

# **SOFIA UNIVERSITY "ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI"**

## **REVIEW**

of the submitted works for participation in the competition for the academic position of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, announced by SU "St. 2.2 History and Archaeology (History of European Integration), in the scientific specialty Contemporary History, for the needs of the Faculty of Arts, promulgated in the State Gazette, issue 61 of 2 August 2022.

Reviewer. Prof. Boris Gavrilov

Candidate Principal Asst. Dr. Boris Kirilov Stoyanov

### **1. Brief biographical details of the applicant**

Born September 7, 1976. 2006. Graduate of the National High School for Ancient Languages and Cultures, BA in History from the Faculty of History of the Sofia University. Master in History at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"; Master in History at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski". Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia, specialization in Modern History, 2001; Doctorate in History with a dissertation on "The Building of United Europe, 1948-1957" with the decision of the SAC of 13 June 2006. History teacher at 55 Petko Karavelov Secondary School; Honorary lecturer in Contemporary History of Europe at the European Studies Department of the Faculty of Philosophy (1999 - 2001) at St. Petersburg University. Lecturer in History (in English) at "Vasil Zlatarski" High School. Head of Extended Essay of students of 12th grade for application to universities and academies (2003 - 2004); Assistant and Senior Assistant at the Faculty of Arts of Sofia University "Sv. Senior lecturer and senior lecturer at the IU of St. Kliment Ohridski in New General History. 2004 - 2007; Senior Assistant, Lecturer in Modern History. Holder of general and specialized lecture courses of

students of Bachelor and Master programs of the Faculty of History, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communications, Faculty of Classical and New Philologies. 2007 - 2022 г.

**Characteristics of the candidate's scientific and applied output .** The publications presented in the list prepared by the candidate for review are monographs, published articles, studies and reports, in non-refereed peer-reviewed journals or published in edited collective volumes. It is evident from the submissions that the author has many other scholarly works, textbooks and teaching aids which remain outside the scope of this review but are an integral part of the overall research profile of the entrant - 13 studies; 8 articles; 5 textbooks for SU; 3 teaching aids. Appendix 10C (Publications selected specifically for the competition contains 19 publications).

In accordance with the requirements of the HEA, the candidate has the following science metrics:

**GROUP A.** Dissertation for the award of educational and scientific degree "Doctor" - 50 points.

**GROUP B.** Published monograph, which is presented as a major habilitation thesis - "Europe before Europe. The projects of the Third Power, the European Federation and the United States of Europe and their destiny, 1945-1949." Kliment Ohridski" ISBN 978-954-07-5559-5 ISBN 978-954-07-5560-1 (PDF) - 100 points

Coming to the review of the habilitation thesis, I have to stress that for me, as a researcher, the topic of the fate of Europe is of serious interest. Two of my monographs and a documentary collection, Europe at the Crossroads. Conflict and Diplomacy in the Age of Religious and Mercantilist Wars"; "The Partition of Europe. Crises, Conflicts and Diplomacy in the Age of the Old Regime" and "The Sunset of Old Europe" are devoted to similar themes, albeit in an earlier period.

The presented monograph *Europe before Europe* (Sofia: University of St. Kliment Ohridski, 2022) is the first study in Bulgarian historiography of the projects for European unification in the post-war period. What is more, it is also a contribution to European and world historiography. Essentially, it examines and analyses three separate issues related to Franco-British relations, the activities of the European unity movements and the establishment of the post-war transatlantic relationship with the resulting role and significance of American policy for the development of Western Europe. Too extensive and diverse, they could hardly be covered in a comprehensive and thorough historiographical assessment. Moreover, each of the themes has its own historiographical tradition, in which not only different research strands can be found, but also distinct national schools.

The book is built on a solid documentary base and a thoroughly analysed and used literature.

The study is structured into an introduction, four chapters and a conclusion.

The first chapter, "Arbiter Mundi: Britain, France and the Mirage of the Third Power", traces the development of Franco-British relations in the 1940s and analyses all the difficulties on the way to forming a bilateral alliance and turning it into an axis around which to group the other European democracies. The dynamics of Franco-British relations are elaborated on the basis of the achievements of leading historians of foreign policy such as John Young, John Bayliss, Alan Bullock, Sean Greenwood, Avi Schleim, Francis Lynch, Georges-Henri Soutou, Gerard Bossuis, Pierre Gerbet and Pierre Guillard. The elaborations of some of these authors concerning the concept of Europe as a third world power are thoroughly and critically reflected in the study. His broad presentation of the main theses of historians sympathetic to the federalist cause has not made him its champion. Their conclusions are frequently and objectively criticized in the pages of the monograph presented. The good balance struck in referring to the different

strands of the study of federalism- Anglo-Saxon and Continental, as well as to the different national schools-is noteworthy. The study would only have benefited if these had been more clearly delineated in the course of the exposition. The controversies between Paris and London, especially over the German question, are examined in detail, as is the decisive role played by certain diplomats in the signing of the Dunkirk Treaty in 1947. Emphasis is placed on British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's plans to upgrade the Entente to a Euro-African bloc that would halt the decline of the European states in the international arena and bring them into line with the new superpowers. Envisioned as a Third World power, the bloc was conceived as an alternative to the American and Soviet models. Analyzing the project of Europe as the Third Power, the author argues that the leading motivation of the European powers to seek closer forms of cooperation stems from the loss of influence in the changed postwar global balance of power. The author convincingly argues that the Franco-British alliance, which had seemed to be the natural basis of Western European unification, had exhausted its possibilities, and it became clear in the second half of the 1940s that the Paris-London axis would not determine the future of continental democracies.

The second chapter, "Ideas of (con)federation and movements for European unity", is devoted to the clash of visions between federalists and unionists within movements for European unity.

Here the author convincingly demonstrates the unsuitability of the idea of federation in the context of a dominant national feeling and loyalty after 1945, and a divergence of political experience between the two currents in favour of the Confederalists. In this chapter, the author defends the inability of the proponents of federation to impose their concept as the leading one in both the immediate post-war debate on the future of Europe. Other significant conclusions relate to the reluctance of the Europeanists to form a cross-border political entity that would

actively participate in the political life of Western Europe; their preference to remain independent and non-governmental; the little influence they exerted over national politics; and the loss of initiative in the negotiations to establish a European Assembly, which allowed governments to reverse the original intention of a supranational character of the regional institution and to establish the Council of Europe as a fully The contribution of federalist and unionist propaganda in promoting European ideas and in encouraging closer cooperation between continental democracies is also noted. The analyses of the evolution of attitudes towards the nation-state, leading to its acceptance as an essential factor in the integration process, and the conviction that federation should not be understood as the destruction of traditional European political entities and national identities, sound very relevant.

The third chapter, "The Problems of European Unity in American Foreign Policy up to the Marshall Plan", is in my opinion one of the most interesting and useful in terms of the current topic of EU-US relations. The world historiography on the Marshall Plan and US-West European relations is vast, but the author skillfully navigates the underlying debate that arose in the 1980s between the views of Alan Millward and Michael Hogan on the necessity, role and significance of the Marshall Plan. Less prominent are the views of David Ellwood, who took a compromise position, but there is room for the theses of John Gillingham, who sees the policy of the United States as the main driver of the process of European unification in the second half of the 1940s and early 1950s. The monograph also draws on some of the best early scholarship such as that of Joseph Jones, Walter Rostow and Max Belloff. The works of more and less well-known later historians, such as Douglas Brinkley, Robert Ferrell, Arthur Funk, John Gaddis, Aud Arne Westad, Laurence Kaplan, John Killick, Armin Rapaport, Mark Trachtenberg, Irwin Wall, and others are used to examine the complex tangle of political,

economic, and security relations among the world's leading democracies from the standpoint of diplomatic history.

The author competently analyses US policy towards the problems of European unity. Tracing the evolution of American strategy from almost complete disregard for integration during the years of World War II to its becoming a leading foreign policy objective under President Truman's administration. The basic thesis regarding the American conception of a United States of Europe is that at its core lies the protection of the interests of the United States of America, conditioned by the need to create in the face of Western Europe a strategic partner in the new free trade system and in the global containment of communism.

Chapter Four: "More Desirable Than Possible: The Failure of the American Design for a United States". This chapter, like the previous one, contains paragraphs of a highly theoretical nature. They concern both the meaning of the transatlantic relationship and the nature of the Western bloc and Dr Stoyanov's innovative approach to the latter as an environment conducive to the emergence and unfolding of the integration experiment. Here again, the author shows an ability to handle with ease the theses of undisputed authorities, among them the names of world-renowned historians and theorists of international relations such as Charles Mayer, John Gaddis, Geir Lundestad, and Robert Keoane. Particular attention is given to the new American approach of broad interventionism in the North Atlantic area, where the United States is pursuing a complex strategy involving containment of communism and promotion of Western European economies. Negotiation rather than coercion, and a flexible approach rather than unconditional hegemony in the relationship, made U.S. actions appear less domineering and constraining highlights the skillful presentation of congressional debates viewing federalism as a solution to the problems of European democracies - both a tool to strengthen their defenses against direct Soviet aggression and a means to achieve sustainable

prosperity by blocking the growth of domestic communist parties and their propaganda. Let me note that even today, eighty years after these debates, this idea seems to me particularly useful. In his analysis, the author convincingly demonstrates that the long-term goal of the initiative is not simply the emergence of an economic United States of Europe, but the construction of a comprehensive supranational political union on the American model. Among the reasons that led to the failure of the whole project, the author highlights the mismatch between Washington's dialogical approach and the categorical unwillingness of the governments of European democracies to sacrifice their sovereignty at a time of heightened international uncertainty and domestic political instability, the results of the Cold War, and the complex nature of the social and economic reforms being implemented. Particularly valuable here is the analysis of the UK's policy of refusing to take the lead in the unification process, with London not only remaining true to its denial of any project that moves the continent closer to federation, but still living with the notion of the Island as a global rather than a European power.

The conclusion - "Why France? " again focuses on the line of behaviour of Italy and especially of France, the development of whose European policies presents them as countries willing to seek and defend supranational solutions. The conclusion systematises the reasons why, following the UK's refusal, it is France that is taking the lead in organising relations in Western Europe, but within a far more limited and modest framework.

**GROUP D. Articles and papers published in non-refereed peer-reviewed journals or published in edited collective volumes - 70 points and Studies published in non-refereed peer-reviewed journals or published in edited collective volumes - 165 points (235 points in total).**

The study "Western Europe at a Crossroads. Problems and Challenges of European Integration in the 1980s" (In: Integration and Disintegration in Europe in the 1980s (ed. Iskra Baeva). Sofia. Kliment Ohridski, 2016) is a successful analysis of the reform movement in the late 1970s and 1980s. It identifies and prioritises the main challenges that integration faced at the end of the Community period- the British budget issue, the difficult functioning of the institutions, the excessive expansion of the Common Agricultural Policy, enlargement and the need to create a common market with a common currency. The focus is on the Fontainebleau European Council, which has been hailed as a watershed in EU history.

Particularly valuable is the summary study focused on the process of integration and the reasons for the success of the supranational experiment - "United in Diversity: Some Observations on European Integration in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century" (In: The End of the Cold War and European Integration/Disintegration in the 1990s (ed. Evgenia Kalinova). Sofia. Kliment Ohridski, 2019). In it, the author defends the thesis of the process as unique not only in European, but also in world history and proposes a periodization of the integration of the second half of the twentieth century, taking into account the main according to sting in the development of the EU.

Another research material with a summarizing theoretical character is the study "Against the State: European Integration as a Means of Weakening the Nation-State in Western Europe through the Eyes of Historians and Political Scientists of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century" (In: The Idea of the State in the Modern Era (ed. Iskra Baeva). Sofia. Kliment Ohridski, 2018) The study criticizes the understanding of the neofunctionalists and the historians-federalists about the nation-state. Although independent of each other, they defend idealist positions that reject the notion of integration as state-centric and state-dominated and suggest ways to permanently weaken it. Against the backdrop of the changes that have taken place



in the countries of democratic Europe, which have ensured the triumph of nation-state power, it has been argued that a one-size-fits-all interpretation of the nature and purposes of the supranational phenomenon does not contribute to its understanding and that the post-1945 nation-state cannot be denied or ignored as a vehicle of power and an expression of will without an equal competitor. From the outset, the modern EU has been a narrow union of states without being a supranational democracy in the full sense of the word. Another implication is that the reconciliation of what are often perceived as antitheses, national structure and supranational union, further underlines its deterministic position in the integration process.

In the study "1945: The Lost Peace" (In: Thirty Years Since the Fall of the Totalitarian Regime: Which Bulgaria "Did We Lose"? (ed. Anton Todorov). Without going into the controversy about the presence or not of continuity in policy between Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, the author highlights the new style of diplomacy of the Truman administration and proves Stalin's unwillingness to keep his commitments. The author ably demonstrates and proves the acceptance by the Western powers of the Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe as early as late 1945 and the irreversibility of the coming rupture.

**GROUP E.** The citations provided meet the requirements. Citations in peer-reviewed monographs and collective volumes - 5 (50 points); Citations or reviews in non-peer-reviewed journals - 3 (15 points). All citations and reviews are in serious scientific journals, collections and monographs. - **65 points.**

## **CONCLUSION**

The peer-reviewed works show, **ch.as. Dr. Boris Kirilov Stoyanov** as a developed scientist who has his own handwriting, opinion and skills to defend it. He moves in well-defined areas of research that are consistent with his professional

specialization and training and with a good methodological basis. As an author, he is extremely loyal to documentary sources and the achievements of historiography. The conclusions, and the analyses, are distinctly personal and represent the author's contribution with full respect for the achievements of the historiographical process. New perspectives and those on the topics he studies have their place in the scholarly space.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the research presented for review and the research work carried out by the author give me reason to state that after the defense of his dissertation, the participant in the competition has continued his research search, effectively using the accumulated knowledge and specialization. The presented scientific works fully meet the requirements of Article 2b of the Law on the Development of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria, in the professional field 2.2. History and Archaeology. The points in the attached scientific metric table - 450, against the required 400, are fully real and meet the legal requirements for individual groups. Moreover, in the attached list of publications of the **head as. Dr. Boris Kirilov Stoyanov** has enough more researches, which he has not proposed for participation in the competition, but have the same scientific weight.

All this, gives me full confidence to vote positively for the academic position of "Associate Professor" to the **head asst. Dr Boris Kirilov Stoyanov** under the announced competition of the Faculty of History of Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski".

20. 11. 2022 г.

Prof. Dr. Borislav Gavrilov