

Tracing the Career of a Forgotten Diplomat Constantin G. Nanu (General Secretary of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 1913–1918)

ADRIAN-BOGDAN
CEOBANU



CONSTANTIN G. NANU, *Universul literar*
(Bucharest) 28, 47 (21 Nov. 1911): 4.

Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu

Lecturer at the Faculty of History,
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași.
Author, among others, of the vol. **Poli-
tică și diplomație la sfârșitul secolului
XIX: Din istoria relațiilor româno-ruse
(1878–1899)** (Policy and Diplomacy in
the Late 19th Century: From the History
of Romanian-Russian Relations, 1878–
1899) (2017).

IN THE last decades, western historiography¹ has shown constant interest in researching the organization of the diplomatic missions of the Great Powers before and during the First World War. The research perspectives exceeded the level of biographic reconstructions, thus providing some necessary explanations. The characters moved in certain settings; they outlined in the notes to their superiors the atmosphere within society. They issued judgments and they proposed solutions, trying to alter the European decision-making structure.

In recent years, a number of studies have been carried out concerning the activity of the diplomats operating within the central administration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Two

This work was supported by a grant of Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, within the Research Grants program, Grant UAIC, code GI-UAIC-2017-09.

of the most important British historians in the field of the history of diplomacy—Keith Neilson and Thomas G. Otte—authored descriptions of the state under-secretaries for the Foreign Office in the period 1854–1946,² starting from the assumption that individual biographies must be studied for a better understanding of the past. The two historians drafted twelve biographies following their access to the diplomatic career and the professional path within the central British administration. They were able to learn of their involvement in British foreign policy decisions, which may even suggest the importance of their position within the central administration.

In Romanian historiography, this topic—the diplomats within the central administration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—has not elicited the interest of historians. Thus far, there are not even lists with the names of those who were general secretaries of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the interval 1878–1918. There is no information regarding their activity and the way in which they were involved in solving matters within the central administration, concerning their relation with the diplomatic corps accredited in Bucharest, or their involvement in solving regional crises affecting the interests of the Romanian state. For the period up to 1918, monographs dedicated to the temporary holders of one of the most coveted positions within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are absent (with few exceptions), and the same even applies to their biographic sheets. For instance, in the work dedicated to Nicolae Mișu, the historian Daniel Cain³ also analyzed his activity as general secretary. Mișu worked alongside the minister D. A. Sturdza, and their relationship often exceeded the limits of the professional relation between a superior and his subordinate.

In the works dedicated to Romanian diplomacy in the 20th century, the name of the Nanu family is often invoked. Most historians have focused on the activity of Frederic C. Nanu,⁴ a career diplomat and the Romanian minister in Stockholm during the Second World War. In these works, references to the activity of his father, Constantin G. Nanu, are scarce, and the attempt to sketch a brief biography has been equally difficult and exciting. In the Romanian archives, the Nanu family does not benefit from a personal collection; several private correspondence items are featured within various personal collections, at the Library of the Romanian Academy, the National Central Historical Archives and at the National Library of Romania. If corroborated with the documents hosted by the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, they may represent a “working foundation” for a short biography, in which I will try to present certain details of his activity as general secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in a period marked by numerous political transformations for the Romanian state.

Biographic Excerpts

CONSTANTIN G. NANU was born on 29 April 1859, the son of Gheorghe (Iorgu) Nanu, a landowner at Siliștea, near Neamț, and of Maria Culianu. He had two brothers: Iorgu and Neculai, the latter born in 1857, who became a lawyer in Iași, the son-in-law of Veronica Micle⁵ and the father of Graziella Nanu, wife of Vasile Grigorcea, a diplomat in the interwar period. His sister Adela was married to Valentin Ursianu, a professor at the Faculty of Law, within the University of Bucharest. As many young people at the time, Constantin Nanu chose to go abroad for his studies, to Paris, where he obtained his bachelor's degree in Law in 1880. In the period spent in the French capital, his aunt Elena Zarifopol, nee Culianu, played an important role. On more than a few occasions, the young Constantin thanked her for "her endless kindness,"⁶ and his brother Nicu regularly sent him news from Paris.⁷

One year later, on 15 December 1881, Constantin became part of the Romanian diplomatic corps, being appointed supernumerary attaché. From that moment on, he began a long activity in the Romanian diplomatic service, which he ended in 1928. At the beginning of his career, he held various diplomatic positions: secretary of legation, second class, in Constantinople and Paris, secretary, first class in Brussels and then again in the "City of Lights."⁸ In the Belgian capital, he met Clara Verbeeck, the daughter of a Belgian banker, whom he married. Several years later, in 1894, their son Frederic was born in Paris. He went on to become a Law graduate in the French capital. The Nanu family had two more children: Roger and Andrei. Colleagues within the diplomatic corps at the end of the 19th century seem to have not held him in high regard. Duiliu Zamfirescu, for instance, wrote on 20 September/2 October 1894 that in Paris there was Constantin G. Nanu "an insidious man, who watches over the minister's child [Ion Lahovari], who is on good terms with the minister's brother [Alexandru Lahovari, minister of Foreign Affairs]."⁹

In the fall of 1898, Nanu was in Baden-Baden, being sick, with his wife and three children, waiting for a "few enlightening lines" from his colleague Ion Papiniu, regarding a new appointment to a European capital.¹⁰ Until he was sent as plenipotentiary minister of Romania to the Greek capital on 1 April 1900, Constantin G. Nanu was also secretary of legation, first class, in Brussels, Constantinople and Saint Petersburg. In Athens he had his first experience as Chief of Mission, staying there until 1 May 1901. Nonetheless, the same Zamfirescu expressed his discontent concerning several nominations, among which that of Nanu: "I can only tell you that the only colleague still active among the ones who started their career, like myself, in 1885, Mavrodi, has been a plenipotentiary minister for 3–4 years; that Mișu, who started after me, is a diplomatic

agent and a vested g[enera]l secretary; that Nanu is minister in Athens; that Mavrocordato is minister in Belgrade. I am not even going to talk about others, like Flo, Mitilineu, etc.”¹¹ Nanu was 41 at that point and he had 20 years of seniority in diplomacy. Quite a lot. By comparison, it took Alexandru Beldiman 10 years, Emil Ghica 11, and Alexandru Em. Lahovari 12 years from the moment they joined the diplomatic corps until they were appointed to lead a legation.¹²

After one year spent in the Greek capital, in May 1901, Nanu was appointed for the first time general secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, being replaced in Athens by his predecessor, Dimitrie I. Ghica. In the journal of the latter, hosted by the Library of the Romanian Academy, there are several lines concerning these changes. Thus, it appears that Nanu “did a lot of stupid things” in the Greek capital and he could no longer be kept there. He had been offered the position of general secretary in the “hope” that he would refuse.¹³ That did not happen. After arriving in Athens, Ghica was “blown away by some of the stupid things done by his predecessor and by the mess in terms of dismissing issues and closing them.”¹⁴

Nanu is among the diplomats who were general secretaries in the central administration, on two different occasions, together with Alexandru Em. Lahovari. His appointment in Bucharest occurred during the mandate of Dimitrie A. Sturdza as minister of foreign affairs. He managed to hold the position for quite a while, around four years, until April 1905. He collaborated with two other heads of the Romanian diplomacy, Ion I. C. Brătianu and Iacob Lahovari, under two different governments—liberal and conservative. In April 1905, he was sent as Romanian minister to Belgrade, but he only remained in this position until 1906, when he was transferred to Galați, where he worked within the European Danube Commission. After three years spent in the country, Nanu was transferred to Rome in May 1909. His appointment was due to Ion I. C. Brătianu, even though at the end of 1908, following a discussion between D. A. Sturdza and King Carol, Duiliu Zamfirescu was to be appointed to the “Eternal City.”¹⁵

After two years spent in the Italian capital, in October 1911, Nanu arrived in Petersburg to replace the most long-standing head of mission in the Russian capital, Gheorghe Rosetti-Solescu, who had ended his diplomatic career after spending 31 years in various European capitals. His nomination was the result of several factors. For a short period, Constantin G. Manu, secretary of legation, remained to manage the affairs of the legation, until the arrival of a new plenipotentiary minister. A part of the Romanian press hinted at the existence of an incident between the Petersburg government and the Bucharest cabinet related to the new head of mission in the Russian capital. Rumor had it that the Russian foreign minister, dissatisfied by the fact that Rosetti-Solescu had

been recalled, did not accept the nomination of Manu as plenipotentiary minister, reason for which he refused to give his agreement. Eventually, Foreign Minister Titu Maiorescu appointed Constantin G. Nanu as Romanian minister to Petersburg.¹⁶ In the context of the changes within the Romanian diplomatic corps, the *chargé d'affaires* of Great Britain depicted Nanu briefly, in anything but flattering terms: “He is not, as far as I have been able to gather, a man of any remarkable ability or of any pronounced views. He is some fifty years of age and he has spent most of his life in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in the Diplomatic Service.”¹⁷ In early 1912, Nanu arrived to Petersburg. Moreover, the only reports sent by him and subsequently published originate from the time spent in the Russian capital. They are included in a volume titled *Cartea Verde* (The Green Book), published in 1913 in the context of the Balkan Wars.¹⁸

General Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1913–1918)

IN SEPTEMBER 1913, Nanu was in Siliștea (Neamț County) on holiday. Mihail Burghelie informed him that the foreign minister, Titu Maiorescu, had decided to recall him from Petersburg and appoint him general secretary of the ministry. The plenipotentiary accepted the nomination and, from 1 October 1913, he started his activity in the central administration. From that moment on, he was authorized “to sign for the Minister all the documents pertaining to daily correspondence and to approve expenditures and to sign money orders within the limits of granted credits and according to the provisions of the Law on general state accounting.”¹⁹ His nomination in the central administration may be partially explained: he had experience because he had managed the “affairs” of the ministry for four years; he knew very well the international setting due to his diplomatic positions abroad and, I believe, he had the appreciation of both liberals and conservatives. It was one of the longest mandates of a general secretary, around five years, until November 1918. During this period, he collaborated with several foreign ministers: Titu Maiorescu, Emanoil Porumbaru, Ion I. C. Brătianu, Alexandru Averescu, and Constantin C. Arion. He remained in this office during difficult times for the country, by collaborating with ministers of various political orientations. Titu Maiorescu appointed him; he worked alongside Brătianu until around 1917; he remained in this position throughout most of 1918.

According to the March 1873 Law for the Organization of the Ministry, the general secretary, who was also the director of the chancellery, was responsible

for several tasks: he received and sent the correspondence; he monitored the activity of employees; he ensured “unity and harmony” within the central administration of the ministry; he could stand in for the minister in different situations.²⁰ The Regulations of the Central Administration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, adopted in July 1880, brought no substantial modifications to the attributions of the general secretary: he was also general director of the ministry and was tasked with producing a registry of assets within the central administration and from abroad. The emergence of the position of head of the minister’s cabinet meant taking over some of the attributions of the general secretary.²¹ The Law for the Reorganization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—issued in February 1894—failed to bring substantial modifications regarding the role of the general secretary. However, Article 40 stated that the general secretary could be recruited outside the ministry’s personnel. That meant such a person no longer had to meet the age, degree and training criteria: age between 21 and 30, a bachelor’s degree or a Ph.D. in Law, completed military service.²²

When Nanu took over the position, the flow chart of the ministry’s central administration was rather complex, in keeping with international realities. Alongside the general secretary, an important role in the management of foreign affairs was played by the heads of “divisions and services” of the ministry. According to the Law for the Reorganization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the central administration comprised the Protocol, Personnel and Orders Chancellery Directorate, the Directorate for Political Affairs and Litigations, the Special Works and Borders Service, the Directorate for Commercial and Consular Affairs, the Directorate of the Minister’s Cabinet, the Directorate of Funds and Accounting, the Archives Service, the Service for Romanian Schools and Churches in Turkey and Bulgaria, the Registry and Expedition Service, the Translations Service. A “survey of the employees with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs” compiled in February 1914—a few months after the appointment of Nanu as general secretary—indicates 81 persons in the central administration, along with another 120 in the foreign service.²³

Between 1913 and 1918, Constantin G. Nanu oversaw several events within the central administration, from organizing competitions within the diplomatic corps to the evacuation of ministry officials to Iași. In the context of the outbreak of the First World War, Nanu’s attitude was known in the diplomatic circles. Along with other diplomats within the ministry, such as Porumbaru or Coștescu, he adhered to the “French-frenzy.”²⁴ Several stories circulated concerning his term in this office. For instance, Nicolae Brațu, sent to manage the consulate in Constantinople, waited for additional funds from Bucharest. Their delay made him come to the capital in person, to present the issue to Constantin Nanu, who “welcomed him leisurely, his beard carefully combed and parted in

two, which he kept on coifing in a reflex gesture, listening to his complaints in silence, interrupted only by sniffled grunts. All of a sudden, an enraged Brațu pauses and shouts: ‘You know what, minister? I did not come here from such a long distance to watch you scratching your beard!’²⁵

In the period 1913–1918, few competitions were organized for aspiring diplomats. The one of 1913, where Constantin G. Nanu was in the commission, along with Trenea-Grecianu, I. C. Filitti and Petre Missir, proceeded under normal conditions. It led to the appointment of Dimitrie Iurașcu, Mihail R. Sturdza, Alecu Rannet, and Sandu Grămățicescu.²⁶ The one of February 1918, however, was held in Iași under rather difficult circumstances for the country, in that “grim world” under the leadership of Alexandru Averescu. Several candidates came before a commission comprising Nanu, Nicolae Docan, C. Cruțescu, and Ion Carp, among whom the sons of several diplomats: Frederic Nanu, Radu Cruțescu, Ionel Plessia and Alexandru Duiliu Zamfirescu. All of them were admitted.²⁷

There were other cases, however, during the First World War, when certain diplomats were removed from the diplomatic corps. In August 1916, the Romanian-German diplomatic relations were interrupted. The Romanian Minister in Berlin, Alexandru Beldiman, with obvious pro-German views, did not return to the country immediately, preferring to stay in Germany for a while. Afterwards, he went to Sweden, from where he criticized the Romanian government and its members, especially Ion I. C. Brătianu and Take Ionescu. He actually wrote quite a harsh letter to the latter. In April 1917, a commission was organized including Nanu, Papiniu and Zamfirescu, and they decided to remove Beldiman from the diplomatic corps: “We conclude that the accusations and invectives within this letter constitute gross misconduct, thus being incompatible with the deference and trust relations between employees and their superiors; as such, the provisions under Art. 62 of the Reorganization Law apply.”²⁸ Around the same period, Constantin G. Manu was also discharged. The reason is provided by the general secretary: “because he did not follow the Ministry to Iași.”²⁹

On 14/27 August 1916, the Romanian Minister in Vienna, Edgar Mavrocordat, presented the war declaration to the Austrian-Hungarian authorities. Nanu did the same thing in Bucharest, where he met with the representative of the Dual Monarchy, Ottokar Czernin. Conțescu, the legation advisor, handed an identical copy to the representatives of Bulgaria and of the Ottoman Empire. At the same time, a legation secretary was posted to the legations of Austria-Hungary and Germany, while another one to the Bulgarian and Ottoman diplomats, to facilitate the “dialogue” with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.³⁰

The first victorious actions across the Carpathians were followed by the battles of Jiu and Neajlov-Argeș, where the Romanian army was defeated in the fall

of 1916. This is why the population was advised to relocate to Iași, a process that began in October and ended in December of the same year. In the morning of November 25, the chancelleries of ministries were overwhelmed by “vivid anxiousness.” All the employees within ministries—those who stayed and those who left—received a three-month downpayment.³¹ In this context, a new phase began in the history of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The archive of the institution was transported to Iași, stored in the residence of the metropolitan bishop, and a building was found where they could conduct their activity. According to the newspaper *Opinia*, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had its headquarters on Copou Boulevard, in the building of the Military Corps. Around 30 diplomats within the central administration left for Iași, accompanied by their families: Nanu with his brother and sister, Gh. Derussi with his wife and child, Conțescu with his wife, his mother-in-law, and the governess.³² Thus, at the beginning of the following year, the ministry was managed by experienced diplomats such as Constantin G. Nanu, general secretary, Nicolae Docan, Constantin Langa-Rășcanu, and Ion Carp. The Directorate for Commercial and Consular Affairs included Victor Mărgăritescu and Ștefan I. Popescu, the Legal Directorate was under Ion N. Papiniu, while the Accounting Directorate employed Ștefan M. Popescu. A “survey of the employees with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs” drawn up in Iași, in July 1917, indicates 31 diplomats—from first-class plenipotentiary ministers to interpreters—and 5 janitors.³³

In the summer of 1917, there was talk of an evacuation to Kherson. In July 1917, Nanu signed the “certificates,” written in both Romanian and Russian, which served as passports or travel documents for the diplomats who were to go to Russia.³⁴ In addition, employees within each ministry had been sent there beforehand to assess the situation. Eight persons were sent from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, among whom the general consul, Victor Mărgăritescu and the secretary of the legation, Ion Trandafirescu. The rent for the place cost 300 lei, while the monthly wages for the eight of them amounted to 3,900 lei.³⁵ First of all, they had to find houses for those in the ministry who stayed in Iași. For Nanu, they had found “an admirable house, 4 wonderful rooms, hardwood floors, electricity, phone, kitchen,” but Colonel Popescu moved faster. He bought it for the family of the war minister. Nanu had to take another house, and brought from Iași “four beds, 4 mattresses, duvets, pillows and bed linen.”³⁶ Moreover, Mărgăritescu also found a house for the ministry, with 11 rooms and a big yard for 11 automobiles. The perspective was far from encouraging: “Please, tell anyone who would listen and understand that the Russians may very well slaughter us all one day.”³⁷

Throughout the year 1917, a part of the ministry’s archive was also sent to Russia. Constantin G. Nanu and mostly Constantin Conțescu coordinated its

transfer. Thus, in January, 16 crates were sent to Petrograd. They comprised files concerning the war of independence, the political correspondence for the period 1910–1916, the protocols and conventions, and the archive of the Ruschuk consulate. On 3 February, 12 more crates were sent. They were stored in the basement of the Romanian Legation. Several months later, in late July, they sent to Moscow 10 crates comprising 99 packages. The secretary of the legation, Trandafirescu, and chancellor Vello were sent to Iași to accompany the transport. The train arrived in Moscow on 3 August, and several days later the Romanian consul in the city told Nanu that the archives of the ministry (including those of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) had been moved from the Kremlin to the Sudnaia Kassa (the Deposit Bank of Russia), where the storage conditions were better. Nonetheless, the files did not stay in Russia for long. In December, they were sent back to Iași: 86 packages comprising the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In May 1918, in Moscow there remained only 11 packages with files, but Conțescu mentioned in a report that they were not of importance.³⁸

Like other families, Nanu's had its tragedies. His sons, Roger and Frederic, organized in 1917 a battalion of army rangers. The first of them died "bravely" at Târgu-Ocna, where Prince Charles was the commander of the battalion and then of the regiment.³⁹ The memories about Second Lieutenant Nanu depict the image of an officer who "instilled in the soul of each of us the idea of getting revenge and punishing harshly those who had crossed the borders of our sacred homeland." In many situations, Nanu was for his soldiers a commander, a father and a brother. He died on 29 August 1917, and he was buried in the cemetery of the nearest village. He was decorated post-mortem, on 17 August 1918, with the Order of Michael the Brave, 3rd class.⁴⁰ The family was affected by this tragic event. Clara Nanu was abroad, in the West. The letters received by the family members or sent by Constantin Nanu show their state of mind.⁴¹ The only comfort in early 1918 was that Frederic was admitted to the Romanian diplomatic corps. His father gave him the possibility of choosing the first city for his diplomatic activity, and the choice was an easy one. Frederic Nanu was sent as an attaché to the Bern legation. This way, he was closer to his mother, around 100 km away. Conversely, Constantin G. Nanu remained in Iași. In a letter to his wife, he told her how difficult the situation was for the country in early 1918.⁴²

After the establishment of the Averescu government, plenipotentiary minister Ion N. Papiniu and Colonel Carol Ressel were sent to talk to the Germans at Focșani. Ion I. C. Brătianu had a different opinion. He believed that Nanu would have been a better choice for this mission.⁴³ Nobody took his opinion into account, though. The government changes in the spring of 1918 also af-

fecting the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was decided to open a “branch” in Bucharest, to ensure a constant contact between the cabinet in Iași and the High Command of the occupation armies in Wallachia. Ion P. Carp, Raoul Bossy and N. D. Ghermani left for Bucharest.⁴⁴ However, Nanu stayed in Iași. In May 1918, Alexandru Iacovaki, who had returned from Bern, paid him a visit. The young diplomat remembered being welcomed by the general secretary, but the conversation never went beyond professional matters. He received the official document appointing him legation advisor. He stated that “the Ministry was actually one very simple room; a simple office where documents were registered and issued. The active part of the ministry was in Bucharest, where it functioned in the Employees’ Palace in Victory Square; that was the actual political administration of the ministry, led by my colleague Ion Carp. . . . The need to get political with the Germans and to remain in power with their support explains this duplication of diplomatic services.”⁴⁵

The lines written by Iacovaki are one of the best depictions of the situation of Romanian diplomacy in those times. Under the Marghiloman government, Constantin C. Arion was the minister of Foreign Affairs, and in late May 1918, rumors circulated that the diplomatic corps would undergo some changes. Those who had stayed in Bucharest under German occupation or who had not been close to Ion I. C. Brătianu would acquire prominent positions within the Romanian diplomacy. For instance, A. Pisoski was to receive the position in Berlin; I. C. Filitti—former director of the Directorate of Political Affairs and Litigations within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the Titu Maiorescu government in 1913 and prefect of Ialomița during the German occupation—was to be appointed to Constantinople, while Ion Carp, the son of P. P. Carp, would go to Budapest or maybe to Ukraine. Diamandi, Lahovari, Derussi, and Djuvara were discharged. Nicolae Mișu remained in London. Nanu, however, was to be sent to Vienna.⁴⁶ He was among the few who had worked with Brătianu and who would get a job abroad. But those were only suggestions and they were never actually implemented. After the victories won by the Entente in the summer of 1918 and once Romania rejoined the war against the Central Powers at the end of the same year, Greater Romania was established. A new phase began for Romanian diplomacy and its actors.

In November 1918, Nanu was replaced by Nicolae Docan, and after two years he was appointed, in October 1920, to Berlin. He managed to keep his position in the German capital for eight years, being replaced by Nicolae Petrescu-Comnen. He became a “victim” of the transfers within the diplomatic corps.⁴⁷ He was 70 years old, of which around 50 years had been spent in the Romanian diplomatic service.



Notes

1. I will mention only some books: Michael Hughes, *Diplomacy before the Russian Revolution: Britain, Russia and the Old Diplomacy, 1894–1917* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000); Giorgio Petracchi, *Da San Pietroburgo a Mosca: La diplomazia italiana in Russia 1861/1941* (Rome: Bonacci, 1993); Raymond A. Jones, *The British Diplomatic Service 1815–1914* (Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1983); Jean Baillou, ed., *Les Affaires étrangères et le corps diplomatique français*, vol. 2, 1870–1980 (Paris: Éditions CNRS, 1984); Lamar Cecil, *The German Diplomatic Service, 1871–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).
2. Keith Neilson and T. G. Otte, *The Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, 1854–1946* (New York–London: Routledge, 2009).
3. Daniel Cain, *Un trimis al Majestății Sale: Nicolae Mișu* (Bucharest: Anima, 2007).
4. See his book *Politica externă a României 1918–1933*, eds. V. F. Dobrinescu and Ion Pătroi, transl. Liliana Roșca and Emanuela Ungureanu (Iași: Institutul European, 1993).
5. Neculai Nanu was first married to Valerie Micle, the daughter of the poet Veronica Micle.
6. ANIC (Central National Historical Archives, Bucharest), coll. Zarifopol, file 72, fol. 1.
7. Ibid., file 74, fols. 1–4.
8. In Paris, the head of the Mission was the writer Vasile Alecsandri. In October 1888, he wrote to Titu Maiorescu and told him that Nanu “aspired” to be appointed first legation secretary in the Belgian capital or in the capital of the UK. V. Alecsandri, *Scrisori, I, către Titu Maiorescu, I. Negruzzi, Al. Papadopol-Callimach și Paulina Alecsandri*, eds. I. Chendi and E. Carcalechi (Bucharest: Ed. Librăriei Soccec, 1904), 311.
9. Duiliu Zamfirescu, *Opere*, vol. 7, *Corespondența A–M*, edited, introductory study, notes, commentaries and index by Al. Săndulescu (Bucharest: Minerva, 1984), 322.
10. ANIC, coll. Papiniu, file 162, fols. 1–2.
11. Zamfirescu, *Opere*, 7: 416.
12. Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu, “Carierile șefilor de misiune români din Vechiul Regat (1878–1914),” in *Diplomați în Vechiul Regat: Familie, carieră și viață socială în timpul lui Carol I (1878–1914)* (Iași: Ed. Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2015), 199.
13. BAR (Library of the Romanian Academy), Manuscripts, Section the journal of Dimitrie I. Ghica, fol. 311.
14. Ibid., fol. 333.
15. Zamfirescu, *Opere*, 7: 483.
16. Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu, “Un diplomat al Vechiului Regat: Gheorghe Rosetti-Solescu,” in *Gheorghe Rosetti-Solescu: Corespondența diplomatică personală și oficială (1895–1911)*. Petersburg, eds. Rudolf Dinu and Adrian-Bogdan Ceobanu (Iași: Ed. Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2016), 43.
17. National Archives London, FO, 371/1212, fol. 217.

18. *Cartea Verde: Textul tratatului de pace de la București 1913. Documente diplomatice = Evenimentele din Peninsula Balcanică. Acțiunea României septembrie 1912–august 1913*, transl. V. M. Ivanceanu (Bucharest: Minerva, 1913).
19. AMAE (Archives of the Ministry of Romanian Foreign Affairs, Bucharest), coll. Personal files, Letter N, issue 12, vol. 2, no page.
20. *Organizarea instituțională a Ministerului Afacerilor Externe: Acte și documente*, vol. 1, 1859–1919, eds. Ion Mamina, Gheorghe Neacșu, and George Potra (Bucharest: Ed. Fundației Europene Titulescu, 2004), 131.
21. *Ibid.*, 442–445.
22. *Ibid.*, 680.
23. AMAE, coll. 77, Problema Personal, vol. 8, no page.
24. I. C. Filitti, *Jurnal*, vol. 1, 1913–1919, ed. Georgeta Filitti (Târgoviște: Cetatea de Scaun, 2008), 42.
25. Dimitrie Iurașcu, *Rugina toamnei: Mărturii de diplomat din vremi apuse*, edited with notes by Nicolae Iurașcu (Galați: Partener, 2012), 333–334.
26. *Ibid.*, 194.
27. Raoul Bossy, *Amintiri din viața diplomatică (1918–1940)*, vol. 1, 1918–1937, edited with an introductory study by Stelian Neagoe (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1993), 36–37.
28. Claudiu-Lucian Topor, “Legățiunea României din Berlin și conduita diplomatică a lui Alexandru Beldiman,” in *Germania și neutralitatea României (1914–1916): Studii istorice* (Iași: Ed. Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2017), 159.
29. AMAE, coll. Personal files, Letter M, issue 50, vol. 2, no page.
30. *Adevărul* (Bucharest) 29, 10575 (1916): 1.
31. Constantin Kirișescu, *Istoria războiului pentru întregirea României 1916–1919*, 2nd edition, completely revised and heavily annotated, in 3 volumes, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Ed. Casei Școalelor, 1925), 316–317.
32. AMAE, coll. 71/1914, E2, vol. 83, fol. 98.
33. *Ibid.*, fol. 59.
34. *Ibid.*, fol. 109.
35. *Ibid.*, fol. 168.
36. *Ibid.*, fol. 157.
37. *Ibid.*, fol. 160.
38. Marian Voicu, *Tezaurul României de la Moscova: Inventarul unei istorii de o sută de ani* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2016).
39. Filitti, 142.
40. Maria Mihăilescu, “Sublocotenent Roger Nanu—erou al luptelor de la Mărășești: Documente și amintiri,” *Cronica Vrancei* (Focșani) 10 (2011): 73–78.
41. ANIC, coll. Victor Rațiu, file 72, fol. 11.
42. *Ibid.*, fols. 21–22.
43. Gheorghe Gh. Mărzescu, *Fapte și impresii zilnice (1917–1918)*, edited with notes by Ioan Lăcustă (Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2004), 231.
44. Bossy, 1: 37–38.

45. BAR, Manuscripts Section, A 2650 m, Alexandru Iacovaki, “Amintiri despre Ionel Brătianu,” fol. 8.
46. Filitti, 136.
47. Adrian Vițalaru, *Nicolae Petrescu-Comnen: Diplomat* (Iași: Ed. Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2014), 193–194.

Abstract

Tracing the Career of a Forgotten Diplomat Constantin G. Nanu
(General Secretary of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 1913–1918)

In Romanian historiography, this topic—the diplomats within the central administration of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs—has not elicited the interest of historians. Thus far, there are not even lists with the names of those who were general secretaries of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs between 1878 and 1918. Consequently, in this paper we present some information concerning Constantin G. Nanu’s activity as general secretary in the period 1913–1918, during both peace and war. He worked closely with several foreign ministers: Titu Maiorescu, Emanoil Porumbaru, Ion I. C. Brătianu, Alexandru Averescu, and Constantin C. Arion. He was a member of the commissions that selected aspiring diplomats and he took part in the discussions during which it was decided to send a part of the ministry’s archive to Russia in 1917.

Keywords

Constantin G. Nanu, diplomat, secretary general, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, First World War