

REVIEW

by

Professor, Doctor of Historical Sciences Milko Stoyanov Palangurski

of the submitted works for participation in a competition for the academic position ½ STATE PROFESSOR announced by New Bulgarian University, Faculty of Finance, Department of History, in professional field 2.2 "History and Archeology", announced in State Gazette, issue 54 / 16.06.2020 and according to Order Z-RK-259 / 21.07.2020.

The only candidate in the competition is Momchil Nikolaev Metodiev. He graduated History at Sofia University "Kliment Ohridski" in 1995 with a master's degree and then became a researcher, editor and part-time lecturer in various scientific organizations, universities and journals. At that time he was working on his dissertation for Doctor of History in the Faculty of History at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski ", Department of Ancient History, Thracology and Medieval History and for a Doctor of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy, Sofia University " St. Kliment Ohridski ", Department of Culturology.

According to the requirements of the Law of Academic Staff Development in Republic of Bulgaria, the candidate has the following scientometric indicators:

Groupe A

1. Dissertation for awarding educational and scientific degree "Doctor" - 50 points. Evolution of the papal institution (beginning of the IV- VII century). Scientific specialty with code 05.03.03 Medieval general history. Diploma № 27 969 /24.06.2002 issued by the High Attestation Commission at the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria.

Groupe B

2. Dissertation for the award of the scientific degree "Doctor of Science" - 100 accurate. - The Orthodox Church and the communist regime in Bulgaria. Scientific specialty 05.08.33. Theory and history of culture. Diploma № 34534 / 23.08.2010 issued by the High Attestation Commission at the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria.

Groupe C

3. A published monograph, which is presented as a major habilitation thesis - Bishop Andrei of New York: biography, memoirs, diaries. Sofia: Riva, 2016. ISBN 978-954-320-561-5– 100 points

The monograph dedicated to Bishop Andrei follows the life of one of those people who had the difficult task of transporting the Bulgarian Orthodox Church from the tough times after the national catastrophes to newer time. It is based entirely on original source material and covers a little known to historical science time from the middle of the 20th century. Like any biography, this one is naturally set in the context of the history of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, considering his personal career in Bulgaria and subsequently in New York.

Bringing to the fore the main problems facing the Bulgarian Orthodox Church based on the personal biography of Stoyan Petkov, is the undoubted scientific contribution of the author. Unquestionably, his thesis that the battles within the church structure are the result of disputes over its public presence, schism and the way it is governed are completely defensible. This happens through a personal story, but corresponds to a real processes and phenomena.

Understandably, the second part of the book is dedicated to the life of the bishop, and then Metropolitan Andrei, as the leader of the Bulgarian diocese in America. The highly politicized character of the Bulgarian church communities in America and the strong influence of the Macedonian Bulgarians are clearly present. The difficult relations between the Bulgarian Church, the church communities in America, the communist government and the anti-communist political emigration are also clearly presented. The unification of the Bulgarian church community in a single diocese, becomes an absolute success with his elected as a metropolitan in 1947. However, he was not recognized by the Bulgarian church until the early 60's. The monograph traces the attempts of Metropolitan Andrei to establish not only his authority, but also his aspiration to create new church communities through his contacts with other emigrant Orthodox communities and to preserve the unity of the Bulgarian Church in America. Finally, his recognition and acceptance by the Holy Synod in Sofia as a full member in the early 1960s leads to another division in the Bulgarian church community along the axis of contact with the communist government that allowed the intervention of the state in the leadership of the diocese and the formation of three parts in the diocese.

The paragraphs about his participation in the negotiations for the abolition of the schism in Constantinople are interesting. Thus, the life of Metropolitan Andrei turned out to be focused on problems dominating the history of the BOC. An undoubted contribution are the texts dedicated to his acquaintance with famous people such as the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras, Monsignor Angelo Roncalli, then Pope John XXIII, with Tsar Simeon II and other leaders of the Bulgarian political emigration, as well as his teaching activity in St. Vladimir. This alone ranks him among the most interesting theologians of the XX century. The publication of

preserved memoirs and excerpts from the diary of Metropolitan Andrew is a great contribution.

4. State security: Advantage by inheritance: Professional biographies of leading officers. Sofia: Ciela, Institute for the Study of the Recent Past, 2015. ISBN 978-954-28-1937-0. in coll. with Maria Dermendzhieva. From the author are pages 9-137,308-605,718-733,887-907.

The monograph dedicated to the professional profile of the leading officers of the totalitarian security service during the communism times was developed on completely unknown and prohibited documents and materials extracted from the archives of the State Security. Essentially, this is a complete analysis of the structure, organization of work and staff development. The conclusions are built on huge statistics based on the professional appearance of the officer corps and the huge number of processed personnel files. The data would be difficult to change and could easily be used by researchers as irrefutable evidence.

The other task that the two authors have set for themselves is the extraction of the so-called institutional culture as part of the totalitarian system and its transfer into the period of post-communist transition. The question of who the State Security serves and how the loyalty of its staff is built and guaranteed, as well as the system for selection and career growth is well documented.

The first part is dedicated to the recruitment, work, organization, structure and career development. The conclusion is that even after 1989 this institutional culture is still present.

The analysis of the biographies of leading employees of the State Security was made in order to demonstrate the difference in the generations who worked in the system and the profiles of the leading officers. The employees who worked in the State

Security during communism are divided into two generations. It has been proven that the leading criteria for the appointment of both generations is their loyalty to the Communist Party. The division between the two generations is the personal merit of employees working around September 9, 1944.

The profile of both generations is very well defined, showing the model for the development of these people. The first generation of operatives are people almost entirely of rural origin, who moved in the course of their education to a nearby town. The backbone of the service are people with secondary education, who participated in the seizure of power and in the persecution of officers in the army. The conclusion is correct that "education and qualifications follow, not precede, the appointment." The leading criteria for the appointment of the second generation is the same, but with an added protection of the party leadership or other superiors. The second generation have a higher education, but this is not a prerequisite for employment, and education is not relevant to the management or position to which the employee is appointed.

The conclusions about the bureaucracy of the system, the stability through the domination of the first generation, the obstruction of growth and the internal tension are completely substantiated. This explains why "State security is becoming a closed and stagnant system that recruits its staff based on their background and does not allow natural generational change." The success of the service to protect the regime is due not to its quality, but to the institutional arbitrariness and the ability to take administrative measures and extrajudicial repression until the end of the "developed socialism".

My only recommendation for the study is that on the basis of the available abundant source material it is possible to make a breakdown of the dependencies at a lower level and to further answer the question if the lower levels of officers are recruited

and depend on the same as senior officers. I realize how difficult and impossible this is to do in a study, but a "drilling" of one or two components could provide interesting information and guidance for future historiographical work.