

Romania and Egypt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

*Gabriel Leahu**

*Ministerul Învățământului, Cercetării și Inovării, gabrielleahu@yahoo.com

Abstract: Romania and Egypt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In this paper we intend to present the steps taken by the Romanian state but also by its citizens for establishing the diplomatic mission in Egypt in the context of the Great European Powers' expansion in the area. The study started with the research of unpublished diplomatic documents from the Historical Archive of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Keywords: Egypt, Romania, interests' representation, International Commission for Compensation, Pâclianu Memorandum

The geographical proximity, the integration of the Carpatho-Danubian-Pontic space and Egypt in the same great imperial formations, Roman and Ottoman, favoured commercial, religious and cultural ties (C. C. Giurescu, 1967; V. Căndea, 1963). Pharaonic Egypt ornaments were discovered in the area of archaeological cultures of Romanian prehistory and protohistory (M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, 1995). After Strabon, both Deceneus and Zalmoxis owed their knowledge to their contact with the Egyptian civilization (Strabon, VII, 3, 5, 11). Egyptian gods were worshiped in Roman Dacia (M. Macrea, 1969), many objects of Egyptian origin being discovered after the Romans disserted Dacia (C. C. Giurescu, 1967).

In the Middle Ages, knowledge of Egypt had multiplied through popular novels (*Alexăndria*) and stories about the lives of the saints. Grigore Ureche and Dimitrie Cantemir mentioned the conquest of Egypt by the Ottomans, the latter narrating Sultan Selim's attempt to build a canal between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea (C. C. Giurescu, 1967). Let us remember that a Romanian prince, Radu Paisie, was exiled by the Turks "to Egipet", where he stayed until his death (C. C. Giurescu, 1967); the Patriarchate of Alexandria and Saint

Catherine's Monastery in Sinai had close links with the Romanian Countries, due to the significant amounts donated by princes and boyars. Nine monasteries, hermitages and churches were dedicated to the Patriarchate, which had 11 estates and a property, therefore, 8 of the 11 patriarchs visited Romanian Countries between late sixteenth century and the second half of the eighteenth century. The Monastery of Mount Sinai possessed in 1863, 55 estates, 270 acres of vineyards, 29 buildings and 320 shops (C. C. Giurescu, 1967). The special impression left by the last place of worship determined Spatharus Mihail Cantacuzino to build Sinaia Monastery in 1695 (I. M. Cantacuzino, 1996).

The economic, social, and mental progress of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries causes a "modification in the space - time framework of the world, and implicitly in the rhythm of history"; this, added "to the pure savour of a bookish curiosity" (D. Radosav, 1985, p. 249) and to the fashion of romantic travels, motivated the increased intellectual interest for exotic lands, Egypt included. The journey of the three forty-eighters' activists, Alexandru Cristofi, Christian Tell and D. Plesoianu should be placed in this context. They visited Egypt in 1851 while in exile (M. Anghelescu, 1983). D. Bolintineanu followed

them, and he was the first one to present travel notes about Egypt, in the true sense of the word (M. Anghelescu, 1983).

In this paper we intend to present the steps taken by the Romanian state but also by its citizens for establishing the diplomatic mission in Egypt in the context of the Great European Powers' expansion in the area. The study started with the research of unpublished diplomatic documents from the *Historical Archive of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs* (AMAE).

The works on the Suez Canal started on April 25, 1859, and were accompanied by a huge media campaign, with echoes in the United Principalities. Romanian elite understood the value and importance of the work undertaken for the advancement of mankind (A. Baligot de Beyne, 1986), which was clearly demonstrated by the letters exchange between Al. I. Cuza and Egyptian leaders (C. C. Giurescu, 1967). In the first letter addressed to Mohamed Said and not to Ismail, according to C. Botoran (1974), the leader expressed his sympathy for the energy and perseverance shown by the Khedive for "carrying out a work that will become the pride of our times" (C. C. Giurescu, 1967, p. 351-352). The other letter, dated two years later, recalls the indirect contribution of the Principalities for building the Canal through "huge amounts" of exported timber and wheat; he also mentions the situation of the Romanians settled on "the land of Egypt, and in charge of considerable commercial affairs, for which I request the benevolent protection of Your Highness" (C. C. Giurescu, 1967, p. 352-353).

These Romanians settled permanently or temporarily in Egypt, asked Romanian authorities to set up a diplomatic and consular representation to protect their interests (C. C. Giurescu, 1967). Not incidentally, Costache Negri, the Principalities' representative in Constantinople, suggested in 1862 the creation of a Romanian Agency in Egypt, with the headquarters in Alexandria (C. C. Giurescu, 1967). Four years later, Al. G. Golescu-Arăpîlă, Negri's successor, proposed "the creation of a consular delegate position to Egypt, necessary to protect our commercial interests", but also of the hundreds of Romanian subjects that "do not enjoy any protection" (C. C. Giurescu, 1967, p. 362-363). Financial difficulties and the indifference left no track for the two initiatives.

The Peace Congress of Berlin recognized Romania's independence, and its right to establish diplomatic representation in the territory of the Ottoman Empire, under the same conditions as the other European powers. Honorific and Career Consulates were set up in Ioannina, Bitola, Thessaloniki, Monastir, Smyrna, Tunis and Tripoli, their main task being defending the interests of Romanian citizens and resolving trade issues (C. Botoran, 1974). The situation was different in Egypt, despite the numerous interventions of Romanian exporters seeking diplomatic protection to guarantee for their exported products the same treatment as in the other states, plus the complaints of Romanian subjects who had no protection there. There were, however, several attempts to regulate the diplomatic and consular representation in Egypt, located in a direct relationship with the "political and economic development of Egypt under English protection" (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, p. 200). Thus, in November 25, 1878, Nicolae Ionescu, Minister of Foreign Affairs, commissioned the diplomatic agent from Berlin to ask the German government for their representative to protect the Romanians residing in Egypt until a Romanian diplomatic agent is named. Unfortunately, the government's collapse has prevented the achievement of this initiative, a telegram being addressed to the Romanian representative, asking him to postpone the presentation of the Note until further orders (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996). Three years later, D. Ollănescu, the Romanian minister in Constantinople, sent a substantially report, requiring that, before the establishment of Romanian consulates, the Romanian subjects' protection to be ensured by "a friendly power"; he thought of Italy, the Ambassador of this country being "very willing to assure it" (* f. 318: *Report of Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, March 10/22, 1881*). Vasile Boerescu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, approved the solution, recommending that the Italian representative granted its protection if he could not receive the position as the consul for Romania (*f. 318: *Report of Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, March 10/22, 1881*). The only remaining difficulty was the consent of the Porte "by recognizing the Italian consular agents in Egypt as the representative of Romanian interests" (*f. 322: *Report of Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, May 1/23, 1881*). Turkey's approval is obtained only in 1886 (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996).

Romania and Egypt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

On June 11, 1882, serious xenophobic disorders broke out in Alexandria, caused by the more visible presence and control exercised by the Europeans. The consuls of Britain, Italy and Greece were attacked, 60 Europeans were massacred, fires and robberies enveloped entirely the city. The Romanian representative to Constantinople reported 80 deaths (*f. 123: *Report of Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, June 13, 1883*). Army and police intervened six hours later, when the disorder was at its peak. The causes of the disorders were put either on the account of Urabi, the leader of the Egyptian nationalist movement, who supposedly was paid by the British (N. Notovich, 1898), or on the Khedive (**VII, 1980), the latter desiring the European intervention. It appears that the explanation is much simpler, as the Romanian representative in Constantinople confirms. The quarrel between an Egyptian and a Maltese degenerated amid the state of irritation caused by the presence of foreign vessels; the threat of the “imminent landing of Anglo-French troops” was not powerful enough “to stop the manifestations against the Europeans” (*f. 123: *Report of Romanian Legation in Athena, June 2/14, 1882*).

The riots in Egypt and, especially, those of Alexandria and Cairo affected seriously the Romanians. Not incidentally, D. Ollănescu asked, on 15/27 June 1882, what to do with the protection of Romanian subjects in Egypt (*vol. 190, f. 131: *Report of Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, June 15/27, 1882*), and on 16/28 June, the Romanian Minister in Athens announced that only one Romanian, refugee from Cairo, arrived at the Legation (*vol. 191, f. 134: *Report of Romanian Legation in Athena, June 16/28, 1882*). Except him, three more refugees would arrive from Alexandria, by the Greek boat, *Bubulina*. “Lacking any means of living”, they were repatriated with the assistance of the Legation (*vol. 191, f. 144: *Report of Romanian Legation in Athena, June 25 / July 7, 1882*). Other Romanians fled to Thessaloniki, occasion on which the Romanian General Consul discovers information about the Romanians from Egypt and their desire to establish a Romanian Consulate. In his report, on 12/24 September 1882 (*vol. 191, f. 208-210: *Report of the General Consul in Thessaloniki*), he said that in Egypt there are a significant number of Romanians (“over 3.000 individuals from Turkey - Aromanians”), plus 4.000 Albanians and 1000 Hebrews, “mainly floaters”, that travel yearly with a

Romanian passport for commercial businesses, their “interests extending to Bombay”. The Romanian diplomat claimed that after the Romanian Legation in Constantinople and the General Consulate in Thessaloniki established “frequent and regular relationship with Egypt”, the resonance of glorious deeds through which Romania became independent, “had awakened a national feeling in the Romanian population in Egypt”. Until then, the author continues, “all were Greeks”, using the Greek Consul protection since they were not treated properly in Egypt as Ottoman subjects, because of the khedival government’s independence velleities. However, this protection was temporary, since “back in Turkey, they were considered as reaya” (*vol. 191, f. 208-210: *Report of the General Consul in Thessaloniki*). The Greek Consul accepted their provisional registration due to the high fees charged. The Albanians did the same. By contrast, the non-resident Jews who came in Romania, “in the absence of a very necessary representative in the Orient”, used the Russian and the French Consulate. Now, the Romanian diplomat underlined, they all despise the Greek protection [. . .] unanimously; today, Romanian population of Egypt refuses to be considered Greek, and under the protection of the Greek Local Consul [. . .] and they request Romanian protection, without which they have come to rely on “Baroque protections”, like Persian or American. It also gave the example of a Romanian, Banica, with a capital of 13.000.000 pounds, who became American subject, but he made all his affairs using the Italian language “in the absence of a Romanian passport”, his family continuing to speak Romanian (*vol. 191, f. 208-210: *Report of the General Consul in Thessaloniki*).

The diplomat was quite sceptical regarding the actual number of Romanians and the amounts that could be collected by a Romanian Consulate, but he considered that its establishment would be useful for the reputation and interests of Romania, giving also satisfaction to the “Egyptian Romanians”. The Report mentions their petition in 1881, with 450 signatures in which they requested to establish the Romanian Consulate (*vol. 191, f. 208-210: *Report of the General Consul in Thessaloniki*). Aware of the financial difficulties of the Government, the Romanian Consul proposed to become the future official of the Consulate in Alexandria, asking for the temporary mission to go on site to determine the actual number of Romanians, Albanians and Jews

that petitioned for a Consulate, “convinced he would also find Romanians from the Kingdom”; he wanted to study the commercial possibilities offered to Romania. If the government would use an Honorary Consul, the Romanian diplomat warned that “in all Orient, Romanian honorary agents were either Greek or grecophiles who prejudiced the interests of Romanians”, insisting that it was essentially to be Romanian (*vol. 191, f. 208-210: *Report of the General Consul in Thessaloniki*).

The necessity to address the problem of Romanian interests’ representation becomes even more obvious in the context of requests “for compensations” for the Romanians who have suffered losses during the summer of 1882. The most representative is the case of Ladislau Lucaci, a Romanian subject who settled “for many years in Alexandria, as associate of Basile Oleyniuk and employee of the French pharmacy on Cherif Pasha Street No. 52” (*vol. 191, f. 201-202: *Petition addressed by Ladislau Lucaci to the subsecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August 2, 1882*). In his petition, addressed on August 2, 1882, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lucaci described the circumstances in which “the bombing, fire and massacre known by everyone” had turned into ashes the pharmacy and all his fortune (*vol. 191, f. 201-202: *Petition addressed by Ladislau Lucaci to the subsecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August 2, 1882*). His appeal was to investigate the damages, detailed in a list attached to the petition (clothing, jewellery, books in the amount of 9039,50 fr.), and “to be compensated in due time just as it is done for all Europeans belonging to other foreign protectors who have Consulates in Alexandria” (*vol. 191, f. 201-202: *Petition addressed by Ladislau Lucaci to the subsecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August 2, 1882*) for the round trip Europe-Alexandria (5000 fr.), and the loss of his job and pharmacy. Lucaci evaluated the total amount for his damages to 39039,50 fr.

The petition of Lucaci determined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to request to the Charge d’Affaires in Constantinople, information on the “procedure employed by other states for the compensations of their subjects who suffered losses following those events, so that the Ministry could give proper instructions” (*vol. 191, f. 201: *Note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed to the Charge d’Affaires in Constantinople, September 2/14, 1882*). In his response, I Papiniu, Legation Secretary,

stated that “after research carried out by the Porte, the compensation applications for those who have suffered damage due to recent events in Egypt, may be addressed to the Porte, which in turn would forward it to the Khedive’s Government” (*vol. 191, f. 213: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, October 1/13, 1882*). Meanwhile, confidential information obtained from English and French embassies claimed that Porte’s action for compensating its foreign subjects “would be ineffective, because only foreign representatives in Egypt could achieve positive results”, which demonstrates, in our opinion, the desire of the two powers to maintain their dominance in all Egyptian problems. For this reason, the action of Italy which addressed directly to the Porte for the compensation of its subjects “was viewed with dismay by the other missions”. Consequently, Papiniu was counselled and advised at his turn to address the Romanian applications to Paris and London governments; their embassies in Constantinople could intermediate that the Romanian subjects’ claims be supported by agents of those powers in Egypt (*vol. 191, f. 213: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, October 1/13, 1882*).

On October 14, 1882, the German Legation in Bucharest addressed to the Foreign Ministry a Note to request reimbursement of 311. 20 marks (1462. 20 Egyptian piastres) spent by the German Consulate in Cairo with Romanian nationals forced to flee from Cairo to Alexandria by fear of the mutiny that broke out in Egypt. The list comprised the names of 10 Romanian Hebrews, from Bucharest, Botosani and from Păpăuți Village, Botoșani (*vol. 191, f. 215-216: *Note of the German Legation in Romania, October 14, 1882*). Simultaneously with the payment of the amount spent, the Ministry requested the Romanian Legation in Berlin to thank the imperial government and ask for Germany “to take under its protection the Romanian subjects’ allowance problem who suffered losses during the recent events in Egypt” (*vol. 191, f. 232-234: *Report of the Romanian Legation in Berlin, October 27/November 8, 1882*). Romania’s desire is presented by A. Beldiman to the German subsecretary Busch, who politely declines the offer, both because of “German disinterest in this matter” and the obstacles elevated by the international law “if a state represents the full interests of another state in an international commission”. For these reasons, the German diplomat recommended Romania, “to address to the

Romania and Egypt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

English cabinet, of which depended mainly the final regulation of this business”, stating at the same time, the availability for Germany “to do favours for Romania in Egypt”. Beldiman suggested D. A. Sturdza “to take advantage of this kind offer in order to be able to obtain with the help of the German General Consul, accurate and authentic information on the situation of our compatriots in Cairo and Alexandria, who have been affected by the Egyptian revolution” (*vol. 191, f. 232-234: *Report of the Romanian Legation in Berlin, October 27/November 8, 1882*).

D. A. Sturdza wished to have more precise information on the International Commission which would deal with compensation for incurred losses due to events in Egypt, on how states which were not directly represented in that Commission, could defend their interests; he addressed to the Legation in Constantinople, asking to contact the embassies of the Great Powers in relation to these issues. He also requested P. Mavrogheni to send all data about the Romanians, owned by the Legation, and their complaints, requesting vigilance over their interests, “being expected that among Romanians in Egypt, to be a fairly large number that cannot legally justify their Romanian nationality”(*vol. 191, f. 235: *Telegram of the Minister of Foreign Affairs to P. Mavrogheni, Special Envoy and Plenipotentiary Minister of Romania in Constantinople, December 10/22, 1882*). In his response (*vol. 191, f. 239-242: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, December 21 1882/ January 2, 1883*), Mavrogheni announced that it was impossible to obtain precise information if the states, not represented directly and particularly in the Commission, could have a collective representative, because negotiations between the Great Powers are held in Egypt, to avoid the interference of the Porte. For this reason, foreign representatives in Constantinople were not updated by their governments on this issue. However, the British ambassador claimed, unofficially, and insisting that he did not have accurate information, that “in the International Commission was accepted only Greece along with the Great Powers, as one of the most interested countries in this field since many Greeks were affected by events in Egypt”; on the collective representative, the English minister said that this issue was not raised, “for all the other interested powers, the solution being the use of specialized delegations”.

Based on this information, the Romanian Minister noted that “in this situation and in the absence of a Consul of Romania in Egypt, consul that would be more than difficult to be accepted at this time by the khedival authority because of the complications provoked by the Sublime Porte to obtain exequaturs, the only way was using a particular delegate. Accredited by the government and the International Commission, he would have the mission “to support and defend the rights of our affected citizens”(*vol. 191, f. 239-242: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, December 21 1882/ January 2, 1883*).

About Romanians in Egypt and their complaints, Mavrogheni stated that the Legation in Constantinople had little information: Ladislau Lucaci’s case and two petitions signed by 26 people “who profited of their status as Romanians and demanded the installation of a consular authority in Alexandria and Cairo”. Both petitions were dated May 10/22, 1882. For the consul function, Tito Hakekian was favoured, and for the vice-consul, Alexandru Anton Zaghikian (*vol. 191, f. 239-242: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, December 21 1882/ January 2, 1883*). The Romanian diplomat agreed with the caution of the foreign minister in “examining the interests which we would accept and for which we would delegate a defence”, because of the lack of accurate data, given that “no authority has ascertained their identity, nor witnessed the entry of their quality as Romanians” (*vol. 191, f. 239-242: *Report of the Romanian Legation of the Ottoman Porte, December 21 1882/ January 2, 1883*).

After consulting the two legations, which believed that a diplomatic intervention at the Foreign Office should have opportunities, D. A. Sturdza requested Prince I. Ghica, the Romanian Minister in London, to ask the British government “to instruct the official British authorities in Egypt to represent, when needed, the interests of Romanians affected by the latest events”(*vol. 191, f. n. n: *Telegram of the Foreign Affairs Minister D. A. Sturdza addressed to the Prince Ghica, Romanian extraordinary and plenipotentiary envoy to London, January 22/ February 2 1883*). Pending the response of Great Britain, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs enters in possession of the khedival decree establishing the *International Commission for compensation*, which specified the conditions for the formation, composition and its functions, largely confirming the

information sent by Mavrogheni from Constantinople (*vol. 191, f. 243: *Extras of "Journal des Debats" January 28, 1883*).

Established by khedival decree, the International Commission had sole jurisdiction to receive complaints of insurrectional movement victims, "having full power to examine them, reject or take action, also setting the benefits" (Article 1). Article 2 stated that no damages could be claimed for consequential loss and loss of cash, jewellery, silverware, art objects, antiquities "which were in the shop and were meant for sale or available to third parties, except if their existence in the register of commerce or by having time secure documents was proved"; also "those whose stored crops were requisitioned or destroyed by rebels" were to receive compensations. Membership of the Committee was established by Article 3: Egypt had two members (Chairman and Vice Chairman), Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, England, Italy, Russia, U. S., Greece had one representative, and the governments of Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden called together a responsible member to represent their interests. In addition to these representatives, there was a special delegate of the nations not represented, to "participate with advisory and deliberative vote in all circumstances in which it was an applicant belonging to these nations". Commission's work related expenses would be borne by the Egyptian government (Art. 5). Unfortunately, both time and means of compensation payment would be determined later (Art. 6).

After Granville made contact with the Egyptian government (*vol. 191, f. 244-246: *Lord Granville's Note to Ion Ghica, February 14, 1883*), he informed the Romanian government that "consular assistance is not required in these cases" and because of the International Commission's rulings "each is free to submit the complaint directly to the Commission", its configuration ensuring "full impartiality regardless of nationality" (*vol. 191, f. 247-249: *Lord Granville's Note to Ion Ghica, 24, 1883*). British Government's response was communicated to the Legation in Constantinople, which had to inform the General Consulate in Thessaloniki, as from that moment the question becoming private.

Romanian presence in Egypt is also mentioned during the armed confrontations against insurgent Sudanese people under the leadership of Mahdi. Thus, during the Battle of Andar-reb, of 4

February 1884, supported by Egyptian troops commanded by Baker Pasha, two Romanian soldiers, Mogorovic and Agigorgu, were mentioned on the list of Europeans who died on the battlefield, information stated by the Italian Legation to Bucharest (*vol. 191, f. 252: *Verbal Note addressed by the Italian Legation in Bucharest to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, February 18/March 1, 1884*).

Availability shown in several circumstances, active presence in the area, the refusal of Germany and difficulties related to establishing an individual consulate in Egypt, are reasons that led the Romanian government to ask again Italy to represent the interests of Romanians. Since 1886, the Italian government "specifically instructed its diplomatic and consular officers with the protection of Romanian interests" (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, p. 20). In 1889, the Italian diplomatic agent sent the Romanian subjects list (70 in Cairo and 176 in Alexandria), stating that "they are only a tiny part of those who demand Romanian protection, but that Italian consuls, unaware of Romanian laws, may not advisedly, examine the records of all these people, nor, therefore, enroll them among Romanian subjects" (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, p. 20). Issues related to the lack of the Romanian legislation, the inability of Italian agents to distinguish "the true Romanian subjects of the Jews born in Romania established in Egypt, who abandoned themselves to pimping and had no right to our protection" (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, pp. 20-21), determines the Romanian government to give up the Italian aid in 1901.

The problems that Italians had with Romanians' representation, the increase of the Romanian colony, and intense commercial activity caused the Foreign Ministry to receive petitions of the Romanians from Egypt or the exporters, which requested the establishment of diplomatic and consular representation (*vol. 15, f. 333; 343-346). Moreover, financial interests and prestige determined consuls of Denmark (Baron Alfred Friedrich of Dumreicher) and the Republic of Haiti (Ludwick G. Wirth) to propose the establishment of Romanian consular representation under their leadership (*vol. 15, f. 335-338).

Changing the government's attitude took place only in 1906, following the Păclianu Memorandum and the opening of a direct maritime line Constanta-Alexandria; Ministry of Public Works considered that without a diplomatic representative in

Romania and Egypt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

Egypt “the new service which we set up could not respond to our righteous expectations and sacrifices that the state makes in order to open a new and large market for the country's production” (C. C. Giurescu, 1976, p. 365). At the request of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Iacob N. Lahovary, Mihail Păclianu edited a documented memorandum that reflected very well the Egyptian realities. He developed six arguments showing the necessity of establishing the Diplomatic Agency and the General Consulate in Egypt:

- The interest in the Romanian State's dignity. “The prestige of Romania in Orient will grow, and this establishment is more appropriate now following the tear in the Romanian-Greek relations”, especially since the country had abroad “a diplomatic and consular representation quite inferior in number as it has real importance in the concert of civilized states”;
- The development of sea service;
- The interest of trade relations with the Orient. “Egypt, could serve us both for the sale of products to its markets, and, by its positioning among three continents, we could send our products in other parts of Africa and Asia; Alexandria and Cairo being mainly exchange markets”;
- Protecting Romanian colonies that already existed in Egypt. “A few months ago the Minister received a new petition signed by hundreds of Romanian subjects, which asked the Government to introduce a Romanian official representation in Egypt. Many of these signatories had clear Romanian names and are traders settled for years in the cities of Egypt. They could become useful agents for the development of our trade”;
- Creating a strong Romanian-Macedonian colony, following the existing model in Sofia. “In Egypt there is a large Greek colony. Many of its most wealthy and influential members are of undisputed *Kutzo-Wallachians* origin. A Romanian diplomatic agent, using his resources, could attract many of them on our side. Under his patronage, we would create a company and a Romanian school”;
- Health interest. “From Cairo, we could better monitor the health status not only of Egypt but of the entire coastline of the Red Sea and neighbouring countries, in Africa and Asia” (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, pp. 18-25).

On April 1, by royal decree, it was established a Diplomatic Agency and a General Consulate in Cairo. Mihail Păclianu was appointed diplomatic agent and general consul, with rank of

second class Minister Plenipotentiary, this being a clear recognition of the role of its Memorandum.

The existence of the General Consulate in Cairo was recognized “temporary” by the Porte, which conditioned its existence by the conclusion of a consular convention, the renewal of the commercial agreement, and by resolving the property problems in Dobrogea (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996). Despite further interventions, this status was maintained until the interwar period, the Romanian representative not being received in solemn audience by the Khedive (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996). Besides formal aspects, with more protocolary consequences, Romania enjoyed equal treatment, the Egyptian government recognising the “right to enjoy capitulations without reserve in Egypt” (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, p. 41). It has, inter alia, the right to establish a consular court, “evidence of the consideration and admiration that the Egyptian government has shown to our country, allowing an absolute equality of treatment in respect of this important privilege, with nations much older than ours, which enjoyed here a situation gained slowly during the years” (Gh. Țârlescu, S. Cotu, N. Nicolescu, 1996, p. 41). Egyptian support is obvious and in the approval of establishing a Consulate in Alexandria, with a representative of the Diplomatic Agency in Cairo (1910), who will meet all consular functions, despite the opposition of the Porte, whose agreement was not obtained (C. Botoran, 1974).

Thus it ended the long and toilsome, but much needed process of setting up a Romanian diplomatic representation in Egypt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

* *Arhiva Ministerului Afacerilor Externe (Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) (AMAE)*, fond 75, vol 15 și fond Arhiva Istorică (Historical Archive), vol. 190, 191.

***Histoire generale de l'Afrique, VII. L'Afrique sous domination coloniale, 1880-1935*, UNESCO, Édition Abrégé;

Anghelescu M., 1983, *Călători români În Africa*, Editura Sport-Turism, București.

Baligot de Beyne A., 1986, *Correspondență cu Al. I. Cuza și Costache Negri*, Editura Junimea, Iași.

Cândea V., 1963, *L'Afrique dans la culture roumaine ancienne*, *Bulletin de la Commission Nationale de la R. P. R. pour l'UNESCO*, 1963;

Gabriel Leahu

Cantacuzino I. M., 1996, *O mie de ani În Balcani. O cronică a Cantacuzinilor În vârtoarea secolelor*, Editura Albatros, București;

Giurescu C. C., 1967, *Înființarea reprezentanței diplomatice a României la Cairo*, în *Reprezentanțele diplomatice ale României, vol. I, 1859-1917*, Editura Politică, București, p. 340-368;

Notovich N., 1898, *L'Europe et l'Egypte*, Paris;

Petrescu-Dâmbovița M. (coord.), 1995, *Istoria României de la Începuturi până În secolul al VIII-lea*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București;

Radosav D., 1985, *Imaginea Africii în cultura română din prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea. Orizont geografic-orizont mental*, în *Civilizația medievală și modernă românească. Studii istorice*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca;

Strabon, *Geographia*;

Țârlescu Gh., Cotu S., Nicolescu N., 1996 *România – Egipt. 90 de ani de relații diplomatice. Culegere de documente*, Romanian Tourism Press – Publishing House, București.