

43

Macedonia's Rise For Freedom

1903

The Great Insurrection

by

IVAN MIHAİLOFF

Macedonia's Rise For Freedom

1903

The Great Insurrection

by

IVAN MIHAILOFF

Translated and Edited

by

CHRIST ANASTASOFF

(Translated from the original Bulgarian manuscript)

Copyright, 1953

by

CHRIST ANASTASOFF

All Rights Reserved

Published by the Central Committee of the Macedonian
Political Organization of the United States and Canada, 107
South Capitol Avenue, Indianapolis 25, Indiana.

— 1953 —

Introduction

EVER SINCE the early part of the nineteenth century the Balkan Peninsula has been considered the "powder keg" that constantly endangers the peace of Europe. But what has been the underlying cause for the existence of such a state of conditions? We shall unhesitatingly answer: The underlying cause has been chiefly because of the Bulgarian question.

The Bulgarian question, which began to emerge on the world scene during the early part of the nineteenth century, had reached a critical stage just about the middle of the century. The inability of the European Ambassador's Conference at Constantinople (1876) to force the Turks to accept the Powers' suggestion to solve the Bulgarian question had forced Russia to intervene (1877). As a result the Bulgarian question was finally solved by the San Stefano Treaty of 1878. The newly created Bulgarian state by this Treaty, with few exceptions, embraced all the land inhabited for centuries by Bulgarians. But, unfortunately, such a solution of the Bulgarian question was disliked by some of the European Powers. At the Congress of Berlin, which was held on June 13, 1878, England led some of the Powers and proceeded with the destruction of San Stefano Bulgaria. Parts of the Bulgarian lands were given to Rumania and Serbia, while all of Macedonia and Thrace were left under Turkish subjugation. *And as a result of the Berlin settlement emerged the Macedonian question*, which, in itself since, has become the bone of contention among the Balkan states.

Being deprived of their prospective freedom, the Bulgarians of Macedonia were the first to rebel against the Berlin settlement. Sporadic revolts occurred in various parts of Macedonia. But the most systematic and well organized was the Ilinden insurrection of 1903. It was a concrete expression of national consciousness of the Bulgarian people left under Turkish rule in 1878.

The Macedonian question has occupied the minds of European statesmen even since 1878. Article 23 of the Berlin Treaty (July, 1878) provided for an autonomous status for Macedonia. Ignoring the provisions of this article, the Turkish government continued its maladministration of Macedonia. But soon after the active termination of the Ilinden uprising, a meeting between the Russian Czar Nicholas II and Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria-Hungary took place in Murzsteg (September, 1903). There they worked out a scheme of reforms for Macedonia. Macedonia was placed under European supervision but the whole thing turned out to be a grand *fiasco*.

Because of the developments which began to shape in the Balkans, King Edward VII and Nicholas II of Russia met at Raval and proposed a program for Macedonian autonomy. Before this measure was implemented, the "Young Turks" revolution thwarted it. Again the corrective effort of the Great Powers were side tracked.

When the "Young Turks" regime began to maltreat the Christian subject races of European Turkey, the neighboring Balkan states united for common action against the Sultan, in order to free their brethren within the confines of European Turkey. The allied Christian nations—Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro—declared war on Turkey in 1912. The Turks were defeated and driven out of Europe, but the outcome of the war did nothing to change the conditions of Macedonia.

The Treaty of Bucharest (1913) that followed the Balkan wars divided Macedonia among Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria. It became evident that Macedonia only changed rulers while the political and economic conditions of her people became even more desperate.

In Macedonia, under Turkish rule, there lived over 2,500,000 inhabitants, of which 1,200,000 were Bulgarians; 500,000 Turks; 230,000 Greeks; 130,000 Albanians; 80,000 Vlachs (Arumanians); and 120,000 others. The Bulgarians, who constituted the bulk of the population, had enjoyed cultural and educational privileges, and they had 1,373 schools of various grades; 2,266 men and women teachers, and 78,854 students. There were 1,331 churches, 294 chapels, 275 monasteries, and seven bishoprics. But now neither the Greeks nor the Serbians recognized the nationality of the Bulgarians in Macedonia. The first called them "Bulgarian speaking Greeks," and the latter "old Serbs."

Conquered and partitioned at Bucharest in 1913, the Paris Peace Treaties of 1919 did not change the fate of Macedonia. Judging from the Diary of the American representative, David Hunter Miller, the Committee on New States—which also drafted the so-called minority Treaties for the first time—considered the Macedonian question on July 10, 1919. Italy stood for the autonomy of Macedonia, while England proposed that the League of Nations should appoint its own representative in Macedonia, to see that the rights of the people there were respected. American and Japanese delegations intimated their adherence to the British proposal. After the arrival of Mr. David Hunter Miller in Paris, the English diplomat, Mr. Tyrrell, suggested to him that the United States should become the mandatory of the League of Nations for Macedonia. But the Franco-Yugoslav opposition thwarted any solution of the Macedonian problem, and the Paris Peace Conference thus sanctioned the Bucharest Treaty of 1913, and Macedonia remained divided.

Misinformed Serbian and Greek chauvinists are still trying to make the world believe that the Macedonian question appeared as a result of Bulgarian propaganda. Ignorant of the ethnic character of Macedonia's inhabitants, they even refuse to avail themselves of the volumes of well established information on the subject.

Was the Macedonian question a result of Bulgarian propaganda, or, conversely, was the creation of the Bulgarian state itself a result, to a certain extent, of the effort on the part of the Bulgarians of Macedonia?

After five centuries of Turkish domination over the Bulgarian lands,

the Renaissance of the Bulgarian people had begun in Macedonia in the middle of the eighteenth century. Father Paissy, who wrote the first Bulgarian history, was born in the Macedonian city of Bansko in 1720, and published his work in 1762 in the Bulgarian monastery at Mt. Athos, Khalkidike Peninsula. The Bulgarian of Macedonia, Ioakim Kirchovsky, of the city of Kichevo, wrote and published in 1814 the first book in the vernacular Bulgarian language. One of the leading Bulgarian writers, Kiril Peichinovich, was also born in the Macedonian city of Tetovo. In 1839 the first Bulgarian printing press was established in the chief Macedonian city of Salonica by archimandrite Teodosy of Doyran, Macedonia. The Miladinoff brothers, of the city of Struga, Macedonia, were the first Bulgarian folklorists. The Bulgarians of Skopie, the second largest city of Macedonia, were the first to ask the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople in 1828 for the appointment of a Bulgarian bishop in their diocese. And again the struggle for the creation of an independent Bulgarian national church began in Macedonia, which culminated with victory in 1870. The Sultan, by a special *FIRMAN*, had recognized the Bulgarian Exarchate as the spiritual head of all the Bulgarian land, including all of Macedonia. This spiritual emancipation of the Bulgarian people from the domination of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople, was the first step of the Bulgarian people toward seeking their political freedom. One could ask the question: How could a non-existent Bulgarian political state exert such influence or propaganda so as to "create the Macedonian question?" The Bulgarian church victory was attained long before the creation of an independent Bulgarian state. This church victory was largely due to the efforts of leading Bulgarians from Macedonia.

The tragic history of the Balkan states, especially for the past six decades, has been closely connected with Macedonia. The political friction among the various Balkan states has often culminated in armed conflicts.

The Balkan wars have not solved any of the political Balkan controversial questions. The conditions have become far more strained than ever before. What was proclaimed as the war of liberation in 1912 turned out to be a war of conquest. No one knows better than the Macedonian people. The country has been economically ruined because of arbitrary political boundaries.

An economic geographic unit under Turkish rule, Macedonia was partitioned at Bucharest in 1913. Greece received 12,000 square miles of Macedonian territory; Serbia about 10,000 square miles; while Bulgaria less than 3,000 square miles. The only apparent result of these struggles has been an economic exhaustion and everlasting self-destructive hatred among the Balkan peoples. It is obvious that should the Balkan states continue to follow the traditional policy of discord, their social, political, and economic development will be retarded.

The Macedonian question has played the most important role during the Balkan wars. It will again play such a role in the present Balkan

situation. The fact that Tito has created a so-called Macedonian People's Republic in no way solves the problem. On the contrary, it aggravates the situation. In this case, the aim of communist Yugoslavia has been to denationalize the Bulgarians of Yugoslav Macedonia. Tito's Yugoslavia has recognized all the ethnic element living in Yugoslav Macedonia except the Bulgarians. As far as the Yugoslav communists are concerned there are no Bulgarians in Yugoslav Macedonia. But there are "Macedonians"—a "Macedonian nation," that speaks a "Macedonian language." By the stroke of the pen, the Yugoslav communists have created a new "nation" with a new "language" built around a local dialect of a Macedonian district adjacent to Serbia. To be sure, the bulk of the 900,000 Bulgarians living in Yugoslav Macedonia cannot understand the new "Macedonian language" because it is full of Serbisms. This is the method now used by the Serbian nationalist communism of denationalizing and assimilating the Bulgarians of Macedonia.

The Macedonian problem must cease to be a football in the politics of the Balkans. The slogan in this case should be William Gladstone's words: "MACEDONIA FOR THE MACEDONIANS."

The only just and equitable solution of the thorny Balkan problem is the creation of a united and independent state of Macedonia, in which all the ethnic groups thereof will enjoy equal rights and obligations. MACEDONIA SHOULD BECOME A SWITZERLAND OF THE BALKANS. Aside from this, an independent Macedonia may join, on equal terms, a future Balkan federation or confederation.

The Macedonian question can no longer be ignored or side-tracked. It will, in all probability, soon command the world's attention with much greater overtone than it had in the past.

It is hoped that the statesmen of the Great Powers of today will profit by the decades of Macedonian struggle and effect a just and equitable solution of the age-old Balkan problem—the question of Macedonia. The study of causes of war comes before the advocacy of panaceas to cure war.

Ivan Mihailoff, the author of this brochure, is the foremost leader of the Macedonian liberation movement. Under several pen names and also under his given name, he has written several works on Macedonia and the Balkans in general. One of his recently published books in the United States is *Macedonia: a Switzerland of the Balkans*, 1950.

This brochure deals with the development and vicissitudes of the most renowned underground liberation movement—the IMRO—and its epic struggle for Macedonian freedom. Translating it from the original Bulgarian manuscript, an effort has been made to adopt the narrative for the benefit of the English speaking world, unfamiliar with the historic background of the Macedonian Illinden insurrection of 1903. To furnish related statistical data, an appendix has been added by the translator.

CHRIST ANASTASOFF

Macedonia's Rise For Freedom

1903

The Great Insurrection

FIFTY YEARS have passed since the heroic Macedonian Illinden insurrection.¹ Its name not only did not fade away but it has since gained much greater radiance. Although defeated in battle, the Macedonian people consider this event as a day of great victory.

There are many things that we could recall in connection with this fateful year. But let us briefly consider, at least, only some of the conditions which brought about the idea for an armed revolt in Macedonia and also the personalities responsible for its organization and guidance.

What were the causes for the Illinden insurrection? They were the same fundamental causes which made necessary the appearance of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO).² Regarding the insurrection itself there existed no special causes except in the sense of its motives which designated the time, place, and its tactics.

IMRO's Emergence

The IMRO (completing now six decades since its foundation) organized, shaped, and directed the policy of the Illinden insurrection of 1903. The Organization emerged because of Turkey's unbearable tyrannical regime. The study of IMRO's history is an educational subject valuable for every worker for Macedonia's freedom. In this brief brochure we do not intend or aim to summarize or consider Turkey's maladministration of Macedonia. It was in several respects—social, economic, political, and cultural, centuries-old oppression. We might also say that the commission of these oppressions came from quarters other than the Turkish admin-

(1) On August 2, 1903, the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO) proclaimed an insurrection in the Monastir vilayet (province), in western Macedonia. It was the festival day of the Prophet St. Illia, hence the name of the rising—*Illindenskoto vostanie* (the Illinden insurrection). Illin-den or Illinden is a compound word made up of the Prophet's name, Illia, and the Bulgarian word for day, *den*. Hence Illinden means the day of Illia.

(2) The IMRO (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization) was organized in 1893. The IMRO was embracing all the Bulgarians of Macedonia, then under Turkish rule. The aim of the IMRO was, and still is, the attainment of self-government for Macedonia.

istration; it came from more privileged Christian quarters, more specifically the Greek Patriarchate at Constantinople.

Turkey Ignores Treaty Provisions

Had Turkey carried out the application of the reforms for Macedonia as foreseen by the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, the launching of the IMRO in 1893 and the subsequent eruption of the Illinden insurrection would have been unnecessary. The reforms for Macedonia considered by the Berlin Treaty were identically the same as those which were already instituted in the island of Crete in 1868. The Sultan managed to play-out this international decision through the enactment of laws of its own, the so-called "new laws for the Vilayets of European Turkey." Because of the absence of concerted European control, these laws were never introduced. Deceiving themselves that they were prolonging their domination over Macedonia by disregarding Article 23 of the Berlin Treaty, the Turkish administration was unconsciously digging the grave of its own empire. Had it not been for such craftiness, it was quite possible that the half million of Macedonian Turkish population would have remained in their native hearths and lived there happily in harmony with the other Macedonian nationalities.

Encouragement for Revolt

For one to understand a historical event in its completeness, it would be necessary that one transfers himself to the period of time in which the event occurs, and study its causes, its interest, its feelings, and its hopes.

The Macedonian Illinden insurrection was an inevitable manifestation. It was the sharpest and most salient expression of a spiritual situation which existed for several decades, and was approaching with greater pressure. The volleys of the uprising were, among other things, the echo from the recent past and of age-old longing of the Macedonian people. It was drawing encouragement of the previous liberating wars of the Great Powers against Turkey. It was inspired by the previous general unrest and uprisings of the Balkan Christians.

The Haidouts

But the Macedonian people were, above all, agitated by the existing conditions and the events occurring in their own midst. There was hardly a village or town where the stories or legends about the exploits of the *baidouts*³ were not discussed. The Christian *baidouts* were flying protectors

(3) The *baidouts* or *baiduks* were Balkan freedom loving peasants who had fled into the mountains and forests in order to escape exaction and Turkish oppression. They were organized in armed bands and from retreats waged intermittent guerrilla warfare against the Turks. The Bulgarian *baidouts* did much to bring on the struggle resulting in independence from Turkish rule. In the Balkans the exploits of the *baidouts* are celebrated in ballads, prose, and poetry by Bulgarians, Serbians, and Rumanians. Through the centuries of Turkish domination *baidouts* were found among all the Balkan Christian nations.

of the poor and oppressed people. In ballads, prose, and poetry their deeds were glorified. The *baidouts* were the sole protectors of the Christian subject races of European Turkey. Appearing as early as the sixteenth century the *baidout* bands were very active and far more numerous toward the eighteenth century. For the liberation of the Serbians from the Turkish yoke the *baidouts* have rendered great help to Karageorge. Songs about their exploits are even now sung throughout the Bulgarian lands. The stories about the last *baidout* "grandfather" Elia Malishevski and his series of heroic deeds are even now vivid throughout eastern Macedonia. He was last seen as vanguard of the invading Russian army in the war against Turkey 1878. Even the work and daring deeds of Vassil Levsky⁴ were well known to many Macedonians.

Church Victory, Uprisings, War on Bulgaria

The self-confidence of the Macedonian Illinden generation was further augmented as a result of the victorious struggle against the Greek Patriarchate at Constantinople for the attainment of an independent Bulgarian national Church (1870). It was more of a national rather than church victory.

Russian military detachments were stationed in the city of Gorna-Djumaya and Tsarevo Selo. During that time an uprising took place in the district of Kresnensko and serious disturbances occurred in the district of Ochridsko, western Macedonia. Although a temporary order was restored, these events exerted their spiritual effect upon the Macedonian people.

As a new stroke against the power of the Turkish state, the unity of Southern and Northern Bulgaria took place.⁵ Because of this act, Serbia declared war on the newly liberated principality of Bulgaria. Hundreds of Bulgarians of Macedonia contributed to the Bulgarian victory at Slivnitsa.⁶

Inspired for Revolt Against the Sultan

The great impetus for the organization and arming of the Macedonian peasants came as a result of the liberation of Bulgaria. As their immediate neighbor, the unredeemed Bulgarians of Macedonia had now a free Bulgarian self-governing state. The citizens of the latter were greatly concerned over the fate of their subjugated brethren. Numerous manifestations occurred in Bulgaria in behalf of the Bulgarians of Macedonia. The latter

(5) Southern Bulgaria known as Eastern Rumalia was united with the principality of Bulgaria in 1885.

(6) Because of the proclaimed unity of Southern and Northern Bulgaria in 1885, King Milan of Serbia declared war on the newly created principality of Bulgaria. The newly constituted Bulgarian army defeated the Serbian army first at Slivnitsa (November 7) and finally at the battle at Pirot (November 17). Serbia was then saved by the intervention of Austria.

were strongly convinced and believed that in case of need Bulgaria would hasten to their help. Moreover, the Bulgarians of Macedonia could never forget the fact that they were once liberated by the San Stefan Treaty (1878), only a few months later to be restored to the Sultan's rule by the Berlin Congress.

Bulgaria's progress in the field of education, industry, and the general build-up of the new country, the enjoyment of freedom of speech and the press; their free elections; in other words, Bulgaria's quick and cultural and social gains, not only aroused great pride among the Bulgarians of Macedonia but it also stimulated their desire and accelerated the preparation for revolt against the Sultan's tyranny. These circumstances were taken by Macedonia's enemies to base their "conclusion" and hence their accusation that the IMRO is serving the cause of some sort of Bulgarian imperialism.

Liberation Through Intervention

Let us ask ourselves first: Which one of the liberated Balkan states did not ask for or seek help from abroad for the overthrow of the Turkish yoke? An eloquent answer to this question would be the following salient historical facts.

In the seventeenth century the Croatian poet Goundoulitch, in his famous work "OSMAN" has expressed great hopes that the Christian Balkan peoples could be liberated through the intervention of Poland, which had, at that time, defeated the Turks at the Battle of Hotin.

Serbia Relies on Austria for Deliverance

After the Turkish military fiasco at the siege of Vienna in 1683, detachments of the Austrian army began to advance and had reached as far south as the middle of Macedonia. Many Serbian voluntary armed groups were cooperating with the Austrian troops in their advance south. The most alert and patriotic Serbs at that time had hoped and were expecting that Austria would deliver them from the Turkish rule. In the Serbian political literature no one could find accusations against the Serbian participants in the Austrian expedition as tools of Austrian imperialism. This Austrian penetration in the interior of Macedonia has left certain psychological effects on the Macedonian people. Invariably, one is apt to hear statements, in many localities of Macedonia, that on this particular barren hill or on that particular barren plain grass began to appear for the first time as a divine mark because of Christian soldiers having run over these places.

Russian Aggression Against Turkey

About two centuries ago Russia also appeared on the scene as a power. Her aggressive attacks on Turkey created joy amidst the subjugated Balkan

Christians. The Serbians, particularly, at that time were expecting much help from Russia. To be sure, they did not figure or consider themselves tools or instruments of Russia's imperialism. Similar high hopes had been entertained even by the subjugated Greeks.

In 1787 the Turks were at war against the Austria-Russian alliance. Serbian military detachments under the name of "Fraikore" (Volunteer Corps) were participating in the Austrian army. Again they did not consider themselves as agents of Austria's imperialism. What they were hoping and expecting was only to receive the needed help from Austria for the deliverance of their people.

Karageorge Receives Aid from Austria

Before he promoted the Serbian uprising in the early part of the nineteenth century, Karageorge was a rebel Serbian immigrant of Austria, where he found sympathy, encouragement and help. In his fight against the *Janissaries*, he even had the Sultan's encouragement and blessings. It was a well-known secret at that time that the Serbian insurgents were receiving their arms and equipment from Austria. Again in a rebellion against the Turks in 1812, the Serbians were rescued by Russia's intervention and won for them autonomous status. While Russia was involved in war against Napoleon, Turkey succeeded to restore her authority in Serbia and Karageorge was forced to flee into Austria to seek the latter's support.

The Subservience of Milosh Obrenovich

Later, Milosh Obrenovich succeeded in attaining from the Sultan the autonomy of Shoumadia (Serbia proper). Assisted by and subservient to the Turks, Milosh delivered the severed head of Karageorge to Constantinople.

Because of the geographic nearness to Austria, the Serbian lands were endangered more by the power and ambitions of Austria than that of Russia. By the peace treaty of Pojarovetz, 1718, Austria received part of Bosnia, populated by Serbs and also Belgrade. Although this occupation was terminated in 1739, it left, nevertheless, a positive influence upon the Serbians.

The existence of Montenegro as an independent state and neighboring subjugated Serbia, it had exerted, no doubt, a great influence on the encouragement and stimulation of Serbia's liberating tendencies.

Greeks Seek Help from Abroad

The case with Greece is not any different. The Greeks had also asked for and received support and encouragement from abroad.

A century before the creation of a Greek state, the province of Morea with Athens were, for a short period of time, under the domination of Venecia. This fact in itself has contributed to the development of the idea among the Greeks for the substitution of the Turkish flag with a Christian flag; that is, of course, their own.

The fact that the seven Ionian islands had an autonomous status, under the British protection, this in itself had a tremendous influence upon the Greek society. Moreover, some of the Archipelago islands had also enjoyed autonomous privileges.

During the eighteenth century the idea was entertained in certain Russian circles for the creation of a Greek kingdom in the Balkans—new Byzantium—with Constantinople as its capital. One could imagine the extent of encouragement this plan had on the intellectual Greeks, who had depended on the then ill-informed Russian Balkan policy.

During 1796 the Greeks appealed to the French authorities for support of their national cause.

In 1770 the Russian empress, Catherine the Great, had been at war with Turkey. Encouraged by Russian emissaries, the Greeks had revolted in several districts. Admiral Orloff had appeared in the Aegean Sea. Many Greek sailors were in this Russian naval detachment. Most certainly these Greek participants were not then nor even now recorded by Greek historians as agents or exponents of Moscow's imperialism.

Just about this period of time the Montenegrins had also rebelled against the Turks.

Greeks in Service of Russian Czar

In the service of Russia under Czar Alexander I had been the two Greek generals, Dimitri and Alexander Ipssilanti, while at the same time another Greek, Count Kapodistia, was one of his ministers. The benevolence of Czar Alexander I toward the Greeks and their cause was well known.

The Greeks had been further encouraged for revolt even by Ali Pasha, the Sultan's deserter. And at this time, of course, they had also been inspired by the waves of revolutionary currents that spread in Italy and the Spanish American possessions. Alexander Ipssilanti, who had already entered Rumania with a revolutionary flag, had called upon the Greeks to launch a wide-spread mass revolt promising the Greeks Russia's support. To be sure, in Greece, at that time, it was believed that Russian troops will undoubtedly follow Ipsilanti's call to action!

The European Powers Aid Greece

When the Sultan was compelled to call upon the Egyptian troops to help him suppress the Greek revolt, Russia hastened to Greece's aid and her army reached the gates of Constantinople, while the combined allied fleets

of England, France, and Russia annihilated the Turkish fleet at Navarin in 1827. By the provision of the subsequent Treaty of Adrianople (1829), the Sultan was compelled to recognize the independence of Greece. From now on, because of the Great Powers' frequent intervention in the internal affairs of Turkey, the pending decline of the Ottoman empire had become more and more apparent. In this respect Russia's aggression had been more pronounced. The hope and expectation for deliverance of all Christian Balkan peoples had now focused toward Russia.

Rumania Relies on Foreign Support

It is unnecessary to go on in great details of historical facts to point out that even the Rumanians relied on foreign support for their national state recovery; that they, too, had taken advantage of certain international events that had resulted in Turkey's detriment. Austria and Poland had greatly contributed to the anti-Turkish and liberating spirit among the Rumanians. In this respect, Russia had been no less a factor. But the fact was that these three powers were aspiring to project their own political and economic influence over the newly created Balkan countries.

In each one of the above cases, and others which we have not mentioned here, the Great Powers—including Russia—have at one time or another intervened in the internal affairs of Turkey in behalf of either the Serbian, the Greek, or the Rumanian liberation, in no less degree than Russia's intervention in 1877-78 for the liberation of the Bulgarians.

Karageorge Offers Serbia to Austria

But let us now see briefly some of the offerings made by the Serbs and the Greeks to those abroad who were helping them to attain their liberation.

As early as the eighteenth century many of the Serbian patriots believe they could seek the solution of the Serbian question within the frame work of Austria itself. Even after they attained certain success during the rebellion only a few of the Serbian leaders appeared to have a faint idea for national independence. Karageorge and the bulk of the Serbian leaders were hoping at that time that Serbia would join the frame work of Austria. In the latter part of April, 1804, Karageorge had a meeting with the Austrian captain, Shaitinsky, to whom he had expressed the wish that Austria should have taken over the Serbian people, under her protection. Should the Serbians succeed to capture Belgrade, stated Karageorge, they were going to offer it, together with Shabatz and Smederovo, to the Austrian emperor and that they should receive from the latter a prince as his substitute. From their camps at Topchider the Serbians sent a petition to the Austrian monarch, July 19, 1804, requesting him to come in person to Zemoun and take them over under his rule.⁷ In a personal letter of

(7) Charovich, Vladimir. "Borba za nezavisimost Balkana" (Struggle for Balkan Independence) br. 2 ot biblioteka "Balkan u Balkansi," izdanje na Balkanskia Institutu.

April 16, 1804, Karageorge wrote to the Austrian major Mitezer for help and offering him supreme authority over the Serbians: "I have recognized you as our chief," wrote Karageorge, "and you may work as God has taught you; rule over us so that you may drive out the enemy from our land."⁸

Serbians Willing To Become Subservient to Russia

Unsuccessful in their effort to incorporate themselves with Austria, the Serbians had asked Russia to take them under her protective wing. They even had asked Napoleon, in 1809, to assume supreme authority and protection of the Serbian lands. In 1830, after the war, Russia had compelled Turkey to recognize Serbia's autonomy under the protection of Russia. A quarter of a century earlier, 1803, certain Serbian leaders had been discussing with the Russians a proposal suggesting that, instead of creating a Greek Kingdom on the Balkans, there should be created a "Slavic-Serbian Kingdom" under the guardianship of Russia.

The Greeks Seek British Protectorate

It is unnecessary to enumerate the various steps taken by the Greeks in this respect. During their arduous struggle for liberation, they, too, had asked to become a British protectorate. Similar proposals had been made to other Great European Powers.

If there had existed at that time an independent Serbian state neighboring the unredeemed rebellious Serbs, and since the latter were asking help from everywhere, would it not be more logical for them to ask for, hope to get, and even expect the necessary help from their free brethren? Since they were asking to become protectorate of other European states, and were even willing to become a constituent part of Austria, would they not fight or ask for their incorporation with the assumed existence of a Serbian state?

The same questions might be asked in regards to the then rebellious Greeks.

Macedonia Asks for European Intervention

Regarding Macedonia's Illinden uprising, what do we see? Rebellious Macedonia was, too, relying on the aid and support of Bulgaria. In this matter, one should not be surprised. The arms and other necessary equipment of the Macedonian rebels was purchased primarily with their own means, and it was procured, for the most part, from countries other than Bulgaria. They did not approach Bulgaria to seek unity, nor did they ask her for protectorate. In this respect, the IMRO approached only the Great Powers for European intervention and the introduction of an autonomous regime in Macedonia. The military intervention of Bulgaria, of which rebellious Macedonia had hoped, and of which the insurrectionary staff had

(8) Ibid. p. 54.

asked, would have been, from a moral standpoint, justifiable. However, Bulgaria did not declare war on Turkey as Greece had done in 1897 during the Cretan uprising. Moreover, no pretensions were proclaimed over Macedonia by Bulgaria. This is a historic fact—that is the truth! Despite this fact concerning the events relative to the Bulgarians of Macedonia, or more particularly the Illinden insurrection, it has been falsely and distortedly written by Serbian and Greek sources. They have been talking about Russia's "Bulgarophilism" and even of "Bulgarian imperialism." Under the latter term, of course, the Serbian and Greek writers understood and feared the unity of the Bulgarian nation, while their own national unity they considered as their justifiable cause.

The Greeks and the Serbians Aid the Turks

Let us also say a few words about the Serbian and Greek attitude during the period of the Illinden insurrection. Nearly three months before the uprising took place, Greek military officers appeared before the Turkish envoy in Athens offering him one thousand Greek volunteers, of which 150 were officers, to join the Turks and fight against the IMRO's guerrilla bands. At the same time the students of the University of Athens were shouting "long live the Sultan!" The well-known Greek friend, but also friend of the truth, the Frenchman, Victor Berard, named this Greek act as a "veritable moral bankruptcy of the Greek." The Serbians had also dispatched bands from Shoumadia that were openly assisted by the Turkish authorities to fight against the IMRO.

We have stated above that during the struggle for the liberation of Serbia many Bulgarian *baidouts* had rendered assistance to the Serbs of Shoumadia. This fact has been acknowledged by all Serbian published works dedicated to Karageorge's uprising. The renowned Bulgarian *baidout* Velko, celebrated in song and legends even by the Serbians, had greatly contributed to the cause of the Serbian rebellion. Karageorge, himself, had referred to Velko as "mlado bougarche" (youthful Bulgarian).

IMRO's Sympathy for Cretans

The Cretan Greek revolt of 1897 was followed with great sympathy by the Macedonian people. During that time series of friendly manifestations took place between the Bulgarians and Greeks. Orders to the Macedonian people had been issued by the IMRO asking them not to render any voluntary work, which the Turkish authorities were expecting from the Christians, of transporting provisions for the Turkish army in Thessaly. Such has been the general attitude of the Macedonian people toward the Greeks. Unfortunately, the latter soon changed their position toward the Bulgarians of Macedonia. Greek military officers, as mentioned above, had offered their services to the Turkish representative in Athens. Greek

bishops in Macedonia had been openly collaborating with the Turkish army in persecuting the Illinden insurgents who were longing for and have risen to fight for their freedom.

It was necessary to mention these episodes because, in addition to the defense of the interests of the Macedonian people, it was also an imposed task of the Macedonian liberating movement to defend itself from Greek and Serbian falsification and also the purpose and objectives of the Illinden insurrection.

The Armenian Crisis

A natural ally of the Macedonian people has been the general discontent of the other subject nationalities within the Turkish empire.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century the Armenian problem had quickly developed into a sharp crisis. The Berlin Congress had also written in Article 61 of the subsequent Treaty by that name (1878) certain reforms for the unfortunate Armenian people. But the provisions of this Article remained a dead letter. In connection with the Armenian affairs, Europe was well on the move in 1895. The sympathies of and the defense, which the Armenian cause had found in certain liberty-loving western European centers, had also its share of influence on the Macedonian liberation movement; it was encouraging the IMRO's leaders because of the then aroused anger of certain European powers against Turkey made them feel that the Great Powers would intervene in behalf of the oppressed nationalities in Turkey.

Europe's Public Opinion Condemns Turkey

The newspapers of the various countries were thundering about the Sultan's tyrannical regime. Turkey's policy of oppression and maladministration was even condemned by responsible European statesmen. The Bulgarian people have not and will never forget the memorable words uttered by the great British statesman, William Gladstone: "If England wants to defend the Sultan's tyranny," he said, "it would have been much better for the world if she did not exist." In the name of England Lord Salisbury had stated in a memorandum sent to the Great Powers in 1895, that "the long patience of the Great Powers would not succeed to prolong the existence of a state which is condemned to destruction by its own blemishes." Both of these British statesmen were condemning Turkey, of course.

Greek and Serbian Hope for Inheritans

Irrespective of the double-faced attitude and frequent flirtation with the Turkish authorities, the Greeks were also dissatisfied. They had been longing for Crete and the Aegean islands—not to mention their illusion of resurrecting the ancient Byzantium.

The Serbians, meanwhile, were causing great concern to the Turkish authorities of the provinces of Kossovo and the Sandjak of Novi—Bazar. It was not quite certain whether or not the Albanians, or for that matter even the Arabs, were willing to fight, under any circumstance, for the territorial integrity of the Turkish state.

Examples of Liberation Movements

The founders of the Macedonian liberation movement were pointing out to the population of every hamlet, village, and town series of foreign examples, how the people there had overthrown their oppressive regimes and how they had succeeded to attain their national liberation. Scenes from the French Revolution were recalled before the more alert listeners; episodes of the Italian *Carboni* movement, the struggle of Garibaldi and Mazzini were widely discussed; their attention was also called to the will and persistent struggle of the Irish liberation workers; the success of the Hungarian liberation movement, and even the exploits of William Tell in the Swiss mountains.

The Virhovist Revolt

After the *Virhovist*⁹ uprising of 1902 there occurred abroad wide discussion over the Macedonian question. In comparison with the previous *Virhovist* action, when Boris Sarafoff had captured the city of Melnick (1895),¹⁰ the interest of the European press in connection with 1902 revolt was much greater. Influential newspapers such as the French daily *Le Temps* had insisted that broad reforms should be introduced in Macedonia. Favorable replies were even coming from the Austrian press. The most restrained press at that time was the German. This is understandable. Germany, at that time, entertained a pro-Turkish policy. Much to the surprise of many, even the Russian press printed sympathetic articles. A campaign to collect aid for those who had suffered as a result of the Gorna-Djumaya uprising, was also launched in Russia. But, in general, the great Slavic state never was on the side of the Macedonian liberation

(9) About 1893 there was organized in Sophia a Macedonian Committee of Macedonian Bulgarian immigrants and also of local Bulgarians. This Committee, which had a benevolent character, began to act as revolutionary. It provoked in 1902 a limited uprising in several Turkish districts adjacent to the Bulgarian border. In theory, the aims of this Committee were not different from those of the IMRO. The latter was an entirely internal organization; that is, it functioned only in the interior of Macedonia. The Sophia *Virhovist* Committee aimed to intrude on the independence of the Macedonian liberation movement.

(10) Boris Sarafoff was the most daring revolutionary leader. He crossed Rila Mountain with a well armed band, invaded the districts of Razlog and Melnik and captured the city of Melnik in 1895. To enlist American help for the Macedonian cause, Sarafoff visited the American consul at St. Petersburg in 1897 and offered his services at the head of 500 Macedonians to assist the American Army against Spain.

movement. In the history of the IMRO Russia does not figure except as Macedonia's enemy: for Russia had decided long ago to give Macedonia to the Serbians. The sympathies toward Macedonia have been, for the most part, coming from the western world. Although the latter's attitude has somewhat changed later, it was not because Macedonia's cause was less just, but because of the existing rivalry among the Great European Powers.

Launching of the IMRO

Nevertheless, even before the Illinden insurrection took place, the bulk of the Macedonian people believed that the end of their subjugation is near. It was this state of mind that had given encouragement to Damian (Dame) Grueff, Gotse Delcheff, Dr. Christo Tatarcheff and their co-workers, for the daring action of launching the IMRO in 1893; it was in conformity with Luben Karaveloff's¹¹ idea of a broad national organization to participate in the liberation struggle.

Similarity and Extent of Revolts

By its motivation, and to a high degree its manifest deeds, the Macedonian Illinden insurrection of August 2, 1903, has resemblance with the earlier uprisings in the Balkan peninsula—the Serbian and the Greek, but more particularly the Bulgarian revolt of April 19, 1876. But there are, of course, certain degrees of differences.

As a result of the Turkish terror, the Serbian peasants' mass revolt had appeared unexpectedly. While the agitation for the Greek uprising had come, more or less, from outside, which hardly penetrated among the masses of the people, the Greek revolt did not appear in any way as a spontaneous national movement. As a result of a combination of agitation and organization on the part of the leaders and the people's will to fight the Bulgarian uprising of April, 1876, appears as the best example, even though it occurred in a relatively small province.

In the Macedonian Illinden insurrection both of the above features were shown: it was the result of a strenuous work of agitation and systematic organization of the peasant masses and at the same time combined with the manifest will of the Macedonian people to fight. Until this time, the Macedonian insurrection appears as the best organized of all armed uprisings of the oppressed Balkan nationalities. There were more agitators and organizers in the preparation of the Macedonian uprising than the Serbians had at the time of their revolt or even during the Bulgarian revolt of 1876. Although all their priests and bishops had advocated

(11) Luben Karaveloff (1838-1879) was a poet, journalist and a noted publicist. He was the intellectual leader of the movement for the liberation of Bulgaria. He was at the head of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee in Rumania. Karaveloff was publishing in Bucharest the newspaper *Svoboda* (Liberty).

revolt, the Greeks, too, had less agitators and organizers in the early part of the nineteenth century.

The Greek revolt took place in much larger and wide-spread provinces, while the Serbians and the Macedonian occurred mainly in the Belgrade and Monastir *Vilayets* (provinces) respectively.

In either case, the bulk of the participants in these uprisings have been the village peasantry. But the most typical of these manifestations were the Serbian and the Macedonian insurrections.

The IMRO Adheres to Its Principles

One should not be astonished of the fact that on the eve of the Macedonian uprising differences of opinion arose within the ranks of the IMRO. The debates centered around the question whether or not the IMRO should proclaim the insurrection.

As it is a well known fact that during the Gorna-Djumaya revolt, which was provoked by *Virbovist* agitation, the armed forces of the IMRO remained neutral. Well armed IMRO bands, such as that of Chernopeeff,¹² stood near by observing the struggle of the revolting peasants without even firing a single shot in their behalf. Because of this attitude on the part of the IMRO, the *Virbovist* faction in Bulgaria had launched a well planned propaganda against it. And, for reasons of its own, the public opinion of Bulgaria condoned the *Virbovist* anti-IMRO agitation. But the IMRO's indifference showed that it was guided mainly by its own well-established principles of independence. As long as the conditions permitted her to remain true to its principles, the IMRO never had allowed itself to be diverted from its aims and objectives.

Discussion on Nature of Revolt

It has been somewhat illogical that some of the leaders had been inclined in the beginning to reject the idea of an uprising, while in IMRO's statute, adopted ten years before (1893), it was expressly written that it was organizing and preparing the people of Macedonia mainly for revolt. In the end the controversy had been concentrated over the question of the nature of the pending revolt: was it to be limited in the number of participants and territory or was it to be a mass and wide-spread revolt?

IMRO's Aims for Intervention

The fundamental problem of the Macedonian insurrection has been, as also in the spirit of the statute or constitution of the IMRO, to cause the intervention of the Great Powers for the solution of the Macedonian

(12) Christo Chernopeeff was known as a daring chief of a guerilla band. He was a member of the Strumitsa district committee.

question. Even neutral observers had pointed out that, to effect such an European intervention, a more serious uprising was necessary. The Bulgarian diplomatic agent in Belgrade, K. Velichkoff,¹³ in his report No. 916 of 1902, wrote:

"If an uprising is necessary to raise the Macedonian question and guide it to a favorable solution, that aim could be reached only through an insurrection in the interior of Macedonia; it should be so organized as to embrace every part of country and to give a prolonged and obstinate resistance to the enemy forces. The weakness of the uprising itself would be a cause of apprehension."

With this remark he was condemning, of course, the *Virbovist* Gorna-Djumaya revolt of 1902.

The Smilevo Congress

In the first place, because of the lack of sufficient arms, the IMRO could not have been able to promote a wide-spread mass revolt, even if it wanted to. After the Salonica Congress had already decided (January 4, 1903) to proclaim the uprising, in the Monastir Vilayet itself, that is, the territory of the Illinden insurrection, the leaders there were still debating on the nature and character of the uprising. However, it had been decided in a subsequent Monastir district congress, held in the village of Smilevo (May 3, 1903), to set the date for the insurrection and to engage the Turkish forces only in a strenuous guerrilla struggle; it had not intended to involve in the struggle the mass of the people. Similar opinions had been entertained even by some of the leading workers in Sophia. But in the territory of the uprising, in many villages, the revolt took a mass character.

The IMRO Challenges the Sultan

Because of insufficient arms and ammunitions, some representatives of the various Monastir districts at the Smilevo congress had declared themselves against the uprising. For the very same reason, Gotse Delcheff¹⁴ and other IMRO workers suggested its postponement. Many districts, such as the Serres district, for example, had very little arms and were wholly unprepared. Damian Grueff, the foremost leader of the IMRO, only because

(13) We are giving the opinion of a Bulgarian diplomatic functionary, to show that in Bulgaria itself there has been negative opinion about the *Virbovists*, despite the fact that he was in the service of Bulgaria's official policy. Many individuals of Bulgaria were fanatical adherents of the IMRO and were fighting against the *Virbovists*. The controversy was mainly about the tactics of the struggle, the independence of the liberation movement, and the eventual political solution of the Macedonian question.

(14) Gotse Delcheff and Dame Grueff were the two most renowned names and revolutionary leaders of that time.

of necessity, had agreed to start the insurrection. He had said that it was "too late to deliberate." Delcheff, too, was now convinced that there is nothing they could do except proclaim the uprising and do the best they can. The insurrection had been imposed as the result of a series of events. There had been a number of districts endangered by the Turkish reign of terror and it was feared that they may be disarmed. Such had been the case, for example, in the district of Kostour, whose local leaders had been the most insistent for an immediate insurrection.

From every point of view, it would have been far more desirable for the IMRO itself to choose the most opportune time, place, and also suitable conditions for the uprising. Such a wish, of course, would be easy to put on paper, but in practice it is difficult to realize. The IMRO had welcomed the Illinden insurrection of 1903 under circumstances which did not depend entirely on its will.

IMRO's Damaging Obstacles

Among the unfavorable conditions under which the uprising had begun was the absence of sufficient arms. Even some of the districts considered best-armed did not possess the needed number of rifles. Some of them, like the district of Prilep, had been ill-prepared with arms. The IMRO had made every effort possible to equip these districts with arms, but it was confronted, at the same time, with many other obstacles. The most damaging of these obstacles had been the existing squabbles with the *Virbovist* group of Sophia. Had it not been for these distracting squabbles the IMRO could have been able to equip with arms on time several more districts, especially those near the Bulgarian border, such as the district of Tsarevoselo, Kochani, Kratovo, Maleshevsko, Struumishko, Radovichko and others. These districts, through their diverging acts, could have more effectively helped the efforts of the Illinden insurrection.

Attempts to Intrude On the Independence of IMRO

From the published memoirs of authoritative workers, such as K. Yavoroff, we know that ever since his first contact with the Sophia *Virbovist* committee, Delcheff had been asked to choose an alternative: to receive arms and other needed help, but in return to surrender the independence of the IMRO movement. Delcheff, on principle of course, rejected the proposal of the Sophia *Virbovist* element. If the time and energy which had been wasted in the disputes and squabbles with the Sophia *Virbovists* could have been utilized for the procurement of arms, it would have been far more useful for the cause of Macedonia than the existence of the Sophia *Virbovist* committee. The efforts of all well-thinking Bulgarians should have been directed then to the problem of arming the subjugated Bulgarians of Macedonia. Unfortunately, while some workers had been putting every

possible effort in the struggle, a great many others were wasting their time in free Bulgaria.

The arms of the rebellious Vilayet of Monastir had been procured primarily from Greece. Through contraband, most of the "Gra" system rifles came from this source. At a high price, through the district of Ohrida, many Albanians and Turks had been furnishing the IMRO with the "Martini" rifles.

The People Contribute Financial Aid

Before and during the insurrection the IMRO had strongly felt the financial need. Had it contrived with more available funds, that would have meant, of course, more and better armament for the peasantry. But taken as a whole, the people themselves had been contributing cash according to their ability and means. One might say that even from the standpoint of material sacrifices the Macedonian movement was a veritable peoples cause rather than that of a privileged social class.

As we have thus far briefly considered the unfavorable or the weak points in the preparedness and the expediting of the uprising, we cannot by-pass the fact of mentioning the absence of a military-trained cadre. Very few were the persons who had any military training. The IMRO did not succeed nor had the time to enlist such trained individuals from Bulgaria; it did not even have time to train local people in the rudiments of military science.

Lack of Military and Technical Training

Along with this a greater number of persons could have been prepared in the technique of laying mines and other explosive assignments. It has been quite striking, even though there had been many objects for demolition during the uprising that such individual actions had rarely occurred. Gotse Delcheff himself had preferred and had been insisting on the commission of individual acts of outrages and other similar deeds, rather than resorting to a hasty uprising. He personally had performed such an attack by blowing up an important bridge of the railroad line in the Serres district. Boris Sarafoff, too, had been an ardent adherent to the performance of similar acts. But the hastiness of the uprising had prevented the IMRO from preparing the needed personnel for such actions.

Until the eruption of the insurrection the IMRO had been engaged chiefly with secret organizational work and the procurement of arms. All pre-insurrectionary affairs and skirmishes had occurred as unavoidable evils; the IMRO had never wished or anticipated them. That is why it had not taken the initiative for single actions, by which it could have prepared by deeds the necessary specialized cadres. Whatever had been done in this direction, that is, whatever single outrages had occurred, it was mainly

acts of separate individuals with semi-anarchistic concepts. Because of this, the IMRO had kept account of the evil effect that such undertakings may have abroad. But blended with the echo of a wide-spread people's revolt, such actions might not have been considered as anarchistic.

Greece's Hostile Attitude

The distance of the Monastir Vilayet from the Bulgarian frontier, its nearness to that of Albania¹⁵ and Greece, and the latter's hostile attitude, had put the Macedonian insurgents and their families in a much more painful situation. Their suffering had been even greater than that of the once rebellious Greeks. The latter had, at least, an open sea coast affording them to look toward the western world. Fleeing on their way to Bulgaria, few were the Macedonian insurgents who found temporary refuge in Greece, and then only to be kept in police prisons. Few others preferred to cross illegally the Albanian borders on their way to Montenegro. Thousands of refugees headed directly for Bulgaria and, later, a great number of them arrived in America.

Ill Effect of Premature Events

In the column of the unfavorable conditions we must add the losses caused to the IMRO by the premature Salonica outrages. Unquestionably the latter have been great exploits, the work of enthusiastic young people. Occurring almost on the eve of the projected conspiracy, these outrages appeared as obstacles of the insurrection. Not only the members of the central Committee of the IMRO had been arrested, but thousands of persons throughout Macedonia were imprisoned. If the heroic group of the ten young persons had waited three to four months longer, and had committed the Salonica outrage parallel with the eruption of the uprising, the Turkish government would have become stunned, while the European world could have given a more useful evaluation of the Macedonian cause and even of the outrages itself. From the practical point of view this event has shown as much instructive value as the entire *Virbovist* action; that in the struggle for national liberation there always should be one directive center, and that no one should undertake any action on his own accord.

Even the most outstanding workers, as we have already stated, had considered the uprising as too hasty. Aside from all other reasons, this hastiness was primarily due to the fact that a year before the *Virbovists* had promoted a limited revolt in the Gorna-Djumaya and Razlog districts. By these actions the attention of the Turkish authority had been drawn and the necessary counter measures taken. Instead of quietly working in

(15) During the insurrectionary period Albania, with its compact population adjacent to the revolting Macedonian districts, has appeared as a convenient bastion of the Turkish administration to direct its forces at will against the insurgents.

arming the population, the above incidents had provoked the disarmament of the villages with an accelerated terror. The military authorities had been alerted in the expectation of new outbreaks.

Besides this the *Virbovist* action had, somewhat, pulled apart the forces of the IMRO itself. If the Gorna-Djumaya district had revolted simultaneously with the Monastir Vilayet, there would have been 15,000 less Turkish troops against the Illinden insurgents and 2,580 more of the latter against the Sultan forces. It would have then been possible for the IMRO to broaden its diversionary actions in the mountainous districts of eastern Macedonia.

The fear of new *Virbovist* attempts at provoking local revolts played an important role of the IMRO's decision, even before it was ready to proclaim the insurrection. This fear figures also in the minutes of the proceedings of the Salonica Congress decision.

Campaign to Annihilate the IMRO

The situation in Macedonia became unrestrainable. During the first half of 1903 there had occurred eighty-six skirmishes with the Turkish army. In some districts, particularly that of Kastoria, a frightful reign of terror was inaugurated. Hilmi Pasha had undertaken not only to disarm the peasant population but also to annihilate the armed bands of the IMRO. Doubtless the *Virbovist* revolt of 1902 and the Salonica outrages had forced the Turkish government to resort to such extreme measures. Because of this state of conditions it had been impossible to disregard the demand at the Salonica Congress by the Kastoria delegates for an immediate revolt; they argued that the arms which were in the hands of the people may vanish either by sporadic fights forced upon them, or by the ceaseless search and plunder by the Turks.

A Peasant Uprising

There have been affairs which did not depend on the will of the leaders. Such affairs have been almost all of the above-mentioned unfavorable incidents: Aside from the historical significance of the insurrection as the people's feat, one must point out one of the more concrete manifestations which, above all, deserves to be underscored, and that is *the total participation of the peasant mass of the Macedonian people*. As one looks through the dark centuries of the past he would discover that the Bulgarian nation has been saved and preserved by the Bulgarian village peasantry. The Bulgarian peasant had never fallen under the influence of its conquerors; his national consciousness has been preserved through the suffering of centuries-old servitude. After it had succeeded to establish its lawful national existence during the Bulgarian Renaissance, in which period the city element had been in the first line, the Bulgarian villagers of Macedonia had

again expressed their word to the world by the Illinden uprising. Perhaps there would have appeared suspicions in the authoritativeness of the Bulgarian national will if only the cities had revolted. But the backbone of the IMRO has always been the villagers. Here one finds the big difference between the Macedonian national liberation movement and those of the Serbian and Greek artificial state armed bands organizations. Let one compare, for example, the statute or constitution of the IMRO with that of the Serbian "Tserna Rouka" (Black Hand) and one shall see what an abyss separates the latter from the Serbian masses of the people and how the IMRO is nothing else but the Macedonian people themselves.

Diversionary Guerilla Skirmishes

The distance of the Monastir Vilayet from the Bulgarian border has been a good political strategy, not only for the insurrection itself but also for the Macedonian movement in general.¹⁶

To alleviate the situation of the Monastir fighters, the IMRO had, from a tactical standpoint, wisely decided in engaging more of the Turkish army through separate guerilla skirmishes in the various outlying rebellious districts. A great number of such skirmishes had occurred in Serres district around the Pirin mountain, where 20,000 Turkish troops had been stationed. If the population of the Serres and other districts had more arms, because of the terrain, they could have engaged an army of 100,000 without even involving all the villages in the struggle.

A very wise move had been made in delaying the revolt in Thrace.¹⁷ The enemy, who had focused his attention to the rebellious Monastir Vilayet, had been unexpectedly surprised by the eruption of a revolt near the Adrianople and Lozengrad fortifications. The Bulgarians of Thrace had conscientiously rendered great sacrifices in behalf of their struggling brethren near the Albanian and Greek frontiers.

The Insurgents Will to Fight

The Illinden insurrection itself had been a surprise to the Turkish government. The secrecy of the Macedonian movement had been excellently kept. This had also been a great credit to the entire movement.

The spirit of the insurgents and their will to fight had been astonishingly high. It was this spirit that served as substitute for better and more

(16) As a rule the opponents of the Macedonian liberation struggle and its cause maintain that the Macedonian movement had been inspired by the Bulgarian state. These allegations do not answer the truth. The eruption of the insurrection in 1903, geographically so distant from Bulgaria, plainly shows how the Macedonian people themselves rose in revolt against the century-old servitude and demanded their freedom.

(17) All the Bulgarians then in Turkey were joining the ranks of the IMRO; that meant, of course, even those who lived in Thrace near Constantinople.

arms and other technical deficiencies. It was this spirit that had shown a stubborn resistance for three months against the Sultan's army of 250,000.

IMRO's Policy Toward the Patriarchist

The IMRO had wisely adopted a consistent policy toward the adherents of the Greek Patriarchate.¹⁸ Scores of villages had deserted the latter, preferring to fight under the IMRO's flag for their political and social liberation. Despite the very unfavorable behavior of Greece and the Greek church during the time of the Illinden insurrection, the IMRO's position had been well chosen not only for the time being, but also for the future. The small number of Macedonian Uniates and Protestants had been in full accord with the program of the IMRO.

The organizing and preparing of the people for the uprising had been the work of the Macedonian intellectuals. The latter were never absent from the first ranks even during the period of the insurrection. The city dwellers had also been sufficiently represented in the front lines.

Volunteers Join the IMRO

Volunteers from Bulgaria had been coming not only during the development of the insurrection itself but even before it took place. However, their number had not been large as hoped to be during the operations of the Illinden insurrection. Whether or not the IMRO's leaders purposely did not wish, at that time, to enlist too many volunteers from Bulgaria is not definitely certain. Perhaps they feared that such a fact may give Macedonia's enemies a reason for false interpretations. This point, however, has not yet been clarified by the present published memoirs of the contemporaries.

The Virhovist Render Help

Of the meritorious actions during Macedonia's rebellious year of 1903, one ought to mention the *Virhovist* participation in the struggle. Several of their leaders had appeared with well armed bands in the Pirin mountain area. They had contributed to the easement of the Monastir pressure by diverting the Turkish forces. After this creditable cooperation they were later noted for their separatist action.

Arumanian-Bulgarian Comradeship

The friendliness and comradeship in arms during the insurrection between the Bulgarians and Arumanians had been noticeable. The Ruman-

(18) There were Bulgarians in Greek Macedonia who were still loyal to and under the domination of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. However, their number was not very large.

ians of Macedonia had been participating in the IMRO on equal terms with the Bulgarians. For them the struggle had been as much against the Turks as it was against the Greeks, who were trying through their church to assimilate them. The exemplary feats of the rebellious Rumanians, particularly from the town of Kroushevo, might have exerted some influence on those of their fellow Rumanians who were still adhering to the Greek Patriarchate. Many victims had been rendered in their struggle against the Greek bands and terrorists in southern Macedonia. The Greek consuls, bishops and chief of armed bands had under consideration in their Turkophilism, and their treasonable behavior, not only the Bulgarians but also the Rumanians of Macedonia.

During the Illinden revolt with arms in hand the Arumanians were alluding to their national consciousness for a second time. They had shown this for the first time during their struggle for the attainment of their own national church. Because of this, anyone who wishes to investigate and determine as to what are and who are the Macedonian Slavs and Arumanians, one should study the Macedonian Illinden insurrection. As far as the nationality of the insurgents is concerned, neither the official Turkish documents nor those of the European diplomatic reports contain any distorted facts.

Over Confidence in Public Opinion

The Macedonian insurrection had its cardinal purpose to provoke the intervention of the European Powers. What had been its diplomatic preparation before it erupted? The first gunshot of Illinden was discharged under the following situation:

1. The Macedonian cause had the sympathy of public opinion in most of the European countries.
2. It was hoped and even expected that Bulgaria would intervene.

Macedonia's faith in Europe's public opinion was over-confident. It was believed that it would provoke the intervention of the Powers. It was also strongly believed that European diplomacy would, undoubtedly, undertake to do something effective for the alleviation of conditions in Macedonia. For did not the *Virbovist* revolt bring about the village watchmen reform in Macedonia?¹⁹ It was believed that a much broader uprising might even bring autonomy.

(19) The great European powers were often interfering in the internal affairs of Turkey. After 1902 they intervened and succeeded to force the Sultan to appoint Christians as village watchmen. Until then only Mohammedans were appointed, even in Christian villages and towns.

False Hopes of Bulgarian Intervention

Not only the fighting Macedonian people but the leaders themselves were expecting Bulgaria to declare war on Turkey. How could they believe that Bulgaria would fight while only a year earlier, during the *Virbovist* revolt she had not shown any sign of such intentions? Doubtless they had based their hopes on some unofficial promises. It was therefore, in this sense, that Boris Sarafoff, Christo Matoff,²⁰ and Pere Tosheff²¹ were giving assurances to the people. They based their beliefs on statements made by Bulgarian politicians. The Macedonian population was surprised more of Bulgaria's passiveness than the inaction of European diplomacy.

Obviously, Bulgaria had not been militarily prepared and had not figured that the political situation was proper to involve herself in war. Bulgaria could not have forgotten Greece's experience in 1897 when she declared war in support of the Cretan uprising, but was defeated by the Turks and then abandoned by the European diplomacy. As noted by contemporaries, the indifference of official Bulgaria has been much greater. She had not even made an effort to protest, as it was usual, against the Turkish horrors inflicted upon the struggling Bulgarians of Macedonia. Such an official attitude has been in full contradiction with the feelings of the free Bulgarian people who had strong sympathy for and stood on the side of the cause of their subjugated brethren—the Macedonian people.

Every Revolt Does Not Attain Its Goal

The victims and ruins of towns and villages of the Illinden insurrection were not in vain. Without this insurrection and the Bulgarian Renaissance, what would the Macedonian people have been? We are certain that spiritually, nationally, and historically they would have been much poorer, but never richer.

Many other people's revolts have terminated without achieving their goal. The Poles had twice, in 1831 and 1863, failed to attain their objective; but they have succeeded to win their freedom only in 1918. Inspired by the Napoleonic epoch and also the *Carbonari* movement, many unsuccessful revolts had occurred in Italy during the nineteenth century but ended triumphantly only in 1870. And here it would be proper to mention the noted example of the Irish people who had carried a continuous national struggle for seven centuries and to attain their self-governing status only in 1922.

(20) Christo Matoff was director of the Bulgarian pedagogical school of Skopje, Macedonia, and also district school inspector. He was a leading member of the Central Revolutionary Committee in Salonica and a foremost theoretician of the IMRO.

(21) Pere Tosheff was one of the founders and member of the Central Revolutionary Committee of the IMRO.

The revolts in Macedonia during the eleventh century against the Byzantine yoke had also terminated without success; the idea which animated these revolts had been realized a century later. But they forever remain as worthy episodes in the history of the Bulgarian people.

The victory and defeat of nations run parallel with or are the results of wars. There have been as many defeats as there were wars. But in many cases not every failure means defeat. Many nations, after their defeat in war, have found within themselves unsuspected forces and have again risen to great power.

The Idea for Autonomy By-Passed

After the expulsion of the Turkish regime in Macedonia one might truthfully say that the rabbit had been chased only to let in the wolf. The ideal for Macedonian autonomy had been by-passed by the Great Powers in 1903; it was played out by the craftiness of the "Young Turks" in 1908; and it was ignored by the Balkan states in 1913. Until now the Great Powers had rendered aid to save the tyrannical regimes but not the Macedonian people. In connection with Macedonia their rivalry had been carried on for a long time. But *one* must know that such rivalry had existed not only with the Macedonian question. This thing should not be taken as signs of discouragement. On the contrary—in them one must also seek confidence for success. This has been verified by the history of other nations.

Factors Creating the Uprising

The Illinden uprising had been the product of its time and also of the work of certain individuals. Which of these factors was its chief creator? Our answer is: identically both of them. If Dame Grueff and Gotse Delcheff had appeared a century earlier they would not have been able to awaken the people and succeed to create such a wide-spread revolutionary organization (IMRO). But, if in 1893 there had not appeared followers of Grueff and Delcheff—strongly affected by their apostolic faith and sound position, again the powerful IMRO could not have emerged and, certainly, there could not have occurred an uprising like that of Illinden. If it had not been for Grueff and Delcheff and their co-workers, perhaps the idea for organizing the people for mass revolt would have been delayed or unaccepted at all in Macedonia. Probably from

time to time there would have occurred raids of *Virbovist* bands similar to that of 1895 and 1902. But such efforts would have been very unsuccessful for the Macedonian cause.

Effectiveness of Revolutionary Gospel

In any case, after the liberation of Bulgaria, the subjugated Macedonian people had become more and more discontent. After their revolutionary apostles, Grueff and Delcheff, had sown their revolutionary ideas, it began to bear fruit even between the stones. We have seen that the insurrection had become unavoidable even when Delcheff himself was against it. Grueff, who had considered it hasty, but by the force of the circumstances, became the chief of the general revolutionary staff. While Georche Petroff, the biggest opponent of the uprising, put himself at the head of a well armed band, left Bulgaria and joined the IMRO forces. So successful and effective had been the preaching of the IMRO leaders. They had given to the Macedonian movement the impetus and depth which has become its specific features. Their idea then had been a motivating idea. Such as it is today and will be so in the future; it will continue to agitate Macedonia's society. Their thought has become national faith. And mainly that is what makes them historical figures with unfading importance.

IMRO's Program as Cure

The political program of the Ilinden insurrection is a practical and realistic one. It is exclusive of all other Balkan uprisings. The other revolts and liberating Balkan movements had purely a nationalistic character. From a political point of view the Macedonian insurrection had an entirely different motto. It called for the brotherhood of the different peoples, regardless of the fact that the majority of the population in Macedonia is Bulgarian. In reality, in their struggle for independence, there are two sacrifices which the Bulgarians of Macedonia are rendering: first, the material sacrifices; and second, their voluntary refusal to unite with Bulgaria. There are other Balkan or adjacent provinces with mixed population, but at no time a similar platform has been presented for them. In this sense the name of the IMRO itself is a program—new and broadhearted. It is this platform the guarantee that, in a free and independent Macedonia, there shall be successfully found the proper cure for every sore spot which otherwise Macedonia's enemies could take advantage of always to the detriment of Macedonia itself.

Arch Enemies of Macedonia

The Macedonian movement has remained faithful to the aims and purposes of the Illinden insurrection. It honors, respects, and acclaims its heroes and martyrs.

The present subjugators of Macedonia have been arch enemies of the Macedonian liberation movement and also of Macedonia's freedom and unity. During the period of the Illinden insurrection they had been active allies of the Turks. Comparing the present social, cultural, and national situation, in which Macedonia finds itself with that against which the Macedonian people rebelled in 1903, one would conclude that Macedonia under the Turkish regime was in a much better position than she is at the present. If the peasants then rose against the government, anyone could imagine their present dissatisfaction.

The Skopie Communists Falsify Illinden

But alas! Today the communists of Skopie, the capital of Yugoslav Macedonia, permit themselves to talk about the Illinden revolt. They talk about even "celebrating" its fiftieth anniversary. The same element for a long time had falsely served itself with the name of the IMRO, knowing that both of these names—Illinden and the IMRO—are deeply imbedded in the hearts of the people. By "celebrating" it, they aim to falsify the true meaning of the Illinden uprising, to defile its glorious action. Sometimes they talk about the exploits of dead Macedonian heroes, only to falsify their ideals and their work. Meanwhile those who have remained loyal to the Illinden ideals and faithful to the IMRO's principles are being persecuted, imprisoned, and hundreds of them executed.

The Beginning of a New Epoch

Illinden is the most expressive moment of an epoch for the Macedonian people—the epoch of the liberation struggle. This, of course, still continues. It is an active and incomplete work. That for which the Illinden generation had wished and dreamed is still the wish and dream of the present generation.

When at Lubotrn, Osogovo and near the Olympus mountain, there shall stand united in guard the sons of Macedonia—Bulgarians, Greeks, Albanians, Turks, Rumanians, and others—then this shall not only be the begin-

ning of a new epoch for Macedonia, but it will also mean that old Europe has healed one of its sorest spots. It shall mean a brighter future for south-eastern Europe. Moreover, it shall mean that a blot has been erased from the forehead of the cultured world. Briefly, it shall mean that the ideals of the Illinden insurrection have been accomplished.

Today we are confronted with far more fateful events than those before the insurrection. The solution of the Macedonian question does not entirely depend upon the Macedonian people. We must not forget that it depends upon the Macedonian people to keep it open until its just solution.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Statistical Data on Events Occurring Prior to and During the Illinden Insurrection

According to the statistics compiled by the Turkish government covering the period of 1893 to the middle of 1903, that is, prior to the IMRO's Illinden insurrection there were:

Arrested	3,764
Tortured	2,503
Died from Torture.....	22
Beaten	90
Killed (unarmed people)	354
Wounded (unarmed people)	95
Sentenced to die	28
Sentenced for life	49
Sentenced from 3-15 years	454
Exiled	103
Burned houses	385
Burned alive	7
Pillaged houses	825
Outraged women and girls	146

In reality the sacrifices and the number of the victims has been much greater than indicated by the above statistics. The official report of the IMRO—*Le Memoire de l'Organisation Interieure* (1893-1903-)—records that as many as 132 skirmishes took place in the period from 1898, that is, five years after the launching of the IMRO, to the middle of 1903, prior to the insurrection. The following table shows the number of skirmishes occurring in the different Vilayets (provinces), the opposing number of combatants, and the number killed on each side:

1. The Vilayet of Salonica (1893-1903)

Number of skirmishes	46	
		Combatants
{ Insurgents	1,846	
{ Troops	37,269	
		Killed
{ Insurgents	164	
{ Troops	1,582	

2. The Vilayet of Monastir (1901-1903)

Number of skirmishes	55	
		Combatants
{ Insurgents	1,154	
{ Troops	15,358	
		Killed
{ Insurgents	145	
{ Troops	1,088	

3. The Vilayet of Uskub (Skopie) (1902-1903)

Number of skirmishes	21	
		Combatants
{ Insurgents	1,080	
{ Troops	19,015	
		Killed
{ Insurgents	185	
{ Troops	1,501	

4. The Vilayet of Adrianople (1901-1903)

Number of skirmishes	10	
		Combatants
{ Insurgents	182	
{ Troops	2,593	
		Killed
{ Insurgents	19	
{ Troops	202	

Adding the above figures for the four Vilayets, we shall have the following totals

Skirmishes	132
Insurgents (engaged)	4,262
Troops (engaged)	74,235
Killed (insurgents)	513
Killed (troops)	4,373

Such has been the balance sheet before the Macedonian Illinden insurrection of 1903 took place.

The balance sheet of the insurrection itself

From the time of the declaration of the Illinden insurrection, August 2, 1903, until its fall, November 2, 1903, there occurred 239 skirmishes, 994 insurgents and 5,328 Turkish soldiers killed. The total number of the insurgents was about 27,000 against a Turkish army of over 250,000.

The balance sheet of the suppression of the insurrection

During the suppression of the insurrection there were 300 Bulgarian villages destroyed by Turkish vengeance, 12,000 houses burned, 5,000 women outraged, 4,700 inhabitants slain, and 71,000 left without roof.

Such was the balance sheet of the heroic climax of the IMRO during the Macedonian Illinden insurrection.

APPENDIX B

The Macedonian Illinden Insurrection and American Public Opinion

As result of the Macedonian Illinden uprising of 1903, the Turks had launched a strenuous campaign of suppression. The Macedonian population had been subjected to a terrible indiscriminate method of persecution, imprisonment, and executions. Public meetings had been held in many places in the United States and England, at which strong protests had been made against the misrule of the Sultan. Newspapers and magazines in Europe and America had published articles defending the cause of the rebellious Bulgarians of Macedonia. Petitions had been sent to the United States Government urging it to use its good office for putting a stop of the unbearable conditions in Macedonia.

During September of 1903, a double committee of leading Americans had been constituted in New York and Philadelphia who had issued in behalf of the Macedonian people the following appeal:

The Cry from Macedonia

"What Paul saw in the spirit, the vision of the man of Macedonia, who called to him for help for his country, we have before us in the flesh. The suffering and destitution, resulting from insurrection in Macedonia, are extreme. Forty thousand Macedonians have managed to cross the border into Bulgaria. Several times that number remain in Macedonia, homeless, their herds and crops destroyed, perishing of cold and starvation. Everyone is familiar to some extent with the conditions which have prevailed in that unhappy country for the last two years and more, the active agitation of the Macedonian revolutionists, the rising in rebellion of a portion of the Macedonian people, the attempt of the Turkish authorities to suppress the revolution with the utmost severity by overwhelming force. With the rights and wrongs of the Macedonians we are not now concerned, but we cannot help being concerned with the relief of fellow human beings and fellow Christians, of innocent women and children, who are perishing by the hundreds and will perish by the thousands, most cruelly, unless Christian Europe and Christian America come to the rescue."

The New York Committee (Signed)

Hon. Seth Low, Ex-Mayor of New York
Rt. Rev. H. C. Potter, D.D., LL.D.
Bishop Edward S. Andrews, D.D., LL.D.
C. C. Creegan, D.D.
Henry O. Dwight, LL.D.
Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D.
John P. Peters, D.D.
Wm. Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D.
David J. Burell, D.D.
L. Ross Stevenson, D.D.
Morris K. Jesup
Robert S. MacArthur, D.D.
John S. Kennedy
Geo. W. Wickersham
Everett P. Wheeler

The Philadelphia Committee (Signed)

Rt. Rev. O. W. Whitaker, D.D., LL.D.
Rt. Rev. A. MacKay-Smith, D.D.
Bishop Cyrus D. Foss, D.D., LL.D.
Floyd W. Tomkins, D.D.
Charles Wood, D.D.
Kerr Boyce Tupper, D.D., LL.D.
Mervin J. Eckels, D.D.
James Crawford, D.D.
Talcott Williams, L.H.D.
Hon. John Wanamaker
John H. Converse
Lewis H. Redner
Rudolph Blankenburg
E. Frank Carson

The Pan-American Conference of Bishops, held in Washington during the month of October in 1903, at which over a hundred delegates from the United States, West Indies, Canada, and other places were present, at a session devoted to the discussion of the conditions and sad plight of the Macedonians, passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this council desires to put on record an expression of its horror and indignation at the wholesale atrocities that have been and are still being perpetrated upon our fellow Christians in the Province of Macedonia. We offer them our profound sympathy in the fiery trials through which they are passing, and we pray God in His mercy to send them deliverance. We would further express the hope that the moral influence of the government of this great republic may be thrown into the scale in favor of such reforms as may give to the Macedonian people the protection of law against injustice and oppression. And where those who survive these terrible persecutions are now perishing from disease, cold and hunger, we commend to all Christian people the prompt and energetic employment of whatever measures may contribute to the succor of this afflicted people, and especially such contributions as may relieve their sore necessities."

The following resolution bearing the names of some of the most prominent citizens of the State of Connecticut, including its Governor, was addressed to the United States Congress, in February, 1904:

"To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Connecticut, desire to express our horror and indignation of the shocking atrocities that have been and still are being perpetrated upon our fellow-Christians in Macedonia, by the forces of a government with which our country holds diplomatic relations, and would, furthermore, most respectfully urge upon the Congress of these United States, through its chief executive, that it use its good offices, in cooperation with the other Christian nations, England, France, and Italy, toward the speedy fulfillment of the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, which guarantees to those Christians humane rule and protection from lawlessness and traditional outrages."

(Signed): Abraham Chamberlain, O. Vincent Coffin, Morgan G. Bulkeley, Bishop C. B. Brewster, Rev. Joseph T. Twichell, Timothy Dwight, Noris G. Osborn, George M. Gunn, Arthur F. Eggleston, John R. Buck, Charles E. Perkins, Arthur Perkins, W. O. Atwater, J. M. Van Vleck, B. P. Raymond, C. J. Winchester, A. R. Cruttenden, M. B. Copeland, Theodore Munger, Newman Smyth, George P. Fisher, John P. Studley, Ezekiel G. Stoddard, Eli Whitney, Pierce N. Welch, Henry P. Wright, Henry Wade Rogers, Charles H. Smith, Livingston W. Cleveland, George B. Martin, Andrew W. Phillips, Lewis N. Welch, Russell H. Chittenden, Edward L. Curtis, William P. Baldwin, C. W. Pickett, Alexander Troup, and others.

Another almost similar petition addressed to the Congress of the United States was signed by such eminent Americans as Bishop Brewster of Hartford, Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, Prof. G. P. Fisher of Yale University, Morris K. Jesup, Bishop Potter, and others.

President Theodore Roosevelt and his Secretary of State, John Hay, were greatly in sympathy with the Macedonian liberation struggle, and according to their own assurances the United States Government had informed England that she could count on America's moral support in any attempt on the part of Great Britain for bringing about the fulfillment of Art. 23 of the Berlin Treaty which guaranteed to Macedonia a local autonomy.

A MACEDONIAN APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Note: Under the above heading an article appeared in the *Independent*, a weekly magazine, of November 2, 1903 (55:2676-8). Below we are reproducing this article *in extenso*. It deals with the state of conditions in Macedonia soon after the official termination of the Macedonian insurrection of 1903. The article appeared anonymous for reasons as stated at that time, by the Editorial note below. Following is the article:

A Macedonian Appeal to the American Conscience

(It is not wise to publish the name of the writer of this article, who is a resident of Turkey. He knows of what he speaks, and what he says deserves attention—Editor.)

There is a story in an ancient book about a man who dreamed one night that he saw a certain Macedonian standing on the shore and shouting a plea to the dreamer to aid his countrymen. So moved was the seer by this summons that he felt it to be a divine call and started off the next day to do what he could in the line desired.

There rings in the ears of the writer today a similar appeal, and he sends it on to the men of conscience across the sea. He is well aware, however, that an appeal to the conscience is useless where there is no ability to act. Hence the object of this article is not only to show the desperate need of help for Macedonia, but also to show that the United States of America can and should give such help.

There is a tendency in some quarters to save the conscience with the remark that the newspaper reports of atrocities are doubtless much exaggerated. In the past there has been some foundation for this charge. It is impossible adequately to impress those who have not lived in Turkey with the weight of tyranny which bears upon the people ordinarily and daily. But in their effort to do so the Bulgarian papers have exaggerated so much, have lied so unblushingly, have fabricated so many outrages, have cried "Wolf" so often, that now, when the wolf is tearing the flock and seems likely to annihilate it, the outside world listens in semi-indifference.

The present situation, however, is such as to make one rather wish to minimize than to exaggerate its horrors, lest the easy-going shrink from facing the facts squarely and the fastidious turn from them in disgust. Even one of the Bulgarian-hating Greeks lately told me that he could not sleep nights for thinking of certain things which eye-witnesses had related to him as occurring in the Monastir region. An English friend also tells me of a young German who was in that district in a capacity which threw him with the soldiery. Not being gifted with official Germany's usual cold-blooded complacency toward wholesale murder (when committed by those who can bestow railway concessions), he threw up his situation and fled the region in dismay. In order that Americans may be informed of the conditions of affairs I select a few instances which come from such trustworthy sources as to preclude any doubt of their truthfulness.

A former pupil of an American school, where every effort is made to inculcate truthfulness as a cardinal virtue, came in as a refugee from the ruined village of Smilevo. This was the place which the soldiery burned and to which they of then compelled the villagers to return from their hiding places in the woods. Of these non-combatants many were "killed, wounded and missing." A younger sister of the woman mentioned is missing. This woman confirms the statement of others that soldiers threw little children into burning buildings. Other people were shot in trying to run out of burning houses. Six maidens, seeing the orgy going on in their village, made a dash for the woods. Soldiers chased and quickly overtook them. Their screams were heard for about an hour. Then silence fell and the

soldiers returned to the village, without taking trouble to bury the corpses. And that deed of hell was committed in the twentieth century, no further from Budapest, the handsome capital of Hungary, then is Philadelphia from Cincinnati.

In a certain hospital is a woman whom a friend of mine has seen. She has five great gashes on her head and neck. She was fleeing from her village with her baby in her arms when a cavalier on horseback attacked her. As she instinctively threw up her hand to protect her head four of the fingers were sliced off. She says that she dropped her baby and it was hacked to pieces by the valiant warriors. And German officialdom (I charge not the German *nation* with such crimes) may chuckle that the Turk is given a "free hand."

The late official order forbidding the troops to bring any more kidnapped children into Monastir may have puzzled some American readers. This shows that they live where the practice of sodomy is not common.

It is better to draw the veil over details at this point. There are certain general facts¹ which may be stated.

Men who have been over as much of the ground as the Turks will allow them to estimate that 140 villages have been burned in the Monastir Vilayet. Let us divide this by two. These villages probably average over 100 houses each, but let us divide this also by two. With an average of five people to a house you have 17,500 people homeless (less those who have been killed), and winter not two months off. Or, taking the highest estimate, you have 70,000 people in this condition (minus those killed). There was a great outcry in America last year over lack of coal to warm good houses. What if the houses themselves had been lacking?

It is a notorious fact, already widely reported, that after the only doctor in Krushevo had been killed, the only drug shop destroyed, and wounded people (mostly *women*) were lying in bare, looted houses in a dreadful condition, Hilmi Pasha, the good Hilmi Pasha, Inspector-General of the Province, appointed to introduce Austro-Russian "reforms"—Hilmi Pasha refused the Sisters of Mercy permission to carry medicines to the place. "It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us."

(1) Since writing the above, more accurate statistics have come to hand. A gentleman with the best facilities of any one, except the Turkish officers, for learning the facts gives the following figures:

DISTRICT	VILLAGES ATTACKED	TOTAL HOUSES IN THEM	HOUSES BURNED
Ochrida	40	3,259	3,021
Resna	19	737	722
Kastoria	23	3,021	2,717
Presba	5	275	262
Florina	5	1,500	1,500
Monastir	3	510	500
Demir-Hisar	4	767	725
Kitchevo	5	160	77
Krushevo	6	163	163

Total	110	10,392	9,687
-------	-----	--------	-------

Krushevo City had shops and houses burned			600
---	--	--	-----

Grand Total			10,287
-------------	--	--	--------

Counting five to a house, at least 50,000 are homeless.

"But," it is argued, "the Bulgarians are just as savage as the Turks." Let us see. I admit that America herself has suffered at the hands of Bulgarians in the outrageous capture of Miss Stone and the blackmail levied for her release. But no violence was done the person of the captive. And the great American nation is just enough to remember that the women and babies of the Monastir region had no part in planning or executing the capture. And, after all, would it have occurred if there had been good government in Macedonia?

The most brutally barbarous acts yet done by Bulgarians were the throwing of a bomb into an open-air theater in Salonica, where many women and some children were seated, and the placing of the infernal machine which wrecked the train near Adrianople. In the latter case several Turkish women were hurt. But the committee had warned the railway not to transport passengers. The man who placed the bomb did not know that women would be hurt, altho he may not have cared. My point is that he did not lay his hands upon and slaughter women directly. And the women were not violated before (or after) being wounded. So also the well-dressed Salonica dames whose screams filled the air when the bomb burst near them—were subjected to no nameless outrages, such as have become so common in the Adrianople and Monastir districts that reports of them scarcely excite comment. But, granting that the Bulgarians were just as bad as the Turks in every respect, would that not be all the more reason for stopping the whole ghastly carnival of outrage? Were there none but armed insurgents and soldiers in the country it might be a different matter. But shall unarmed and helpless women and children be tortured and done to death and no man lift a finger? The Macedonian cry for help is plain, piercing, heart-rending.

But it is claimed the United States has no responsibility in the matter. Has he no responsibility who, with a good revolver in his hand, sees a ruffian choking a woman to death in the alley? "Ah, but the cases are not parallel!" Very well, change the illustration. Has he no responsibility who sees an officer trying to rescue a maiden from two or three kidnapping "cadets," who are dragging her to a bawdy house, when his strong arm, or the weapon in his pocket, might turn the scale?

"But America can't go to war with Turkey." No, America is too far away to wage a successful war with Turkey. But America can stop the excesses which the Turkish soldiery are committing tomorrow—if she will. How so?

The British are deeply stirred by the state of affairs in European Turkey. So is France, but she is also tied to Russia (whom nothing but her appetite ever stirs) that she will do nothing. England hesitates and is distracted because of her fear that the history of the Armenian affairs will be repeated. She wished than to intervene, but found that her European neighbors were preparing the moment she became embroiled with Turkey, to make a united attack upon and humiliate her Empire. It lies with the United States to prevent a repetition of that history. She owes England a heavy debt of gratitude for her attitude during the Spanish War. Now is the golden opportunity to pay the debt. In short, let America say to England: "Go ahead and take such measures as you think best to establish order in Macedonia. If any power but Turkey attacks you, count on me to come to your side." The simple knowledge that such an agreement existed would prevent any need of carrying it into operation. The sole result would be that England would be given a commanding position in the European "Concert," and the other Powers would hasten to adopt her suggestions and cooperate with her in carrying them out, lest she get too great an influence over Turkey by doing it alone. That this would be the result is the opinion of every Englishman and American on the scene of disturbances. Of course, America must be ready to back her promise

by force if necessary. But her very readiness would make it unnecessary.

Hence I contend that the American conscience should be moved by the Macedonian cry of today, since it is entirely in America's power, without taking any rash step, and without firing a gun, to grant the relief for which that cry pleads.

Turkey.

The Salonica Bombing

About three months before the Illinden insurrection, on April 28 and 29, a group of young Macedonian revolutionists blew up with dynamite the French vessel *Gvadalkvivir*, anchored in the Salonica bay, and the bank *Ottoman* in the very heart of the city itself. This isolated action of desperation, as events proved later on, was inspired by the impassiveness of the European powers in ameliorating the situation in Macedonia. More or less it was a violent protest against the failure of European diplomacy to secure a better future for Macedonia.

Commenting editorially on the Salonica bombing, *Harper's Weekly* in its issue of May 20, 1903, wrote as follows:

"The recent happenings at Salonica have made it true, in a literal as well as figurative sense, to say that the Macedonian question is full of explosives. A deliberate and elaborately devised plan seems to have been made which, had it succeeded, would have laid the city of Salonica in ashes and destroyed the banks and foreign consulates, thus forcing the question upon the foreign powers.

"... If the Sultan be not encouraged by certain occult influences to resist the reform plans, we may hope for definite results within five or six months; but we can not but shudder when we contemplate the possible fate of many Macedonians, both men and women, during these months. This country not long ago intervened on behalf of the Berlin Treaty in Rumania; this precedent would amply justify an intervention, in cordial support of Austria and Russia on behalf of those sections of the Berlin Treaty which guaranteed good government in Macedonia."

Greeks Taking Side of the Turks

In an editorial entitled, *The Turkish Troubles*, this is what *The Independent* in its issue of August 20, 1903, had to say about the conduct of the Greeks during the Illinden insurrection:

"One of the most surprising phases of the uprising in Macedonia is the attitude of the Greek Christians in Macedonia, who fraternize with the Turks against their Bulgarian fellow Christians, and the utterance of the Greek Government at Athens, taking the side of the Turks, and advising the Greeks in Macedonia to denounce the revolutionists to the Turkish authorities."

Islamic Government and Macedonian Situation

Following are some excerpts from a special article published under the above title in *The Outlook* (September 19, 1903), signed by a Native of Turkey:

"When from time to time the insistent cries for help come from the outraged Christians of Armenia and Macedonia, and European statesmen have felt obliged to put the 'sick man's' domain in order, treaty after treaty has been drawn up with blare of trumpets and solemn promises on Turkey's part for the amelioration of the lot of her Christian subjects. But none of these treaties has ever been kept. If pressed very hard by European diplomacy, the Porte will appear to yield, promise much, plead time for execution of what it has promised, and, after dilly-dallying along until other events claim the attention of European Cabinets, slip out of the promised reforms altogether.

"Is it any wonder that the Macedonians, seeing what the promise of reforms meant in Armenia, have been reduced to the madness of despair, realizing as they do the hollow mockery of reforms?"

"It is impossible to secure reforms in Macedonia by diplomacy. That has been tried and found wanting. 'Time to get his house in order' is no excuse for the Sultan. He has had that for twenty-five years, and his house is still an Augean stable that rivers of waters cannot make clean.

"It is not the need of making new stipulations for reforms in Macedonia, it is the necessity of seeing that the old ones are executed. The Russo-Austrian scheme of reforms will prove another fiasco for Macedonia, unless the appointment of a Christian governor is assured, as in Crete, Lebanon and Samos."

The True Inwardness of the Situation in Macedonia

In its issue of October 3, 1903 *Harper's Weekly* wrote a special article entitled, *The True Inwardness of the Situation in Macedonia*, blaming the European powers for refraining to exact the fulfillment of the promised reforms in Macedonia. Part of that article reads as follows:

"... It does not follow that the Christian powers of Europe ought to remain impassive spectators of the conversion of Macedonia into shambles at the hands of the revengeful Turk. Whatever other motive may have prompted the uprising of the Bulgarians in Macedonia, there is no doubt that one ground for it was avowable, adequate and righteous. We refer to the failure of Sultan Abdul-Hamid to introduce the reforms to which he pledged himself by the Treaty of Berlin a quarter of a century ago. Whose fault is it that not even a pretence of fulfilling the promises has been made? It is the fault of the same Christian powers, cosignators of the Berlin Treaty, which refrained from exacting the fulfillment in the case of Turkish Armenia, and which when Armenian Christians struck a blow on their own behalf, looked on unmoved while the insurrection was put down by appalling massacres. Does anybody doubt that if Mr. Gladstone had been Prime Minister of Great Britain England's duty, as one of the guarantors of the Berlin Treaty, would have been performed? Does any one doubt that he would have forced the Sultan to keep his word both in Armenia and Macedonia?"

"The truth is that the public conscience throughout central and western Europe is now and has been for sometime, torpid; that it needs to be electrified, shocked into recognition of its duty to compel the fulfillment of international compacts and to alleviate human misery. Because the Greeks have been foolish enough to be so swayed by racial or political jealousies as to profess a preference for Ottoman over Bulgarian ascendancy in Macedonia, it does not follow that enlightened onlookers should permit Bulgarian, Greek and Servian Christians alike to be subjected to nameless outrages and decimated or annihilated at the hands of the Turkish soldiers."

Autonomous Macedonia with a Christian Governor

Pleading the case for an Autonomous Macedonia with a Christian Governor, *Harper's Weekly* in its issue of October 31, 1903 wrote this:

"... We shall be just as well prepared to learn that the insurrection has broken out next Spring, whether or not Russia and Austria get their reforms accepted by the Porte. For as to these reforms, the truth is that they will never affect much; at least never enough to satisfy the Bulgarian revolutionists. For the Porte will always find ways and means to make them nugatory... Therefore, unless the powers agree to enforce a programme of Macedonian Autonomy, with a Christian governor, on Turkey, and further insist on the withdrawal of Turkish troops from the Slavonic areas, the condition of Macedonia will remain

practically unameliorated and the work of the insurgents will continue. The best hope, therefore, for the miserable Macedonians is a coalition of the more humane powers—England, France, Italy, Austria and Russia—strong enough to ignore or override the opposition of Germany, and to dictate to the Porte the conditions of Autonomous Macedonia. In due time an Autonomous Macedonia will, doubtless, give in its adherence to Bulgaria, just as did autonomous Eastern Rumelia, by the peaceful revolution of 1885. In this way another step will be taken towards the settlement reached by the San Stefane Treaty, which was upset by the Berlin Congress, from motives of frank hostility to everything slavonic."

Macedonian Amelioration

In its issue of October 31, 1903, *The Outlook* published an article under the heading, *Macedonian Amelioration*, explaining the Russo-Austrian scheme for the amelioration of affairs in Macedonia:

"One Austrian and one Russian Assessor are to be appointed, and are to be attached to the staff of Hilmi Pasha, the Inspector General, with a corps of assistants, secretaries, and interpreters, whose duties will be to exercise control over all the acts of the provincial authorities . . ."

Commenting that the Sultan will object to the scheme, the article thus concluded:

"The second objection may come, not from the Sultan, but from the Macedonian insurgents, who now regard Hilmi Pasha, despite his reputed good intentions, as being transformed from an inspector of the first reforms agreed upon months ago into an instrument of butchery, defilement, and devastation. In our opinion, no scheme is likely to prove satisfactory which stops short of complete provincial autonomy under a Christian Governor-General."

The Missionary Spirit in Macedonia

The Illinden insurrection in Macedonia created a very unstable situation in that part of the Ottoman Empire. Being aware of this, the American Minister in Constantinople (Istanbul), Mr. Leishman, sent a letter to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, calling attention to Macedonian conditions and suggesting that it would be wise for the missionaries to withdraw from Macedonia until quiet was restored, because safety could not be assured to American citizens in that part of the country.

In reply to that letter, Rev. Lewis Bond, American missionary at Monastir (Bitolia), published a letter in the November 7, 1903 issue of *The Outlook*, part of which reads as follows:

"We missionaries are fully persuaded that we are, just now, at the post of duty, and therefore the safest place for us—if safety be an important consideration—is this particular spot. It is possible, of course, that we may be massacred—very much against our personal desire—but we indulge a strong hope that for a while, at least, we may comfort and strengthen the hearts of many native friends who are in a measure depending on us . . . We would rather perish in Macedonia, if it be the Lord's will, than to prolong our days outside, somewhere, and be ashamed of ourselves."

Macedonian Realities

Under the above title *The Outlook* (November 7, 1903) published an article by George Lynch, sent from Rila Mountain on the Turko-Bulgarian frontier at the time. Following is part of Mr. Lynch's report:

"It must be borne in on the mind of every observer here with overwhelming conviction that the Turks are bent on a policy of extirpation of the Christian

population of Macedonia. It is nothing short of that. At a conservative estimate, forty-five thousand to fifty thousand people have already been killed in West Macedonia. Fifty thousand to sixty thousand refugees are at present in the mountain forests.

"The important question is, What is to become of these latter? The winter is coming right upon us. Yesterday I was walking knee-deep in snow on the mountains. In the same snow I saw women and children plodding barefooted. These people dare not go down into the plains, and what is to be their fate during the winter? One cannot but admire the conduct of the Bulgarian people through this crisis. Their charity towards the fugitives who reach the frontier is limited only by extent of their limited means. The generosity, especially of the very poor, is simply wonderful. But what is to become of these poor people who cannot reach the frontier? I see nothing but famine before Macedonia, whatever the attempted solution adopted."

