

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”

Faculty of History

Department of Bulgarian history



„Andrey Toshev – statesman, diplomat, politician“

Abstract

of a thesis for adjudication of a doctoral educational and scientific
degree

Doctoral candidate: Maria Sashkova Valkova

Doctoral adviser: Prof. Vesselin Yanchev

Sofia
2023

This thesis is dedicated to a person whose contribution to the progress of the Bulgarian society in the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th century has never, until now, been honored with a proper detailed research that closely follows his life and work in various branches of the social structure. That is Andrey Toshev – an educator, a scholar, a diplomat, a statesman, a publicist and an overall well respected public figure.

The author's main motive to take on researching and portraying this remarkable Bulgarian's life is the firm belief that it's about time to allow society to fully appreciate Toshev's contributions as a politician, diplomat and a scholar by giving it wide publicity with this work. Toshev has always been overshadowed by certain other historical figures from the same period that were repeatedly researched in the last few decades which seems to the author to be rather unduly given his overall importance. This is Valkova's rationale to aim to construct a full-bodied portrait of this historical figure that will not only fairly and adequately reflect all of Toshev's personality traits that the author could touch to in his research on the matter, but also envelops almost half a century of socio-political activities.

The thesis focuses mainly on Toshev's periods as a government official. First and foremost, his period as a member of the diplomatic corps serving in Bitola (1903 – 1905), Cetinje (1905 – 1906), Athens (1906 – 1908), Belgrade (1908 – 1913), Constantinople (1913 – 1915) and Vienna (1915 – 1919). He also briefly combined the role of an ambassador to Vienna with that of a temporary representative to Bern after the start of the official bilateral relations between Bulgaria and Switzerland. The second key topic is Toshev's brief service as a Prime minister of the Kingdom of Bulgaria (April 21st 1935 – November 23rd 1935) when King Boris III appointed the 53rd government and gave it the task to work of affirming the Monarch's main role in the Kingdom's political landscape. Aside from those two main topics, this thesis also covers Toshev's activities as an educator, a scholar, a publicist and an overall political figure. That includes not only his thorough researches on Bulgaria's botanical richness, but also his works on historical, ethnological and economical topics and his aim to support the cause of the Bulgarian minorities in the neighboring countries and contribute as much as possible to it, which he did by participating as a delegate in several conferences dedicated directly or impudently to the problem of minorities all over Europe after he retired from diplomatic service.

Valkova's work covers Andrey Toshev's whole lifetime between 1867 and 1944 and it's divided in three main chapters: 1. The period between 1867 and 1908 follows the foundations of his views, his time as an educator in various Bulgarian schools, in and out of the country, his start in botany and the start of his diplomatic career with the first three appointments he

was given; 2. The period between 1908 and 1919 – the most important period in Toshev’s diplomatic service, because his time in Belgrade, Constantinople, Vienna and Bern concurs with events that proved to be decisive for Bulgaria’s course of development in the first two decades of the 20th century – the proclamation of independence and the subsequent struggle to earn admission for it, the Balkan wars and the First World war which put not only the Kingdom of Bulgaria, but Europe as a whole in a new, much more complicated situation; 3. The period between 1919 and 1943 – it follows Toshev’s endeavors after he voluntarily retired from active diplomatic service in 1919 and decided to dedicate his time to the protection of the Bulgarian minorities and to research for his historical, ethnological and economical writings. This part also includes Toshev’s last period as a government official – his short stint as a Prime minister in 1935 followed by the last eight years of his life, once again dedicated to writing and analyzing his past experiences.

The main resources for the thesis can be divided in several categories: unpublished documents from the several sources – Central State Archive in Sofia, the Bulgarian historical archive at the National Library in Sofia, the Scientific archive at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, the Capital Library in Sofia, Sofia university’s Central Library etc.; several newspapers from the period –the Official Gazette of the Bulgarian government published in Sofia, “Borba” (“Struggle”) published in Plovdiv, “Varnenski novini” (“Varna’s news”) published in Varna, “Iztochna misal” (“East’s Mind”) also published in Varna, “Literaturnen glas” (“The voice of literature”) published in Sofia, “Mir” (“Peace”) published in Sofia and “Novo edinstvo” (“New unity”) published in Dobrich; corpuses of published documents; memoirs; works of fellow historians in which Toshev’s involvement in the development of Bulgarian politics is mentioned albeit not the main focus of the said works.

In this thesis all dates are tailored according to the Gregorian calendar despite the fact that it wasn’t introduced in Bulgaria up until 1916. The events are followed in chronological order with the sole exception of Toshev’s scientific and publicist work between 1919 and 1943 which is situated at the end of the third chapter after his political involvement in 1935.

With this work the author aims to do the cover the following tasks: 1. To analyze the influence of Toshev’s family on the formation of his personality traits and life goals; 2. To look closely at his diplomatic service and to analyze how much of an impact he had on Bulgaria’s bilateral connection with the countries he was assigned to; 3. To take in account his scientific and publicist works albeit as a secondary topic in the thesis; 4. To analyze how much of an influence Toshev’s had as a Prime minister on the situation in the country, on its foreign relations and how much of an affect, if any, did his decisions as a leader of the

government have on his successors; 5. To give an overall assessment to Andrey Toshev as a politician, statesman and a diplomat.

The first chapter - "From Stara Zagora to Athens" - is key for the reader to understand the positions and perceptions of the future diplomat and politician. The chapter covers the largest span of time, starting with Toshev's childhood years, goes through his teaching activities and his initial steps in the scientific field and ends with his first appointments in the diplomatic corps - those in Bitola, Cetinje and Athens. This initial period formed An. Toshev as a person, as a patriot and as a professional. Although the data for the years before 1903 is rather scarce, the author is diligent in presenting and analyzing the available sources and extracting the fullest possible image of his subject from them.

Serious attention has been paid to the role of the family environment in the development of patriotic feelings and moral values in Toshev. His closest relatives, who were respected members of their community, taught him valuable life lessons, but not only that. They remain in his mind as an example of standing up for the national cause. It is these observations of his, though still a child, that transform Toshev in one of her most ardent supporters. Talking of examples of his strong patriotic feelings and his sympathy for the cause of the Macedonian Bulgarians, we can point to the fact that he interrupted his studies abroad and went to teach in the Macedonian lands. In this part of the chapter, the emergence of interest in the surrounding world is also emphasized, to which the author attributes his later development as a botanist. In parallel with the teaching activity in Thessaloniki, he began his botanical research in the vicinity of the city and Southwestern Macedonia. This combination will become commonplace for Toshev, as he continued to enrich the scientific fund of Bulgarian botany during his subsequent teaching appointments in different parts of Bulgaria.

Toshev's time as a teacher at the Military School in Sofia (1896 – 1903) became the most active period of his scientific work, which led to a number of publications, unsurpassed to this day. It is on this basis that the recognition from the Bulgarian Literary Society (renamed in 1911 to Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) comes, which also leads to the growth of Toshev in the hierarchy of this prestigious Bulgarian institution, the peak of which came in 1931 when he officially became an academician.

In the next part of this chapter comes the pivotal moment of Toshev's first diplomatic appointment. He was sent as a commercial agent to Bitola. Here, the dimensions of the diplomatic position in question and the role of its holder are specified. In addition, there is a brief retrospective of the beginning of the bilateral relations between the Principality of

Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire. The request of the Principality of Bulgaria to have its own representatives in European Turkey, made as early as 1879, is mentioned specifically. This first commitment as a member of the diplomatic corps will become the beginning of the most dynamic period in Toshev's life, which lasted about sixteen years. A period in which he got the opportunity to harness all his intellectual and psychological qualities, as well as his unquestioning patriotism, all this in defense of the interests of the Bulgarian people and state before the relevant governing circles in the country in which he is accredited.

Taking up the position in Bitola right after the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie Uprising that shook the European part of the Ottoman Empire, the novice diplomat was faced with the challenge of protecting, as far as the circumstances allowed, the local Bulgarian population from the revanchism of the Ottomans and from the infiltration of Serbian, Greek and Wallachian propaganda. In addition, his persistent attempts to draw the attention of the rulers in Sofia to the urgent need for an official Bulgarian position regarding what happened and a direct commitment to the fate of the compatriots who remained after 1878 within the framework of European Turkey are tracked. Influenced by his contacts with the local population and based on his observations of the behavior of the Ottoman authorities, An. Toshev came up with a short list of four points concerning the most urgent, in his opinion, reforms that must be undertaken without any delay in order to normalize the living conditions for Bulgarians in Macedonia and Eastern Thrace. The subject of reforms concerns not only the Bulgarian representative. Also discussed in this part of the chapter are the initiatives of the Great Powers to draw up and impose on the Ottoman government similar programs aimed at the theoretical improvement of the position of Christians within the empire, as well as the attempts of the responsible factors in the latter to invalidate such projects, proclaiming hijacked ideas for changes that they have no intention of implementing, let alone preventing, European intervention.

When in 1904 the Bulgarian government took some concrete measures to normalize relations with Constantinople, with the aim of alleviating the fate of the Bulgarian minority in the Ottoman Empire, An. Toshev welcomed this decision with enthusiasm. The attempt was, unfortunately, marred by the misconduct of the Sublime Porte, for which Toshev also writes in his later works, cited in this part of the first chapter.

A long journey of the Bulgarian commercial agent through some of the territories devastated after the uprising, populated mainly by Bulgarians, is also examined in detail - a clear testimony of his personal commitment to the difficult fate of these people, who became victims not only of Turkish oppression, but also of the Greek, Serbian and Wallachian

agitators and executors who were encouraged from the authorities who had the ambition to suffocate the spirit of the Bulgarian population.

We see a very different picture in the next part of the first chapter, where An. Toshev's appointment as a diplomatic agent in Cetinje is touched upon. It represents some kind of a promotion for him, because now he gets the opportunity to be a key figure in bilateral relations, being the official representative of his country before the Montenegrin government. Here we observe an overview of the rights and duties of the holder of that diplomatic position. Added to that is a historical overview of Bulgarian-Montenegrin relations before the appointment of Toshev as a holder of the Bulgarian legation there. The main focus of the latter's activities in the Montenegrin capital was active communication with the always unpredictable Prince Nikola, with the aim of maintaining good relations between the two countries, which Sofia needed, considering its attempts to resolve the problem with the Bulgarian population in Macedonia. A task which, as the new Bulgarian representative is convinced, is not at all easy due to the huge ambition of the ruler to turn himself, his dynasty and his country into a leading factor in the Balkans, although there are no realistic conditions for this, in view of the fact that at that time, Montenegro was the smallest and poorest country on the peninsula. During his stay at the head of the Bulgarian legation in Cetinje, An. Toshev found himself involved in one of Prince Nikola's successive attempts to play the role of a progressive democratic ruler in front of his people - the case for drafting and adopting a constitution and convening the Assembly. The Bulgarian representative was sought by the monarch for advice and even received a copy of the project, with a request to make a comparison with the Tarnovo constitution. All the noise surrounding the constitutional issue turns out to be a "storm in a teacup" and does not result in any significant change in the balance of power in the country.

In his reports, reflected in this part of the first chapter of the thesis, An. Toshev also conveys Prince Nikola's attempts to drag Bulgaria into a tripartite military-political union, which would also include a third Balkan country. The ruler first spoke of attracting Serbia (whose dynasty he otherwise strongly disapproved of), and later suggested seeking rapprochement with the Ottoman Empire. As it turns out, this was once again an ill-judged attempt to jump over one's own capabilities and those of the country on the part of Nikola. As expected, it did not even come to real negotiations for such an alliance, due to the firm position of Prince Ferdinand that it would be disadvantageous and untimely.

While on duty in Cetinje, An. Toshev also carefully monitors the rapprochement between Montenegro and Italy, which he duly reflects in his reports to his superiors in Sofia. Also

present in this part of the chapter are his thoughts on the reasons for it and the expected results.

The next part of the first chapter concerns the period of An. Toshev at the head of the Bulgarian legation in Athens. It was surprising even for himself how warmly he was received, given the simmering tension between the two countries, because of the behavior of the Greek troops in Macedonia. It is the fate of the Bulgarians there that once again became the main emphasis in the work of the Bulgarian diplomat after his arrival in the Greek capital. This is the reason for two of his extensive reports from this period that have reached us, in which he makes a brilliant dissection of the historical and ethnographic character of Macedonia, worthy of a professional in this field. In them, for the first time, he raised a theory that he would later defend firmly, namely, that under the circumstances, the best solution for the district would be for it to receive some autonomy, which would protect it from cleavage. During his mission to Athens, An. Toshev carefully followed the terror of the Greek legions over the Macedonian Bulgarians who wish to go to the Exarchate, writing in detail about the methods of the Greek Patriarchate for forced submission of those people. Last but not least, he again calls on the Bulgarian government to intervene directly and consistently in the matter of the fate of the Macedonian Bulgarians, opposing Serbs and Greeks who confidently ascribe to themselves the right to dictate the terms of any possible changes in Macedonia and to continue with their tendentious policy in detriment of Bulgaria.

The second chapter - "From the Declaration of Independence to the end of the First World War" examines the three diplomatic appointments that left the brightest mark on Toshev's professional development. From 1908 to 1919, he held positions in the capitals of Serbia, the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary, and this period coincided with key events for Bulgaria and Europe, in which the Bulgarian diplomat was directly involved due to the nature of his position. This is the reason why this chapter has the largest volume, and in it Toshev's character and perceptions come through.

At the beginning of the part about Belgrade, a brief overview of the situation that welcomes Toshev in the Serbian capital is given. The complications in Bulgarian-Serbian relations from the previous year are mentioned and attention is drawn to the negative attitude of certain circles of the Serbian public towards the newly appointed diplomatic agent. To build an idea of the sentiment towards Toshev the author of the thesis quoted headlines from the local press, as well as opinions of Serbian politicians and diplomats. Analyzing their motives, the author of the thesis comes to the conclusion that they are afraid of the activity

and consistency of the Bulgarian representative, which sharply contrasts with their expectations of imposing dominance in Bulgarian-Serbian relations.

Attention is drawn by the author to the fact that with the Democrats' rise to power in Bulgaria in 1908, the idea of a Bulgarian-Serbian rapprochement under the auspices of Russia was revived, which was not possible in the previous years, when the government in Sofia headed by the People's Liberal Party was oriented towards Austria-Hungary. Toshev's opinion and memories on this issue are explored here, some of which are expressed in his later works. The synchronicity between the Bulgarian diplomat's reports from the time of these events and his later reflections he emphasized, gives us reason to believe that what is told in the books from the 1930s and 1940s is to a large extent an objective recollection of his views, and not an interpretation influenced by later events.

The complications in Macedonia that occurred after the failure of the Mürzstegg reforms and the conflict between the Great Powers regarding the British proposals for partial autonomy of these lands are noted. An. Toshev analyzed the resistance of Serbs and Greeks to this concept, while also looking at their motivation. The idea of autonomy to preserve the integrity of Macedonia continues to be advocated by him, calling on the Bulgarian government to insist that Serbia express a clear position on the subject. In case the Serbs continue to persist, he recommends strengthening the Bulgarian armed volunteers' actions in Macedonia.

Attention is also drawn to Austria-Hungary's attempts to create a diplomatic conflict between Serbia and Bulgaria claiming that the former are negotiating with the Ottomans for some kind of a military union. Those attempts were thwarted by the Serbian Foreign Minister M. Milovanovic, who assured Toshev that the Serbs have no intention of signing an alliance with Constantinople against Sofia.

This part of the chapter presents the Young Turk revolution of the summer of 1908 and its consequences for the situation in Macedonia. Emphasis is also placed on the events that led to the complication of relations between Bulgarians and Ottomans, which catalyzed the declaration of Independence. An. Toshev conveys the sharp reaction of the Serbian public, which is both worried about Bulgaria's international rise and afraid of the fact that the action was coordinated with Austria-Hungary. In addition, the Bulgarian representative defends the legality of the act of October 5, 1908.

After the situation was managed, there was a "softening" of the Serbs and new proposals for rapprochement with Sofia against the backdrop of the continuing tension along the Belgrade-Vienna axis. An. Toshev is closely monitoring these processes and sympathizes with the government's decision to negotiate, although both him and the PM Malinov are

skeptical about the sincerity of the Serbs. The Bulgarian diplomat points out Serbia's attempts to assume the role of a misunderstood benefactor whose initiative for union was ignored.

Attention is also paid to the internal political tension in Serbia, with the Bulgarian representative analyzing the situation and pointing out the potential dangers, both for the peace inside the country and for the radicalization of the Kingdom's behavior in terms of foreign policy. In the situation that has arisen, the issue of Bulgarian-Serbian rapprochement continues to exist. Talks on this axis followed in the next few months, which did not lead to a final result due to the fickleness of Serbian wishes. In this period, the topic of Bulgarian-Greek negotiations is also raised, which does not seem to be a priority for the Bulgarians, but nevertheless becomes a reason for dissatisfaction with the always suspicious Serbs.

Also mentioned in this part of the second chapter, is the destabilization of the Ottoman Empire in the period 1909-1910, which was caused by the strengthening of the Albanian separatist feelings and the dissatisfaction with the Ottoman power in Yemen, Armenia and Macedonia. As it was expected, the Bulgarian government took an opinion on the matter of Macedonia, in line with Sofia's attempts to take advantage of the situation in order to alleviate the permanent oppression of Bulgarians there.

Given the circumstances, An. Toshev repeatedly reflected in his reports on Bulgaria's role in the situation and came to the conclusion that we should mainly rely on our own strength, and not expect that any of the Great Powers will stand up for us in front of our neighbors and especially in front of the Turks. This thesis will also appear in his later conceptual reflections on the state of Bulgarian politics.

The change of government in Sofia at the end of March 1911, caused by the desire of Tsar Ferdinand to seek rapprochement with Russia, is also included in the second chapter of the thesis. As expected, the reaction in Belgrade and Petersburg is positive and the new situation makes the Serbs even more ambitious to raise their demands in a possible union. Knowing the Russophile nature of the ruling coalition and worried about unfounded concessions from the Bulgarian side, in his report Toshev analyzes in detail the hypothesis of division of Macedonia and firmly rejects it, once again pointing to autonomy as the most relevant option. These reflections of his can be accepted as his constant position on the subject.

Using the outbreak of the Italo-Turkish war, the Bulgarians and the Serbs began negotiations for an alliance with an anti-Ottoman orientation, for which An. Toshev was deliberately not informed. The possible reasons for this are examined, and the author tries to show the different points of view in the situation that has arisen. Having learned through other sources about the ongoing negotiations, the Bulgarian representative ignored the insult and

sought to be useful with his actions and reflections on the international situation, which he presented in lengthy reports to the government in Sofia. Once again, the tendency of the Serbs to present themselves as agents of rapprochement, who are ignored by the Bulgarians, is observed.

Towards the end of 1911, the situation of the Bulgarians in Macedonia became even more complicated after the bombings by Bulgarian revolutionaries and subsequent massacres there. In addition, the Ottomans became increasingly suspicious of demonstrations of closeness between the Balkan Orthodox states.

It is emphasized in this part of the chapter that both during the earlier negotiations between Sofia and Belgrade and at the signing of the official bilateral treaty of friendship and alliance on March 13, 1912, An. Toshev has been sidelined and not informed, which is yet another open act of disrespect on the part of the Bulgarian government to its representative in Belgrade, who is now tasked with defending clauses that were not discussed with him and to some extent contradict the views. The most adequate example is the fact that Sofia agreed to divide Macedonia into "disputed" and "undisputed" zone, which sharply contradicts the position already proclaimed by the Bulgarian diplomat to preserve the integrity of the region and grant autonomy. At the same time An. Toshev warned that Serbian oppression of Bulgarians in Macedonia continues even after the signing of the treaty and was encouraged the government to stand up to it. The rather complicated negotiations with Greece, which ended with the signing of a defensive alliance treaty on May 29, 1912, are also noted in this chapter.

In late August and early September 1912, An. Toshev traveled between Sofia and Belgrade on several occasions in order to coordinate a simultaneous military action that would start the war. In the end, although he was bypassed during the direct negotiations and the conclusion of the treaty with Serbia, the Bulgarian government accepted the draft agreement on the declaration of war prepared by An. Toshev's, which is nevertheless a certificate of the importance of the latter in the subsequent events. The resulting situation has seen an inexplicable hesitation on the part of the Serbs and Greeks, who up to that point had seemed firmly in favor of going to war. An analysis was made by Maria Valkova of both their motivations and their possible concerns that cause this behavior.

Eventually the position of indefinite waiting was abandoned and on September 30, 1912, the Allies mobilized their armies. Attention was paid to the attempts of the Serbs to belittle the territorial clauses of the signed treaty. The possible position of a neutral Romania is considered and Toshev warns that the territorial aspirations of Bucharest should not be

underestimated. An important nuance, which is reflected in the thesis, is the warning of the Bulgarian representative at the beginning of the hostilities, that Sofia must be very careful with the help offered by Serbia, which can be used for selfish purposes. The military strategies of the Allies, the progress of their armies on Ottoman territory and the diplomatic activity taking place against this backdrop are briefly discussed in this part of the second chapter.

An. Toshev clearly emphasizes that military successes must be used wisely in diplomatic negotiations, and his judicious approach makes a vivid impression, which is in no way clouded by the euphoric feelings spreading among the Bulgarian public after the good news from the front. In his reports, he appealed to the Bulgarian government to adhere as much as possible to the treaty with Serbia, especially for the territorial clauses, warning that Austria-Hungary would try in every possible way to break the Balkan Union.

The steps taken by the Ottoman Empire to conclude a truce are examined. On December 16, 1912, a peace conference was opened in London, following the progress of the negotiations and the relations between the countries of the Balkan Union against the backdrop of the conference.

At the end of the year An. Toshev presented a report to the Council of Ministers, with which he warned about possible territorial claims on the territories occupied by the Serbs, as well as about the fact that Bulgaria is no longer a profitable ally in view of Belgrade's future plans.

The denunciation of the truce and the resumption of hostilities are noted by Valkova. That further strained relations in the Balkan Union. The capture of Edirne by the Bulgarian army and its impact on military operations and diplomatic negotiations are duly highlighted.

In this part of the second chapter we see Sofia's attempts to seek assistance from the Entente against the excessive claims of Athens and Belgrade regarding the territorial clauses. Meanwhile, the Turks capitulate and begin negotiations for a new peace conference in London. In those few weeks, An. Toshev was under constant tension due to the strained relations between Bulgaria and Serbia. During this period, he traveled to Sofia several times, gave reports to the Council of Ministers and had meetings with the leaders of the opposition parties. Even after that An. Toshev is left without clear instructions on specific actions to take in Belgrade.

The ambassadorial conference of the Great Powers in St. Petersburg is also included in the second chapter, as is the decision to correct the Bulgarian-Romanian border.

This is followed by a review of acts of rapprochement between Serbs and Greeks on anti-Bulgarian grounds, followed by secret arrangements between the two sides, which confirms Toshev's suspicions of such ongoing processes.

On the way to the signing of the final London Peace Treaty (May 30, 1913), attention is once again paid to the persistent Serbian demands to abandon the territorial clauses of March 1912. Attention is drawn to Toshev and D. Rizov's conversations with the main figures at the General Headquarters of the Army. They were sent there with the aim to feel the mood in the army. Toshev reflects on the visit in a report to the Prime Minister, who meanwhile announces his intention to resign, which threatens to lead to even greater complications in the situation of the Kingdom. The tension within the government itself, crystallized in a disagreement between the ministers regarding a possible war with the former allies of Bulgaria as such scenario is considered.

Here Valkova mentions the appointment of the new government headed by St. Danev, again a coalition between the previous ruling parties, which has the task of finding a way out of the complex situation through diplomatic means. Events overtook these intentions and on June 29, 1913, the Tsar, provoked by the Serbian atrocities against the Bulgarians, gave orders to attack the positions of Serbs and Greeks in Macedonia. This ignites the so-called "Inter-Allied War". Although the Bulgarian government threatens Belgrade with the recall of An. Toshev even before the outbreak of the conflict, this became a fact only after Serbia and Greece broke off their relations with Bulgaria on July 5 and 6, 1913, which was the actual end of his mission in the Serbian capital.

The military actions and diplomatic negotiations to end the war are briefly traced, paying attention to the intervention of Romania and the Ottoman Empire, which turned the war into the Second Balkan war and pitted the Bulgarian army against five armies on three fronts.

The crisis that broke out led to the resignation of St. Danev and the appointment of a government composed of Radoslavists, Stambolovists and the so-called "Young liberals" with the aim of seeking support from the Central Powers against Bulgaria's Entente-affiliated opponents, with V. Radoslavov as Prime Minister. The circumstances and unfavorable conditions at the signing of the Bucharest Peace are presented.

The next stage of Toshev's diplomatic career is related to his involvement as a delegate in the bilateral Bulgarian-Turkish peace negotiations. Again, there is a lack of clear instructions to the delegation, despite its meetings with the Tsar and his sons. However, the main objective of the several formal and informal meetings between the delegations crystallized – the

clarification of the border, with the question of the fate of the respective minorities being discussed in detail.

Also touched upon is the short-lived Republic of Gyumri, as well as the resistance of some of the Turkish leaders in Western Thrace against the accommodation of the Bulgarian authorities. The Treaty of Constantinople was signed on September 29, 1913. Despite the efforts of An. Toshev and the other delegates, the clauses do not fully cover the goals of the Bulgarian representatives. After the end of the peace conference, it was decided that Toshev was to be appointed as Bulgarian ambassador to Constantinople. This coincided with a period of rapprochement between the two countries and, at this initial stage, his mission was to keep the good relationship. A key issue connected to that was the status of Western Thrace and the behavior of the Ottoman authorities when it came to the Bulgarians in Eastern Thrace. No less important is the case with the refugees, as in conducting the negotiations An. Toshev followed the instructions given to him by the Foreign Minister N. Genadiev and launched the idea of forming a mixed commission. However, An. Toshev advises to prolong the matter as much as possible, because if such a convention is concluded, it would only benefit the Ottoman Empire. V. Radoslavov accepts the idea of delaying the negotiations, noting that Bulgaria can conclude such a convention if it needs it and encourages An. Toshev to continue the successful maneuvering, during which he gives the impression that he is working for a closer rapprochement with Constantinople.

Hypothetical options for political combinations in the Balkans are examined in detail, with St. Petersburg increasingly insisting on improving relations between Serbia and Bulgaria. The Russian representative in Constantinople, M. Girs, met Toshev's firm and reasoned refusal. The Bulgarian representative attaches serious importance to the Greek-Turkish disputes over the islands in the Aegean Sea, because he believes that this topic may prove to be decisive for the behavior of the Ottoman foreign policy in Thrace. A curious detail are his recommendations for rapprochement with the USA, pointing out possible advantage for both sides.

During the service of Toshev in Constantinople the idea of a military convention was also discussed. Such idea is seen as the first step towards a Bulgarian-Turkish-Romanian union. Negotiations for the signing of a trade agreement, as well as for a postal and telegraph convention, also began. At that time, a cooling of relations between the two countries was observed. The Ottomans dragged out the negotiations for the trade treaty with Bulgaria, causing Toshev to worry mainly because this would delay a withdrawal of the Ottoman

authorities from Western Thrace and again the issue of the Bulgarians living there would remain pending.

It's once again underlined that Toshev's tactic is not to rush into ties with surrounding countries until all the circumstances are clear. The topic of the above-mentioned Bulgarian-Turkish-Romanian union was one of the main ones during his entire service in Constantinople. In this part of the second chapter, several conversations between the Bulgarian representative and the Ottoman rulers on the subject are examined in detail. It also focuses on the attempts of the Central Powers to force such an alliance, so that they can secure the friendship of the three countries at once, with which they can finally gain the upper hand against the encroachments of the Entente in the Balkans. Time will show that such an alliance was never made.

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand found Toshev still in office in the Ottoman Empire. In the situation that has arisen, the role of Bulgaria is predicted to be decisive, given its geographical position and its recent defeats against the neighboring countries. The thesis reflects the opinion of the Central Powers that Sofia would be the most suitable ally in the looming war against Serbia.

It is important to note that An. Toshev was the first to report the ever-approaching possibility of an outbreak of an armed conflict, given the bellicose mood in Austria-Hungary. His German counterpart insists that Bulgaria should join the Central Powers very soon and promises great positives for the Kingdom. This behavior of his is not at all accidental, given the above-mentioned views of Bulgaria's role in dealing with the threat from Serbia. Firmly disagreeing, the Bulgarian diplomat strongly advises the government not only to maintain neutrality, but also to demand "appropriate retribution" for its non-intervention in the event of localizing the conflict and limiting it to an Austro-Serbian war.

In the coming weeks, the topic of how Bulgaria should react to the escalating conflict becomes central for the members of the Bulgarian diplomatic corps, who express their theses before the cabinet. Anne's position. Toshev remains steadfast. Despite Toshev's advice, the cabinet in Sofia plans to begin soundings for a possible accession of the Kingdom to the Triple Alliance. Against the backdrop of these events, the Bulgarian representative informed the government of V. Radoslavov that the negotiations between the Ottoman Empire and Germany were going in a positive direction, but Constantinople was still extremely keen on Bulgaria's inclusion in the war and would not commit firmly without guarantees that Sofia will join too.

Meanwhile, the pressure on Toshev by the Russian representative M. Girs continued. The latter tried to convince his Bulgarian colleague of the benefits of the accession of the Kingdom to the Entente, ergo Bulgaria is expected to help the Serbs. This met Toshev's adamant stance that under no circumstances would the Bulgarians support their western neighbor.

During this period, the contacts between Constantinople and Sofia were extremely intense, and An. Toshev had a pivotal role in that. The Turks continued to press for an agreement towards the proposals of the Central Powers. At the same time An. Toshev was campaigned by his Austrian and German colleagues, Marquess von Pallavicini and Baron von Wangenheim, that Bulgaria's priority should not be the Balkan combinations, but its direct ties with Vienna and Berlin. Somehow contradictory, clear instructions have been sent from Sofia to start negotiations with Turkey, which would be a bridge to the country's accession to the Central Powers. Although An. Toshev didn't take any action concerning this idea, the government itself did. Toshev was not informed about deepening the negotiations, but a concrete result was reached only on August 19, 1914 with the signing of a Bulgarian-Turkish treaty. Ultimately, the treaty was not ratified by either side, which invalidated it. Notified about that failure and influenced from it, An. Toshev continues to defend the position of strict neutrality until the last possible moment and warns to be careful with Turkey because its moods change too often.

Valkova also mentions that the Entente's welcomed and encouraged the neutrality maintained by Bulgaria. This was further helped by a change in the cabinet in Sofia, as the Ministry of War was entrusted to Gen. I. Fichev, a figure openly approved by the Brits and the French.

Also noted in the thesis is Toshev's reasoning that the pressure on Bulgaria to end its neutrality is provoked by the fact that Sofia is a sought-after ally. He therefore advises the government to carefully consider how to use this to ensure dividends for the country. He points out that this is the way to communicate with both sides. Toshev's firm position suddenly became a problem for Radoslavov's plans, which is proven by the fact that the Prime Minister did not submit his reports for discussion in the Council of Ministers. At this very moment An. Toshev warned that the inclusion of the Ottoman Empire in the war might benefit the Central Powers, but would catalyze the process of including Greece and Romania in the Agreement, ergo it could prove to be dangerous for Bulgaria. At this stage of the war, the Entente changed their tactics in an attempt to engage the Bulgarians and threatened them that they would receive absolutely nothing in return for their neutrality. Toshev is informed

about that threat, but nevertheless maintains his firm position of neutrality. The involvement of the Ottoman Empire in the war further cemented this. One of the main arguments that Toshev used before the representatives of the Central Powers in Constantinople that the intervention of neutral countries would push peace even further.

In this tense situation, An. Toshev receives a new appointment, this time in one of the capitals of the Central Powers - Vienna. In the first months of his appointment, he already began to feel pressure on himself, and hence also on the Kingdom. The Austrians insisted that Bulgaria should abandon the position of neutrality and should join the Central Powers. Precisely on this occasion, are the words of Foreign Minister I. Burian, who directly stated to the Bulgarian representative that no one would receive a reward for their neutrality and that the Central Powers can only guarantee the territories that are actually occupied by Bulgarian troops. That advice that can also be seen as a threat is underline repeatedly in the next few weeks.

The proposals of the Entente remained uncertain even after the start of the Dardanelles operation, during which the Entente powers considered a possible inclusion of the Bulgarians as key to a successful outcome. It was during this period that the interest in attracting Bulgaria grew more and more. However, there was a rift among the leaders of the Entente, caused by Russia's disagreement with the British proposals to Sofia. With the beginning of the summer, we see a clear change of mind from the government in Sofia. The idea that the Kingdom should abandon its claim for the Midia-Enos line and form its expectations based on avoiding unnecessary conflicts with the Ottoman Empire arises. The pressure on An. Toshev in Vienna continues, but he categorically supports the position of V. Radoslavov for acquisitions as a reward for the neutrality and emphasizes that Bulgaria prefers to act by peaceful means until the last possible moment, hoping to obtain the approval of both groups for territorial expansion of this base.

Meanwhile, the German military successes continued and on July 25 V. Radoslavov expressed readiness to start negotiations for alliance treaties with the countries of the Central Powers, guaranteeing the territorial integrity of the country, and for its previous neutrality the Kingdom should receive the "undisputed" and "disputed zone" in Vardar Macedonia. A proposal also came from the Entente, but it seems far more uncertain.

Meanwhile, there is preparation of a joint action by Berlin and Vienna against the Serbs and the intervention of Bulgaria is also expected and seen as instrumental. An. Toshev again advises the government that the Kingdom remain neutral and explains in detail the possible consequences in each of the possible scenarios of military action. In his reports from this

period, An. Toshev thoroughly examines and analyzes the reasons why Germany and Austria-Hungary sought Bulgaria's cooperation. Against this backdrop, we again see how the Bulgarian diplomat is isolated from the deepening negotiations for the inclusion of Bulgaria in the war, as in 1911-1912, probably because of his unwavering opinion in defense of the neutrality. In this context, An. Toshev advises Radoslavov to continue insisting that Bulgaria's neutrality actually contributes to the successes of the Central Powers, because this way the Balkans remain relatively calm, which helps their cause. All these reflections of his prove to meaningless in the situation that the cabinet in Sofia has already chosen its path.

On September 6, the Kingdom of Bulgaria officially joined the Central Powers. Its intervention was shaped by the signing on that day of four separate documents – a Bulgarian-German treaty, a secret agreement as an addition to the latter, a Bulgarian-Turkish convention (all three signed in Sofia) and a military convention between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria (signed in the Pszczyna Castle in present-day Poland). Unaware of what had happened, a week later, on September 13, the Entente sent another proposition to the Bulgarian government with uncertain promises about the “undisputed” zone in Macedonia, without first obtaining the consent of the Serbs on the subject. In order to further strengthen the pending situation, V. Radoslavov clarified in a circular that Bulgaria is moving into a phase of armed neutrality, but emphasized that this does not mean starting military operations. The reaction of the Entente was very sharp, going as far as a threat from Russia and recalling the plenipotentiary ministers from Sofia. On October 14, 1915, the Kingdom of Bulgaria declared war on Serbia, officially entering the First World War.

In the meantime, the Bulgarian government decided to strengthen its positions in one of the neutral countries - Switzerland, and on November 4, 1915, An. Toshev left for Bern to hand over his credentials. He combined the two positions until October 23, 1916, when he was informed that the position in Bern became permanent and would be occupied by S. Radev.

In this part of the chapter Valkova indicates that the signs of rapprochement of Greeks and Romanians with the Entente are seen as a problem for Bulgaria. Meanwhile, V. Radoslavov expresses suspicion that the Austrians are trying to provoke his resignation. Rather disappointed from this reaction, An. Toshev advises him to concentrate on state affairs and not his own well-being. It is noteworthy that the Bulgarian diplomat stands behind his superiors in Sofia, despite his personal opinion of maintaining neutrality and protecting against hasty decisions, which was not taken into account by them at all. In a series of reports, he followed and analyzed carefully not only the statements and attitude of Austria-Hungary

towards the situation in Europe, but also followed the tendencies in Austria-Hungary's internal affairs.

The inclusion of Romania and Greece in the war on the side of the Entente provoked Toshev to reflect again on the current situation around the fronts of the war and on the future conditions for concluding peace treaties. The idea of peace, initiated by the US President W. Wilson, began to gain more and more popularity. It was proposed that the belligerent states should submit drafts of the conditions under which peace might be concluded. The Bulgarian government's requests include Macedonia, Dobrudja and the district around the Morava river. The Cabinet sent Washington and the neutral countries a memoir containing justification for Bulgaria's territorial claims.

One of the main topics in the Toshev's period as the Bulgarian representative in Vienna, is the internal political situation there – changes in the government, the reaction of the Dualist Empire during the war and the various reasons for its instability, as well as the desire from the beginning of 1917 to gradually break away from Germany.

An. Toshev is convinced that the outbreak of the February Revolution will speed up the peace process. His opinion on the role the US would play in a possible entry into the war, which contrasts with that of Germany, is also examined by Valkova.

As underlined in the thesis, An. Toshev continued to protect Bulgarian interests at every moment of the war, even if the cabinet did not listen to his advice. The firm position on the governance in Northern Dobrudja, on which he persistently and consistently defends the idea of being Bulgarian, is impressive.

The course of events changed decisively with the coup d'état carried out in Russia on October 25, 1917. The new Russian rulers launched the idea of concluding a peace without annexations and contributions, which idea was willingly accepted by the Austrian foreign minister Count Ottokar Chernin. This does not coincide with the position of the Bulgarian cabinet, because it would mean another unsuccessful attempt on the achieving the so-called "national ideal".

The progress of the negotiations for the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty between Russia and the Central Powers is also closely followed in the thesis. The Entente did not respond to the invitation to participate. On January 30, V. Radoslavov left for Brest-Litovsk, accompanied by An. Toshev and Iv. Stoyanovich. The main task of the Bulgarian delegation is to provide assistance to the Germans and the Austrians without discussing issues of Bulgarian borders. The meetings held, the terms of the peace, and Toshev's role in the process are analyzed by Valkova. Also presented, are his views on the Dobrudja issue where

he analyzes the interests of each of the parties involved in the issue. The position of the Cabinet in Sofia regarding possible concessions are examined and the author of thesis stressed on the fact that they contradict with the views stated by D. Rizov in Berlin - that the Bulgarian government should not and will not sign the peace treaty with Romania, in which Dobrudja is ceded to the allied forces and entirely up to Bulgaria.

On June 21, a coalition government was formed from the Democratic and Radical Democratic parties. Al. Malinov once again was chosen for the PM position, in order to use the democratic leader's well-known pro-Entente positions. The Ottoman territorial claims to Bulgaria are also closely examined by Valkova.

In his reports to the Bulgarian government, An. Toshev increasingly touches on the topic of internal political instability in the Dual Monarchy. Another important issue is the eventual loss, which seems more and more likely. Austria-Hungary proposed to open negotiations with the Allied Powers, but according to An. Toshev, this can happen only if Germany also participates in them. He advises the Bulgarian government that even at this moment the maximum and minimum aspirations of the Kingdom must be specified.

Territorial disturbances deepen Bulgaria's disadvantageous position. The Central Empires insist that Dobrudja can be transferred to Bulgaria only if it cedes to the Ottoman Empire the territory along the eastern bank of the Maritsa River with the Edirne station. A scenario that seems unacceptable to the Cabinet in Sofia.

In the ensuing crisis after the Dobro Pole breakthrough, the Bulgarian government sought to limit the damage by looking for opportunities for a truce with the representatives of the USA, Great Britain and Switzerland, for which the Central Powers accused Sofia of disloyalty. Despite that, on September 29, the Thessaloniki Armistice was signed, marking the beginning of Bulgaria's withdrawal from the war. An. Toshev reports that Vienna looks with hope towards the approaching peace and a secession from Berlin seems more and more real. The internal political problems in the Empire continued, with the Bulgarian representative presenting to the attention of the cabinet his detailed analysis of some of the events and reasons that led to the collapse of the failing empire. These turned out to be some of his last reports, sent from the capital of the now-disintegrated empire, because An. Toshev voluntarily retired from the diplomatic career in 1919.

The third chapter - "The last quarter century of Andrey Toshev's life" – examines his public, scientific and publicist activity, with an important emphasis being placed on the period April - November 1935, when he held the post of Prime Minister.

In the first part, which covers the period 1919-1935, there is not much information about his activities. At the beginning of 1932, An. Toshev participated in the signing of the Albanian-Bulgarian protocol for the mutual protection of the respective minorities in both countries, but Albania did not ratify the document and it did not have any effect on the subsequent situation of the Bulgarian living there. In March 1933 Ann. Toshev was invited to be a part of the Bulgarian delegation for the conference of the Council of the Balkan Conference, where he participated in the drafting of a memorandum for the protection of the relevant minorities in Bulgaria and Romania. Along with these commitments, An. Toshev selflessly participated in a series of "free people's conferences, where the downtrodden minorities appealed to the world to protect their promised rights" as he calls them, where the Bulgarian people sought to popularize their cause, which did not meet with understanding and sympathy from the governments in Europe.

The next part is dedicated to one of the key moments in Toshev overall activity, namely his appointment as Prime Minister. The internal political situation in the country, the general trends emerging in the administration, as well as the most important factors influencing them are examined in detail. It reflects on the reasons and motives of Tsar Boris III for choosing the experienced diplomat for this position. As the most likely reason, Valkova points at the desire of the monarch to intervene directly in the decisions concerning the country's political orientation and to isolate the influence of the architects of 19 May coup d'état. Attention is also paid to the manifesto for the appointment of Toshev's Cabinet, where there is no mention of the restoration of the party-parliamentary regime. The composition of the cabinet is indicated, and an attempt is made to reflect on King Boris III's choice of personnel.

The tasks of the government, both in domestic and foreign policy terms, are examined in detail. The priority in domestic policy is the achievement of legality and peace in the country, and in foreign policy - rapprochement with the neighbors, especially with Yugoslavia. The reaction of the French, Austrian, German, Romanian, Serbian and Greek press to Toshev's appointment is examined closely.

The continuing trend to issue ordinance laws is traced, presenting and analyzing some of the more key ones of Toshev's administration. Programs for financial and social reforms have been drawn up, and some of the measures taken have been reviewed. The attacks by the political opponents of the government, that the activities of the National Assembly are not

restored, as well as the PM's reaction, are briefly presented. On this occasion, he promised the creation of a new parliament, which was approved by some political circles. The role of the Military Union as a factor is examined, as well as the effort to limit its political weight. The domestic political situation is presented against the backdrop of the rumor that a coup against the government is being prepared, which is used as an excuse by the Cabinet to declare martial law in the country. The attempts to improve the relations with the neighbors are presented, and it is in this spirit that the trade agreement concluded with Turkey, which does not achieve its hidden goal of improving relations between the two countries in political terms. Attempts to improve relations with the USSR were also tracked, which was reflected only in the conclusion of a postal convention. Germany continues to be the country with which the government of An. Toshev maintains the most intense relationships.

One of the main topics of the Toshev cabinet is the drafting of a new constitution. The origin of the idea for such a thing, as well as the reasons that led to it, are briefly discussed. In the end, two draft constitutions were drafted. The goals, ideas and changes that went into the development of the two options are presented. The reaction of some of the contemporaries of the draft constitution is analyzed, among them are the former PMs N. Mushanov and Al. Tzankov.

The trends related to the dissatisfaction generated among the former political circles by the empty promises of not returning the parliamentary regime have also been traced. Their main wishes sent to the Tsar and some of the main reasons that led to instability in the cabinet and hence to his resignation on 23 November 1935 are briefly discussed.

An attempt was made to estimate the seven months in which Ann. Toshev heads the cabinet and at the same time his opinion is presented, reflected mostly in the press.

Both comments by his contemporaries and those that appeared in later scientific studies are analyzed.

In the last part of this chapter, a brief overview of some of Anne's scientific publications is made. Toshev. It is noted that although a professional botanist, he did remarkable historical and ethnographic research on certain topics.

His book "The Balkan Wars", published in two volumes, tracing the events of the period 1911 - 1913, is briefly presented. Some of the comments of prominent lawyers, linguists and public figures, who indicate the importance of the book and give their positive evaluations of it, are reviewed by Valkova.

An. Toshev is also interested in Poland, provoked by his frequent trips to the country. He is also an active participant in the Polish-Bulgarian Society, founded in 1918 and was later elected as Chairman.

Serbia as a topic is also present in some of Toshev's works. He makes either a brief historical overview of Bulgarian-Serbian relations or refutes the Serbian claims for Macedonia with historical facts and analysis of events.

The fate of the Macedonian Bulgarians continues to preoccupy An. Toshev and that can be seen in his writings. Even years after the end of his diplomatic career in these lands, he returns to them and recalls with nostalgia the times when he was a direct champion of the cause of his countrymen in these lands.

An. Toshev died on January 10, 1944 as a result of the heaviest of the series of bombings over Sofia in WWII. An overview of his entire activity as a politician, statesman and diplomat is made in the conclusion of the thesis. His key appointments and actions during his time as Prime Minister are also reflected upon there.

Articles:

1. The early years of Andrey Toshev
2. Andrey Toshev as Bulgarian plenipotentiary in Athens and the Macedonian question
3. Macedonia after Ilinden-Preobrazhenie Uprising and the Bulgarian Bulgarian trade attaché in Bitola Andrey Toshev