

**Research Project: New and Ambiguous Nation-Building Processes  
in South-Eastern Europe**

**Working Paper Series**

**WHAT ABOUT THE INSTITUTE OF NATIONAL HISTORY?  
INSTITUTIONALIZED HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE PROCESS OF BUILDING  
THE MACEDONIAN NATION**

Irena Stefoska

[http://www.oei.fu-berlin.de/nation-building/resources/wp/stefoska\\_01](http://www.oei.fu-berlin.de/nation-building/resources/wp/stefoska_01)

The project is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).



## **What about the Institute of National History?**

### **Institutionalized Historiography in the Process of Building the Macedonian Nation**

Irena Stefoska

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Institute of National History (INH), originally named as the Scientific Institute of National History, was founded by a decree of the government of the People's Republic of Macedonia (PRM) in 1948. The need for such an institution was raised at the first Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM)<sup>1</sup> on 2 August 1944, which was also when the foundations of the Macedonian state as part of the Yugoslav Federation were laid. A paper presented to the Assembly and entitled *The Popular/Democratic Governance of Macedonia*, stated the following: "I shall not fail to mention the importance of organizing a scientific institute that will be responsible for collecting and preparing the historical and scientific material needed by our National Liberation Struggle for both now and after liberation. *Tomorrow's protection of our national cause demands it* (author's italics). We therefore need to bring together everyone working in the sciences and assign them this important responsibility."

In response to the ideological and political context, one of the priorities of the new Yugoslav government was to verify and legitimize the history of each nation in the Federation as soon as possible. According to the federal principle, the sovereignty carriers in the federal units were the majority nations, recognizing Macedonian as the official language in the Republic of Macedonia, and as one of the four equal official languages in the Federation. They also enabled the institutionalization of the official historiography.

This article is the result of three months of research which involved investigating archival records and conducting interviews with several retired historians from the INH. I would like to present a short review and analysis of the forms, the organizational setup, as well as the goals and objectives on which the INH was grounded. The research so far has shown that, both chronologically and synchronically, one may generally ascertain that within the Socialist Republic of Macedonia - that is, before the dissolution of SFRY - there were two stages in the operation of the INH. The first spans from its establishment

in 1948 to the end of the 1960s, when the Institute rounded off its achievements in Macedonian historiography by publishing the *History of the Macedonian People* in three volumes. The second continues till the end of the 1980s, differing considerably from the provisional first both in production and range, as well as with regards to the resources assigned by the government.

I believe that proceeding in this methodological manner will allow for greater clarity (creating one's own database) for establishing and analyzing the problems regarding the role and the function of the INH in building the national identity during the first decades of the Macedonian state. Very few studies, or none whatsoever, have been carried out previously on this topic. I would hence like to identify the following problems:

- The official historiography and the national identity;
- Ideology and politics as opposed to history;
- Moving from popular towards academic historiography;
- The tasks of the national historians and their position in society;
- The treatment of the histories of the minorities as part of the official discourse, etc.

In this article, by means of a primarily structuralist approach, I would like to present the results of my research thus far, with a special emphasis on the process of institutionalizing the Macedonian historiography through the work of the INH.

## **THE SOURCES**

I would first like to stress that the archival materials/the “written memory” of the INH (records from the sessions of the INH Council, the Management Board, decisions, solutions, plans and projects, statutes, legislative acts, etc.) kept at the INH Documentation Department are in a fairly poor condition. The resources were stored inappropriately, there are documents and materials from different periods missing – that is, there are chronological holes in the documentation. Furthermore, there is no INH fund for the Macedonian Archives, a leading state institution – which is, at the very least, incomprehensible. From the conversations I conducted with my senior fellow historians I also found that the recorded materials/tapes of the INH Council sessions regarding the *Three-Volume History of the Macedonian People* and the *Macedonian History Dictionary* projects, as well as two big INH projects, are also missing. Furthermore, the personal archives of several retired colleagues have not been preserved neither. Highly curious is the case of one of my senior colleagues. During the beginning of the 1990s he offered the INH his personal

archive of documents and copies from the 1960s, when he was first employed. Absurdly, the archive was rejected, and so my colleague donated or sold it to the *Komuna* paper factory!

With regards to field work, I have at this stage conducted several interviews with senior fellow historians who, without any problems or preconceptions, agreed to discuss different topics regarding the INH and their personal work. As has been the case so far, these conversations will prove most valuable in my future work as well – enabling me to contrast the written, sometimes declarative, goals and objectives in the INH work and the living testimonies of the actors in the narrative of “our” national history and its primary agent, the INH.

## **GOALS AND ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP OF THE INH**

The reasons for establishing this institution are presented in the founding decree for the *INH of the Macedonian People* by the government of the People’s Republic of Macedonia, as noted in the Government Gazette, No. 21, Skopje, 1<sup>st</sup> August 1948, article 1. The article clearly states: “in order to study the national and cultural history of the Macedonian people, a Scientific Institute of the National History of the Macedonian people has been formed, as an independent organization of the Committee for Universities, Colleges and Scientific Institutions”. Even though this article clearly defines the role and the function of the INH, it is worth mentioning that the following article, paragraph 1, defining the objectives of the INH, states that the INH will collect, keep and publish materials relative to the national and cultural history of the Macedonian people, as well as “materials, documents and other monuments of the history of minorities and other ethnic groups living in Macedonia.” It seems as if the first two articles of the Statute collide since, apart from on a declarative level, the INH, since its formation, has carried out practically no studies on the history of the minorities in the Republic of Macedonia. Also worth mentioning is paragraph 3 of the same article. It states that in addition to scientific production, the INH is supposed to “organize popular lectures and publish popular editions with the purpose of popularizing the study of the cultural and national history of the *Macedonian people* among the masses...” In fact, this paragraph of article 2 only confirms and specifies the objective stated in article 1, thus defining the notion of national history.

The strictly defined goals and objectives defined for the INH by the state have undoubtedly expressed the ideological function of the Institute, established also for a specific purpose. It is nothing new to say that every attempt to create a national identity also

represents a political action with political repercussions<sup>2</sup>, and that the Macedonian example is no exception in the Balkans. In other words, the Macedonian political nation was also “constructed” in an ethnic sense. The Macedonian case, however, is an interesting example demonstrating how (with all the controversies, of course, accompanying the national issue after the Second World War) the process of constituting the Macedonian ethno-national identity was progressing under the socialist/Yugoslav ideology.

I believe that the fact that the INH was founded in the same year as the Resolution of the Information Bureau of 1948, when the Yugoslav-Soviet relations deteriorated, is more of a coincidence than a planned action of the government at the time. Nevertheless, this political context must have influenced the historiographical writings as well, when one takes the following into consideration: It was at that exact point that the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) took a stand for a greater representation in the studies of the history of the CPY and the development of the communist and socialist movement in the Yugoslav states, as well as in the National Liberation War/NLW (practically a synonym for the Second World War in Macedonia) and the building of the federation. According to V. Ačkovska and statements from my interviewees, the *Political Report on the Work of the Central Committee of CPM in 1948* formed the main conceptual and political direction in writing history in the People’s Republic of Macedonia (PRM). It was submitted by Lazar Koliševski<sup>3</sup> and later published as a separate pamphlet.<sup>4</sup> It is in fact a so-called guide used for a long time by the historians of the INH in their work, and, although they had not received any outright instructions to use it, as one of our interviewees said: “History was seen through the prism of Koliševski’s guide – a short version of history and, at the same time, a guide on how history is supposed to be written.”

Namely, a year after the foundation of the INH, it included, as a starting point, the library and documentation from the Macedonian Scientific Institute in Sofia. Towards the end of 1948, at a turning point in the Macedonian-Bulgarian relations<sup>5</sup> (that is, when Bulgaria changed its attitude regarding the Macedonian question), the Institute was supposed to release material on history, ethnology, economy, geography and the Macedonian national struggle. Kiril Nikolov’s essay on the *Macedonian Nation* was delivered in a debate on the Macedonian Question. It was held at the Macedonian Scientific Institute in Sofia in 1946 and was soon published in Skopje as a separate book with a preface by the eminent journalist and political activist, Mito Hadži-Vasilev [later a member of the Management Board of the INH and on the staff of the *Glasnik (Review)* magazine of the INH]. In

the preface, the author also gives directions for the work of historians regarding the clarification of the problems surrounding the Macedonian nation. He thus explicitly indicates that:

“The issue of producing the necessary historiographical literature is set before our historians and other scholars in the field; literature dedicated to the history of our people and revealing the historical truth cleansed of all obscurities and hegemonist attempts and appropriations, so that the masses may learn about our past in the way that our people themselves created it”.<sup>6</sup>

In 1960, the INH also included the History Department from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Macedonia, which was created in 1949 with the purpose of collecting archival material and memoirs on the history of the workers' movement, as well as on the development of the communist movement and the NLW in Macedonia.

In 1965, the government of the PRM also enacted the *Special INH Law* regulating the work of this “independent and self-governing scientific/research institution”. Unlike the Law of 1948, the first article of this law stresses that the objective of the INH is to study the national history of the Macedonian people and other ethnicities – the national minorities living in Macedonia. The following article, specifically defining the INH activities, mentions on several occasions the term *national history* without any specification as to whether it refers, or might refer, strictly to the Macedonian people, unlike the previous state act of 1948. It did not, however, instigate any changes in the name of the Institute. Despite the definition in the Law, even before its enactment, several academic historians at the INH Council sessions of 1956 instigated the need for expanding the name of the Institute on account of a more comprehensive study of Macedonian history. P. Lisičar (historian, university professor), for instance, suggested the *History Institute of Macedonia*, and H. A. Poljanski (historian, university professor and later on academician) recommended the *Historical Institute of the People's Republic of Macedonia*.

Article 4 of the *Special Law* clearly states that: “The Institute is an institution working for a special social interest.” With this article, in fact, the role and place of the INH in society was for the first time stressed on a formal/legislative level. At that particular time the activities of the Institute and its associates regarding the project (discussed below) of the *Three-Volume History of the Macedonian People* continue and intensify, accompanied by increased funding for its realization from the budget of the Republic.

Apart from these legislative acts, the INH goals and objectives were also regulated by the Institute's internal acts, the Statute (verified by the Executive Council/Government of the Republic at the time) and the working instructions of its members and associates. Of even more importance, were the influential views and opinions of high-ranking political and party officials who, directly or not, participated in the INH bodies. In the INH documentation, for instance, I came across an article by Lazar Mojsov<sup>7</sup> (journalist, politician and diplomat) who was president of the Council of INH for many years. He explicitly presents the Institute's objectives. In the article entitled *On the Future Tasks of the Institute of the National History of the Macedonian People*, submitted at the annual INH assembly in 1956, the author first debates at length about the foreign bourgeoisie, as well as about the socialist historiographies that he believes to be spreading lies on Macedonian history, unscientifically using forgeries and propaganda. They (it is unclear whom *they* refers to), Mojsov stresses:

“persist in explaining the events of our past and our national development as phenomena of different national colouring, thus striving to continually subject the studies in Macedonian history to politics. They can no longer demolish our TODAY, but wish to defend their own YESTERDAY, and that is all merely a sad memento of the times when Macedonia was the arena of mutual conflicts and struggles for foreign interests.”

After a long and detailed introduction, Mojsov states that immediately after liberation, it was the responsibility of the young historiography to fulfill the important task of “producing accurate studies of Macedonian history and to present all endeavors undertaken thus far to clarify certain historical events from Macedonia's past in a truthful light”. Historians were to deal with the “historical obscurities and falsifications about Macedonia and to go to all efforts to expose the areas of the national past which are lacking in any scientific evidence... .” In the vein of a high government official of the time, Mojsov glorifies the communist movement in Macedonia and the advantages of the NLW, evoking Goce Delčev's<sup>8</sup> legacy, as well as the work of the state and party leaders in the PR of Macedonia in the realm of the “clarifying and scientific work in the field of our national history”.

In the final section of his article, Mojsov specifically deals with the INH objectives. The Institute was supposed to attend to the education of the historians within the concept of national history; it was also supposed to organize lectures and platforms for the expert

public, and national history lectures for the general public - all as a means of contributing to a "wider popularization of national history". At the Assembly he also raised the importance of publishing a scientific magazine - the future INH *Review*. Mojsov believed the special purpose of this magazine should be to follow and review all literature, published locally and abroad, about the "Macedonian Question".

When discussing the INH publishing activity, Mojsov notes that in addition to collecting and publishing documents, the Institute should publish academic monographs and create a special popular edition, "which could be quite useful in expanding the knowledge on our national history among the masses". The Institute's financial reports show that for the following year in 1957 the government of the PRM set aside increased funding for the INH and its work, as well as for an appropriate location.

Finally, Mojsov mentions that it is essential for the Institute to have an Information Department to keep records of all the information and articles from the foreign press about the "Macedonian Question". These, he says, should then be distributed amongst the INH employees and the other institutes in the country.

In contrast to the Mojsov's speech, in 1957 the director of the INH, Ljuben Lape, (university professor and later academician) talks about the particular problems the INH is facing from the viewpoint of a professional historian. He indicates that the Institute lacked sufficiently qualified staff and that the library was in poor condition. He places emphasis on the need for the INH employees to obtain higher academic standards by specializing and studying abroad. He considers the need for learning foreign languages equally important, especially "Greek and Turkish, to allow for an all-inclusive study of the complex issue of Macedonian history", as well as classical languages (Ancient Greek, Old Church-Slavonic, and Ottoman). While under the directorship of Ljuben Lape, the INH established an exchange with 64 institutions in the FPRY / SFRY and just as many, according to him, abroad.

Ten years later, in 1967, when the Institute was under the management of General M. Apostolski, the highest managing body of the INH, the Institute Council enacted the so-called *Perspective Program of the Institute of National History*.

In addition to analyzing the current work of the INH according to departments and sections, the Program also defines the objectives, topics and problems of each department for the following five to ten years.

The Program states that after nearly twenty years of existence, the INH needs to engage with the study of the delicate problems in Macedonian history. The primary objective of

the Institute should be researching the archival sources both in the country and abroad, publishing original documents, creating bibliographies, as well as collecting personal archives and memoirs. According to the Program, this *modus operandi* “would allow for writing monographs, studies, etc. that would treat the history of the Macedonian people and their nationalities, and the history of the workers’ movement and the League of the Communists of Macedonia”. The overarching goal of the INH was to provide a solid foundation for the history of the Yugoslav peoples and the history of the workers’ movement.

The Program has established that the *Three-Volume History of the Macedonian People* project is in its final pre-publishing stage and that, in addition to the existing editors, a special editing group will be formed to edit the texts by all authors-collaborators on the project, based on the editors’ suggestions. Although a more detailed analysis of this project will form part of my further research, I would like to digress and highlight several interesting instances.

From interviews with my colleagues I learned that all the editors’ meetings, where crucial roles were assumed by A. Hristov,<sup>9</sup> B. Koneski,<sup>10</sup> D. Mitrev, and other public figures, were recorded. Secondly, the first version of the first volume manuscript, mainly treating the Middle Ages, with a brief reflection on Antiquity, was returned to the author S. Antoljak (historian, university professor). At the editors’ meetings, usually led by B. Koneski, (who, by the way, had contributed almost none of his own texts to the *Three-Volume History*) and before whom “all, even senior historians, withdrew”, as an interviewee stressed, the decision was made to use the phrase *Macedonian Slavs* for period from the arrival of the Slavs in Macedonia up to the beginning of the Ottoman period, and to use *Macedonian people* for the time after the start of Ottoman rule. After editing parts of Antoljak’s texts, as instructed by the editors, the interviewee pointed out that “the only good thing was that *they* never insisted, they were aware that the lines of our heritage should be drawn from the Middle Ages, not from Antiquity as is so crudely done today.” The standard *Three-Volume History* was published just before the arrival of Josip Broz Tito in Macedonia. “So, this great event – the publication accompanied by a befitting celebration, was a joy for all of us,” another interviewee stated. The first copy of the *Three-Volume History* was presented and dedicated to Tito himself, during his visit to the INH. This act, our interviewee stressed, “meant recognizing the Macedonian people and its history as an equal in the Yugoslav federation”. Copies of the *History* were also taken to the World Congress of Historians in Moscow 1969/1970, in order to: “show our col-

leagues what we had done. We also took other historiographical texts which were distributed at the Congress, but they could not be compared in quantity with the books and other material that the Bulgarian delegation of historians, with whom we debated fiercely at the sessions, had brought.”

The INH was formed with specific goals and objectives by the government, and its work as an institution of a special state interest was closely monitored and highly centralized. The ideological and “academic” directions in the INH research policies were mainly determined by the high party and state officials, as well as by eminent writers, journalists, scholars, safe personnel “on the line”, with minimal participation by professional historians. In the first decades following its formation, its priority became to expose the “falsifications of Macedonian history” and to spread the “truth about the history of the Macedonian people”. Apart from the published documentation, the first published articles and several monographs were of a popular nature so that the national history could be brought closer to the people. Or, as one of the interviewees stated, “in the first two decades most of the articles published had nothing or very little to do with serious academic research”. *The Three-Volume History*, the interviewee said, “with all its flaws, was still the first more serious and summative historiographical work produced by the INH”.

## **ON THE INH ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP AND INTERNAL STRUCTURE**

The Institute started off during the Second World War with several participants, a library containing 3,712 books and magazines “primitively fitted and in relatively poor conditions”. Three departments were established at the beginning: 1. The Department of the National/Revolutionary and National Liberation Period; 2. The Department of National Rebirth; and 3. The Turkish Department. The departments were gradually expanded with sections, such as the Medieval Macedonian History Section (more specifically, the Slavic/Byzantine period), which up until the end of the 1960s did not have a single employee, as well as the Modern History and National Liberation War sections. The Institute Council had the highest management role according to the legislative acts and statutes of the INH, and it coordinated the overall work, reviewed and approved the plan for publishing activities, outlined the working plans and research projects, and organized competitions for new associates, etc. As the INH Director Ljuben Lape pointed out in one of his reports: “The Institute Council evolved into a management body by properly orienting its work... .” As an illustration, in various records until 1960, those most often referred to as Council members were: L. Mojsov, Kiro Miljovski (high state official), T.

Tomovski (university professor, historian), Dimitar Mitrev (writer and literary critic), M. Sokoloski (oriental philologist and, at one point, INH director), B. Koneski, Mitko Zafirovski (director of the National-University Library), Dime Bojanoski – Dize (NLW memorial recipient), amongst others.

In the same year of 1956 only one expert associate, one assistant, and four high-school history teachers were permanently assigned to the INH. Out of the two qualified historians at the time, one, an oriental philologist, was carrying out his doctoral studies in Belgrade, and the other, fluent in Greek, was reassigned to a different government body. In those days, mostly bibliographies were written and published on topics and issues corresponding to the department names. It is still worth mentioning that the first published documents, apart from the NLW ones, were in fact documents related to the Ottoman period that had been acquired from personal archives, from the vakaf funds in Bitola, and from the first research conducted in Istanbul by Dušanka Šopova.

Apart from the INH Council, the Institute Management Board was also involved in managing the institution and it too consisted of eminent scholars, and public and political figures. The INH director and several Council members were automatically assigned to the Management Board. In the records of 1960, the following were mentioned as board members: Ivan Katardžiev (historian, later minister of education and academician), Orde Ivanovski (historian), Blaga Aleksova (archeologist, later academician), Gjorgji Abadžiev (writer), A. Hristov (lawyer, university professor and INH director at one point), amongst others.

It seems rather paradoxical, but in the formal INH hierarchy, the Academic Board, consisting of the whole INH academic staff (as well as several external INH associates) was the *final and latest* body to be formed. With the establishment of the Academic Board, in fact, the employees – the academic historians in the INH - were for the first time able to decide on the problems concerning their academic work. Thus, according to the 1968 INH acts, the Academic Board was authorized to deal with human resources, financial and scientific issues, and to participate in organizing symposia, conferences, publishing activities, etc.

This same organizational structure could be noted towards the end of the 1960s as well, when according to the changes in the political system of the country – the famous self-governance, the abovementioned bodies became the Institute's self-governance organs. Later on the Institute began gradually expanding and educating its staff, and at the same time expanding its departments. They were structured mostly chronologically, and only

partially thematically. Towards the end of the 1960s, when General Mihajlo Apostolski was the Institute director, there were several departments, within the INH structure as follows:

1. The Department of the Slavic/Byzantine Period. Formed in 1967, with one junior assistant employee.
2. The Turkish Period (15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Centuries) Department, with three employees, all with PhDs.
3. The Department of the National/Revolutionary Period (19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century History): I. Katardžiev, the only historian with a PhD, the then minister in the Government of the PRM, four research assistants and one junior assistant.
4. The Modern History (1918-1945) Department, with five historians with PhDs, two senior assistants and one junior assistant.
5. The Balkanology Department, which is in the process of formation.
6. In addition to these academic departments, there were also other departments at the INH: for collecting memoirs, for bibliography and for archiving and documentation.
7. Special departments: a library, administrative and technical services.

In 1968 there were twenty-six professional historians working at the INH. One of whom was an academician and another thirteen had PhDs in history. Here were also two senior assistants and two junior assistants and expert associates.

A superficial glance at the organizational structure and the staffing of the Institute would show not only a quantitative increase in human resources, but also a higher academic level, judging by the number of employees with PhDs and MAs. One could also note that the greater staffing and academic titles are mostly found in the National Rebirth Department and the Modern History Department. It is remarkable that the Medieval History Department, with one junior assistant in 1969, was formed 20 years after the foundation of the Institute, and the Balkanology Department did not even exist at the time.

The way the departments were designed, seen from the chronological perspective of periodization in history and from the viewpoint of professional staffing, also indicates the policy of the state and party leaders at the time. Despite the existence of the Turkish Department, from judging by the numbers of professional historians in the departments, the

main research interest and the comprehension of what the national history of the Macedonian people and the minorities is (even if only on a declarative level), was focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This is also evident from the monographs and the collection of documents published by the INH by 1969, as well as the historians' (and non-historians') articles published for other magazines and publishers outside the INH. Amongst the published works one could also find a small amount of research dedicated to the Macedonians from the so-called Aegean and Pirin parts of Macedonia. The notion of the national history of the Macedonian people also included its history in the "ethnic/geographical territory of Macedonia". To illustrate this, at the INH Council session held at the office of its president L. Mojsov in 1957, a stand was taken regarding the preparation of the popular/scientific history of Macedonia: "up to 1912, Macedonia should be treated as a unique whole, and afterwards the territory of the PR of Macedonia should be central, but the other two parts should also be included."

In the plans for 1969 and 1970, funding was set aside for the associates of the National Rebirth Department to research archives locally and abroad, although more specifically for research in Belgrade, Zagreb, Prague, Bucharest, Paris, and Great Britain. Funding was also set aside for two members of the Turkish Department who were supposed to go to Istanbul and Paris. The main objective of the Modern History Department in the ensuing years was to prepare an extensive monograph on the NLW in Macedonia, as well as on the Civil War in Greece. As a curiosity we would like to single out the *Position of the Minorities in Macedonia between 1912 and 1945* topic. The associates of the departments for the so-called memoirist materials continued to collect mainly testimonies from the Partisan Movement in Macedonia, whilst at the Bibliography Department they prepared various bibliographies, and in the Archives Department they systematized the documentation.

Even though there were at least formal attempts to study the Middle Ages at the very onset of the INH, the need for more thorough studies was only stressed in the agenda of the early seventies. It was therefore necessary to begin collecting and processing sources on the medieval history of the Macedonian people, more specifically, the period between the 6<sup>th</sup> and the mid 10<sup>th</sup> centuries. In a record from the INH Council from 1959, the Institute director D. Zografski, who was informing the Council about the directives from the Central Committee and L. Koliševski regarding the Institute's Program, states that: "Comrade Koliševski recommended that popularism should be replaced with developing the scientific aspect of the INH, and the suggested topics on Samuil<sup>11</sup> and the Bogomils

should be removed from the program”. There was no mention of topics and research regarding the history of Antiquity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia* was the people’s main legislative and executive representative body of the Macedonian state from 1944 until the end of World War II.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. Smit, *Nacionalni identitet*, Beograd 1998, 158.

<sup>3</sup> General Secretary for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Macedonia (named the League of Communists of Macedonia after April 1952) from October 1941 - July 1963. Prime Minister from 1945 – 1953.

<sup>4</sup> V. Ačkoska- D. Petreska, *Osoznavanje na istorijata*, Skopje 2007, 125.

<sup>5</sup> According to the Bled agreement between J. Broz Tito and G. Dimitrov in 1947, Bulgaria recognized the minority rights of the Macedonians in Western Bulgaria - the so-called Pirin Macedonia, allowing them cultural autonomy. After the Information Bureau Resolution, the estrangement between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria resulted in the abolishment of the cultural autonomy of the Macedonians in Bulgaria and the return to the old positions regarding the Macedonian Question in general.

A chronology of the key events in the bilateral relations between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia regarding the Macedonian Question after 1944, and their impact on the work of historians in Macedonia and Bulgaria, was produced by S. Troebst. Cf. S. Troebst, *Bugarsko – jugoslovenskata kontroverza za Makedonija 1967-1982*, Skopje 1997, 119-195.

<sup>6</sup> V. Ačkoska- D. Petreska, *op. cit.*, 124

<sup>7</sup> He was deputy minister of foreign affairs in Yugoslavia between 1974 and 1982, and from 1977 to 1978 the president of the United Nations General Assembly.

<sup>8</sup> One of the leaders of the Ilinden Uprising against the Ottomans in 1903.

<sup>9</sup> Neither Hristov nor Koneski and Mitrev were professional historians.

<sup>10</sup> An eminent linguist, university professor and poet; author of the first Macedonian grammar book, of the Dictionary of the Macedonian Language, etc.

<sup>11</sup> Tsar Samuil’s tenth century medieval state, which included the territory of today’s Republic of Macedonia, is the key part of the Macedonian Grand Narrative, but also one of the greatest sources of controversy and debate between the Macedonian and Bulgarian historiographies.

## References:

1. Part of the INH Council records, 1955-1960, folder No. 18, INH Documentation Department.
2. Part of the INH Executive Board records, 1956-1960, folder No. 19, INH Documentation Department.
3. Stenographer’s notes of the INH annual assembly of 1<sup>st</sup> July 1956, filed under slide No. IV.264, INH Documentation Department.

4. Stenographer's notes of the INH annual assembly of 25<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup> October 1958, filed under slide No. IV.264/2, INH Documentation Department.
5. Stenographer's notes of the INH annual assembly of 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> October 1961, filed under slide No. IV.264/3, INH Documentation Department.
6. Discussion of scientific workers at the Balkanology Congress in Sofia of 1967 and their impressions of the congress, Skopje, 1967, filed under slide No. IV. 355, INH Documentation Department.
7. People' Republic of Macedonia Government Gazette No. 21, Skopje, 4<sup>th</sup> August 1948, p.142.
8. Socialist Republic of Macedonia Government Gazette No. 16, 1965, p. 438.
9. *Perspektivna programa na Institutot za nacionalna istorija*, Skopje 1967.
10. *20 godini na Institutot za nacionalna istorija (1948-1968)*, Skopje, 1968.
11. *30 godini Institut za nacionalna istorija*, Skopje 1978.
12. Interviews conducted in April and May of 2007 with retired INH historians.
13. Ačkoska V. – Petreska D., *Osoznavanje na istorijata*, Skopje 2007.
14. Smit, D. A., *Nacionalni identitet*, Beograd 1998.
15. Troebst, S., *Bugarsko-jugoslovenskata kontroverza za Makedonija (1967-1982)*, Skopje 1997.