

UDC 930.85(4-12)

ISSN 0350-7653

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

BALCANICA

XLVI

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief

DUŠAN T. BATAKOVIĆ

Director of the Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

Editorial Board

JEAN-PAUL BLED (Paris), LJUBOMIR MAKSIMOVIĆ,
ZORAN MILUTINOVIĆ (London), DANICA POPOVIĆ, BILJANA SIKIMIĆ,
SPIRIDON SFETAS (Thessaloniki), GABRIELLA SCHUBERT (Jena),
NIKOLA TASIĆ, SVETLANA M. TOLSTAJA (Moscow)

BELGRADE
2015



you do but usurp authority, the Orientals instantly, and as a matter of course, obey.”

The third chapter of the book is devoted to diplomats and deals with the first part of the nineteenth century. Even though Kostić makes use of some new sources, this chapter does not bring as much as the previous ones in terms of new ideas and new perspectives on the period that the book covers. The fourth and final chapter is about literature. Kostić starts with Dositej Obradović and his connections with Great Britain, but by far the most interesting section is the one about Petar Petrović, the Serbian Orthodox bishop of Timisoara in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Kostić’s analysis of the content of Petrović’s library introduces readers to the intellectual world of an Orthodox bishop whose library contained more than one thousand volumes, including Thomas Paine’s *Rights of Man*. As far as is known, he was also the first Serb who had William Shakespeare’s works in his library. Kostić pays attention not only to British influences on Serbs but also to Serbian motifs in British poetry and prose which, consistent with contemporary political developments, were mostly motifs of wars and battles.

Overall, the book reviewed here is a significant contribution to scholarship, especially to historiography on the eighteenth century. What seems to be its only flaw is its title. It is by no means a history of bilateral relations between two countries. It is unclear what Serbia was in, for instance, 1700 or in 1800? Contemporary cartographers did not have a clear answer.³ What adds to the confusion is the author’s statement that he had in mind Serbia in its present-day borders and, therefore, there is no reference to Serbs in Montenegro, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, etc. Readers should also be aware that the index, compiled with little care, is imprecise and that some names are missing.

³ E.g., in 1734 the British cartographer Herman Moll drew “A general map of Turkey in Europe” where Serbia, as a historic region, included areas as far south as Skopje. See *Belgrade above the Danube: According to European Cartographic Sources between XVI and XIX Century* (Belgrade City Library, 2008), xlvii, xlvi.

BILGIN ÇELİK, *İTTİHATÇILAR VE ARNAVUTLAR. II. MEŞRUTİYET DÖNEMİNDE ARNAVUT ULUŞÇULUĞU VE ARNAVUTLUK SORUNU* [THE UNIONISTS AND THE ALBANIANS. ALBANIAN NATIONALISM AND THE ALBANIAN QUESTION IN THE SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL PERIOD]. ISTANBUL: BÜKE KİTAPLARI, 2004, 537 p.

Reviewed by Ognjen Krešić*

The author of the book reviewed here, Dr Bilgin Çelik, is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Literature of Dokuz Eylül University in İzmir, Chair in Modern History, and head of the Balkan Region Research Centre. His main area of interest is Ottoman politics during the last

decades of the Empire, and especially the Albanian component in the complexity of Ottoman politics and society.

* Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

The place of Albanians in early twentieth-century Ottoman politics was quite prominent but it was also marked by some ambivalence. Some Albanian intellectuals were among the founders of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP, in Ottoman Turkish: *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*),¹ the reform political organisation which was to play a decisive political role after the reinstatement of the Constitution following the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Involved in the activities of the CUP from its inception, the Albanians began to have disagreements with its policies soon after the promulgation of the Constitution. It was a turbulent and important period which, however, is not sufficiently studied in Turkish historiography. Bilgin Çelik addresses it from the perspective of the usual Ottoman concept of religious communities but also from the perspective of the creation and development of national identities. He reviews and sums up the relevant literature from the period under study until the present. His research also relies on the documentary sources produced both by the Ottoman central authorities and by the Albanian organisations and leading politicians, as well as the contemporary press.

A short foreword and introduction (pp. 11–15) are followed by the bulk of the book which is divided into four chapters (pp. 31–522) and ends with a conclusion (pp. 523–527) and bibliography (pp. 529–536). Çelik adopts a combination of chronological and problem-oriented approaches, which has its strengths and its

drawbacks. Selecting several important aspects or topics of the Albanian national movement in the Ottoman Empire and its relationship with the ruling CUP, the author seeks to present them in their chronological order. In that way, the reader can easily find an overview of each highlighted topic. On the other hand, some important topics are recurrently discussed and bits of information are scattered throughout the book, producing many overlaps between chapters and frequent repetitions.

The first chapter, “The Birth of Albanian Nationalism” (*Arnavut Usluşuluğu'nun Doğuşu*) (pp. 31–88), offers a historical overview of the cultural and political influences that inspired the creation of several Albanian movements of a national nature in the nineteenth century. Besides factors such as geopolitical rivalries and overlapping interests of the Great Powers and, later in the century, newly-independent Balkan states, the Albanian movements were marked by internal and mutual differences to a degree uncommon among the other peoples of the Empire. The Albanians were predominantly Muslims but the number of Christians was also considerable. Moreover, among the Christian Albanians were both Roman Catholics and Orthodox, and among the Muslims there was a considerable influence of the Bektashi dervish order. As a result, different sections of the Albanian people were responsive to different foreign influences and enjoyed different standings in the Empire. Yet, they developed common goals, and the aspiration for autonomy and the use of mother tongue as the language of instruction and local administration was gradually articulated. It was in order to achieve those goals that Albanian intellectuals entered Ottoman politics. Since the autocratic regime of Abdul Hamid II blocked any ambitious plan for reform, however, the need arose for closer relations between

¹ Although the CUP was strongly intertwined with the Young Turk movement, the two were not fully overlapping and cannot be fully equated with one another. For that reason the author chose to use the term “Unionists” commonly used for the members of the CUP in Turkish historiography, and not the term “Young Turks” common in the West.

prominent Albanian political figures and the Young Turks and the CUP.

The second chapter, "Constitutionalism and the Albanians" (*Meşrutiyet ve Arnavutlar*) (pp. 88–202), is focused on the Albanian attitude towards the new political system put in place by the Constitution, and on their relations with the most influential political organisation of the period, the CUP. Even before 1908, there had been internal disagreements in the CUP about the way in which the Empire should be reformed. The most prominent Albanian political figures, such as Ibrahim Temo and Ismail Qemali, supported Prince Sabahaddin's Private Enterprise and Decentralisation Association which gradually distanced itself from the CUP and its highly centralised vision of the Empire. The author also draws attention to the fact that Prince Sabahaddin and his supporters, unlike the other Young Turks who embraced the concepts of Islamism, Ottomanism and Turkism, envisaged a confederal state. Nevertheless, the CUP, exploiting the fear of foreign intervention and the imposition of reforms unwanted by the Albanian leaders, managed to secure Albanian support, especially in military circles, even though their interests and plans were sometimes diametrically opposite. Thus the role of Albanians in the Young Turk revolution was quite important.

In the second part of this chapter Çelik shows that this alliance was short-lived, and that soon after the restoration of the Constitution political dissent arose between Albanian proponents of different policies. Conservative Albanians, mostly from Kosovo, expected the Constitution to provide for a better implementation of the sharia law and the protection of their traditional privileges, while more liberal-minded Albanians supported the enactment of the highest law of the state because they saw it as an opportunity to finally obtain official support for the

opening and spread of Albanian schools and the use of mother tongue in education and the press, which they expected would eventually result in the achievement of territorial autonomy. The author gives exhaustive information about the participation of Albanian politicians in the work of the Ottoman parliament and their connections with different parties. The greatest attention is naturally paid to the question of the ambiguous relationship between Albanians and the CUP. From the information presented, it appears that the Albanian deputies devoted most of their time in parliamentary discussions to the question of education and the use of language.

Recognising the importance of these questions for the Albanian national movement, Çelik devotes a whole chapter to their analysis: "The Cultural Dimension of Albanian Nationalism" (*Arnavut Ulusçuşunun Kültürel Boyutu*) (pp. 203–344). The activities of the Albanian intelligentsia towards cultural and political development were diverse, and the author divides them into the founding of various societies and committees, the press, and the convening of a series of congresses. All those activities were initiated abroad because the sultan's autocratic regime did not look benevolently on the autonomous wishes of his subjects. The Albanian associations had both political and cultural aspirations from the start. Those founded before 1908 advocated the use of the Albanian language and, especially, the adoption of an appropriate alphabet, the improvement and expansion of education in Albanian, as well as the translation and publication of important books. At the same time, the secret society "Central Committee for the Defence of the Rights of the Albanian People", founded in 1878 in reaction to the significant change of the political map of the Balkans, formulated for the first time the idea of unification of the provinces inhabited by Al-

banians² and of political autonomy. Such ideas would be later propagated by organisations such as the Leagues of Prizren and Peć. The Constitution of 1908 gave rise to a further increase in the number of Albanian societies. Of special importance was the network of societies called Bashkimi (Unity), founded in major cities of the Ottoman Empire inhabited by Albanians. These societies continued the work on the question of alphabet and education in Albanian, although the political aspect of Albanian unification and autonomy was also present. Within the first ten months following the promulgation of the Constitution more than sixty cultural and political clubs were founded, which is telling evidence of the extent of Albanian activities. Among the most important centres were Istanbul, Thessaloniki, Monastir (Bitola), Shkoder, and Durres. The author also provides information about conservative Albanian associations which called for the preservation of traditions and the use of the Arabic alphabet. He also observes that Albanian intellectuals living abroad were by far more radical in their plans and expectations for the Albanian future than those who lived in the Empire. The former were eager to achieve Albanian interests through full independence from the Ottomans,

² Çelik repeatedly denotes four Ottoman provinces or *vilayets* (of Janina, Kosovo, Monastir and Scutari) as Albanian. Although they were so named in the Albanian proclamations demanding the creation of an “Albanian vilayet”, it was not their official denomination and they were far from being exclusively inhabited by Albanians. They accounted for 44% of the population in the four vilayets. Besides, the author often wrongly denotes the major towns in those provinces as Albanian. Presumably his motive was to avoid over-repetition of the terms, but they are anachronisms nevertheless.

while the latter retained a sense of belonging to Ottoman society and wished to have the backing of the central authority for their plans. All of these activities crystallised at the Albanian congresses, to which much attention is paid in the book. The main subject of dispute at the congresses, which were held successively in Monastir (1908), Debar (1909), Elbasan (1909) and again in Monastir (1910), was the question of the alphabet. Although the conservatives, backed by the CUP, kept on supporting the use of the Arabic alphabet as a symbol of belonging to a broader Islamic civilisation and a bar to Western cultural influences, the majority of Albanian intellectuals adopted a modified Latin alphabet as the most appropriate for the Albanian language. Besides the language issue, the congress participants insisted on the importance of education in mother tongue, and on the widening of the network of Albanian schools. Çelik stresses that the cultural aspect of these discussions was always combined with a political one because the achievement of cultural privileges and rights was seen as a step closer to political autonomy, even independence. The CUP was generally opposed to the activities of the Albanian societies and congresses, and relied upon the conservative sections of the Albanian people. Towards the end of the period the Unionists, faced with an increasingly complex geopolitical situation, tried to win over broader Albanian circles by partially consenting to their demands in the area of education, but these reforms were cut short by the Balkan Wars.

Throughout the period under study, 1908–1912, disputes between the ruling CUP and Albanians led to frequent armed conflicts. The Albanian armed revolts are the subject of the last chapter, “The Albanian Question and the Albanian Uprisings” (*Arnavutluk Sorunu ve Arnavutluk İsyamları*) (pp. 345–522). The roots of the Albanian Question, and of

the disagreements between the CUP and the Albanian leaders, lay in the basic political tenets of the new Ottoman government. The Unionists envisioned a unified and reformed Empire, free from both foreign influences and internal differences. Privileges and special accommodations to different ethnic and religious groups did not fit well with the policy of centralisation and promotion of common Ottoman identity irrespective of other affiliations. On the other hand, the Albanian political and intellectual leaders saw decentralisation and the achievement of broad cultural and political rights as the only way for them to remain within the Ottoman state. Some of the uprisings were local in character, motivated by opposition to the modernisation process or tax and mobilisation reforms launched by the CUP, but the author nevertheless draws attention to the fact that local Albanian notables on the one hand and politicians and intellectuals on the other eventually found common ground and began to work ever more towards Albanian independence.

Çelik describes every uprising in great detail and gives much attention not only to armed conflicts but also to political aspects and parliamentary debates. The first Albanian armed revolt, provoked by the attempt to collect weapons and levy new taxes, started in Peç in 1909 and was quickly quelled, but a more serious revolt broke out next year, again mainly in the province of Kosovo. This time it involved not only Muslim but also Catholic Albanians, and was also marked by foreign involvement, such as Montenegrin and Austro-Hungarian. Even more complex was the next year's revolt known as the Malissori Uprising. This uprising saw the proclamation of Albanian short-lived independence by Terenzio Tocci, an Albanian from Italy, but more important was the so-called Gerçe Memorandum or the Red Book drawn up by Ismail Qemali,

one of the most prominent Albanian politicians in the Ottoman parliament, and the Albanian tribal leaders. The memorandum stated Albanian long-standing demands such as the use of Albanian in schools, the employment of Albanian officials, the privilege of doing military service only in Albanian-inhabited provinces, etc. The Ottoman government soon decided that a peaceful way of ending the conflict was preferable to the continuation of fighting. A general amnesty was granted and the main Albanian demands were met. The last Albanian uprising took place in 1912, and was marked by cooperation between local leaders and the most prominent Albanian politicians and members of parliament, such as Hassan Prishtine and Nexhip Draga. They professed allegiance to the sultan, but claimed that the CUP's insistence on some constitutional changes and meddling into the ongoing election process called for a change of government. Based on the demands put forth a year before, they drew up a new list of demands where political autonomy for the Albanians retained the central place. The uprising spread quickly, and it was joined by deserting Albanian officers and soldiers. The government was compelled to enter into negotiations with Albanians, and the uprising ended when it conceded to their demands. Autonomy was finally gained, but it would soon become evident that the compromise was achieved too late as only a month later a war between an alliance of Balkan states and the Ottoman Empire began. Although the Albanians remained divided on the question of independence versus autonomy within the Empire until the end, the independence faction prevailed. Ismail Qemali presided over the congress in Vlore (Valona) where on 28 November 1912 independent Albania was proclaimed. Çelik ends the book by considering the course and results of the Balkan Wars, mainly subscribing to the views of Noel Mal-

colm. The Albanians, like the Ottomans, saw the outcome of the Balkan Wars as a defeat because they had failed to unite the four provinces of the Empire that were populated by Albanians in a greater or smaller degree, but the author stresses that the Unionists' policies, the Albanian armed revolts and the lack of military discipline due to conflicts between Albanian and Unionist officers greatly contributed to the final outcome of the war.

Çelik's book offers a comprehensive picture of Albanian political and cultural history in the last decades of the Ottoman Empire. Being a broad overview, some topics are examined in more depth than others, and therefore the presentation of

the latter mostly relies on the existing literature (mostly Turkish or available in Turkish translation). A very prominent aspect of the book is in that the author gives the Ottoman perspective on many problems, which is very important for fully understanding some of the most crucial issues of Balkan history but which is often under-researched. This book can be highly useful to those interested in the extremely complicated political situation in the Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the roots and development of the so-called *Albanian Question*, but also to those interested in how contemporary Turkish historiography views this period.

KRÜST'O MANCHEV, *SÛRBILA I SÛRBSKO-BÛLGARSKITE OTNOSHENILA 1804–2010*
[SERBIA AND SERBIAN-BULGARIAN RELATIONS 1804–2010]. SOFIA: PARADIGMA,
2014, 499 p.

Reviewed by Jelena N. Radosavljević*

The author of the book reviewed here, Krüst'o Manchev, is a Bulgarian historian who, it may be curious to note, was born in the village of Verzar near Caribrod (present-day Dimitrovgrad) in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1926. He graduated in history from the University of Sofia, and then pursued his further studies in the Democratic Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union. He worked as a fellow of the Institute for Balkan Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Manchev published several books on the history of Balkan peoples, but the area of his special interest is the history of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Serbia.

Manchev's book on Serbian-Bulgarian relations opens with a preface in which he expresses his view that Serbian-Bulgarian relations through history have not been adequately studied and that his book is an attempt to improve such a state of re-

search. The book is divided into two parts. The first part, *Serbia 1804–2010*, is subdivided into five chapters: "The Serbian national revolution"; "State and political development"; "National policy"; "Serbia at the time of wars (1912–1918)"; and "Serbia in Yugoslavia". The second part, *Serbian-Bulgarian relations*, consists of six chapters: "National-territorial demarcation"; "Serbia and Bulgaria in the wars of 1912–1918"; "Under the Versailles status quo (1919–1941)"; "In Hitler's 'New Order'"; "Under communism (1944–1989)"; and "Bulgaria and the end of Yugoslavia (1990–2010)".

The first two chapters span the period from the beginning of the Serbian revolution (1804) through the Principality of

* Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia doctoral research holder