolitical nature of their space, were directly affected by these realities.

In order to understand the underlying causes of the transformation of the Balkan space and later of an important part of Central Europe into a conflict zone where the great powers of the moment (Hungary, Poland, Austria, Czarist Russia) fought to control this space geographically we must turn our eyes back centuries ago.

Strengthening the Turkish state under Emperor Osman I (1281-1326) will lead to the emergence of an expansionist policy in Asia Minor. The destiny of this kingdom was mainly influenced by the precariousness of the authority of the Byzantine Empire in an accelerated dissolution process.¹ The weaknesses of the Byzantines allowed the Ottoman state to expand its territory to Asia Minor, as it was during the sultan Mahomed II (1421-1451), and Constantinople, the second Rome, as is known in historiography, the ecumenical center of Oriental Christianity, or Orthodoxy, to be conquered.

This territorial expansion had had complex consequences. Apart from the fact that the last form of government of the Roman Empire had disappeared, it was for the first time that the Mediterranean, the cradle of the Greek-Roman European culture, was gradually losing its importance. Territorial expansion was accompanied by maritime affairs. The control of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles by the Turkish military navy led to a de facto control over Black Sea and Marmara trade with geopolitical effects on the Aegean Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. If we were to see symbolically Europe and Asia in the form of an hourglass, Constantinople, the two straits and the Asia Minor extension represented the passage between the two continents. Indeed, the Ottoman state controlled the passage of the entire flow of goods, on the old commercial roads that existed in the Roman period between Europe and Asia. The immediate effect was a major increase in the economic resources of the Ottoman state, which were invested in territorial and maritime expansion policies and a gradual reduction of the economic resources of the states of the Italian peninsula, Central and Southern Europe. The most important effect of this geopolitical reality was the desire of the great European powers in Western Europe (Portugal, Spain, France, England, the Netherlands) to find a new

¹ Edward Gibbon, *The history of the decline and collapse of the Roman Empire*, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest, 1976.

trade route to the Orient. Thus, the era of great geographic discoveries from the turn of the 15th to the 16th century was opened. The consequence of this policy of discovery of new territories was that the Mediterranean Sea was progressively losing its role for almost two millennia, the role of center of European culture and civilization. Indeed, the center of commercial weight, and as a result of economic, political, cultural, civilization, had moved to the European West. In return, European countries in the Mediterranean Sea had fallen. For the Romanian countries, the Ottoman expansion led not only to a progressive decrease in the capacity for internal development, but also to a continuous form of economic and financial exploitation. Step by step, with the passing of the ages, the Romanian lands would be increasingly controlled by the Ottoman Empire, especially with the abolition of native domination and the introduction of the foreign domination of the Phanariotes, ending up in a situation of cultural breakdown and civilization of Western Europe, a space of values of Reformation, humanity, Enlightenment, modernizing revolutions, etc.²

The Romanian space evolved slowly, due to the control imposed by the Ottoman authorities, which, in the light of the past experiences, avoided permanently devoting themselves to the form of domination by introducing the *pashalic*. The negative reactions of the local Wallachian, Moldavian or Transylvanian elites forced the Turks to use a far more subtle policy of controlling these territories. With the passage of time, the space inhabited by the Romanians began to become increasingly isolated, the local elites sending their children to study in Constantinople or in Petersburg. It was necessary that the French Revolution of 1789 broke out so that in the Romanian space would start to penetrate the ideas of a new type of modern society. It is interesting that we have the first information on the perception of these ideas three decades after the French Revolution, which demonstrates, once again, the degree of closure that the Romanian society knew. It was necessary that the generation of Dinicu Golescu, who was deeply disappointed with the reformist projects backed by Tsarist Russia in the Balkans at the beginning of the nineteenth century, turned his gaze to the West, to visit Paris, Vienna, London, Venice, etc. to understand the civilization rupture existed between the two parts of Europe - Western and Oriental. Once aware of the state of delay in the modernization of the state and of the Romanian society, the new generations of boyars had definitively left the schools of Constantinople

² For a better understanding of the phenomenon, it is recommended Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the time of Philip II*, vol. I, Meridiane Publishing House, Bucharest, 1985, and the following five volumes published in the following years.

and Petersburg, and therefore the oriental-feudal mentality, heading for Paris, the city of light, more progressive ideas had been expressed for almost half a century. This change in the educational paradigm would have a direct and major impact on the road followed by the Romanian space in the next 100 years until the end of the First World War. The connection with the European values of the moment involved the emergence of groups of boyars who played a triple role: political, economic and cultural, which in the process modernized the Romanian society by applying a modernizing political project. The ideas expressed by the Romanian revolutionaries in 1848 during the meetings and demonstrations in Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania showed very clearly that the reconnection with the Western space had been achieved. Ultimately, the Oriental paradigm had been abandoned, and the road of modernization was that imposed by the ruling Romanian elites. The declaration of state independence on 9 May 1877 and its confirmation on May 10 by the act of Prince Carol I were preceded by the date of 5-24 January 1859, which consecrated Moldavia's union with Wallachia and thus the appearance of the Romanian state. The natural evolution implied, of course, gaining independence as a guarantee of the implementation of a modernization program.³

In the forthcoming speeches, we will present, analyse and explain, through the specific type of comparison and language analysis, both the realities of the moment and the way in which the European ideas entered into the domestic political thinking.

Ideas, concepts, principles

On May 9, 1877, in the Chamber of Deputies' Meeting, Mihail Kogalniceanu spoke a magistral speech, proclaiming the State Independence of Romania. The word is actually a response to a speech of Nicolae Fleva⁴. Fleva wanted explanations from the Foreign Minister in the context of the Russian-Turkish conflict, about the positioning of Romania over the old agreements with the Ottoman Empire. The result of this speech was to cast a motion with 79 votes for and 2 abstentions, the Assembly of Deputies acknowledging the breaking of relations with the Ottoman Empire and the official declaration of Romania's independence.

³ Frederick Kellogg, *Romania's Road to Independence*, European Institute Publishing House, Iași, 2002.

⁴ Nicolae Fleva, 1840-1920, lawyer, Romanian politician, liberal-radical, Mayor of Bucharest in 1884, Minister of Internal Affairs in 1895, Agriculture and Royal Domains. At the time of the interpellation he was a liberal-radical deputy.

Mihail Kogalniceanu

We will play back the fragments of his discourse, and full play is not possible due to its extent.

Declaration of the absolute independence of Romania (Meeting of the Chamber of Deputies of May 9, 1877)

"Honourable Members, besides my position as minister, as a Romanian I applauded the Romanian, energetic, patricious language of honor. Fleva. This once said, I have to ask myself if I, the Minister of the Foreign Affairs, and through whose low voice Romania speaks abroad today, are allowed to follow him and consult more the heart than cold reason. (...)

Gentlemen, the Chamber, and the Senate, at the interpellations of Mr. Stolojan⁵ and Falcoianu⁶, have admitted that we are in a state of war, have admitted that we are unconnected with our links with the Sublime Porte. These two votes decided the situation and did not need a bigger comment. In a state of war, with broken links, what are we? We are a self-standing nation! (applause) But, gentlemen, does our labor stop here? Does our mission stop? I have come to the aim pursued not today, but can I say, for centuries, and more particularly pursued since 1848 onwards? First of all, gentlemen, let us ask ourselves: what was it before the war was declared? Do we have new addicts to Turkey? Were we a new Turkish province? Are we the new vassals of Turkey? Do we have the Sultan as a suzerain? The strangers said this; we never said it. We were not vassals. The Sultan was not our suzerain, but it was something: there were sui generis ties; some ties that were weak when the Romanians were strong; some ties that were strong as the Romanians were weak. (general applause) (...)

So, gentlemen, I have no fear and no doubt to declare before the national representation that we are a free and independent nation. (Long repetitive applause) But now, gentlemen, we are beginning to make the hardships, because our new condition, defining our independence in a more determined and absolute way, must be accepted by Europe. This is the point, so patriotism is claimed, so caution is required, so cold blood is claimed. (...)

We have to prove that we are a living nation, we must prove that we have the conscience of our nation, we must prove that we are able to make new sacrifices in order to preserve this country and its rights for

⁵ Anastase Stoloja, 1836-1901, lawyer, politician, liberal, founder member of PNL, mayor of Craiova in 1868, deputy, minister of justice, agriculture, industry, commerce and domains, interior.

⁶ Scarlat Fălcoianu, 1828-1877, magistrate, political, liberal, supporter of Al. I. Cuza, Minister of Cults and Public Instruction, of Justice.

our children, and this mission in these moments it is entrusted to our brothers and sons who die at the border. (prolonged applause) (...)

But once this has been done, not only the government, but the Chamber, and the Senate, and the nation should plead before Europe, before the great ereopagus, that arophobe in which Russia itself is addressing its cause; to address and to firmly and wisely advocate our good faith and the good cause of our independence. (...)

Once again, I declare to you, on behalf of the government, that we are at war with the Sublime Porte that our ties to the Porte are broken, that the government will do its utmost to make our state of independence and independent state to be recognized by Europe in the future peace, which the government, both you and the whole country wants to see it for an hour before. (prolonged applause) (...)

There are on this bench those men who in their youth worked to get where we are; also on this bench are the juniors, who will carry on what the elders have begun.

One word I have to say to you today: you see all cold, without enthusiasm, thinking coldly. Well, on the day that Europe recognizes what we all need to work on, it will recognize our determination and put us under the shield of a future European peace treaty - that day, on this bench, you will no longer find the elders; you will find us all young and full of enthusiasm. (prolonged applause)".⁷

From the text we identified the following key words: Romanian, war, Turkey, independence, Europe, the Treaty of Paris, the 19th century, Russia, Austria.

Kogalniceanu, in his speech, uses a balanced tone to respond to the interpellation emphasizing his quality of minister. He explains the specific conditions underlying the decision-making: "*... when the convention with Russia was voted ... maybe I also spoke as a Romanian ... Today I have to speak only as a minister.*" One of the intentions of the Romanian dignitary was to urge caution of the excited audience by the historical moment lived.

He modestly characterized himself by the use of metonymy as "*a weak voice through which Romania speaks abroad*", while reminding that Romania's independence depends not only on entering the war with Turkey but also on the attitude of the great European powers. He urges caution by warning the Assembly that "*a word, a letter written or imprudently written by the one who has the honor of directing the country's interests with foreigners can compromise ... the fate of the Romanian nation.*"

⁷ Gh. Buzatu, *Speeches and parliamentary debates, 1864-2004*, Mica Valahie Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006, pp. 88-91.

While referring to the use of reason in everything that will be done in the process of gaining independence as a dignitary of the Romanian state, the orator realizes the need to maintain a weighted tone while trying to strengthen the enthusiasm of the audience in support of the cause to be pleaded before the great European powers. By the way he positions himself, he adopts an air of proclamation and national pride in his speech, saying: *"We are independent! We are a self-standing nation! (applause) We have an independent ruler! (applause)"*

After the applause, the call to caution comes again, warning *"But, gentlemen, here is our labor stop? Does our mission stop here? I have come to the goal pursued not today, but can I say for centuries and especially pursued since 1848 onwards?"*

Interrogations with a strong persuasive degree represent the way of introducing historical argumentation, the wishes of the Romanian nation, facts that give legitimacy to the act of independence. The orator's arguments are reproduced through a series of interrogative statements of value, which trained the audience in the proposed demonstration: *"What were we prior to the declaration of the war? Have we been dependent of Turkey? Were we a new Turkish province? Are we the new vassals of Turkey? Did we have the Sultan as a suzerain?"*

Then the confirmation answers: *"We were not vassals. The sultan was not our suzerain. And the ties with Turkey were only "some sui generis ties: some ties that were weak when the Romanians were strong; some ties that were strong when the Romanians were weak".*

The speaker's plea is aimed at convincing the representatives of the great European powers that Romania did not violate in any way the Treaty of Paris, which enshrined the appearance of the Romanian state, being aware that defiance would harm the interests of the country and its needs. He highlights the need for the treaty to be respected by the European forces and at the same time highlights Turkey's failure to do so: *"I will not do the process of Turkey; this is the job of the state people, who are in the government and who have been, and who, today, take part in the Ottoman Parliament. They are obliged to see that they have been wrong when they have always responded and in a systematic way with non-possimus to all our demands."*

Being a diplomat whose abilities were highlighted throughout the political activity, Kogalniceanu continues his argumentation with a symmetrical approach. Stressing the lack of the necessity of conflicting ties with Turkey, but also the need of European approval, and Romania's support, alliance and guarantee of independence.

Using this prolepsis, he recalls and justifies the position adopted by the country, being obliged to defend *"the same and we have recourse to*

the cannon, and our cannon responds to the Ottoman cannon", then using the argumentation: "Are you wondering what we are now? We are in a state of resentment with the Turks, and when peace is to be done, I do not believe that a single Romanian will agree that Romania will return to its former, badly defined, hybrid and offensive position both to the interests of Romania and to Turkey."

The politician's recognition of fears follows: *"the definition of our independence ... must be accepted by Europe,"* and then the call to prudence and cold blood that involves lack of sentiment.

Through prolepsis are reminded the words of an English parliamentarian: *"... I very much cared for those words, he said at the Parliament's tribune in London, that Romania is an integral part of the Ottoman Empire and that the Ottoman army can pass the Danube. These words worried me."*

Rhetorical question: what do we do? Let us be dead, introducing a series of pathetic arguments with a persuasive purpose, addressing not only the audience but the whole of Europe: *"No, gentlemen, for no one can help them, no one computes with the dead. We must prove that we are a living nation, we must prove that we are able to make new sacrifices in order to preserve this country and its rights for our children, and this mission is now entrusted to our brothers and sons who die at the border."*

The tone is then tempered by the fact that it is the duty of the House and the Senate to plead before European diplomacy before the great airship *"to which Russia itself addresses and pleads its cause"*, the cause of Romania's independence, not necessarily as a patriotic desire of the Romanians, but as an act justified by the evolution, modernization, of entire Europe in the nineteenth century. The speaker uses arguments: *"We have to prove that we are claiming our independence because we as a nation have the right to live with our lives", all in front of a Europe that "preaches feelings of justice." (...)(...) "So, to prove that if we want to be a free and independent nation, it is not for us to be anxious about our neighbors,"* but instead, the aim is to prove that *"we are a nation determined to we take care of our people, let us take care of its development."*

The speaker sends a message to the Romanians' enemies: *"We want to be good with all our powers, with Russia, with Austria, and even with Turkey."*

Kogalniceanu speaks of Romania's interests at the *"Danube mouths"* that are of interest to European forces. The argument is particularly sensitive because, with the economic development of the Romanian countries and its gradual inclusion in the European economy, especially in the field of cereals, the commercial interests of the great European powers

were increasing.⁸ Therefore, the desire expressed by the author to guarantee the access of European merchant vessels to the Danube ports and to the mouths of the Danube by the young Romanian state was fundamental. He continues to recall the reasons underlying the decision to break relations with the Gate, making itself "guilty of" the state of war it is in.

It also calls for the help and support of all, "the voice of the country and the duty of those who are on these benches", prophetically emphasizing that "what God will do", but also reminds that any action taken requires caution that "we are not allowed to do anything against the great European interests."

The finish finds the orator using a prophetic tone, hopeful, confident in the future, in the one of the descendants and the country as a European state: "On the day when Europe recognizes what we all need to work, it will recognize the determination and will put us under the shield of a future European peace treaty - on that day, on this bench you will no longer find the elders; you will find us all young and full of enthusiasm. (prolonged applause)"

The rhetorical figures used during the discourse do not have the role of obtaining an agreement, because it already exists, but pushing for a decision in support of the case. The logical, historical type of argument combines with the pathetic one.

Epanalepsa, "Have we been addicted to Turkey? Were we a new Turkish province? Have we been new vassals to Turkey? "Combines with antithesis" some ties that were weak when the Romanians were strong: some ties that were strong when the Romanians were weak".

The rhetorical interplay is intertwined with the paradox: "Are we dead? No, gentlemen, for no one computes with the dead. We have to prove that we are a living nation."

After the speech, Nicolae Fleava proposes to vote the motion, winning the case; and the next day, sovereign Carol I praises the work of senators and deputies.

Ion C. Bratianu

The second speech to be analysed belongs to Ion C. Bratianu. Bratianu was one of the fiercest supporters of the convention with Russia and, at the same time, of Romania's entry into war. He makes a speech before the parliament on the day they vote to cancel the tribute to the Ottoman Empire, May 10, 1877.

This is the full speech, the speech addressed to the Ruler by Ion C. Bratianu on 10 May 1877.

⁸ Ștefan Zeletin, *Romanian Bourgeoisie*, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008.

"Your Majesty, for eleven years, since Your Majesty is on the Throne of Romania, neither the tempting afflictions nor the most audacious challenges have deprived our country, to distract it from the work of its reconstruction and to throw it in adventures which could have rocked the peace of the East.

With all these temptations, however, with the most implacable prudence, patience and perseverance, we did everything we could to achieve the international conditions established by solemn treaties and recognized by the Guarantee Powers. We have thus proved to the world that those qualities that have distinguished in the center of Europe the most distinguished men of Your Majesty's race have accompanied you to the mouths of the Danube, and that the Romanian people still preserve the wisdom and energy that, for centuries, inspired our ancestors and made them keep a free homeland in the midst of the most terrible cataclysms.

But when all hope has ceased that the thunders across the Danube can quench diplomatically when the war between Russia and Turkey broke out, and when nothing can be assured of the consequences of this terrible conviction for the Balkan Peninsula; when, even before it is sure that it will be victorious from this war, from the terrible political and social crisis it will go through, Turkey, in its circular to powers, cuts us through the whim of its wrath a fate that is not in conformity neither our rights nor our desires; when the program from that circular is already executed, by treating our agent in Constantinople as a simple Ottoman official, when our open cities and villages, where there were neither Russian troops nor Romanian troops, are not occupied as strategic points, but daily bombarded, burned and robbed, when our plains and fields are desolate and burned when our sentinels along the Danube are killed and barbed in the most barbarous way when the workers are kidnapped from their plow and taken together with their women and children, as in the time of Mahomet II, when, in a word, we see our Homeland being threatened by all the horrors of the wild invasions of the past centuries, the same sense of caution and wisdom, which has always led us, imposes today our duty to raise us all, to keep the chest of danger, to save the political individuality of the Romanian state. Our past, Your Majesty, could, believe, already assure all the Guarantee Powers of the purpose we pursue. Our actions, in our present events, will prove to all, and especially to our powerful neighbors, Russia and Austria, that our policy is only a policy of preservation, and that if we undo today and forever Turkey, it is we no longer feel the effects of its aggressions, put a strong stance and make it impossible for them to repeat in the future.

Powers will be convinced that, as we are, between two great and powerful Empires, the sense of preservation itself forbids any other adventurous aspirations that could endanger our existence even.

At the outset of present Romania, which in fact is European public law, is our patrimony, we believe that we will not deny the solicitude and protection of the Guaranteed Powers if we see ourselves today fighting, and fighting to the extreme to defend our rights and our independence.

With God, ahead, Your Majesty! You are already saluted with enthusiasm by the people from all angles of Romania, and if the enormous sacrifices to which the country is called would have no effect but to make you know the Romanian under a new phase, to love him and more, and to gain even greater trust in him, it would still be enough; for only the absolute faith, the mutual and unwavering love between the sovereign and the people can secure the future of Romania, we can give everybody the strength to fight in any vicissitude it would have to pass.

Long live, Your Majesty, the first and the free and independent Lord of Romania! Long live the queen and her virtues live a mild balm to the sufferings the nation is exposed to today! Long live, Romania!"⁹

Keywords from the discourse of one of the most important liberal politicians of the moment are: Romania, the Guarantee Powers, diplomacy, Russia, Turkey, Austria, preservation, independence.

The speaker addresses Prince Carol I, reminding him that "for eleven years" since he occupied the throne, there were no "temptations and challenges" that would have stood for independence.

Making an eulogy of the sovereign's origins, "the most distinguished men of your Majesty's race," as well as of the Romanian ancestors, the orator points out that Romania did not violate the provisions of international treaties.

Using logic-based argumentation intertwined with the pathetic one through the use of metaphors, Bratianu explains the reasons that led Romania to enter into war with Turkey, the diplomatic channel unable to stop the "thunder over the Danube", and Turkey "in the whim of its wrath" occupies Romanian localities using them as "strategic points". Bratianu reminds the historical events of the time of Mahomet II when the territory of our country was robbed, "threatened by all the horrors of the wild invasions of the past centuries" and the Romanians used as slaves for the welfare of the Ottoman population.

It assures Russia and Austria that the only goal that Romania is pursuing is "a policy of preservation and that if we untie today and totally Turkey, it is not to feel the effects of its convulsions, if we take the guns, it

⁹ ***, *To C.A. Rosetti, 100 years from his birth, commemorative volume dedicated to, "Democracy", Bucharest, 1916, pp. 319-331.*

is to answer of its aggressions, to put a strong barrier on them and make them so that they can no longer repeat in the future."

By adopting a prophetic air, the orator shows that the European forces will understand that the only desire of the Romanians is to gain their independence, not to embark on "other adventurous aspirations".

It points out that the borders of the country, the "European public space", is "our patrimony" and that the Guarantee Powers will empathize with the Romanians and will offer them the diplomatic support necessary for the "defense of our rights and independence". And Austria and Russia, our "strong neighbors," the traditional rivals of Romania, speaks the orator on a prophetic tone, will be convinced by the strict territorial conservation spirit and will support Romania's armed action, located "between the two great and powerful Empires."

At the end of the speech, Bratianu praises the kingdom and reminds him of the trust that has been given to him by the Romanian people and the duty he has.

"God, ahead, Your Majesty! You are already hailed with enthusiastic transports by the people from all angles of Romania, and if the enormous sacrifices to which the country is called, it would have no effect but to make you know the Romanian under a new phase, to love them even more because only the absolute faith, the mutual and unwavering love between the sovereign and the people can ensure the future of Romania."

The rhetorical figures used, such as epanalepsis, love, love, repeated at the end of the discourse, are aimed at highlighting the sovereign-people relations.

The metaphor, "thunder over the Danube", "the whim of the urge", the "sweetening conditioner" and the use of pathetic arguments, are meant to express the devotion to the sovereign and the hope in beneficial decisions that will help to devote the Romanian state to the international level.

The referring term is we, the orator identifying himself with the Romanian people.

Ion C. Bratianu's speech is part of the series of speeches dedicated to the declaration of Independence aimed at maintaining enthusiasm, as well as issuing clear signals to the great European Powers about the political determination.

Dimitrie Bratianu

The third speech selected is that of Dimitrie Bratianu. Liberal politician, brother with Ion C. Bratianu, Dimitrie served as vice-president of the Senate at the moment of the proclamation of Romania's independence on 10 May 1877.

Although Romania's independence is proclaimed on May 9, 1877, the day when the Assembly of Deputies officially states that the country is at war with Turkey is 10, the decision is adopted and voted by the Senate, being immediately proclaimed by Carol I.

Also on 10 May, parliamentarians present the *Declaration of Independence* to the King.

Dimitrie's speech is not addressed to a large audience but to a single person, King Carol I.

Here's the speech of Dimitrie Bratianu:

"Your Highness, the Senate brings a respectful devotion to your Majesty! Its congratulations and the wishes it does, so that the reign of Your Majesty may be long, fertile, glorious.

Your Majesty, for eleven years, the 10th of May, the day of your inauguration, on the Romanian Throne, is a national day of celebration. So far, on that great day, our souvenirs and our sure aspirations were the flattering of our souls. Today, you see, Your Majesty, all the hearts of joy, the selfishness of our ancestors revived in their own great-grandsons, and our aspirations have become a reality.

Today the pact between the nation and its chosen August has been committed! When you have ascended to Throne, we have promised our hearts and Your Majesty have promised us that you will do miracles with the Romanian people. Today we restored the broken three centuries of our nation's life as a stand-alone nation and ante-guard of civilization in the Orient.

Your Highness, the Chamber and the Senate recognized Romania's independence from Turkey. Your Majesty, in the head of our heroic army, you will make it impose to the enemy and recognized by the Guarantee Powers as a necessity to Europe.

And the Senate, Your Majesty, is embraced by the worries and the hopes that make the heart of Your Majesty tickle. If age does not allow us, the sublime impulses that make the youth heroism, our heroism is cold blood; cold blood is not indifference, it is the resignation of the conscience not to recapture before any sacrifice.

The times have arrived. You see it, Your Majesty! And the old Senate fired at the blast of the cannon from Calafat and Oltenita. When you have the right and the power, the wisdom is to cure. Dare, dare, dare, son of Friederich the Great, of Stephen the Great and of Michael the Brave! Throw away the faith of the elect of God on the path of salvation of the homeland in which you are pushing the tradition of your heroic families, and the genius of Romania. And we are back loaded with the glory of the Romanian people and the blessings of mankind. Inward through freedom, at the forefront of heroism, maintains our homeland

Independence and conquers the esteem and love of the civilized world. Europe, together with us, with veneration and love, will greet you in the Great King of Romania.

Long live, Your Majesty! Long live the queen! Long live independent and free Romania!"¹⁰

From the reading of the text are identified the following keywords: May 10, Romania, Turkey, Guarantee Powers, Europe, Independence

Addressing is a direct one, Your Highness, and the tone indicates respect.

He remembers that on that day there celebrated 11 years since Carol I became King of Romania, and that on that great day, until then, the Romanian had been feeding with hopes: our safe souvenirs and aspirations were the comfort of our souls, but that in that day, the dreams of independence were seen to be fulfilled: the selfishness of our ancestors revived in their own great-grandsons, and the country finally enjoyed seeing the possibility of realizing the , '48's dream, independence from the Turks.

The elite member of the '48 generation highlights the sacrificial relationship between the ruler and the people: we have promised our hearts and Your Majesty, you have promised us that you will do miracles with the Romanian people.

He reminds Prince Carol that the connection between him and the people will be fruitful only when he, despite the external pressures and political family relations, and the Senate, Your Majesty, is encompassed by the worries and the hopes that make the throat of Mary Tale ... and will assume the wishes of the Romanian people stated in the revolution of 1848 with an emphasis on the independence of the Romanian state: Throw with the faith of God's chosen men on the path of salvation of the homeland in which you push the tradition of your heroic families, and the genius Romania. And we are back loaded with the glory of the Romanian people and the blessings of mankind. Inwardly, through freedom, at the forefront of heroism, maintains our homeland Independence.

The mission that Carol has is given in an exclamation tone Dare, dare, dare, son of Friederich the Great, of Stephen the Great and of Michael the Brave!, recalling that although he is a king of Western origins, in the country he is seen as a follower of the Wallachia and Moldavian great leaders that Romania had.

Appealing to history, the orator reminds that Romania has no longer been independent for three centuries broken of our self-standing and anti-war nation of civilization in the Orient.

¹⁰ Ibidem, pp. 331-332.

The discourse ends in the tone of the proclamations of "Long live, Your Majesty! Long live the queen! Long live independent and free Romania!"

Being adapted to the requirements of the moment, the discourse is a patriotic one, specifying the wishes of the '48 generation. Its purpose is not to persuade, but to legitimize a political decision. However, we encounter the epanalepsy combined with antithesis the ancestors' selfishness, our heroism is cold blood; cold blood is not indifference, discursive marks that emphasize the force of speech.

The speaker uses the logical arguments to emphasize the necessity of Romania's integration into the modern European space: conquers the esteem and love of the civilized world, Europe.

The romantic metaphor, specific to the '48 language, is also used to emphasize the necessity of the act of Independence: the egoism of the ancestors, the flattering of the souls, the cold blood, the blessings of mankind.

The logical, historical arguments are highlighted by epanalepsy: the 10th of May, the day of the signing of Your Majesty on the Throne of Romania, is a national celebration day. So far, that great day.

The term referent is we, the author using it to identify himself not only with the audience, but with the entire Romanian people.

C.A. Rosetti

The fourth analysis is C.A. Rosetti's speech, President of the Chamber. Rosetti, in his speech from 10 May 1877, gives the emotions of the Romanian political class to the proclamation of Independence, linking the sovereign's statements on his arrival in the country and his deeds in the context of the Russian-Turkish conflict.

This is the speech of C.A. Rosetti:

"Your Majesty, there are 11 years today, entering for the first time in the palace where the nation, through its representatives, awaiting its chosen, Your Majesty pronounced the following words:., A choice of nation with spontaneity Lord of the Romanians, I left without any doubt my country and my family for responding to the call of this people who entrusted their destiny to me. Putting the foot on this sacred earth, I became Romanian as well. Citizen today, tomorrow, if needed, soldier, I will share with you the good and the bad fate. From this moment everything is common to us; believe me, as I believe in you. Providence, who has led your chosen up here and who has removed all the obstacles in their path, did not leave his work unfulfilled!"

These words were acclaimed by the whole country as a goodwill of a new era in which the secular aspirations of the Romanians were to be realized.

The illustrious name of the chosen inspires his faith, his force and his youth, the patience to wait for the work to be done. The nation is already seeing the dawn of the day, in which the old independence for which all gentlemen, who were the real expression of the country, had fought for centuries for nothing but to mean to their descendants the way that would lead them to the desired goal.

11 years have just passed since then and today the flag of Mircea and Stephen, carried by the Romanian arm of Your Majesty, is again unfolded in the great light, and the whole nation is enthusiastically gathering around it, determined to defend it.

The Assembly of Deputies is happy to greet this great day and to acclaim in Your Majesty the Romanian independent sovereign.

Long live, Your Majesty! Long live, the queen! Long live Romania!"¹¹

The key words resulting from this discourse are: 11 years, independence, Romania.

The speech is addressed to the sovereign, Carol I.

The orator reminds Carol's 11 years of reign and the promise made by him on the day of the crowning that becoming a Romanian will assume the beliefs of this people and will fight together for emancipation. "The choice of a nation with spontaneity of the Romanians, I left without question my country, and my family I became Romanian. Citizen today, tomorrow, if needed, soldier, I will share with you the good and the bad fate.", Words that gave hope to the Romanian people.

Rosetti specifies the patience that the Romanian people showed in anticipation of modernization as a nation, using the logical argumentation, recalling the history of all the gentlemen with which they fought, the sacrifice of the ancestors, to pave the way for the achievement of state independence.

The orator also uses the pathetic argument when nominating the great rulers of the two Principalities, Mircea and Stephen, who wore the flag of Romania to glory, a flag that is now "on the Romanian arm of Your Majesty", in order to excite the audience.

The conclusion is an uplifting and time-specific one: "Long live, Your Majesty! Long live the queen! Long live Romania!"

The discursive marks are 11-year-old, designed to highlight the moment of Prince's inauguration and the patience that the Romanians

¹¹ Ibidem, pp. 333-334.

have had to live that monumental moment; metaphor, bleached dawn, and metonymy, new era, to amplify the emotion of the audience.

Carol I

The fifth discourse discussed is that of Carol I. The Sovereign holds a speech on the same day:

"Mr. President, gentlemen, you remind me of what I am 11 years old when I first set foot in the Palace of the Nation. These words are dear to my heart, they have been the myth of my reign for the whole of the years I have gone through together.

Today, as on May 10, 1866, I do not even cry that I left my family, nor did I break up from the country of my birth. No gentlemen, I do not repent that I made my country from Romania, that I made my own family from the Romanian Nation.

On the contrary, today, when I know better the beauties of this country and the destinies to which it has the right to aspire, today, when I could appreciate more of the great qualities that distinguish the Romanian people, I rejoice with joy the day of my election, the day that I came to the middle of the Romanians, the day you put me on a Throne illustrated by so many glorious Gentlemen, defenders of national independence and Christendom in front of the Ottomans.

A single shadow covered the past years, a single humiliation existed for Romania and for its Lord, wanting to talk about those badly defined and unqualified covenants that were called suzerainty in Constantinople and, for Bucharest, vassal.

In order to remove these inappropriate covenants, our position, our interests, even our ab antiquo rights, to replace them with the covenants of the nineteenth century, those to which free-standing states and peoples have worked two generations of Romanians, and more from 1857 now.

And I have the right to argue that my choice, that my calling to the mouth of the Danube from the very streams of the great river, that the very mission of My Lord meant only the emancipation of Romania of these covenants.

In the midst of unwanted events that we have not provoked, the High Porte has broken these covenants on its own. We will not restrain them! Or not your, or not all the bodies of the state, or not proclaimed the entire nation, they have declared that by breaking these covenants, Romania reverts to its old independence, as a free nation, as a state of its own, as a useful member, a civilian in the great family of European states?

It now belongs to the energy and devotion of all the sons of this country, belongs to the political prudence of the state bodies, it now belongs to me, forgive me this affirmation, belongs to my zeal, my

activity and my tireless efforts to mediate, to become a new political state of Romania receive a European consecration.

When we look at the benevolence, the great affection with which the Great Powers, with whom the Augur Monarchs surrounded all our forces of rebirth, all our national acts either allowed us to hope and to have the firm belief that their mighty contest will not miss Romania, even in these supreme moments, when it will only claim that it is a people worthy of being free, a country that has not disowned the expectations of Europe, as a state that has the strength and the intelligence to fulfil a mission that is drawn to it through its geographical position.

This we hope for, we want, we will, and Romania's independence, far from being a care for the peace of Europe, for the peace of the neighboring states, we will firmly believe that this will not only be a satisfaction for our national needs, but will also satisfy a great European interest.

Once again, thank you, gentlemen, for the good words that you are addressing on this memorable day, and the queen, by associating with these thanks, together we wish you: Long live the deputies of Romania and, above all of us, long live Romania!"¹²

Keywords: 11 years, Romania, emancipation, covenants, High Porte, Great Powers, Independence.

It responds to deputies' messages, also evoking the past, the 11 years of reign, a period in which he has never felt the pain of separation from the country of origin or family: "I do not even repent that I left my family, I have separated from the land of my birth."

The sovereign praises the "beauties" of Romania and the character of the Romanian people he belongs to since 1866. He also remembers the "single shadow" and "the one humiliation" they live, not to be free, using the antithesis "suzerainty" and "vassalite".

The monarch reminds the country's need to align itself with the other European states on the road to modernity imposed by the "covenants of the nineteenth century", a road for which they fought and which the two previous generations, the '48 and the "past 1857 now".

The rhetorical question demonstrates the need of Romania to act "in the midst of these undesirable events", to respond by force to them, these being, on the one hand, caused totally by the High Porte, but at the same time necessary for Romania in its approach to integrate "into the great family of European states".

¹² Roxana Patraș, *Romanian political oratory, 1847-1899*, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, Iași, 2016, pp. 278-279.

The necessity of diplomacy in the relations with the Great Powers is underlined by the ruler, alongside, at the same time, the hope of supporting the steps undertaken by Romania by the Monarchs to be free and independent, in order to align with the other states on their way to modernity, the country being supported by "Its geographical position".

Finally, the monarch thanks the deputies and appeals to the necessary unity in the official steps, the desire for state immunity, highlighting the patriotic quality.

"Long live Romania's deputies and, above all of us, long live Romania!"

The rhetorical marks used are epanalepsy, day, family, to emphasize the lack of regret of being the monarch of a foreign state, a single shadow, a single humiliation, highlighting the necessity of liberation, and metonymy, covenants, in order to show the disrespect of the Treaty of Paris by Turkey.

In the beginning of the discourse, the term "me" is a term that is transformed in ourselves, the monarch identifying not only the audience, but the entire Romanian people, that, in the end, I will be reborn.

Instead of conclusions

The five selected speeches of Kogălniceanu, declaring the "absolute independence of Romania", the three *augura* of the Bratianu brothers, Rosetti and Carol I, find a number of key terms such as independence, nationality, freedom, 11 years. We can say that these terms have a fundamental symbolic value. The symbols are persuasively used in political speeches, evoking either the glory of the past, the remarkable personalities, the sacrifice of predecessors to do something, their struggle for a cause, and the disappointment of the present, but at the same time underlines the hope in a bright future. The objective is to highlight the current historical moment and the path to be followed. The aim is to continue the process of modernization, which can also be done by sacrificing political interests.

We find in the speeches analysed evoking the image of Mircea the Elder, Stephen the Great, Mihai the Brave, outstanding personalities in the evolution of the Romanian people, with a special emphasis on the fight for identity and independence. Being a special historical moment, that of declaring the independence, the appeal to the rulers who fought against the Turks, especially for defending the independence of their own voivodate, is aimed at strengthening the argumentation.

Based on the history of predecessors, political language involved the use of several symbols, symbolic situations, the aim being to highlight the

sense of national identity, the individual with the forefathers, and national freedom.

In this category, we can even count the number of past years, 11 years, since the performance of a historical event, the number representing the homage to those who sacrificed to his service. The message is subtle but strongly at the same time, and was sent to Carol I, with the necessary deference, of course, that bringing him to the throne is the fulfillment of an objective assumed in the political project of the foot-masters, which was achieved by giving up the right to enter the throne of the country's most important Romanian boyar families.

"The symbol is not a residual dimension of the so-called true policy; the less it is not a smoke curtain upon which pale and fiery shapes can be projected. Symbolism is true politics, expressed in a very special and extremely insidious way."¹³

By identifying politicians with a popular symbol, it is the value of a powerful instrument in the marathon for obtaining and preserving power.¹⁴

All this reporting of the past to the present and to the present in the future only increases confidence in our own forces by highlighting the idea of continuity and conviction that the world in which we live is the same as that in which our ancestors lived and with what they want live our descendants.

By the past, present, emphasis is placed on the mythical time dimension. We refer here to a selective creation of a reality, an image of a certain type of historical reality that fits into the ideology of time, which promotes as a form of struggle against outdated political systems, specific to the feudal period, new, modern concepts, what they wanted a change in the cultural-civilization realities of the time. The concepts of national nation and state, based on a common history and roots, were part of this ideological project that finds its origins in Enlightenment and the French Revolution of 1848.

Malinowski is the one who asserts that man teaches the myths of the people he belongs not by telling them, but from the experience of living inside the "social texture of his tribe."¹⁵

The approach is correct, but here we feel to add that the founding myths of the nation can only be achieved if the selective creation of what

¹³ Clive S. Kussler, *Islam and Politics*, Cornell University Press Publishing House, 1978, pp. 244-245.

¹⁴ David I. Kretzer, *Politics and power*, Univers Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002, p. 19.

¹⁵ B. Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, Glencoe, The Free Press Publishing House, Illinois, 1948, p. 93.

constitutes the "past" and "the future" depends to a great extent on contemporary needs.

As a partial conclusion to such a vast and meaningful argument in the last two centuries, cyclically and forcefully taking the lead in European politics, we can see once again how the political people of the time were strongly anchored in ideological point of view in the Western European universe, which demonstrates that the process of reconnecting the Romanian space with the European reference was achieved, at least at the level of the leading elite.

References

***(1916), *To C.A. Rosetti, 100 years from his birth, commemorative volume dedicated to, "Democracy"*, Bucharest;

Braudel Fernand, (1985), *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the time of Philip II*, vol. I, Meridiane Publishing House, Bucharest;

Buzatu Gheorghe, (2006), *Speeches and parliamentary debates, 1864-2004*, Mica Valahie Publishing House, Bucharest;

Gibbon Edward, (1976), *The history of the decline and collapse of the Roman Empire*, Minerva Publishing house, Bucharest;

Kellogg Frederick, (2002), *Romania's Road to Independence*, European Institut Publishing House, Iași;

Kretzer I. David, (2002), *Politics and Power*, Unvers Publishing House, Bucharest;

Kussler, S. Clive, (1978), *Islam and Politics*, Cornell University Press Publishing House;

Malinowski, B., (1948), *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, Glencoe, The Free Press Publishing House, Illinois;

Patraș Roxana, (2016), *Romanian Political Oratory, 1847-1899*, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, Iași;

Zeletin Ștefan, (2008), *Romanian Bourgeoisie*, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest.