

## **Bulgaria and the Young Turk Revolution (June 1908 – April 1909): The Beginning of the End of Ottoman Empire**

Voin Bojinov<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The article examines the Bulgarian-Ottoman relations immediately before and right after the Young Turk Revolution (1908). Two main questions stand between Sofia and Istanbul (Constantinople) – the Bulgarian independence and the rights of the Bulgarians in Macedonia and the Edirne (Adrianople) region. Those are difficult issues, because at that time the Balkans was in very difficult situation, when the war seems inevitable. So, the struggle for the Ottoman patrimony enters in a final phase.

**Key Words:** Balkans; Bulgaria; Istanbul (Tzarigrad); IMARO (VMORO); Ottoman Empire; Sofia; Young Turks.

## **Bulgaristan ve Genç Türkler Devrimi (Haziran 1908-Nisan 1909): Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Bitişinin Başlangıcı**

### ÖZET

Bu makalede Genç Türkler Devriminden (1908) önce ve sonra Bulgaristan-Osmanlı Devleti ilişkileri değerlendirilmektedir. Bulgaristan'ın bağımsızlığı ve Bulgarların Makedonya ve Edirne bölgelerindeki hakları; Sofya ve İstanbul arasındaki başlıca iki konudur. Savaşın kaçınılmaz olduğu dönemde Balkanların durumu nedeniyle bu konular oldukça önemlidir. Böylece, Osmanlı mirası için verilen mücadelede sona gelinir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Balkanlar; Bulgaristan; İstanbul; Makedonya-Edirne Dâhili İhtilâlcî Örgütü (VMORO); Osmanlı İmparatorluğu; Sofya; Genç Türkler.

---

1 Institute of History, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. (voinbojinov@abv.bg)

It will not be wrong if we say that the Young Turk Revolution was a turning point in the 20<sup>th</sup> century political history of the Balkans. Behind this cliched expression stand many circumstances that clearly show us the meaning and the consequences from the deeds of the Young Turks, not only for the Ottoman Empire, but for all the Balkan countries. In fact, the Young Turk revolution opens the last big crisis in the huge Sultan's state and brings, through the Balkan wars, the new *status quo* at the Balkan region after the World War I (WWI) and the birth of New Republic of Turkey.<sup>2</sup>

The question can be posed as where is Bulgaria in this wide political context? The beginning of the Young Turk revolution tangible catalyzes the Bulgarian wish for independence and gives more ambitions to Sofia to search for a suitable way for the national union. At the same time, the radical change in Istanbul (known in Bulgarian as Tzarigrad; Constantinople) is also a serious challenge for the Bulgarians in Macedonia and the region of Edirne (Adrianople), who were struggling for political rights, opposing the tyranny which was occurring during the late Ottoman State and fighting against the Serbian and Greek propagandas.

Before we start looking into these problems as well as into the results and/or consequences of the Revolution, however we must first answer the question, who were the Young Turks are and what were their intentions and aims?

The Young Turks start their movement around the late 80s of 19<sup>th</sup> century and they were considered to be followers of the "Young Ottomans", whose leader was the well-known Midhat Pasha.<sup>3</sup> Still from the mid 60s of 19<sup>th</sup> century they have stood up for inauguration of a constitution in the Empire and parliamentary government.<sup>4</sup> These ideas were in a sharp contrast with the absolute rule of the Sultan and with the unwillingness of the religious and land upper crust for radical changes. Still, when constitutionalism became the last chance for the Empire to be preserved, though reluctantly, the Padishah and the political circles around him, proclaimed the Constitution from 1876, thus resorting to a delusive liberty only to stop the separation of Bulgarian lands from the Porte.<sup>5</sup>

These reforms, however, prompted only by the specific situation that cannot reduce the tension in the state, especially after the loss in the Russian-Ottoman war (1877-1878) and the disturbing situation in the Balkan *vilayets* and Armenia. This is one of the main reasons for the birth of the Young Turks movement, which wanted, through serious social pro-Western changes, to preserve the unity of the disintegrating Empire.<sup>6</sup>

2 История на Османската империя. С., 1999, с. 591-662

3 Тафрова, М. Танзиматът, вилаетската реформа и българите. С., 2010, с. 91.

4 For detailed information about the "Young Ottomans" cf. Mardin, S. The genesis of Young Ottoman thought. Princeton University Press, 2000.

5 Петросян, Ю. Османская империя. Москва, 2003, с. 323.

6 Zürcher, Erik J. The Unionist Factor. Leiden, 1984, p. 22.

The tasks set by the Young Turks were not to be solved easily. In this multiethnic Empire the central and local powers were steeped in corruption, robbery was widespread and the administration did not want or was not able to restrict it. The frictions in the very Ottoman society were increasing. The intelligence, the lower officials and, most of all, the army came into a harsh conflict with the fanatic and conservative part of the religious and land upper crust, which took any probable change as a threat for losing their power. On top of everything comes the evident intensification of the national movements, particularly in the Balkan provinces. This is especially true for the Greek and Serbian propaganda in Macedonia that made an uplift after the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie uprising, whose suppression severely stroked the Bulgarian Internal Macedonian-Edirne Revolutionary Organization, namely VMORO.<sup>7</sup> All these factors cause complications in the “ill man’s” condition and lead to the real threat, that is, the collapse of the Empire. Thus “Hamid’s Turkey” faced a difficult choice, on which depended not only her fate, but also that of the Balkans in general.

Sofia officially followed the course of events in the Ottoman Empire to look for a way, as has been mentioned above, to settle the two fundamental questions for the Bulgarian nation after the partition on the Berlin Congress:

- Proclamation of the Bulgarian independence;
- Improvement of the condition of the Bulgarians in Macedonia and Edirne region.

The settlement of these problems was a primary task for January 1908 cabinet of the Democratic Party, lead by Alexander Malinov. This ministry stands out with two important tendencies: moderate pro-Russian orientation,<sup>8</sup> and the tangible influence of the Macedonia-Bulgarian diaspora in the Council of ministers.<sup>9</sup> This illustrated well the way, which the government of the Democrats will take in the very soon upcoming fateful events on the Balkan Peninsula.<sup>10</sup>

In the beginning of June 1908 in the town of Ravel (modern Talin) British King Edward VII and Russian Emperor Nikolay II agreed on conducting a new reformation policy in Macedonia.<sup>11</sup> This was taken by Turkish governing circles as direct violation on the integrity of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>12</sup> The Anglo-Russian initiative increased even more the clashes between the so-called Old Turks and the Young Turks. The latter

7 On the situation in European Turkey after the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie uprising cf. Силянов, Хр. Освободителните борби на Македония. Том II. С., 1943

8 Саздов, Д. Демократическата партия в България 1887-1908. С., 1987, с. 45.

9 Member of the cabinet is Andrei Liapchev – a prominent figure of the Supreme Macedonian committee, whose representatives take active part in the building of Karavelov’s party; cf. Божинов, В. К. Земното кълбо не престава да се върти, ако и ние да спим. С., 2005, с. 54.

10 В-к “Пряпорец”, бр. 9, 21. I. 1908 г.

11 Акмеşe, Н. N. The birth of modern Turkey. New York, 2005, p. 56;

12 Сп. “Ново време”, 1908, кн. VIII-IX, с. 463; Kansu, A. The revolution of 1908 in Turkey. Leiden, 1997, 86.

decided that the moment has come to take the power and to carry out changes from the inside, not outside, which would have given them the advantage to make the rule of the Empire to their liking.

The revolution started in the beginning of July 1908, when Niyazi Bey, a Turkish notable from Resne (Resen in Macedonia), lead his detachment to the *vilayet* centre of Manastir (Bitola), demanding on restoration of the Constitution from 1876.<sup>13</sup> Exactly here the local committee of the Young Turks announced to the citizens of the town that the main law, passed 32 years earlier, has been brought back to life.<sup>14</sup> The news spread quickly around the Empire, while the adherents of the new order immediately succeeded in taking the local power. This process was accompanied with murders of Muslims by Muslims, which turned the revolution into a severe civil conflict. For example, Bulgarians from Edirne region witnessed how Turks (mainly militaries) hang other Turks (imams and mullahs) – something which “*has never been seen before*”.<sup>15</sup> Even the Sultan, “*being in fear of his throne and life*”,<sup>16</sup> did not want to and was not able to stop the invasion of the Young Turks in the government and was forced to conform to them. In short, the change in the Ottoman Empire was groundbreaking and comprehensive, which makes Bulgarian politicians undertake adequate actions concerning the new status quo in the Empire.

The information which the Bulgarian government received can be generalized as follows: the coup d'état was exclusively conducted by the army, supported by the petty officialdom; the political transformation was nation-wide; the Young Turks gave signs that they will look for some kind of agreement with VMORO and good relations with the Bulgarian state.<sup>17</sup>

The news that the new ruling circles insisted on having good relations with VMORO, as well the fact that after the revolution “*the situation of the Bulgarians (in Macedonia) has become stable*”,<sup>18</sup> was the reason for the Bulgarian diplomacy to raise the question about the independence.<sup>19</sup>

Bulgaria did not have to wait for long to proceed with the implementation of its intentions. The assurances given by the Young Turks that they were ready to deepen the relations with Sofia turned out to be in vain. The “Geshov incident” was taken as a good reason for the Bulgarian government to launch its plan for eliminating the vassalage to the sultan. This opportunity was reinforced by the strike in the Eastern Railways which stopped the Bulgarian export to the Empire and proved again the dependency of the

13 Първанова, З. Между неосъществения хюриет и неизбежната война. С., 2002, с. 48-49.

14 ЦДА, ф. 176К, оп. 2, а. е. 2, л. 2

15 Op.cit., а. е. 110, л. 5.

16 Документи по обявяването на независимостта на България 1908 година. С., 1968, с. 21

17 НБКМ-БИА, ф. 317, а. е. 9, л. 4-10.

18 Документи по обявяването..., 23.

19 НБКМ-БИА, ф. 317, а. е. 9, л. 19.

Bulgarian economy on one company, benefiting from ex-territoriality on the Bulgarian land. Under these circumstances, the ruling circles in Sofia had to wait nothing more. The Democratic cabinet gave out an order in the Bulgarian section of the railway Bulgarian officials to be appointed.<sup>20</sup> With this act the Malinov's ministry irrevocably raised the question for the Bulgarian independence. After much consulting, secret negotiations and agreements, it was promulgated on 22.09.1908, when with a special manifest, read in Turnovo, prince Ferdinand I proclaimed Bulgaria an independent state and himself – its Tsar.<sup>21</sup>

The proclamation of Bulgarian independence unleashed a new wave of major changes in the region. On the next day Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina – an act which was directly supported by agreements between the Bulgarian Monarch and the Emperor of the dualistic monarchy.<sup>22</sup> In turn, Athens announced the annexation of Crete Island to the Greek Kingdom.<sup>23</sup> These actions were a direct challenge to the Young Turks, since the Empire's prestige was strongly impaired, which in turn became a trump-card in the hands of their domestic opponents.

Under the new circumstances, the ruling circles in the Porte were forced to zigzag in their positions towards Bulgaria. Since it is well known that the Bulgarian independence was proclaimed in agreement with Vienna, hence, at first, by Bosphorus preferred not to hurry to change their attitude towards Sofia, but rather to start direct negotiations with Austria-Hungary and thus to settle the problem with Bosnia and Herzegovina. The might of the dualistic monarchy, however, made the Sublime Porte (kind of a Council of Ministers dominated by the Young Turks) to take a passive position and direct its forces to small Bulgaria in order to restore the authority of the Ottoman Empire. As a result, it led to extremely strained Turkish-Bulgarian relations and a pre-war status between the two countries.<sup>24</sup> The situation became so tense that the Great Powers exerted pressure over Sofia and Istanbul, which agreed to start dialogue with each other to resolve the problems.

The negotiations for the recognition of the Bulgarian independence move slowly, with each side using delays and subterfuge as an essential tool in discussions to gain time and to seek external support, without whose presence, the standing issues could hardly be solved.<sup>25</sup> The domestic situation in the Ottoman Empire also turned out to be

20 *Op.cit.*, ф. 13, а. е. 38, л. 4.

21 The issues on the political combinations preceding the proclamation of the independence are well elucidated in the historical science. As newest in-depth study on these issues, cf. Марков, Г. *Независимостта на България и балканската криза 1908-1909*. С., 2008.

22 Божинов, В. К. За българската независимост, ковачът и неговата ръка, нажеженото желязо и клещите. – In: *Независимостта на България 1908 г. – поглед от XXI век*. С., 2010, с. 234-240.

23 Feroz, A. *The making of modern Turkey*. L&NY, 1993, p. 33.

24 Тодорова, Цв. *Обявяване независимостта на България през 1908 г. и политиката на империалистическите сили*. С., 1960, с. 124-132.

25 Божинов, В. К. Андрей Ляпчев и българската независимост. ИДА, 2008, том 95-96, с. 18-24.

unstable, and the struggle between Yildiz Palace (the official residence of Sultan Abdul Hamid II) and the Porte intensified with every day, which slowed down even more the Bulgarian-Turkish negotiations. The acrimony in the struggle for power between the Old and Young Turks reached its apogee when a new coup d'état (31.03.1909) was conducted by the conservative militaries in support of the sultan.<sup>26</sup>

The crisis in the Empire made the Bulgarian side to force the recognition of the independence by Istanbul, through open threats for war or uprising in Macedonia and from here for a common-Balkan conflict.<sup>27</sup> Faced with a looming new coup, prepared by the Young Turks, and after a strong international pressure, the government in Istanbul recognized Bulgarian independence, with protocol signed at the beginning of April 1909.

In this way, the first important problem in which the Bulgarian political elite faced after the outbreak of the Young Turks' revolution has been settled. The recognized Bulgarian independence brought more confidence to the Bulgarian nation to look for new means to achieve its national unification, turning the Bulgarian state into a separate political entity in the international law. The opportunity also appeared for the restored Bulgarian kingdom to play more active role on the Macedonian question, which was complicated enough by the strong historical traces and turned out to be the most difficult problem to solve among the Balkan Christian states.

The fact that the centre of the Young Turks' movement turned out to be in Macedonia proved once again that the Macedonian question and related to this was Reval's reform programme which was one of the main motives for conducting radical political change.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, the situation in the region was extremely complex and complicated. After the suppression of the Inlinden-Preobrazhenie uprising and the subsequent weakening of VMORO, the Greek and Serbian armed propaganda tangibly intensified, tacitly supported by the Turkish authorities. However, this was an old policy of Istanbul, inspired by the Roman maxim "Divide and Rule". Whenever the Greek became too powerful, the sultan gave advantage to the Bulgarians (the recognition of the Bulgarian Exarchate).<sup>29</sup> In turn, when the Bulgarians strengthened their influence too much, the Porte tolerated the Serbian propaganda (The Firmilianov Question).<sup>30</sup> With the aim to confuse everything and to lay permanent division among the Christians, Istanbul gave priority to the Romanian (Vlachs) claims, recognizing the Aromanians separate millet in Macedonia, etc.<sup>31</sup> Thus the Sultan was able to keep the

26 ЦДА, ф. 3К, оп. 8, а. е. 1430, л. 72.

27 Документи по обявяването..., с. 112.

28 ЦДА, ф. 176К, оп. 2, а. е. 140 л. 62.

29 Ников, П. Възраждане на българския народ. Църковно-национални борби и постижения. С., 1971, с. 225-311.

30 Грънчаров, Ст. България на прага на двадесетото столетие. С., 1986, 190-198.

31 Tokay, G. Makedoniya Sorunu. Istanbul, 1995, s. 68.

region under his control, using the hostility reigning among the non-Muslims there which transferred in the relations among the small Balkan states.

The objective historical truth requires to be mentioned that not only the suppression of the uprising led to the hard fate of the Macedonian Bulgarians. On the eve of the Young Turk revolution in the Bulgarian community itself some rather negative phenomena could be observed. For example, the Exarchate priests became a byword for “*brutal greed*” and the Bulgarian bishop in Manastir (Bitola) did not pay attention to the requests for assistance from the Bulgarian villages, forced by the Greek andantes to go under the auspices of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In Exarchate schools, the teacher did not dare to make note of the student, since the latter was ready to take out a revolver and shoot his mentor, while “*physical depravity spreads with amazing rapidity*”. Most striking were the cases of association of a Bulgarian village with the Turkish army or Albanian bandits, so that another Bulgarian village was to be invaded and plundered. The VMORO itself was not healthy. Anyone refusing to pay tax to the local voyvoda was punished, often with death. There were cases of execution of fathers to their families – to serve as an example.<sup>32</sup>

This national Bulgarian nightmare accompanied by the terror of the Greek, Serbian and Albanian troops, as well as the deliberate indifference of the official authorities lead to elimination of the Bulgarians in whole regions in Macedonia. Only from the suppression of the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie uprising to the Young Turk revolution nearly 42.000 men aged 16 to 40 left from the Manastir (Bitola) region to the United States of America (USA) “*who pulled themselves and their families*” to the new world. These people are “*forever lost to Macedonia*”, leaving behind whole villages and hamlets only with few old.<sup>33</sup>

This unbearable situation made the change, proclaimed and brought by the Young Turks, awaited by the Bulgarians in the Empire. This mood was used by the first still at the outset of the revolution. The “*Resen movement*” of Niyazi Bey was supported by the Bulgarian population in the regions of Ohri (Ohrid) and Manastir (Bitola), although the Bey states that in Macedonia until there is even “*one Turkish head, we will not allow somebody else to be in charge here, as you might think (the Bulgarians)*”.<sup>34</sup> The desire for more freedom and legal order left such statements unnoticed by the Bulgarian population. Moreover, on the day when the constitution was proclaimed in Manastir (Bitola), over 3000 Bulgarians, living in the town, demonstrated their support for the new regime, which was seen as a chance for more political rights.<sup>35</sup>

---

32 БИА-НБКМ, ф. 317, а. е. 79, л. 1-35, 94.

33 Op.cit.

34 ЦДА, ф. 176К, оп. 2, а. е. 140, л. 31.

35 Op.cit., л. 37.

The Young Turks also had interest to be in good relations with the Bulgarians in the Empire. The Bulgarian population in Macedonia was the largest Christian community in the region, making it able to cause a number of troubles to the new governors in Istanbul. Therefore, the Young Turks started to court VMORO, defining it as “*a valuable contributor*”,<sup>36</sup> and also it declared an amnesty that led to the release of 1500 Bulgarians, closed in the Turkish dungeons throughout Asia Minor.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the new conditions in the Empire allowed many Bulgarian villages in Macedonia to return to the bosom of the Exarchate, since the Serbian and Greek troops which have been harassing them, were weakened.<sup>38</sup> This further strengthens the hope among the Bulgarians that in the Ottoman state a real change was made, which would help to smooth the national and social contradictions in it.

What happened in the Empire puts VMORO in an entirely new situation. Like the Serbian and Greek troops, those of VMORO also entered peacefully in the bigger Macedonian towns and put the gun.<sup>39</sup> This “*demilitarizing action*” became a watershed for the relations within the Internal Organization. The Left, with Yane Sandanski at the head, firmly stand behind the Young Turks, for which the “*serchans*” and their leader personally received a solid cash and full confidence of the new government.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the Left wins a powerful ally in its fight against the internal opponents in VMORO. The Right, led by people like Hristo Matov and considered by Istanbul as a conductor of the Bulgarian policy in Macedonia,<sup>41</sup> initially also lead conversations with the Young Turks, but remained strongly suspicious towards them.<sup>42</sup> Despite being “*disarmed*” the supremacist troops left guns “*in feet*” to show that they were ready at any moment to start fight against the official authorities.<sup>43</sup> The above mentioned facts further reinforce the division in VMORO, which was a desired effect by the Young Turks who succeeded in weakening one of their strong opponents.

Later, during the crisis over the Bulgarian independence and after that, favoring the Left would become clear when the Bulgarian parties, which were to participate in the legal political life of the Empire, were formed. Prior to the activity of the Union of the Bulgarian Constitutional Clubs (dominated by the Supremists), the authorities posed a number of obstacles in order to weaken the Right.<sup>44</sup> On the contrary, the National-

36 БИА-НБКМ, ф. 317, а. е. 37, л. 10.

37 Божинов, В. Тр. Българската просвета в Македония и Одринска Тракия 1878-1913. С., 1982, с. 273.

38 Влахов, Т. Криза в българо-турските отношения 1895-1908. С., 1977, с. 152.

39 Aarbakke, V. Ethnic rivalry and the quest for Macedonia 1870-1913. New York, 2003, 146-147.

40 БИА-НБКМ, ф. 317, а. е. 37, л. 9.

41 ЦДА, ф. 176К, оп. 2, а. е. 140, л. 124.

42 Китанов, В. Аспекти на политическите отношения на ВМОРО с Турция 1903-1914 г. Благоевград, 2009, 107.

43 Матов, Хр. М. Мълчаливецът от Струга. С., 2007, 159.

44 About UBCC cf. Първанов, Г. Политическата дейност на Съюза на българските конституционни клубове. МПР, 1991, № 4.



federative party (the Bulgarian section), which was under the influence of Sandanski, in spite of being initially tolerated by the Young Turks, due to the limited influence of the Left and the discords in it, failed to become a serious political factor.<sup>45</sup>

The curious “honeymoon” between the Macedonian Bulgarians and the Young Turks did not last for long. Bulgarian-Turkish controversies caused by the intentions of the Principality to declare independence, as well as the very act of overthrowing the vassalage, strained the relations between Sofia and Istanbul. Unable to exert direct pressure over the Bulgarian policy, the Young Turks started a campaign against the Bulgarians, living within the Empire. The Porte went back to the old manners of actions, starting to tolerate the aspirations of Greeks and Serbs, so that they may oppose to the Bulgarian affinities. The practice of arresting prominent representatives of the internal organization, who refused to cooperate with the Young Turks, was resumed. Hristo Matov himself was detained by the authorities,<sup>46</sup> so that pressure to be exerted over that part of VMORO which did not want to follow blindly Sandanski and the Young Turks, respectively. Such course of action lead the Macedonian Bulgarians and the government in Sofia to only one conclusion – the change in the Ottoman Empire was impossible, an agreement with the Young Turks “*on the fate of Macedonia is entirely ruled out*”,<sup>47</sup> while the actions of the latter were just a skillful maneuver to preserve the Empire’s integrity. Actually, the situation of the Bulgarians in Turkey, “*in fact remains the same: stagnation, insecurity, dead, miserable future*”.<sup>48</sup> The only way to change this situation appeared to be war.

The Young Turk revolution was met with great expectations by the Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire and the government in Sofia saw a convenient occasion to realize these intentions regarding the independence and the Macedonian question. The assurances of the new rulers in Istanbul that the reforms they have begun will bring constitutionalism and freedom were met with hope that a real change will really take place. But we must ask the question, whether the desire of the Young Turks for reforms was sincere and to what extent do the Balkan neighbors of the Empire, and Bulgaria, respectively, want the changes to be carried out thoroughly? What would happen if the Young Turks’ committee gives full freedom of the Christians in the Balkan *vilayets*? This would mean autonomy for Macedonia and the Adrianople region, with the Bulgarian demographic predominance there, leading to a situation similar to that in Eastern Rumelia – from autonomous Ottoman province to unification with Bulgaria. Moreover, such an option is not the only scenario. The appetites of Greece and Serbia to the Ottoman heritage are also large, which causes even more fears among the Young

45 On the National-federative party (б. с.) cf. Първанов, Г. Народно-федеративната партия в национално-освободителното движение. Сп. “Векове”, 1989, № 3.

46 БИА-НБКМ, ф. 317, а. е. 37, л. 8.

47 Данев, Ст. Мемоари. С., 1992, с. 118.

48 БИА-НБКМ, ф. 317, а. е. 78, л. 3.

Turks. The constant provocation, so well used by the Turkish government, among Bulgarians, Greeks, Albanians, Serbs, etc. has been the recipe, preserving the Ottoman Empire for decades after the congress in Berlin, but under full granted freedom and conscientiously conducted reforms, would it work properly? Such issues bother the Young Turks, who ultimately decide to limit the changes in the state, so that they do not lead to its full disintegration.

And if the Young Turks are clearly aware of what they want, we can doubt if the situation is the same about the Bulgarian state and society. On the one hand, the reforms are wanted by the Bulgarians in Macedonia and the Edirne region as well as by many people in the principality. On the other hand, however, a successful reformation policy in the Empire would deprive Bulgaria and the other Balkan states from their main argument to start a war against Turkey. This leads to the paradox that the success of the reforms, so much discussed by both Christians and Muslims, is unwanted by the political elite of all parties involved in the Balkan Gambit.

#### ABBREVIATIONS:

а. е. – архивна единица – file-number

бр. – брой – number

В-к – вестник – newspaper

г. – година – year

л. – лист – leaf

НБКМ-БИА – St. St. Cyril and Methodius National Library (Sofia), Bulgarian Historical Archive

оп. – опис – inventory

С. – София – Sofia

с. – страница – page

Сп. – списание – review

Том – volume

ЦДА – Централен държавен архив – Central State Archive (Sofia)

ф. – фонд – fund