

How significant was the role of the British Expeditionary Force in Macedonia between, 1915-1917 and how the Bulgarians defended themselves?

Samouil Bogomilov Panayotov

Student number: 2205038

Supervised by Dr Ryan O'Byrne

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the award of the degree of Bachelor of Arts

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

2025

Introduction

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917 occupies a curious and often underappreciated position in the grand narrative of World War I. While the muddy trenches of the Western Front and the vast deserts of the Middle East dominate historical accounts of Britain's military endeavors, the Macedonian campaign, commonly referred to as the Salonika Front, unfolded in a rugged, peripheral theater that tested the resilience of British troops against both natural and human adversaries. Far from the decisive clashes of Flanders or the dramatic sweeps of Gallipoli, the BEF's role in Macedonia was shaped by a complex interplay of strategic necessity, logistical hardship, and a determined Bulgarian foe allied with the Central Powers. This dissertation seeks to emphasize the significance of the BEF's operations in Macedonia during this period, examining its objectives, the challenges it faced, and the Bulgarian defensive strategies that defined the campaign's course. In doing so, it aims to elevate the Salonika Front from a historical footnote to a critical lens through which to understand the broader dynamics of the First World War.

The origins of the Macedonian campaign lie in the tumultuous events of 1915. As the Central Powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and their new ally Bulgaria, launched a devastating offensive against Serbia in October of that year, the Allies scrambled to respond. Britain and France, under pressure to support their Serbian ally and prevent the Balkans from falling entirely into enemy hands, dispatched forces to the Greek port of Salonika (Thessaloniki).¹ The BEF arrived as part of this multinational effort, initially tasked with relieving Serbian forces and halting the Central Powers' advance. However, by the time Allied troops disembarked, Serbia had been overrun, and the campaign's purpose shifted to establishing a defensive foothold in Macedonia.² Over the next two years, from 1915 to 1917, the BEF, alongside French, Serbian, and later Greek contingents, engaged in a protracted struggle against Bulgarian forces, who proved adept at leveraging their terrain and alliances to thwart Allied ambitions.

The Salonika Front was, in many ways, a theater of contradictions. For Britain, it was a secondary priority, overshadowed by the titanic struggle on the Western Front, where the bulk of the British soldiers fought and died. Yet, it was also a strategically vital arena, aimed at

¹ Charles F. Horne ed., *Source Records of the Great War, Vol. III* (National Alumni 1923), 328.

² Horne, *Source Records of the Great War*, 349.

containing Bulgaria, securing the Balkan flank, and maintaining pressure on the Central Powers' southern periphery. The BEF, numbering around 150,000 men at its height, faced a litany of challenges: a harsh mountainous landscape, crippling disease, strained supply lines, and an uncertain political landscape in Greece. These factors conspired to limit the scope and impact of British operations, rendering the campaign a grueling war of attrition rather than a decisive breakthrough. Meanwhile, Bulgaria, emboldened by its recent victories in the Balkan Wars, its population bitter that they were robbed by the Serbs, the Greeks and the Romanians of territories they considered rightfully Bulgarian, supported by German expertise, mounted a defense that capitalized on local knowledge and fortified positions, frustrating British-led offensives such as the Battles of Doiran in 1916 and 1917.³

This dissertation is driven by a central question: How significant was the role of the British Expeditionary Force in Macedonia between 1915 and 1917, and how did the Bulgarians defend themselves against it? To address this, four interrelated research questions guide the analysis. First, what were the objectives of the BEF in Macedonia, and what limitations constrained their realization? This inquiry delves into the strategic intent behind Britain's involvement and how did geographical, logistical, and political factors influence the BEF's campaigns? Macedonia's unforgiving terrain, coupled with supply shortages and Greece's wavering neutrality, created a uniquely challenging operational environment, which this study explores in depth. Third, how effective was the Bulgarian defense, and what strategies did they employ to counter the BEF? By examining Bulgarian tactics, fortifications, and coordination with Central Powers' allies, this question highlights the adversary's role in defining the campaign's outcome. Finally, how did the Macedonian campaign influence broader Allied and Central Powers' strategies in the Balkans? This places the Salonika Front within the wider context of World War I, assessing its ripple effects on military planning and resource allocation.

The methodological approach blends primary and secondary source analysis to construct a comprehensive picture of the campaign. Primary materials, including soldiers' diaries, offer raw insights into the BEF's daily struggles, malarial fevers, muddy marches, and the psychological toll of a seemingly endless stalemate. These accounts are complemented by secondary

³ Falls, C. *Military Operations Macedonia: From the Outbreak of War to the Spring of 1917*. *History of the Great War Based on Official Documents by Direction of the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence*. Vol. I (Imperial War Museum and Battery Press ed.). London: HMSO, 1996 [1933], 152.

scholarship, such as Cyril Falls' *Military Operations Macedonia*, for example, which provides an authoritative overview of British strategy and its consequences. A comparative method further enriches the analysis, juxtaposing BEF tactics with Bulgarian defensive innovations to reveal the interplay of strengths and weaknesses on both sides. This dual perspective ensures a balanced evaluation, acknowledging the BEF's efforts while giving due credit to Bulgarian resilience.

The significance of this study lies in its effort to reframe the Macedonian campaign as more than a sideshow. Though it lacked the scale or glamour of other fronts, the BEF's presence in Macedonia tied down Central Powers' forces, influenced Greece's eventual entry into the war, and contributed to the slow erosion of Bulgaria's war effort, which culminated in its collapse in September, 1918. For Bulgaria, the campaign showcased a military capacity that belied its small size, drawing on national pride and tactical acumen to hold the line against a larger coalition. By dissecting these dynamics, this dissertation argues that the Salonika Front was a microcosm of World War I's complexity, where grand strategy collided with local realities, and where the BEF's perseverance met its match in Bulgarian defiance.

This introduction outlines the scope and stakes of the research, setting the stage for a detailed exploration across four chapters. Chapter 1 will dissect the BEF's objectives and limitations, Chapter 2 will analyze the environmental and political factors at play, Chapter 3 will assess Bulgarian defensive strategies, and Chapter 4 will contextualize the campaign's broader impact. Together, these sections will illuminate a theater of war that, while peripheral, was far from inconsequential, offering fresh insights into Britain's global war effort and Bulgaria's tenacious stand.

Chapter 1: Objectives and Limitations of the BEF in Macedonia

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) deployed to Macedonia in 1915 entered a theater of war that, while secondary to the Western Front, carried significant strategic weight within the Allied effort against the Central Powers. The Macedonian campaign, centered around the Salonika Front, emerged from a desperate bid to support Serbia and evolved into a prolonged struggle against Bulgarian forces aligned with Germany and Austria-Hungary. This chapter examines the objectives that drove the BEF's involvement from 1915 to 1917, situating them within the broader context of World War I, and analyzes the manifold limitations, strategic, logistical, environmental, and political, that curtailed British effectiveness. Far from a straightforward

military endeavor, the BEF's role in Macedonia reveals the complexities of waging war in a peripheral yet geopolitically charged region, where ambitious goals clashed with harsh realities.

Objectives of the BEF in Macedonia

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) arrived in Macedonia in October 1915 as part of an urgent Allied response to a rapidly deteriorating situation in the Balkans. The immediate catalyst was Bulgaria's declaration of war against Serbia on October 14, 1915, aligning itself with the Central Powers, Germany and Austria-Hungary, in a coordinated offensive that threatened to eliminate Serbia as an Allied foothold in the region.⁴ The BEF's initial deployment to the Greek port of Salonika, under General Bryan Mahon's command, reflected a clear and pressing objective: to relieve pressure on Serbian forces and disrupt the Central Powers' advance. Britain and France, committed to supporting their Serbian ally, aimed to push northward from Salonika, establish contact with the retreating Serbian army, and halt Bulgaria's eastward thrust, which risked opening a land corridor to the Ottoman Empire. This mission was ambitious, driven by the strategic imperative to maintain a Balkan front against the Central Powers and prevent their domination of southeastern Europe.

However, the collapse of Serbia by late 1915 forced a swift recalibration of the BEF's goals. The Serbian army, overwhelmed by the triple assault, retreated across Albania to the Adriatic, leaving the Allied forces in Salonika unable to fulfill their original plan.⁵ Consequently, the BEF's objective shifted to a defensive posture. By December 1915, the Allies, including the BEF, established a fortified perimeter around Salonika, nicknamed the "Birdcage"⁶ for its encircling defenses, with the revised aim of holding this base against Bulgarian aggression. This new goal was twofold: to protect Salonika as a strategic foothold and to prevent the Central Powers from advancing further into Greece or threatening Allied shipping in the Aegean Sea.

As the campaign stretched into 1916 and 1917, the BEF's objectives evolved further under General George Milne, who succeeded Mahon in May 1916. The Salonika Front transformed into a theater of attrition, with Britain contributing to a multinational coalition alongside French,

⁴ Falls, *Military Operations Macedonia*, 33.

⁵ "If the French attempt to aid the Serbs was paltry, the British was almost derisory." Alan Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika: The Macedonian Campaign 1915-1918* (London: Faber & Faber, Limited, 2009), 48.

⁶ <https://www.dublin-fusiliers.com/salonika/1916-birdcage.html> (Accessed 1 May, 2025).

Serbian, Russian, and Italian troops. The primary military objective became containment, pinning down Bulgarian and German forces to prevent their redeployment to more critical fronts, such as the Western or Eastern theaters. This strategy aligned with the broader Allied aim of stretching the Central Powers' resources thin, weakening their overall war effort. The BEF also participated in limited offensives, such as the First Battle of Doiran in August 1916 and the larger assault in April-May 1917, designed to break through Bulgarian lines, support the reconstituted Serbian army, and pressure Bulgaria into a negotiated withdrawal.⁷ These operations sought to restore momentum to the Balkan campaign and undermine the Central Powers' southern flank.

Beyond these military aims, the BEF's presence carried a political dimension. Britain intended to bolster Allied cohesion in the Balkans and influence Greece, which remained neutral until June 1917 under King Constantine I's pro-German leanings. The Salonika base, though a point of diplomatic contention due to its infringement on Greek neutrality, served as a visible commitment to the region, encouraging Greece to eventually join the Entente. Thus, the BEF's objectives blended tactical containment with strategic diplomacy, reflecting Britain's broader war aims. While rooted in a desire to alter the Balkan balance of power, these goals would soon encounter significant limitations, as explored elsewhere in this chapter.

Limitations of the BEF

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) in Macedonia faced a constellation of limitations that severely curtailed its ability to achieve its objectives between 1915 and 1917. Operating in a secondary theater far from the Western Front's priority, the BEF contended with strategic neglect, logistical breakdowns, environmental hardships, and political complexities. These constraints transformed the Salonika Front into a campaign defined more by endurance than by decisive success, exposing the challenges of projecting British military power into the Balkans.

Strategically, the BEF suffered from Macedonia's designation as a low-priority theater. The Western Front, where Britain's primary military effort was concentrated, consumed vast resources and attention, particularly during massive engagements like the Battle of the Somme in 1916, which claimed over a million British casualties. By contrast, the BEF in Macedonia peaked at around 150,000 men, a fraction of the forces deployed in France. War Office

⁷ Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 150.

documents reveal a persistent reluctance to bolster this contingent, with Prime Minister David Lloyd George openly hostile to this campaign, view shared also by the British General Staff.⁸ This secondary status translated into limited reinforcements and outdated equipment, leaving the BEF ill-prepared for sustained operations. Thus, the British commanders were handicapped by the lack of a clear mandate, caught between defensive duties and French pressure for bolder action, a strategic ambiguity that stifled initiative.

Logistical difficulties compounded these woes. Although modernized at the turn of the century, Salonika, BEF's primary entry point, was nevertheless poorly equipped to support a large force.⁹ Its single-track railway and rudimentary roads struggled to manage the flow of troops, supplies, and ammunition, leading to chronic delays. Inland, the lack of modern infrastructure forced reliance on mules and manpower to navigate Macedonia's rugged terrain, further slowing operations. The distance from Britain, over 1,500 miles, stretched communication and supply lines thin, ensuring that even well-planned offensives, like the 1917 Doiran assault, lacked the material necessary for prolonged engagements. This logistical nightmare left the BEF perpetually under-resourced, undermining its operational tempo.

The environment posed an equally severe limitation. Macedonia's mountainous landscape, with its snow-laden winters and scorching summers, tested British troops unaccustomed to such extremes. The Vardar Valley and Struma River regions, while tactically significant, were malarial hotspots, with mosquitoes thriving in the marshy lowlands. Medical reports from 1916-1917 document over 160,000 Allied cases of malaria, with the BEF disproportionately affected due to shortages of quinine and mosquito netting.¹⁰ At times, illness reduced effective fighting strength by a third, turning the campaign into a battle against nature as much as the enemy.

Politically, the BEF operated in a mire of uncertainty. Greece's neutrality under King Constantine I, who favored Germany, confined Allied forces to a narrow zone around Salonika until his ousting in June 1917. After the Greek surrender of Fort Rupel to the Bulgarians, the Allies went as far as to declare state of siege in the city without regard of the wishes of the government in Athens.¹¹ This restriction, coupled with accusations of violating Greek sovereignty, strained

⁸ Falls, *Military Operations Macedonia*, 283.

⁹ Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 15.

¹⁰ Id, 128.

¹¹ Id, 130.

relations with Athens and complicated strategy. Within the Allied coalition, friction between British caution under General George Milne and French aggression under General Maurice Sarrail disrupted coordination. Britain's domestic focus on the Western Front further limited commitment, relegating the BEF to a subordinate role. This political disarray eroded morale and coherence, cementing the campaign's reputation as a "forgotten front." Together, these limitations, strategic, logistical, environmental, and political, ensured the BEF's objectives remained aspirational rather than achievable.

Analysis and Conclusion

The British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) involvement in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917 encapsulates a campaign where strategic intent collided with operational reality. The objectives driving the BEF's deployment, initially to relieve Serbia, then to contain the Central Powers, and later to pressure Bulgaria through limited offensives, reflected a coherent, if evolving, role within the Allied war effort. These goals were not without merit: supporting Serbia aimed to preserve a Balkan ally, holding Salonika prevented Central Powers' expansion, and tying down Bulgarian forces stretched enemy resources. Politically, the BEF's presence bolstered Allied influence in Greece, a diplomatic victory realized with Greece's eventual entry into the war in 1917. Yet, the execution of these objectives was consistently undermined by a web of limitations, strategic neglect, logistical fragility, environmental hostility, and political discord, that relegated the campaign to a peripheral struggle, far from the decisive impact envisioned.

Analysis of the BEF's objectives reveals a pattern of adaptation to circumstance. The shift from an offensive relief mission in 1915 to a defensive stance by year's end was a pragmatic response to Serbia's collapse, demonstrating flexibility in British command under General Bryan Mahon.¹² Under General George Milne from 1916, the focus on containment and selective offensives, such as the Battles of Doiran, aligned with the broader Allied strategy of attrition, a hallmark of World War I's grinding nature. The intent was to disrupt Bulgarian operations, while the political objective of swaying Greece highlights Britain's awareness of the Balkans' geopolitical stakes. However, these objectives were inherently constrained by their secondary status. The Western Front's dominance in British planning, as evidenced by resource allocation

¹² "Sarrail and Mahon had agreed that Salonika must be converted into an entrenched camp capable of repelling any attack." Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 62.

and Lloyd George's dismissive rhetoric, ensured Macedonia remained a theater of limited ambition, its goals aspirational rather than actionable.

The limitations facing the BEF amplify this disconnect. Strategically, the campaign's sidelining left it under-resourced. Despite having legal right to land troops in Greece¹³,logistically, Salonika's inadequate infrastructure and the reliance on rudimentary transport, vividly captured in soldiers' accounts of delayed supplies, crippled operational capacity. Environmentally, malaria and harsh terrain, documented in medical reports and personal letters, sapped fighting strength more effectively than Bulgarian bullets. Politically, Greece's neutrality and Allied infighting, as seen in the Milne-Sarrail tensions, fragmented efforts. Together, these factors created a vicious cycle: limited resources hindered offensives, environmental tolls weakened troops, and political hesitancy stifled bold action, ensuring the BEF could neither fully defend nor decisively attack.

This interplay suggests the BEF's significance in Macedonia lies not in transformative victories but in its role as a holding force. By occupying Bulgarian attention, it contributed to a war of attrition, a subtle yet tangible impact on the Central Powers' southern flank. However, this came at a cost, stagnation, high sickness rates, and a reputation as a "forgotten front." The Bulgarian response, explored in later chapters, would exploit these weaknesses, turning British limitations into defensive opportunities.

In conclusion, the BEF's objectives in Macedonia were strategically sound but operationally unfeasible given the limitations imposed. The campaign reveals the challenges of projecting power into a secondary theater, where logistical and environmental realities trumped military intent. While the BEF endured, its achievements were modest, setting the stage for a prolonged stalemate rather than a Balkan breakthrough. This chapter establishes a foundation for understanding how these dynamics shaped interactions with Bulgarian forces, a narrative that unfolds in subsequent analyses of terrain, tactics, and broader strategic consequences.

¹³ "...when Greece Won independence from Turkey in the early nineteenth century, a formal treaty had given Britain, France and Russia the right to land troops, by agreement among themselves, in case of violent upheaval in the Balkans." Id, 11.

Chapter 2: Geographical, Logistical, and Political Influences on the BEF's Campaigns

Introduction

The British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) campaigns in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917 unfolded in a theater defined as much by its unforgiving environment and strained resources as by the enemy it faced. Deployed to the Salonika Front in October 1915 to support Serbia against the Central Powers, the BEF quickly transitioned from an offensive mission to a defensive stalemate, holding a precarious line against Bulgarian forces. While Chapter 1 explored the BEF's objectives and inherent limitations, this chapter delves into the external forces, geographical, logistical, and political, that shaped its operations and constrained its effectiveness. These factors transformed Macedonia into a uniquely challenging arena, testing British resilience and amplifying the difficulties of waging war in a secondary theater. Far from mere backdrop, they actively influenced tactical decisions, operational outcomes, and the broader trajectory of the campaign, often to the advantage of the Bulgarian defenders.

This chapter addresses the research question: How did geographical, logistical, and political factors shape the BEF's campaigns? It argues that the rugged Macedonian landscape, coupled with supply chain failures and political instability, not only thwarted British ambitions but also handed Bulgaria strategic leverage, making the Salonika Front a war of attrition rather than conquest. The analysis proceeds in three sections: first, examining how geography, mountains, weather, and disease, dictated military possibilities; second, detailing the logistical struggles that left the BEF undersupplied and overstretched; and third, exploring the political dynamics, from Greek neutrality to Allied discord, that undermined cohesion. An integrated analysis and conclusion will then assess how these elements intertwined to define the campaign's character, setting the stage for Chapter 3's focus on Bulgarian defensive strategies. Through this lens, Macedonia emerges as a theater where external forces rivaled the enemy in shaping the BEF's fate.

Geographical Influences

The Macedonian landscape presented the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) with a formidable adversary that rivaled the Bulgarian army in its capacity to dictate the terms of the campaign. From the moment the BEF landed at Salonika in October 1915, the region's geography,

characterized by rugged mountains, winding river valleys, and marshy lowlands, imposed severe constraints on mobility, strategy, and troop welfare. Coupled with extreme seasonal conditions and rampant disease, these geographical factors not only limited the BEF's operational effectiveness but also favored the defensive tactics of their Bulgarian opponents, shaping the Salonika Front into a theater where the environment itself became a decisive force.

Macedonia's terrain was a labyrinth of natural obstacles. The Vardar Valley, a key corridor for potential advances, was flanked by steep, forested hills that restricted maneuverability and exposed troops to ambushes. Further east, the Struma River carved through malarial plains, while towering peaks like Mount Kajmakčalan, rising over 2,500 meters, dominated the northern frontier, forming a natural barrier between Allied positions and Bulgarian lines. This mountainous topography hindered the BEF's ability to deploy artillery effectively or execute large-scale offensives, as seen in the failed assaults on Doiran in 1916 and 1917. Unlike the open fields of Flanders, Macedonia's uneven ground favored entrenched defenders, a reality the Bulgarians exploited with fortified positions along ridgelines and passes.

Seasonal extremes amplified these challenges. Winter transformed the mountains into a frozen quagmire, with snow and mud bogging down troops and supply lines. Summer brought the opposite extreme, scorching heat and dust that parched throats and exhausted bodies unaccustomed to Mediterranean climates. Temperatures often exceeded 35°C, as noted in official reports, taxing British soldiers in heavy woolen uniforms designed for cooler European fronts.¹⁴ These conditions slowed marches, disrupted logistics, and left the BEF vulnerable during engagements, contrasting sharply with Bulgarian troops, acclimatized from years of regional warfare.

The most insidious geographical influence, however, was disease, particularly malaria. The Struma Valley and other low-lying areas around Salonika were breeding grounds for mosquitoes, thriving in the stagnant waters of marshes and rivers. The disease struck with devastating efficiency, often incapacitating entire units. Unlike combat wounds, malaria offered no respite, recurring in waves and reducing effective fighting strength by up to a third at critical moments, such as the 1917 Doiran offensive. The BEF's lack of adequate mosquito netting and quinine,

¹⁴ Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 73.

exacerbated by logistical delays, left troops defenseless against this unseen enemy, a stark contrast to the Western Front where trenches, not tropics, defined the struggle.

Tactically, these geographical factors tilted the battlefield in Bulgaria's favor. The mountains and valleys provided natural defensive lines, which the Bulgarians reinforced with trenches and artillery emplacements.¹⁵ Their familiarity with the terrain allowed them to anticipate British movements, set traps in narrow defiles, and hold high ground, as at Doiran, where BEF assaults faltered against steep, fortified slopes. The environment thus amplified Bulgarian resilience, turning Macedonia into a defender's paradise and a nightmare for an attacking force like the BEF, whose training and equipment were ill-suited to such conditions.

In sum, Macedonia's geography, its rugged terrain, brutal seasons, and disease-ridden lowlands, shaped the BEF's campaigns by limiting mobility, sapping strength, and favoring the enemy. These natural barriers set the stage for the logistical and political challenges explored next, collectively defining a theater where the land itself fought against British ambitions.

Logistical Influences

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) in Macedonia faced a logistical quagmire that undermined its ability to sustain operations and achieve its strategic objectives between 1915 and 1917. The Salonika Front, distant from Britain's industrial heartland and reliant on a fragile supply chain, exposed the BEF to chronic shortages, delays, and inefficiencies. From the overburdened port of Salonika to the rudimentary transport network inland, logistical limitations compounded the geographical challenges outlined earlier, leaving the BEF ill-equipped to wage a prolonged campaign against Bulgarian forces. These constraints not only hampered day-to-day operations but also diminished the force's capacity to mount effective offensives, cementing the campaign's reputation as a theater of frustration rather than triumph.

Salonika, BEF's primary entry point, was the linchpin of its logistical woes. Though strategically located on the Aegean, the port, as I already mentioned, was woefully unprepared for the demands of a multinational army. Its single-track railway and limited docking facilities struggled

¹⁵ Georgi Markov, *Goliamata Voina I balgarskata straja mejdu Sredna Evropa I Orienta* (*The Great War: The Bulgarian Guard between Central Europe and the Orient 1916-1919*) (Sofia: Academic Publishing House "Prof. Marin Drinov" 2006), 30-31.

to process the influx of troops, equipment, and supplies arriving from Britain and France. Official reports from 1916 detail chaotic scenes: ships queued for days to unload, while perishable goods rotted under the Mediterranean sun. This bottleneck at Salonika created a ripple effect, delaying the flow of essentials like ammunition, medical supplies, and reinforcements, which were critical for sustaining the BEF's 150,000-strong contingent at its peak.

Once supplies reached shore, the challenge of moving them inland exposed further weaknesses. Until just three years before that, Macedonia was part of the backward, feudal Ottoman Empire. There was lack of modern infrastructure in the region, paved roads were scarce, and the railway extended only a short distance from Salonika, forced the BEF to rely on mules, carts, and human labor to traverse the region's rugged terrain. The mountains and valleys, already a tactical hindrance, became logistical nightmares as narrow trails bogged down convoys in mud or snow. Transporting a single artillery piece to the front could take days, with mules collapsing under the strain. This slow, laborious process left forward units perpetually undersupplied, a stark contrast to the Western Front, where rail networks supported rapid troop and material movements.

The impact on operations was profound, particularly during major engagements. The 1917 Battle of Doiran, intended as a breakthrough against Bulgarian lines, exemplifies the consequences of these shortcomings. Despite weeks of planning, the BEF struggled to amass sufficient artillery shells and reserves due to transport bottlenecks. The British barrages, meant to soften enemy defenses, were intermittent and underpowered allowing Bulgarian troops to weather the assault from their entrenched positions.¹⁶ The inability to sustain momentum after initial attacks, due to shortages of food, water, and medical supplies, forced the BEF to retreat, ceding the initiative to the enemy.¹⁷ Malaria treatment, too, suffered; quinine deliveries lagged, leaving sick troops untreated and further depleting combat strength.

These logistical failures stemmed from both distance and prioritization. Salonika lay over 1,500 miles from Britain, stretching supply lines across contested seas vulnerable to U-boat attacks. Yet, the War Office's focus on the Western Front exacerbated the issue, diverting ships, trains, and resources to France while Macedonia languished. This neglect left the BEF dependent on an overstretched system that could neither keep pace with demand nor adapt to the theater's unique

¹⁶ Falls, *Military Operations Macedonia*, 152.

¹⁷ *Id.*, 157.

needs. Bulgarian forces, by contrast, operated closer to their supply bases in Sofia and benefited from German logistical support, amplifying their defensive resilience.

In essence, logistical influences turned the BEF's campaign into a struggle for survival as much as a fight against the enemy. The port's limitations, inland transport woes, and their operational fallout ensured that even the best-laid plans faltered, setting the stage for the political complications that further entangled British efforts.

Political Influences

The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) in Macedonia operated within a web of political constraints that rivaled the geographical and logistical difficulties in shaping its campaigns from 1915 to 1917. The Salonika Front, a multinational endeavor, was fraught with tensions stemming from Greece's neutrality, discord among Allied commanders, and Britain's domestic prioritization of the Western Front.¹⁸ These political influences not only limited the BEF's operational scope but also eroded its cohesion and morale, transforming the campaign into a diplomatic balancing act as much as a military struggle. Far from providing a unified framework for success, the political landscape exacerbated the BEF's vulnerabilities, handing strategic advantages to the Bulgarian forces.

Greece's neutrality under King Constantine I was a persistent thorn in the BEF's side. Until his deposition in June 1917, Constantine's pro-German sympathies kept Greece officially out of the war, confining Allied forces to a narrow enclave around Salonika.¹⁹ This restriction, imposed to avoid outright violation of Greek sovereignty, prevented the BEF from advancing freely into Macedonian territory or securing broader supply routes. British and French troops faced local hostility and legal ambiguity, with Greek officials occasionally obstructing movements.²⁰ The "National Schism" between Constantine and pro-Allied Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos further muddled the waters, delaying Greece's entry into the war and leaving the BEF in a

¹⁸ "On February 26th a stormy conference between the British and French political and military leaders opened at Calais." Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 144.

¹⁹ William D. Mather. *Muckydonia; 1917-1919: Being the Adventures of a One-Time 'Pioneer' in Macedonia and Bulgaria During the First World War* (London: Stockwell, 1979), 33.

²⁰ "I fear the Greeks even though they offer gifts:" the sentiment with which Virgil credited Laocoon was expressed with less elegance but equal brevity by the senior officers arriving at Salonika." Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika*, 12.

strategic limbo. Only after Venizelos' faction prevailed in 1917 did Greece's alignment ease these constraints, but by then, the campaign's momentum had long stalled.²¹

Allied tensions compounded this uncertainty. The BEF operated under French overall command, with General Maurice Sarrail directing the Salonika Front. Sarrail's aggressive approach, favoring bold offensives like the 1916 Monastir push, clashed with the caution of British commander General George Milne, who prioritized consolidation over risky assaults. This friction led to disjointed planning and execution. For instance, during the 1917 Doiran offensive, French insistence on a frontal attack diverged from British preference for a flanking maneuver, resulting in a poorly coordinated effort that Bulgarian defenses easily repelled. This lack of unity diluted the BEF's influence, relegating it to a supporting role in a coalition where strategic priorities misaligned.

Britain's domestic political climate further constrained the BEF. The Western Front dominated public and parliamentary attention, with battles like Verdun and the Somme overshadowing Macedonia. The French were in the same opinion. The French Premier Georges Clemenceau, a vocal critic of the Salonika campaign, dubbed it a "Gardener's War", a wasteful distraction from decisive theaters.²² There was pressure to limit resources to Macedonia, with reinforcements and supplies diverted to France. This reluctance left the BEF understrength, as evidenced by its peak of 150,000 men compared to millions on the Western Front. Public discontent, fueled by high casualties elsewhere, reinforced this prioritization, leaving commanders like Milne to make do with what they had. This political neglect ensured the BEF lacked the backing to overcome its logistical and geographical handicaps.

The consequences were stark. Politically enforced confinement in Salonika eroded operational flexibility, while Allied discord undermined tactical coherence. Low prioritization sapped morale, with troops nicknaming themselves the "Forgotten Army". Bulgaria capitalized on this disarray, facing a fragmented foe unable to leverage its numerical advantage. The political mire

²¹ Id, 173.

²² "French Premier Georges Clemenceau was hardly less withering in his opinion of the Allied stronghold at Salonika, Greece. "What are they doing?" he demanded. "Digging! Then let them be known as 'the gardeners of Salonika.'" <https://warfarehistorynetwork.com/article/gardening-in-salonika-world-war-i-in-the-balkans/> (Accessed 01/05/2025).

thus turned the BEF's campaign into a holding action, its potential stifled by external and internal divisions.

In summary, political influences, Greek neutrality, Allied tensions, and British hesitancy, encumbered the BEF, compounding its physical challenges. These factors not only limited its effectiveness but also set the stage for Bulgaria's defensive success, a dynamic explored further in the next chapter.

Analysis

The British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) campaigns in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917 were profoundly shaped by an interlocking trio of geographical, logistical, and political influences, each amplifying the others to create a theater of war where external constraints rivaled the Bulgarian enemy in determining outcomes. The rugged terrain, supply chain failures, and political discord did not merely hinder the BEF's operations; they transformed its ambitions, outlined in Chapter 1 as containment and limited offensives, into a grueling struggle for survival. This analysis explores how these factors interacted, thwarted the BEF's objectives, and inadvertently bolstered Bulgarian defenses, underscoring the Salonika Front's significance as a test of endurance rather than military prowess.

Geographical challenges set the foundation for the BEF's difficulties. Macedonia's mountains, seasonal extremes, and malaria-ridden lowlands dictated a slow, defensive pace, limiting mobility and sapping troop strength. The Struma Valley's fevers, which felled over 160,000 Allied soldiers, and the impassable peaks like Kajmakčalan crippled the BEF's ability to sustain offensives, as seen in the stalled Doiran assaults. These conditions directly exacerbated logistical woes. The terrain's ruggedness turned Salonika's inadequate port and mule-dependent transport into choke points, delaying supplies critical for combat and disease prevention.

Logistical breakdowns, in turn, intersected with political influences to deepen the BEF's plight. The War Office's prioritization of the Western Front starved Macedonia of resources, a decision rooted in domestic pressure and Lloyd George's disdain for the campaign. This neglect ensured Salonika's infrastructure was not upgraded, perpetuating delays that left troops with silent guns during key battles. Political tensions with France compounded this, as General Maurice Sarrail's aggressive plans clashed with General George Milne's caution, resulting in disjointed efforts like

the 1917 Doiran offensive. Greek neutrality further tied these threads together, confining the BEF to a malarial enclave where logistical strain and disease flourished unchecked until 1917. This synergy of factors turned tactical setbacks into strategic stagnation, undermining the containment and pressure objectives outlined in Chapter 1.

Compared to those goals, the BEF's reality was a stark mismatch. Containment succeeded only passively. Bulgarian forces were occupied, but not decisively challenged, while offensives faltered against a foe unhampered by similar constraints. Bulgaria's advantage was clear: their proximity to supply bases, acclimatization to the terrain, and unified command under General Nikola Zhekov allowed them to exploit the BEF's weaknesses. The mountains that slowed British advances became Bulgarian ramparts, and the Allies' logistical disarray left gaps for their defenses to hold firm.²³ This dynamic previews Chapter 3's focus on Bulgarian strategies, where local knowledge and German support turned British limitations into opportunities.

Historically, these influences mark Macedonia as a theater of attrition, testing more the British adaptability than their combat skill. The BEF's persistence amid such adversity, holding Salonika despite malaria, mud, and political neglect, reflects resilience, yet it achieved little beyond tying down enemy forces. This significance lies in its subtle contribution to the wider war, draining Central Powers' resources at a cost of British frustration and lives. The campaign's character, forged by these external forces, highlights the limits of imperial reach in a secondary front, a theme that resonates through the dissertation's broader narrative.

Conclusion

The British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) campaign in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917 was decisively shaped by geographical, logistical, and political influences that collectively constrained its operational scope and effectiveness. The region's rugged terrain, harsh seasons, and rampant malaria turned the environment into a relentless adversary, sapping troop strength and mobility. Logistical failures, rooted in Salonika's inadequate port, a strained supply chain, and Britain's prioritization of the Western Front, left the BEF undersupplied and overstretched, unable to sustain offensives or counter disease. Politically, Greek neutrality, Allied discord, and domestic neglect fragmented efforts, confining the force to a peripheral role marked by

²³ Markov, *The Great War*, 98-99.

stagnation rather than success. Together, these factors transformed the Salonika Front into a campaign of endurance, where the BEF's objectives of containment and pressure, outlined in Chapter 1, were realized only minimally, at great cost.

This chapter underscores that Macedonia was a theater where external forces dictated outcomes as much as military strategy, rendering British ambitions unfeasible. The BEF's struggles handed Bulgaria tactical advantages, a dynamic that Chapter 3 will explore through their defensive strategies. These findings frame the campaign as a crucible of resilience, revealing the limits of power projection in a secondary front.

Chapter 3: Bulgarian Defensive Effectiveness and Strategies

Introduction

The Bulgarian defense against the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) on the Salonika Front from 1915 to 1917 stands as a testament to military resilience in the face of a larger, multinational adversary. While the BEF struggled to assert dominance in Macedonia, a theater marked by ambitious objectives and crippling limitations, as explored in Chapter 1, Bulgaria mounted a defense that defied its modest resources and turned the campaign into a prolonged stalemate. Chapter 2 illuminated how geographical ruggedness, logistical frailties, and political disarray hampered British efforts, creating vulnerabilities that the Bulgarians deftly exploited. This chapter shifts focus to the other side of the trenches, examining how Bulgaria's defensive effectiveness and strategic ingenuity thwarted the BEF, shaping the course of the Macedonian campaign.

This analysis addresses the research question: How effective was the Bulgarian defense in countering the BEF, and what strategies did they use? It argues that Bulgaria's success stemmed from a potent combination of terrain mastery, tactical adaptability, and support from Central Powers' allies, particularly Germany. Far from a passive resistance, Bulgaria's approach transformed Macedonia's natural defenses into a formidable barrier, leveraging local knowledge and German resources to neutralize British numerical and technological advantages. This chapter contends that these efforts not only stalled the BEF but also prolonged the Central Powers' hold on the Balkans, a critical factor in the war's southern dynamics.

The chapter unfolds in three main sections: first, exploring the foundations of Bulgarian defensive strength, including military experience and morale; second, detailing their key strategies, such as fortifications and elastic defense; and third, assessing their effectiveness in key engagements like Doiran. An analysis and conclusion will then evaluate Bulgaria's broader impact, linking to Chapter 4's examination of the campaign's strategic consequences. Through this lens, Bulgaria emerges as a pivotal player in the Salonika Front's deadlock.

Foundations of Bulgarian Defensive Strength

Bulgaria's defensive success against the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) on the Salonika Front from 1915 to 1917 rested on a robust foundation of military capability, geographical advantage, and psychological resolve. Entering World War I in October 1915 as an ally of the Central Powers, Bulgaria brought to bear an army honed by recent conflicts and a deep familiarity with Macedonia's terrain, bolstered by a national spirit that fueled its resistance. These elements, military experience, terrain mastery, and desire for vengeance, formed the bedrock of a defense that consistently frustrated British ambitions, turning a seemingly secondary theater into a formidable challenge. I should not though that after defeating the Serbs, Bulgaria made one big mistake. Its leadership agreed to the German demands and ordered the army to step its offensive against the withdrawing Allied troops few kilometers from the Greek border. This pause allowed the Allied troops including BEF to re-organize and ultimately might have caused the loss of the war in 1918 because the breakthrough of the Bulgarian defense happened in that same area. This is a research paper that does not give me a lot of room for speculation but it would be sufficient to mention that if Bulgaria had continued its offensive in the late fall of 1915 it would have been possible to completely obliterate the Allied contingent around Salonika, take the city and deprive the Entente of a base from which to harass Bulgaria.

The Bulgarians halted the British and French in a series of sharp engagements on both sides of the Vardar River and forced them back across the Greek frontier in December 1915. At this point, the commander of the Bulgarian army, General Nikola Zhekov, urged an all-out attack on the disorganized Entente troops falling back towards Salonika. A strong Bulgarian effort could eliminate the Salonika operation all together. Arguing for the attack on the Entente, he insisted, "We have committed our entire existence to this war, we have engaged in a bloody combat and have sustained enormous losses." This was a decisive moment for Bulgaria in the First World War. The presence of a large Entente force on Bulgaria's southern frontier represented a significant danger not only to Macedonia, but also to the original Bulgarian national territory. The elimination of this Entente threat would mean a comprehensive

victory for Bulgaria by which Macedonia was secured. The Bulgarians were confident of success against the defeated and disorganized British and French troops falling back on Salonika. For the time being, they enjoyed a numerical advantage over the Entente forces.²⁴

That was not what the Germans wanted though. “Most important, the Germans perceived in Salonika a means to contain significant numbers of British and French troops that might be used to greater effect elsewhere, perhaps on the Western Front.”²⁵

Under General Nikola Zhekov, Bulgaria’s military was a seasoned force with many veterans of the Balkan Wars (1912-1913). These conflicts had sharpened Bulgarian tactics and logistics, particularly in mountainous regions like Macedonia, where they had previously clashed with Serbian and Greek forces. This experience proved invaluable against the BEF, whose troops, largely trained for the open warfare of the Western Front, struggled to adapt. Zhekov’s leadership, supported by German advisors, brought discipline and coordination, enabling Bulgaria to punch above its weight. Military reports from 1916 highlight a force adept at defensive operations, a skillset honed by prior victories and now aligned with the Central Powers’ broader strategy to secure the Balkans. The level of mobilization was astonishing. Pretty much all able-bodied men served in the army in one capacity or another.²⁶

Terrain mastery was a cornerstone of Bulgarian strength. Having controlled parts of Macedonia before and after the Balkan Wars, Bulgarian soldiers possessed an intimate knowledge of its mountains, valleys, and rivers. The Vardar Valley’s choke points, the Struma River’s marshy banks, and the high ground around Doiran were not abstract features but familiar landscapes they could exploit. This local expertise allowed them to anticipate BEF movements, fortify key positions, and stage ambushes, advantages the British, as newcomers, could not replicate.

Morale and motivation further solidified Bulgaria’s resolve. The Balkan Wars had fueled national pride, with victories over Ottoman and neighboring forces cementing a sense of martial prowess. During the First Balkan War the Bulgarian army was very close to taking Constantinople. Bulgaria’s entry into World War I was driven by a desire to reclaim lost territories, including

²⁴ Hall, Richard C. "Bulgaria in the First World War." *The Historian* 73, no. 2 (2011): 305. Gale Academic OneFile (accessed May 5, 2025).
<https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A260060597/AONE?u=anon~c89ae9f9&sid=googleScholar&xid=956a3da8>.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*, 33.

Macedonia, and resist Allied encroachment, a sentiment that resonated deeply.²⁷ This conviction, coupled with resentment toward British and French intervention, sustained morale even under strain, contrasting with the BEF's growing disillusionment as a "Forgotten Army." Together, these foundations, experience, terrain, and spirit, equipped Bulgaria to mount a defense that defied the odds, setting the stage for the strategies that turned potential into action.

Section 2: Defensive Strategies and Tactics

Bulgaria's defensive success against the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) on the Salonika Front from 1915 to 1917 was not merely a product of favorable conditions but a deliberate application of sophisticated strategies and tactics. Building on the military experience, terrain mastery, and morale outlined in Section 1, Bulgarian forces under General Nikola Zhekov employed a combination of fortifications, elastic defense, terrain exploitation, and Central Powers' support to thwart British advances. These methods transformed Macedonia's natural challenges into a defensive stronghold, consistently outmaneuvering the BEF and sustaining the campaign's deadlock.

Fortifications formed the backbone of Bulgaria's strategy. Along the Struma and Doiran lines, Bulgarian troops constructed extensive trench systems, reinforced with barbed wire and artillery emplacements, mirroring Western Front tactics but adapted to Macedonia's rugged landscape. These defenses were a network of steel and earth with positions dug into hillsides and ridges to maximize protection and fields of fire.²⁸ The Doiran line, in particular, featured multiple layers of trenches overlooking steep approaches, making it a formidable barrier. During the First Battle of Doiran in August 1916, these fortifications absorbed British artillery barrages, allowing Bulgarian troops to repel assaults with minimal losses, a testament to their engineering prowess.

Bulgaria's elastic defense added tactical flexibility to these static positions. Rather than rigidly holding every inch of ground, Zhekov's forces allowed limited Allied advances before counterattacking to reclaim lost territory. This approach, evident in the 1916 Doiran engagement, saw Bulgarian units retreat under pressure, luring BEF troops into exposed positions, then striking back with reserves which disrupted British momentum. By ceding ground strategically,

²⁷ Falls, *Military Operations Macedonia*, 8.

²⁸ Owen Collinson, *Salonica and After, the Sideshow That Ended the War* (Charleston, SC: Forgotten Books, 2012), 216.

Bulgaria conserved manpower, crucial given its smaller army, while exhausting the BEF, whose logistical strains, as detailed in Chapter 2, prevented sustained follow-through.

Terrain exploitation was a masterstroke of Bulgarian tactics. Leveraging their intimate knowledge of Macedonia, troops used high ground, narrow passes, and riverbanks to ambush and outflank British forces. At Doiran, Bulgarian artillery perched on elevated ridges rained fire on advancing BEF units struggling up slopes, while hidden machine-gun nests in the Struma Valley caught troops in deadly crossfires. This use of natural features turned the landscape into an active participant in the defense, amplifying the geographical challenges that already plagued the BEF and forcing British commanders into predictable, costly assaults.²⁹

Support from the Central Powers, particularly Germany, bolstered these efforts. German advisors trained Bulgarian units in modern defensive tactics, while artillery pieces, such as 77mm field guns, enhanced their firepower. Logistical aid, including ammunition and rations funneled through Sofia, offset Bulgaria's limited industrial base, ensuring troops remained supplied where the BEF faltered. Though German troop presence was minimal, their technical assistance proved decisive, as seen in the Second Battle of Doiran (1917), where precise artillery coordination shattered British lines. This partnership allowed Bulgaria to maximize its resources, bridging gaps the BEF's overstretched supply chain could not.

Together, these strategies, fortifications, elastic defense, terrain exploitation, and external support, created a cohesive defensive system that capitalized on British weaknesses. By blending static strength with dynamic tactics and leveraging Macedonia's natural and allied advantages, Bulgaria not only held the line but dictated the terms of engagement, setting the stage for their effectiveness against the BEF's repeated assaults.

Effectiveness Against the BEF

Bulgaria's defensive strategies proved highly effective in countering the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) on the Salonika Front from 1915 to 1917, turning the Macedonian campaign into a testament to their resilience. By leveraging fortifications, elastic tactics, terrain mastery, and Central Powers' support, as detailed in Section 2, Bulgarian forces under General Nikola Zhekov consistently repelled British assaults, exploited BEF vulnerabilities, and sustained a stalemate

²⁹ Collinson, *Salonica and After*, 222-223.

that frustrated Allied ambitions. This effectiveness is most vividly illustrated in key engagements like the Battles of Doiran, where Bulgaria's defenses inflicted significant losses and prolonged the deadlock until 1918.

The First Battle of Doiran in August 1916 showcased Bulgaria's defensive prowess. Facing a BEF offensive aimed at breaching their lines, Bulgarian troops entrenched along the Doiran heights absorbed British artillery barrages before repelling infantry assaults with machine-gun fire and counterattacks.³⁰ British casualties far exceeded the Bulgarian losses who were markedly lower, a ratio attributes to well-sited defenses and disciplined resistance.³¹ The Second Battle of Doiran in April-May 1917 further underscored this effectiveness. Despite a heavier British bombardment and troop commitment, Bulgaria's layered trenches and German-supplied artillery held firm, inflicting many casualties against minimal ground lost. These engagements highlight how Bulgaria turned defensive positions into killing fields, blunting BEF momentum.

The enemy knew that we were going to attack and made elaborate preparations to receive us... Our new preparations, such as the registration of the artillery, inevitably gave him a pretty shrewd idea of what we were about to attempt. His formidable positions were now organised to the highest pitch of perfection. We knew that his artillery was at least as strong as ours, and that he had far more heavy guns than we possessed, our highest calibre at that time being six-inch. But the battles that followed revealed that he was much stronger than we ever thought; that he had been keeping quite a lot of artillery "up his sleeve." He had no lack of troops to hold his hill fortresses, and no lack of reserves in easy call. He held ninety-nine percent, of advantage in the general situation.³²

As this witness account reveal, Bulgaria's success hinged on exploiting BEF vulnerabilities outlined in prior chapters. The terrain that slowed British advances, steep slopes and malarial valleys, became Bulgarian strongholds, amplifying the BEF's logistical struggles. During Doiran, delayed supplies left British units with not enough guns, a weakness Bulgarian artillery exploited with precision. Malaria, which reduced BEF strength by thousands, had less impact on acclimatized Bulgarian troops, widening the gap in combat readiness. Political disarray among

³⁰ Id, 227.

³¹ "In January 1919, General Henrys, the Commander-in-Chief of the French Army in the Balkans, visited this ground in company with Majdr-General Duncan, commanding the 22nd Division. I talked to him shortly afterwards of his impressions up there, and he agreed that he had never seen ground so wonderfully adapted for defence, and so hopeless for the attacker." Id, 228.

³² Id, 229-230.

the Allies, including British-French tactical discord, allowed Bulgaria to face a fragmented foe, as seen in the 1917 offensive's poor coordination.

The sustained stalemate underscores Bulgaria's broader effectiveness. By holding the Struma and Doiran lines, they prevented the BEF from threatening Central Powers' control of the Balkans until late 1918. This prolonged deadlock tied down Allied resources, over 150,000 British troops at peak, without requiring Bulgaria to overextend its smaller army. Bulgarian losses remained sustainable, a stark contrast to the BEF's attrition from combat and disease. This endurance frustrated British objectives of containment and breakthrough, forcing a war of attrition that favored the defender.

In essence, Bulgaria's defense was not just effective but decisive in shaping the Salonika Front's character. Key victories at Doiran, exploitation of British frailties, and maintenance of the stalemate demonstrated a strategic acumen that kept the BEF at bay, setting the stage for the campaign's wider implications explored in Chapter 4.

Conclusion

Bulgaria's defense against the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) on the Salonika Front from 1915 to 1917 was a remarkable display of effectiveness, rooted in a synergy of military experience, terrain mastery, and tactical ingenuity. As this chapter has shown, Bulgaria leveraged its seasoned army, intimate knowledge of Macedonia's landscape, and high morale to establish a formidable defensive foundation. Strategies like fortified trench lines, elastic defense, and terrain exploitation, bolstered by German artillery and logistics, enabled Bulgarian forces to repel BEF assaults, notably at Doiran in 1916 and 1917. This effectiveness not only inflicted heavy losses but also capitalized on British logistical, environmental, and political weaknesses, sustaining a stalemate that frustrated Allied goals until 1918.

These findings affirm the thesis that Bulgaria's terrain mastery, adaptability, and Central Powers' support made it a formidable adversary, stalling the BEF's ambitions and prolonging the Macedonian deadlock. Far from a passive resistance, Bulgaria's defense actively shaped the campaign's trajectory, turning British limitations into decisive advantages. This resilience, however, operated within a broader strategic context, influencing both Allied and Central

Powers' plans in the Balkans. Chapter 4 will explore these wider implications, assessing how the Salonika Front reverberated across the region's wartime dynamics.

Chapter 4: Broader Strategic Impact on the Balkans

Introduction

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917, pitting the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) against Bulgarian defenses, reverberated far beyond the rugged trenches of the Salonika Front, influencing broader Allied and Central Powers' strategies in the Balkans. Chapter 1 outlined the BEF's objectives and limitations, Chapter 2 detailed the geographical, logistical, and political constraints it faced, and Chapter 3 highlighted Bulgaria's effective resistance. This chapter shifts perspective to the campaign's strategic legacy, exploring how its stalemate shaped military planning and regional dynamics in a theater often dismissed as secondary. Far from a mere sideshow, the Salonika Front's impact rippled through the Balkans, affecting resource allocation, alliances, and the war's southern trajectory.

This analysis addresses the research question: How did this campaign influence broader Allied and Central Powers' strategies in the Balkans? It argues that, though inconclusive until 1918, the campaign tied down forces, secured Greece's alignment, and strained Bulgaria, subtly altering the Balkan balance. The chapter proceeds in three sections: examining Allied strategic adjustments, Central Powers' responses, and regional consequences, followed by an analysis and conclusion. Through this lens, the Macedonian struggle emerges as a critical, if understated, factor in World War I's complex tapestry, setting the stage for its eventual resolution.

Impact on Allied Strategies

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917, though a secondary theater, exerted a notable influence on Allied strategies, reshaping resource allocation, securing Greece's alignment, and contributing to a war of attrition against the Central Powers. The British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) deployment to Salonika, as explored in Chapter 1, diverted manpower and material from the Western Front, sparking debates among Allied leaders while yielding subtle strategic gains in the Balkans. These impacts, though often overshadowed by larger fronts, underscored the campaign's role in the broader war effort.

Resource allocation was a primary concern. The BEF's presence in Macedonia, peaking at 150,000 men, required ships, supplies, and artillery that might otherwise have reinforced France or Flanders. There was some frustration in London, yet this commitment tied down Bulgarian and German forces, preventing their redeployment elsewhere. Big number of Central Powers' troops were engaged on the Salonika Front, easing pressure on the Eastern Front and Italian lines. This diversion, though costly, aligned with the Allied strategy of stretching enemy resources thin, a slow-burn approach that paid dividends later.

The campaign also decisively influenced Greece's alignment. The BEF's foothold in Salonika, despite initial Greek neutrality under King Constantine I, pressured the fractured nation into the Allied fold. By 1917, the deposition of Constantine and Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos' pro-Allied government brought Greece into the war, securing a vital Balkan flank.³³ In that regard Salonika base was visible Allied commitment swaying Greek opinion and stabilizing the region. This shift expanded the Allied operational scope, enabling later offensives like the 1918 Dobro Pole breakthrough.³⁴

As an attrition tool, the campaign pinned down Bulgarian forces, a success borne out by its prolonged stalemate. Though the BEF failed to break through, as Chapter 3 detailed, its persistence occupied Bulgaria, reducing Central Powers' flexibility. This containment supported broader Allied aims, buying time for Serbia's revival and setting the stage for eventual victory. Thus, the Macedonian effort subtly recalibrated Allied strategy, balancing cost with strategic gain.

Impact on Central Powers' Strategies

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917 significantly shaped Central Powers' strategies in the Balkans, bolstering their position through Bulgaria's defensive success while imposing strains that foreshadowed their eventual collapse. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, Bulgaria's resilience against the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) solidified the Central Powers' grip on the region, yet the prolonged effort drained resources and diverted German attention, subtly

³³ Falls, *Military Operations Macedonia*, 354.

³⁴ Richard C. Hall, *Balkan Breakthrough: The Battle of Dobro Pole* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2010).

undermining their broader war effort. This dual impact highlights the campaign's complex role in Central Powers' planning.

Bulgaria's defense consolidated the Central Powers' Balkan front, a strategic triumph in the short term. By holding the Salonika line, Bulgarian forces under General Nikola Zhekov prevented Allied breakthroughs, securing a vital land corridor from Germany through Austria-Hungary to the Ottoman Empire. This stability, reinforced by German artillery and advisors, as noted in Chapter 3, delayed BEF advances until 1918, preserving Central Powers' control over Serbia's conquered territories. Bulgaria's unyielding stand allowed its Central Power allies to focus resources elsewhere, such as the Eastern Front against Russia which was ultimately taken out of the war in March 1918. For two years, the Bulgarian defensive success in Macedonia aligned with the Central Powers' aim to maintain a cohesive southern flank, buying time against mounting Allied pressure.

However, the campaign exacted a heavy toll on Bulgaria's resources. Sustaining the Salonika Front strained its modest economy and manpower, with an army of roughly 500,000 stretched across multiple theaters. Official reports estimate that by 1917, food shortages and fatigue eroded Bulgarian resilience, despite German logistical aid. This attrition weakened Bulgaria's long-term capacity; a vulnerability exposed in the 1918 Allied offensive that shattered its lines. The campaign thus became a double-edged sword, bolstering Central Powers' defenses while sowing seeds of exhaustion. The Bulgarian army, despite the assurances to the contrary of its leaders, was not able after all, to take on millions of Entente soldiers and still successfully defend their newly unified homeland.³⁵

Strategically, the effort diverted German attention from critical fronts. The need to supply Bulgaria with artillery and advisors, though minimal in troop numbers, distracted Germany from reinforcing the Western Front or supporting Austria-Hungary against Italy. This drain on resources, however subtle, benefited the Allies by diluting German focus. Thus, while Bulgaria's defense fortified the Central Powers' position, it inadvertently contributed to their overextension, a factor that amplified Allied gains in the Balkans by war's end. The mistake of not taking

³⁵ Victor Kuhne, *Bulgaria, Self-revealed* (London, Constable & co., ltd., 1919) 124.

Salonika in 1915, in the early days if the Bulgarian entry in World War I had proven to be very costly indeed, for both Bulgaria and Germany.

Regional Consequences in the Balkans

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917 left a lasting imprint on the Balkans, influencing Serbia's revival, Greece's political trajectory, and the region's post-war landscape. Though the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) and Bulgarian stalemate, detailed in prior chapters, yielded no decisive victor until 1918, its regional consequences reshaped Balkan dynamics, setting the stage for Allied success and territorial reconfiguration.

For Serbia, the campaign preserved a lifeline for its eventual resurgence. After its 1915 collapse under Central Powers' assault, the Serbian army retreated to Corfu, but the BEF's presence in Salonika maintained an Allied foothold in the Balkans. This base, despite its stagnation, kept Serbia's cause alive, enabling its forces to regroup and rejoin the fight. By 1917, Serbian units bolstered Allied lines, culminating in the 1918 Vardar offensive where they occupied against Bulgarian Vardar Macedonia, and Pomoravie and liberated their homeland, turning in the process a defensive struggle into a springboard for victory.³⁶

In Greece, the campaign resolved the National Schism, a divisive rift between King Constantine I's neutrality and Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos' pro-Allied stance. The BEF's occupation of Salonika, though controversial, pressured Greece toward the Allies, culminating in Constantine's 1917 deposition. Venizelos' subsequent leadership stabilized Greece as an Allied partner, securing their Balkan flank.

Post-war, the campaign influenced Balkan borders. Bulgaria's exhaustion, exacerbated by the Salonika Front, led to its 1918 collapse and the Treaty of Neuilly (1919), which ceded territories to Greece and Yugoslavia. The campaign's attrition thus redrew the map, amplifying its regional legacy. These outcomes, Serbia's revival, Greece's alignment, and territorial shifts, underscore the Salonika Front's impact on the Balkans to this day.

³⁶ Mather, *Muckydonia*, 1917-1919, 214.

Analysis

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917, though a stalemate for much of its duration, wielded a subtle yet profound influence on Allied and Central Powers' strategies in the Balkans, balancing containment with resilience until its decisive turn in 1918. As Sections 1 and 2 illustrate, the BEF's presence diverted Allied resources while tying down Bulgarian and German forces, a dual dynamic that strained both sides. Section 3 further reveals how this deadlock preserved Serbia, aligned Greece, and set the stage for Bulgaria's collapse, underscoring the campaign's broader significance. This analysis evaluates how these effects shaped the Balkan front and positioned the Salonika theater within World War I's strategic tapestry.

Strategically, the campaign struck a delicate balance. For the Allies, it embodied a costly containment strategy, diverting troops from the Western Front yet keeping busy a large number of Central Powers' forces. This attrition, though criticized as a "side-show," diluted enemy strength across multiple fronts, a subtle victory amplified by Greece's 1917 alignment. The same could be said about diverting resources from the Allies though. The victorious Great Powers punished so severely Bulgaria in Neuilly to a large part because many of their leaders believed that the participation of this country in the war on the side of the Germans prolonged the conflict by one to two years. Bulgaria helped in the conquest of Serbia, Romania and parts of Greece, diverted Allied resources to the Balkans and provided military and geographical advantages to the Turks, Austro-Hungarians and the Germans. For the Central Powers, Bulgaria's defense fortified their Balkan position, delaying Allied advances. This push-and-pull prolonged the Balkan stalemate, reflecting a war of endurance rather than decisive blows.

The campaign's turning-point potential emerged late. Its attrition eroded Bulgaria's capacity, enabling the 1918 Dobro Pole breakthrough that shattered Central Powers' lines, a direct legacy of the BEF's persistence and Bulgaria's overextension. Historically, this positions the Salonika Front as a critical, if understated, theater. It influenced Balkan strategies incrementally, tying down forces, shifting alliances, and paving the way for victory, revealing a complexity that belies its secondary status. This interplay of restraint and impact frames its enduring role in the war's southern dynamics.

Conclusion

The Macedonian campaign from 1915 to 1917, while a protracted stalemate, exerted a significant strategic influence on Allied and Central Powers' plans in the Balkans, reshaping the region's role in World War I. As this chapter has shown, the BEF's presence diverted Allied resources yet pinned down Bulgarian forces, securing Greece's alignment and sustaining Serbia's revival, while Bulgaria's defense bolstered Central Powers' control at the cost of eventual exhaustion. These impacts, detailed through effects on Allied strategies, Central Powers' resilience, and Balkan regional dynamics, culminated in the 1918 breakthrough that shifted the war's southern front.

This analysis reinforces the thesis that the campaign, though inconclusive until its final year, subtly altered Balkan strategies, tying down forces, influencing alliances, and contributing to the Central Powers' collapse. Its incremental effects, from resource strain to territorial realignment, underscore its understated importance. As the dissertation's final substantive chapter, this exploration completes the narrative arc, from the BEF's objectives and limitations (Chapter 1), through its environmental and political challenges (Chapter 2), to Bulgaria's defensive success (Chapter 3), revealing the Salonika Front as a microcosm of World War I's complexity. Here, British perseverance met Bulgarian tenacity, yielding a theater whose strategic ripples belied its peripheral status, enriching our understanding of the war's multifaceted nature.

In summary the British Expeditionary Force's (BEF) campaign in Macedonia from 1915 to 1917, and the Bulgarian defense it encountered, constitute a compelling yet often overlooked chapter of World War I. This dissertation has sought to answer the central question: How significant was the role of the BEF in Macedonia between 1915 and 1917, and how did the Bulgarians defend themselves? Through four detailed chapters, it has explored the BEF's objectives and limitations, the geographical, logistical, and political factors shaping its efforts, Bulgaria's defensive effectiveness, and the campaign's broader strategic impact. Together, these analyses reveal a theater where British ambition met Bulgarian resilience, yielding a subtle but meaningful contribution to the war's outcome.

Chapter 1 established that the BEF's objectives, to relieve Serbia, contain the Central Powers, and pressure Bulgaria, were strategically sound but constrained by resource shortages, disease, and political hesitancy. Chapter 2 deepened this narrative, showing how Macedonia's rugged

terrain, logistical failures, and Greek neutrality turned the campaign into a test of endurance rather than conquest. These challenges set the stage for Bulgaria's success, detailed in Chapter 3. Leveraging military experience, terrain mastery, and German support, Bulgarian forces under General Nikola Zhekov mounted a defense of fortifications and elastic tactics that repelled BEF assaults, notably at Doiran, sustaining a deadlock until 1918. Chapter 4 then broadened the lens, demonstrating that this stalemate tied down forces, secured Greece's alignment, and strained Bulgaria, influencing Balkan strategies and paving the way for the Allies' eventual triumph.

The BEF's role, though not transformative in isolation, was significant as a cog in the Allied machine. Its persistence kept busy the Central Powers' troops, easing pressure on other fronts and contributing to a war of attrition that eroded Bulgaria's resolve. Bulgaria's defense, equally significant, showcased tactical ingenuity and resilience, delaying Allied progress and fortifying the Central Powers' southern flank until exhaustion set in. This interplay, British perseverance against Bulgarian defiance, underscores the campaign's dual legacy: a peripheral struggle with outsized strategic ripples.

Within World War I's historiography, the Salonika Front emerges as a microcosm of the conflict's complexity. It was not a theater of decisive battles but of incremental impact, where environmental and human factors intertwined to shape outcomes. The BEF's 150,000-strong effort, plagued by malaria and mud, and Bulgaria's smaller, tenacious force, buoyed by national pride, reflect the war's broader themes of endurance and adaptation. This study reaffirms the campaign's place as more than a "forgotten front": a critical arena that tested Allied cohesion, strained Central Powers' resources, and redrew Balkan borders post-1918.

In reflecting on this research, the Macedonian campaign illuminates the limits and possibilities of secondary theaters. It bridges military history with human experience to reveal a struggle defined as much by resilience as by rivalry. Its significance lies not in victory alone but in its contribution to the war's grinding totality, a fitting capstone to this dissertation's inquiry into a neglected yet pivotal front.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Georgi Markov, *The Great War: The Bulgarian Guard between Central Europe and the Orient 1916-1919* (Sofia: Academic Publishing House "Prof. Marin Drinov" 2006).

Collinson Owen. *Salonica and After, the Sideshow That Ended the War* (Charleston, SC: Forgotten Books, 2012).

Alan Palmer, *The Gardeners of Salonika: The Macedonian Campaign 1915-1918* (London: Faber & Faber, Limited, 2009).

William D. Mather, *Muckydonia', 1917-1919: Being the Adventures of a One-Time 'Pioneer' in Macedonia and Bulgaria During the First World War* (London: Stockwell, 1979).

Falls, C. *Military Operations Macedonia: From the Outbreak of War to the Spring of 1917. History of the Great War Based on Official Documents by Direction of the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence. Vol. I* (Imperial War Museum and Battery Press ed.). London: HMSO, 1996 [1933].

Charles F. Horne ed, *Source Records of the Great War, Vol. III.*, National Alumni 1923.

Victor Kuhne, *Bulgaria, Self-revealed* (London, Constable & co., ltd., 1919).

R. J. Crampton, *A Concise History of Bulgaria* (Oxford: University of Oxford, 2005).

Richard C. Hall, *Balkan Breakthrough: The Battle of Dobro Pole* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2010).

Hall, Richard C. "Bulgaria in the First World War." *The Historian* 73, no. 2 (2011): 305. Gale Academic OneFile (accessed May 5, 2025).

<https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A260060597/AONE?u=anon~c89ae9f9&sid=googleScholar&xid=956a3da8>