NATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF THE UNION OF THE MACEDONIAN EMIGRANT ORGANISATIONS
IN BULGARIA

MEMOIR

ON

THE SITUATION OF THE BULGARIAN MINORITY IN GREEK AND SERBIAN MACEDONIA

SUBMITTED TO

THE ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ASSOCIATIONS

FOR

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SOFIA — 1925.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF THE UNION OF THE MACEDONIAN EMIGRANT ORGANISATIONS
IN BULGARIA

MEMOIR

ON

THE SITUATION OF THE BULGARIAN MINORITY IN GREEK AND SERBIAN MACEDONIA

SUBMITTED TO

THE ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ASSOCIATIONS

FOR

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SOFIA — 1925.

MEMOIR

on

The Question of the Bulgarian Minority in Macedonia, under the Serbian and Greek Regime.

Submitted to the Assembly of the International Union of Associations for the League of Nations, by the Committee of the Union of the Macedonian Emigrant Organisations in Bulgaria.

The Committee of the Organisations of the Macedonian Emigrants in Bulgaria, considers it its duty to elucidate before The Assembly of the International Union of Associations for the League of Nations the question of the Minorities in Macedonia under the Serbian and Greek regime, in view of the report presented by the Honourable Asistant — secretary of the Commission for the Minorities of the International Union to the session of the 10—11 Feb. 1925 in Brussels.

We do not wish to dwell on certain passages of the preamble to this report which might be a prejudgment on the situation in Macedonia.

It is not right however, for instance, to say „that it would be difficult to find a territory more exposed to violence, massacres, rapine and to the different kinds of crime which accompany a political ambition without restraint". Because what has occurred in the Macedonian country, during its whole history, is far from reaching the degree of violence, massacres, rapine and all kinds of cruelties which have ravaged many other countries even comparatively in recent times. We may allude to the events transpired in Europe during the war of Hundred Years in France, during the long historical struggles in England, durung the Thirty Years war etc. Can the „Macedonian struggles", so much discredited be compared with what has happened in our days in Ireland? And the political ambition in these struggles was certainly not more „without restraint" than in those led in many other European countries.

If we start a discussion of the „Macedonian question" with such unfounded assertions, we are bound to be misled. The struggles which ravaged Macedonia during the Middle Ages do not differ in anything from those

which have occurred, in war time, in European countries. It is at least the same „political ambition without restriant" which pushed the Kings of England to invade France, the Roi-Soleil to war in Spain, in Holland and in Germany, King Frederick the Great to aggrandize Prussia, — to quote only a few examples, taken at hap-hazard. Nobody would say that all these wars were made without vilence, massacres, rapine aud other forms of crime".

On the other hand, it would be difficult to find a territory in Europe in which it has been attempted to throw so much confusion into a very plain question by all kinds of subterfuges and falsifications, which have finally made it appear as one fullof traps in which are apt to fall too often all who study the Balkan questions in haste and we may add — too often with prejudice. To throw light on the question let us in the first place, consider the occupation of the country by the Slavs.

Macedonia has well defined frontiers if we keep to Geography and to the majority of the population (p. 2). Let us fix the frontiers. The Shardagh to the North and the Tcherna-gora (Karadagh), the ancient Serbian frontier, the Ossogovo mountains and the Rila ; to the East, the Rhodopes and the course of the Mesta down to its mouth; to the South, the Aegean sea, the Kambounitza mountain to the South of the river Bistritza, the Pindus mountain ; to the West, the eastern Albanian Mountains and the Ochrida lake. In any case, geographically and ethnographically, Macedonia is not constituted only of the old Turkisch vilaget of Salonica, and of the eastern part of he Monastir vilayet, as is stated in the report mentioned (p. 2).

The Slavs who inhabit this country belong ethnographically and by national sentiment to the Bulgarian nation. In this there should be no doubt for all acquainted with the country, its history, and its inhabitants, in the first place for all the Slavists of world wide reputation.

These Slavs belong to the ancient Slovenes who, coming from the Carpathians, descended down the Pruth and crossing the lower Danube, invaded in the VI and VII centuries, the territory to the South of the Danube down to the Aegean sea, reaching to Thessaly and even into the Peloponesus and the Albanian Mountains. On the other hand, the slav tribes belonging to the Serbo-Croat-Slavs of the South passed through Panonia, crossed the middle Danube, and establisched themselves in the VII century in the corner of the Country northewest of the Balkan peninsula, not passing beyond the so called Bulgarian Morava.

All the known scholars who have studied the question agree to fix the frontiers between the Slovenes who later took the name of Bulgarians, and the Serbo-Croat at Shardagh and Tcherna-gora (Karadag) to the South and the Bulgarian Morava and the Timok, at the most, to the East. To quote two or three of these competent authorities on the question, taken from among those who enjoy a good reputation among the Serbians themselves, we will-

select, in the first place, the historian and linguist Florinski, member of the Serbian Academy. He defines the country occupied by the Serbians as follows:

„In the X century the Serbians appear as a people already completely established and occupy nearly the same countries which they occupy today . . .

From here (the Adriatic sea) to the southeast along the Scutari lake and fullowing the mountains towards Prizrend and the sources of the Morava. It is difficult to find the frontier up to which the Serbian element extended in the East: here it is mixed with the Bulgarians, but it has probably not passed the Morava". (In the work. „The Slavs of the South and Byzance in the second quarter of the XIV century". Second edition. „The Formation of the Serbian Empire"). Also in his book „Lessons on the Linguistic Slav", I vol. Kiev 1895. „. . . the spread of the Serbo-Croat language — extends along the eastern bank of the Scutari lake, turns at its northern part to the East and South — east and follows the Zeta river, passes by the towns of Goussigne, Diakovo and reaches Prizrend, then turning to the North — east and the North follows the mountains which stretch on the left of the Bulgarian Morava, runs in the direction of Nisch, passes by Nischevtzi towards the Timok and following this river attains the Danube to the North of Vidin" (p. 217.

On page 58, in the same book he says:" . . . one is obliged to recognise that in the Treaty of San Stefano the ethnographic froniers of Bulgaria were generally well indicated". We may notice here that two years after the appearance of this work, by this eminent Russian Scholar, he was proclaimed member of the Serbian Academy of Belgrade.

Likewise the distinguished Tchec historian, Jireček, writes in his history of the Serbians: „Amongst the Slav peoples who penetrated into the Balkan Peninsula the true Serbians established themselves at the commencement in the interior of the country; they remained inside of the Danube and of the sea in the river vallies of Lim, Ibar and Western Morava" (I. 9. 10). And further, in an article on the „Balkan Peoples and their Cultural and Political Aspirations" published in 1909 in the Vienna paper „Urania" he speaks of the „West-Bulgarian dialect spoken between Sofia and Ochrida" p. (195.)

We have also the well known Slavist Croat, Jagič, in his article „The Slav Languages" published in the „Kultur der Gegenwart" 1908. He places the Macedonian dialects in the language of the Bulgarian group, and according to him the Serbian idiom comprehends „Serbia including Old Serbia (the so Called Sandjak), Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Montenegro, the South-eeastern parts of Croatia, all Slavonia and parts of Hungary" (p. 25).

We will also quote another Tchec slavist, L. Niederle, who in his work „Slovanske Starozitnosti" (dil. II. 1906, p. 401) writes as follows: . . . the tribes which established themselves in the regions from Ochrida and Debra and to the east of the Bulgarian Morava and the Timok have always been closely

Iraated, as to the language and ethnography". We can further mention the Russian scholars Grigorovitch, Hilfering, Kotchoubinski, Rovinski, Sobolevski, Derjavine, Kondakoff, Milioukoff and Selichtcheff, the Tchec slavist Safarik, the polish Krückner, the Slovene Oblak, the French slavists Louis Leger and Andre Mazon, as also Leon Lamonche, the German Scholars Mazing, Leskien and Weigand etc.: all to the same effect.

History confirms equally this same truth. The Slav apostles Cyril and Methodius accepted the dialect spoken around Salonica as basis for the language in which they translated the holy books; that language is now called by all acquainted with the question the „Old Bulgarian". — When, after the conquest of the Bulgarian empire of Tzar Peter, in the second half of the X-th century, Tzar Samuel established the new state in Macedonia with Prespa and Ochrida for capitals, this state was called by him and by the Byzantines Bulgarian empire, and the byzantine emperor Basil II, who after long and bloody struggles succeded finally to subject this empire also, was named „the Bulgarian Killer" (Bulgaroktone), and the had made war only upon these Bulgarians of Samuel. — We have also the Norvegian Harald, who, in 1040 with his army in the pay of Byzance, aided the Byzatines to stifle a revolt of the Bulgarians in Macedonia and was named by the Norvegians „Bolgara Brennir (plunderer of the Bulgarians). The revolutionaries proclaimad in Skopie their leader, Peter Delian, „Tzar of the Bulgarians".

In the XIII and XIV centuries the Serbians conquered Macedonia from the Greeks and Bulgarians, and held it during 10 to 75. years. After the death of the Serbian emperor Douchan, the country was divided into several principalities governed by princes of Serbian birth, such as King Marko of Prilep, King Valkaskine or Voukachine, father of Marko. But these princes, although of Serbian origin, called themselves Kings of Bulgaria, and so they have been called also by foreigners. Thus the Albanian Musache says in his work „Historia della casa Musachia" 1510: „ . . . il qale combatti col re Vucasino ch'era re de Bulgaria". — „ . . . e Marco re di Bulgaria". — About the same time the historian Theodore Spandoun Cantacasin of Constantinople writes: Marco Carlovich despot, that is to say seigneur of Bulgaria". — The Serbian writer Michel d'Ostrovitza, of the same period, speaks of the brothers Voucachine and Ouglèshe as ruling in a Bulgarian Country „The tzar Ourouche gave to the two brothers Voucachine and Ougliche the Bulgarian country".

The first Turkish writers in Europe, travel in Macedonia two centuries after the conquest of the peninsula. They of course know that the last princes in that country were Serbians. Notwithstanding, they also envariably speak of the Bulgarian Macedonian population. Thus the historian and geographer Hadji Kalfa, who travelled in the XVI century, in speaking of the inhabitants of Kastoria, Bilishta, Nasselitza, Monastir, Ochrida etc, calls

them Bulgarians. About the same time, Evliya Tchelebi, in mentio ning the villages of Nagoritchino (north-east of Scopié) and Izvor (in the neighbourhood of Kuprulu (Veless) calls them Bulgarian villages.

And ever afterwards when travellers visit the country and come in contact with the inhabitants, we find these travellers speak of the Bulgarian popu- lation. The same is affirmed, among others, by the French Pouqueville, Bea- jour, Cousinery in the beginning ot the XIX century. later by Viquesnel, Ami Boué, Legean, the English Urquhart, Mackezie andirby, Henry Transhawe, Tozer, Lord Strangford, Arthur Evans, Brailsford, the Germans Grisebach, v. Hahn, Barth, the Russians Grigorovitch and Helfeding as also the monk Partheni, the Serbian of Bosnia Verkovitch etc.

To falsify history, which is so clear for those acquainted with the country and the people as also with history, to delude those who cannot carefully look into the question, the Serbians have made affirmations simply ridiculous in the eyes of serious people. Thus they believe in the existence of a simple people who will walk into their trap laid by simply maintaining that the word „Bul- garians" by which the Slav Macedonians, call themselves, signifing their natio- nality, has with them the meaning of simple or common people (from the latin word „vulgari"!); thus if a Mucedonian Slav calls himself Bulgarian, it means a simple, „common-man". Is it not however surprising and even funny, that these very inhabitants of this country, which, according to the ethno- graphy and the history of the migration of the Bulgarian people, is inhabited by Bulgarians should call themselves as they are called by all the other nations inhabiting the country, as also by those of the neighbouring countries (the Greeks have always called the Slav Macedonians, who continued under the Greek Patriarchate „Hellenes speaking Bulgarian" — Bulgarophonoi ellenoi), while the Slavs to the North of Shardagh, true Serbians, call themselves „Serbian" and not „Bulgarian"; herefore simple or common people! Can the Macedonian Bulgarians call themselves" men simple and common, „they being, perhaps the most intelligent and most gifted among the Bulgarians!

It was in the Mecedonian country that the awakening of the Bulgarian nation was started, there were born the first Bulgarian historian Païssi; the first writer who printed the first books in Bulgarian; the father of Bulgarian teaching (Neofit Rilski). as also he who founded the first Bulgarian prin- ting press in Salonica. The brothers Miladinoff of Strouga published the first collection of Bulgarian songs, Janzifoff of Veless one of the first Bulgarian poets etc were born in Macedonia. All this happened when the rise of the Bulgarian people started from its midst, without any outside impulsion or support from any organised institution; the Exarchate which later took in hand the educational and ecclesiastical work was created only in 1870. Be- sides, the movement for an independent Bulgarian church was started in Mace-

donia, in Skopié, the inhabitants of which town were the first to expel the Greek bishop demanding a Bulgarian in his stead.

They wish to treat as „simple or common" a population which after the establishment of the principality of Bulgaria has inundated this Bulgaria with a great current of emigrants, who have succeeded to create for themselves, there an exceptional position, particularly in Sofia, where they have possessed themselves of nearly all the trades: as bakers. masons, grocers, fruiterers, butchers, green grocers, fishmongers, contractors, merchants etc.

A great percentage of the officials and army officers in the highest ranks are Macedonian Bulgarians. There has scarcely been a cabinet without a Macedonian in it, there has been a cabinet with as many as four Macedonian ministers. And of the representatives abroad today 6-are Macedonian born!

Should this imagined meaning of the word „Bulgarian" in Macedonia fail to convince, the Serbians have invented another quite worthy of the authors. The so called Serbians of Macedonia changed their national name to that of Bulgarian, because the Serbians were not well considered by the Turks on account of the frequent trouble they gave the Turkish rule!

Here again we have an ingenious deception as regards a country which according to its slav ethnography is inhabited by Bulgarians. Why should the Slavs to the South of Shardagh change their national name from fear of the Turks, and this in the whole of the territory the Serbians covet, when only a few miles further North, where according to ethnography inhabit Serbians, this same fear of the Turks disappears as by disenchantment, and the inhabitants there freely call themselves Serbians. It is, however, apparent that these arguments fail to persuade the Serbians themselves, as also their friends, who often support them on this question for very transparent reasons. And so they advance a third argument, leaving to their audience the choice of all these shallow pretentions, which, besides, disagree one with the other.

They say that these „simple — common people" who „from fear of the Turks" change their true national name Serbian to that of Bulgarian" are neither Bulgarians nor Serbians, but something indefinite which according to the circumstances may change them from Bulgarian to Serbian and vice versa. Also, that the Slav population of Macedonia is at such a degree of civilization that it possesses no national conscience, and is an amorphous mass with no „true national status". (p. 7.)

Yet, this Slav population has demonstrated by its national rise in the commencement of the XIX century, when it awoke up, as we have already stated, that it has a very strong national sentiment, which is, perhaps-unequalled in the Balkan peninsula and it has proved it in its struggle with the greek church and in particular against the Turkish regime. This population carried out these struggles, in the first place, in its quality of Bulgarian element. It is clearly a

serious offence for this couragious population to place it upon a degree of civilization lower than that of the Albanians, the Koutzo-Valachs etc, to whom is accorded a national sentiment but not to the Macedonian Slavs!

But let us hear again what the well informed say, as regards this population and its national sentiments. The widely known Russian statesman, Professor Milioukoff, who has studied thoroughly the Macedonian question, who has travelled extensively in the Country, said in the month of june 1913, in the Russian Douma: „The inhabitant of Macedonia knows himself in full conscience as Bulgarian. In order to preserve his nationality he is enduring all the sufferings and prevations; he has been subjected to untheard of violence under the Turkish regime durung dozens of years . . . If it is necessary to introduce a regime of terror in order to denationalize the Macedonian people to make it Serbian or Greek, it simply proves that the real concience of this population is neither Serbian nor greek . . . and we know that notwitstanding Turkish pressure, notwithstanding the support Turkey gave to their artificial national propaganda, the immense majority of the Macedonian population has remained Exachiste and Bulgarian . . This is a fact which not even the greatest Serbian chauvinist can defile".

The Russian Slavist and Accadamician Sobolevski wrote in May 1913 in „Les Nouvelles Russes": What is more important is that the Slavs of Macedonia are in their strong belief Bulgarians, they feel and declare themselves as such".

The distinguished Tchec slavist, Niederle, already quoted, wrote in the month of June 1913, in the Tchec paper „Narodni Listy" . . . It is not languistic difference or some ethnographic usage which make Macedonia Bulgarian, it is the old tradition and national conscience of the country . . I prefer to hear that state reasons dem andthat the province be conquered even when it feels itself Bulgarian in its very soul, in such a case if it is such a State reason which decides, then there is no purpose for advancing doubtful arguments that Macedonia is not Bulgarian".

The English writer Brailsford, in his book on Macedonia, which is, not withstanding some errors, the best book on the situation in Macedonia before the Balkan war, fails to find words in praise of the national sentiment of the Macedonian Bulgarian: The Serbian cause in Macedonia is therefore artificial and diserves no attention. It is maintained in so-far as it is supported with money and there is the fact that the Tufks laugh at it-a proof that it presents no danger, and is condemned to impotence. As things are today, the Serbian Consuls (in Macedonia) will as soon turn the Macedonians into Serbians as the American missionaries will succeed to convert them to protestantism.

We will give the opinion on this question also of the well known linguist Léon Lamouche, who passed some years in Macedonia as officer of the European gendarmerie, during the period of the reforms, and who is master of the countrys language: „The European consuls, the officers who during the years of 1904 to 1909 were appointed to organize the gendarmerie in that country speak only of Bulgarians. It cannot occur to the mind of any one of them. that there are Serbians... the conscience of the people has manifested itself with such force during the past fifty years, that this alone should suffice to prove the Bulgarian character of the country. If It were possible to speak of „national conscience" in a part of the old territories of Turkey of Europe, it would be incontestable here". And again: Amougst the peoples who during the XIX century, the century of nationalities, and in the commencement of the XX century have struggled in defence and the consolidation of their individuality, the Bulgarian people of Macedonia is surely one of those who have fought most vigourously and most energiticaliy, they surmounted the greatest difficulties and gave the greatest sacrifices".

Surely we have a touching and signal proof, althougt superfluous of the nationaiity of the Macedonian-Slavs in the fact, that they are taking refuge in masses in Bulgaria [1]) just as they did in the Turkisk time, because they refuse to renounce their nationality, and the fact that Greece signed the protocol regarding, the reights of the minorities, with the intermediary of the League of Nations, with Bulgaria and not with Serbia. The latter made no objection to the protocol during nearly a whole year from its conception until its signature, and if she all of a sudden has opposed its application, although so just and so necessary for a start towards the realisation of peace in the Balkans, it was not so much because the document recognizes the Bulgarian character of the Slavs of Greek Macedonia but because she foresees that this protocol was bound to end with a demand for the application of the treaty stipulation concerning the Bulgarian population of Macedonia under Serbian regime as well.

We do think that enough has been said to prove the Buigarian character of the Slav population of Macedonia for all who are of good faith and are desirous to understand this question, which is obscured only by the political complications, which have nothing do with the ethnographical condition of the coontry.

The Macedonian question has been embroiled and complicated subsequent

[1]) There has never been importat emigration from Macedonia into Serbia (as from Bosnia) the population never fled there in masses to save itself from Bulgarian oppression; only such went there who desired work, just as they went to Roumania, to Hungary, to America (p. 6 of the report).

to the handing over of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austro-Hungary by the Berlin treaty. This act deprived the Serbo-Croat people of these two provinces, and closed for it its righlfull access to the sea. In order to turn away the Serbian claims from these provinces, Austro-Hengery directed them towards Macedonia which the Serbians until then had regarded as the patrimony of the Bulgarian people. And the struggle between the Macedonian Bulgarian and the Serbian propaganda was thus started. To be correct we must admit that there has been a Serbian propaganda in Macedonia, that is to say a foreign interference but no such Bulgarian has existed, considerng that the Bulgarian people is of the country itself. Besides, the Serbians recognized that fact by the treaty of the 13 of March 1912, in which they expresely admitted the Bulgarian character of the greater part of Macedonia. Bulgaria had to come to this arran gement and saw herself obliged to detach a small part of northern Macedonia to the North of a line running almost straight from the North corner of the lake Ochrida o the Bulgarian frontier North of Kriva-Palanka, which was called the Contested" zone, and on the destiny of which the Russian Tzar was to arbitrate, by partitioning it, probably, between the two countries. The fact that Bulgaria hesitated to concede willingly the least part of this Contested zone, which included this very part of the northwest of Macedonia with Scopie, to be Serbian, and that Serbia agreed not to obtain directly the least part of this territory proves again and clearly that even Serbia accepted the facts which support the claim of Bulgaria, that is to say, that this region was likewse peopled by Bulgarians, and that Bulgaria had been obliged to leave to the arbitraton of the Tzar a purely Bnlgarian territory in favour of Serbia.

Convinced that we have proved the Bulgaria nationality of the Macedonian Slavs, and trusting that henceforward the Macedonian question, as to the nationality of the inhabitants of this country, will not be "an affair full of traps in which eaily fall those who study hastily the Balkan questions" as stated in the mentioned report, we will proceed to remark that the designation of "Old-Slavs", which this report attributes the Bulgarians to the Macedonian Slavs (p. 6 and 8 of the report) is never given by a Bulgarian to the Slav inhabitant of Macedonia, they are ever called Bulgarians.

No ficticious reasons exist (p. 2) for the emigration of the Macedonian sPeople leave this country to seek e better existence; but the greater part of the emigrants in this case leave their mother country driven out of it by the inhuman regime to which ordinarily they are subjected deprived of the right to call themselves Bulgarian, to read Bulgaian books even the, most innocent, as the first reader or the bible; to bear their proper Bulgarian names, with the terminatin of eff or off. No people abondon their ancestral homes in mases for fictious reasons except for such as have ren dered living there impossible, which guarantee only suffering and misery. Why has Ireland given such a strong contingent of emigrants to America? Why

such great masses of Russians are fleeing from their country and taking refuge in all the countries of Europe! It is scarcely necessary to seek further the reasons for this emigration in Bulgaria. This is not the place for refuting the calumny which our enemies and "their friends" spread without restraint, in attributing the efforts of Bulgaria to come to the assistance of the nationals of Macedonia to an ungoverned imperialism. This is a new trap set for those who do not habitually use their brains to avoid such traps. The Greeks could, wihout provoking such accusations interest themselves in the fate of the Greeks of Thessaly, Epirus, as also Crete and the islands of the Aegean sea, even of those of Asia Minor. they were free to claim humane rights for their nationals in all these countries, and even to attempt their deliverance, was natural. The Serbians likewise could take interest in their brothers in Bosnia and Herzegovina and prepare for their liberation from a regime which in any case granted them liberty such as is unatainable for the Macedonian; they could also loudly claim a better fate for the Serbians, not very numerous, mixed with the Albanians still under the Turkish dominion; they can add after the world war to their State, extraordinarily aggrandized, not a few Germans, Hungarians Roumanians, besides the Bulgarians of Macedonian and parts of Bulgaria herself this is all natural but is nothing less than imperialism. The Roumanias have been aggrandized beyond their imagination and have added to (their people Hungarians, Germans and Russians without counting the Bulgarians of the Dobroudja, yet all this is not to be taxed with imperialism! The Bulgarians alone have to keep quiet, they must not peep beyond their frontiers if they do not wish to be proclamed the greatest chauvins; or avoid Punishment for disturbring the peace!

Be is as it may, politicaly the question is settled in a definite manner, although in a way which does little honour to the authors of the peace treaties. Ifa noble Frenchman could write that the greatest crime humanity ever committed In recent times was the peace which followed the great war, it must be said of, the peace which decided the destiny of Macedonia. Much was said during the war, that it was carried on for the liberty of the small nations, that they may have the right to dispose of themseves, of their destiny and for the rights of man; but they failed to consider the wish of the Macedonian people and this people has been treated as a barbarous one and delivered into hands of the most foro cious enemies of national culture. It is true that some fine words were inserted in the treaties guarantying rights to the minorities, but evidenty there was no intention of realising them, and they have remained scraps of paper — a phrase which had a resounding effect among the allies durung the war, that they had determined to render it impossible in the future policy of Evrope. It is also true that a Leagne of Nations was instituted, to guarantee the new treaties which were to forbid all possible avasion of imposed obligations by the treaties for whoever it may be. Experience howcver,

of several years, since the existence of the League of Nations, as to the obligation inposed upon the conquerors, has demonstrated that when it is a question of applying the stipulations to the account of the conquerors, the League of Nations is impotent to see to the observation of these rights; there is evidence even of fear of vexing the old small States by inviting them not to evade their duties, as an honourable representative of one of the Greatest Powers of the League of Nations has expressed it.

It cannot be then surprising that the Macedonian people, tired of waiting in vain that its rights, provided for in the treaties, be recalled to memory has fround it opportune to seek in its experienced Organisation, and in its unexhaustible courage the remedy to a situation imposed upon it against its sacred will However, there is the decision as its destiny against its will, it does not rebel against the treaty itself which it accepts as final but it rebels aganst the bad faith careless even as to the insignificant rights accorded to it. The Union of the Organisations of the Macedonian Emigrants in Bulgaria, whose object. amongst others is to use legal means in order that the stipulations of the treaties regarding the minorities be realised, is bound to contribute to the reestablishment of true peace in the Balkans, in so far as such peace depends on the situation in Macedonia; it therefore appeals to the International Union of the Associations for the League of Nations, and requests it to do what is in its power that the execution of the treaties regarding the minorities, which has not so far taken a step forward, may not continue to be a dead letter. We know that Yougoslavia specially will use every subterfuge to evade the obligations inposed upon her regarding the Bulgarian people of Macedonia. In the first place Yougoslavia denies the existence of Bulgarians in Macedonia, notwithstanding all the Slav science, which in its most eminent representatives in the Tchec, Russian, Polish languages, not to speak of the German and other scholars, is unanimous in acknowledging the Bulgarian nationality of the Macedonian Slavs, and more, there is the strong sentiment of these Slavs themselves as to their nationality. They believe in Serbia that by employing means forbidden to a modern State, they will succeed to denationalize the Bulgarian people, as they succeeded by such means, in thirty years of time, to serbise the Bulgarian people of the Pirot district, ceded to Serbia by the treaty of Berlin.[1]) Such Is the reason for which the population is deprived of Bulgarian churches and Schools, even, as we have already said, of the most innocent books and of the

[1]) "It must he born in mind that the Bulgarian population of Macedonia is much more numerous, that it possesses a national sentiment, which without exaggeration, has no equal and this sentiment has been further strengthend by the struggle of thirty years. during the Turkich regime. We also believe firmly. that the League of Nationas will not permit much further the employment of means incompatible with the new ideas which gave birth to an institution of such a high moral value as the League ot Nations". (Memoir on the situation of the Bulgarian minority in Serbian and Greek Macedonia presented in Geneva to the Council of the League of Nations, on the 18 September 1924.

right to keep their Bulgarian family names. And further, and more characteristic of the complete disregard of the stipulations regarding the minorities in this unhappy country — the inhabitants are forbidden to baptize ther new born in names other than those in a given list, provided in every church, which are of course specialy Serbian ones.

The best proof of the veracity of our assertions will be found in the results of an impartial international inquiry on the spot. It is for the International Union of the Assotiations for the League of Nations to call for such an inquiry by some competent institution. Such an inquiry will have our approval. even our warmest wishes for the sucess of its impartial and humane task. We are, however, persuaded that the Serbians will have everything to say against such inquiry. Will not such conduct be a most striking proof from our point of view, similar to the judgment of Solomon in the well known case in the bible?

Meanwhile, there remains imfortunately, no other alternative for the Bulgarian population of Macedonia, in order to enforce the respect of the treaties, concluded against its will than to strengthen the ranks of the Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation with the risk of being accused of pushing the Macedonian movement to its most extreme consequence „and to be discredited for abandoning itself to „brigandage and agitation" even as vulgar robbers".

Sofia the 16 June 1925.

President: **Dr. K. D. Stanicheff**

Secretary: **Wl. K. Boulyow**