International Journal of Social Science, Management and Economics Research
Volume 2 Issue 6 Nov-Dec 2024
ISSN: 2583-9853| www.ijssmer.com

FORGING FREEDOM: THE TREATIES AND TRIUMPHS THAT SECURED MODERN GREECE'S INDEPENDENCE

Dr. Marios Kyriakidis
Docent at the Hellenic Army Academy, Ai Lia & Makedonias 17, Amigdaleza Stamatas, Athens
Greece

Received: 12/12/2024 Accepted: 20/12/2024 Published: 21/12/2024

DOI - https://doi.org/10.61421/IJSSMER.2024.2612

ABSTRACT

This research examines the key factors that shaped Greece's path to independence and the establishment of the modern Greek state, focusing on the period leading up to the Treaty of London's Additional Protocol in August 1832. It investigates the interplay of military strategy, diplomatic efforts, and international negotiations critical to achieving independence from Ottoman rule. By analyzing treaties from the London Protocol (1828) to the Additional Protocol of 1832, the research underscores the pivotal role of military victories, the tactical training of Greek forces, and subsequent diplomatic successes in defining Greece's modern statehood. It delves into the turbulent political landscape of 19th-century Greece and the external influences that shaped its outcome, illustrating the intertwined nature of military success and diplomacy in the nation's struggle for sovereignty.

Keywords: Treaty, convention, protocol, international diplomacy, military training, armed forces, independence, strategy

1. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the modern Greek state was not the result of a singular moment of independence but a complex process shaped by military triumphs and intricate diplomacy. The struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire, spanning the early 19th century until the official recognition of Greece in 1832, was marked by a series of critical treaties and international negotiations. These agreements, deeply intertwined with the strategic and military efforts of the Greek armed forces, reflected the Greeks' persistent fight against tyranny, with battlefield victories proving decisive in altering history.

This research examines the role of key treaties, beginning with Greek autonomy and culminating in the Additional Protocol of London (August 1832). Through these agreements, Greece secured international recognition, defined its territorial boundaries, and laid the foundation for modern statehood. These achievements, however, were not realized in isolation but stemmed from coordinated military campaigns, unity among Greek factions, and the involvement of foreign powers pursuing their own interests.

The perseverance and sacrifice of Greek revolutionaries compelled European powers to intervene, transforming military victories into political leverage through diplomacy. Treaties such as the London Protocols (1828, November 1828, March 1829), the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), the London Protocol (February 1830), the Convention of London (May 1832), the Treaty of Constantinople (1832), and the Additional Protocol of London (August 1832) exemplify the intersection of war and diplomacy, showcasing the contributions of Greek and foreign leaders in shaping Greece's political landscape.

This work emphasizes that the creation of modern Greece was not a mere act of international generosity but the outcome of a relentless struggle for freedom under adverse conditions. It highlights the deliberate integration of military success and diplomatic strategy in achieving one of the 19th century's most significant geopolitical transformations: the establishment of Greece as Europe's first modern nation-state.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical framework

The period between the London Protocol (1828) and the Additional Protocol of London (1832) was marked by the intersection of military history, diplomacy, and international relations, all contributing to the creation of modern Greece. During this time, interdisciplinary theories such as Realism, Constructivism, Geopolitics, and Military Strategy illuminate the dynamics of the Greek War of Independence and its culmination in the establishment of the modern Greek state.

Realism underscores the role of power and national interest in international relations. The Great Powers (Britain, France, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire) acted primarily to preserve their geopolitical influence and maintain the European balance of power. Their intervention in the Greek struggle was less altruistic and more strategically motivated, aimed at weakening the Ottoman Empire while safeguarding their own interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. For the Greeks, military victories and effective leadership, particularly by figures like Theodoros Kolokotronis and Georgios Karaiskakis, proved essential. Despite limited resources and training, their tactical ingenuity, including guerrilla warfare, kept the revolution alive, ultimately influencing international diplomacy (Kokkinos, 1956).

These military achievements—such as those at Navarino (1827)—helped shift negotiating positions in key treaties, including the London Protocols (1828, November 1828, March 1829), the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), and the Additional Protocol of London (1832). The strategic and moral victories of the Greeks, embodied in events like the "exit of Mesolonghi" and their motto "Freedom or Death," not only bolstered patriotic fervor but also swayed European public opinion and forced diplomatic interventions (Kitromilides & Tsoukalas, 2021).

Constructivism highlights how shared norms, ideas, and values shaped the Greek struggle. The revolution symbolized a broader quest for freedom, fueled by nationalism and the revival of ancient European civilization. The rise of nationalism across Europe and the ideological framing of Greece as a cradle of Western heritage influenced the Great Powers, particularly Britain and France, to support Greek independence. These ideological factors added weight to the military and diplomatic achievements, making Greece's emergence as a sovereign state not merely a geopolitical decision but also a cultural and symbolic triumph.

The contributions of military leaders like Ioannis Kapodistrias, alongside the role of European diplomats and military commanders, bridged the gap between military success and diplomatic leverage. While Greek military training lagged behind European standards, the perseverance and experience of revolutionary leaders who had served in earlier conflicts (e.g., the Napoleonic wars) proved pivotal. Victories on the battlefield, though limited, were instrumental in shaping international perceptions of Greek resilience and negotiating power.

The Eastern Question and the decline of the Ottoman Empire provided the broader geopolitical context. For the Great Powers, Greece's independence offered a means to limit Ottoman influence, contain Russian expansion in the Balkans, and secure their own interests in the Mediterranean. Russia, driven by both Orthodox solidarity and territorial ambitions, sought to weaken the

Ottomans. Britain and France, in contrast, aimed to maintain stability while containing Russian influence and ensuring a gradual Ottoman decline.

Ultimately, the Greek War of Independence reflected a convergence of military success, strategic diplomacy, and the geopolitical interests of the Great Powers. The recognition of Greek sovereignty and the creation of the modern Greek state emerged as one of the 19th century's most significant geopolitical transformations, driven by the interplay of military and diplomatic achievements with the ideological and strategic ambitions of Europe.

2.2 Research studies on the period under investigation towards the independence of Greece

Individual treaties related to Greek independence, such as the London Protocols (1828, November 1828, March 1829), the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), the London Protocol (February 3, 1830), the Convention of London (May 1832), the Treaty of Constantinople (1832), and the Additional Protocol of London (August 1832), are well-documented. However, no comprehensive studies have directly linked these treaties to the interconnected diplomatic and military developments that led to Greece's independence. European-centric studies often emphasize the role of the Great Powers (Britain, France, Russia) and their diplomatic documents while overlooking the influence of Greek military strategies and local conditions.

Diplomatic histories typically focus on European negotiations, marginalizing the role of Greek actors and neglecting the interplay between military and diplomatic developments. Similarly, military histories center on battles, leaders, and tactics, often disregarding the geopolitical context. For instance, while the London Protocol (1828) granted autonomy to Greece, the naval Battle of Navarino (1827) played a decisive role in shaping the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), which concluded the Russo-Turkish War, strengthened Greek autonomy, and expedited negotiations for independence.

Scholars such as David Brewer (Brewer, 2001) have explored diplomatic interventions, yet their works largely separate these from military strategies. Lucien Frary (Frary, 2015) analyzes Russian Orthodox diplomacy's role in Greek affairs but minimizes military implications. Archival records of the international treaties are scattered across national archives in Britain, France, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, 1895), complicating unified research. Furthermore, Greek archives, which could bridge military and diplomatic efforts, remain less accessible to non-Greek-speaking scholars, limiting comprehensive studies.

Integrated research can demonstrate how Greek revolutionaries, military leaders, and their strategies actively influenced diplomatic outcomes, shifting the narrative from passive recipients of Great Power diplomacy to active agents. Treaties such as the London Protocols were directly shaped by military developments, including Greek naval actions and the broader Ottoman-European conflict. Military victories, such as Navarino, proved instrumental in influencing diplomatic negotiations and highlighting the interdependence of military and diplomatic spheres.

Placing Greek independence within global 19th-century trends of nationalism and imperialism further enhances its significance. The role of European military advisors, particularly Philhellenes, and the establishment of military schools post-1827, were critical for aligning Greece with contemporary military and educational trends. Ioannis Kapodistrias' efforts to modernize Greece using European models underscore the link between military reforms and diplomatic achievements. Scholars such as Mark Mazower (Mazower, 2021) touch on military modernization, while Kitromilides (Kitromilides, 2024) emphasizes the intellectual and diplomatic backdrop of Greek independence.

A systematic analysis of how treaties reflect military realities remains underdeveloped. For example, the impact of the naval Battle of Navarino on the Treaty of Adrianople, or how Kapodistrias' military reforms influenced the negotiation of Greece's borders in the London Protocols (Kyriakidis, 2015), merits deeper examination. Combining diplomatic history with military historiography through geostrategic analysis can bridge these gaps. European diplomatic correspondence and Greek revolutionary texts (Diplomatic & Historical Archives of Greece) offer insights into how military leaders viewed treaty negotiations and how treaties, in turn, shaped military priorities.

Currently, treaties and military events are studied in isolation, leaving a gap in understanding their interconnections. This research aims to address that gap, providing a richer, more integrated understanding of Greek independence.

3. DATA AND METHOLOGY

3.1 Research methodology

The research methodology reflects the nature of the material and the study's objectives, utilizing the historical-pedagogical method and detailed source analysis. Within the context of diplomacy, military education, and the Greek armed forces' role in modern Greek history, the historical scope encompasses:

a) Greek military education history, including systems, institutions, and military training organization;
b) Analysis of educational levels in diplomacy and politics;
c) Examination of political challenges across eras, such as conflicts, territorial
d) changes, and shifting policies of major powers;
e) Critique of educational systems and planning;
f) Historical educational policy analysis (Borg & Gall, 1989).

This qualitative research systematically investigates diplomatic issues in modern Greek history, analyzing treaties that secured Greece's independence and established the modern state. Primary archival texts explore the risks and uncertainties during periods of shifting alliances and national interests of Great Powers. D. Mavroskoufis distinguishes primary sources as those from the studied period, and secondary sources as later interpretations (Mavroskoufis, 2005).

The research is both theoretical and practical, relying on incomplete data and analyzing long-past events, which present unique challenges (Verdi, 2015; Athanasiou, 2003). It seeks answers to complex historical questions, aligning with Jaspers' notion that modern science embarks on an endless process of inquiry (Jaspers, 1950).

Historical analysis, the primary method, establishes facts, critiques evidence, and determines chronological sequences (Mialaret, 1999). It investigates causes, outcomes, and the institutions and attitudes of various eras (Athanasiou, 2003). Cohen and Manion describe historical research as "the systematic and objective identification, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence" to reconstruct past events critically (Cohen & Manion, 1977). This approach serves as a tool for understanding the past, interpreting the present, and forecasting the future (Nova-Kaltsouni, 2006).

Primary sources, distinguished by their originality, and secondary sources complement each other in this study (Cohen & Manion, 1977). Hill and Kerber categorize the benefits of historical research as:

a) Solving contemporary problems through past insights;

b) Highlighting trends;
c) Emphasizing cultural interactions;
d) Reassessing past theories (Hill & Kerber, 1967).

The research examines international treaties, protocols, and conventions of the 19th and early 20th centuries that secured Greece's independence after centuries under Ottoman rule. It aims to deeply understand human experiences while analyzing the symbolic interactions of the period's society (Verdi, 2015).

In education and training, historical research underscores the importance of historical interactions and the interconnectedness of politics, education, and society (Nova-Kaltsouni, 2006). It reevaluates and reconstructs past theories, offering insights for present and future use. Its objectives include:

1. Drawing conclusions relevant to the present and future.
2. Uncovering historical events, ideas, and contexts.
3. Applying the ideas of great thinkers in contemporary settings (Bitsaki, 2005; Melanitou, 1957).

This study seeks not only to describe historical facts but also to foster sensitivity to issues like state freedom, peace, alliances, and the interplay of diplomacy and education. Ultimately, it highlights education's role in cultivating national consciousness.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The London's Protocol of November 1828. Philhellenism, Diplomacy, and Kapodistrias: Shaping Greece's Path to Independence

The Philhellenes, foreign supporters of Greek independence, played a multifaceted role during the revolution. Motivated by romantic ideals, admiration for classical Greece, and liberal political sentiments, they actively participated in military, diplomatic, and cultural spheres (Clair, 2008). As volunteers from Europe and the United States, they contributed European military knowledge to the Greek armed forces. Figures such as Jean-François-Maxime Raybaud and Charles Fabvier sought to organize Greek troops into structured battalions, though they often clashed with the irregular tactics of local guerrilla fighters.

Diplomatically, philhellenic movements pressured European governments to support Greece, culminating in interventions such as the Treaty of London (1827) and the Battle of Navarino (Le Moniteur Universel, 1827). Culturally, artists and writers inspired by Greek antiquity, such as Eugène Delacroix with The Massacre of Chios, heightened European public support for the Greek cause.

The Treaty of London (1827) and the subsequent Battle of Navarino underscored the necessity of establishing a Greek state. In January 1828, Ioannis Kapodistrias, elected by the Third National Assembly of Troizina, arrived as the first Governor of Greece. Although his tenure was cut short by his assassination in 1831, Kapodistrias made significant contributions, including the establishment of the "Hellenic State," the reorganization of Greek armed forces into regular corps, and continuous diplomatic efforts to expand Greek borders.

Inspired by European models, Kapodistrias professionalized the military by founding the Military Academy of Evelpidon (1828), modeled on French institutions. The term Evelpidon derives from the ancient Greek words eu (good) and elpis (hope), signifying the soldier as the "good hope" of the Hellenic nation. This academy, now the "Hellenic Army Academy of Evelpidon," remains a

cornerstone of military education. To strengthen maritime defense, Kapodistrias also established the Naval Academy, with guidance from European advisors (Kyriakidis, 2022).

Beyond military reforms, Kapodistrias centralized governance using Swiss and Russian bureaucratic models and prioritized education and economic stability. He implemented vocational training, founded schools and orphanages, and funded agricultural initiatives with his personal fortune, demonstrating unparalleled commitment to the nascent Greek state.

Following Navarino, the deteriorating position of the Ottoman Empire opened new opportunities for negotiations. The representatives of the Great Powers (Britain, France, and Russia) convened at Poros in 1828, allowing Kapodistrias direct contact to advocate for Greece's territorial expansion. In a memorandum to the ambassadors, he proposed borders extending from Epirus to Mount Olympus, including Euboea, Crete, Samos, and the Aegean islands, prioritizing territorial claims over autonomy or independence.

The London Protocol of December 1828 (Douglas, 1973) marked a pivotal moment. Article 1 granted Greece autonomy, restricting its borders to the Peloponnese and the Cycladic islands. Article 3 imposed an annual tribute to the Ottoman Empire, preserving nominal Ottoman control while leaving room for further negotiations. Other provisions included Greek self-administration under Great Power guidance (Article 4) and a transitional period supported by the Great Powers (Article 5).

Kapodistrias resisted these restrictive terms, lobbying Russia to advocate for a broader border extending to the Pagasitikos-Amvrakikos line. His efforts bore fruit with the revised London Protocol of March 1829, which expanded Greece's borders beyond the 1828 provisions. This diplomatic success, coupled with Kapodistrias' military and governance reforms, laid the groundwork for the establishment of a modern Greek state.

4.2 The London's Protocol of March 1829: A Milestone in Greece's Path to Autonomy

The London Protocol of March 1829, a lesser-known but significant diplomatic agreement, preceded the more famous London Protocol of 1830. Drafted during the Greek War of Independence (1821–1830), it was part of ongoing negotiations to determine Greece's status after the conflict with the Ottoman Empire. The Great Powers—Britain, France, and Russia—played central roles in supporting the Greek cause, balancing their geopolitical interests (Crawley, 1930).

The Protocol, agreed upon during the London Conference, built on the Treaty of London (1827), which had committed the Great Powers to mediate between the Greeks and Ottomans (Hertslet, 1875). While it aimed to outline Greece's future as an autonomous state, it stopped short of granting full independence, a limitation that frustrated the Greek people.

Consisting of six articles (Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs' historical archives), the Protocol set the framework for Greece's autonomy under Ottoman suzerainty. Key provisions included:

- Article 1: Greece would remain a vassal state, paying an annual tribute to the Ottoman Sultan.
- Article 2: Greece would have its own internal government and administration, free from direct Ottoman control.
- Article 3: The ruler of Greece, elected by the Greek people, would be a Christian but subject to approval by the Great Powers and the Sultan.
- Article 4: Greece's borders were limited to the Amvrakikos - Pagasitikos line, significantly narrower than those defined later in 1830.

- Article 5: Provisions for minority protections and religious freedom for non-Orthodox residents.
- Article 6: An annual payment of 1,500,000 piastres to the Ottoman Sultan.

The Protocol of 1829 was a crucial step in the diplomatic process but was seen as a temporary measure. While it granted autonomy, it failed to deliver full independence, leaving unresolved issues that did not satisfy the Greek side. The limited territorial provisions, excluding key Greek-populated areas, underscored these shortcomings.

Despite its limitations, the Protocol was the first international agreement recognizing Greece as an autonomous state, marking a diplomatic milestone for the Greek Revolution. After nearly eight years of struggle, it symbolized the international acknowledgment of Greek self-governance, validating the sacrifices of the revolutionaries and establishing a defined territorial identity for the nascent Greek state.

The Protocol laid the groundwork for full independence and kept Greece on the diplomatic agenda. It reinforced the Great Powers' commitment to a self-governing Greece, pressuring the Ottoman Empire and making clear that Greek independence was only a matter of time. The stipulation that Greece would be ruled by a Christian leader chosen by the Greeks and approved by the Great Powers provided a foundation for future political stability, including the eventual establishment of the Greek monarchy.

However, the Sublime Porte initially rejected the Protocol, refusing even the limited autonomy proposed for the Greeks. This stance shifted dramatically when Russian forces advanced toward Adrianople, threatening Ottoman survival. Faced with destruction, the Ottomans agreed to renegotiate the Treaty of London, leading to the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), which significantly advanced the Greek cause.

The London Protocol of March 1829 thus marked a turning point, legitimizing Greek self-governance and setting the stage for the eventual recognition of full independence. It highlighted the evolving stance of the Great Powers toward the Greek question and underscored the interplay of diplomacy and military developments in shaping Greece's future.

4.3 Treaty of Adrianople (1829): Russia's Triumph and Greek Autonomy

In mid-April 1828, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire, citing the latter's refusal to honor earlier treaties favoring Russia in the Balkans and addressing the Greek question. The war demonstrated Russia's military superiority, with successive victories forcing the Ottomans to capitulate.

The Treaty of Adrianople, signed on September 14, 1829, following Russia's overwhelming victory in the Russo-Turkish War (1828–1829), marked a significant triumph for both Russia and Greece while further eroding Ottoman control in the Balkans and the Black Sea region (Sedivy, 2011). The treaty comprised 16 articles and a separate act (Sazonov et al., 1992), with key provisions (Anderson, 1966) including:

Territorial Changes:

Russia gained the Danube Delta and strategic Black Sea strongholds, such as Anapa and Poti, and secured recognition of its sovereignty over Georgia and parts of Armenia (Articles 2–4).

Freedom of Navigation:

Russia was guaranteed free passage for merchant ships through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, consolidating its influence over Black Sea trade routes. Violations by the Ottoman Empire would be considered acts of hostility, warranting armed retaliation (Articles 3, 7, 8).

Greek Autonomy:

Article 10 required the Ottoman Empire to recognize Greek autonomy, following the 1827 Treaty of London and subsequent diplomatic agreements between Russia, Britain, and France. The Ottoman Empire, under pressure, agreed to appoint commissioners to implement measures ensuring Greek autonomy. This provision marked a critical step toward full Greek independence, formally achieved in 1830 (Vacalopoulos, 1975).

Autonomy for Other Territories:

Serbia was granted additional autonomy (Article 1), while Moldavia and Wallachia received assurances of autonomy under Russian protection, further weakening Ottoman control.

War Reparations:

The Ottoman Empire agreed to pay substantial reparations to Russia, reflecting the severity of its defeat (Article 9).

Diplomatic Relations:

Articles 12 and 13 established protocols for resolving conflicts between the empires, exchanging property, granting amnesty, ceasing hostilities, and defining troop withdrawals.

Prisoner Exchanges and Treaty Implementation:

Article 14 addressed prisoner exchanges, while Articles 15 and 16 defined the treaty's formal implementation.

The treaty's separate act included provisions for Moldavia and Wallachia, guaranteeing their territorial integrity, autonomy, and tax exemptions for two years. It also required population evacuations and property sales within 18 months.

The Treaty of Adrianople further diminished Ottoman influence and solidified Russia's dominance in the Balkans and the Black Sea. For Greece, it represented a diplomatic victory, as autonomy was officially recognized, paving the way for full independence. This treaty was a turning point in the Greek struggle, providing tangible results after years of conflict and setting the stage for the 1830 London Protocol.

4.4 The consequences of the Treaty of Adrianople for Greece

The Treaty of Adrianople marked a significant turning point in the Greek revolution. The recognition of Greek autonomy by the Ottoman Empire was its most direct and positive impact on Greece. This recognition followed the Greek War of Independence (1821-1829), which had received substantial support from Russia, Britain, and France. The treaty set the stage for further negotiations and treaties regarding Greek independence and paved the way for Greece's full independence, formally recognized by the Protocol of London in 1830. Thus, Greek autonomy ultimately led to Greek independence.

On the other hand, Russia's role in securing Greek autonomy solidified its position as the protector of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, particularly the Greeks. Russian support for Greece during the War of Independence, culminating in the Battle of Navarino (1827), was pivotal in

tipping the balance in favor of the Greek revolutionaries. The treaty also marked a shift in the balance of power in the Eastern Mediterranean, with Russia gaining significant influence over the Ottoman Empire and the Balkan region.

Finally, the recognition of Greek autonomy served as a precursor for other Ottoman-controlled Balkan territories, such as Serbia, Moldavia, and Wallachia, to push for greater autonomy or independence. The weakening of Ottoman control in the region accelerated the rise of nationalism in the Balkans, contributing to a broader wave of independence movements throughout the 19th century.

4.4 The London's Protocol of February 3, 1830 and its Significance for Greece

The London Protocol of 1830, signed on February 3, was one of the most important agreements made by the Great Powers (England, France, Russia) in support of the Greek cause. The transition from the London Protocol of 1829 to that of 1830 reflects the changing political climate and the increasing influence of the Great Powers in shaping Greece's future. The 1830 Protocol is considered one of the most significant documents in the creation of modern Greece, as it marked the formal recognition of Greek independence (Mazower, 2021). The 1829 Protocol laid the groundwork for the 1830 agreement, which ultimately recognized Greece as an independent kingdom. Without the 1829 Protocol, the more definitive agreements that followed might not have been possible so quickly.

This protocol essentially built upon the Treaty of London (1827), which had expressed the intention to recognize Greek independence (Crawley, 1930). It formally completed the process begun by the 1827 Treaty and granted Greece full independence, marking the end of the Greek War of Independence and laying the framework for the creation of a Greek state. Ioannis Kapodistrias, who had arrived in Greece as Governor in 1828 following the Third National Assembly of Troizina on April 1, 1827 (Kyriakidis, 2016), became the first Governor of the newly established Greek state (1830-1831).

The most crucial article of the 1830 Protocol was Article 1, which formally recognized Greece as a fully independent state, enjoying all the political, administrative, and commercial rights associated with full independence (Marriot, 1917). This article represented a significant departure from earlier proposals that had considered Greece an autonomous territory under Ottoman suzerainty. The weakened Ottoman Empire, pressured by its defeats, was forced to accept the will of the Great Powers, although it did not sign the protocol itself.

Regarding the geographical borders of the new Greek state, the protocol defined the territories that would belong to Greece, including the Peloponnese, Central Greece, and the Cyclades, including the island of Amorgos (Sir Oakes & Mowat, 1918). The exact borders were to be determined in further negotiations, but the protocol established a clear commitment to Greek statehood. Initially, the borders of the new Greek state were limited compared to the areas sought by Greek nationalists. The line delimiting Greece's boundaries was to run from the mouth of the Aspropotamos River to the mouth of the Spercheios River. Significant Greek populations, however, remained outside these borders, especially in Crete, Thessaly, and Macedonia, which were still under Ottoman rule. Over the following decades, Greece would continue to pursue territorial expansion to unite these areas with the new state.

In accordance with Article 3 of the Protocol, the Great Powers decided that Greece would be a hereditary monarchy, not a republic. They offered the throne to a foreign prince from a European royal family, excluding the royal families of the countries signing the Protocol, to ensure stability and prevent internal conflicts between Greek factions. Several communications with Prince

Leopold were made regarding the sovereignty of Greece (State Papers, 1833). This decision was part of a broader plan to stabilize and legitimize the new Greek state, which was still recovering from years of war and internal division.

Article 4 stipulated that peace would be deemed to have been established ipso facto (by that very fact) between the Ottoman Empire and Greece once the parties concerned became aware of the treaty's terms. Nationals of the two states would be treated equally regarding the rights of commerce and navigation, as nationals of other states at peace with the Ottoman Empire and Greece.

Acts of full and complete amnesty were to be published immediately by the Sublime Porte and the Greek Government, declaring that no Greek within the sovereignty of Greece would be deprived of property or disturbed because of their participation in the Greek rebellion. The amnesty applied to all Muslims or Christians who had taken part in the War of Independence. It was also stipulated that Muslims wishing to remain in the territories ceded to Greece would retain their property and live in complete security (Article 5).

The Sublime Porte would grant Greek subjects wishing to leave Turkish territory a one-year reprieve to sell their property, and the same provision applied to the Greek government (Article 6). Article 7 ordered the complete evacuation of military and naval forces from territories, fortresses, and islands beyond the line outlined in the Treaty, with the least possible delay. The Great Powers undertook to ensure the implementation of the Protocol and the protection of Greek sovereignty, agreeing to take measures to enforce the conditions and support the Greek government (Article 8).

Article 9 provided for the appointment of British, French, and Russian border commissioners to accurately draw Greece's borders and create two maps, one for each of the warring parties. This work was to be completed within six months. Article 10 called for instructions to be sent to the contracting parties for the application of the treaty's terms and the creation of a formal treaty with the present provisions, to be signed in London as an executory document of the Treaty of July 6, 1827.

It is clear that Greece was recognized as an independent, sovereign state, free from Ottoman control or suzerainty. This was the first successful national revolution within the Ottoman Empire to achieve full sovereignty in the 19th century. The recognition of Greek independence by Britain, France, and Russia, three of the most powerful states in Europe at the time, ensured that Greece's sovereignty was secure and internationally recognized. The Great Powers played a central role in stabilizing Greece during its early years of statehood, both diplomatically and economically.

In a speech by George Strait in 1930 on the anniversary of February 3, 1830, he stated that the foundation of the Greek state was not only the result of diplomatic agreements (Archives of the Academy of Athens, 1930). It was the product of the long struggle of the Greeks, their awakening and their sacred oath of "Freedom or Death," their heroic deeds, and their self-sacrifice on the battlefields, as well as the valuable help of the philhellenes, who rushed from all over to offer their assistance in the cause of Greek freedom. For a state exists when its people are conscious of their nation's existence, organized with independent political power, preserving its language, religion, and the Greek soul.

It can be stated with certainty that the Protocol of London in 1830 laid the foundations for the future development of Greece as a sovereign nation in Europe. However, two key issues remained unresolved: the definition of the borders and the person who would lead the newly established Greek state.

4.6 The London Convention of 1832 and the Establishment of the Kingdom of Greece

The London Convention of 1832, signed between the Great Powers (Britain, France, and Russia) and the Ottoman Empire and Greece, was a continuation of the Protocol of 1830 and part of the process that formulated the final terms of Greek independence. The convention, which took place on May 7, 1832, established the Kingdom of Greece under the protection of Britain, France, and Russia, outlining its borders, which were to be renegotiated in the future (State Papers, 1833). This convention was crucial in gaining international legitimacy for Greece as an independent state, strengthening its sovereignty ("National Newspaper," 1832).

Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg (later King of Belgium) had been chosen to govern the country (Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, 2006). Although he initially accepted the proposal, he later refused it (State Papers, 1832). After Leopold's resignation and the assassination of Ioannis Kapodistrias, Prince Otto of Wittelsbach from Bavaria, who was then 17 years old, was proclaimed King of Greece, and the new state was named the Kingdom of Greece (Finlay, 1861). His father, Ludwig I of Bavaria, a philhellene, played a key role in this decision. The Great Powers were not entirely supportive of the choice, particularly Great Britain. Prince Otto, the second son of King Louis I, was officially appointed as the first king of Greece in 1832 ("National Journal," 1832).

The convention finalized Otto of Bavaria's appointment as the first king of Greece. His selection was part of the Great Powers' efforts to establish a stable and acceptable Greek monarchy (Article 1). The Great Powers pledged to guarantee the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Greece as an independent monarchical state under Otto, who would bear the title "King of Greece" (Article 3). Greece would form a monarchical and independent state according to the terms of the Protocol of February 3, 1830 (Article 4). The boundaries of Greece were to be settled through further negotiations between the Great Powers and the Sublime Porte, as part of the execution of the Protocol of September 26, 1831, aimed at ensuring stability and peace in Europe (Article 5). The Great Powers agreed to convert the Protocol of February 3, 1830, into a definitive treaty as soon as negotiations concerning Greece's boundaries were concluded and to communicate the treaty to all states with which they had relations. Greece's king, Otto, would become a party to the treaty and be recognized by all the sovereign states with which the Great Powers had relations (Articles 6 and 7).

The convention addressed the hereditary succession of the crown in Article 8. Article 9 stipulated that Prince Otto of Bavaria would come of age at 20, on June 1, 1835, and that until then, the sovereign rights would be exercised by a Regency of three Councillors appointed by King Ludwig of Bavaria. Article 10 made it clear that the Regency would exercise Otto's sovereign powers until his coming of age.

Article 11 stated that Prince Otto would retain full possession of his apanages in Bavaria and that King Ludwig would assist Otto in his position in Greece until the revenues for the Greek crown were established. For the financial support of the new Greek state, Article 12 guaranteed a loan of up to 60 million French francs, with the possibility of increasing it if necessary. Article 13 outlined the conditions for the repayment of interest and any Turkish indemnities from this capital.

Article 14 provided for the establishment of a Bavarian corps of troops, not exceeding 3,500 men, to be employed in the service of the King of Greece. These troops would be armed, equipped, and paid for by the Greek state and sent as soon as possible to relieve the Allied forces still stationed in Greece. Once the Bavarian troops arrived, the Allied forces would withdraw from Greek territory.

Article 15 stipulated the appointment of Bavarians to oversee the military training of Greek soldiers, and Article 16 emphasized the need for speeding up the process of reforming the newly

established Greek state. The final two articles, Articles 17 and 18, dealt with the formalities for publishing the convention to the parties involved.

The London Convention of 1832 contributed significantly to the stabilization and legitimization of Greece as a nation-state, laying the foundations for its subsequent development and international relations. However, it also reflected the considerable influence of the Great Powers in shaping Greece's political future.

4.7 The Treaty of Constantinople (1832) and Greece's Path to Full Sovereignty

Two months after the Treaty of London, on July 19/31, 1832, a new treaty, the Treaty of Constantinople (British and Foreign State Papers, 1847), was negotiated. Greece had already signed various international treaties, securing its path to statehood. The first of these, which made Greece autonomous under the Sultan's suzerainty, was the Second Protocol of London in November 1828. This protocol defined Greek borders up to the Isthmus of Corinth, including the Peloponnese, the adjacent islands of the Saronic Gulf, and the Cyclades. This was followed by the Third Protocol of London (March 1829), which extended the frontier to the boundary of the Pagasitikos-Amvrakikos line, incorporating all of Central Greece, and the Fourth Protocol of London (February 1830), which established the frontier line between the Acheloos and Spercheios rivers, including the Sporades and Amorgos within Greek territory.

The Representatives of the Great Powers (Britain, France, and Russia) informed the Foreign Minister of the Greek Government, Spyridon Trikoupis, that the Treaty of Constantinople had been signed between the three Powers and the Ottoman Empire for the final settlement of issues between the two countries. They sent him a confidential copy of the articles concerning the demarcation of the frontiers between Greece and the Ottoman Empire. Signed on July 21, 1832, the treaty was a continuation of the earlier London Protocol of 1830, which had recognized Greek independence but left certain issues unresolved.

Under the Treaty of Constantinople, the borders of the Greek state were extended to the line between the Amvrakikos and Pagasitikos Gulfs, whereas the Treaty of London (1830) had set the borders along the Acheloos and Spercheios rivers. In this treaty (Hertslet, E., 1875), which contained eight main articles (British and Foreign State Papers, 1847), the northern border of Greece was defined in Article 1 as the line Arta-Volos. The ownership of the region of Lamia, referred to as "Zeitoun" in 1832, was left unresolved and referred to further negotiations. The outcome of these negotiations was the London Protocol of August 18/30, 1832, which awarded the region of Lamia to Greece. Thessaly was not initially included within Greece's borders but would be incorporated into the Greek state in the following years.

Article 3 of the treaty provided for the immediate demarcation of the borders between Greece and the Ottoman Empire, to be completed within six months. Articles 2 and 4 stipulated that Greece would pay financial compensation to the Ottoman Empire: 40,000,000 Turkish lire if the Amvrakikos-Pagasitikos border line was adopted, or 30,000,000 Turkish lire if the smaller Amvrakikos-Sperchios border line was chosen. In this case, Greece would also lose the region of Lamia (then "Zitouni"). This financial compensation was intended to facilitate relations between the two states and acknowledge the economic impact of Greek independence. The request from Sami and Cretans to join Greece was also rejected.

An important aspect of this treaty was its acceptance and full ratification by the Ottoman Empire, which had initially been reluctant to acknowledge the new reality. The Ottoman Empire officially recognized Greece as a fully independent kingdom, marking the end of Ottoman rule over Greek

territories. Article 5 of the treaty required the complete evacuation of Greek territories by Ottoman forces by December 31, 1832, at the latest.

Article 6 allowed Greek ships free navigation without obstacles or taxes from the Ottoman Empire. Article 7 granted an 18-month period during which individuals could sell their properties at a fair price before abandoning them. Finally, Article 8 gave the Greek government the authority to enter negotiations to regulate commercial and maritime relations with the Sublime Porte based on the principle of reciprocity, allowing free movement of Ottoman or Greek subjects between Greece and the Ottoman Empire.

The Treaty of Constantinople (1832) was a pivotal agreement that consolidated Greece's sovereignty and territorial borders. It marked a key moment in the creation of the modern Greek state, formalizing Greece as an independent kingdom, ending the Greek War of Independence, and resolving the Greek question. The Great Powers (Britain, France, and Russia) served as guarantors of Greece's independence, responsible for ensuring the country remained a stable and independent state, protected from external threats and internal instability.

This treaty marked the final step in Greece's recognition as an independent state. It provided formal recognition from the Ottoman Empire and solidified Greece's status as a sovereign kingdom. By establishing Greece's new territorial boundaries, the treaty laid the geographical framework for the new state. While territories with significant Greek populations, such as Crete and Thessaly, remained outside Greece's borders, the treaty set the stage for future territorial adjustments.

By referring to the King of Greece as monarch, the treaty implicitly confirmed the royal status of the newly established Greek state, seeking to ensure political stability. Otto's reign represented a new era for Greece, characterized by efforts to modernize and consolidate the newly established state. However, his reign also faced challenges, including internal political conflicts and economic difficulties.

The financial compensation paid to the Ottoman Empire and the continued role of the Great Powers in Greek affairs highlighted the complex diplomatic and economic relations of the period. These arrangements played a crucial role in managing Greece's integration into the European political landscape. Greek nationalism and the desire to incorporate other Greek-speaking regions remained influential in shaping Greek foreign policy, eventually leading to further territorial acquisitions. The Treaty of Constantinople was an essential step in the early history of Greece as a modern nation, shaping both its domestic politics and international relations for the years to come.

4.8 The Additional Protocol of London (1832) and the Creation of the Independent Greek State

The Additional Protocol of London, signed on 18/30 August 1832, was a crucial agreement that laid the groundwork for the establishment of an independent Greek state following the Greek War of Independence. Signed by the United Kingdom, France, and Russia, it defined the borders and governance of Greece (History of the Hellenic Nation, 1977). This protocol was a supplementary agreement to the Treaty of Constantinople and the earlier Treaties of London, and it was approved by the Conference of London in its 52nd Protocol on 30 August. The protocol resolved the remaining political issues and formally established Greece's status as an independent kingdom with the backing of the international community. This diplomatic process illustrated the complexity of negotiations at the time, balancing Greek aspirations for sovereignty with the strategic interests of both European powers and the Ottoman Empire.

On the diplomatic front, the protocol was negotiated to ensure that the terms of Greek independence were not only acknowledged by the Ottoman Empire but were also supported and formalized through the commitment of the Great Powers. It provided a legal and diplomatic framework for Greece's transition into a fully recognized independent kingdom.

In terms of governance, the protocol contributed to the stabilization of the newly established state by solidifying the monarchy under King Otto, marking a key step in organizing the Greek political and administrative systems. This was done under the watchful eye of the Great Powers, who had guaranteed Greece's independence.

Regarding the delimitation of borders, the protocol finalized Greece's territorial boundaries and further clarified the terms of Greek independence, aligning Greece's status within the broader European diplomatic framework shaped by the Great Powers. It was essential for resolving outstanding diplomatic and administrative issues concerning Greece's internal organization, foreign relations, and the final arrangements for the governance of the new state, including financial support for its establishment.

The Great Powers decided that the Amvrakikos-Sperchios border line (British and Foreign State Papers, 1847) did not provide the maximum security necessary for peaceful coexistence between the Ottoman Empire and Greece. Instead, they approved the Amvrakikos-Pagasitikos line, which had been proposed during Greece's autonomy in the London Protocol of 1829 (British and Foreign State Papers, 1832). This approval included the area of Lamia (then known as "Zitouni"), which the Ottoman Empire had claimed, as it had not been liberated by Greek forces. This region was officially granted to Greece (Hertslet, 1875).

However, Greece's territorial expansion was limited by the rejection of key territorial demands. The Cretans' call for the union of Crete with Greece was denied, and the request for the island of Samos to join Greece was also rejected. Instead, Samos was declared an autonomous Christian principality under the sovereignty of the Sultan.

By the end of 1832, specifically on 14/26 December, the Sublime Porte formally accepted the decision of the Great Powers, recognizing the imposed borders and Prince Otto as King of Greece. As a result, Greece emerged as an independent state with a territory of 47,516 square kilometers and a population of approximately 750,000 in 1833, though its borders were still very limited.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The emergence of Greece as an independent state was shaped by a combination of complicated diplomacy and military actions. The treaties and protocols we've examined reveal a strong interaction between these two elements, as well as the growing role of international intervention in the formation of modern nation-states.

The case of Greek independence is a prime example of early humanitarian intervention backed by military action, where international diplomacy played a pivotal role in resolving a national liberation struggle. The Greek War of Independence (1821–1829) stirred public opinion across Europe, ultimately leading to a coalition of Great Powers—Britain, France, and Russia—intervening to balance humanitarian concerns with geopolitical interests.

This coordinated intervention in Greece set a precedent for using international protocols to redefine sovereignty, based on collective agreements rather than unilateral actions. This diplomatic approach, blending humanitarian goals with strategic calculations, would be repeated in future geopolitical crises.

The Convention of London (1832) marked a significant shift from local revolutionary action to international arbitration, with the establishment of King Otto of Bavaria as Greece's monarch and the definition of Greece's borders. This reflected the evolving nature of Greek independence, transitioning from a regional conflict to an international negotiation.

The Treaty of Constantinople (1832) provided the final settlement, establishing the borders and sovereignty of Greece. This treaty was an early example of state-building driven largely by external factors, with the Great Powers ensuring Greece's independence and territorial integrity.

Greek independence underscored the importance of multilateral negotiations in determining state borders, a recurring theme in modern international relations. This process also highlighted the necessary role of military success in achieving diplomatic recognition. Battles like those at Navarino (1827) and the siege of Messolonghi were not only decisive militarily but also played a crucial role in mobilizing European public and governmental support for Greece's cause. Without these military victories and the continued Greek struggle for freedom, the diplomatic momentum that led to treaties such as Adrianople and the London Protocols would likely have stalled. This highlights the timeless principle that military power enhances diplomatic negotiations.

Greek leaders, such as Ioannis Kapodistrias, skillfully combined military strategy with diplomatic efforts, navigating the rivalries between the Great Powers. Their efforts demonstrated the interdependence of local and international diplomacy and revealed how effective diplomacy requires aligning local revolutionary goals with the strategic interests of international stakeholders. This principle remains relevant in contemporary conflicts.

The Greek War of Independence also offers valuable insights into military strategy and national planning. Local resistance proved effective against Ottoman forces despite limited resources. The intervention of European fleets at Navarino demonstrated the strategic importance of allied military assistance in securing independence. After independence, the professionalization of the Greek military under foreign advisors highlighted the need for military training to secure and maintain sovereignty. This experience underscored that modern military training should emphasize not only tactical skills but also coordination with international forces—a lesson that remains relevant in contemporary conflicts.

From a diplomatic perspective, the Greek struggle for independence provides a framework for understanding revolutionary diplomacy. By leveraging European philhellenism (sympathy for the Greek cause), Greece was able to secure support and strategic alliances. The geopolitical rivalries between Britain, France, and Russia worked to Greece's advantage, as these powers sought to counterbalance Ottoman influence in the region. Institutionally, the treaties signed during this period became blueprints for modern diplomatic practices, emphasizing legal frameworks for international mediation in sovereignty disputes.

In conclusion, Greece's path to independence underscores the evolving relationship between national action and international diplomacy. The scholarly lessons drawn from this period highlight timeless principles in state-building: the strategic coupling of military effort with diplomatic negotiation, the importance of multilateral agreements, and the role of humanitarian concerns in shaping international policy. These lessons resonate in contemporary conflicts and peacebuilding efforts, demonstrating the significance of the Greek model as a prototype for modern state-building.

REFERENCES

1) Anderson, C., R., (1952), Naval Wars in the Levant, 1559-1853, United States: Princeton University Press
2) Anderson, S., M., (1966), The eastern question, 1774-1923: A study in international relations, London: Palgrave Macmillan
3) Athanasiou, L., (2003). Research methods and techniques in education. Ioannina: ed. University of Ioannina, pp. 223,224
4) Archives of the Academy of Athens (1930), The Protocol of 3 February 1830 in London, by Streat G., in "Speeches", pp.33-39
5) Bitsaki E. Ant., (2005), The education of man according to the Apostle Paul. Athens: Grigoris, pp.21-22
6) Borg, W. R. - Gall. M. D., (1989), Educational Research. 5th ed., New York: Longman
7) Brewer, D., (2011), The Greek War of Independence: The Struggle for freedom from Ottoman Oppression, 1st ed. New York: Abrams Press
8) British and Foreign State Papers, 1828-1829, (1832), Volume 16, State Archives and Diplomatic Collections, Foreign Office, London: James Ridgway
9) British and Foreign State Papers, 1830-1831, (1833), Volume 18, State Archives and Diplomatic Collections, Foreign Office, London: James Ridgway, p.624
10) British and Foreign State Papers 1833-1834, (1847), Volume 22, State Archives and Diplomatic Collections, Foreign Office, London: James Ridgway, pp. 934- 941
11) Clair, St., W., (2008), That Greece Might Still Be Free. The Philhellenes in the War of Independence, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers
12) Cohen L., Manion L., (1977), Methodology of Educational Research, ed. Chrysoula Mitsopoulou, Mania Filopoulou, Athens: Expression, p. 71
13) Crawley, W. C., (1930), The Question of Greek Independence. A Study of British Policy in the Near East 1821-1833, United Kingdom: Camdridge University Press
14) Douglas, D., (1973), The Greek Struggle for Independence, 1821-1833, United States: University of California Press
15) Jaspers, K. (1950), Is Science evil? Commentary 9, pp. 229-233, in Filia V., (1993), Introduction to the methodology and techniques of social research, Athens: Gutenberg, pp. 17,18
16) Hertslet, E., (1875), The Map of Europe by Treaty, vol 2, No142, London: Butterworths, pp. 804-809
17) Hertslet, E., (1875), The Map of Europe by Treaty, vol 2, No161, London: Butterworths, pp. 903-908
18) Hertslet, E., (1875), The Map of Europe by Treaty, vol 2, No165, London: Butterworths, pp. 917-918
19) Hill, J. E. & Kerber A., (1967), Models, Methods and Analytical Procedures in Educational Research. Detroit: Wayne State University Press,
20) Hellenic Republic, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Service of Diplomatic & Historical Archives, Treaties and Protocols of Independence
21) History of the Hellenic Nation (1977), Volume 12, "The Greek Revolution (1821-1832)", Athens: Athenian Publishing
22) Finlay, G., (1861), History of the Greek Revolution and the reign of King Otho, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and sons
23) Frary, J., l., (2015), Russia and the Making of Modern Greek Identity, 1821-1844, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Cambridge: Proquest LLC

24) Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons, (2006), Communications with His Royal Highness Prince Leopold, relating to the sovereignty of Greece,
25) Kitromilides, M. P., Tsoukalas, K., (2021), The Greek Revolution. A Critical Dictionary, Cambridge: Harvard University Press
26) Kitromilides, M. P., (2024), Enlightenment and Revolution. The interconnection of two historiographical terms in their multiple contexts, The Gleaner, (30), 591–598. https://doi.org/10.12681/er.36131
27) Kokkinos, D., (1956), The Greek Revolution, vol. 4, Athens: Melissa
28) Kyriakidis, M., (2016), The Training of the Greek Armed Forces from the Greek Revolution until the Revival of the Olympic Games (1821-1896). Athens: Grigoris
29) Kyriakidis, M., (2022), The Most Important European Educational Influences in Education. Modern History of the Greek Armed Forces. Athens: Andy's publishers
30) Le Moniteur universel, 1827, No. 197, London Times, July 12, 1827
31) Mazower, M., (2021), The Greek Revolution: 1821 and the Making of Modern Europe. London: Penguin
32) Marriot, J., (1917), The Eastern Question: An Historical Study in European Diplomacy, Virginia: Clarendon Press
33) Mavroskoufis, K. D. (2005), Seeking the traces of History: historiography, teaching methodology and historical sources. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Brothers Publications, p. 26
34) Melanitou, G. N. (1957), The Method of Historical Pedagogical Research. Athens, pp. 14-28
35) Mialaret, G., (1999), Introduction to the Sciences of Education. Athens: Print Dardanos, p. 145
36) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia (1895), Collection of Treaties and Conventions concluded by Russia with foreign powers, ed. Martens, F., Volume XI, Treaties with England, 1801-1831, St. Petersburg: A. Benke Printing House
37) Mitzen, J., (2013), Five Governing Together: The Greek Revolt and the Eastern Question, 1823–32, in "Power in Concert: The Nineteenth-Century Origins of Global Governance", United States: University of Chicago Press
38) "National Journal" at Nafplio, Saturday 20 August 1832, no. 36, p. 191
39) "National Journal" at Nafplio, Saturday 24 August 1832, no. 37, pp. 203- 204
40) Nova - Kaltsouni, Chr., (2006), Empirical Research Methodology in Social Sciences, Data Analysis using SPSS 13, Athens: Gutenberg, p. 24
41) Verdi, N. Ath., (2015), Educational Researh and Evaluation, Athens: Borg & Gall, 1989
42) Sazonov, A., A., Gerasimova, G., N., Glushkova, O., A., Kisterev, S. N., (1992), Under the banner of Russia: Collection of archival documents, P44, 432 p., 16 l. ill.
43) Sedivy, M., (2011), From Adrianople to Münchengrätz: Metternich, Russia, and the Eastern Question 1829–33, "The International History Review Vol. 33, No. 2", United Kingdom: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Ltd.
44) Vacalopoulos, A., (1975), Histoire de la Grèce moderne, Roanne: Horvath
45) Sir Oakes, A., Mowat, R., B., (1918), The Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century, intro Sir Richards, H. Erle, Oxford : Clarendon Press
46) Svolopoulos, C., (2014), Greek Foreign policy 1830-1981, Athens: Estia

