

OPINION



by Prof. D.Sc. Petar Ivanov Stoyanovich, "New Bulgarian History" section, Institute for Historical Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences regarding the monograph "Bosnian Crisis 1908-1909, the Great Powers and Bulgaria" by the head assistant Petar Stoyanov Parushev, Ph.D., to occupy the academic position of "associate professor" in professional field 2. Humanities, professional field 2.2. History and archaeology, scientific specialty "New and most recent history (incl. History of the Balkan peoples)", University of Burgas "Prof. Dr. Asen Zlatarov"

The monograph consists of a preface, two large sections with three chapters each, and a conclusion (it should be noted that the latter is not included in the table of contents). The first section covers the Young Turk coup and the deepening crisis in the Balkans, the constitutional reforms in the Ottoman Empire since 1908, the coup and its aftermath, and the annexation itself. The second section is dedicated to the relationship between the Bosnian crisis and Bulgaria, Bulgarian independence and annexation, the coverage of the annexation crisis in the reports of our diplomatic representatives in Belgrade and Vienna, as well as in the government newspaper "Priaporets".

The INTRODUCTION presents the author's point of view to the time frame of the monograph, which is logical. The candidate's work on the Young Turk coup is comprehensive, with some detailed explanations (for example, the differences in calendar) weigh on the volume, and others such as the translation of "tributary" are excessive. Perhaps, in the next edition, more literature resources on the diplomatic preparation of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 should be attached, as well as the question of why Austria-Hungary only controlled and did

not rule Sanjak should be included. The author's accusation that at the Berlin Congress Bismarck did not seek satisfactory solutions for the Balkan peoples, but rather a compromise and balance, finds no basis in the logic of the time, nor in the principles of diplomacy.

The main objectives of the study, the development of the Bosnian crisis, its causes, and stages, as well as its influence on Bulgaria and its politics, are well presented. The historiographical and bibliographic overview is satisfactory, as I would recommend adding some research from Central Europe, but primarily from Austria.

SECTION ONE (I), Chapter 1 frames the problem of constitutional reform up to 1908. The war of 1876 and the conference are both taken into place and in proper relation to the subsequent events. The regime of sultan autocracy as well as the distinction between Islamism and Ottomanism adds to the value of the study.

It is important that the author tries his best to show the logical contradiction in the literate Ottoman stratum welcoming the constitutional regime, but at the same time expecting security in the protection of the territorial integrity of the empire. The birth of the Young Turk movement, the division of the 1902 congress, the second congress of 1907, and the great division in philosophy between Ottomanism and ethno-nationalism are shown skillfully and in detail. And here there is room to be filled in terms of the richness and variety of the literature that has been used.

Chapter 2 is dedicated to the Young Turk coup. The most important milestones of the attempt to reform in European Turkey are well described, Müritzsteg 1903 (the clumsy approach of the forces and their subsequent failure in Macedonia) and Reval 1908 (the last strong attempt at European intervention) are well described. Throughout the whole body of the study, the author runs the important thread of the never-ending internal antagonism - both in political philosophy and in the interests of the powers, an approach that gives additional weight to the monograph.

The great difference in the attitude of some of the powers towards the Young Turk movement is aptly shown, first of all- on behalf of England, which was in favor of reforms until 1908, against the support of the Sultanate status quo by Vienna and Berlin, a situation which changed sharply after the coup, when these great powers switched roles, tentatively ending German influence and opening a new page of British closeness and support to the new regime.

The revelation of the repercussions of the coup in the Balkan capitals is extensive and thorough, showing how (un)principledly the nation states in South-Eastern Europe act in relation to the events and only in the service of their national interest (Athens is pro-Turkish because of Slavic antagonism; Belgrade because of Macedonian antagonism, etc.)

The period of the attempted expansion of Austria-Hungary to the south after the Congress of Berlin, followed by the policy and treaties with Serbia (1881) and the overall policy in preparation for the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, is treated well. The overview of the international context of the crisis is extremely good. The perception of the annexation in Constantinople and Belgrade is presented in a detailed way. In general, I find the author's attempt to show the political context of the era successful, from which it is clear how secondary the Bulgarian participation in it was, but at the same time that the state administration managed to absorb the maximum of the things born in the crisis.

THE SECOND SECTION (II) puts the emphasis on the Bulgarian decision and the arguments for it, although the author aptly reveals the complexity of both the relations between Belgrade and Sofia, as well as the controversial, but logical in the context of the time, reaction of Russia. When revealing the role of the Bulgarian diplomats, as well as the activities of the village of "Priaporets", the author has chosen the classic path of research, leaving the reader with some expectations about personal specifics.

THE CONCLUSION is complete and comprehensive, finding the emphasis on three facts:

- that for Constantinople the "loss" of Eastern Rumelia and the untying of the hands of the Sofia government to Macedonia was more serious than the annexation itself.

- that Germany had the key role in humbling Russia at the height of the crisis.

- and for the Italo-Turkish War of 1911 as a prelude to the disastrous events surrounding the WW1. All of them are used well and at the right place.

NOTES (apart from a few in the text):

- What does the annexation mean for Austria-Hungary in organizational and economic terms?
- Recommendation for using a wider range of sources, especially those from Central Europe.

STYLE AND WORDING RECOMMENDATIONS:

- At the beginning, the author claims that in the Belle Epoque the two great European blocs are being formed, while they are already formed (he later corrects himself)
- The names of the settlements (especially in Macedonia) are given only in Bulgarian.
- The spelling of "hurriet" does not correspond to the original Hürriyet, which should be spelled "hjurriet".
- Noble titles are sometimes written with a capital letter, and sometimes with a small letter.
- The German practice is XXX Graf/Baron von XXX, not the title before the personal name.
- I suggest that the author unify the spelling of the names - either with a title before the name, or only the name.
- Ascension to the throne can more easily be replaced by ascension
- The titling of Franz Joseph as Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary "and the other states of the Austro- Hungarian Monarchy" is incorrect.
- Stéphane Pichon is Etienne Pichon.
- Casus belli is written once in Latin, once in Cyrillic.

- Despite the imposed name of Bülow in our country, it is actually Bülo (like Masso, Iago, etc.)
- I don't find words like "Serbism" and "Germanism" to be correct.
- Mjurány is Murani
- Page 161 we have Berthold, a misprint.
- Page 178, the explanation for plenipotentiary ministers is repeated
- Page 195 it is explained again who Forgach is.
- We have an explanation of what iradeh is, but we don't have what sheikh Yul Islam is?
- Basically: the quotes are in italics, but why the names of the newspapers are in italics too - I find no logic in this.

CONCLUSION:

I give a **positive assessment** of the work of Dr. Parushev, with which he appeared in the competition for the academic position "associate professor" in professional direction 2. Humanities, professional direction 2.2. History and archaeology, scientific specialty "New and most recent history (incl. History of the Balkan peoples)", University of Burgas "Prof. Dr. Asen Zlatarov".