

## **BULGARIA'S ENTRY AND PARTICIPATION OF IN WORLD WAR I AS SEEN BY THE BRITISH JOURNALIST JAMES D. BOUCHIER**

Prof. Dr. Roumen Genov (New Bulgarian University)

The press in modern times, had risen to the position of major cultural and political factor, and played important propaganda role in all stages of wars, their preparation, waging and post-war settlement. That is especially valid of the British press which came to a position to exercise vast influence over popular opinion. In his political novel "Coningsby", published in 1844, the great statesman and author Benjamin Disraeli declaimed: "Opinion now is supreme, and the opinion speaks in print. The representation of the press is more complete than the representation of Parliament". At the same time new journalism entered the scene with enhanced sense of self-confidence and mission. John Thaddeus Delane (who occupied the post of editor of *The Times* for thirty-six years from 1841, and had built its reputation), was clear in 1852 of the principle: "The duty of the Press is to speak; of the statesmen to be silent".<sup>1</sup> The custodians of the printed word referred to themselves as "the Press", with capital letter, that denoted a formal collective entity analogous to the Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

The influence of the press was even more increased due its emancipation from state control (the removal of all duties on newspapers, or the "taxes on knowledge" as Richard Cobden called them, by the mid-1850s), the technological advance in printing and distribution, which gave rise to the mass press, that reached millions of readers and earned the designation "fourth estate".<sup>3</sup> The 19th British century press was variegated and covered all sections of the public, from the *News of the World* (the "flagship" of the popular

press, cheapest newspaper of its time priced at just three pence the most widely read Sunday paper, whose sales plummeted from around 12,000 copies a week when first published in 1843, to the circulation of two million by 1912, three million by the early 1920s), and was aimed directly at the newly literate working classes, to the *The Times* (the longest running newspaper, long considered the British newspaper of record, generally seen as a serious publication with high standards of journalism), the paper of establishment.

The modern press was able to intervene dramatically in politics. As for World War I, the press had had its role in the events leading to the conflict, and during the period of the war. For instance, a series of articles in the Liberal magazine *Pall Mall Gazette* in 1884, had caused alarm in the public just regarding the war unpreparedness, and helped create support for intensive building of war ships.<sup>4</sup> So far as *The Times* is concerned, its owner from 1908, the press and publishing magnate Alfred Harmsworth, Lord Northcliffe (1865–1922), was accused by fellow newspapermen that "Next to the Kaiser, Lord Northcliffe has done more than any living man to bring about the war".<sup>5</sup>

On the one hand the rise of the modern mass press was an element of the expansion of the public society and democratization of political system, on the other side the corporate-owned press was not only motivated by marketplace considerations, but manipulated by political leaders and governments.

*The Times* was considered the most significant newspaper through the 19<sup>th</sup> century, even after the rise of the mass press, when a number of strongly competitive titles flourished. So high was the prestige of *The Times* that they used to call it "less a paper, than a British institution", and this paper was imitated around the world (*Times of India*, *Times of Malta*, *New York Times*), and for instance the most authoritative conservative daily published for half a century "*Mir*", was called "the Bulgarian Times". Besides that, *The Times* introduced new methods of getting its information; they were the first papers to

sent its own correspondents to report from the place of events using the telegraph which revolutionizes communications in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They had sent during the Crimean War their special correspondent William Howard Russell, who became pioneer of "live" war reporting, with considerable political effect on the part of the informed public.<sup>6</sup> Not only the newspaper readership informed public opinion in Britain as never before but since then the other major paper followed suit and created a network of their correspondents sent on temporary basis to, or residing, in strategic places in Europe (the Balkans including) and the world.

But *The Times* was not always that a authoritative and weighty paper; in 1887 the paper was implicated in one of the greatest scandals of the Victorian era, having purchased and published ten letters forged by the Irish journalist Richard Piggott, purportedly showing a connection between Irish Parliamentary Party leader Charles Stewart Parnell and terrorists in Ireland (the Phoenix Park Murders). A Judicial Commission set up by Parliament vindicated in February 1889 Parnell, by proving that the letters were forgeries. That affair, "the Piggott debacle", as the official historians of *The Times* called it, discredited the paper, and it took the efforts of a number of vigorous and talented journalists in the next decades, to restore its reputation.<sup>7</sup>

One of that cohort of those distinguished reporters of *The Times* was James David Bouchier. A scion of the Anglo-Irish gentry, a privileged class that served traditionally a reservoir of cadres ruling the country and the empire, he had chosen a career in journalism to become one of its greatest representatives in the late Victorian and Edwardian era. Stationed as *The Times* own correspondent in the Balkans for more than a quarter of a century, he had not only become one of the leading experts in the politics, history and ethnology of that "storms centre" of Europe, but also played a significant role in the complicated and entangled relations between the Balkan states. More than that, he was not an indifferent observer of events but sympathized with the

peoples struggling for liberation, espoused the principle of self-determination of nations, and often sided with the underdog. The life and work of Bourchier was so far scholarly treated by his first and only biographer Lady Grogan (Elinor Flora Bosworth Grogan), partly by the British historians Phyllis Otty and Richard Crampton, and the Irish scholar Michael Foley; and by Bulgarian historians Ivan Ilchev and the author of this paper.<sup>8</sup>

James David Bourchier was born on 18 December 1850 in family estate Bagotstown, near **Bruff**, in County Limerick (Southern Ireland). He belonged to an ancient family which came from France with the Normans, one of its many branches whose moved to Ireland in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. At the age of 12 he was sent to Portora Royal School in Enniskillen, a preparatory boarding school, where his classmate was the future literary genius Oscar Wilde. Then Boucher graduated with a gold medal at Trinity College Dublin, the oldest and most prestigious university in Ireland, and finally he got complete classical education at Cambridge. His had great love was music, and his interpretations were so so inspirational that despite his problems with hearing (a consequence of childhood disease), he was invited to concerts in London's Albert Hall.

Since 1877 Bourchier began teaching career at the prestigious Eton College. As master there he was distinguished by his erudition and unorthodox attitudes, and although pedagogy was of no particular attraction to him, he won the respect and gratitude of his students (many of them subsequently prominent political figures, and two of them like Bourchier himself associated with *The Times*, Sir Reginald Rankin, as a war correspondent, and Jeffrey Dawson as editor-in-chief in 1912-1919 and 1923-1941). After 10 years of teaching at Boucher had to quit due to progressive deafness, and turned to journalism, to which he was attracted since his youth, and which took him far from Britain, but he used to come at Eton on each of his annual leaves.

This life-changing turnaround in Bouchier's life occurred in 1888, when after meeting an old Etonian, Brinsley Richards, *The Times* correspondent for South-Eastern residing in Vienna, he was sent to Romania to report a peasant uprising, and then to Bulgaria also in state of turmoil after dethronement of Prince Alexander of Battenberg, not to leave the Balkans until 1915. Since the beginning of his career as a journalist, he made long journeys through the troubled Balkan countries, like other British eccentric explorers before him but unlike them, his descriptions are immediately available to the public, in newspapers and prestigious magazines (like *Fortnightly Review*, *The Nineteenth Century*, *Quarterly Review*, and others). Initially more or less freelance journalist, he finally became *The Times* "own correspondent" for the Balkans in 1892 and so were his further reports signed.<sup>9</sup>

Bouchier travelled extensively all over the Balkan Peninsula and the neighboring regions, Crete in the state of revolt against the Ottoman Empire making contacts with the insurgents striving the independence, a cause of which he became champion. He then accompanied the new monarch of Bulgaria Prince Ferdinand Saxe-Coburg-Gotha who was getting acquainted with his new country, and the British journalist became his close confidant.<sup>10</sup>

In the course of his career Bouchier came to know intimately virtually all the Balkan states' figures of importance, their monarchs, political leaders, such as Stefan Stambolov, Konstantin Stoilov, Ivan Evstratiev Geshov, Charilaos Tricoupis Eleftherios Venizelos, Nikola Pašić, Ion I. C. Brătianu, Take Ionescu and many others. But he also met many ordinary people. During the decades he reported for British periodicals Bouchier traversed the Balkans, visiting cities and remote villages, monasteries, a often living in peasants' homes, getting to know the way of life, folklore and traditions, which gave him a unique insight into the people and the places. He spoke Bulgarian and modern Greek, and acquired passing knowledge of other languages of the area. Bouchier demonstrated exceptional gregariousness, considered distinctive trait of the

Irish national character, though he never laid particular stress on his national identity, and easily made contacts and friends, despite his deafness.

As a result Bouchier became the European journalist probably the most informed about the problems of the region, then and perhaps later. And he acquired his extraordinary expertise during a period when the region with its dramatic events was often the focus of European press.<sup>11</sup> It is hard to compare Bouchier with the many of the stars of international journalism of the past or the present passing through the Balkan countries or staying there for a shorter or longer time. It is enough to focus on one particular case. Among Bouchier's noted colleagues who had visited the Balkans was Hector Hugh Munro, who got fame as one of the greatest British satirists under the pseudonym of Saki. He came over to Bulgaria as the correspondent of the London *Morning Post* at the end of 1902. He wrote moving descriptions of Christmas in Sofia, took some interviews, went to Skopje, and left shortly before the outbreak of the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie (St. Elijah-Transfiguration Day) Uprising, an event that centered the attention of the European newspapers, but remained unforeseen by that great journalist. So the result of his visit to the Balkans was the publication of a short few stories and a play, filled with sarcasm to the Balkan political mores .

Unlike some of his colleagues who put an emphasis on speed and efficiency of information often at the expense of deeper penetration into the essence of the problems, Bouchier due to his mindset, intellectual training , length of stay in the region had become a recognized expert in the complex and controversial Balkan issues. His articles in *The Times* had a particular resonance , not only because the paper's reputation as the “heavy weight” of serious press, but also because they were characterized by broad awareness and competent analysis. In addition to information collected from observations derived from all places of the peninsula, from the capitals to obscure villages , Bouchier preferred to get first-hand information when it came to big politics . “I

walk straight off,” he used to say, “to the highest-placed expert that I know—the Premier, the Foreign Secretary, the Commander-in-Chief—send in my card, and I may say that I am never kept waiting—and thrash the subject out with them until I thoroughly grasp it. It is their business to make me hear, and it is to their interest to make me understand”.<sup>12</sup> Indeed Balkan political leaders and monarchs met and talked willingly with the journalist because they knew of every his reportage or interview will put them immediately in the focus of European and world public opinion.

His expertise won him fellowship of the British Royal Geographical Society. At the beginning of his stay in the Balkans Bouchier intended to write a book on the peninsula, as some present day journalists often do, but it seems that vast knowledge and too deep penetration in the problems prevented him from doing that. At the expense of that, he wrote numerous scholarly articles, and was commissioned to write on Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, Macedonia, Balkan cities, for the 10th edition of the most authoritative reference tool Encyclopedia Britannica.<sup>13</sup> “No single individual,” said the writer of *The Times* article on Bouchier's death, “has been so intimately associated with the tangled story of the Balkan Peninsula and the Aegean Islands during the last generation.”<sup>14</sup>

Bouchier's time was one of rise of political press in Europe, and in Britain in particular. The newspapers not only exerted great influence on the public opinion, but also to manipulate it and even change the course of affairs. Lord Northcliffe who dominated the British press "as it never has been before or since by one man", by owning a chain of newspapers in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, *The Times* including, was able pull down and set up governments (as was the case with the bringing down the wartime government of Herbert Henry Asquith, forming the coalition government, and appointment of Lloyd George's as Prime Minister in 1916).

While reporting the Balkans for so long time Bouchier became involved in their political affairs. In that respect he was not an exception; his counterpart in Constantinople was Paul Weitz, for thirty years the correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, who probably knew more about affairs in the Near East than any other German.<sup>15</sup> Bouchier became champion of the causes of small nations, Bulgaria, first of all, not forgetting British national interests, as he understood them. Bouchier's championing the causes of small nations Bulgaria, first of all, was not unique, there was a number of other Englishmen, like the members of the Buxton family, each of took up the cause of little nations in the East (Noel Buxton, Charles Roden Buxton, Harold Buxton, the Bishop of Gibraltar, and their sister Victoria Alexandrina Buxton De Bunsen did, choosing one of another nation that was once part of the Ottoman Empire), or Edith Durham, dubbed the "Queen of the Highlanders" by grateful Albanians, James Bryce, Edward Boyle and others.

Most of these, Bouchier including, became founders of and key figures in in a pressure group called the Balkan Committee, established immediately after the suppression of the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie Uprising in 1903, comprising prominent figures from the academic and political circles. Its first president was the Oxford don, politician and diplomat Lord James Bryce and unchanging chairman and main engine was Lord Noel Buxton. As a nonprofit organization that sought objective clarification of complicated Balkan problems and the formation of public opinion and government decisions, the Balkan Committee continued the tradition of the Eastern Question Association of 1876-78. These were public bodies which attempted influence and control of conductig of nation's foreign affairs, traditionally domaine of professional diplomats. Unlike the Eastern Question Association, the Balkan Committee had longer life, officially disbanded only in 1946, although the peak of his influence was before the First World vojna.<sup>16</sup> It was not by chance that during the First World War some of its member entered the the Union of Democratic

Control, a British pressure group formed in 1914 to press for a more responsive foreign policy. While not a pacifist organization, it was opposed to military influence in government.

Bourchier was sometimes reproached of having too pro-Bulgarian sympathies, which was, however, not quite correct. He had never accepted uncritically all the actions of the Bulgarian Government, and often his relationship with them were strained. So was the case with his coverage of the Dospat incident (the massacre of Pomaks, or Islamised Bulgarians) in 1893, or the assassination Stefan Stambolov in 1895, for which he blamed the government of the day and the Prince Ferdinand himself.<sup>17</sup>

His sympathies with the struggles of the Greeks from the island of Crete were appreciated by Greek political leaders, Eleftherios Venizelos including. Bourchier had a definite place in the diplomatic efforts leading to the creation of the Balkan Union in 1912, acting as an intermediary between the leaders of Bulgaria and Greece.<sup>18</sup> The sympathies with the Balkan peoples made him almost to identify with their causes. The first Balkan War was presented in his paper as a manifestation of the inevitable result of "progress" in the region.<sup>19</sup>

Even after Bulgaria's debacle in 1913, Bourchier did not swerve in his sympathy and protection. In his sixth and last article of the Balkan Union, which appeared on June 16, 1913, he continued to advocate the view that the regulation of the Balkans after the war should follow the principle of nationality, rejecting claims of historical rights, geographical symmetry or so-called equilibrium in the Balkans.<sup>20</sup> That, of course, did not happen, and in January 1914 Boucher wrote to the editor of *The Times*, Geoffrey Dawson that no solution of the Balkan problems can be achieved until the Bucharest Treaty is removed.<sup>21</sup>

With the outbreak of World War I, from August, 1914, onwards, Bourchier's main pre-occupation concerned the part that Bulgaria would take

in the war. He spared no effort, by personal argument and persuasion, not only with Bulgarian statesmen and with King Ferdinand himself, but also with those who were responsible for the diplomacy of the Entente Powers, to bring Bulgaria over to the side of those Powers. Bouchier made great efforts to attract Bulgaria to the Entente, although he acknowledged how little London government and the head of British diplomacy, Sir Edward Grey, had done to satisfy the "just aspirations" of Bulgaria.<sup>22</sup>

In a letter to the editor of *The Times* Wickam Steed and in article on "The *Perspectives in the Balkans*" from Bucharest (not published because of the war-time censorship), both dated October 20, 1915, Bouchier tried to explain the reasons for Bulgaria's entry into the war. He contrasted the emotions of troops passing through Sofia with sullen silence, unlike spontaneous enthusiasm they marched to the front in the First Balkan War in 1912. He expressed regret that the Allies, and the British government, in particular, made a chain of mistakes not offering agreeable terms to Bulgaria (for instance his suggestion to Lord Curzon (member of the Asquith coalition) to have Central Macedonia occupied by the Allied forces as guarantee that fair claims would be met). He was ironical of Tsar Ferdinand strategic decision to tie Bulgaria to the Central Power, citing a Bulgarian proverb "We'll call our aunt the one who gives us a bigger bun". Bouchier blamed the Allies that they saw Bulgaria as a appendage of Russia, sending ultimatum to the Bulgarian government. At the same time Bouchier saw the developments in the Balkans generally, as a failure of constitutional government.<sup>23</sup>

On November 20, 1915, he wrote from Bucarest to Noel Buxton: "*The simple fact is that the bulk of the nation sympathises with us, but Ferdinand and his immediate advisers came to the conclusion (after the Russian reverses in Poland and Courland) that Germany was going to win, and that if they were not with her they would lose Macedonia. The miserable blunders of our diplomacy no doubt confirmed this impression. It is unfair to blame them if*

*they really believed (as seems to be the case) that the fate of Macedonia depended on their decision. I believe the Bulgarians would have been disposed to come over to us once they had secured Macedonia".*

It may seem Bouchier that attached too great importance to strategic place of Bulgaria. His views were, however, shared by the members of the war government, who had Noel and Charles Roden Buxton on an unofficial mission to try to win over Bulgaria and Romania on the Allies side. Bouchier was with them in October, 1914, in Bucharest, when the two brothers were shot in the street by a fanatic Turk.<sup>24</sup>

On June 8, 1915, he wrote to Wickham Steed, head of the Foreign Department of *The Times*: *"You at least realise of what immense importance the attitude of Rumania and Bulgaria is to our cause just now. If Bulgaria would intervene, the fate of Constantinople would be decided in a few weeks; if Rumania would act, the tide would probably turn in Galicia and the Carpathians, and the issue of the whole Eastern campaign would be decided promptly. I do not believe that the Austro-Germans could contrive to fight on two new fronts together—the Rumanian and the Italian. In our unfortunate plight in the Dardanelles, Bulgarian aid would be invaluable now. Foreseeing that neither Rumania nor Bulgaria could be induced to act with us so long as their action is paralysed by mutual suspicions, I have given a great deal of time and trouble to the task of bringing the two countries together—the duty has been literally imposed upon me by the inefficiency of our diplomacy".*

In a letter to the editor of *The Times* Wickam Steed and in article on "The Perspectives in the Balkans" from Bucharest (not published because of the war-time censorship), both dated October 20, 1915, Bouchier tried to explain the reasons for Bulgaria's entry into the war. He contrasted the emotions of troops passing through Sofia with sullen silence, unlike spontaneous enthusiasm they marched to the front in the First Balkan War in

1912. He expressed regret that the Allies, and the British government, in particular, made a chain of mistakes not offering agreeable terms to Bulgaria (for instance his suggestion to Lord Curzon (member of the Asquith coalition) to have Central Macedonia occupied by the Allied forces as guarantee that fair claims would be met). He was ironical of Tsar Ferdinand's strategic decision to tie Bulgaria to the Central Power, citing a Bulgarian proverb "We'll call our aunt the one who gives us a bigger bun". Bouchier blamed the Allies that they saw Bulgaria as an appendage of Russia, sending an ultimatum to the Bulgarian government. At the same time Bouchier saw the developments in the Balkans generally, as a failure of constitutional government.<sup>25</sup>

On November 20, 1915, he wrote from Bucharest to Noel Buxton: "*The simple fact is that the bulk of the nation sympathises with us, but Ferdinand and his immediate advisers came to the conclusion (after the Russian reverses in Poland and Courland) that Germany was going to win, and that if they were not with her they would lose Macedonia. The miserable blunders of our diplomacy no doubt confirmed this impression. It is unfair to blame them if they really believed (as seems to be the case) that the fate of Macedonia depended on their decision. I believe the Bulgarians would have been disposed to come over to us once they had secured Macedonia*".

In a letter to the Prime Minister Dr. Vassil Radoslavov of the autumn of 1915 Bouchier offered his services to act as an intermediary to come to terms with the Allies, though he added he was in despair of the recent developments.<sup>26</sup> Indicative of the attitude of the Bulgarians towards Bouchier was the proposal by the Prime Minister Radoslavov, after the declaration of war, to remain in the country, although it is a citizen of an enemy country. Bouchier of course refused but he was given a special carriage on the railway, and was officially escorted to the frontier, with every mark of attention.

When in 1915, Bulgaria definitively sided with the Central Powers, Bouchier wrote with bitter irony, but also showing understanding, of the pragmatism of the Bulgarian politicians.<sup>27</sup> He was not, however, inclined to blame it entirely on them. If the Allies had offered to satisfy the just demands of Bulgaria immediately, Bouchier wrote to Lord Bryce on January 28, 1916, it would be "not only politically sound, but fair". The Bulgarian government not only because they "took the bait" of Germany, which promised them gains in Macedonia, but they lost hope that otherwise the Allies would not help them to avoid the fate of Belgium in case of refusal.<sup>28</sup> Most of the Bulgarians, Bouchier claimed, did not want an alliance with the Germans, but they sought for national unification<sup>29</sup>.

The years 1916 and 1917 were probably the most difficult and sad of Bouchier's life, who continued to act as *The Times* correspondent, but he was hampered by censorship. In January, 1916 Bouchier sent Noel Buxton a long paper which the latter described as "a strikingly well-reasoned case for detaching Bulgaria".

In March, Bouchier was sent to Odessa as *The Times* correspondent for South Russia, and after the Bolshevik takeover he went to Petrograd as temporary correspondent. True to his method, Bouchier sought meetings with its most prominent functionaries; December 2, he was received by the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Leo Trotsky, who declared his expectations for revolutionary cataclysm and hope that the European proletariat in the near future would make their own their governments to conclude a general peace (an "illusion" to Bouchier).

The years 1916 and 1917 were probably the most difficult and sad of Bouchier's life, who continued to act as *The Times* correspondent, but he was hampered by censorship. In January, 1916 Bouchier sent Noel Buxton a long paper which the latter describes as "a strikingly well-reasoned case for detaching Bulgaria". In March, Bouchier was sent to Odessa as *Times*

correspondent for South Russia, and after the Bolshevik takeover he went to Petrograd as temporary correspondent. True to his method, Bourchier sought meetings with its most prominent functionaries; December 2, he was received by the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Leo Trotzky, who declared his expectations for revolutionary cataclysm and hope that the European proletariat in the near future would make their own their governments to conclude a general peace (an "illusion" to Bourchier).

Deteriorating health, however, made Bourchier to leave this last journalist job. His newspaper gave him a handsome pension, and the months before the war ended Bourchier spent in his native Ireland without ceasing to think of the Balkans and Bulgaria. In October 1917 he published in the "Quarterly Review" article on "*Final Settlement in the Balkans.*" - a program to determine the fair boundaries based on the principle of national self-determination and the actual distribution of ethnic elements. Rejecting theories of "strategic balance" Bourchier pleaded for the return of Bulgaria to its lawful rights and heritage - South Dobrudja, Western Macedonia, Eastern Thrace, access to the Aegean Sea.<sup>30</sup>

Bourchier's efforts in support of the Bulgarians, their national aspirations, which it considers fair, did not terminate after Bulgaria was out of the war, defeated and becoming a kind of pariah among European countries. He went to Paris, where the victorious Allies hold the peace conference, as a kind of unofficial representative of the Balkan countries and Bulgaria. Bourchier made strenuous efforts, despite ailments of old age and fatigue, to counter hostile public opinion, and to persuade the leaders of the Entente to give Bulgaria a fair treatment. He had numerous meetings and discussions with representatives of the Allied delegations, and tried to meet the American president Wilson himself.

His defense of Bulgaria in tragic moments in 1913 when assessing the Bucharest treaty as "the greatest diplomatic crime", or in 1919 when Bulgaria was treated contrary to the principles of fair and democratic peace announced in "*The Fourteen Points*" of President Wilson's, an expression of his sense of justice and his innate willingness to side with the fallen and the weak. As for Macedonia, Bouchier, in agreement with other prominent English, French and American experts on Balkan issues, stated in 1919 that the creation of an autonomous state would allow the free self-determination of its population.

Along with another great friend of Bulgaria Noel Buxton sent a telegram to Wilson, and his name is first among the memoranda of April 4, 1919 to President English, French and American experts on Balkan issues, or differ in their beliefs and views, but in this case united by a common position - to avoid once again a historical injustice against Bulgaria.<sup>ii</sup> The failure of his efforts in Paris in 1919, was for diplomat and Bouchier the biggest disappointment in his life that, as Richard Crane, an American diplomat and friend, wrote Boucher could not live with.<sup>31</sup>

In 1920 Bouchier edited a volume containing speeches made in the British Parliament of MPs demanding a fair treatment of Bulgaria.<sup>32</sup>

One could easily say, following postcolonial theories, that James Boucher saw the Balkan countries, and their "indigenous" peoples with the eyes of Western imperialist and colonizer, and that he wanted to see them "civilized", i. e. "westernized", embracing the values and institutions of Western, or rather of the Anglo-Saxon world. But this can hardly explain the unique place of Bouchier in Balkan history and historical memory of the Bulgarians. There is also another factor which may be key to his attitude towards Bulgaria and other Balkan nations, that it came from the "Emerald Island", whose people have ever fought for freedom and independence, so there was similarity of their fate. In this sense, he was among those Irishmen,

known among the other things, with their sympathy for the Balkan peoples, like the genius Oscar Wilde, and not so famous, like the philanthropist Patrick de Lacy O'Mahony,<sup>33</sup>

or as his former colleague at Eton and famous writer and historian Arthur K. Benson wrote, Bouchier's character and work can be explained with the "transparent sincerity and a genial sort of combativeness; added to this, a clear intellectual grip, with a strong sense of proportion, a marked gift of style and expression, and at the back of all a Celtic power of holding and pursuing with unshaken tenacity a generous and apparently unrealisable ideal".<sup>34</sup>

Modern mass media, the printed one in particular; possess great potential of influencing and forming the public opinions. Journalism, the British in particular, is characterised as "power without responsibility". Bouchier was not that type of journalist, a true professional of the old school, he can serve as example of high quality journalism, competent and deeply analytical, and identifying with democratic and just causes . His reports of the Balkans are marked with a balanced approach to controversial issues of the region in the past and today.

He saw the destiny of the peoples of the region in historical terms. possessic specific traits and distinctiveness but at the same time as a human community inhabiting a relatively small space they shared certain common characteristics , traditions, values that permeate each other so that they form a cultural and historical community. Agreeing with the internationally renowned French cultural historian of Bulgarian origin Tzvetan Todorov, we can say that human , ethnic and cultural communities are best identified when seen through the eyes of "the other". With regard to understanding of self-identity and relationships of the Balkan peoples, it is still useful to turn to the writings of James Boucher. They largely confirm the thought of Albert Camus that " journalist historian of contemporaneity". His approach to the relationship of the

Balkan peoples is worth considering. They were in many cases bitter, strained and marked by tragic conflicts. However, the Balkan peoples share not only a common history, their culture, in the broadest sense of the word had acquired certain common features and characteristics. Their co-existence; was accompanied not only by the striving for domination and oppression of one nation of another or others, but with mutual penetration and enrichment of their cultures and traditions. Bouchier's reporting of the Balkan politics, illuminated by true erudition, emphasized the unity of the history of the Balkan nations, and in the final run, of their interests.

<sup>1</sup> Koss, Stephen. *The Rise and Fall of the Political Press in Britain*. Vol. 1. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1981, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Boyce, G., J. Curran, and P. Wingate, Eds. *Newspaper History*. London, 1978, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Schultz, Julianne. *Reviving the Fourth Estate*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 49.

<sup>4</sup> Scott, J. W. Robertson. *The Story of the Pall Mall Gazette*. London: Oxford University Press, 1950; Parkinson, Roger. *The Late Victorian Navy: The Pre-Dreadnought Era and the Origins of the First World War* (2008).

<sup>5</sup> Bingham, Adrian. "Monitoring the popular press: an historical perspective". *History & Policy*. - <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-27.html>. Retrieved 3 September 2013, p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Figes, Orlando. *The Crimean War: A History*. New York: Picador Publishing, 2010, p. 411; Hogg, Ian V. *The British Army in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. London: Ian Allan, 1985, p. 11.

<sup>7</sup> *The History of The Times*. [Vol. 3], *The Twentieth-century Test, 1884-1912*. London : The Times, 1947, ch. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Lady Grogan (Elinor Flora Bosworth Grogan). *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*. London, Hurst & Blackett, N. d. (1924); Oty, Phylis. *James David Bouchier, correspondent of The Times for the Balkans. Unpublished Documents for the Period 1914-1915*. [In Bulgarian]. - In: Problems of Bulgarian Historiography [Problemi na balgarskata istoriografiya]. Ed. by Dimitar Kosev et al. Sofia, 1973: 474-488; Crampton, Richard. *The Times and the Consolidation of the Stambolov Regime*. [In Bulgarian]. - In: Bulgaria from Antiquity to Modern Times [Balgariya ot drevnostta do nashi dni]. Vol. II. Sofia, 1979; Foley, Michael. John [sic] David Bouchier: an Irish Journalist in the Balkans. - Foley, M.: John David Bouchier: an Irish Journalist in the Balkans. *Irish Communications Review*, Vol. 10, 2007; Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*. [In Bulgarian] - *Izvestiya na darzhavnite arhivi* [Proceedings of the Bulgarian State Archives] Vol. 50 (1985): 13-191 [A publication of Bouchier's documents]; Genov, Roumen. *James Bouchier and the Bulgarians*. [In Bulgarian]. - *Minalo*, 1995, No. 3; Genov, Roumen. *James Bouchier and the Balkans. Certain Didactic Aspects of Modern Political Journalism*. [In Bulgarian]. - In: A Teacher of the Teachers. Festschrift for Yordan Shpov. Comp. by Maria Radeva. Sofia, 2006: 213-220.

<sup>9</sup> Lady Grogan. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*, p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> Bouchier, James D. *Through Bulgaria with Prince Ferdinand*. London: Chapman, etc. 1888, pp. 39-56. - In: *The Fortnightly Review*. Vol. XLIII, N. s. 1888, No. CCLIX; Vol. XLIX, O. s.; Bouchier, James D. *In the Balkans with Prince Ferdinand*. 1889. London: Chapman, etc. 1889, pp. 38-56. - In: *The Fortnightly Review*. 1889, July. No. CCLXX, N. s., No. CCCVIII, O. s.; Bouchier, James D. *In Rhodope with Prince Ferdinand*. 1891. London: Chapman, etc., 1891, pp. 598-614.

<sup>11</sup> Villari, Luigi (ed.) *The Balkan Question: The Present Condition of the Balkans and European Responsibilities*. By Various Authors. London: John Murray, 1905.

<sup>12</sup> Lady Grogan. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*, p. 17.

<sup>13</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1902, updated 11th edition of 1910). *The Encyclopaedia Britannica, a Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. Vol. IV. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Edinburgh. MDCCCXXVI (1876); *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Constituting a combination of the 9<sup>th</sup> edition, the 10<sup>th</sup> edition and also supplying a new, distinctive and independent library of reference. Vol. 2 (being vol. XXVI of the complete work). London and Edinburgh. MCMII (1902).

- <sup>14</sup> Lady Grogan. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*, p. 2.
- <sup>15</sup> Morgenthau, Sr., Henry. *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918, Chap. XXVII.
- <sup>16</sup> Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*. [In Bulgarian] - *Izvestiya na darzhavnite arhivi* [Proceedings of the Bulgarian State Archives] Vol. 50 (1985): 136; Ilchev, Ivan. *Балканският комитет (1903-1946)* [*The Balkan Committee (1903-1946)*] [In Bulgarian]. - In: Ilchev, Ivan (Comp. and ed.). *Балканският комитет в Лондон (1903-1946)* [*The Balkan Committee in London (1903-1946)*]. Sofia, 2003, p. 9.
- <sup>17</sup> Bouchier, James. *The Pomaks of Rhodope*. - *Fortnightly Review*. Vol. 54 (July-December 1893); Markovich, Slobodan G. *British Perceptions of Serbia and the Balkans, 1903-1906*. - [http://www.anses.rs/assets/text\\_hist/sloba2.pdf](http://www.anses.rs/assets/text_hist/sloba2.pdf).
- <sup>18</sup> *The History of the Times*. Vol. 5. Part 1. London, 1952, p. 74.
- <sup>19</sup> *The History of the Times*. Vol. 5. Part 1, p. 76.
- <sup>20</sup> *The History of the Times*. Vol. 5. Part 1, p. 105.
- <sup>21</sup> *The History of the Times*. Vol. 5. Part 1, p. 109.
- <sup>22</sup> Bouchier to Ivan E. Geshov, Sofia, September 5/18, 1914 г. - TsDIA (Central State Historical Archive), Collection No. 558, Opis 1, a. e. 139, f. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*, pp. 154 – 156.
- <sup>24</sup> Buxton, Noel and Charles. *The War and the Balkans*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1915; Buxton, Noel and Charles. *Misiya na Balkanite* [*Mission in the Balkanite*]. Ed. with foreword by Ivan Ilchev. Sofia: University Publishing House “St. Kliment Ohridski. 1987.
- <sup>25</sup> Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*, pp. 154 – 156.
- <sup>26</sup> Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*, p. 152.
- <sup>27</sup> Ilchev, Ivan. *James David Bouchier and the Bulgarian National Cause (1912-1920)*, pp. 150-156.
- <sup>28</sup> J. D. Bouchier to Lord Bryce, Bucharest, January 26, 1916. – *Papers of James Bryce*. Modern Western Manuscripts, New Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS Bryce 31, fols. 22-23.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 64
- <sup>30</sup> Lady Grogan. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*, pp. 187-188.
- <sup>31</sup> Lady Grogan. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*, p. 186.
- <sup>32</sup> *The Bulgarian Peace Treaty. Speeches delivered in the British Parliament*. With an introd. by J. D. Bouchier. London: Christopher, S. a. (1920).
- <sup>33</sup> See, Genov, Roumen. *Poets and Politics: The Response to the Eastern Question Crisis of the 1870s in British Poetry*. – In: Shurbanov, Alexander (Ed.) *Victorian England: Literary Perspective*. Sofia, 1996, pp. 78-79; Spasova, Maria, and Seamus Shortal. *Pierce O'Mahoney – edin irlandets v Bulgaria* [*Pierce O'Mahoney – an Irishman in Bulgaria*]. Sofia, 2002.
- <sup>34</sup> Benson, A. C. *J. D. Bouchier, the Champion of Bulgaria*. - *Cornhill Magazine*, February, 1923.