

## A LESSER-KNOWN MOMENT IN CHRISTIAN RAKOVSKY'S BIOGRAPHY: HIS 1907 EXPULSION FROM ROMANIA

*Flavius Solomon*

Romanian Academy A.D., Xenopol Institute of History, Str. Codrescu 6,  
Pavilion C OP 6, CP 1313 RO - 700479 - Iași, Romania,  
e-mail: flavius.solomon@xenopol.acadiasi.ro,  
ORCID: 0009-0007-4468-7069

In early July 1907, invoking the stipulations of the “Law Concerning Foreigners,” which had been passed in 1881, the Romanian government took the decision to expel from Romania the well-known Socialist activist and militant, Christian Rakovsky. This decision sparked a heated journalistic and legal debate, both inside Romania and outside its borders. The Romanian Liberal government, headed by Dimitrie A. Sturdza, was accused, in particular, of having resorted to a rather controversial administrative tool which seemed highly dubious from a legal viewpoint, mainly in order to consolidate its own political position and leverage. The government also aimed at discouraging and thwarting the activities of left-wing groups which had been accused of direct involvement in organizing the peasant uprising that had shaken the Romanian state earlier in 1907. Specifically, this article analyzes a number of archival documents currently held in the collections of the National Archive of the Republic of Moldova in Chișinău. These documents focus on the ways in which the Romanian authorities collected the relevant data concerning Christian Rakovsky's legal status in Romania. Apparently, the authorities built their case for Rakovsky's expulsion on the basis of the legislation regarding Dobruja's integration into Romania, which had been passed after 1878.

**Keywords:** Cristian Racovski (Christian Rakovsky), expulsion from Romania in 1907, history of the Romanian Socialist movement, Romanian legislation on citizenship before World War I, Dobruja

In his autobiographical work *Пережитое и передуманное* [My Life and Thoughts] (Aksel'rod 1923), published in 1923, while he was again in exile,<sup>1</sup> the well-known Russian Menshevik Pavel Axelrod remembered, a rather funny moment from the beginnings of his émigré experience. In 1881, having arrived in Iași from where a part of the left-wing literature printed in the West was transported to the Empire of the Romanovs, Axelrod was arrested, together with Dr Russel. “A week or so [after getting arrested], I was summoned to the chancellery, where I found all my prison mates. There were also various authorities present, even the local prefect and prosecutor. The prosecutor told us that case opened against us had been closed and that we were all free. «Does that mean – one of us asked – that we can leave prison today?» – «No, no – the prosecutor or prefect said – you are expelled from Romania, and you must indicate the border you want to use». – «However, I noted, no law in Romania stipulates administrative expulsion». – «There was no such law, but there is now; it is being adopted these days». – «But can a law have retroactive effects?» I asked the prosecutor. He replied that our matter no longer pertained to the Court but to the public administration. All this «discussion» with the authorities ended with us declaring that we would choose the Turkish border”. Several days later, the group, comprising five Russian socialists, left Romania through the port of Galați on board a ship of the “Lloyd” navigation company (Aksel'rod 1923, 369–374, 377).

During the first days of July 1907, the Romanian government used the 1881 “Law on Foreigners”,<sup>2</sup> to which Axelrod referred, to expel another notorious militant of the left-wing

<sup>1</sup> For biographical details and his stance on the Bolshevik Revolution see: Ascher, A. 1972.

<sup>2</sup> Promulgated on 6/18 April 1881 and published in the “Official Journal” the very next day, the first article of the Law stated that foreigners living in Romania could be expelled if, through “their conduct”, they “compromised the domestic or foreign safety of the state, if they disturbed public peace or engaged in actions meant to bring down public or social order in the country or abroad”. The Council of Ministers took the expulsion decision (Colecțiune de legiuirile României vechi și celei noi, 754–755). Until the First World War, the “Law on Foreigners” represented the legal ground for expelling numerous people without Romanian citizenship from Romania. Concerning the expulsion of Jews: Iancu, C. 1979; Iordachi C. 2019, 352–399.

European movement, Christian Rakovsky. The event stirred a large-scale political and journalistic polemic in Romania and abroad, especially taking into account that he was a Romanian citizen, that he was on the electoral rolls and that he served as a medical officer of the Romanian army since September 1898.

The press with close ties to the National-Liberal government in Bucharest set the tone of the discussions by publishing, in the summer/autumn of 1907, a series of articles attacking the political activity of Christian Rakovsky and approving decision to deport him. In this respect, the most relevant materials were published in the “*Voința națională*” [The National Will] and “*Secolul*” [The Century] journals. They portrayed the Socialist using not only phrases commonly reserved for the foreigners expelled from the Kingdom in the same period (“conman”, “fraudulent citizen”, and “person subverting the social order” (*Voința națională* 6649, 6656), but also labels and insults that were to spice up the discussion and target him individually (“internationalist sycophant”, “a homeless at home everywhere” or “leader of the Jewish gang” (*Secolul* 2386, 2388, 2400). In Romania, the case gained notoriety not only due to partisan journalistic stances but also to it being debated in Romanian legal circles, where even fervent supporters of the “1881 Law” had significant doubts about the legality of the expulsion decision taken by the Council of Ministers on 2 July 1907. For instance, the lawyer Mihail Mora – who supported the law “meant to spare us, at least, from the bad habits of foreigners” – contested, in an article published in October 1907 in “*Revista judiciară*” [Judicial Review], the legality of Rakovsky’s expulsion (Mora 1907, 10–17) invoking four essential arguments. 1) The generally known information concerning the status of the Stancev – Rakovsky family in Dobruja,<sup>3</sup> corroborated with the legislation on the province’s integration into Romania,<sup>4</sup> showed beyond doubt that the socialist’s parents legally obtained and benefitted from Romanian citizenship. 2) The natural consequence of Gheorghe Stancev<sup>5</sup> and Christian Rakovsky obtaining Romanian citizenship was their inclusion into the electoral rolls. 3) A person registered within the electoral rolls can be expelled only by the decision of the Communal Council having jurisdiction over a person’s place of residence. 4) In such cases, a preliminary ruling by a Court is necessary (Mora 1907): “This last aspect is crucial. If we admit that the Council of Ministers can expel someone based on an act not submitted to verification by the justice system, one can imagine the potential abuses that would be allowed to result from this. It would be a terrible weapon in the hand of governments. It would be enough to invoke an act – which nobody could appeal against or nullify – and the government could banish abroad anyone they deemed undesirable” (Mora 1907).

Meanwhile, Rakovsky made sure to publicize his position concerning the accusations brought against him, especially the contention that his Romanian citizenship was not legally granted and that he instigated the peasants to revolt. Rakovsky spoke accordingly during meetings of left-wing militants, but he also gave statements to this effect in the foreign and Romanian socialist press, mostly in “*România Muncitoare*” [Working Romania] and other famous publications. Constantin Mille provided him with another occasion in this respect, though Rakovsky said they were not on the best of terms. Mille published his letter titled *The Government and the Socialists* in the 28 April 1907 issue of “*Adevărul*” [The Truth]. In that letter, Rakovsky accused the government led by Dimitrie A. Sturdza that it took advantage of the peasants’ uprisings to launch an intimidation campaign against those “who disturb the harmony of our political parties.” In his opinion, it was precisely the goal of the expulsion campaign targeting numerous peo-

---

<sup>3</sup> The family name in the Romanian public records documents was Stancioff (Stancev). Cristian (Krâstiu/Krăstiu) took the name Rakovsky (In Romanian spelt: *Racovski*) at 14 to honour his uncle Georgi Rakovsky, a renowned activist of the “Bulgarian Revival” (Chernyavskiy, Stanchev, Tortika (Lobanova) 2014, c. 16–21; Solomon 2011, p. 273).

<sup>4</sup> *The Law for the Organisation of Dobruja*, promulgated on 9 March 1880, marking the end of the *ad-hoc* regulations and the beginning of the *exceptional regime* (valid until 1908), stated under article 3 that “all the inhabitants of Dobruja who were on 11 April 1877 Ottoman citizens become and are Romanian citizens”. Article 13 stipulated: “Only the inhabitants residing in Dobruja on 11 April 1877 and entitled under Ottoman laws, Romanians and the persons entitled through Article 7 of the Romanian Constitution can buy rural buildings in Dobruja” (Iordachi 2002, 24).

<sup>5</sup> Christian Rakovsky’s father.

ple without Romanian citizenship. Though he remained highly critical of the Conservatives, too, in the matter of his expulsion, he found them more cautious. He stated, “They were hampered by the formal prescriptions of the law that did not allow the Romanian citizens to be banished” (Adevărul 6349). The same journal, “Adevărul” – in an interview published in the 5 July 1907 issue – featured Rakovsky with new details on his citizenship. He insisted on certain “Turkish documents” issued before 1877, “established by the central commissions of 1880”. From his perspective, they proved that his father and grandfather had lived in Dobruja up to that year (Adevărul 6349).

Two years later, in 1909, Rakovsky published the book (including a collection of documents) titled *Din regimul arbitrarului și lașității* [Excerpts from the Regime of Arbitrariness and Cowardice] (Racovski 1909), featuring many files referring to this case, some of them even extracted from “the Turkish documents”. He developed the idea of the exclusively political motivation of his expulsion. In his opinion, the Council of Ministers took that decision due to the pressures made by Russia on Romania, especially following the “Potemkin” incident (Kardashev 2008, 97; Grosul 2007, 395–413). In addition, he claimed, the Sturdza government used the peasants’ uprisings of February–March 1907 as a pretext to annihilate the socialist circles. Besides discussing the grounds for his expulsion, the most significant part of the book details how the Romanian authorities collected and used the information which later served as legal grounds for the expulsion (Racovski 1909, 123–178). Rakovsky accused, especially, Ion I. C. (Ionel) Brătianu, at that point the Minister of Foreign Affairs, of using his personal relationships and increasing authority among the Liberals to launch a denigration campaign against him.

The documents published by Rakovsky nine decades ago, many made available by people with a significant political influence, account for a small part of a systematic action initiated by the Romanian central and local authorities and by the Romanian diplomatic representatives from several European states to collect a comprehensive file comprising of the expulsion-related documents. In this respect, in what following lines, I will discuss some documents included, since 1907, in the “Doctor Christian G. Stancioff-Racovski” file<sup>6</sup> managed by the *Siguranța* (Romanian secret police) under file number 6/53/1907.<sup>7</sup>

One of the main conclusions drawn from a thorough reading of this file, starting from the first pages, concerns, as one the most striking aspects, the tension created by the “Rakovsky case” within the central and local Romanian political circles in early 1907. In this respect, one of the most important pieces is a personal letter written in French, on 9 April 1907, by the prefect of Constanța, Scarlat Vârnăv, to Ionel Brătianu, which I quote here in full:

*Monsieur le Ministre et très cher ami,*

*Croyez bien que je fais tous mes efforts pour donner à vos intentions la suite qu’elles comportent.*

*Je n’ai pas à louer mon activité; je n’en suis pas juge, je puis cependant affirmer que j’ai peiné des jours et des nuits sur l’affaire Racovsky; tâchant de découvrir tout ce qui était de nature à mettre en évidence le rôle de ce misérable.*

*Je suis pénétré du devoir qu’il y a pour nous de venger sur cet étranger tant de sang roumain qui a coulé en partie par sa faute.*

*J’ai fait toutes les recherches dans ses papiers; j’ai demandé et obtenu l’article de l’Humanité de M. Jaurès; je fais en ce moment dresser des actes prouvant que cet individu, en qualité de conseiller général du Département, désigné pour présider les élections – le sort (!) lui a donné précisément comme mission la présidence de ces élections dans la sous-préfecture de Silistra Nouă, la seule où nous ayons une population bulgare compacte – a usé de la charge que la loi*

<sup>6</sup> For a small part of the Romanian archives concerning Cristian Rakovsky see: **Racovski**. Dosar secret. 2008.

<sup>7</sup> That file was part of the Romanian archival deposits transferred to the USSR by the Soviet occupation authorities after 23 August 1944. Currently, it is included in Collection 691 “Direcția Generală a Poliției și Siguranței României, or. București” [General Directorate of the Romanian Police and *Siguranța*, city of Bucharest] within the National Archive of the Republic of Moldova, in Chișinău. Some “*Siguranța*” Collection documents were returned to Romania in the early 1960s.

lui a donnée pour faire, la veille de chaque élection, des réunions préparatoires d'électeurs, auxquels il recommandait de n'élire, à aucun prix, les candidats roumains et de donner leurs votes aux seuls bulgares d'origine.

J'ai cherché dans tous les dossiers de la Préfecture et de la Police de Constanța, dans ceux de la ville de Mangalia et de la commune de Gherengic<sup>8</sup> le fameux N° 748, année 1902, dont Mr Corbescu fait mention dans sa lettre du 2 Avril.

N'ayant pas trouvé au dit N° ce que nous cherchions, j'ai fait une révision totale des dossiers en remontant en arrière de 1902.

Je n'ai pu trouver jusqu'à présent qu'un seul acte, sous N° 4597 de 1902, dont copie annexe, qui se réfère au père du dit Stanciof.

J'ai fait rechercher les tableaux statistiques dressés en 1880 et contenant, à cette date, la nomenclature nominale de tous les habitants du Département. Ces tableaux sont introuvables, aussi bien ceux de la préfecture de Constanța que ceux de la sous-préfecture de Mangalia.

Que les actes ont existé, j'en ai la preuve vu les lettres d'envoi que je trouve à la Préfecture, mais les annexes ont disparu aussi bien de l'archive de la préfecture que des dossiers de Mangalia. Il ne reste plus qu'à envoyer chercher en Bulgarie le certificat original sous N° 748; pour ce faire, je vous prie de me communiquer quel est le dépôt de recrutement dont dépend le village de Cottel; c'est là, seulement, que ce document peut être retrouvé. J'attends, à ce sujet, vos ordres pour expédier, dans le plus bref délai, un agent sûr à cette destination.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de mes sentiments du tout affectueux dévouement.

(ss) Sc. Vârnav

P.S. Au moment de clore cette lettre, je suis avisé télégraphiquement de Gherengic que l'archive pour l'année 1892 est incomplète et qu'il y manque aussi bien à l'enregistrement que dans les dossiers les N°s depuis 740 jusqu'à y compris 749. J'ai fait donner ordre que toute l'archive pour 1892, aussi bien que les registres, me soient expédiés d'urgence à Constanța. Nous sommes évidemment sur la voie; malheureusement, la pièce, comme toutes les autres que nous recherchons, paraît devoir nous échapper (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 19–20).

This letter also highlights the high degree of uncertainty in connection with the attempts of the Romanian authorities to find a legally sound pretext for issuing the decision to expel Rakovsky. The authorities were at pains to find decisive evidence about his lack – or illegal granting – of Romanian citizenship. This state of uncertainty was heightened by the fact that the evidence presented to the authorities tended to show the contrary. For instance, following intensive searches, on 9 April 1907, the county (*plasă*) (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 17) deputy prefect of Traian, Medgidia, and Mangalia reported, in all disappointment, that, in 1880, Gheorghe Stancev was on the electoral roll of the Ghelengic commune (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 17). The various demands addressed to the Ministry of Finances were equally fruitless, including that of 12 April 1907 sent by the Service of the General Police and Statistics with the aim of inquiring about the passport visa registries for 1878–1880 concerning the border points of Ilanlâc and Cara-Omer. Their goal was to discover the types of passports which Christian Rakovsky's father used to cross the border (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 23).

Given the lack of reliable domestic leads, the Bucharest government contacted Romanian diplomats from several European states, especially Bulgaria, Switzerland, France and Germany. As is apparent from the archival file discussed here, Bulgaria – where they hoped to find the mysterious “certificate 748” – was a prime target in this respect.

In early March 1907, the Romanian diplomatic agent in Sofia, Mișu, reported to his superiors in Bucharest that the Bulgarian Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Police Prefecture in Sofia had issued him a certificate stating that there was no surveillance file concerning Rakovsky (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 5). Mișu added that he went beyond the formal correspondence with the Bulgarian authorities. He got in touch with several Bulgarian officials of various ranks who provided him with intelligence on Rakovsky's visits to Bulgaria, on the

---

<sup>8</sup> A village near Mangalia, also called Ghelengic. Present-day Pecineaga.

speeches he held during the sessions of the socialist circles, and on the likelihood of his presence on a communal electoral roll as a Bulgarian citizen (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 5 verso–6). A month later, more information became available, with data provided by the local authorities in Kotel, through the Ministry of Internal Affairs: Rakovsky's parents had apparently emigrated to Romania with him in 1880.

In March–June 1907, Sturdza, Brătianu and other authorities in Bucharest repeatedly contacted Mișu, asking him to provide various documents or relevant details concerning the papers already delivered. Hence, on 28 April 1907, the diplomatic agent in Sofia sent a report to Dimitrie A. Sturdza stating that, following “private letters” from Ionel Brătianu, he liaised with the Bulgarian authorities to obtain official information regarding the Stancev – Rakovsky family (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 34). Subsequently, to complete the report, Mișu sent several copies of Bulgarian Public Records certificates, including Certificate 748 of 3 March 1902, issued by the Kotel Townhall, based on which Christian Rakovsky was removed from the Bulgarian recruitment lists, as he was considered a Romanian subject (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 37)<sup>9</sup>. Mișu also sent a copy of a “Public Records Certificate” of 19 April 1907, also issued by the Kotel administration. It confirmed that Christian Rakovsky's parents “had left the town in the spring of 1881 and settled in Mangalia. Still, they had presumably lived “in Dobruja even before, working in cattle farming and agriculture” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 37)<sup>10</sup>.

Another research lead which could facilitate the issuing of the expulsion decision concerned Rakovsky's potential professional activities abroad. In a note of 11 April 1907, Ionel Brătianu personally asked the Romanian minister in Paris, Grigore Ghika, to notify him urgently “si le Docteur Rakovsky a servi dans le courant des dix dernières années, comme médecin d'arrondissement de la Ville de Paris, ou a été sous toute autre forme au service de l'État français.” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 15). In response to the repeated requests of Sturdza and Brătianu to provide detailed information about Rakovsky's stays in France, Ghika sent a thorough report on 18/31 May 1907, which can serve as crucial documentary evidence to fill the lacunae in the socialist's biography, especially certain aspects concerning his presence in Mornex (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 44–45 verso) (in 1891) and Nancy (in 1894), his settling in Montpellier in 1896 with his girlfriend Elisabeta Ryabova, and the PhD he received from this university in July 1897 (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 44–45 verso). However, the conclusions formulated by the Romanian envoy in the French capital did not seem to be particularly useful in the final drafting of the expulsion decision. “All of the above shows that Rakovsky [with uncertain citizenship status] applied for naturalization in France, but he never worked in Paris or the surroundings as a district physician, nor did he practice medicine, even privately. He was never invited to leave the French territory, either” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 46). Hence, in late May 1907, Ghika got orders from Bucharest to further research the matter “immediately, focusing on determining the nature of the acts based on which Rakovsky obtained the right to stay in France and to clarify with the Bulgarian diplomatic agency in Paris whether he was included in their lists as a Bulgarian citizen” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 68).<sup>11</sup>

The documents discussed above show that, due to the need for more reliable legal documents in order to categorize Rakovsky as a foreigner, many central and local decision-makers were gradually engulfed by increasing doubts regarding legality of the entire endeavour. On the other hand, the government's temptation (mostly visible in the case of Ionel Brătianu and his closest advisors) of using the peasants' uprisings as a pretext for their own power consolidation made the ever more vocal political left a natural and direct target, given that it had no means to respond in kind to forceful actions by the government. This led to a hastening a radical decision in the Rakovsky case, since he was increasingly viewed as a spokesperson for the “anarchists”. This ambiguity is apparent even in the documents included in the above-mentioned archival file. In mid-June 1907, for instance, the same prefect of Constanța, Vârnav, explained to the Bucharest authorities that raising the question of removing Rakovsky from the County Council was impossible. One of the reasons was the lack of consensus in this respect and the fear of setting an unfortunate precedent,

<sup>9</sup> See appendix 1.

<sup>10</sup> See appendix 2.

<sup>11</sup> See for more details the report of 20 June 1907 (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 72–73 verso).



given that Vârnav had presumably always followed the letter of the law.<sup>12</sup> However, Vârnav militated for expulsion, being convinced that “enough elements justify it” and that “Russia would be happy to receive him” stance (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 71 verso). The Minister of Justice, Toma Stelian, expressed similar ideas. He explained the delay in the final approval of the expulsion decision by the “election period when it would be advisable to refrain from conducting campaigns supporting this expulsion” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 71 verso). Without waiting for any further reliable evidence to fully justify the enforcement of the provisions under the “Law on Foreigners”, on 2 July 1907, following a joint formal request by Ionel Brătianu and Ion Panaitescu (accusing Rakovsky of “fraudulently obtaining Romanian citizenship in Dobruja” and of fomenting “dangerous agitations against State security”) (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 81), the Council of Ministers ordered the expulsion. The decision stated that Rakovsky purportedly was a “Bulgarian subject” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 82),<sup>13</sup> though the documents which were available to the authorities could not confirm it beyond a reasonable doubt.

Viewed from a broader perspective, the administrative measure of Rakovsky’s expulsion from Romania should be analysed against the background of domestic Romanian political developments in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. This period was marked, among other things, by the gradual rise of the socialist current and by the significant complications that some left ideologists and activists created for Romania’s relations with Russia.

Though the ideological debates within the Romanian socialist current led to various conflicts and internal ruptures over time, the most significant was the 1899 “treason of the generous faction” (Jurca 1994, 42–47). However, the intellectual and political stature of many representative figures of Romanian Socialism – also reflected in their close ties to some influential personalities of the European socialist current (Karl Kautsky und...) – turned the Left into a force with significant growth potential. These ideological debates went beyond general and theoretical discussions regarding the shape and future development of Romanian society and its possible evolution paths (a landmark moment in this respect is the debate between Dobrogeanu-Gherea and Maiorescu (Ornea 1982, 326 ff.). These debates also resulted in increasing demands for substantial reforms. Most liberals (including the neophytes – former socialists) and conservatives saw these demands as “utopian” and “anarchic”. This framework of interpretation also explains the authorities’ growing interest in Rakovsky’s activities, since he was seen as the primary ideologist of the socialists within the Kingdom. Even before the government change of March 1907, several prefectures where the socialist worked received requests for his surveillance. Reacting to such a request from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the prefect of the Covurlui County sent a reply, on 25 January 1907, countersigned by the local chief of the General Police and Statistics Service. He demanded approval for additional measures to be taken “against doctor Rakovsky”, “this parvenu of foreign nationality”, who, “by propagating his socialist ideas, has become increasingly dangerous for our public order and social situation” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 1). The adding to the “Rakovsky file” of certain relevant data that would have been of great interest to the authorities for preparing the legal ground for the future expulsion predates the “jacquerie” of 1907 (Eidelberg 1974) and the coming to power of the Liberals. In March 1906, the Constanța deputy prefect, Zadic, reacted to his superiors’ demands, penning a brief biographical presentation of the surveyed socialist. It showed that the initial inclusion of Gheorghe Stancev in the electoral rolls of Ghelengic, in 1880, was based on his rights as an inhabitant of Dobruja before 1877.<sup>14</sup> His close surveillance, even before 1907, was no secret to Rakovsky

<sup>12</sup> The cautious reaction by the Constanța prefect may have been influenced by the reserved attitude of the military authorities concerning such an endeavour and by Prince Ferdinand’s stance (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 71).

<sup>13</sup> See appendix 4.

<sup>14</sup> “Both Cristea Stancioff and Ana Stancioff (also called Racovski) are children of the late Gheorghe Stancioff, the owner of around 800 hectares in Ghelengic, of which he owned 132 hectares, 2876 square metres since the period of the Turkish empire. So, Gheorghe Stancioff was part of a Turkish *raya*, hence included in the electoral rolls of the Ghelengic commune in 1880, given that we found no files or lists before, except for an 1879 file featuring a service provider list with the name Gheorghe Stancioff on it. Thus, Gheorghe Stancioff, the owner of «*tapu*» in Ghelengic since the times of Turkish domination can only be viewed as a part of the Turkish *raya*; everybody in the locality knows him as such” (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 18–18 verso). “*Tapu*” – Ottoman ownership document (Iordachi 2002, 28).

himself. In his above-mentioned book, *Din regimul arbitrariului și lașității* he presented several documents, including a circular letter of February 1906 issued by the General Secretary of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Rachivian. In it, the official asked the then Constanța prefect, Capșa, to gather, as quickly as possible, “rather accurate intelligence concerning the family and person of Dr Rakovsky”, especially regarding the fact “whether, on 11 April 1877, Dr Rakovsky’s father, who at that point was in Mangalia, was a Turkish subject or whether he had another foreign citizenship.” (Racovski 1909, 1–2).

From the outset, it is clear that the expulsion idea was articulated before 1907, being strongly encouraged by “the Russian interventions” (Racovski 1909, 1–2). As evidence to support this statement – along the lines of the pressures made on Romanian authorities by Russian emissaries with a view at expelling undesirable socialists from the Kingdom – an older experience of the “suspicious foreigner,” (GARF, F. DPOO, op. 1898, d. 15/29, l. 44) Christian Rakovsky can be invoked. The Romanian socialist had attracted the attention of the Russian secret police as early as the late 1890s, due to his close ties to the Marxist circle known as “Osvobozhdenie truda” [Liberation of Labour], to his contacts with certain revolutionaries trying to reopen the “Romanian route” for transporting illegal literature to Russia, and later due to his participation in some left-wing groups in Saint Petersburg (Solomon 2011, 274). In June 1905, Rakovsky was among the Romanian Socialists involved in supporting the rioting sailors on the “Prince Potemkin” battleship (Kardashev 2008, 130–131). This activity did not go unnoticed by the Russian secret agents and diplomats in Romania. One should note that the Russian archival documents contain plenty of relevant data regarding the exchange of information between Romanian and Russian authorities (Kardashev 2008, 130–131). This information also touched upon the expulsion from Romania of some of the former “Potemkin” sailors, starting from 1906 (Kardashev 2008, 257 ff.).

To avoid violent reactions by the socialists and criticism from conservatives regarding the forceful expulsion of Rakovsky, the Romanian government decided to wait for him to leave for Stuttgart (Germany), where he was to attend the Congress of the Socialist International (Internationaler Sozialisten-Kongress...). The government then sent orders to the prefects of the border districts, instructing them to take all the measures necessary to prevent his return to Romania (ANRM, fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 107–198). Furthermore, the Socialist also lacked the possibility of legal action by appealing against the decision taken by the Council of Ministers (Racovski 1909, 117). He found the sought-for legal pretext in late January 1908, when the mayor of Gherengic removed his name from the electoral rolls without requesting the approval of the Local Council, as the law prescribed. Nevertheless, the Constanța Court of Appeal rejected the request, invoking a formal legal reason: the documents submitted to the Court did not comprise a power-of-attorney authenticated by one of Romania’s diplomatic missions (Racovski 1909, 123–126). However, securing a power of attorney was impossible because the Romanian diplomatic missions within the European capitals received explicit instructions to reject any request from Rakovsky or his mandataries. Hence, European newspapers and journals of various political orientations, as well as certain highly influential legal periodicals of the time discussed Racovsky’s case extensively (Revue de droit..., 662–667).

## Appendices

### 1

**Sofia, [28 April 1907]. In Romanian. Copy of a certificate issued by the town hall of the Kotel commune in Bulgaria regarding the Romanian citizenship of the Stancev (Stanchev) family.**

“Copy of the Certificate of [3 March 1902] issued for Dr Racovsky by the town hall of the urban commune of Kotel (Bulgaria), No. 748.

Certificate.

The present certificate was issued by the town hall of the urban commune of Kotel to attest and confirm that the young Krăstiu Gheorghoff Stanceff from Kotel is in Romania with his entire family as well as a Romanian subject, settled here before the liberation of the Principality.

According to the intelligence gathered by the town hall, he completed his military service in Romania.

The authenticity of the above is hereby certified by the signature and seal of the town hall.

The Mayor of the urban commune of Kotel, (ss) Hr. Simeanoff.

Secretary, (ss) D. Popoff.

For conformity, the Commander of the Military Circumscription of Reg. II, Lieutenant-colonel (ss) illegible.

For the translation's conformity, Plenipotentiary Envoy, Romanian Diplomatic Agent in Bulgaria, (ss) N. Mișu.

(Seal of the Bulgarian Diplomatic Agency)."

*Source:* Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova [National Archive of the Republic of Moldova] (Chișinău), fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 37.

## 2

**Sofia, 28 April 1907. In Romanian. Copy of a certificate issued by the town hall of the Kotel commune in Bulgaria regarding the definitive settlement of the Stancev (Stanchev) family in 1881 in Mangalia, where they had also resided earlier**

"Copy of the Certificate issued to Dr Racovsky by the town hall of the urban commune Kotel (Bulgaria), under No. 1725 on 19 April 1907.

Certificate.

The town hall of the urban commune of Kotel certifies that Dr K.G. Racovsky's parents left the city of Kotel in the spring of 1881 and established their residence in Mangalia, Dobruja, Romania, where Racovsky's father had also lived before, being engaged in cattle farming and agriculture.

The present certificate is issued to the Minister of Internal Affairs ex officio, and no stamp fee is applicable.

The mayor of the urban commune Kotel, (ss) D. Spiridonoff.

L.S.

Secretary, (ss) illegible.

For the translation's conformity, see the attached original in Bulgarian.

Sofia, 28 April 1907.

Plenipotentiary Envoy, Romanian Diplomatic Agent in Bulgaria, (ss) N. Mișu.

(Seal of the Bulgarian Diplomatic Agency)".

*Source:* Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova [National Archive of the Republic of Moldova] (Chișinău), fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 38.

## 3

**Bucharest, 2 July 1907. In Romanian. Report signed by Ion I.C. Brătianu and I. Pănaiteșcu, addressed to the members of the Council of Ministers, regarding the approval of Christian Rakovsky's expulsion from Romania.**

"Dear Ministers,

Doctor Stancioff Racovski, an anarchist revolutionary – who obtained Romanian citizenship in Dobruja by fraud and thus benefited from various public positions and functions – stirs agitations that threaten State security and public order by agitating the unionized workers and by inciting them to disorders and anarchic manifestations.

For this reason, it is my honour to ask you, Dear Ministers, based on the provisions of Art. 1 of the 1881 Law on foreigners, to approve the expulsion from the country of the above-mentioned individual.

Minister of Internal Affairs, Ion I.C. Brătianu [handwritten signature].



Director, I. Panaitescu [handwritten signature].  
Nr. 39487 bis, 2 July 1907.”

*Source:* Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova [National Archive of the Republic of Moldova] (Chișinău), fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 81.

#### 4

#### **Bucharest, 2 July 1907. In Romanian. The decision of the Council of Ministers regarding Christian Rakovsky's expulsion from Romania.**

“No. 920 bis.

In the session conducted today, 2 July 1907, discussing the Report under No. 39487 bis of the Minister Secretary of State at the Department of Internal Affairs concerning the expulsion from the country of the Bulgarian subject Dr Stancioff Racovski, who lives in the city of Constanța.

Considering that this individual is dangerous to the State's security and order;

Based on the provisions of Art. 1 of the 1881 Law on Foreigners;

The Council Decides:

Art. I. The above-mentioned individual, Dr Stancioff Racovski, is to be expelled from the country within 24 hours from the notification of this measure, under Art. 2 of the Law mentioned above.

Art. II. The Minister State Secretary at the Department of Internal Affairs is responsible for executing and implementing this decision.

[Handwritten signatures] D.A. Sturdza, I.I.C. Brătianu, V.G. Morțun, S. Haret, A. Averescu, E. Costinescu, T. Stelian”.

*Source:* Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova [National Archive of the Republic of Moldova] (Chișinău), fond 691, opis 2, dosar 51, f. 82.

#### REFERENCES

- Adevărul, nr. 6349, 28 aprilie 1907. (In Romanian).  
Aksel'rod, P. B. 1923. Perezhitoe i peredumannoe [My Life and Thoughts], kniga pervaya. Berlin, Izdatel' stvo Z. I. Grzhebina, 444 pp. (In Russian).  
Аксельрод, П. Б. 1923. Пережитое и передуманное. Книга первая. Берлин, Издательство З. И. Гржебина, 444 с.  
Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova (Chișinău) [National Archive of the Republic of Moldova] (Chișinău) (ANRM).  
Arkhiv vneshney politiki Rossiyskoy imperii (Moskva) [Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire] (Moscow) (AVPRI) (In Russian).  
Архив внешней политики Российской империи (Москва).  
Armata română și răscola din 1907. Documente. 2007 [The Romanian Army and the Uprising of 1907. Documents], ed. by Florin Șperlea, Lucian Drăghici and Manuel Stănescu. București, Editura Militară, 204 pp. (In Romanian).  
Ascher, A. 1972. Pavel Axelrod and the Development of Menshevism. Harvard, Harvard University Press, 420 pp.  
Avramescu, T. 1973. Constantin Mille. Tineretea unui socialist [Constantin Mille. The Youth of a Socialist]. București, Editura politică, 1973, 111 pp. (In Romanian).  
Chernyavskiy, G., Stanchev, M., Tortika (Lobanova), M. 2014. Zhiznennyy put' Hristiana Rakovskogo, 1873–1941. Evropeizm i bol'shevizm: neokonchenaya duel' [The Life Path of Christian Rakovsky, 1873–1941. Europeanism and Bolshevism: An Unfinished Duel]. Moskva, Tsentrpoligraf, 556 pp. (In Russian).  
Чернявский, Г., Станчев, М., Тортика (Лобанова), М. 2014. Жизненный путь Христиана Раковского, 1873–1941. Европеизм и большевизм: неоконченная дуэль. Москва, Центрполиграф, 556 с.  
Colecțiune de legiurile României vechi și celei noi, câte s-au promulgat de la 1 ianuarie 1875 până la finele anului 1885. 1885 [Collection of Laws of Old and New Romania Enacted from January 1, 1875 to the End of 1885], ed. by Ioan M. Bujoreanu, vol. III/I. București, Tipografia Academiei Române, 318 pp. (In Romanian).

- Eidelberg, Ph. G. 1974. The Great Rumanian Peasant Revolt of 1907: Origins of a Modern Jacquerie, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 259 pp.
- Georgescu, T., Marcu, G. 1955. Potemkiniștii în România. 50 de ani de la răscoala marinarilor de pe crucișătorul „Potemkin” 1905–1955. [The Potemkinists in Romania. Fifty Years Since the Revolt of the Sailors on the Cruiser “Potemkin”, 1905–1955]. București, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură Politică, 1955, 208 pp. (In Romanian).
- Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Rossiyskoy Federatsii (Moskva) [State Archive of the Russian Federation] (Moscow) (GARF) (In Russian).
- Государственный Архив Российской Федерации (Москва).
- Grosul, V. Ya. 2007. H. G. Rakovskiy i sotsial-demokraticeskoe dvizhenie v Rossii (konets XIX – nachalo XX vv.). [H. G. Rakovsky and the Social Democratic Movement in Russia (Late 19<sup>th</sup>-Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries)]. *Svyaz' vekov: Issledovaniya po istochnikovedeniyu istorii Rossii do 1917 goda. Pamyati professora A.A. Preobrazhenskogo: sbornik statey*. [Link Through the Centuries: Selected Studies in the Source Criticism of the History of Russia until 1917. In Memory of Professor A. A. Preobrazhensky: Collection of Articles]. Moskva, Rossiyskaya akademiya nauk, Institut rossiyskoy istorii, pp. 395–413. (In Russian).
- Гросул, В. Я. 2007. Х. Г. Раковский и социал-демократическое движение в России (конец XIX – начало XX вв.). [H. G. Rakovsky and the Social Democratic Movement in Russia (Late 19<sup>th</sup>-Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries)]. *Связь веков: Исследования по источниковедению истории России до 1917 года. Памяти профессора А. А. Преображенского: сборник статей*. Москва, Российская академия наук, Институт российской истории, с. 395–413.
- Iancu, C. 1979. Les juifs en Roumanie 1866–1919. De l'exclusion à l'émancipation. Aix-en-Provence, Ed. de l'Université de Provence, 382 pp.
- Internationaler Sozialisten-Kongress, Stuttgart 1907, vom 18. bis 24. August. 1907. Berlin, Buchhandlung Vorwärts, 132 pp.
- Iordachi C. 2019. Liberalism, Constitutional Nationalism, and Minorities. The Making of Romanian Citizenship, c. 1750–1918. Boston, Brill, 682 pp.
- Iordachi, C. 2002. Citizenship, Nation- and State-Building: The Integration of Northern Dobrogea into Romania, 1878–1913. Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg, 86 pp.
- Jurca, N. 1994. Istoria social-democrației din România [The History of Social Democracy in Romania]. București, Editura Științifică, 408 pp. (In Romanian).
- Kardashev, Yu. P. 2008. Vostanie. Bronenosets "Potemkin" i ego komanda. [Uprising. The Battleship Potemkin and Its Crew]. Moskva, 542 pp. (In Russian).
- Кардашев, Ю. П. 2008. Востание. Броненосец „Потёмкин“ и его команда. Москва, 2008, 542 с.
- Karl Kautsky und die Sozialdemokratie Sudosteuropas: Korrespondenz 1883–1938. 1986, ed. by Georges Haupt, János Jemnitz and Leo van Rossum. Frankfurt am Main, Campus Verlag, 649 pp.
- Mora, M. 1907. Cei înscrși în listele electorale pot fi expulzați? [Can Those Registered in the Electoral Rolls be Expelled?]. *Revista judiciară*, issue 4, October 3, pp. 10–17 (In Romanian).
- Nenarokov, A. P. 2001. Poslednyaya emigratsiya Pavla Akselroda [The Last Emigration of Pavel Axelrod]. Moskva, AIRO-HH, 166 pp. (In Russian).
- Ненароков, А. П. 2001. Последняя эмиграция Павла Аксельрода. Москва, АИРО-XX, 2001, 166 с.
- Ornea, Z. 1982. Viața lui C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea [The Life of C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea]. București, Cartea Românească, 1982, 511 pp. (In Romanian).
- Racovski, C. 1909. Din regimul arbitrarului și lașității. (Contribuție la istoria oligarhiei române). [Excerpts from the Regime of Arbitrariness and Cowardice. (Contribution to the History of the Romanian Oligarchy)]. București, Cercul de Editură Socialistă, 239 pp. (In Romanian).
- Racovski. Dosar secret. 2008 [Rakovski. Secret Lile], ed. by Stelian Tănase. Iași, Polirom, 272 pp. (In Romanian).
- Revue de droit international privé et de droit pénal international. Tome V, 1909, p. 662–667.
- Secolul, nr. 2386, 2 august 1907. (In Romanian).
- Secolul, nr. 2388, 4 august 1907. (In Romanian).
- Secolul, nr. 2400, 21 august 1907. (In Romanian).
- Solomon, F. 2011. Un diplomat al revoluției. Cristian Racovski și social-democrația rusă în 1917 [A Diplomat of the Revolution. Christian Rakovski and Russian Social Democracy in 1917]. *Partide politice și minorități naționale din România în secolul XX* [Political Parties and National Minorities in Romania in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century], vol. 6, ed. by Vasile Ciobanu et al., Cluj-Napoca, Editura Institutului pentru Studierea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale; Editura Kriterion. (In Romanian).
- Voința națională, nr. 6649, 26 iulie 1907. (In Romanian).
- Voința națională, nr. 6656, 4 august 1907. (In Romanian).

*Date of submission: 9 July 2023.*