HANDBOOKS PREPARED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE HISTORICAL SECTION OF THE FOREIGN OFFICE.—No. 22

D 6
.G7
no. 22
Copy 2

BULGARIA

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00013470947

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY H. M. STATIONERY OFFICE.

1920

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Class D6
Book .G7

153

HANDBOOKS PREPARED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE HISTORICAL SECTION OF THE FOREIGN OFFICE.—No. 22

Gt. Brit.

507
1407

BULGARIA

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY H. M. STATIONERY OFFICE.

1920

2d set

D6
.G7
Copy 2

D. of D.
MAY 27 1920

EDITORIAL NOTE

In the spring of 1917 the Foreign Office, in connexion with the preparation which they were making for the work of the Peace Conference, established a special section whose duty it should be to provide the British Delegates to the Peace Conference with information in the most convenient form—geographical, economic, historical, social, religious, and political—respecting the different countries, districts, islands, &c., with which they might have to deal. In addition, volumes were prepared on certain general subjects, mostly of an historical nature, concerning which it appeared that a special study would be useful.

The historical information was compiled by trained writers on historical subjects, who (in most cases) gave their services without any remuneration. For the geographical sections valuable assistance was given by the Intelligence Division (Naval Staff) of the Admiralty; and for the economic sections, by the War Trade Intelligence Department, which had been established by the Foreign Office. Of the maps accompanying the series, some were prepared by the above-mentioned department of the Admiralty, but the bulk of them were the work of the Geographical Section of the General Staff (Military Intelligence Division) of the War Office.

Now that the Conference has nearly completed its task, the Foreign Office, in response to numerous inquiries and requests, has decided to issue the books for public use, believing that they will be useful to students of history, politics, economics, and foreign affairs, to publicists generally and to business men and travellers. It is hardly necessary to say that some of the subjects dealt with in the series have not in fact come under discussion at the Peace Conference; but, as the books treating of them contain valuable information, it has been thought advisable to include them.

It must be understood that, although the series of volumes was prepared under the authority, and is now issued with the sanction, of the Foreign Office, that Office is not to be regarded as guaranteeing the accuracy of every statement which they contain or as identifying itself with all the opinions expressed in the several volumes; the books were not prepared in the Foreign Office itself, but are in the nature of information provided for the Foreign Office and the British Delegation.

The books are now published, with a few exceptions, substantially as they were issued for the use of the Delegates. No attempt has been made to bring them up to date, for, in the first place, such a process would have entailed a great loss of time and a prohibitive expense; and, in the second, the political and other conditions of a great part of Europe and of the Nearer and Middle East are still unsettled and in such a state of flux that any attempt to describe them would have been incorrect or misleading. The books are therefore to be taken as describing, in general, *ante-bellum* conditions, though in a few cases, where it seemed specially desirable, the account has been brought down to a later date.

G. W. PROTHERO,

General Editor and formerly
Director of the Historical Section.

January 1920.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. GEOGRAPHY PHYSICAL AND POLITICAL

(1) Position and Frontiers 1
(2) Surface, Coasts, and River Systems
Surface 1
Coasts 4
River Systems 4
(3) Climate 5
(4) Sanitary Conditions 6
(5) Race and Language 6
(6) Population 8

II. POLITICAL HISTORY

Chronological Summary 10
(1) Introductory ; early history 11
Tsar Simeon 12
Tsar Samuel 13
Kaloyan and Ivan Asen 13
Capture of Trnovo by Turks 14
(2) Bulgaria under the Turks 15
Exarchate established 15
(3) Crisis of 1875–7 16
Massacres in Bulgaria 17
Berlin Memorandum 17
Conference at Constantinople 18
(4) Russo-Turkish War 20
(5) Congress of Berlin 22
Constitutions for Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia 23
(6) Union of Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia . 24
Prince Alexander 24
Revolution at Philippopolis 26
The Prince Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia 26

Wt. 41225/396 1,000. 3/20. O.U.P.

PAGE

(7) Serbo-Bulgarian War 27
Battle of Slivnitsa 27
Abdication of Alexander 28
(8) Reign of Ferdinand ; Stamboloff in power . 29
Election of Prince Ferdinand . . . 29
Stamboloff's policy. 30
Marriage of Ferdinand to Princess Marie-Louise of Parma 31
Assassination of Stamboloff . . . 31
(9) Policy of Ferdinand ; Macedonian troubles . 31
Reconciliation with Russia . . . 31
'Internal Organization' and Macedonian bands 33
Relations of Balkan States . . . 34
Schemes of Reform. 35
Mürzsteg Scheme 35
Arrangement between Bulgaria and Turkey 36
Customs Treaty with Serbia . . . 37
(10) Independence of Bulgaria 37
The Young Turk Revolution . . . 38
Proclamation of Ferdinand as Tsar . . 39
Arrangement with Turkey ; Bulgarian independence recognized 40
(11) Formation of the Balkan League . . 40
Macedonian troubles continued . . 41
Serbo–Bulgarian negotiations . . . 43
Treaty between Serbia and Bulgaria. . 44
Treaty between Bulgaria and Greece. . 45
Military Conventions 46
(12) First Balkan War ; Conferences of London . 47
Warning by Powers 48
Declaration of War. 50
Successes of Allies 50
Armistice 51
First Conference in London . . . 51
Armistice denounced 52
Second Conference in London . . . 52
Treaty of London 53
(13) Second Balkan War ; Treaty of Bucarest . 53
Dispute between Serbia and Bulgaria . 54

PAGE

Russian arbitration refused . . . 54
Bulgaria declares war on Serbia and Greece 55
Intervention of Rumania 56
Treaty of Bucarest 57
Distribution of captured territory . . 57
Dissatisfaction in Bulgaria . . . 59

III. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS

(1) Religious
Orthodox Church ; Exarchate . . . 60
Statistics of different religions . . . 61
Religious toleration 61
(2) Political
Constitution 62
Local Administration 63
Justice 63
Political parties 64
(3) Naval and Military Organization . . 65
(4) Public Education 66
Primary and Secondary Education . . 66
Progress since 1888. 67

IV. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

(A) Means of Communication
(1) Internal
(*a*) Roads 68
(*b*) Rivers 69
(*c*) Railways 71
(*d*) Posts, Telegraphs, and Telephones . 72
(2) External
(*a*) Ports
Danubian Ports
Ruschuk 73
Sistov 74
Nikopol 74
Samovid 74
Rahovo 74
Lom Palanka 75
Vidin 75

PAGE

Black Sea Ports
Varna 76
Burgas 77
Aegean Ports
Dedeagach 79
Porto Lagos 79
(b) Shipping Lines 79
(c) Cables 81
(B) Industry
(1) General Position of Bulgarian Industry . 81
(2) Labour
(a) Supply and Conditions of Labour . 85
(b) Emigration and Immigration . . 86
(3) Agriculture
(a) Products of Commercial Value . . 87
Cereals 87
Cheese 88
Cotton 88
Live-stock 88
Rice 89
Rose-growing 89
Sericulture 91
Sugar Beet 92
Tobacco 92
(b) Methods of Cultivation . . . 94
(c) Forestry 95
(d) Land Tenure 96
4) Minerals
Coal 97
Copper 99
Gold 100
Granite 100
Gypsum 100
Hematite 100
Iron 100
Lead 100
Magnetite 101
Manganese 101
Marble 101
Oil Shale 101

PAGE

Pyrites 101
Salt 101
Zinc 102
Mineral Springs 102
(5) Manufactures
(a) Metallurgy 102
(b) Textiles 103
Woollen Goods 103
Cotton Goods 103
Silk 104
Cordage 104
Miscellaneous 104
(c) Chemicals 105
(d) Miscellaneous
Wine, Spirits, and Beer . . . 105
Leather 106
Wooden Goods 106
Cement and Pottery 106
(6) Power
Electricity 107
Water-power 107
(C) Commerce
(1) Domestic
(a) Principal Branches of Trade . . 107
(b) Towns, Markets, Fairs . . . 107
(c) Organizations to promote Trade and Commerce 109
(d) Foreign Firms and Companies . . 110
(e) Methods of Economic Penetration . 110
(2) Foreign 111
(a) Exports
Quantities and Values . . . 113
Countries of Destination . . . 114
(b) Imports
Quantities and Values . . . 115
Countries of Origin 116
(c) Customs and Tariffs 117
(d) Trade Routes 118
(D) Finance
(1) Public Finance 119

PAGE

(2) Currency 120
(3) Banks 121
(4) Credit Institutions 124

APPENDIX

TABLE I. Principal Crops: annual cultivation and value 126
" II. Principal Cereals: area cultivated and estimated yield 127
" III. Principal Exports 128
" IV. Trade with Principal Countries: Exports 129
" V. Principal Imports 130
" VI. Trade with Principal Countries: Imports 131
" VII. Revenue and Expenditure, 1906–15 . 132

AUTHORITIES 133

MAPS 134

I. GEOGRAPHY PHYSICAL AND POLITICAL

(1) Position and Frontiers

The kingdom of Bulgaria lies between 40° 40′ and 44° 5′ north latitude and 22° 10′ and 28° 5′ east longitude, and forms a roughly oblong area between Rumania on the north, the Black Sea on the east, Turkey on the south-east, the Aegean Sea and Greece on the south, and Serbia on the west. Its frontiers were fixed by the Treaties of Bucarest and Constantinople, 1913. The boundary, from where it meets the Tunja river to the mouth of the Maritsa, was subsequently modified by a convention made between Bulgaria and Turkey in 1915, and later discussions also took place.

(2) Surface, Coasts, and River Systems

Surface

The area of Bulgaria is about 43,310 square miles, including all the new territory acquired in 1913 at the end of the Balkan Wars, but excluding the area, amounting to about 500 square miles, said to have been ceded to Bulgaria by the Convention of 1915. It occupies between one-fourth and one-fifth of the Balkan peninsula.

This area is traversed about the centre from west to east by the Balkans, parallel to which on the south run the Sredna Gora and the Srnena Gora; south and west

of the Sredna Gora are other ranges, including the Rila Planina and the Rhodope Mountains. To the north of the Balkans lies the tableland known as the Balkan Foreland. Between the Balkans and the Sredna Gora are the sub-Balkan valleys, and south and west of the Sredna Gora, between it and the south-western mountain group, is a region containing several important basins of depression. Thus, although to a large extent a mountainous country, Bulgaria has extensive areas of plateau, plain, and valley.

The Balkan Foreland rises at once to over 300 ft. above the Danube; it has an average height above sea-level of nearly 500 ft. and, rising gradually towards the south, reaches at the foot of the Balkans a height of about 1,470 ft. Its greatest depth, 74 miles, is between Silistra and the Kamchik river. Its superficial area is nearly 8,000 square miles. The Foreland is as a whole a gently undulating and fertile district, but rather dry, treeless, and bare; the greater part is now, however, arable land, growing maize and wheat.

South of the Foreland lie the Balkans, the highest points of which do not exceed 7,800 ft. The summits are rounded, the northern slopes generally well wooded, the southern more steep and bare. The Balkans start from the Timok and curve at first south-east, but run due east from Mount Baba in the central Balkans, and end abruptly with a 200-ft. cliff at the Black Sea. Their length is over 300 miles, their average breadth about 18 miles. They may be divided into three groups, the western, central, and eastern Balkans: the western Balkans extend from the Timok to the Isker gorge; between that gorge and the Demir Kapu pass are the central Balkans; from the Demir Kapu to the Black Sea are the eastern Balkans.

The sub-Balkan valleys, between the Balkans and the Sredna Gora, are all of the same character; having a

well-watered soil, rich alluvial deposits, and a mild climate, they are exceedingly fertile. The most important valleys are those in which are situated respectively the towns of Zlatitsa, Karlovo, Kazanlik, Tverditsa, and Slivno.

The Sredna Gora and Srnena Gora run south of the Balkans, from Radomir to Yamboli. They fall into three divisions: the Vitosha Planina, west of the upper Isker; the central Sredna Gora, between the Isker and the Stryama; and the Srnena Gora or Karaja Dagh to the east. The greatest heights are found in the centre, where, nevertheless, the summits are rounded, the slopes very fertile, and magnificent woods alternate with rich pasture-land.

In the west a broken mass of hills separates Bulgaria from Serbia. This region, having an average height of about 3,250 ft., is traversed by the Struma valley, which provides a good route between Sofia and the Aegean. The basins of Gyueshevo and Kustendil are thickly populated and well cultivated. Other western Bulgarian plains are those of Pernik, Dupnitsa, and Nevrokop.

Between the valley of the Struma and the upper Maritsa extends the Rila Planina, with an average height of over 6,100 ft., while the Pirin Dagh (8,794 ft.) separates the Struma from the Mesta. Farther east is the Rhodope range, from the highest summit of which, Mus Alla (9,631 ft.), flow both the Mesta and the Maritsa. The range stretches east-south-east, and between the northern foot-hills and the Sredna Gora lies the plain of the Maritsa.

The plains consist for the most part of isolated depressions, the most important being those of Sofia, Philippopolis, and Stara Zagora. The region falls into a small western part, containing a number of separate basins of which the largest is that of Sofia, and a large

eastern part, the so-called Eastern Rumelian plain, the two being divided by hilly country. The plain of Sofia is not large, being 46½ miles long and 10 to 12½ miles broad, but is deeply sunk among the mountains at an altitude of about 1,800 ft. This plain, watered by the Isker, is very fertile, and an important centre of communication. The Eastern Rumelian plain is for the most part well-watered and fertile alluvial land. Its western portion is traversed by the Maritsa from west to east nearer its southern than its northern border; through the central portion flows the Tunja; on the east streams flow into the Black Sea.

Coasts

The whole Aegean coast, between the Mesta and the Maritsa, is inhospitable. West of Mount Maroniya the two alluvial plains of Xanthi and Gumuljina extend between the mountains and the sea; both are unhealthy. Porto Lagos (Kara Agach) on the Buru lagoon, is the only roadstead on this portion of the coast. To the east lies Dedeagach, the principal Aegean port in Bulgaria, which is, however, shallow and unprotected.

The Black Sea coast is more hospitable than that of the Aegean. It possesses two important ports, Varna and Burgas. Bela, Missevriya (Mesemvria), Ahillo (Ankhialo), and Sozopol are possible landing-places. The low-lying parts of this coast are malarial.

River Systems

The river systems are four in number:—

1. The Danube, which for part of its course forms the northern frontier of Bulgaria, together with its tributaries;

2. The rivers flowing into the Black Sea, of which the most important is the Kamchik;

3. The Maritsa, which, with its tributaries the Arda and Tunja, waters the plain of Eastern Rumelia and flows into the Aegean Sea;

4. The Struma and Mesta rivers, which drain the southern and western valleys of the western mountain group, and also flow into the Aegean.

The Danube for 244 miles divides Bulgaria from Rumania; its breadth varies from 760 to about 2,400 yards. It has a seasonal rise and fall of 20 to 27 ft. It begins to rise in April, attains its highest level in June, and is at its lowest in the autumn. The Danube is frozen over about seventy-two winters out of a hundred, the ice lasting on an average 39 days.

(3) Climate

A continental type of climate prevails over almost the whole of Bulgaria. The summers are hot, the winters cold; and the rainfall, although distributed throughout the year, is heaviest in summer. There is a general tendency for cold winds to blow from the north during the winter months, but their effect is moderated by mountain ranges in Eastern Rumelia, while in other parts a series of cyclonic depressions, which make their way eastward along the Mediterranean belt of low pressure, frequently cause southerly winds to blow over the country. In summer a flow of air from the north-west over the eastern Mediterranean carries the temperature conditions of southern central Europe over the greater part of Bulgaria.

Winter temperatures are low, especially in regions most exposed to northerly winds. In the plains of Eastern Rumelia winter conditions are less severe.

Varna and Burgas on the Black Sea have a somewhat milder climate than places farther inland; and along the Aegean coast the Mediterranean type of climate prevails, with mild wet winters and hot dry summers.

The mean temperature for the months of January and July at different stations in the kingdom are as follows:—

	January °F.	July °F.
Chepalare	25·5	61·0
Kustendil	27·7	69·8
Sofia	26·4	68·0
Gabrovo	30·0	68·5
Ruschuk	28·0	72·0
Burgas	33·0	73·0
Haskovo	31·0	74·0

(4) Sanitary Conditions

The peasants live in a condition of rough comfort. Their medical and sanitary arrangements are far from satisfactory, but they keep the interiors of their houses clean, and are personally cleanly. Some fever and malaria occur in the plains, and notably along the Aegean and Black Sea coasts.

(5) Race and Language

Race.—The Bulgarians are to be regarded as mainly a fusion of Bulgars and Slavs. The country now known as Bulgaria was in ancient times inhabited by the Thraco-Illyrian race; this was expelled, or more probably absorbed, by Slavonic immigration, which took place on a great scale between the end of the third and the middle of the sixth century. The Bulgars were a tribe of the stock which we know as Turanian, Mongol, or Tatar, supposed to have come originally from eastern Asia, who established themselves, probably not in large numbers, between the Danube and the Balkans about A. D. 650. In the course of two centuries the Bulgars

became gradually merged in the Slavonic population, adopting its language, customs, and local institutions, but giving it their name and political organization. The Bulgarians were therefore a mixed race, into which a Turkish element was subsequently intruded, yet a race showing great cohesion, virility, and initiative. For five centuries (1393–1878) Bulgaria was ruled by the Turks, who converted to Islam the isolated communities now known as Pomaks. In 1861 some 12,000 Crimean Tatars and a still larger number of Circassians were settled by the Turkish Government on confiscated lands. In discriminating among the various elements making up the present population of Bulgaria it is difficult to discover any adequate criterion of race. Neither language nor religion affords an infallible test. Slavs, Bulgarians, and Turks are all round-headed, and undoubtedly much racial mingling has occurred. The Bulgarians probably constitute about 73 per cent. of the inhabitants, and are found in their purest type in the mountain districts, the Ottoman conquest and subsequent colonization having rendered the population of the plains more mixed. Nowhere does the Bulgarian show a pronounced Slavonic type; and in the central Balkans the Ugrian or Finnish cast of features occasionally asserts itself. The men are as a rule rather below middle height, compactly built, broad-shouldered, and (among the peasantry) very muscular. The Bulgarians possess to a remarkable degree the qualities of patience, perseverance, and capacity for laborious effort.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the majority of the population of the Eastern Rumelian plain was Turkish. The Turkish element has steadily declined, especially, as noted below, since 1879.

Language.—Bulgarian, which belongs to the Slavonic group of languages, was simplified in structure by the Turkish conquest. Unlike any other Slavonic tongue,

it supplements the loss of case-endings by prepositions. Its former richness survives only in the conjugation of the verb. It resembles Albanian and Rumanian in having the definite article placed after the substantive. As regards literature it is the poorest of the Slavonic tongues.

(6) Population

No census has been taken since the institution of the present frontiers. According to that of 1910 the population of the kingdom was 4,337,516 (2,206,691 males and 2,130,825 females). This gave 116 inhabitants per square mile, divided among the districts as follows: Burgas, 351,500; Varna, 329,612; Vidin, 237,571; Vratsa, 312,460; Kustendil, 231,522; Philippopolis (Plovdiv), 447,309; Plevna, 365,868; Ruschuk, 406,309; Sofia, 481,598; Stara Zagora, 442,969; Trnovo, 448,197; Shumla, 282,601. The following particulars regarding nationality were also given in 1910: Bulgarians, 3,203,810; Turks, 488,010; Rumanians, 75,773; Greeks, 63,487; gipsies, 98,004; Jews, 37,663; Germans, 3,863; Russians, 3,275; other nationalities, 61,690. The capital, Sofia, had in 1910 a population of 102,812. In the same year the other principal towns had the following populations: Philippopolis, 47,981; Ruschuk, 36,255; Varna, 41,419; Shumla, 22,225; Slivno (Sliven), 50,598; Plevna, 23,049.

The estimated population of Bulgaria in 1914 was 4,759,997, giving 110 inhabitants per square mile. Of the new population added after the Treaty of Bucarest (1913) 227,598 were Bulgarians, 75,337 Pomaks, 275,498 Turks, and 58,709 Greeks. But, as a set-off against these gains, about 273,000 in the Dobruja passed to Rumania; of these about one-third were Bulgarians and one-third Turks or Moslems. The net gain, as

deduced from the 1910 and 1914 totals, is about 375,000.[1]

With her rich soil and natural advantages Bulgaria could easily support a considerably larger population. Although the number of towns is relatively large (73), most of the inhabitants live in the rural districts.

The following are the birth and death rates per thousand for the years 1901 to 1911 :

	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911
Births	37·5	38·8	41·0	42·4	43·5	44·0	43·6	40·4	40·6	41·3	42·8
Still-births	0·2	0·2	0·2	0·2	0·3	0·3	0·3	0·2	0·4	0·4	0·3
Deaths	23·1	23·8	22·7	21·2	21·8	22·3	22·3	24·3	26·6	23·4	21·7

Infant mortality is high, especially among the peasants.

[1] Compare, however, the slightly different estimates quoted on pp. 59 and 62.

II. POLITICAL HISTORY

Chronological Summary

About A. D. 650.	Bulgars appear in Balkans.
893–927.	Tsar Simeon : first Bulgarian Empire.
1014.	Basil the Bulgar-slayer overthrows Tsar Samuel.
1218–41.	Ivan Asen II: second Bulgarian Empire.
1330.	Bulgarians defeated by Serbs at Kustendil.
1393.	Trnovo taken by Turks. Bulgarian Patriarchate abolished.
March 10, 1870.	Bulgarian Exarchate instituted.
May 1876.	Bulgarian Insurrection and 'Atrocities'.
December 23, 1876 to January 20, 1877.	Constantinople Conference.
April 19, 1877.	Russo-Turkish War.
March 3, 1878.	Treaty of San Stefano.
July 13, 1878.	Treaty of Berlin.
April 28, 1879.	Prince Alexander elected.
July 13, 1881.	Suspension of Bulgarian Constitution.
September 18, 1883.	Restoration of Bulgarian Constitution.
September 18, 1885.	Union of Eastern Rumelia with Bulgaria.
November 14, 1885.	Serbo-Bulgarian War.
March 3, 1886.	Peace Treaty signed.
April 5, 1886.	Prince Alexander appointed Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia.
August 21, 1886.	Abduction of Prince Alexander.
September 4, 1886.	Abdication of Prince Alexander.
July 7, 1887.	Election of Prince Ferdinand. Stamboloff in power.
1893.	'Internal Organization' for Macedonian Affairs.

May 31, 1894.	Resignation of Stamboloff.
July 15, 1895.	Assassination of Stamboloff.
1895.	Bulgarian Bands in Macedonia.
February 14, 1896.	Reception of Prince Boris into the Orthodox Church.
March 14, 1896.	Recognition of Prince Ferdinand by Turkey.
1903.	Turkish Inspector-General appointed in Macedonia.
November 25, 1903.	Mürzsteg Programme of Macedonian reform.
1905.	Customs union with Serbia.
1908.	Young Turk Revolution. Austria annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina.
October 5, 1908.	Proclamation of Bulgarian Independence. Ferdinand declared Tsar.
1909.	Bulgarian Independence recognized by Russia and the other Powers.
March 13, 1912.	Bulgaro-Serbian Treaty of Alliance.
May 29, 1912.	Greco-Bulgarian Treaty of Alliance.
October 17, 1912.	First Balkan War.
May 30, 1913.	Treaty of London.
July 1913.	Second Balkan War.
August 10, 1913.	Treaty of Bucarest.
September 29, 1913.	Turco-Bulgarian Treaty.

(1) *Introductory*

THE original inhabitants of the country now known as Bulgaria were Thracians or Illyrians; little is known of their origin or history, and they became tributaries of Rome about the dawn of the Christian era. But they were unable to withstand the successive inroads of barbarians who poured down from the north. Goths, Huns, and Slavs in turn dispossessed each other; and the last-named were in turn overrun (probably about A.D. 650) by the Bulgarians, a people of Finnish or Tatar stock, who adopted the language of the conquered Slavs and have in process of time come to be regarded as a Slav people, though clearly of a very

mixed type, which often in certain districts indicates a Tatar origin.

Frequent wars ensued between Bulgaria and the Byzantine Empire. In 809 the Bulgarian Prince Krum defeated the Greeks, and besieged Constantinople. After his death peace was preserved for a period of years, during which, through the preaching of the monks Cyril and Methodius, the Bulgarians, under Boris I, became converted to Christianity, about the year 860. After considerable hesitation between the Eastern and Western Churches Boris decided to adhere to the former. The Greek Patriarch's consent to recognize the Bulgarian Church as autocephalous, a concession which the Pope had refused to make, proved a decisive argument.

The first Bulgarian ruler who really made a name for himself was Simeon (893–927). He more than once defeated the Greeks and appeared at the gates of Constantinople; he also extended his dominions at the expense of the Croats, until his possessions extended from the Black Sea to the Adriatic and from the Danube to the Rhodope Mountains. He assumed the title of Tsar of the Bulgarians and Autocrat of the Greeks. But with his death in 927 his empire began to wane. The Greeks regained much of their lost territory; Serbia won back her independence; and Bulgaria, a prey to invasion and defeat, separated into two halves. The western of these was governed by Shishman, a noble from Trnovo, who usurped the royal dignity. Religious dissension helped on the disunion; the Bogomil heresy appeared at this time and gained many adherents. Russians and Pechenegs invaded the land on the east, and the aid of the Greeks was invoked against them. The assistance proved fatal. The warlike Emperor Leo Zimisces drove out the invaders but annexed the country; and the year 971

saw the fall of the empire of Simeon. But in the west the Shishman dynasty remained, and in glory and extent soon outstripped Simeon's achievements. In 976 Samuel, the fourth son of Shishman, succeeded to his father's dominions over the western or Macedonian regions of Bulgaria. When, after the death of Leo Zimisces, a revolt against Byzantium broke out in eastern Bulgaria, Samuel placed himself at its head, overran Thessaly, and extended his sway to the Adriatic. But he was defeated in successive wars by Basil II, known as Boulgaroktonos or Slayer of the Bulgarians; and in 1018 the whole of Bulgaria passed under the direct domination of Constantinople, which by its conquest of Serbia and Croatia became supreme throughout the Balkan peninsula.

From 1018 to 1186 Bulgaria was a dependency of the Greeks, who sought by every means to extinguish all national and patriotic sentiment among the Bulgarians; even the Church, while retaining a nominal independence, was ruled over by a Greek archbishop; and thus arose the Bulgarian hatred for everything Greek which has continued unabated to the present day. In 1186 a successful rebellion took place; and by the end of the twelfth century Kaloyan had established the second Bulgarian Empire, which included the greater part of the present Serbia and Bulgaria. The Pope recognized the new ruler as Emperor of the Bulgarians and Wallachians; and in 1204 Kaloyan was crowned at Trnovo by a cardinal.

It was in the days of Kaloyan's successor Ivan Asen that the Bulgarian Empire reached its highest point of glory. His dominions extended to the three seas, and included Serbia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Albania; only Constantinople and its immediate environs remained to the Greek Emperor. Ivan's capital of

Trnovo almost vied with Constantinople; he restored the full independence of the Bulgarian Church, admitting the supremacy neither of Rome nor of Constantinople, and restoring to its head the patriarchal dignity. But his death was the signal for the rapid dissolution of his empire. In less than a generation Greek authority was again paramount in the land; the Venetians overran the coast districts; and, by a series of murders, in 1257 the dynasty of the Asens became extinct.

In 1330 the Serbian king, Stephen Urosh III, defeated and routed the Bulgarians at Kustendil; and thereafter Bulgaria lost her independence and became a tributary principality of Serbia. More than once she strove to throw off the yoke, even invoking the aid of the Turks, who were by that time established in the Balkan peninsula. On the death of the Bulgarian vassal Prince Ivan Alexander Shishman, his three sons divided his dominions among them, thus further weakening the country; the death of King Dushan of Serbia merely substituted a Turkish for a Serbian overlord. The Bulgarian tsar who ruled at Trnovo became in 1366 a Turkish vassal; in 1389 Serbia itself was incorporated in Turkey after the fatal battle of Kosovo; and in 1393 Trnovo was taken by assault by the Turks. The very name of Bulgaria was lost for five centuries. Its fall was due to an entire lack of harmony between the ruling aristocracy and the peasant multitude. The corroding influence of Byzantinism sapped the vigour of the land and left behind nothing but a heritage of hate. Yet five centuries of Turkish domination could not extinguish the dormant national spirit of this stubborn race, which remembers with the tenacity of Eastern memory the short-lived glories of the past, when its adventurous and for a time successful rulers nominally extended their brief sway over the greater

part of the Balkan peninsula; and the hope of regaining these conquests some day has never been abandoned by the Bulgarian people.

(2) *Bulgaria under the Turks*

Oppressed administratively by their Ottoman rulers and ecclesiastically enslaved by the Greeks, who imposed on them the Greek liturgy and a Greek priesthood, it is a marvel that the Bulgarians should have preserved their language and their strong sentiment of nationality. The Bulgarian monk Païssi, by his literary labours in the latter half of the eighteenth century, brought about something like a renascence; and the torch kindled by him was never allowed to suffer extinction. Exiles, voluntary or enforced, at Bucarest or elsewhere, gave freely of their best in substance, in literary labour, or in sacrifice of liberty or life, towards the national movement, which was at first directed to the educational and ecclesiastical enfranchisement of the nation from the Greek yoke. It is difficult to realize that until 1835 Bulgaria possessed no school in which the national language was taught. Such a state of things could not last; the resentment against the Greeks rose to such a pitch that about 1860 the Bulgarians were almost ready to submit to Papal jurisdiction and to desert the Eastern Church for that of Rome. Russia came to their assistance, and eventually on March 10, 1870, the Sultan issued his firman establishing the Bulgarian autocephalous Church under a primate entitled the Exarch, whose residence was at Constantinople. The Greek Patriarchate declared the new Church schismatic (though its only point of difference was that of language), and has been its bitter opponent ever since. But gradually the new Church extended its influence and increased the number of its bishops, notably in Macedonia; and its effect

on the political advancement of Bulgaria has been incalculable.

The national spirit, stimulated by this success, now began to turn hopefully towards the realization of its aspirations for independence. But, so late as 1875, the Bulgarians were merely one of the subject races of Turkey, spread throughout the north-east and the south and south-west of the Balkan peninsula. At intervals slight risings had taken place, when misgovernment and oppression were unusually intolerable. These movements were often instigated by emissaries from outside, in order to create a diversion when insurrections occurred in other parts of the Turkish Empire, such as Crete; they were easily suppressed by the Turks, who affected to treat them as outbursts of brigandage, devoid of all political character or significance. To the outer world the Bulgarians were practically unknown; and there were few travellers who had grasped the fact that in those regions there existed a race of Slav-speaking peasants, capable farmers and gardeners, woodsmen, cloth-workers and artisans, dour, egotistical, and unsympathetic in character, but laborious, painstaking, frugal, and pertinacious—in other words, endowed with many of the qualities which tend to success in life.

(3) *Crisis of* 1875–7

In 1875 Turkish misgovernment had brought about an extensive and well-organized insurrection of the Christian peasants in Bosnia and Herzegovina, then the most outlying provinces of Turkey, which threatened to set ablaze the whole of the Near East. In order to distract Turkey's attention from these border regions by fomenting disturbances nearer home, the Panslavist Committees of Odessa and the Bulgarian Revolutionary Organization at Bucarest had for some

time past been preparing the ground in Bulgaria; and a number of 'Apostles of Liberty', one of whom was Stamboloff, the future Prime Minister of liberated Bulgaria, traversed the country far and wide, terrifying the peasants with tidings of impending massacre, and urging them to organize themselves for purposes of defence. As a consequence, in September 1875, an abortive insurrection broke out at Eski Zagra (Stara Zagora); it failed completely, and its only result was to fill the prisons of Tatar-Pazarjik and Philippopolis with Bulgarian captives, suspected of being concerned in the rebellion. But the committees continued their propaganda still more zealously; and early in May 1876 the premature outbreak of what was really a widespread and carefully planned rebellion in Bulgaria took the Porte entirely by surprise. The provincial authorities, at their wits' end, allowed the arming and employment of the local Moslems in order to resist the threatened attack of the Bulgarians. The insurgents, whose elaborate plans were nowhere followed by anything like effectual execution, were completely routed in a few days. Then ensued a series of acts of unrestrained violence against the unarmed population, which, on becoming known, filled Europe with horror and indignation.

The Powers, anxious to re-establish tranquillity and to prevent the extension of the disturbances, which now threatened to involve Serbia and Montenegro in war with Turkey, sought to induce the Porte to promulgate satisfactory reforms under European guarantees. Russia, Austria, and Germany took the lead, and on May 13, 1876, submitted to the other Powers a programme with that object, known as the Berlin Memorandum. England, though strongly condemning the outrages which had been committed, and repeatedly warning the Porte in the most impressive terms that no assistance could be expected from her,

was not at this time prepared to impose on Turkey conditions impairing her sovereignty and independence; she therefore refused her assent to the Berlin Memorandum. Accordingly, beyond giving promises of reform, Turkey did nothing.

In June Serbia and Montenegro declared war. The abdication and death of Sultan Abdul Aziz, followed three months later by the deposition of his successor Murad V and the accession of Abdul Hamid, brought about no improvement. In Russia a strong feeling of sympathy with the oppressed Christian Slav subjects of the Sultan overcame the evidently peaceful desires of the Government; and it became clear that Russian intervention would be inevitable unless Turkey set her house in order. Meanwhile, in England, Mr. Gladstone's stirring speeches on the Bulgarian atrocities tended to extinguish British sympathy for Turkey.

A conference at Constantinople was now suggested with a view to discussing the state of things in Turkey and deciding on the reforms to be imposed by Europe. Turkey was obliged to submit, and the Conference met shortly afterwards. Russia continued her military preparations, and made no secret of her fixed intention to use force, if persuasion failed to induce Turkey to grant adequate reforms, which should include real autonomy for the disturbed Christian provinces. Hereupon, in order to throw dust in the eyes of Europe and also to cut the ground from under the feet of the Conference by extending to the whole empire the privileges which it was sought to secure for certain provinces only, a liberal constitution was proclaimed in Turkey. Its existence was brief, and its promulgation may be said to have been a potent factor in bringing on the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–8, just as its restoration in 1908 led to still greater calamities for Turkey.

The reforms agreed upon by the European members of the Conference and submitted for acceptance by Turkey were as follows: That portion of Turkey later formed into the Principality of Bulgaria was to be divided into two vilayets, for each of which a Christian vali was to be named for five years, with the assent of the Powers; provincial representation and local self-government were to be instituted; a portion only of the local taxation was to be paid to the Porte, the remainder being retained for local requirements; and a Christian militia was to be enrolled.

The only result of the Conference was the prolongation of the armistice to March 1, 1877. The Turkish delegates rejected nearly every proposal; the suggested valis would be independent of the Porte; the assignment to Turkey of a portion only of the revenues was practically a tribute; the commission of control was strongly objected to. On January 15, 1877, a 'mitigated project' was presented by Lord Salisbury, but it was rejected as containing the obnoxious clauses relating to the International Commission and the nomination of valis with the previous assent of the Powers.

Russia now sought to urge the Powers to compel Turkey to give way; and, after long negotiations, the document known as the Protocol of London was drawn up (March 31, 1877). It embodied the decisions of the Conference, called on the Porte to carry them out, and stated that, if Turkey failed to do so, the Powers would themselves take such measures as might be deemed necessary for ensuring the well-being of the Christians and the interests of peace. Turkey's answer, dated April 9, 1877, was an indignant rejection of the protocol. Half-hearted negotiations went on between the Powers, but on April 19 Prince Gorchakoff announced that, all means of bringing about the pacification of Turkey having failed, and the

Porte's rejection of the protocol having proved their futility, the Tsar had resolved to undertake alone the task which His Majesty had invited the Powers to carry out in concert, and had given to his armies the order to cross the frontiers of Turkey.

(4) *Russo-Turkish War*

On the outbreak of the war England, in common with the other Powers, issued a proclamation of neutrality, which was followed on May 6 by a note from Lord Derby to the Russian Ambassador in London. This document stated that, if the war should spread, British interests might be endangered; thus, the Suez Canal might be blocked or Egypt imperilled, neither of which events could be regarded without concern by England; further, Her Majesty's Government could not view with indifference Constantinople passing into other hands than those of its present possessors, nor did they desire that the regulations for the navigation of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles should be altered. There were, besides, other interests, e.g. on the Persian Gulf, which might require protection; but Her Majesty's Government would confine themselves to stating their hope that the war would be restricted within such limits as should leave those interests unassailed and enable British neutrality to be maintained. The note ended with a reminder of the pledges given by the Tsar to Lord A. Loftus not to acquire Constantinople or occupy Bulgaria otherwise than temporarily. This communication met with a favourable response. On May 30 Count Schuvaloff stated that Russia disclaimed all intention of injuring the British interests enumerated in Lord Derby's note, and that the Tsar would not extend the war beyond what was required to attain the object so clearly proclaimed.

On June 22 the Russians crossed the Danube, meeting at first with little or no opposition, owing to the faulty disposition of the Turkish armies, and the jealousy and incapacity displayed by most of their commanders. Much horror was excited by the manner in which the war was carried on; each side accused the other of atrocious conduct, doubtless not without foundation. The Bulgarians, who followed in the wake of the Russians and had been supplied by them with arms, did undoubtedly wreak a terrible vengeance for the sufferings of their brethren.

In July the advance of Russia received a temporary check, both in Europe and in Asia. A considerable revulsion of feeling ensued in favour of the Turks; and the valour displayed at the Shipka pass earned for them the admiration of the world. Elation took the place of despair at Constantinople; and it began to be thought that Turkey would soon be in a position to impose terms on her enemy. These hopes were destined to be short-lived, and in November the balance of success turned against Turkey. Kars fell on November 22. On December 11 Osman Pasha's heroic defence of Plevna came to an end, and that fortress fell, thanks largely to the aid of Rumania given in response to Russia's pressing appeal. On December 14 Serbia declared war. The Russian advance towards Constantinople now became rapid and irresistible. After vain appeals for the mediation of the Powers, Turkey was obliged to address herself directly to Russia. But the Russian advance continued, and on January 20 Adrianople was reached by the invaders. On February 2 the bases of an armistice were agreed upon; and a month later the definitive treaty of peace was concluded at San Stefano. It provided for the creation of a large autonomous Bulgaria, extending to the Aegean Sea, and comprising the greater

part of Macedonia and Thrace. Serbia and Montenegro received considerable accessions of territory, and were declared independent. Russia took Bessarabia, and in Asia the greater part of Eastern Armenia, and demanded a heavy war indemnity.

(5) *The Congress of Berlin*

A fortnight earlier the British fleet had been sent through the Dardanelles to Constantinople; and, before the signature of the treaty of peace, England had stated that the conditions, especially those affecting British interests, required the participation and assent of England. Similar views were expressed by the other Powers. Russia consented to take part in a Congress to be held at Berlin, to which the Treaty of San Stefano should be submitted for such alterations as should be found necessary. Before entering the Congress, England stated her objections to the Treaty of San Stefano. These were the dimensions of the new Bulgaria, and the disastrous effect of its creation on the non-Bulgarian elements within its boundaries; the compulsory alienation of Bessarabia from Rumania; the acquisition by Russia of Batum and the strongholds of Armenia; and the magnitude of the war indemnity demanded. Russia tried to explain away these objections, which were, however, for the most part sustained by the Congress. The chief results of the deliberations of the Powers, embodied in the Treaty of Berlin, signed on July 13, 1878, were as follows. There was a material reduction of the new principality of Bulgaria, nearly two-thirds of its area being restored to the direct rule of the Sultan; the portion south of the Balkans was constituted into a semi-autonomous province, for which the name of Eastern Rumelia was invented; the western or Macedonian part of the territory assigned at San

Stefano to Bulgaria remained Turkish. In this connexion it is to be borne in mind that, prior to 1878, the territory now formed into the Principality of Bulgaria, the province of Eastern Rumelia, and the Macedonian region relegated to Turkish rule had all been Turkish territory, indistinguishable in any way the one from the other, and differing only in the greater or less proportion borne to the total number of inhabitants by the Bulgarian population in any district. The division effected at Berlin was therefore arbitrary, and destined to be obliterated.

As the original cause of the war, Bulgaria received the honours of precedence in the Berlin Treaty, the first twelve articles of which deal with the new principality. Eastern Rumelia follows next. Art. XXV hands over Bosnia and Herzegovina to the administration of Austria; Montenegro, Serbia, and Rumania are formally declared independent, and receive rectifications of frontier — in the case of Rumania this consisted in the retrocession of Bessarabia to Russia, in return for the cession of the Dobruja. Kars, Ardahan, and Batum are ceded to Russia; provision is made for reforms in Crete and Macedonia (Art. XXIII) and Armenia (Art. LXI).

In pursuance of the treaty, elaborate constitutions were drawn up for Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, as well as a law for the government of the European provinces of Turkey. This law remained a dead letter; and the two constitutions were so liberal in character as to give rise to the suspicion that Russia, to whose inspiration they were mainly due, had purposely endowed the newly-created provinces with liberties unknown within her own territory in order to render their future government unworkable.

(6) *Union of Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia*

The first Prince of Bulgaria was Prince Alexander of Battenberg. He was elected by the Bulgarian Assembly on April 28, 1879; on July 15 the Sultan assented to his election, which was subsequently agreed to by the Powers severally, as provided by the Treaty of Berlin. His appearance and personality were calculated to gain for him the esteem and affection of the people over whom he was called to rule, though he may have been less proficient in those arts of astute and far-seeing policy which distinguished his successor. Alexander's difficulties began almost on the first day of his reign. Russia had emancipated Bulgaria, and not unreasonably claimed to exercise considerable, if not supreme, control over her. The Prince's natural impulse was to respect the wishes of Russia, whose ruler had always shown him great kindness; on the other hand, his Bulgarian advisers constantly urged him to maintain the independence of a country which has from the first jealously resented all foreign interference. Moreover, the ultra-liberal constitution hampered the Prince at every turn, and went far to make the government of the country impossible.

Prince Alexander attempted at first to govern with the aid of the Russian Ministers and of the Conservative party. This was soon found to be impracticable, and the Liberal party was called in to form a cabinet, with Russian co-operation. But, instead of improving, the situation became worse, chiefly on account of the domineering tone and conduct of the Russian ministers and officers. The government could not be carried on on constitutional lines; and accordingly, with the consent of Russia, Prince Alexander prevailed upon the Grand Sobranye to suspend the constitution and to invest him for seven years with dictatorial powers;

the vote was passed on July 13, 1881. But here again the change proved to be for the worse. The Russian generals Soboleff and Kaulbars, sent to undertake the duties of Ministers of War and of the Interior, drew all power to themselves and imposed their will on the Prince, whose appeals for support to Petersburg, where Alexander III had succeeded to his father's throne, but not to his friendly feelings towards Prince Alexander, were disregarded. Disdaining to remain the puppet of his Russian satraps, the Prince was driven to effect a reconciliation with the Liberal party; and on September 18, 1883, the constitution was restored. The Russian generals, seeing themselves stripped of their hitherto unrestrained authority, resigned and left the country, after an unsuccessful attempt to force the Prince to abdicate. From this time Prince Alexander had to reckon with the constant and determined opposition of Russia, which was not to cease until he was driven from the throne; from then also dates that struggle for emancipation from Russian control and interference which was so long and so ably conducted by Stamboloff.

In Eastern Rumelia a Bulgarian with the Turkish title of Pasha, Aleko Vogoridis, had been appointed the first governor-general. The militia in Rumelia was commanded by a motley collection of foreign officers; and the numerous and costly bureaucracy with which the autonomous province was burdened by its organic statute rendered financial embarrassment certain. From its creation various parties sought to bring about its union with Bulgaria; the point at issue was whether this should be achieved with or without Russian aid. In May 1884 Aleko Pasha was dismissed and was succeeded by Gavril Pasha Krestovich, who had been his secretary-general. The new governor-general was known to be in the Russian interest; and the opposi-

tion took advantage of this fact to work upon the population, already exasperated by the heavy taxation and by the arrogant bearing of the Russian officers and civilians, to declare the union with Bulgaria and get rid simultaneously of Russians and taxes. On September 18, 1885, by a bloodless revolution at Philippopolis, the union was proclaimed, without the knowledge of Prince Alexander and against the will of Russia. The Prince accepted the situation and thereby still further increased the enmity of Russia, who could not admit that the two Bulgarias should be united without her consent. Orders were sent at once to recall all Russian officers in the Bulgarian army, which thus remained without any officer above the rank of captain.

The union was the first open breach of the Berlin Treaty. Europe was unable to countenance it; Turkey was indignant at the disregard of her sovereign rights; Greece and Serbia saw with dismay their rivals, the Bulgarians, receive this aggrandizement and clamoured for compensation. England had by this time realized that a strong Bulgaria was the best barrier to Russian aggression in European Turkey, and stood practically alone in accepting the union. She had thus completely changed policies with Russia, whose designs for a large and powerful Bulgaria she had so effectually checked in 1878. The ability and energy of Sir W. White, the British representative at Constantinople, succeeded in defeating the proposals of Turkey and Russia that Turkish troops should be sent to restore the *status quo*. The Sultan himself was pacifically inclined, and withstood the warlike counsels of his ministers. A conference of Ambassadors accordingly met at Constantinople, and on April 5, 1886, concluded the Convention of Tophani, conferring on the Prince of Bulgaria the Governor-Generalship of Eastern Rumelia.

(7) *Serbo-Bulgarian War; Abdication of Alexander*

But, while these international negotiations were proceeding with wonted deliberation, events had been moving fast elsewhere. Serbia had taken advantage of the withdrawal of the Russian officers to make, on November 14, 1885, an unprovoked attack on Bulgaria. The rapidity with which the Principality mobilized its raw troops was equalled by the stubborn tenacity with which they withstood the Serbian onslaught. On November 18, at the battle of Slivnitsa, the Serbians were totally defeated; and Prince Alexander was about to reap the fruits of his victory when Austria peremptorily forbade all further advance of the Bulgarian troops, threatening to use force if her request were disregarded. An armistice was accordingly concluded on December 21, 1885; and the definitive treaty, consisting of a single article, to the effect that peace was re-established between Bulgaria and Serbia, was signed on March 3, 1886. Meanwhile the turbulent public opinion of Greece could not be restrained; the consolidation of Bulgaria into a compact Slav state of three million inhabitants seemed a death-blow to Hellenic aspirations. Meetings were held; war-like decisions were adopted: and the Government under popular pressure mobilized its troops. An international blockade became necessary to force Greece to accept the inevitable.

On April 24, 1886, the Imperial Firman investing Prince Alexander with the Governor-Generalship of Eastern Rumelia was promulgated; in the country itself, however, the union at once became complete, and no distinction remained between the principality proper and the late autonomous province. It appeared as if an era of tranquillity were in store for the East. But Russian hostility had been too deeply roused to allow Prince Alexander to remain in Bulgaria. The fact that

he was in name Turkish Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia was made use of to impair his popularity; and advantage was taken of the wounded feelings of certain officers disappointed in the distribution of rewards after the war. By bribery and by other means some of the troops were induced to mutiny; the palace was surrounded on the night of August 21, 1886; and Prince Alexander was compelled to sign his abdication. He was then conveyed down the Danube to Russian territory, where he was set at liberty. Public opinion in Bulgaria, stirred by these events, brought about a counter-revolution. The Provisional Government formed by the conspirators was ejected, and a regency in Prince Alexander's name was instituted. On August 29 the Prince returned to Bulgaria amid the universal acclamations of the people. But his restoration was viewed in Russia with the deepest displeasure; in reply to a telegram which he addressed to the Tsar on arrival at Ruschuk he received a chilling answer deprecating his return. This circumstance, and the widespread disaffection prevailing in the army, led Prince Alexander to renew his abdication; and on September 7 he left the country for ever.

The indignation caused throughout almost all Europe was expressed by Lord Salisbury in a speech which described the Prince as having been dragged from his throne by the influence of foreign gold; but speeches, however sympathetic, could not outweigh Russian hostility. Russia now sent General Kaulbars to Bulgaria as Imperial Commissioner, with the ostensible mission of pacifying the country; his demeanour was, however, rather that of a provoker of disturbance. He refused to recognize the legality of the regency established after the Prince's departure; he demanded imperiously the release of all those implicated in the plot against Prince Alexander; and, after interfering

in an unwarrantable manner in the government of the country, he undertook an electioneering tour throughout Bulgaria with the object of influencing the elections for the Grand Sobranye convoked to choose the new Prince. Their choice fell on Prince Waldemar of Denmark, who, however, declined the offer. General Kaulbars continued to seek by every means in his power to bring about a disturbance, so as to furnish Russia with a pretext for armed intervention; finally, after actually fomenting an unsuccessful outbreak at Burgas, he broke off relations and left Bulgaria, which remained for nearly ten years without an accredited representative of Russia. Germany assumed the protection of Russian interests.

(8) *Reign of Ferdinand; Stamboloff in power*

The prospects of Bulgaria were at this time very gloomy. War and a Russian occupation seemed imminent. But for the pacific labours of the rulers of Great Britain and Germany, the anxious fears prevailing throughout 1887 and 1888 would have been realized, and the Austrian and Russian troops massed along the frontiers would have come into collision. Thanks to the loyal and strenuous support afforded by England and Austria to Stamboloff, Russia failed to carry out her designs against Bulgarian independence. With the support of the two Powers mentioned the national tenacity held firm. In July 1887 Prince Ferdinand intimated his readiness to accept the throne of Bulgaria; on August 14, 1887, he was crowned Prince. His election, however, was not ratified by Turkey, nor did Russia assent; and consequently his position was irregular and unrecognized.

The new Prince, who was the son of Prince Augustus of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Kohary, and of Princess Clémentine of Orleans, was at this time twenty-

six years of age. He had nominally served as an officer of Honveds, and his sympathies were naturally divided between Austria and France, while he was also credited with leanings towards Russia. By nature and training a student and dilettante rather than a soldier, he had an exalted idea of his personal dignity, and was endowed with great political craft and sagacity.

During the first years of his reign he had little opportunity of exercising his talents of statecraft beyond the limits of petty intrigue, as his masterful premier, Stamboloff, would brook no interference in politics. That statesman, who, though young in years, had, after being identified with the Bulgarian insurrectionary movements in Turkey, risen to the highest rank in the councils of his country, was firmly convinced that the independence of Bulgaria could be defended against Russian aggression only by maintaining good relations with Austria and Turkey. In this task he received the constant support of England; and if, in carrying out his policy, he was sometimes compelled by circumstances to act harshly or to overstep the bounds of the constitution, it must be remembered that the peril of Russian occupation was often imminent, and that the people were hardly fit for a thoroughly liberal constitution. During the first few years of Prince Ferdinand's reign constant vigilance was necessary to unmask and defeat the machinations of Russian emissaries as well as of resentful Macedonian patriots, disgusted with what they considered Stamboloff's desertion of the cause and his subservience to Turkey. But it is certain that that policy yielded better results than the system adopted later. By restraining the activity of the Macedonian insurrectionary bands it was possible to gain Turkey's favour and to obtain tangible benefits in return in the shape of *berats* for Bulgarian bishops in Macedonia and privileges for churches and schools.

Stamboloff was firm in the conviction that in this way, and by the pacific influence of the priest and the schoolmaster, Bulgarian influence would eventually become paramount in Macedonia, and that that province would fall into the hands of Bulgaria 'like a ripe pear', to use his own expression, without striking a blow.

On April 20, 1893, Prince Ferdinand married Princess Marie-Louise of Parma, and by her (who died in 1899) he had two sons and two daughters. The Bulgarian constitution requires the children of the ruler to be brought up in the Orthodox faith. As both the Prince and his bride were Catholics and naturally desirous that their children should be of their parents' religion, it became necessary to induce the Sobranye to modify this clause in the constitution. This was the last service rendered to the Prince by Stamboloff, who thereby brought on himself all the odium attaching to what was a most unpopular measure. Shortly afterwards, owing to a quarrel with General Savoff, ex-Minister of War, Stamboloff resigned, on May 31, 1894. A year later he was assassinated in the streets of Sofia; and his assassins, though well known, were left practically unpunished.

(9) *Policy of Ferdinand; Macedonian troubles*

Stamboloff's resignation enabled the Prince to exercise far greater power than before, especially in matters affecting foreign policy. The first result was a *rapprochement* with Russia, eagerly desired by the Prince so that his election might be at last recognized by the Powers, and that he might receive at home and abroad the honours to which he was entitled. The death of the Emperor Alexander III on November 1, 1894, made a reconciliation possible, but it became complete only when an agreement was arrived at for the reception of Prince Boris, the heir to the throne, into the Orthodox

Church. This had become necessary not only as a satisfaction to national desires but also because, having gained in importance through the increase of his political power after Stamboloff's death, the Prince had become more exposed to the danger of assassination, and it was necessary that a successor acceptable to the nation should be at hand. The baptismal ceremony took place early in 1896, in spite of the formal opposition of the Pope. Prince Ferdinand was thereupon recognized by Turkey as Prince of Bulgaria on March 14, 1896. The assent of the Powers followed soon after, and thus his status was at last regularized.

Stamboloff's anti-Russian policy had been supported by England and Austria, as stated, and latterly by Italy, in order to prevent the triumph of Pan-Slavism over the national and patriotic party; and, by timely action at Constantinople, these Powers were able to induce the Sultan to refrain from interfering with his vassal or from countenancing any intervention by Russia. But in the country itself the policy cannot be said to have been universally popular; and the reconciliation with Russia was undoubtedly hailed with relief, especially by the older generation, which was mostly Russophile at heart. Abroad, however, a revulsion of feeling took place; public opinion was shocked by Stamboloff's murder and by the tolerance displayed by the Government towards his assassins. Relations, especially with England, Austria, and Rumania, became less cordial; and the tendency was accentuated through the altered attitude of Bulgaria towards the Macedonian insurrectionary movement, which now met with connivance, if not with open encouragement.

Since 1880 no actual outbreak had occurred, but in 1893 the younger and more adventurous spirits among the Macedonian *intelligentsia*, despairing of ever

obtaining any results from the pacific methods advocated by Stamboloff, formed the 'Internal Organization', with the object of collecting funds, arms, &c., and of preparing for a rising at a suitable moment. The Armenian massacres of 1895 were made the occasion of a meeting at Sofia, at which sympathy was expressed with the victims and a resolution was passed demanding that whatever reforms were obtained for Armenia should be applied to Macedonia. As a result of this effervescence, several bands crossed the frontier and attacked and destroyed Turkish villages. Serious representations by the Powers checked the movement for the time being. But it must be remembered that, besides the moral considerations of national ambition and of sympathy for the sufferings of those so closely connected with her by race-affinity, Bulgaria was always liable to be affected practically and immediately by the direct pressure of the very numerous Bulgarians of Macedonian origin either permanently residing within her borders or periodically resorting thither in search of work, not to mention such as took refuge there to avoid arrest or escape persecution. Since the creation of the Principality these Macedonians, by their numbers and their superior intelligence, have constituted an element which it was impossible to disregard and which at times exercised a paramount influence.

The reconciliation with Russia led to an increase of that country's influence in Bulgaria, while Austrian prestige waned. Various cabinets succeeded one another, but the Prince, while leaving them a comparatively free hand in internal affairs, kept a close control over the foreign relations of the country. Meanwhile lavish expenditure on useful public works on the one hand and on military preparations on the other caused Bulgaria's frequent appearance as a borrower in the money market and resulted in the piling up of a considerable volume of debt.

With the neighbouring countries Bulgaria's relations could not be cordial. Greece had indeed made unsuccessful overtures in 1891 and again in 1897 for joint action against Turkey, the common foe; after the unfortunate campaign of 1897 her attitude towards Turkey changed. Both Greece and Serbia, whose original designs on Bosnia and Herzegovina had been thwarted by the Austrian occupation and who was consequently led to push her dormant aspirations in Macedonia, conducted in that province an active and lavish propaganda; and from 1896 onwards the various Comitadjis, or Committees, carried on a ruthless guerrilla warfare both against the Turks and against Christians of other denominations. Turkey, on the principle of *divide et impera*, did nothing to check the rivalries so violently displayed; while Russia (who did not desire that the Balkan question should be raised prematurely, having in 1897 come to an agreement with Austria for the maintenance of the *status quo*) regarded the encroachments of the Greeks and Serbians as a not undesirable check on the growing influence of Bulgaria. The depredations and excesses of the bands, and the violent measures of repression adopted from time to time when the disturbances became too flagrant to be overlooked, bore equally heavily on the distracted population and caused thousands of refugees to flee to Bulgaria. The Government, even if desirous of suppressing the criminal practices of the revolutionary committees, were powerless to do so in face of the popular sympathy. Moreover, in spite of the agreement of 1897, Russian unofficial incitements to Bulgaria to intervene in Macedonia were not wanting. However, the Russian Government made it clear that they were determined that the peace should not be disturbed, and that, if Bulgaria attempted to take action, she would do so at her own risk.

In order to bring about an improvement, Russia and Austria propounded, in 1903, a scheme of reforms for Macedonia, based in some measure on a plan recently put forward by Turkey. It provided for the appointment of a Turkish Inspector-General for the three Macedonian vilayets of Turkey, who could not be removed for three years save with the consent of the Powers; the reconstruction by foreign specialists of the *gendarmerie*, which was to be largely recruited from the Christian element; amnesty for political offenders; and the introduction of financial reforms. Under pressure from Russia, Bulgaria dissolved the Macedonian Committees, but the reform scheme was not extensive enough to satisfy her; and, a Stambolovist cabinet being at the time in power, an attempt in accordance with the traditions of the party was made to arrive at a direct understanding with the Turkish Government. The idea was not favoured by Russia, and was not realized, Turkey declaring herself bound to put the Austro-Russian scheme into execution.

The incursions and outrages continued meanwhile with undiminished violence, and the relations with Turkey grew steadily worse. At this juncture the British Government proposed plans of reform for Macedonia, to be executed under the control of the whole European concert and not of two of its members only. It was hoped thus to put an end to bloodshed and anarchy in that unhappy region. Deliberations between the Powers ensued, resulting in a fresh scheme formulated by Austria and Russia in October 1903 and known as the 'Mürzsteg scheme'. Its principal provisions were the nomination of an Austrian and a Russian Civil Agent, as assessors to Hilmi Pasha, the Inspector-General; the reorganization of the *gendarmerie* by foreign officers of each of the Powers, a district being assigned to each; the rearrangement of the administra-

tive areas on a racial basis; judicial reform; and financial aid to refugees and sufferers—in 1905 financial commissioners of the other Powers were added. The scheme met with some measure of approval, but in Bulgaria exception was taken to the vesting of the control in the two least disinterested or progressive Powers, to the absence of an amnesty, and to the omission from its scope of the vilayet of Adrianople.

It was not unnatural that the continued disturbances in Macedonia and the hardly concealed support afforded to the bands by unofficial, if not official, Bulgaria should once more have strained the relations between Turkey and her vassal. In 1904 war seemed nearly inevitable; and Bulgaria, while resenting the severity displayed by Turkey in putting down the insurgents, began to fear that Russia's defeats at the hands of Japan would render her incapable of affording that assistance to which Bulgarian statesmen were now in the habit of looking when menaced by Turkey. It was also suspected that Austria might be tempted by Russia's weakness to extend her sway to northern Macedonia. Accordingly, prudence indicated the desirability of a fresh attempt at an arrangement with Turkey; and, after negotiations which almost broke down owing to Bulgaria's insistence on the extension of the Mürzsteg programme to the vilayet of Adrianople, an agreement was signed on April 8, 1904. By it Bulgaria engaged to prevent the formation of bands in her territory, to punish all who fled to the Principality after committing in the adjoining vilayets of Turkey acts calculated to disturb public order, and to prevent the introduction of arms and explosives into those vilayets. On her part Turkey undertook to carry out her share of the Mürzsteg reforms, to grant an amnesty for political offences, and to repatriate the refugees and assist in their re-settlement. But the agreement was not carried out by either

side; and the tension between the two countries was not relieved. In 1905 various conventions relating chiefly to matters of commercial interest were concluded between Turkey and Bulgaria, but these were never ratified or put into force; and it was found impossible to come to an understanding on the important point of linking up the Turkish and Bulgarian railways in Macedonia.

About this time a recrudescence of activity among the Greek bands in Macedonia led to an outbreak of anti-Greek feeling in Bulgaria which at one time threatened to assume serious proportions, and left behind much latent animosity. With Serbia the relations became slightly more cordial. The feeling of enmity engendered by the war of 1885 had died out, though resentment at Serbian interference in Macedonia had in some measure replaced it. The rulers of the two countries met at Nish, and the result was a temporary *rapprochement*, under the influence of which a Customs Union Treaty between Serbia and Bulgaria was signed on July 9, 1905. It was greeted in Bulgaria with general approval; but Austria, dismayed at the prospect of too close an agreement between the neighbouring Balkan States and the barrier likely to be formed thereby to her aggressive designs, prevailed upon Serbia to refuse to ratify the Treaty.

(10) *Independence of Bulgaria*

The year 1908 was pregnant with results for Turkey and the Balkan States. In that year the Balkan agreement between Russia and Austria came to an end, as the aims of the two countries were diametrically opposed, and Austria would no longer consent to be satisfied with the *status quo*. Russia and England having now composed their differences, the two monarchs met at Reval (June 1908). The Turkish constitutionalists, who had

for some time been at work in secret, now precipitated matters in the fear that the outcome of the Reval meeting would be a permanent diminution of Turkish authority in Macedonia. The Constitution was restored; and it was hoped that henceforth Turkey would follow the path of reform and equality. The Mürzsteg reform scheme came to an end, as being no longer necessary. Fraternization was the order of the day; and the bands ceased their depredations.

But Bulgaria was inclined to be sceptical, and the overtures of the Young Turks to the Macedonian Committee were received with much reserve, though co-operation at some future date was not excluded. Time and more mature consideration led to the conclusion that, while a constitutional regime in Macedonia, if honestly meant and conscientiously and impartially applied, could not fail to further greatly the political and material development of the Bulgarian element, it would nevertheless deal a death-blow to all the hopes cherished in Bulgaria of eventually absorbing the country. The Bulgarian Government therefore judged it prudent to await events, while carefully watching the course of the negotiations between the Young Turks and the Macedonian Internal Organization, conducted in the hope that concessions in regard to schools and local autonomy might afford satisfaction to the desires of the people. But it became evident that Turkey would not be allowed to carry out her experiment in constitutionalism unhampered. Austria was preparing her *coup* for the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and Bulgaria made no secret of the fact that, in that case, she would declare her independence.

It so happened that the latter step was hastened by two events. The first was the circumstance that, in issuing invitations to a dinner given to the diplomatic corps at Constantinople, the Turkish Minister for

Foreign Affairs omitted the Bulgarian representative on the ground that, as the agent of a vassal state, he really possessed no diplomatic character. This gave great offence in Bulgaria, and a strong movement for declaring her independence was set on foot. Almost at the same time difficulties arose with the Oriental Railway Company, an Austrian concern owning the line from Constantinople to Sofia. A strike occurred on the railway, whereupon Bulgaria occupied militarily that portion of the line which ran through Eastern Rumelia, and refused to restore it, while professing her readiness to respect the company's rights of ownership. During a visit to the Austrian Emperor, Prince Ferdinand gave assurances that the question would be settled favourably for Austria. But he was overruled by his Ministers, who succeeded in convincing him that the retention of the railway line in Bulgarian hands was indispensable for the safety of the country, and a necessary corollary to the declaration of independence, so dear to the Prince's heart. Accordingly, on October 5, 1908, Prince Ferdinand was proclaimed Tsar of the Bulgarians. Turkey protested against this violation of the Berlin Treaty, and declared that she reserved her rights. It had long been a cherished design of Prince Ferdinand to declare himself king of an independent Bulgaria. The plan had been mooted in his early days, and had been brought forward more than once since. It had aroused in the country no particular enthusiasm, nor was it likely to do so as long as the Macedonian question remained unsettled. But the recent slight put on the country had stirred public opinion to the depths; and the proclamation met with general satisfaction throughout the country.

At this time Bulgaria had 100,000 men under arms. The war party clamoured for instant mobilization, and have subsequently alleged that a unique opportunity of

attacking Turkey was lost. But peaceful counsels prevailed; and it then became a question of paying compensation for the railway and of satisfying certain other Turkish claims. From the first Bulgaria declined to pay more than 82,000,000 francs; Turkey was eventually induced by the Powers to accept 125,000,000 francs; and, as Bulgaria adhered to her first offer and was indeed unable to pay more, Russia undertook to settle the matter by making good the difference herself, abandoning to Turkey forty of the annuities of £350,000 which Turkey was bound by treaty to pay to Russia in respect of war indemnity, and which when capitalized would realize the desired sum. Bulgaria admitted her indebtedness to Russia in the sum of 82,000,000 francs; the necessary agreements were concluded on April 6, 1909. As a result, Turkey desisted from further claims regarding the railways, the arrears of Eastern Rumelian tribute, or compensation for Turkish State property in Bulgaria or Eastern Rumelia; she also renounced any claim to a Bulgarian tribute or to the assumption by Bulgaria of a share of the Turkish debt (though against this proviso a *caveat* was entered by the Public Debt Council), and agreed to recognize the new state of affairs in Bulgaria. Various other pending questions were settled at the same time, among others those relating to Moslem communities in Bulgaria and to *vakufs* or religious properties. On April 21, 1909, the Emperor of Russia recognized the independence of Bulgaria; and within a week all the other Powers had followed his example.

(11) *Formation of the Balkan League*

But the constitutional movement in Turkey, and especially the ultra-national and chauvinistic form which it took, could not fail to bring about a fundamental change in the prospects of the Macedonian

question. If Turkey's new rulers succeeded in 'turkifying' the country, the aspirations of the Christian States of the Balkans were at an end. It was therefore obviously their interest to sink their differences and by mutual concession to secure at least a portion of the long coveted gains which were now threatened with total loss. For this purpose Serbia and Bulgaria began to draw nearer. King Ferdinand had recently visited Petersburg to lay before the Russian Government the condition of affairs in Macedonia, in the hope of obtaining support. He next proceeded to Constantinople, where he received promises that a commercial treaty would be concluded, the frontier demarcated, the railway junction settled; and that in Macedonia all reasonable demands of Bulgarians for equal treatment should be granted, so as to establish permanent good relations between Turkey and Bulgaria.

The disturbances in Albania and Crete in 1909 and 1910 caused no trouble with Bulgaria, where, however, great offence was given by the Turkish order for the disarmament of the people of the three Macedonian vilayets and the manner in which it was carried out. Only the Christians were disarmed, often in circumstances of great cruelty; as usual, refugees fled to Bulgaria. Representations were made to Turkey, who denied that any brutalities had been committed. Eventually the refugees were repatriated, and matters resumed their normal condition. But in view of the rapidly growing danger from Turkey on the one hand, and from Austria on the other, it is not surprising that the Balkan States showed an increasing tendency to unite; and this inclination was fostered by Russia, now led by events to take up a more decided attitude in the peninsula.

The year 1911 showed no diminution in the activity and outrages of the revolutionary bands, public feeling in Bulgaria being more than usually excited by Turkish

misrule in Macedonia. The British Government urged Bulgaria not to allow her territory to be used by the leaders of bands as a base from which to conduct operations against Turkey; the Porte also made complaints. Matters improved somewhat on the formation of a coalition ministry under M. Geshoff. Stronger measures were now taken to prevent bands from crossing the frontier. But border affrays occurred from time to time; and it was not long before even M. Geshoff was much dissatisfied with the state of things. The Macedonian Organization memorialized the Powers on the condition of Macedonia, which they described as being worse than in Abdul Hamid's time, when at least some European control was exercised. The war with Italy now occupied all Turkey's attention; and the Comitadjis decided that, while exerting pressure to obtain autonomy for Macedonia, they should make no movement until the spring of 1912, unless through reverses in Tripoli civil war should break out in Turkey. Though not followed by any immediate overt act on the part of Bulgaria, the Turco-Italian War was welcomed as likely to weaken Turkey and to bring about civil dissensions which might have an important bearing on the fate of Macedonia. Austria urged Bulgaria to remain peaceful, and received the assurance that the *status quo* would be maintained, and that Bulgaria would not move unless interests which she considered vital were threatened by other Powers. Meanwhile, the negotiations between Bulgaria and Turkey on the subject of railway connexions and other matters continued, but without result.

Greater issues, however, were now at stake; and it became necessary for the King of Bulgaria to abandon his policy of vacillating between Austria and Russia, the real rivals in the Balkans, and to decide on throwing in his lot with the one or the other. Hitherto, his choice

had been dictated by personal considerations and the impulse of the moment. But it was now plain that, not satisfied with the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, Austria intended to take advantage of Turkey's difficulties to make a step forward in the Balkans; she was credited with the desire of establishing a large autonomous Albania, by which Serbia would be permanently debarred from access to the sea, and the future of the Balkan States would be threatened. The Balkan States naturally gravitated towards Russia, after abandoning the hope entertained for a moment of forming a league with Turkey. Since 1878 Bulgaria had been chafing at the loss of the territories awarded to her by the Treaty of San Stefano. The deplorable condition of Macedonia and the failure of the various reform schemes proposed or encouraged by the Powers kept alive the hope that Bulgaria would some day be able to realize her hopes of acquiring the country which she deemed her own. Now that Turkey was at war with Italy, and Serbia made proposals for an alliance, the long-desired opportunity seemed to have come.

Accordingly, in October 1911, negotiations took a concrete form. Originally directed quite as much against Austria as against Turkey, they were conducted with the cognizance and under the guidance of Russia, who stipulated that no forward movement should take place at that time. The first desideratum was an agreement as to the division of the expected spoils. A partial understanding was come to, the question of the definite division of Macedonia between Bulgaria and Serbia being reserved for the future arbitration of Russia, who accepted the task. It was agreed that neither Italy nor Austria should be admitted to any share in the territorial division, and that Turkey should not be weakened more than was absolutely necessary. It was also decided to induce Greece to join. King Ferdinand's

scruples at thus breaking definitely with Austria were overcome only by direct pressure from the Tsar; the concurrence of Greece was obtained at the festivities of the coming of age of Prince Boris on February 2, 1912, when the Princes of the various Balkan States attended at Sofia.

After this matters moved rapidly. On March 13, 1912, a treaty of peace and friendship was concluded between Serbia and Bulgaria, by which each Power guaranteed the political independence and the territorial integrity of the other, and each undertook to come to the other's assistance, employing for that purpose the whole of its forces, in the event of an attack by one or more Powers. The latter undertaking was to hold good in case any one of the Great Powers should attempt to annex or to occupy even temporarily any part of the Balkan peninsula actually under Turkish domination, should such action be deemed by either party to be contrary to its vital interests. Both parties bound themselves not to conclude a separate peace; and provision was made for the conclusion of a military convention. By a secret annexe it was provided that, in the event of serious disturbances in Turkey threatening the preservation of the *status quo* in the Balkan peninsula, that party which first came to the conclusion that military action should be taken was to communicate with the other party with a view to an agreement, subject always to the concurrence of Russia, to whom such agreement was to be communicated at once; and, in case of divergence of views between the parties, the decision was to rest with Russia. All territorial gains accruing were to be held under a condominium of the two allies; and a settlement was to take place not later than three months after the restoration of peace, on the following terms: Serbia recognized Bulgaria's right to the territories east of the Rhodope and of the Struma;

Bulgaria recognized Serbia's right to the territories north and west of the Shar Planina. As to the region between the Shar, the Rhodope, the Aegean, and the Lake of Okhrida, if both parties agreed that, owing to the interests of the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalities, or for other reasons, these could not be formed into an autonomous province, Serbia consented not to claim any territories beyond a certain line extending from Mount Golem (north of Kriva Palanka) on the original Turco-Bulgarian frontier and proceeding generally in a south-westerly direction to the Lake of Okhrida. Bulgaria undertook to accept this line if the Emperor of Russia should pronounce in favour of it; and both parties agreed to abide by His Majesty's award as regards the future frontier-line. The text of the treaty and the annex were to be communicated to the Russian Government, by whom any divergences of view were to be settled.

The clauses indicating Russia's position as arbiter—which afford a presumption that the negotiations were conducted with her knowledge and approval—added greatly to the value of the treaty from the Serbian point of view, making it very difficult for King Ferdinand to withdraw from its stipulations, should he wish to do so.

The treaty of alliance between Bulgaria and Greece was signed on May 29, 1912. Its stipulations were: (1) an undertaking of mutual defence in the event of an attack by Turkey, whether in the territory of the parties or by systematic violation of treaty-rights or of fundamental principles of the law of nations; no separate peace to be made; (2) a mutual promise to use their influence with their respective race-brethren in Turkey to induce them to contribute conscientiously to the pacific coexistence of the elements constituting the population of the empire, and, on the other hand, to

co-operate in any representations to Turkey or the Great Powers with the object of bringing about or of assuring the realization of the rights granted by treaty or otherwise to the Greek and Bulgarian nationalities, and the application of political equality and of constitutional guarantees; (3) the treaty to remain in force for three years, and thereafter from year to year, failing denunciation, and (4) to be kept secret. Provisions reserving its effects as regards Crete figure in an annexed declaration. It will be observed that the thorny question of delimitation was not mentioned; this was left for future settlement, its present discussion being likely to impede the conclusion of the alliance.

Military conventions were also signed. That between Bulgaria and Serbia (dated May 12, 1912) provided that, in the event of the action contemplated in the Treaty of Alliance, Bulgaria was to furnish a force of not less than 200,000 combatants and Serbia one of at least 150,000; if Rumania or Turkey attacked Bulgaria, Serbia was to supply at least 100,000 combatants; while, if Austria attacked Serbia, Bulgaria was at once to declare war against Austria and to furnish 200,000 men. These were the principal provisions; the rest contemplated certain other contingencies or referred to details of a military nature. The military convention with Greece was not concluded until September 22, 1912. By its terms (1) Greece promised in the event of war with Turkey to intervene with a force of at least 120,000 men, Bulgaria undertaking to furnish 300,000; (2) each Power undertook to assist the other, if attacked, with the number of troops already mentioned; the Greek fleet was also to secure command of the Aegean Sea and to interrupt communication between Asia Minor and European Turkey; other provisions excluded the grant of an armistice of more than 24 hours' duration without the

consent of the Allies, &c. The alliances with Montenegro were left to the last, in the desire of avoiding indiscretion or premature action. The various agreements were concluded with the utmost secrecy; and, though the fact that negotiations had been conducted could not be concealed, up to the outbreak of war the existence of the treaties was not generally known.

(12) *First Balkan War; Conferences of London*

Meanwhile, Turco-Bulgarian relations were in their usual unsatisfactory condition. In Bulgaria the Ishtip massacre (1911) had caused much ill feeling; on her side Turkey complained of the activity of the band-leaders and of the smuggling of arms, &c., into Macedonia. In the spring of 1912 emissaries of the Macedonian Internal Organization had visited the European capitals in order to call attention to the disastrous state of affairs and to induce Europe to urge Turkey to institute real reforms. Everywhere their representations met with a sympathetic hearing. Throughout Bulgaria mass meetings were held, at which resolutions were passed calling on the Government to intervene to save Macedonia by enforcing Article XXIII of the Berlin Treaty, but no hostile manifestations against Turkey were made.

On August 6, 1912, a massacre of Christians at Kochana had followed on a bomb outrage; Bulgaria at once demanded an impartial inquiry, the punishment of the guilty, and the prevention of such acts in future. A commission of inquiry was sent, but nothing else was done. The excitement in Bulgaria was increased by rumours that Albania was to receive autonomy—a concession which would be deeply resented in the Balkan States unless Macedonia were accorded the same privilege. In the hope of relieving the tension, and perhaps of increasing her influence in the Balkans, a

proposal was made by Austria that the Powers should urge the Porte to adopt decentralization, so as to afford legitimate guarantees to the Christian nationalities, and should endeavour to induce the Balkan States to await peacefully the result of this policy. The proposal was, however, dropped, as Russia did not favour it, while it was clear that Turkey would refuse compliance. Meanwhile the growing unrest was heightened by alleged massacres at Berana and Sienitsa ; and Bulgaria began to make military preparations.

On August 29 Russia warned Bulgaria against committing any act of aggression ; a fortnight later a similar and stronger admonition followed, to the effect that Turkey would make peace with Italy, buy off Greece with Crete, and contain Serbia by means of the Albanians, so that Bulgaria would be left unaided. M. Geshoff reminded the Russian Minister that it was Russia who had brought about the alliance between the Balkan States, and that, if she now sought to detach them, her influence in the Balkans would be at an end. In her turn Bulgaria now made strong representations to the Powers, urging, so late as September 20, that the Government would be powerless to restrain the warlike spirit unless Turkey introduced immediate and acceptable reforms ; no mere promises would avail, and the Allies were strong enough to enforce their will on Turkey if she declined to give way. M. Sazonoff, who was at this time in London, urged on both the Serbian and the Bulgarian representatives the necessity of remaining peaceful ; Russia, he said, had indeed welcomed the Balkan agreement as being for mutual defence and the recognition of their mutual interests ; but if, in defiance of the repeated warnings given, they attacked Turkey, Russia would be guided only by her own direct interests. As a last attempt for the preservation of peace, Austria and Russia, acting more or less as the

mandatories of Europe, made a joint representation to all the Balkan States, including Turkey, promising that the Powers would take in hand, in the interests of the Christians, administrative reforms on the basis of Article XXIII of the Berlin Treaty, it being understood that these reforms would not impair the integrity of the Ottoman dominions. They deprecated any measure likely to lead to a breach of the peace, and declared that, if war broke out, they would not consent, on the termination of the war, to any change in the territorial *status quo* in the Balkan peninsula.

This communication was made on October 8, just at the moment when Montenegro declared war against Turkey. Five days later the four Balkan States replied. They stated that, after the many promises given by Turkey and expressly recorded in international instruments, it would be cruel not to endeavour to institute reforms more radical and more definite. The Balkan States had therefore considered it their duty to address themselves directly to the Turkish Government to point out the principles on which the reforms to be introduced should be based, and the guarantees which must be given for their conscientious application. The Porte's reply was to the effect that Turkey had recognized the necessity of introducing reforms in European Turkey, and intended to apply them without foreign interference. The failure of her attempts to improve the internal situation was due to the state of unrest produced by agitators. Turkey intended to lay before Parliament the law of 1880 on the European vilayets, and, if it were passed, to see to its prompt and impartial application.

The communication of the Balkan States to Turkey, made on October 13, took the form of an ultimatum. Its chief demands were the full confirmation of the ethnical autonomy of the nationalities of the Empire;

proportional representation in the Ottoman Parliament of every nationality; admission of Christians to all public offices in provinces inhabited by Christians; recognition of Christian schools on the same footing as Moslem schools; an engagement by the Porte not to modify the ethnological character of the provinces by transplanting the Moslem population; district recruitment of Christians for military service with Christian cadres; reorganization of the Macedonian *gendarmerie* under the effective command of Swiss or Belgian organizers; appointment of Swiss or Belgian valis in the provinces inhabited by Christians; and the creation at the Grand Vizierate of a superior Council composed of Christians and Moslems, in equal numbers, to superintend the application of these reforms, under the supervision of the Ambassadors of the Powers and of the Ministers of the four Balkan States. Turkey was to bind herself to carry out the reforms demanded within six months. The terms in which the ultimatum was couched were deliberately chosen to make their acceptance impossible; as anticipated, they were rejected by Turkey, and war was declared on October 17, nine days after Montenegro had broken with the Porte.

In the hostilities which ensued Montenegro was victorious in many encounters with the Turks, but was long baffled by the defence of Scutari, which eventually fell to her and her Serbian allies on April 23, 1913; the Serbians captured Prishtina, Kumanovo, Skoplye (Üsküb), Prisren, and Monastir, and reached the Adriatic coast, occupying Alessio and Durazzo. Greece overran Thessaly and Epirus, capturing Salonica on November 8, besides occupying Chio and the remaining islands. Bulgaria was even more strikingly successful; great victories were won over the Turks at Kirk Kilisse and at Lule Burgas, and the enemy fled to the lines of Chatalja, before Constantinople. The successes of the

Allies had been received with enthusiasm throughout Europe, and extinguished the prospect of enforcing the principle laid down by the Powers that no modification of the *status quo* would be permitted. But it soon became clear that Austria would not allow Serbia to retain her conquests on the Adriatic or Montenegro to possess Scutari, while Russia was equally opposed to a Bulgarian entry into Constantinople, or to the Greeks threatening the Dardanelles. Austria and Russia agreed not to intervene if the other refrained from so doing, but they took their precautions; Austria poured troops into Dalmatia, and Russia also adopted defensive measures.

On November 5 Turkey approached the Great Powers with a request for their mediation, but this proved impracticable. Eight days later she consented to appeal direct to Bulgaria for a cessation of hostilities with a view to arranging preliminaries of peace. The terms of the armistice gave rise to various proposals and counter-proposals, and were not signed until December 3, 1912.

The negotiations, which began in London in December 1912, at first led to no satisfactory result. The demands of the Allies, which included the cession of all Turkey's dominions west of a line drawn from Rodosto on the Marmora to Malatra on the Black Sea (exclusive of the Gallipoli Peninsula, but including Albania), as well as all the islands, were regarded by Turkey as exorbitant; her counter-offers were wholly inadequate. In presence of this deadlock, the Powers, on January 17, 1913, made a collective representation to Turkey, urging on her the importance of adopting a moderate and conciliatory attitude. They reminded her that after the war she would stand in need of the goodwill of the Powers, and warned her that she could reckon on it only if she now followed their advice, which was to cede Adrianople and leave to the Powers the decision of the fate of the Aegean Islands. Turkey was

giving signs of accepting the inevitable and of yielding to the demand of the Powers, when a military *coup d'état* was carried out at Constantinople to prevent this concession. Enver Bey, who now became all-powerful, was for prosecuting the war with vigour. However, on January 30, 1913, Turkey replied to the collective note of the Powers that she was ready to cede that part of Adrianople which was situated on the right bank of the Maritsa (i. e. excluding the greater part of the town); it might be possible for her to give way in respect of the islands, if the Powers would take into account their strategic value for the defence of the capital or of the Asiatic provinces, as the case might be. At the same time, she claimed a free hand in the matter of customs duties, and demanded concessions in respect of the foreign post offices and of the capitulations.

On the same day the Allies denounced the armistice; and four days later the bombardment of Adrianople was resumed. The recrudescence of warlike energy in Turkey evaporated after the failure of an attempt to dislodge the Bulgarians from before Chatalja; and on February 10, 1913, she appealed to the Powers to mediate for the conclusion of peace on the express basis of her statement of January 30. By the end of February, however, she agreed to their unconditional mediation. The prospects of peace seemed now more favourable, as Bulgaria's tone began to be more moderate, in view of the prolongation of the war and the sufferings of her troops. Negotiations were, however, delayed by the Balkan States in the hope that Adrianople would fall; this event did not occur until March 26. On April 15 a fresh armistice was agreed to, and the delegates once more met in London. The proposals and counter-proposals on each side were very divergent; moreover, matters were much complicated by Austria's insistence on the formation of an autonomous Albania and the

consequent inhibition of Serbia and Montenegro from retaining the conquests they had achieved in that region. It became necessary for the Powers to exert considerable pressure on the Allies, whose dissensions had now reached the point of a rupture, in order that peace should be signed. This aim was attained only on May 30, 1913, when, on being summoned either to sign or to leave London, the delegates of the belligerent Powers affixed their signatures to the Treaty of London. Its main provisions were the cession by Turkey to the Balkan Allies of all the European dominions of the Ottoman Empire west of a line drawn from Enos on the Aegean to Midia on the Black Sea, with the exception of Albania; the Great Powers were to decide on the delimitation of Albania and all questions concerning it, as well as the ultimate disposal of the islands of the Aegean Sea (except Crete, ceded to the Allies) and of the peninsula of Mount Athos.

(13) *Second Balkan War; Treaty of Bucarest*

The results of the short campaign seemed to be more brilliantly successful than any of the Allies could have hoped for. But, unfortunately, the dissensions between them had become so acute that it was clear, even before the signature of the treaty, that a fresh war between the Allies could be avoided only by the exercise of moderation and conciliation such as no one of them was willing to display. The disposal of the spoils could hardly be effected peaceably. As regards Greece and Bulgaria, no preliminary agreement had been arrived at; each country was accused of having trespassed on the other's rightful share of the conquered territory. Greece and Bulgaria had indeed come to open strife at Nigrita in March 1913; and, though the hostilities did not extend at the time, much ill feeling arose from the mutual jealousies and exorbitant claims of both parties.

Bulgaria, already supported by Austria, claimed both Salonika and Kavalla, which Greece was determined not to abandon. Between Serbia and Bulgaria the treaty of alliance had apparently provided for all contingencies, yet the most serious divergencies soon arose.

When hostilities against Turkey were renewed in February, Bulgaria addressed to Serbia a pressing demand for siege artillery and additional troops in order to overcome the resistance of Adrianople. The request was complied with by Serbia, who, however, gave it to be understood that, in return for this aid, territorial compensation would be claimed, and that Bulgaria would be required to cede to Serbia Monastir, Prilep, and Veles, thus bringing the Serbian frontier to the Vardar. Bulgaria rejected this demand on the ground that the Military Convention required Serbia to furnish unlimited help, and claimed that no departure from the terms of the treaty was permissible.[1] Serbia, however, persisted in maintaining that the support given by her in Thrace went beyond the stipulations of the Military Agreement, and that Bulgaria had failed to comply with certain provisions of the latter; Bulgaria, moreover, would now probably acquire Adrianople, a gain which had not been contemplated at the time of the alliance, while Serbia would have to renounce her conquests in Albania owing to Austrian opposition. She therefore claimed a revision of the treaty. Neither party would recede from its position; and the strenuous intervention of Russia with a view to bringing about an agreement or to induce the parties to refer the question to her decision, as the natural protectress of the Slavs, had no effect but to make her unpopular and to create a pro-Austrian party in Bulgaria.

As a last attempt at conciliation, the Serbian and

[1] See text of Treaty and Convention given in Appendices XII and XIII to *The Eastern Question*, No. 15 of this series.

Bulgarian Prime Ministers met; and it was hoped to arrange a meeting of the Ministers of the four Balkan States in some Balkan town or else at Petersburg, to discuss the points at issue. But in spite of Russia's strong advocacy the plan fell through; M. Geshoff, whose conciliatory attitude was adversely criticized in Bulgaria, now resigned and was succeeded by M. Daneff. On June 10 the Emperor of Russia addressed to the Kings of Bulgaria and Serbia a strong personal appeal, promising to arrange all questions at issue between the two countries and urging that they should demobilize. Bulgaria, who underrated the strength of her opponents and was determined to insist on what she considered to be her rights, replied that she could in no circumstances assent to a revision of the Treaty, though she was ready to submit to the arbitration of Russia in everything indicated in it as subject to arbitration. This reply greatly incensed Russia, who considered that, as the protectress of Bulgaria, to whom she had furnished arms, &c., and as having held Austria in check during the Balkan War by keeping 400,000 men on a war-footing, her advice should have been followed. As for Serbia, she expressed her readiness to reduce her forces by three-fourths, provided that Bulgaria did the same. A proposal for joint action by the Powers to bring about demobilization failed owing to lack of support from Austria, who was now clearly favouring Bulgaria and encouraging her in her opposition to Russia and Serbia. The consequence was that war was declared by Bulgaria against both Serbia and Greece.

In the fighting which ensued the general result was unfavourable to Bulgaria, who might, however, have held her own had her antagonists been only her former allies, though her army was greatly exhausted by the previous campaign and her troops were far from displaying against brother Slavs the same vigour as when fight-

ing against the hereditary Moslem enemy. But Bulgaria found herself paralysed by the intervention of Rumania. Ever since the conclusion of the Treaty of Berlin Rumania considered that she had a substantial grievance in having been deprived of Bessarabia; as soon as it became a question of modifying the territorial arrangements determined by that treaty, she put forward her claim to compensation. This she based in part on services rendered in the past to Bulgaria, in harbouring refugees and serving as a base of operations against Turkey, and also on her neutrality during the Balkan War. But she had never concealed her determination that she must receive some aggrandizement; and this could only be given at the expense of Bulgaria. When it became clear that Bulgaria would acquire a large accession of territory and an increase of population, and also in view of her cherished aspirations in the Dobruja, Rumania considered it essential that the frontier between the Danube and the Black Sea should be strengthened, and that for this purpose Silistria must be in her hands. Bulgaria showed little inclination to fall in with these views, but on January 29, 1913, consented to dismantle the forts round Silistria and to concede a slight rectification of the frontier. The matter was referred to the decision of the Ambassadors at Petersburg, under the presidency of M. Sazonoff; and on April 17, 1913, this body awarded the town of Silistria to Rumania, the new frontier passing about three kilometres west of Silistria.

Rumania was not satisfied with this award, and, when war broke out between the late Allies, she decided to intervene. Her armies overran a considerable part of Bulgaria, whose military operations against Greece and Serbia were thus much hampered, though no actual fighting took place between Rumanian and Bulgarian troops, the latter retiring before the advance of the

former. To add to Bulgaria's discomfiture, Turkey, who had persistently withstood all pressure to demobilize, now marched into Thrace, in open disregard of the Treaty of London, recaptured Adrianople, and invaded Bulgaria proper. Russia urged coercion and a naval demonstration to force Turkey to respect an undertaking so recently concluded under international auspices, but the Triple Alliance would not agree; and the prestige of the European Concert suffered through its inability to prevent the violation of a covenant just drawn up under its own sanction. Bulgaria's position was now hopeless, and she could save herself only by agreeing with Rumania's demands; she therefore consented at last to part with the territory comprised within a line from Tutrakan to Balchik. Rumania, having gained what she desired, proposed on July 21 an armistice, to which Greece and Serbia were induced to consent by pressure from Austria and Russia, who warned them that they would incur grave responsibility if they refused, as they would thereby be facilitating Turkey's invasion of Bulgaria.

On July 30 the peace negotiations began at Bucarest. Bulgaria relied on the help of Austria, to whom she had appealed to support a proposal for an autonomous Macedonia, and who had promised that she would use her influence on behalf of Bulgarian claims and also to re-open later any territorial settlement arrived at. Bulgaria, moreover, made attempts at concluding a separate peace with Rumania, in the forlorn hope that she would then be able to deal with Greece and Serbia. These expectations were not realized. Rumania refused to enter into separate negotiations, and Austria was unable to obtain better terms for Bulgaria. On August 10, 1913, the treaty of peace was signed at Bucarest. It reduced Bulgaria's gains in Macedonia to the upper valley of the Struma, besides a slice of Thrace

extending roughly along the Maritsa (but excluding Adrianople) to the Aegean, and as far west as the Mesta river, thus leaving to Bulgaria Dedeagatch and Porto Lagos; further, the Turco-Bulgarian frontier was slightly rectified so as to give Mustafa Pasha to Bulgaria. The rest of the territory conquered from Turkey was divided between Greece and Serbia; finally, the cession to Rumania of the Tutrakan–Balchik line was made effective. It is interesting to note that by Article V of the Treaty, Bulgaria explicitly abandoned any claim to the island of Crete, thus showing how far-reaching her aspirations had been. The plan of submitting the treaty to the revision of the Powers, though favoured by Austria and supported in other quarters, was not realized. On August 25 the formal ratifications were exchanged. Some days earlier a secret agreement had been signed by Rumania, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro to ensure the execution of the treaty by Bulgaria, using force if necessary.

The results of the two Balkan Wars are set out below:

			Total after 1913:	
	Sq. km.	*Inhabitants.*	*Sq. km.*	*Inhabitants.*
Bulgaria: gained from Turkey	25,257	656,535		
ceded to Rumania	7,525	282,131		
net gain	17,732	374,404	114,017	4,711,917
Greece: gained from Turkey	55,400	2,066,647	120,060	4,698,599
Serbia: ,, ,, ,,	39,000	1,750,000	87,300	4,600,000
Montenegro: ,, ,, ,,	5,100	150,000	14,180	435,000
Rumania: ,, ,, Bulgaria	7,525	282,131	145,427	7,791,140

The three chief belligerents were thus left in a position approaching equality as regards population, while Rumania retained a decided preponderance.

It may be computed that the second Balkan War cost Bulgaria nearly 50,000 men, some twenty millions sterling, and the loss of at least 40,000 square kilometres of territory. Thus were the brilliant results attained in

the field during the joint war against Turkey almost entirely annihilated a few months later. The Treaty of Bucarest, by depriving Bulgaria of the legitimate conquest of her arms, turned her against Russia, whom she blamed for deserting her in her extremity. Austria took full advantage of the change, and after 1913 quite regained her lost influence; the use she made of it was to bring Bulgaria (where an Austrophil ministry came into office on M. Daneff's resignation, July 1913) over to the side of the Central Powers in the European war, thus affording an opportunity of revenge on Serbia and of regaining the lost Macedonian territories. With Turkey also Bulgaria had become reconciled. On September 29, 1913, a treaty was signed at Constantinople between the two countries, delimiting the new frontier in Thrace and settling questions of nationality, property, &c.[1]

[1] See text in Appendix XVII of *The Eastern Question*, No. 15 of this series.

III. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS

(1) Religious

The Bulgarian Church claims to be an inseparable member of the Eastern or 'Greek' Orthodox communion, from which it differs in no respect doctrinally. It was, nevertheless, excommunicated as schismatic by the Greek Patriarch in 1872 (see p. 15). After the abolition of the Bulgarian Patriarchate of Trnovo in 1393, and of that of Okhrida in 1766, the Bulgarian Christians in Turkey were subject to the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople till March 11, 1870, when the Imperial Firman of that date established the Bulgarian Exarchate with jurisdiction over 15 dioceses, including Nish and Pirot (subsequently adjudged to Serbia by the Berlin Treaty), and Veles in Macedonia; other dioceses in Turkey were to be added in case at least two-thirds of the Christian local population so desired. In virtue of this provision the Porte subsequently issued the *berat* or *exsequatur* for Bulgarian bishops in Okhrida, Üsküb, Monastir (Pelagonia), Veles (a restoration), Nevrokop, Dibra, and Strumitsa, all in Macedonia. The firman and the berats possess historical importance as indicating a recognition of the Bulgarian character of the regions affected. Constantinople remained the seat of the Exarchate till 1913, when the Exarch Joseph withdrew to Sofia; after his death (two years later) no successor was appointed. The Bulgarian Church now numbers 22 dioceses, of which 7 are in Macedonia and 3 in Thrace. The Macedonian bishops were driven from their sees

by the Serbians in 1913; and many of the Bulgarian churches, which had survived in Turkish times, were burnt.

The bulk of the population of the Bulgarian kingdom belongs to the national Church. Of the population in 1910, 3,643,951 belonged to the Orthodox Church (of these a certain number remained subject to the Patriarch and called themselves Greek); 602,101 were Moslems, 40,070 were Jews, 32,130 were Roman Catholics, 12,270 were Gregorian Armenians, 6,252 were Protestants. Of the new population added by the Treaty of Bucarest 286,307 were Orthodox (227,598 Bulgarians and 58,709 Greeks), and 350,585 Moslems (75,337 Pomaks, i.e. Bulgarian converts, and 275,498 Turks). In the part of the Dobruja ceded to Rumania by the same treaty there were about 90,000 Moslems and 100,000 Orthodox.

The Constitution accords complete liberty to alien creeds; and difference of religion involves no restriction of civic rights. Mohammedans, Jews, Patriarchists, Catholics, and Protestants receive subsidies for their schools and salaries for the members of their respective religious organizations. The Moslem element is fully represented in the national Parliament. In general, religious toleration prevails to a greater extent than in any other State in Eastern Europe.[1]

[1] Thus, when the Bulgarian Dobruja was appropriated by Rumania in 1913, the Moslem population lost the civic rights it had hitherto enjoyed. In Bulgaria no disabilities are imposed on Jews, as in Rumania. The Roman Catholic community in Bulgaria is organized under two bishops, and possesses numerous churches. The only exception to the rule of toleration in Bulgaria is to be found in the case of the Greek bishops who were expelled from their sees in retaliation for the alleged connexion of Greek ecclesiastics with atrocities committed in Macedonia.

(2) Political

The form of government is based on the Constitution of Trnovo, submitted in the shape of an Organic Statute by the Russian Commissary-General, Prince Dondukov-Korsakov, to a Constituent Assembly in 1879, and largely modified in a democratic sense by that body. It was suspended in 1881, restored in 1883, and revised in 1903 and 1911.

Bulgaria is declared to be a constitutional and hereditary monarchy. The King must profess the Orthodox faith, only the first elected sovereign having been released from this obligation. The legislative power is vested in the King acting jointly with a National Assembly. The King is the supreme head of the army, and represents the country in its international relations; he supervises the executive power, and appoints and dismisses Ministers.

The national representation is vested in the Sobranye or ordinary assembly, elected by manhood suffrage in the proportion of 1 member to every 20,000 of the population; and the Grand Sobranye, elected in exceptional circumstances, in the proportion of 2 to every 20,000. The Sobranye, which votes all legislative and financial measures, may be prorogued for a period of two months or dissolved by the King. The King may *proprio motu* impose measures having the force of laws whenever the State is threatened with immediate danger, but cannot levy fresh taxation without the previous sanction of the Sobranye. The Grand Sobranye is summoned to elect a new sovereign, to nominate a regency, to sanction a change in the Constitution, or to ratify an alteration in the limits of the kingdom. Any Bulgarian subject who has attained the age of 30, and can read and write, is eligible as a deputy to either assembly. The voting is by secret ballot. Naturalized

foreigners possess the right to vote, and may be elected after a residence of 15 years in the country. The system of proportional representation has been adopted. An annual Budget is presented to the Sobranye, which exercises supreme authority in the department of finance; the items of public expenditure are, at the same time, strictly controlled by the High Court of Accounts, an independent and semi-judicial organization.

The executive is entrusted to a Cabinet, at present (1918) consisting of nine Ministers. The Ministers are responsible to the King and the Sobranye, and may be impeached by the latter and tried by a special tribunal.

Local administration is organized on the Belgian model. The country is divided into a number of Departments, each under a prefect, assisted by a Departmental Council and aided by several sub-prefects. In some of the principal towns there is also a prefect of police. The system of municipal government, left untouched by the Turks, descends from primitive times. Each community, urban or rural, has its *Kmet* or mayor, and its council, and enjoys a large amount of local autonomy.

The administration of justice is vested exclusively in the Law Courts. The lowest Court is that of the justices of the peace, who possess jurisdiction in minor civil and criminal cases. Next comes the Departmental Court, or Court of first instance, which is competent to pronounce sentences of death and penal servitude, and also acts as a Court of Appeal. Above this are the three Courts of Appeal sitting at Sofia, Philippopolis, and Ruschuk. The highest tribunal is the Court of Cassation, sitting at Sofia, and composed of 12 judges. Its duty is to ensure the just and uniform application of the laws by the various tribunals throughout the

country. The Mohammedans and other alien religious communities are allowed to have their own ecclesiastical Courts, which deal with questions of religion, marriage, divorce, and inheritance.

In general the methods of government are more in accordance with modern ideas than might have been expected in view of the comparatively recent liberation of the country from Turkish rule; they compare favourably with those prevailing in neighbouring countries which have enjoyed a longer period of self-government. The system of communal autonomy, the retention of which was jealously insisted upon by the Constituent Assembly, on the whole works well; the mayors and urban or rural councils effectively defend local interests, and often provide a useful check on the action of the prefects and other functionaries of the central Government. The decision of conflicts arising between private persons and the administrative authorities rests exclusively with the Law Courts. The permanency of the judiciary has, to a large extent, been secured. Oppression, corruption, and nepotism have not been wholly eradicated, but are perhaps less prevalent than in some more highly civilized countries.

In regard to home affairs, popular opinion in recent years has shown a tendency to accept advanced democratic ideas, notwithstanding the extremely liberal character of the existing Constitution. This tendency has displayed itself in the formation of two Socialist groups—the 'broad' and the 'narrow'—in the present Chamber; these are more or less in alliance with the Agrarians, a numerous group representing the interests of the peasant class. The Bulgarian peasants, who, as a rule, are small proprietors, care little for Socialist theories; they are sturdy champions of economy, both in public and in private life; and the alliance

between the Socialists and Agrarians is based not on a community of fundamental principles, but on a joint programme of retrenchment and reform, combined with hostility to the Court and the military element. Together with the Radicals, a small group, these parties desire peace and friendly relations with the other Balkan States. The other parties in the Chamber are the Nationalists (formerly Conservatives), under M. Geshoff; the Progressists (Zankovists or Russophils), under M. Daneff; the Democrats (Karavelists), under M. Malinoff; and the Liberals (Stambolovists, &c.), who are divided into various factions. The Cabinet from 1913 to 1918 represented a coalition of the Liberal group owing allegiance to M. Radoslavoff, the Prime Minister, and M. Toncheff, the Minister of Finance. The Turkish deputies have hitherto supported the Government of the day.

(3) Naval and Military Organization

The organization of the military forces of the Principality was entrusted to Russian officers (1879–85). and during the same period the Eastern Rumelian 'militia' was instructed by foreign officers. According to the Budget of 1914, the total peace effective was 5,155 officers and 74,910 non-commissioned officers and men, with 18,620 horses. The war effective is given in the *Almanach de Gotha* (1918) as 211,124 men, with 44,352 horses and oxen, 1,204 guns, and 9,732 vehicles. All Bulgarian subjects are liable to military service, but Moslems can obtain exemption on payment of £20.[1] The Bulgarian peasant makes an admirable soldier; the army, however, has suffered very heavily in the course of three successive wars.

[1] This privilege was recently withdrawn.

The small flotillas on the Danube and the Black Sea were reorganized and trained for some years before the war of 1912 by French officers; they have not been increased in recent years.

(4) Public Education

Until 1835, when the first Bulgarian school was founded at Gabrovo, education was entirely in the hands of the Greek clergy. Greek was the language of instruction; and the bulk of the population was totally illiterate. The upper classes sent their children to be educated abroad. After the creation of the Principality great efforts were made by the Government, and heavy expenditure was incurred for the spread of education; the satisfactory results attained are largely due to the keen desire for learning which exists among the people.

During the last three decades of Turkish rule, educational committees began to appear in various places; they contributed more than any other institution to the intellectual and moral awakening of the nation and the foundation of an independent Bulgarian Church. Owing to the important part which they played in the national revival, these committees have become a traditional institution, which has been embodied in all the further developments of the educational system. They exist in every town and village, and exercise a general supervision over the primary schools. Each department has also its educational council, under the presidency of the prefect, which superintends the application of the educational laws under the control of the Minister of Public Instruction.

The educational system was reorganized in 1891. Primary education is obligatory for children of both

sexes between the ages of six and eleven. In primary schools the course of study is for four years. From the beginning of May till the 1st of September the rural schools are closed, as the whole population works in the fields. The schools are provided and maintained by the communes; the teachers are paid by the State.

For secondary education there are gymnasia for male students, and 'high schools' for female; there are also 'class schools' in many communes. The course of instruction extends over seven years; during the last four years it is specialized in classical and science sections. There are also several technical, agricultural, and other schools. Government aid is given to students of limited means. The University of Sofia has three faculties, with 17 professors and 33 assistant professors.

The progress of education in Bulgaria is very striking. In 1888 only 11 per cent. of the population was literate; to-day the proportion is probably over 60 per cent.; the illiterate minority is mainly composed of aged persons and women. The spread of learning has unfortunately engendered a distaste for agricultural and industrial pursuits, and enormously increased the number of candidates for Government employment. The American institution of Robert College on the Bosphorus rendered an invaluable service to the young State in its early years by providing it with a number of well-educated young men fitted for positions of responsibility. The American school at Samokov has also done much for the country.

IV. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

(A) MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

(1) Internal

(*a*) *Roads*

Originally the method of road construction was by forced labour. In 1883 a road tax was established for the main roads, and in the case of local roads alternatives were allowed of either paying an additional tax or doing four days' work on the roads annually. In 1900 the road service was reorganized, and roads were classed either as national roads or district roads; in the former class were placed military roads and those which run between important towns, railway stations, and ports; in the latter the roads which link up the villages with each other and with the national roads. The national roads are divided into three classes according to width, first-class roads having a metalled surface of 20 ft., second-class roads one of 16 ft., and third-class roads one of 13 ft. Although the national roads compare favourably with those of other Balkan countries, they cannot be described as good.

According to the official return for the year 1912, there were at that date 8,945 kilometres of roads, of which 6,420 kilometres were national roads, and 2,525 kilometres district roads. It is further stated that of these only 4,024 kilometres were good roads. The same return gives a total of 14,126 bridges and 1,184 culverts on the State and district roads.

It is stated that since her entry into the European War, Bulgaria has employed large numbers of prisoners

of war and civilian labourers in constructing military and other roads.

(*b*) *Rivers*

The most important river of Bulgaria, excepting the Danube (see *Rumania*, No. 23 in this series), is the Maritsa, which rises in the Rhodope Mountains, traverses the plain of Eastern Rumelia, and flows into the Aegean Sea at Enos. The length of the river is about 260 miles. Below Adrianople it is navigable for barges from October to June, and for flat-bottomed boats at all seasons of the year. It is also used by a local type of sailing boat of 30 tons. The average depth of the river in this section is 7 to 10 ft. The bed is sandy, and the current about 2 miles an hour in summer. Above Adrianople, though the current is slow and the river is in places very broad, the constant shifting of the river bed and the frequency of floods render it unsatisfactory as a waterway. It is stated that it would not be difficult by building up the banks to render the river a valuable waterway from the mouth to Philippopolis, in which case it would serve the whole of the Eastern Rumelian plain. The most important of its tributaries are the Elli Dere, which is used for floating timber; the Tunja, normally from 3 to 7 ft. in depth, and used by small boats; and the Arda, which is not navigable.

Of the other rivers flowing into the Aegean, the most important are the Mesta and the Struma. The former rises in the Rhodope Mountains, and flows in a general south-eastern direction into the Aegean Sea east of Kavalla. For most of its course it is shut in by mountains; the volume of water in it varies considerably in different parts of the year. Its greatest depth is almost 6 ft. In its lower courses the current flows at 3 to 4 miles an hour. It is not considered

to be of value as a commercial waterway, though presumably it might be used for rafting timber.

The Struma rises due south of Sofia, and after traversing the plains of Pernik, Radomir, and Kustendil, flows south, for the most part through a narrow valley, till it crosses the frontier into Greek Macedonia through the Rupel defile and finally reaches the Aegean Sea. The length of the river is about 150 miles. Though it has numerous affluents coming from the mountains on either side, it has not any steady volume of water. At times, especially in spring, it has a very rapid current, but in summer there is very little water in the river. It is stated that for long stretches it could be controlled and made serviceable as a waterway. If this were done it would become an important commercial thoroughfare for the produce of a fertile district, following as it does the natural outlet to the Aegean.

Of the rivers which flow into the Danube, the most important are the Isker, the Osma, the Yantra, and the Lom. The rivers are fed by the Balkan Mountains and flow swiftly; there are consequently considerable engineering difficulties in the way of their being made useful for navigation, particularly as the melting of the mountain snows in the spring causes extensive inundations, but they might be made of service for the generation of electricity.

Of the rivers which flow into the Black Sea, the most important are the Provadi Dere, which flows into the Black Sea at Varna, and the Kamchik, which flows into the Black Sea about 15 miles south of that town. Neither is used for navigation.

(c) *Railways*

In 1912 there were 1,210 miles of railway in Bulgaria; in 1914 the total had increased to 1,486 miles. With the exception of a few miles of railway belonging to private industrial concerns, and the section of the Salonika–Adrianople Railway from Okjilar near Xanthi to Dedeagach (the ownership of which has not been settled), the railways are owned by the State, and are controlled by the General Board of State Railways and Ports. The lines are single throughout, and of the normal European gauge, viz. 1·436 metres. The average cost of construction per mile has been much lower in Bulgaria than in other European States, except Finland and Sweden, in spite of the difficult nature of the country. As a result the lines were badly laid, and were not before the war capable of bearing any great strain.

The following lines are projected:

1. From Michailovo, on the Philippopolis–Stara Zagora line, across the main continental line to Haskovo, and thence to Porto Lagos on the Aegean Sea. The line was being surveyed in 1913, and the cost, including two tunnels, was estimated at from £1,000,000 to £1,500,000 sterling. By means of this line, supplemented by a bridge over the Danube at Sistov or Nikopol, it was hoped that Bulgaria would provide an important artery for commerce from southern Russia and Rumania to the Mediterranean.

2. From Sofia down the Valley of Roses to Kazanlik and Slivno.

3. From Aitos to Shumla. Construction was to be begun on this line in 1918.

4. From Slivno to Shumla.

5. From Kaspichan to Silistria (Dobruja) (gauge uncertain).

6. From Yambolia to Adrianople (narrow gauge).

In 1912 the Bulgarian railways possessed 212 engines, 335 passenger wagons with accommodation for 15,415 passengers, and 4,605 trucks of a capacity of 63,355 tons. The rolling stock was said to be quite inadequate to the economic needs of the country. The fuel used was chiefly coal; wood and oil are also used to a limited extent. In 1911 the railways consumed 153,000 metric tons of coal and 532 metric tons of oil.

The traffic on the railways has largely increased in recent years, as is seen by the following figures:

Year.	*Number of passengers.*	*Merchandise in metric tons.*	*Gross receipts. Leva.*[1]	*Gross expenses. Leva.*	*Net receipts. Leva.*
1905	1,349,550	1,274,555	11,170,970	7,372,105	3,798,865
1909	2,830,593	1,591,995	19,830,200	13,873,687	5,956,513
1910	3,069,917	1,670,687	22,632,959	15,392,711	7,240,248
1911	3,489,372	2,592,087	27,674,597	17,427,039	10,247,558

The principal railway repair shops are at Sofia (employing about 650 men), Gorni Orehovitsa, Burgas, Karagach (near Adrianople), and Dedeagach.

According to official figures, the proportion the net receipts bear to the capital employed averages about 2 per cent. per annum, but as the amount of capital is estimated by the addition yearly of the sums expended in construction, rolling stock, and upkeep, and no annual sums are set aside for depreciation, renewals, &c., the calculation cannot be considered trustworthy.

(*d*) *Posts, Telegraphs, and Telephones*

In 1913 there were in Bulgaria 2,342 post offices, which in that year dealt with a total of 43,006,000 letters, 23,793,000 postcards, and 28,924,000 newspapers. There were also 397 telegraph offices, with 3,201 miles of line and 11,152 miles of wire, the wires being mostly above ground. The number of telegrams

[1] The lev = 1 franc.

dispatched in that year was 3,045,558. The telephone systems numbered 42, with 1,156 miles of line and 4,838 miles of wire.

(2) External

(a) *Ports*

Danubian Ports.

The Bulgarian ports on the Danube contain only moderate accommodation for vessels and primitive means of dealing with cargoes. Before the European War the Bulgarian Government was beginning to spend money on the improvement of its Danube ports; and between 1907 and 1911 considerable sums were voted for construction work at Sistov, Ruschuk, Vidin, &c., but much still remains to be done.

Ruschuk (or Russé), 309 miles above Sulina. Population 33,600, of whom 9,000 are Turks, 1,200 Jews, and 1,000 Armenians.

In addition to the railways there are the following good roads: South-east to Varna; North-east to Turtucaia (Dobruja); South to Trnovo, with a branch going west to Plevna. There is a steamboat service with Giurgiu in Rumania, on the opposite bank.

Ruschuk is the chief Bulgarian port on the Danube. The depth of water at the port is about 25 ft., but only when water in the river is very high can vessels of between 600 and 700 tons reach Ruschuk. A wharf is being constructed. The railway station has considerable accommodation for rolling stock.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	55,149	50,487	31,763	33,086
1911	70,058	66,858	33,884	36,388

SISTOV, 345 miles above Sulina. Population 13,408, including 3,000 Turks. There is a railway to Levski and a second-class road south-east to the Plevna–Ruschuk road. There is an anchorage opposite to the town.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	31,300	23,346	13,379	17,913
1911	34,871	40,111	11,236	12,000

NIKOPOL, 372 miles above Sulina. Population about 10,000, of whom a large number are Turks. There is no railway, but there are two second-class roads to Sistov and Plevna. There is a steamer station and anchorage, and a ferry to Turnu–Magurele (Rumania).

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	5,566	10,301	7,934	9,334
1911	7,529	14,442	9,592	8,927

SAMOVID, 378 miles above Sulina. There is a railway to Yasen, but no good road. There is a steamer station and anchorage. The railway station is near the steamer station.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	36,615	15,897	29,215	35,442
1911	46,419	33,010	29,372	29,662

RAHOVO, 423 miles above Sulina. Population about 7,000. There is a second-class road to Vratsa, but no railway. The town has no harbour of importance.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	9,825	54,161	11,201	12,038
1911	11,723	55,740	14,898	15,247

LOM PALANKA, 462 miles above Sulina. Population about 11,000. It is stated in German papers that this port has greatly increased in importance since the outbreak of war, owing to the impossibility of using the railway from Sofia to Belgrade for commercial traffic. There is communication by rail with Mezdra on the line from Sofia to Plevna and by road to Sofia and the Serbian frontier. There is a steamer station and anchorage.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	27,128	44,780	21,696	24,573
1911	19,676	39,795	22,013	23,990

VIDIN, 492 miles above Sulina. Population 16,500, including 3,000 Turks and 1,500 Jews. There is a railway to Mezdra on the Sofia–Plevna line, and roads into Serbia. There is connexion by ferry with Calafat, on the Rumanian railway system, which lies 5 kilometres up stream. There is a steamer station and ferry, and winter quarters for vessels of light draught.

Trade for 1910 and 1911, according to official returns:

Year.	*Cargo discharged.*	*Cargo loaded.*	*Passengers landed.*	*Passengers embarked.*
	tons.	*tons.*		
1910	18,463	40,306	23,630	23,806
1911	18,811	70,959	25,694	26,888

Black Sea Ports.

According to Bulgarian official statistics there are six ports on the Black Sea. Of these, Bela, Missevriya, Ahillo, and Sozopol are unimportant, the ships which call there being small coasting vessels, many of which are sailing craft. They do not average as much as 200 tons. The total amount of cargo loaded and discharged at these ports represents less than 5 per cent. of the total trade done from Black Sea ports.

The only ports of value are Varna and Burgas. Down to 1908 the Bulgarian Government did all it could to attract trade to Varna at the expense of Burgas, as the railway serving Burgas belonged to the Imperial Ottoman system, whereas the railway serving Varna has always been part of the Bulgarian State Railway system. It is probable that the trade of Burgas will improve; and the future of Varna depends upon whether the Dobruja is to be Rumanian property after the war, as a large quantity of the cereals shipped from Varna came from this district.

VARNA.—At the mouth of the Provadi Dere. Population about 41,000.

The harbour is one of the safest anchorages in the Black Sea. It possesses a quay, 220 metres in length, with 4½ fathoms of water alongside, equipped with two cranes of a lifting capacity of 10 tons and 40 tons respectively, and one floating crane (privately owned) of a lifting capacity of 35 tons. The accommodation has recently been increased by a canal, 16 ft. deep and 98½ ft. wide, which connects the harbour with Lake Devna lying west of the town. Additional quays are being provided along the canal. As it is never ice-bound, the port, during the winter months, should attract trade from the Danube by rail from Ruschuk.

The following are the official returns of the shipping and trade of Varna for the years 1910 and 1911:

Year.	Entered. Number of vessels.	Entered. Tonnage.	Entered. Cargo landed. Metric tons.	Cleared. Number of vessels.	Cleared. Tonnage.	Cleared. Cargo loaded. Metric tons.
1910	2,025	1,004,197	133,703	2,019	1,006,151	137,024
1911	1,915	1,053,293	163,231	1,919	1,052,102	277,708

These vessels sailed under the following flags:

1910.	Entered. Number of vessels.	Entered. Tonnage.	Cleared. Number of vessels.	Cleared. Tonnage.
United Kingdom	76	135,273	75	134,080
Austria	131	214,299	131	214,299
Belgium	16	23,621	17	25,338
Bulgaria	753	120,352	750	122,025
France	41	62,180	41	62,180
Germany	64	100,355	64	100,355
Greece	189	107,437	189	107,090
Holland	24	41,409	24	41,409
Russia	136	149,541	137	150,261
Turkey	584	34,375	580	33,759
Other countries	11	15,355	11	15,355

1911.	Entered. Number of vessels.	Entered. Tonnage.	Cleared. Number of vessels.	Cleared. Tonnage.
United Kingdom	116	202,749	115	200,521
Austria	141	240,848	141	240,848
Belgium	8	13,118	8	13,118
Bulgaria	676	111,762	679	112,105
France	31	50,470	31	50,470
Germany	52	87,138	52	87,138
Greece	283	184,300	284	184,684
Holland	18	31,965	18	31,965
Russia	84	85,729	84	85,729
Turkey	490	22,301	491	22,611
Other countries	16	22,913	16	22,913

Burgas.—In the gulf of the same name. Population about 13,000.

The length of the quays is 1,966 ft., and there are two berths for steamers to load grain. The depth of water at the bar and alongside the quays is 25 ft., so that vessels up to 6,000 tons can take full cargoes direct from the quays. Vessels can load from 1,000 to

1,200 tons of cereals a day. Two other quays, each 2,294 ft. long, are being constructed. There is an excellent supply of fresh water to the harbour, and the railway comes down to the quays. Nevertheless, as regards accommodation for steamers and facilities for handling cargo, Burgas is insufficiently equipped according to modern standards.

The following are the official returns of the shipping and trade of Burgas for the years 1910 and 1911 :

	Entered.			*Cleared.*		
Year.	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*	*Cargo landed. Metric tons.*	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*	*Cargo loaded. Metric tons.*
1910	2,610	762,230	117,568	2,604	759,986	113,367
1911	2,161	819,277	142,706	2,149	808,778	243,519

These vessels sailed under the following flags :

	Entered.		*Cleared.*	
1910.	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*
United Kingdom .	46	82,914	44	79,653
Austria . . .	111	168,319	112	168,854
Belgium . . .	13	20,112	13	20,112
Bulgaria . . .	1,678	74,768	1,673	74,715
France . . .	42	63,804	42	63,804
Germany . . .	60	93,690	60	93,690
Greece . . .	166	94,158	164	93,676
Holland . . .	22	38,759	22	38,759
Russia . . .	88	98,781	88	98,781
Turkey . . .	369	9,700	370	9,718
Other countries . .	15	17,198	16	18,224

	Entered.		*Cleared.*	
1911.	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*	*Number of vessels.*	*Tonnage.*
United Kingdom .	72	124,229	69	117,460
Austria . . .	110	169,550	110	169,550
Belgium . . .	6	9,615	6	9,615
Bulgaria . . .	1,061	72,708	1,056	70,715
France . . .	35	56,532	35	56,532
Germany . . .	49	81,951	49	81,951
Greece . . .	267	166,604	269	167,085
Holland . . .	15	26,462	15	26,462
Russia . . .	72	67,219	72	67,219
Turkey . . .	451	13,549	446	12,362
Other countries . .	23	30,858	22	29,825

Aegean Ports.

DEDEAGACH.—To the west of the mouth of the River Maritsa. Population about 4,000. The town is connected by rail with the main line from Salonika to Adrianople.

There is at present no harbour of any consequence, the port being an open roadstead, and the water is so shallow inshore that vessels have to anchor over half a mile out, and load from and discharge into lighters. The anchorage is unsheltered from the south, and in bad weather communication with the shore is at times impossible. There is a boat-harbour, 138 yds. long and 95 yds. wide, protected, except from the south-east, by a concrete wall. There is one crane of a lifting capacity of 2 tons. On the quay-side are iron sheds for storing grain. There are eight iron piers, 90 ft. long and 10 ft. broad, which are used for loading and discharging lighters. There is also a small railway pier to the west of the town.

PORTO LAGOS (Kara Agach).—A small port at the head of the bay of the same name, on the shore of a lagoon opening into the marshy lake of Buru. It is well sheltered. The town has no railway, but it has good roads to Xanthi and Gumuljina. Only small craft can load at the quay. Before the entry of Bulgaria into the war, it was intended to develop the port as a centre for export trade to the Aegean; but before it could become commercially important a large outlay of money would be necessary. The district is stated to be unhealthy.

(*b*) *Shipping Lines*

The mercantile marine of Bulgaria is small, and in 1913 (according to statistics prepared by the Bureau Veritas) comprised only eight vessels of more

than 100 tons, viz. 5 steamers with a total net tonnage of 2,776 tons and 3 sailing vessels with a total net tonnage of 402 tons.

Bulgarian Steam Navigation Co.—This is the only steamship line now receiving subsidies from the Government. It has local services on the Danube, and also plies between Varna, Burgas, and Constantinople. The Bulgarian Government owns one-fourth of the capital stock, and under the original arrangement paid the company an annual subsidy equal to 9 per cent. of the paid-up capital stock, or about 180,000 leva. In return the company was to carry the mail free of charge, and to transport soldiers, state employees, and munitions at half the usual rates. This subsidy is now paid on a mileage basis, and varies from 2 to 5 francs a mile.[1] The amount of the subsidy paid in recent years was approximately:

Year.	*Leva.*
1907	368,000
1908	478,000
1909	383,000
1910	329,000
1911	386,000
1912	332,000

Before 1910 Government subsidies were also paid to the French Fraissinet Line and to the German Levant Line.

English Lines.—Johnston Line and Westcott & Laurance Line, the former of which plied regularly and the latter irregularly between Liverpool, London, Antwerp, &c., and Burgas, Varna, and the ports of Rumania. Before the European War both these companies had an arrangement with the Bulgarian Government which enabled them to quote through rates from the United Kingdom to any town in Bulgaria.

[1] From the *Report on Bounties and Subsidies in respect of Shipbuilding, Shipping and Navigation in Foreign Countries*, 1913.

Austrian Lines.—Austrian Lloyd Steam Navigation Co., a regular line between the Mediterranean and the Bulgarian Black Sea ports.

French Lines.—Fraissinet & Co., whose ships plied regularly between the Mediterranean and Bulgarian Black Sea ports.

Russian Lines.—The Russian Steam Navigation and Trading Co., trading between Odessa, Rumanian and Bulgarian Black Sea ports, and Constantinople.

Greek Lines.—Navigation Hellénique (John MacDowall), which had regular services between Burgas and Varna and Mediterranean ports.

(c) *Cables*

In 1914 there was only one cable between Bulgaria and foreign countries, viz. from Varna to Sevastopol.

At the same date there were no stations for wireless telegraphy in the kingdom.

(B) INDUSTRY

(1) General Position of Bulgarian Industry: Industrial Legislation

Although several kinds of handicraft have been established in the country for many years, the industries of Bulgaria, apart from agriculture, are even to-day very few and simple. In fact, it may be said that Bulgaria is only now emerging from the period of transition from domestic handicraft to the factory system; and in certain parts of the country there is still a considerable amount of primitive manufacture by the old-fashioned methods. The State, however, since the establishment of the kingdom of Bulgaria, has always been alive to the importance of encouraging modern methods, and by a succession of special laws has endeavoured to arrive

at the best ways of stimulating industry. But except in the textile industry, which had long existed as a domestic industry in many parts, progress has been slow. This is due partly to the national dislike of foreign innovations, and partly to the strong hold on the national life of the *zadruga* or home community system, under which three or four families of peasants combine in a species of primitive co-operative society, and till their lands and make the articles necessary for their own simple wants. Originally State assistance was only granted in the case of certain manufactures, such as glass, textiles, soap, sugar, paper, metal goods, &c., but in 1897 the privileges were extended to industries of a partially agricultural character. The law on the subject now in force was passed in 1909, being an extension of a comprehensive enactment of 1904. The most important provisions of the law of 1909 'For the encouragement of Native Industries and Trade' are as follows:

1. The establishment of an Industrial Council whose duty it is to advise the Minister of Industry and Commerce as to the granting of privileges.

2. The grant of certain privileges to concerns which—

(a) use mechanical power of not less than 10 h.-p.;

(b) have invested in machinery not less than 20,000 leva;

(c) employ not less than 10 workmen for at least six months of the year.

3. The following are the privileges obtainable by all industrial enterprises which comply with the conditions mentioned above and by all agricultural undertakings:

i. Free grant of water-power.

ii. Free import of machinery, if such machinery is not manufactured in the country.

iii. Free import of raw material.

iv. Free grant of land for factory sites.

v. Reduction of 35 per cent. on railway rates.

vi. Preference over foreign goods for the supply of the requirements of public offices and State, district and municipal authorities.

4. Concerns engaged in any one of eleven specified branches of industry, provided they employ not less than 50 workmen during the whole year, and provided they possess mechanical machinery of a value of not less than 150,000 leva, can obtain by the vote of the National Assembly, for a period not to extend beyond 1925, the exclusive right to carry on that industry within a particular area consisting of two or three districts. The industries to which this special privilege is accorded are :

i. The manufacture of articles of food, except flour-milling and distilling.

ii. Textile industries, except wool-weaving.

iii. Mining.

iv. Metal industries.

v. Quarrying, &c.

vi. Chemical industries.

vii. Tanning.

viii. The manufacture of wooden goods.

ix. The manufacture of paper.

x. The electrical industry, especially the production of electric power.

xi. Co-operative societies for production founded by artisans.

That these enactments have greatly stimulated industrial enterprise is shown by the figures given below. The number of concerns entitled to benefit under them has grown as follows :

1897.	*1900.*	*1904.*	*1909.*	*1911.*	*1912.*
151	175	196	266*	347*	389*

* Including 5 Government establishments in 1909 and 1911, and 8 in 1912.

In 1909 and 1912 these concerns were distributed among the various industries as follows:

	1909.	*1912.*
Production of food-stuffs, beer, and alcohol	100	158
Textile industry	61	76
Chemical industry	25	30
Leather industry	22	28
Metal industry	16	31
Wood industry	18	22
Ceramic industry	10	24
Mining and quarrying	4	4
Paper manufacture	3	6
Generation of electric power	2	2

In the food industry the principal increase occurred in the number of flour mills.

The fixed capital invested in these enterprises in 1909 (which is the latest date for which figures are available) amounted to about 80,000,000 leva, of which 14,649,000 leva was foreign capital. The bulk of the foreign capital invested in the industries of the country is Belgian.

The number of employees in manufacturing industries in Bulgaria in 1912 was slightly under 15,600.

The transition from domestic handicraft to the factory system has not been effected without creating certain familiar economic difficulties. For instance, information furnished by the Chamber of Commerce of Sofia shows that, whereas in 1876 there were in that town about 60 soap boilers, in 1906 only 4 or 5 remained, although the population had in the interval quadrupled. At Stara Zagora there are to-day only about 20 weaving sheds for coarse cloth in place of over 2,000 in early days. Similar examples could be drawn from any of the trades which have been captured by the new methods of production. The decline of handicraft and the eclipse of the individual by machinery has made the position of the work-people difficult, and the

employment of women and children and the reduction of workmen's wages have aggravated their hardships. The Bulgarian Government has, however, taken the matter in hand, and labour legislation has already been passed to meet the difficulties.

(2) Labour

(a) *Supply of Labour and Labour Conditions*

The labour market is largely regulated by the fact that the Bulgarian is first and foremost a farmer, and any work he undertakes away from his farm is undertaken subject to the condition that he is to be allowed to return when necessary for tilling the ground and sowing or harvesting his crops. Consequently, Bulgarian industrial legislation, though insisting on the employment of Bulgarians, does not make a condition that Bulgarian labour shall be employed in factories for more than six months in the year, and a considerable proportion of the labourers employed in factories consists of Greeks and Armenians and to a less extent of other foreigners.

The Bulgarian labourer is among the most industrious in Europe, and, when not occupied on his farm, he will go abroad in search of work. Bulgarians readily obtained employment for a portion of the year in Turkey, Serbia, and Rumania, and even so far afield as Austria and South Russia where they were largely employed as gardeners. Labour is obtained either by the employment of individuals, or from the head of a village, who undertakes to supply as many labourers as are required, and who is responsible for their behaviour and efficiency, and sometimes even occupies the position of contractor and makes his own arrangements with his gang. Much of the cultivated land in Bulgaria lies in high altitudes, and consequently

the crops ripen at different times, and a gang of labourers will travel from one place to another gathering the crops as they are ready for cutting. There is no scarcity of labour; for normal work the rate of pay is about two shillings a day, but harvest work is always paid by the piece. The Bulgarian works long hours, and a gang of labourers will live practically in the open on the ground where they are working, and work from early morning to late evening.

(*b*) *Emigration and Immigration*

A certain amount of emigration to the United States takes place, but no precise figures can be given. The Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Immigration groups together the immigrants coming from Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro. The figures given below are small; and it is probably reasonable to believe that a larger proportion came from Serbia and Montenegro than from Bulgaria.

The following table shows the number of emigrants from Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro to the U.S.A., and of persons returning from the U.S.A. to these countries:

Year	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915
Entered U.S.A.	4,737	4,695	4,447	1,753	9,189	1,403
Left U.S.A.	1,566	3,154	3,577	9,664	2,553	1,964

Since 1878 a considerable exodus of the Turkish population has been going on. In 20 years (1879–99) at least 150,000 Turkish peasants left Bulgaria. This emigration was still going on recently, in spite of the efforts of the Bulgarian Government to arrest its progress. Since 1879 a considerable influx of Bulgarians from Macedonia, the vilayet of Adrianople, Bessarabia, and the Dobruja has taken place. A certain number of Greeks have come into the country in recent years for

trading purposes. Probably about one-third of the Rumanian inhabitants of Bulgaria were born in Rumania.

(3) Agriculture

The Bulgarians are essentially a peasant people, and nearly the whole population is occupied in some form of agriculture. Though there are in Bulgaria more than 40 towns with a population of over 5,000 inhabitants, 80 per cent. of the population of the country is rural, and practically all its exports are derived from agricultural pursuits.

The total area of Bulgaria before the Balkan Wars was 9,634,000 hectares; of this 4,077,000 hectares, or roughly 42 per cent., was under cultivation in 1912. The cultivation of cereals, of which the most important are wheat, maize, barley, rye, and oats, accounted for over 2,500,000 hectares, and pasture land and forage crops for 558,000 hectares. The area under vines was 61,500 hectares, and that under plants of industrial value, fruit trees, &c., amounted to 186,000 hectares. The chief of such plants are linseed, colza, sesame, tobacco, and hemp. Plums, raisins, and melons are largely cultivated, the last-mentioned being an important item in the diet of the Bulgarian peasant.

Particulars as to the area under cultivation for different crops are given in Tables I and II in the Appendix.

(*a*) *Products of commercial value, vegetable and animal*

Cereals.—Of these by far the most important is wheat; and the area under this has increased somewhat in recent years. Next in importance is maize, after which come barley, oats, and rye.

The most important agricultural region is the land between the Balkan Range and the River Danube, which produces considerably more than half of the

wheat and maize grown in the country. Wheat is the chief product of this region, except in the west, where maize predominates, as climatic conditions are more favourable for its growth; barley and oats are of considerably less importance. Wheat and maize are also extensively grown on the lower slopes of both sides of the Balkan Mountains, in the valley of the upper Tunja, and on the plains and lowlands of Eastern Rumelia. Barley, rye, and oats are cultivated chiefly in the departments of Sofia and Kustendil, though these crops are grown in all agricultural districts.[1]

Flour-milling is a most important industry. In addition to hundreds of small mills for local needs, there are 110 corn-mills entitled to the benefits of the industrial law (see p. 82). These are mostly situated at the large distributing centres. In 1911 the output of the mills was valued at 44,654,000 leva. About 40 per cent. of the output was sold abroad.

Cheese.—Bulgaria produces a cheese called *kachkaval*, of which Turkey purchases almost the whole export. From 1907 to 1911, the average annual value of the cheese exported was 3,157,000 leva. The cheese is nearly all produced in the eastern districts, especially at Varna, Ahillo, Burgas, Aitos, and Kotel.

Cotton.—This is grown in the departments of Burgas, Philippopolis, and Stara Zagora, the last-named being by far the most important. The total area under this crop has during recent years never reached 1,000 hectares, and the production of cotton has not yet reached 250,000 kilos annually.

Live-stock.—The rearing of live-stock, particularly sheep, constitutes an important branch of rural industry, but the area of ground under pasture tends to diminish. To meet the demands for forage, however, the cultivation of vetches and lucerne has increased

[1] See Appendix, Table II.

in recent years. Bulgaria does a large trade in the export of live animals, but has at present only an insignificant trade in meat. To improve the breed of animals there are several large Government stations for stallions, and other stations for cattle breeding. The census of live animals taken in 1900 and 1910 gave the following results:

	1900.	1910.
Horses	494,557	478,222
Mules	8,887	12,238
Donkeys	108,098	118,488
Cattle	1,596,267	1,606,363
Buffaloes	431,487	412,978
Sheep	7,015,385	8,669,260
Goats	1,405,190	1,464,719
Pigs	367,501	527,311
Poultry	4,751,751	8,688,853

Poultry farming is an important industry, and Bulgaria does a large trade in the export of eggs. The centre of this trade is Sofia: from 1902 to 1911 it averaged over 9,000,000 leva in value, and is on the increase. Most of the eggs went *via* Germany to Belgium, and ultimately reached London; Austria-Hungary was the next best customer.

Rice.—Rice has been cultivated in Bulgaria for many years. It is produced to a small extent in the department of Kustendil, but is mostly grown in the department of Philippopolis, where some irrigation is possible. The following figures show the area under cultivation for this crop and the production for the years 1905–11:

	1905.	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
Hectares	2,955	2,376	2,358	2,386	3,903	3,274	2,319
Quintals	49,433	37,216	35,193	28,740	51,827	46,448	30,239

There are rice-mills at Philippopolis and Tatar-Pazarjik.

Rose-growing.—The cultivation of roses is a national industry of considerable importance. The roses are

used exclusively for the distillation of attar or essence of roses, which is an important ingredient in the scents used all over the world, and the product finds a ready market in the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Russia, and Turkey.

Three distinct products are obtained: rose water, rose oil, and rose wax. The oil is the most important of the three, and it requires approximately 40 kilogrammes of petals to produce 4 to 5 grammes of oil.

The industry is confined to the valley lying between the main Balkan Range and the Sredna Gora and Srnena Gora Mountains, the chief centres of industry being Kazanlik, Karlovo, Klisura, and Stara Zagora. The area under cultivation for roses has steadily increased, and in 1912 amounted to 7,900 hectares. The roses cultivated are a red rose (*Rosa damascena*) and a white rose (*Rosa alba*); the red rose is the more satisfactory. Female labour is chiefly employed. The export of essence of roses, which in 1894 was valued at 387,000 leva, has in recent years reached the following figures:

	1906.	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
Leva .	4,521,000	4,642,000	4,231,000	5,328,000	5,492,000	7,404,000

The price of the essence has also greatly increased, and in 1911 amounted to over 1,800 leva per kilo. In consequence of this the practice of adulterating the essence with oil of geranium has become common, and the authorities, being unable to prevent the smuggling of oil of geranium, contemplate withdrawing the prohibition against the import of this commodity, so that the mixture may become a recognized article of commerce and buyers may take precautions accordingly.

A large distillery on modern lines, erected some years ago at Karlovo with French capital, does not appear to have been successful; but it is stated that recently

Germany has introduced new methods with good results.

Sericulture.—The efforts of the Government have brought about a considerable expansion of this industry. Large numbers of women and children receive Government instruction in the breeding of silk-worms and the handling of cocoons. The Government further supervises the distribution of healthy eggs, which are now for the most part bred in the country instead of being imported, and has attempted to supply the scarcity of food for the worms—the chief hindrance to breeding—by founding schools of instruction in mulberry-growing. The chief centres of the industry are the departments of Burgas, Philippopolis, and Stara Zagora in Old Bulgaria, and the neighbourhood of Sufli (on the lower Maritsa) in the new territory.

The total area of the mulberry plantations in 1912 was 2,866 hectares; the total value of the crop for 1911 was 608,410 leva. The yield of mulberry leaves, a most important factor in the breeding industry, increased from about 20,000 quintals in 1905 to about 90,000 in 1911.

It is stated by competent authorities that Bulgarian cocoons are the best in the world, owing to the freshness and strength of leaf which the mulberry tree maintains in Eastern Rumelia throughout the summer. The silk made from these cocoons has the advantage of retaining its tenacity and twist of thread when exposed to vapour heat. The quantity of cocoons fluctuated only slightly between the years 1905 and 1914, the average yearly weight being 1,548,000 kilos. Formerly the cocoons were all exported (chiefly to Italy), but in recent years a little silk has been reeled in the country, and in 1910 the value of the raw silk exported reached almost 100,000 leva. That of the cocoons exported in the same year amounted to upwards of 3,600,000 leva.

Sugar Beet.—The cultivation of beetroot for sugar has only been introduced in recent years, and for some time was confined to the department of Sofia. It is now being grown in many places, the largest centres of production being the provinces of Kustendil, Sofia, Vratsa, Plevna, and Trnovo. The area under cultivation increased from 1,600 hectares in 1905 to about 3,300 hectares in 1912, and the production from 22,100 metric tons to 65,200. The amount of sugar (in kilos) manufactured from beetroot during the period 1905–11 is shown by the following figures:

1905.	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
3,268,429	2,657,712	6,241,819	3,630,318	3,198,901	3,950,113	5,440,439

The production of sugar in Bulgaria is as yet far below the country's requirements; the average annual import during the same period was over 10,000 metric tons.

Tobacco.—Before the last Balkan War tobacco was produced in almost every part of Bulgaria, the chief centres being Philippopolis, Kustendil, and Stara Zagora. It was of a coarse and cheap quality and of little value for export; the crops varied greatly from year to year and from one district to another. This tobacco fetched a poor price (about 2½ leva a kilo), and was often mixed with Turkish and Virginian tobacco to form a cheap blend.

The newly acquired territories have greatly increased the value of the tobacco industry. It is true that the former Bulgarian Dobruja, which was ceded to Rumania, contributed 15 per cent. of the exports of tobacco grown in the country; but the tobacco-growing districts round Xanthi and Gumuljina, in the new Bulgarian territories, are capable of producing some of the finest tobacco in the world. Under Turkish rule roughly 8,000 hectares were planted with tobacco, yielding on an average 66,000 quintals a year, which

is only 25 per cent. of the potential output, but in the hands of the industrious Bulgarians the production is likely to be very largely increased. The Ottoman Régie concession, which affected the tobacco industry in the new territory, expired in March 1914 and was not renewed. Tobacco of an inferior quality is also cultivated in the neighbourhood of Nevrokop, Jumaya, Strumitsa, and Petrich, and with efficient management the quality might be greatly improved.

The Xanthi brand, 'Fleur de Xanthi', is considered to be the finest in Europe: it has steadily increased in quality and value, and in 1911 sold for 7 francs a kilo, as compared with 4 francs a kilo for other brands of tobacco in European Turkey. Properly developed, therefore, the cultivation of tobacco should become one of the most profitable branches of Bulgarian agriculture. The largest concern engaged in the tobacco industry of Old Bulgaria is the Société Anonyme Fabriques de Tabac Réunies, of Philippopolis, whose capital of 5,000,000 leva is largely held by the French Banque de l'Union Parisienne. It is stated that over £500,000 of British money is invested in the cultivation of tobacco in the new territories.

The following table shows the area under cultivation and the yield of the crops for the years 1905–14:

	1905.	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*
Area (Hectares) .	5,592	7,018	5,787	4,880	5,448
Yield (Quintals) .	39,180	64,277	40,894	34,504	35,468

Averages: 5,745; 42,860.

	1910.	*1911.*	*1912.*	*1913.*	*1914.*
Area (Hectares) .	7,789	12,123	8,891	*7,000	*15,000
Yield (Quintals) .	63,248	106,473	58,125	*60,000	*150,000

Averages: 10,160; 87,570.

* Approximate figures only.

The Government encourages the cultivation of tobacco by distributing seed of good quality free of cost

to the growers, by a bounty on exports, and by giving financial facilities to growers through the medium of the National Bank.

(*b*) *Methods of Cultivation*

The soil is extremely fertile, as will be seen from Table II in the Appendix, which shows the areas under different crops, the total yield, and the yield per hectare and per acre. Up to the present the Bulgarian farmer has found little need for artificial manures, and practically the only manures used are such as can be obtained from the homesteads. Little is known about the rotation of crops, and the usual system is to give the land a considerable rest after it has been tilled for several years.

Until recent years the scarcity of modern implements and machinery was one of the chief hindrances to agricultural development. The Bulgarian peasant is naturally conservative; and, though associations for agriculture on the basis of the *zadruga* (see p. 82) have long been customary, even to-day the primitive wooden plough is largely in use. The introduction of modern methods of farming has also been hindered by the small size of the farms (see p. 96), in consequence of which the peasants were often unable to find money for the purchase of modern implements. The State, however, has come to their aid with excellent results. Since 1897 agricultural machinery has been admitted to the country free of duty; and, by means of the Bulgarian Agricultural Bank, farmers are able to obtain credits repayable over a period of years for the purpose of purchasing modern machinery. In consequence the import of agricultural machinery and implements has in recent years enormously increased, its value rising from 1,663,000 leva in 1905 to 6,888,000 leva in 1912. The

State has also done much to assist agriculture by the institution of model farms and agricultural schools.

Oxen and buffaloes are the principal draught animals used in agriculture, Bulgarian horses being unsuitable for agricultural work. In the eastern districts camels are occasionally used.

Except to a small extent in the district of Philippopolis, where rice is grown (see p. 89), irrigation is practically unknown in Bulgaria; and there is no indication that any extensive system of irrigation is necessary in order to render any part of the kingdom fertile.

(c) *Forestry*

The country used to be largely covered by forests, but during the Turkish rule vast areas of forest were destroyed, partly by improvident felling of the timber, and partly in order to clear the ground for agricultural purposes. In 1878 the Bulgarian Government took over the control of the forests, and appointed special keepers. Since then official control of the forests has by degrees become effectual, the process being assisted by a complete survey of the forests which was carried out in 1904, when nurseries were also started for the growth of young trees, and a course of instruction in forestry provided.

To-day the superintendence of forests is in the hands of the Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture. The country is divided into four districts, and district inspectors with efficient staffs have been appointed. In 1907 a bureau was formed to superintend the canalization of mountain streams with a view to increasing the means of bringing timber down to the plains.

The total area of the forests of Bulgaria in 1908 was 2,834,000 hectares, of which about 900,000 hectares were owned by the State, and about 1,400,000 hectares

by communes or by schools, churches, and other religious establishments. The State forests are in mountainous regions of the Stara Planina, the Rhodope Range, and the Rila Planina. The forests owned by schools, churches, and religious establishments are mostly in the south and west of the kingdom. Those belonging to individuals, which are small and scattered, are mostly in the plains. The chief deciduous trees are the oak, elm, beech, plane, ash, lime, willow, and poplar. The coniferous trees are the pine and fir. A large portion of the forests consists of beech, which will flourish in high altitudes. The ash and lime forests are chiefly along the Kamchik river. Bulgarian wood is stated to be of an excellent quality.

The production from the forests in the years 1902 and 1911 was as follows:

		1902.	*1911.*
Wood for building, &c.,	cubic metres	382,276	526,226
Firewood	,,	1,406,700	2,531,300
Charcoal	metric tons	6,108	6,370

Down to 1902 the export of timber was on the increase and the import on the decrease. The position has now been reversed, and the import of timber shows in recent years a steady increase. The bulk of the wood cut is used for building or fuel, and there are only a few factories engaged in the manufacture of wooden goods. In addition to more than 600 small saw-mills in the forests, which utilize water-power from the streams and are only run at seasons when this can be obtained, there are important timber-yards at Belovo, Burgas, and Varna.

(*d*) *Land Tenure*

Peasant proprietorship is universal; and, as the system of land tenure in Bulgaria is based upon the Code Napoléon, the holdings of land tend to become smaller and smaller. The number of holdings in 1897

was 799,588, while according to the statistics for the year 1908 (which are the most recent available) the number of holdings had increased in the latter year to 933,367, out of which only 10,109 holdings exceeded 30 hectares (74 acres) in extent, and of these only 91 exceeded 500 hectares (1,235 acres) in extent. Most of the large estates are owned by monasteries.

(4) Minerals

In Bulgaria all minerals belong to the State, and the right to work them is obtained by concession subject to the payment of a royalty.

Geologists state that the mineral wealth of Bulgaria is considerable, and there is evidence to show that in olden times much mining of a primitive character was done. At present, with the exception of some of the deposits of coal and copper, the minerals are not being exploited commercially. This is due partly to difficulties with regard to fuel, for though Bulgaria possesses large deposits of coal, its calorific value is so low that without the addition of other fuel it is of little use for treating minerals, and partly to the absence of sufficient railways to render the working of the deposits profitable, but chiefly to the lack of capital in the country and to the national aversion to the intrusion of foreigners.

The following are the chief mineral deposits at present known:

Coal.—Deposits of lignite and brown coal exist in many places in Bulgaria on both sides of the Balkan Mountains, particularly on the western side of the country, but owing to lack of railway communication, many of the deposits cannot yet be worked to any extent.

The following are the official returns of the output

of coal from Bulgaria for various years from 1901 to 1911:

Year.	State mines. Metric tons.	Private mines. Metric tons.	Total. Metric tons.
1901 .	138,776	5,495	144,271
1905 .	171,182	1,817	172,999
1909 .	208,587	12,967	221,554
1910 .	225,113	14,573	239,686
1911 .	251,605	17,000	268,605

During the period 1901–11 the annual import of coal and coke has averaged 74,315 metric tons. The import is on the increase.

The following deposits are being worked commercially:

Pernik, south-west of Sofia, on the railway from Sofia to Kustendil. The deposit is stated to be very large and to contain not less than 4,000,000 tons of coal. The analysis of the coal gives:

Humidity	14·91 *per cent.*
Ash	7·08 *per cent.*
Volatile matter . . .	37·63 *per cent.*
Calories	5,965

Before the war the mines were worked by the State, but it is reported that they are now being worked by a German company.

Bobovdol, near Dupnitsa. This coal is stated to be found in six seams of a thickness varying from 1·5 to 4 metres, all of which have been proved. The mining of the coal has only been undertaken on a large scale since the completion of the railway to Kustendil.

The coal has been analysed with the following result:

Humidity	9·98 *per cent.*
Ash	5·27 *per cent.*
Volatile matter . . .	40·54 *per cent.*
Fixed carbon . . .	44·21 *per cent.*
Calories	5,400

These mines are said to have been acquired by the same company that works the Pernik mines. This company is chiefly financed by German and Austrian banks. Its capital is reported to be 7,500,000 leva.

Other deposits of coal are said to exist in the following localities, but the calorific values, as a rule, are low:

At Drenovo, on the Trans-Balkan Railway, south of Trnovo.

Near Trevna, a little farther south of Trnovo. Some work has been done here.

At Gabrovo, on the north slopes of the Balkan Mountains. The analysis of the coal shows a high percentage of volatile matter and fixed carbon, and a calorific value of 6,095.

At Kazanlik, on the southern side of the Balkans.

Near Slivno.

At Belogradchik, 25 miles south of Vidin.

Near Vratsa.

In the vicinity of Sofia at Moshino, Buchino, and Vladaya. The calorific value of the coal found here is stated to be about 5,000.

At Gorno Uino, near Kustendil.

At Samokov, 27 miles south-east of Sofia.

Copper.—There are said to be numerous deposits of ore containing high copper values. Though the industry was developing, the production of copper ore had not attained any importance before 1914, the only deposit from which ore was being recovered being that of the Plakalnitsa mine at Zgorigrad near Vratsa. The depth of the mine is 220 ft. It is said to contain lead and some silver as well as copper. The average daily output of ore in 1910–11 was about 60 metric tons, containing on an average 5 to 7 per cent. of copper. The ore is treated at a smelter at Elisena, near the railway. According to reliable information the mine is

now in German hands, and is producing a considerable quantity of the metal. The Germans are stated to be working another deposit near Burgas on the Black Sea, the production of which is also said to be large.

The following deposits of copper are also known :

In the neighbourhood of Belogradchik.

South of Vratsa (copper and zinc).

In the neighbourhood of Sofia.

Near Slivno.

The quantity of copper ore produced in Bulgaria, which was only 160 tons for 1904, amounted to over 19,000 tons for 1909.

Gold.—It is stated that gold has been found near Dupnitsa, Kustendil, and Kazanlik. It is also found in many places in the sand of the rivers. There is no systematic industry. It is stated that there is a gold mine at Glatshonitsa (Salesh district) in New Bulgaria.

Granite is found near Dupnitsa and Kustendil.

Gypsum.—There are said to be deposits near Stara Zagora and Nova Zagora.

Hematite.—A large body of ore has been located at Breznik, 22 miles west of Sofia. The deposit is stated to be from 30 to 40 metres in thickness, and to contain more than a million tons of ore. According to analysis, the ore contains more than 45 per cent. of iron.

Iron.—Deposits of iron are stated to exist in various places, but none are known to have been worked in recent times. The chief deposits are at Kustendil, near Berkovitsa (west of Vratsa on the north slopes of the Stara Planina), and at Kavakli, 30 miles north-west of Adrianople. It is asserted that evidence of the existence of iron deposits has been found near Sofia.

Lead.—Deposits have been found at Berkovitsa and Etropolye (in the Balkan Mountains), and near Panagyuriste (north of Tatar-Pazarjik). A body of ore containing lead, zinc, and silver exists near Kustendil.

According to official statistics, a certain amount of lead-mining has been done, the output of lead ore for the years 1909–11 ranging from 3,400 metric tons in 1909 to 7,500 metric tons in 1911.

Magnetite.—This has been worked by the peasants at Samokov on a small scale, but no information is available as to the size or quality of the ore body.

Manganese.—Deposits of this mineral are stated to exist in two localities near Varna on the Black Sea, and from official returns it appears that some prospecting has been done, but no industry is yet established.

Marble.—White and blue marble is found at Berkovitsa. Marble is also to be found in the hills round Gabrovo, near Kazanlik and Nova Zagora, and at Tatar-Pazarjik.

Oil Shale.—A large deposit of oil shale lies about 25 miles south-west of Sofia at a distance of 15 miles north-west of Batanovtsi on the Sofia–Kustendil railway. The deposit has been proved to a certain extent, and is said to contain at least 30,000,000 tons of oil-bearing shales. It has been tested and reported upon by Mr. James Lomax, M.I.M.E., according to whom it compares favourably with all known deposits of shale in the world. A concession to work the deposits was granted to Messrs. Charles Turner and A. H. Jackson by the Bulgarian Government before the outbreak of war, but beyond proving the property, nothing has yet been done towards developing it. Other deposits in the neighbourhood have not yet been proved.

Pyrites.—It is stated that there are deposits of pyrites near Zlatitsa, south of Etropolye.

Salt.—At Ahillo on the Black Sea, salt deposits have been worked from remote times. The production varies, the highest return during the period 1902–11 being about 28,000 metric tons for 1909. The average annual production from 1902 to 1911 was about

12,000 metric tons. The import of salt during the same period averaged 34,000 metric tons. There are also deposits at Sozopol. The deposits are worked by private individuals.

Zinc.—It is reported that there is a large body of zinc and lead ore at Lakatnik, south-west of Vratsa.

Mineral Springs.—There are numerous mineral springs in the country, and many of them are used for medicinal purposes. The most important are the following:

Near Burgas (Bains de Aitos). These were famous in Roman times. The water has a temperature of 105° F. (41° C).

At Slivno.

At Hisar, south-west of Karlovo.

At Krasnovo, north-west of Philippopolis.

At Dolna Banya, Bielchin, and Kostenets, near Samokov.

At Sofia.

At Vrsets, west of Vratsa.

(5) Manufactures

(a) *Metallurgy*

Although official statistics show thirty-one establishments engaged in the metal industry in 1912, the fixed capital invested in these is less than 4,000,000 leva, and the value of the annual production in normal times is only about 3,000,000 leva.

There are ironworks at Varna, Gabrovo, and Vratsa, but none is important. Almost their whole output is consumed in the country, which moreover imported metals and metal goods to an average value of 19,000,000 leva a year between 1907 and 1911. Until Bulgaria's fuel supply is placed on a satisfactory basis, no large development of the metal industry can be expected.

(*b*) *Textiles*

In 1912 there were in Bulgaria 76 factories engaged in the textile industry. The total fixed capital employed at that date was 17,400,000 leva, of which 1,280,000 leva was known to be foreign (mainly British) capital. The annual output is steadily increasing. The most important branches of the industry are the manufacture of woollen and cotton yarns and cloths, linen and hempen goods. The total output of textiles for the year 1911 was valued at 21,415,000 leva.

Woollen Goods.—Of the 38 factories engaged in the manufacture of woollen goods, the most important are at Slivno, Kazanlik, Karlovo, and Gabrovo. The chief products are native cloths called *abas* and *shayak*; the former is of a coarser kind than the latter, and is similar in texture to Scottish homespuns. This cloth normally supplies the clothing of the peasants, though in recent years there has been a tendency to abandon the picturesque national dress in favour of cheaper and inferior ready-made clothes imported chiefly from Austria. In addition there is a considerable export, mostly to Serbia and Turkey, but also to Greece and Rumania. Stockings and woollen gloves are also manufactured to a considerable extent.

At Kotel and Panagyuriste there is a considerable manufacture of carpets similar in design and style to the well-known Turkish carpets. These are mostly sold to Turkey. Bulgarian shawls are also famous, and manufactured in large numbers.

Cotton Goods.—In 1912 five factories were engaged in the spinning and weaving of cotton. The most important is the Prince Boris mill at Varna, the property of the National Cotton Spinning Company of Bulgaria, Ltd. This is an English concern, and was founded at the

end of the last century. Its business has been steadily on the increase since 1901, the yarn used being principally American, though latterly Smyrna has also supplied a certain proportion. In 1910 the output reached about 2,500,000 lb. of cotton yarn, and as the mill gets the benefit of the law for the encouragement of native industry, it can compete on favourable terms with foreign imports. Another company holds a concession for the exclusive manufacture of cotton yarns and tissues in the departments of Burgas, Stara Zagora, and Philippopolis, and has recently constructed a mill at Yamboli, but owing to the disturbances caused by the Balkan and European Wars, it is not yet securely established. There is also an important factory at Gabrovo. The *Narodni Prava* (May 4, 1917) states that concessions have recently been granted for the erection of two cotton-mills at Sofia and Gabrovo.

There were in 1912 twelve small factories for the manufacture of hosiery.

Silk.—As previously stated, the manufacture of silk is still in its infancy, and has not yet got beyond the simple reeling of silk from cocoons. There were two factories engaged in this industry in 1912.

Cordage.—In 1912 four factories were engaged in making cordage and twine of different kinds, and the cultivation of hemp is on the increase. The most important factory is near Sofia. The total value of hemp manufactures in 1911 was about 500,000 leva, the whole of which was sold in the country.

Miscellaneous.—There were in 1912 five dye-works, two factories for the production of tapestry, and two for the printing of textiles.

(c) *Chemicals*

The most important branch of this industry is the manufacture of soap. In 1912 there were in Bulgaria thirteen soap factories receiving assistance under the industrial law. The chief centres of the industry are Burgas, Varna, Ruschuk, Philippopolis, and Sofia.

In other branches of the chemical industry there were five factories for the manufacture of explosives, three for the manufacture of glue, ink, &c., and one for the manufacture of matches, this being a State monopoly.

(d) *Miscellaneous*

Wine, Spirits, and Beer.—Bulgaria produces a considerable quantity of wine, chiefly in the neighbourhood of Peshtera, Tatar-Pazarjik, Stanimaka, Chirpan, Stara Zagora, and Slivno. Between 60,000 and 70,000 hectares were under vines in 1911, but the area devoted to this crop has shown a steady decrease for some years. The industry has suffered from the diseases known as phylloxera and peronospora. To combat these the State has tried to introduce the American vine, but with only moderate success, owing to the inherent Bulgarian suspicion of foreign innovations. It is stated that, if scientific methods were followed, Bulgarian wine would compete successfully with any in Europe.

In 1912 there were seven distilleries in Bulgaria. According to official figures, the annual production of spirits averaged 3,000,000 litres for the period 1902–11. These figures do not take into account a certain amount of brandy which is produced from wine-lees; on this the State at present charges no duties. The home production of spirits is almost sufficient for the requirements of the country, but there is no export trade.

There were sixteen breweries in the country in 1912, four of them in the department of Sofia. The quantity of beer produced annually increased from 5,000,000 litres in 1902 to 22,000,000 in 1911. This supplies almost the whole demand in the country. There is a small export trade in beer, which in the last few years has slightly exceeded the import of foreign beer. The hops imported come almost entirely from Austria.

Leather.—Of the twenty-eight establishments engaged in the leather industry twenty-six are tanneries, only two being engaged in manufacturing leather goods. The most important tanneries are situated at Slivno, Gabrovo, Kazanlik, Karlovo, Philippopolis, and Sofia.

Bulgaria does a considerable trade in hides and skins, the exports (mainly sheep, lamb, goat, and kid skins) for the period 1907–11 averaging a value of 3,516,000 leva, but during the same period the import of hides and skins (the bulk of which came from France) averaged 2,790,000 leva, and in addition sole leather and 'uppers' for boots were imported of an average value of 3,620,000 leva. It is evident, therefore, that there is a large opening for the development of the leather industry in the country.

Manufacture of Wooden Goods.—The total number of factories in 1912 was eighteen, thirteen of which were engaged in the production of house-fittings and furniture of various kinds. The most important are those at Krichim and Dolna Banya (which make window-frames and doors), and the furniture works at Sofia and Panagyuriste. There are also works at Gabrovo which turn out wooden bowls, mortars, &c. The total output of the industry in 1911 was valued at 565,000 leva only, and none was exported.

Cement and Pottery.—In 1912 there were three factories engaged in the manufacture of cement and concrete, one for glass, and twenty for the produc-

tion of bricks and earthenware goods. The capital invested is between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 leva. The chief centres of these industries are Varna, Ruschuk, Plevna, Kazanlik, Panagyuriste, and Sofia. The Isida factory at Novo Selo, the most important in the country, supplies a large proportion of the earthenware used in the country.

(6) Power

Electricity.—Of the two establishments for the production of electricity, only the one at Sofia is of any importance. Its capital is 6,000,000 leva, all of which is Belgian money.

Employment of Water-power.—Water-power is largely used in Bulgaria for driving saw and corn mills, but there is no evidence that it is otherwise exploited to any extent, and hydro-electric installations are few. According to the official return for 1911, there were seven branches of industry in which hydro-electric installations were used, but the total effective horse-power of the motors driven was under 900.

(C) COMMERCE

(1) Domestic

(*a*) *Principal Branches of Trade*

The wants of the Bulgarian being simple, there are not many commodities in which a large home trade is done. The shops in the towns deal mainly in groceries, hardware, clothing, dry goods, and other necessaries.

(*b*) *Towns, Markets, Fairs*

Before railways were developed in the country, fairs were numerous, and every place of any pretensions had its annual fair, many of them specializing in some

particular article of commerce. Many of these fairs, however, have been given up.

The principal towns of the country are:

Town.	*Population.*	*Principal articles of commerce.*	*Communications.*
Burgas . .	15,000	Export of grain and flour; import of iron, cotton, machinery, hardware, textiles	Black Sea Railway
Dedeagach .	5,500	Export of cereals, cocoons, hides, wines, timber; import of textiles, rice, drugs, ironmongery, &c.	Aegean Sea Railway
Gabrovo . .	12,000	Cloth, leather, wooden goods	Railway
Gumuljina .	18,500	Cereals, tobacco, hides, soap	Railway
Kazanlik .	12,500	Essence of roses, tobacco, trimming	Road
Kustendil .	14,000	Cereals, flour, tobacco	Railway
Philippopolis .	48,000	Cloth and braid, silk, essence of roses, tobacco	Railway
Plevna . .	25,000	Cereals, leather	Railway
Rahovo . .	8,000	Timber, cereals, export and import	River Danube
Ruschuk .	40,000	Export and import; flour, soap, tobacco, hats	River Danube Railway
Shumla . .	22,000	Silk, tobacco, cereals, carpets	Railway
Slivno . .	25,000	Woollen goods, cloth, carpets, wine	Railway
Sofia . .	120,000	Brewing, cement, and pottery, furniture, leather, sugar	Railway
Sufli . .	12,000	Cereals	Railway
Varna . .	41,000	Import and export trade; cotton-spinning, soap, milling	Black Sea Port Railway

Town.	*Population.*	*Principal articles of commerce.*	*Communications.*
Vidin . .	17,000	Cereals	River Danube Railway
Vratsa . .	16,000	Silk, wine	Railway
Xanthi . .	16,000	Tobacco	Railway

(c) *Organizations to Promote Trade and Commerce*

For so young a kingdom, Bulgaria has shown a keen appreciation of the necessity for the organization of its industries and has realized to an unusual degree the importance of commercial education and of the supply of information to traders and merchants. Information is given below (p. 124) as to the grant of financial assistance to farmers and traders and schemes for encouraging thrift. Apart from such measures, however, the State is trying to encourage trade and commerce in the following ways:

i. By rendering primary education compulsory for all children of both sexes.

ii. By the organization of evening and holiday classes for children who have passed through the primary schools. The subjects taught comprise all branches of agriculture, and (for girls) dressmaking and domestic economy.

iii. By founding technical schools in which pupils are taught designing and artistic work for various branches of industry and the modelling and decorative arts.

iv. By means of Chambers of Commerce, of which there are five—at Sofia, Philippopolis, Ruschuk, Varna, and Xanthi. In connexion with these Chambers of Commerce there are information bureaux, which supply information on all commercial matters. It may be mentioned here that in 1911 a commission was appointed by the Chambers of Commerce to visit the

markets of the eastern Mediterranean, to study their needs and resources, and to report upon the means by which the products of Bulgarian industries might best be introduced into these places. The report was issued early in 1912, and proved of considerable interest, not merely to Bulgarian merchants but to all others trading in that part of the Mediterranean.

The success of the recent efforts of the Bulgarian Government to promote trade is largely due to the education which many Bulgarians have received at Robert College, founded by Americans at Constantinople, where there have always been a number of Bulgarian students. It is asserted that nearly all the Bulgarians holding high positions in their own country received their education at this college.

(*d*) *Foreign Firms and Companies*

The amount of foreign capital invested in companies established in Bulgaria for industrial purposes is negligible. In 1911 only ten industrial concerns, with a total combined capital of 13,779,000 leva, were founded exclusively with foreign money, and there were only four concerns, with a total combined capital of 869,000 leva, in which Bulgarian and foreign capital was combined. Of the foreign capital engaged at that date, 10,500,000 leva was Belgian, 1,900,000 leva was Russian, 1,000,000 leva was English, and the remainder German, French, and Turkish.

(*e*) *Methods of Economic Penetration*

In spite of the fact that both Austria and Germany have, in recent years, captured a very large portion of the import trade into Bulgaria, the economic penetration by the Central Empires has not been so extensive as, for instance, in Rumania. One reason is that the

Bulgarians, naturally jealous of foreign interference, have until quite recently done little to encourage the introduction of foreign capital. On their side, foreign merchants have been reluctant to commit themselves to large operations in an undeveloped and somewhat unsettled country, with poor railway communications.

Austria, however, has long been an important trader in Bulgarian markets, owing to the advantages she possesses in her geographical situation, and the almost complete monopoly which she held until recently in the up-river trade of the Danube. It appears, moreover, that since 1906 Austria and Germany have made organized attempts to capture Bulgarian trade. The familiar methods have been adopted, viz. :

The foundation of banks. Of the four large trading banks in Bulgaria, one was founded with German money, one with Austrian money, and a third with French, Belgian, and Austrian money.

The grant of financial assistance to the Bulgarian State Bank.

The institution of a regular service of steamers to Bulgarian Black Sea ports.

The employment of well-trained commercial travellers, who visit all parts of the country, study the requirements of their customers, and thus have a great advantage over competitors who rely on circulars alone to bring them orders.

The establishment in the large trade centres of commercial museums, where information on all matters relating to trade may be obtained.

(2) Foreign

The foreign trade of Bulgaria increased enormously during the years 1902–11, as is evident from the following figures :

	Imports.		Exports.		
Year.	*Weight in metric tons.*	*Value in thousand leva.*	*Weight in metric tons.*	*Value in thousand leva.*	*Excess Exports (+) Excess Imports (−) in thousand leva.*
1902	184,642	71,246	692,979	103,685	+32,439
1903	218,022	81,802	718,665	108,074	+26,272
1904	287,696	129,689	1,089,521	157,619	+27,930
1905	304,955	122,250	857,532	147,961	+25,711
1906	289,506	108,475	674,495	114,573	+ 6,098
1907	357,898	124,661	725,871	125,595	+ 934
1908	447,270	130,151	544,624	112,357	−17,794
1909	473,943	160,429	469,497	111,434	−48,995
1910	502,571	177,357	632,492	129,052	−48,305
1911	564,199	199,345	1,036,059	184,634	−14,711

As has been already stated, 80 per cent. of the active population of Bulgaria is engaged in some form of agriculture; consequently a bad harvest is reflected in the trade returns of the following years. For instance, while the harvests of the years 1901–4 were good, those of the years 1905–7 were either moderate or bad, the result being a large decrease in the export trade for the years 1906–8.

An unsatisfactory feature of Bulgarian trade in recent years has been the change in the balance of trade from an excess of exports to an excess of imports. This change is partly the effect of the industrial legislation, to which reference has been made, by which facilities were given to persons willing to erect new factories to import the necessary raw materials and plant free of duty. Other causes which have contributed are the operation of the Customs tariff of 1906, which substituted specific for *ad valorem* duties, and the improved system of valuation of imports. It is believed that imports were considerably undervalued in the period from 1894 to 1904. The main reason for the change was, however, the special expenditure of a large part of the sums obtained by means of foreign loans upon the purchase abroad of rifles, ammunition, and equipment for the army (the sums

spent in this way amounting between 1906 and 1911 to 86,000,000 leva, a sum about equal to the amount spent on the same object during the previous 27 years), and upon materials, rails, bridge work, locomotives, rolling stock, cement, machinery, &c., for the new works on railways and ports which have formed part of the scheme of industrial development to which the Bulgarian Government had committed itself before the Balkan Wars.

(*a*) *Exports*

Quantities and Values.—On the average of the years 1902 to 1911, the annual value of the exports of agricultural and dairy produce and live-stock from Bulgaria was 109 million leva, out of a total export value of 129 million leva. Agriculture thus provides about 84 per cent. of the exports of the country. If variations in the harvest be taken into account, it appears that the export of agricultural produce is on the increase, owing to the spread of modern methods and the greater use of agricultural machinery.

From 1902 to 1911 the wheat exported averaged in value 19,000,000 leva, and in weight 275,000 metric tons. Next among the cereals exported comes maize, and then barley, rye, and oats. The export of flour has steadily increased in recent years, thanks to the encouragement extended by the Government to the milling industry. Of other agricultural exports, the most important are sheep, cheese, and eggs. In the last an increasing trade is being done, the export trade having steadily increased from 6,592,000 leva in 1902 to 13,636,000 leva in 1911.

Apart from agricultural produce there are only two articles of export which are of importance, viz. essence of roses (the trade in which averaged over 5,400,000 leva

for the years 1907–11, as against 3,400,000 leva for the previous five years, see p. 91), and woollen goods, consisting of the native cloths known as *abas* and *shayak*.

Countries of Destination.—Normally, Bulgaria's two best customers were Belgium and Turkey. Belgium took cereals (especially wheat and maize) in large quantities, and to a less extent eggs; the eggs used to go by rail through the Central Empires, the cereals by sea. It is doubtful what proportion of the cereals was really intended for Belgian consumption. The sales to Turkey consisted chiefly of live animals, butter, cheese, flour, Bulgarian homespuns, cocoons, grain (especially wheat, maize, and barley), beans, and wood in the rough. Belgium and Turkey have in recent years taken together about 45 per cent. of Bulgaria's exports, but the trade with Turkey was adversely affected in 1911 by a tariff war, and the exports to that country dropped from 34·3 per cent. of the total in 1910 to 15·8 per cent. in 1911. Great Britain, at the end of the period 1902–11, still stood third in importance among Bulgaria's customers, mainly owing to large purchases of maize and rapeseed in 1910 and 1911, but her purchases from Bulgaria of other goods were on the decrease. The sales to Germany rose from 11,000,000 leva in 1902 to 23,000,000 leva in 1911; the trade was chiefly in eggs, maize, rye, and essence of roses. With France and Greece a fair trade was done, that with Greece being on the increase, but that with France showing a marked downward tendency in recent years. The six countries mentioned account for over 80 per cent. of Bulgaria's export trade. Exports to Austria-Hungary during 1902–11 were fairly steady, and consisted mainly of eggs, barley, corn offals, maize, and lamb skins.

(*b*) *Imports*

Quantities and Values.—The imports into Bulgaria are as yet unimportant, averaging only 158,388,000 leva, or £6,335,000 sterling, for the five years 1907–11. In 1911, the latest year for which the particulars are available, it appears that imports were divided into the following broad classes, viz.:

	Value in leva.	*Proportion per cent.*
Food and drink . .	23,800,000	12
Materials, raw or simply prepared . .	39,900,000	20
Manufactured goods .	135,600,000	68
Total .	199,300,000	

Most of the food consumed in the country is produced at home, and imported food-stuffs consist for the most part of tropical and semi-tropical kinds, such as coffee, rice, sugar, southern fruits, dried fruits, and spices.

Among the raw materials the principal articles imported were raw hides and skins, coal and coke, oils, greases and waxes, wood for building, raw wool, and raw cotton.

Among manufactured goods the outstanding items are cotton yarns and manufactures, iron and steel manufactures, woollen manufactures, machinery and apparatus, paper, leather and glass manufactures.

Cotton yarn and cotton manufactures have always stood first among the imports, and between 1901–11 the value of these goods imported was practically doubled. The imports of cotton yarn for use in the factories increased from 5,000,000 leva in 1901 to 14,000,000 leva in 1911. Manufactures consist very largely of piece goods. Still more remarkable is the increase in the import of machinery, which rose from a value of 2,000,000 leva in 1902 to over 16,500,000 leva in 1911. There has

also been a large increase in the import of metal and metal goods, this item having risen from 6,500,000 leva in 1902 to nearly 24,000,000 leva in 1911; this includes the import of rails, &c., for the State railways. The import of coal has also increased greatly, rising from 20,000 metric tons in 1902 to 184,000 metric tons in 1911, notwithstanding the increased production of coal in the kingdom during the same period. The import of refined petroleum during these years remained practically constant.

Countries of Origin.—For some years Austria-Hungary has contributed the largest share of Bulgaria's imports, and her goods entering Bulgaria in 1911 reached a value of 48,000,000 leva, as against 18,000,000 leva in 1902, a result largely due to geographical proximity. Germany, however, has in recent years increased her trade with Bulgaria even more rapidly, and her share of the trade in 1911 (40,000,000 leva) was nearly five times the value of her share in 1902. Next in importance comes the United Kingdom, whose imports increased from 15,000,000 leva in 1902 to 30,000,000 leva in 1911; after the United Kingdom come Turkey and France. Imports from France rose in value from 4,000,000 leva to 25,000,000 leva from 1902 to 1911. Turkey's trade, on the other hand, did not show any very marked increase, and was less in 1911 than in previous years, owing to the tariff war already mentioned. In normal times the countries named supply 79 per cent. of Bulgaria's imports.

Austria-Hungary supplied goods of almost every class in the list of Bulgaria's imports. In the sugar trade she had practically the monopoly; she contributed largely to Bulgaria's imports of metal, machinery, and metal goods, and did a large trade in calico and prints and in cement. Germany supplied a very large proportion of Bulgaria's requirements of railway rolling stock

and machinery, the total sum spent by Bulgaria on such goods in 1911 going to Germany; she furnished a large share of Bulgaria's imports of woollen goods, and held a strong position in many other branches of Bulgaria's import trade. Bulgarian purchases from Great Britain consisted mainly of cotton and cotton goods; in this department of trade Great Britain has for many years headed the list. The bulk of the coal imported into the country likewise came from the United Kingdom, which also sent machinery, rails, and other metal goods, though competition on the part of Belgium, Germany, and Austria was very serious. The import trade with France consisted of soap, dry hides, leather, silk goods, and in recent years included a large trade in firearms and munitions of war. Imports from Turkey consisted of fruit, vegetables, coffee, coal, olive oil, soap, leather, raw wool and cotton, and low-grade cotton yarn.

The following tables relating to foreign trade will be found in the Appendix:

Table III. Principal exports, 1902–11.

Table IV. Export trade with principal countries, 1902–11.

Table V. Principal imports, 1902–11.

Table VI. Import trade with principal countries, 1902–11.

(c) *Customs and Tariffs*

Before 1904 the tariff was arranged mainly upon an *ad valorem* basis with the object of producing revenue. This led to the under-valuation of imports, and in 1904 the system was changed, a specific tariff of a strongly protectionist character being substituted.

The tariff now in force is that laid down by the law of 1911, amending that of 1904. It is designed to protect home industries rather than to obtain revenue;

hence goods likely to be of use in the development of industry are only lightly taxed. The following statement compares the average incidence of the tariff in force in 1905 with that of the tariff in force in 1911. The calculation relates to goods actually imported, and takes no account of the goods kept out by either tariff:

	Average Incidence	
	On all goods.	*On dutiable goods only.*
Import Tariff of 1905 . .	12 % *ad val.*	16 % *ad val.*
Import Tariff of 1911 . .	14½ % ,,	20 % ,,

Considerable sums are raised annually by duties on exports.

(*d*) *Trade Routes*

For the eight years 1904–11 the external trade of Bulgaria was divided between the Black Sea, the River Danube, and land transport as follows:

	Imports. Per cent.	*Exports. Per cent.*
Black Sea	42·67	45·94
River Danube	24·29	26·55
By land	33·04	27·51

Land transport is used more for imports than for exports, because Austria and Germany send to Bulgaria far more goods than they take from her.

Nearly the whole trade from the Black Sea is through Varna and Burgas, the former holding a considerable lead over the latter in all returns down to 1911. Subsequent figures are not available. In the Danube trade, Ruschuk is far ahead of all rivals, doing on an average four times as much trade as either Sistov, Rahovo, Vidin, Samovid, or Lom Palanka. At Ruschuk the import trade is much more important than the export trade. At the other Danube ports the balance is usually in favour of the export trade.

A very large part of the goods imported by land is consigned to Sofia, and a considerable quantity to Philippopolis. Both these towns have also a share of the export trade by land. The only other towns which have any considerable share in the trade by land are Tsaribrod, the frontier town on the Sofia–Nish railway, and Harmanli, until recently the frontier town from Bulgaria to Turkey on the Sofia–Adrianople–Constantinople route.

The transit trade of Bulgaria is insignificant.

(D) FINANCE

(1) Public Finance

For the five years 1902–6 the State expenditure averaged 133,209,000 leva: for the period 1907–11 it averaged 221,681,000 leva.[1] The growth is mainly due to increased expenditure on the army, railways, harbours, roads, and education, and to the increased amount required for the service of the public debt, the national indebtedness having risen from 203,000,000 leva in 1901 to 597,000,000 leva at the beginning of 1913. During that period a number of loans, chiefly expended on works of national value, were floated, and for the period 1905–12 the amount required for service of the loans (interest and amortisation) averaged over 47,000,000 leva annually.

The chief sources of revenue are (*a*) direct taxes, which include taxes on land, buildings, sheep and goats, patents, and road and military taxes; (*b*) indirect taxes, of which the most important are those on the manufacture and sale of tobacco and spirits, excise duties, import and export duties, and warehouse charges; (*c*) state monopolies of salt, cigarette paper,

[1] See Appendix, Table VII.

matches, and playing cards; (*d*) notarial, stamp, and registration duties; (*e*) revenue from railways, harbours, and the post office, and (*f*) income from the State domains and from the State share in the profits of the National Bank of Bulgaria.

The Finance Ministers have always found a difficulty in making both ends meet; and between 1902 and 1910 the balance was on the wrong side on four occasions. In fact, since 1907 Bulgaria has been living beyond her means and the Budgets have only been balanced by recourse to loans. Bulgarian newspapers profess to take an optimistic view of the financial position of the country to-day, notwithstanding the effect of three years of war, but it is difficult to see how Bulgaria will be in a position to meet her liabilities in the near future without recourse to taxation which may retard her development for some time to come.

(2) Currency

The Bulgarian monetary units are:

The lev = 1 franc.

The stotinka = $\frac{1}{100}$th of the lev = 1 centime.

The coins normally in circulation are:

Gold 100, 20, and 10 leva pieces.

Silver 5, 2, 1, and $\frac{1}{2}$ leva pieces.

Nickel 20, 10, 5, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ stotinki pieces.

Copper 2 and 1 stotinki pieces.

The following coins were returned as being in circulation in 1912:

	Gold.	*Silver.*	*Nickel.*	*Copper.*
Number .	257,500	32,600,000	115,000,000	150,000,000
Value, leva	5,000,000	54,000,000	11,000,000	4,100,000

The Bulgarian gold coins in circulation are insufficient; and the gold circulation is mainly supplied by foreign

10 and 20 franc pieces. It is stated that 12,000,000 leva of these were put into circulation in 1912.

The Bulgarian Government has recently called in the nickel coins, substituting for them token coins made of an alloy of zinc (*Chemiker Zeitung*, September 8, 1917). This is apparently only a temporary expedient.

Gold bank-notes issued by the National Bank have been in circulation for many years. Silver bank-notes have been in circulation since 1899. In 1910 there were in circulation gold notes for 83,360,000 leva and silver notes for 27,429,000 leva.

Bulgaria has had many difficulties to contend with in regard to currency; and her statesmen have not shown an adequate grasp of the problems involved. Originally, i. e. in 1880, the bimetallic standard was introduced, but no effort was made to study the relation between the gold and the silver coinage; and between 1880 and 1894 successive Ministers of Finance were tempted to increase the silver coinage in circulation with the object of assisting them in balancing the budget—always a difficult matter—by means of the profit made on the minting of silver coins. The result has been an almost invariably high premium on gold, which between 1880 and 1897 reached at times 20 to 30 per cent., causing enormous losses to trade.

In 1897 Bulgaria decided to adopt the gold standard only, but the Act authorizing this mentioned no time within which the gold standard was to come into force. The minting of gold coins was resumed in 1912, for the first time since 1894, but the wars have postponed the benefits that this change should produce.

(3) Banks

For so small a country Bulgaria boasts a large number of banks and credit institutions; and in 1912

there were, excluding the Banque Nationale de Bulgarie, which is a State institution, over fifty banks operating in the country. Of these many are quite small institutions, with paid-up capitals of 50,000–400,000 leva, or £2,000–£16,000. Owing to a law which made it compulsory for any banking establishment in Bulgaria to have a majority of Bulgarians on its board of directors, the Imperial Ottoman Bank was compelled to close branches at Sofia, Philippopolis, and Ruschuk. Three of the chief banks have been founded with foreign money and are doing a large business.

The most important banks in Bulgaria are:

Banque Nationale de Bulgarie.—Founded in 1879 with a capital of 2,000,000 leva. Originally its operations were chiefly that of a deposit bank, but in 1885 its capital was increased to 10,000,000 leva, and it was given fresh statutes, which included power to issue bank-notes. With the growth of the commercial life of the kingdom, even this capital was found insufficient, and in 1886 a loan of 10,000,000 leva was obtained from the Deutsche Bank on the security of 'mortgage preference shares', and by means of a similar issue in 1893 a further 10,000,000 leva was obtained from the same source. The turnover has steadily increased, and in 1911 reached 6,037,000,000 leva as against 1,843,000,000 leva in 1902 and 499,000,000 leva in 1892. The following particulars taken from the balance-sheet of the bank for 1915 are given by the *Banking Almanac*:

Liabilities.	*Leva.*	*Assets.*	*Leva.*
Paid-up capital	17,825,000	Cash	87,321,000
Reserve fund	14,497,000	Bills	48,865,000
Notes in circulation	242,096,000	Advances	78,729,000
Mortgages, 1909	28,320,000	Correspondents	89,620,000
Deposits	57,528,000	Current accounts	181,958,000
Current accounts, &c.	151,952,000	Sundry assets	26,199,000
Profit and loss	2,892,000	Investments, &c.	8,705,000
		Bank premises	4,607,000

The head office of the bank is at Sofia, and there are branches in twenty-three towns in the country. London agents: Deutsche Bank, Anglo-Foreign Banking Company, Crédit Lyonnais, Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris.

Banque Balkanique.—Established 1906, founded by the Wiener Bankverein. Head office, Sofia. Branches at Burgas, Plevna, Philippopolis, Ruschuk, Varna, and Vidin. Capital, 6,000,000 leva; reserve fund, 2,023,000 leva; dividends, 1906, 5 per cent., 1907, 6 per cent., 1908, 7 per cent., 1909–10, 8 per cent., 1911–13, 8½ per cent., 1914, 5 per cent. London agents: Deutsche Bank, Dresdner Bank, Anglo-Austrian Bank.

Banque Bulgare de Commerce.—A purely Bulgarian concern. Head office, Sofia. Branches at Burgas, Dedeagach, Gabrovo, Lom Palanka, Philippopolis, Ruschuk, and Varna. Capital, 7,500,000 leva; reserve funds, 1,800,000 leva. London agents: Credito Italiano, Swiss Bankverein, Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris.

Banque Générale de Bulgarie.—This bank was formed by the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas and the Pester-Ungarische Bank. Head office, Sofia. Branches at Burgas, Dedeagach, Philippopolis, Ruschuk, and Varna. Capital, 5,000,000 leva; reserve fund, 1,183,000 leva; dividends, 1909–10, 10 per cent., 1911–14, 15 per cent. London agents: London County & Westminster Bank, Kleinwort Sons & Co., Russian Bank for Foreign Trade, London City & Midland Bank.

Banque de Crédit.—Established in 1905; founded by the Disconto-Gesellschaft, the Norddeutsche Bank, and S. Bleichröder (Berlin). Head office, Sofia. Branches at Ruschuk and Varna. Capital, 3,000,000 leva; reserve fund, 164,000 leva; dividends, 1909–14, 5 per cent. London agents: Disconto-Gesellschaft.

Other banks of importance, all of which have been founded with Bulgarian money, are:

Ghirdap Bank, Ruschuk. Capital, 2,000,000 leva.

Progress Bank, Plevna. Capital, 1,000,000 leva.

Banque de Sofia. Capital, 1,000,000 leva.

Banque de Commerce et d'Industrie, Philippopolis. Capital, 1,000,000 leva.

(4) Credit Institutions

Banque Agricole de Bulgarie.—This institution is an amalgamation of the agricultural banks which were originated in 1863 during the Turkish rule, and after many vicissitudes were for the first time regularized by legislation in 1894. The Banque Agricole in its present form dates from 1903. Its initial capital was 35,000,000 leva; its head office is at Sofia, and it has branches and agencies in all the towns and most important villages in the kingdom. Its chief transactions, apart from the usual banking business, are the following:

i. Loans on the security of goods, cattle, seeds, and agricultural produce.

ii. Advances to farmers to enable them to buy cattle, seeds, and agricultural implements.

iii. Financing co-operative societies.

iv. Loans to the departments and communes for the purpose of improving the rural economy of the country.

The interest which the bank pays on deposits is graduated according to the length of term. The turnover amounted to 1,308,698,000 leva in 1911, as against a turnover of 507,307,000 leva in 1900, and 127,731,000 leva in 1895. The balance-sheet for 1911 shows:

	Leva.
Capital	44,354,000
Reserve capital . .	5,890,000
Loans against security .	100,226,000
Deposits	58,000,000

Post Office Savings Banks.—Bulgaria has a system of savings banks which are managed by the post offices throughout the country, and are organized on a similar system to that of the English Post Office Savings Bank. The law governing them was passed in 1896. The banks are guaranteed by the State, and the funds of the savings banks are deposited with the Banque Nationale de Bulgarie. The banks may not be used for the deposit of sums over 2,000 leva, except by friendly societies, whose limit is 5,000 leva. The Banque Nationale pays 4½ per cent. on deposits, of which ½ per cent. is retained by the savings banks to cover expenses, and the balance goes to the depositors.

The sums deposited in 1911 amounted to 35,784,000 leva (an increase of over 5,000,000 leva on the deposits of the previous year), sums withdrawn during the same period amounting to 29,741,000 leva.

Banque Centrale Coopérative de Bulgarie.—This bank was founded in 1911 with a capital of 5,000,000 leva, of which half was found by the Banque Nationale and half by the Banque Agricole. Further capital to an amount of 88,600 leva was obtained by public subscription, and 'obligations' for 1,000,000 leva were authorized, which were taken by the Banque Nationale. The turnover during the nine months, April–December 1911, amounted to 25,077,000 leva, and for the complete year 1912 to 76,726,000 leva.

APPENDIX

TABLE I. PRINCIPAL CROPS. ANNUAL CULTIVATION AND VALUE

1. Area under Cultivation, in Hectares. 2. *Value of the Crops, in Leva or Francs.*

Nature of cultivation.		*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*	*1912.*
Cereals . .	1	2,156,858	2,243,899	2,219,639	2,313,521	2,394,252	2,506,133	2,523,738	2,564,588
	2	*266,000,489*	*300,883,838*	*209,143,073*	*357,279,171*	*344,114,587*	*385,588,603*	*397,552,475*	*436,487,337*
Industrial plants .	1	76,004	22,033	16,802	15,476	13,214	21,540	41,542	37,014
	2	*14,250,466*	*10,112,825*	*6,323,640*	*6,359,460*	*5,954,000*	*11,433,262*	*18,685,233*	*14,666,984*
Leguminous plants	1	38,609	51,310	55,752	72,751	60,259	59,210	76,082	89,300
	2	*8,982,564*	*14,739,143*	*9,431,712*	*12,838,889*	*8,832,663*	*14,851,202*	*18,621,586*	*23,127,317*
Garden produce .	1	30,763	33,971	30,875	36,522	36,317	37,888	38,688	40,336
	2	*11,096,852*	*14,758,889*	*15,187,712*	*16,723,295*	*13,339,131*	*14,009,694*	*17,396,585*	*18,790,968*
Fodder . .	1	486,035	498,850	505,545	512,485	523,371	539,815	558,032	572,473
	2	*66,357,877*	*65,626,637*	*63,683,139*	*91,060,232*	*113,771,718*	*124,596,191*	*112,890,226*	*95,990,624*
Orchards and mulberries	1	7,869	8,637	8,980	9,392	9,949	10,640	11,337	11,699
	2	*4,795,694*	*4,886,544*	*4,728,331*	*8,551,946*	*3,739,586*	*8,887,552*	*4,075,265*	*3,785,323*
Vineyards . .	1	90,975	92,106	88,671	86,434	85,240	79,405	67,872	61,504
	2	*57,228,889*	*31,546,764*	*50,281,652*	*95,485,307*	*59,520,973*	*38,976,516*	*36,168,942*	*56,122,988*
Rose gardens .	1	7,304	7,319	7,258	7,348	7,621	7,606	7,666	7,907
	2	*3,000,016*	*2,821,366*	*2,652,803*	*3,163,564*	*3,767,098*	*3,540,400*	*5,641,199*	*6,505,535*
Fallow . . .	.	683,302	645,650	686,325	638,400	742,498	665,158	706,663	692,168

TABLE II. PRINCIPAL CEREALS. AREA CULTIVATED AND ESTIMATED YIELD.

1. Area in Hectares. 2. *Total yield in Quintals.* 3. Mean yield in Quintals per Hectare. 4. Mean yield in Bushels per Acre.

Crop.	*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*	*1912.*	*1913.*	*1914.*
WHEAT										
1	979,570	1,009,628	977,190	980,422	1,040,140	1,088,696	1,118,409	1,168,199	1,476,520	1,208,420
2	*9,511,638*	*10,643,719*	*6,407,956*	*9,932,513*	*8,728,359*	*11,497,982*	*13,143,812*	*12,180,752*	*13,949,672*	*8,005,126*
3	9·7	10·5	6·6	10·1	8·4	10·6	11·8	10·4	9·4	6·6
4	14·4	15·6	9·8	15·0	12·5	15·7	17·5	15·5	14·0	9·8
MAIZE										
1	472,831	507,650	498,282	570,758	607,455	611,518	631,935	643,156	634,700	635,700
2	*4,608,067*	*7,056,446*	*3,576,366*	*5,262,239*	*5,200,122*	*7,203,928*	*7,770,422*	*7,233,011*	*8,433,286*	*7,849,200*
3	9·7	13·9	7·2	9·2	8·6	11·8	12·3	11·2	13·3	12·3
4	14·4	20·7	10·8	13·7	12·7	17·5	18·3	16·6	19·8	18·3
BARLEY										
1	233,178	231,594	232,227	251,371	241,206	260,329	251,178	260,000	244,155	240,400
2	*2,488,785*	*2,614,436*	*1,474,508*	*2,462,639*	*2,029,568*	*3,066,232*	*2,697,665*	*4,000,000*	*3,024,436*	*2,255,811*
3	10·7	11·3	6·3	9·8	8·4	11·8	10·7	15·4	12·4	9·4
4	15·9	16·8	9·2	14·6	12·5	17·5	15·9	22·9	18·4	14·0
RYE										
1	175,711	186,847	182,447	173,730	201,542	227,344	220,721	213,890	208,600	202,700
2	*1,806,664*	*1,914,736*	*986,322*	*1,423,567*	*1,754,248*	*2,297,523*	*2,284,139*	*2,139,239*	*2,388,055*	*1,771,363*
3	10·3	10·2	5·4	8·2	8·7	10·1	10·3	10·0	11·4	8·7
4	15·4	15·3	8·0	12·3	12·8	15·0	15·3	14·9	16·9	12·9
OATS										
1	173,699	189,611	189,743	227,699	196,541	197,849	180,797	176,139	186,900	162,000
2	*1,361,602*	*1,724,935*	*1,076,416*	*1,633,280*	*1,358,037*	*1,565,987*	*1,512,637*	*1,263,849*	*1,469,647*	*1,251,620*
3	7·8	9·1	5·7	7·2	6·9	7·9	8·4	7·2	7·9	7·7
4	11·6	13·5	8·4	10·8	10·2	11·8	12·5	10·8	11·7	11·4

1 hectare = 2·47 acres; 1 quintal = 3·67 bushels.

TABLE III. PRINCIPAL EXPORTS

VALUE IN THOUSANDS OF FRANCS (MERCHANDISE ONLY)

Principal articles.	*1902.*	*1903.*	*1904.*	*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
Cheese	2,207	2,650	3,190	3,255	2,812	2,609	2,782	2,687	3,694	4,013
Colza	6,257	689	12	6,166	10	16	3	4	434	3,493
Eggs	6,592	6,423	8,500	9,113	10,649	11,482	7,297	9,212	8,846	13,636
Flour of all kinds	2,661	3,655	4,054	3,674	4,612	5,289	5,339	6,816	11,607	13,654
Grain : barley	5,730	5,097	9,449	6,878	5,735	3,162	4,665	3,707	5,816	8,911
„ maize	18,980	12,467	22,770	11,216	14,072	26,838	13,861	17,016	13,491	39,534
„ millet	690	799	185	192	583	407	895	111	326	530
„ oats	2,311	3,764	4,916	3,114	3,371	3,201	837	1,644	294	766
„ rye	3,258	2,803	6,269	8,183	4,247	5,336	6,183	3,925	6,113	9,154
„ wheat (including buckwheat)	28,501	42,566	72,982	64,822	35,505	35,227	39,033	32,500	37,638	47,639
Haricots	756	2,315	824	2,404	4,456	2,612	4,140	979	3,730	6,165
Hides and skins	2,975	2,767	2,794	4,046	4,905	2,802	3,126	3,670	3,504	3,309
Live stock	7,355	5,272	6,305	6,126	4,828	8,188	6,437	6,729	7,324	8,341
Perfumes (essence of rose)	2,609	3,735	2,741	3,712	4,521	4,642	4,321	5,328	5,493	7,404
Wood, rough or sawn	1,306	1,009	850	529	616	516	516	780	610	175
Woollen mnfrs. (known as *abas* and *shayak*)	1,763	1,766	1,762	1,761	2,331	2,393	1,679	3,426	4,203	2,290

TABLE IV. TRADE WITH PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES. EXPORTS

TOTAL VALUE IN THOUSANDS OF FRANCS (MERCHANDISE ONLY), DISTINGUISHING PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES

Countries.		*1902.*	*1903.*	*1904.*	*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
United Kingdom		24,499	20,180	24,728	12,884	14,985	20,706	9,680	8,279	15,315	24,237
Austria-Hungary		8,245	9,697	14,090	18,887	8,200	8,023	6,346	11,778	7,828	10,567
Belgium		19,107	25,948	52,988	42,415	20,142	26,970	22,039	19,341	20,944	53,790
France		7,652	7,506	7,606	8,917	8,977	6,991	6,210	5,045	9,039	11,119
Germany		10,609	9,278	12,216	11,709	15,410	17,022	11,626	13,524	14,218	22,912
Greece		3,551	4,912	3,731	5,457	9,721	8,019	8,933	4,601	6,340	12,650
Italy		2,766	2,836	4,762	4,437	3,906	3,100	4,012	2,732	1,818	3,948
Rumania		1,209	1,511	1,756	1,851	1,121	923	959	621	869	1,246
Russia		262	258	142	218	306	249	247	210	301	336
Serbia		319	359	1,746	2,357	584	348	344	359	404	614
Turkey		22,211	23,165	25,645	21,310	21,699	27,283	33,482	36,652	44,283	29,210
United States		699	917	515	1,411	1,372	1,264	826	1,430	1,117	1,167
Other Countries		2,556	1,507	7,694	16,108	8,150	4,697	7,653	6,862	6,576	12,838
Total exports	Thousands of francs	103,685	108,074	157,619	147,961	114,573	125,595	112,357	111,434	129,052	184,634
	Thousands of pounds	4,147	4,323	6,305	5,918	4,583	5,024	4,494	4,457	5,162	7,385

TABLE V. PRINCIPAL IMPORTS

VALUE IN THOUSANDS OF FRANCS

Principal articles.	*1902.*	*1903.*	*1904.*	*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
Clothing (ready-made)	1,329	1,399	2,316	1,813	1,114	1,255	1,173	1,284	1,465	1,656
Coal and coke	526	717	934	1,032	1,088	2,187	3,905	2,939	3,162	4,952
Coffee (raw and roasted)	1,046	1,127	1,379	1,449	1,480	1,396	1,558	1,735	1,774	2,906
Cotton (raw)	1,462	1,138	1,554	1,613	1,967	1,398	1,337	1,363	1,262	1,357
„ (yarns)	6,126	7,059	8,606	9,724	9,892	8,932	9,336	12,139	10,985	14,155
„ (manufactures)	10,356	10,617	15,098	14,835	13,842	14,666	11,633	16,517	14,252	18,535
Glass and glassware	1,177	1,257	1,563	1,911	1,765	1,679	1,997	2,129	2,492	2,259
Hides (raw and dried)	1,238	1,253	2,333	2,188	2,643	3,111	1,812	2,768	4,129	7,726
Iron in the rough (including hoop and plate iron)	1,475	1,617	2,207	2,316	2,367	2,943	2,762	3,181	3,562	3,646
Iron (manufactures of)	2,611	4,157	4,149	4,119	4,244	6,951	8,433	9,629	11,177	9,358
Leather (for soles)	1,666	1,898	2,594	2,392	2,244	1,852	1,869	2,194	2,073	2,180
Machinery and apparatus (including locomotives)	1,969	2,347	4,413	4,799	5,286	8,004	8,373	12,708	13,171	16,674
Paper of all sorts	1,907	1,859	2,562	2,576	1,889	2,591	2,668	2,259	3,327	3,086
Petroleum (refined)	1,919	2,308	3,767	2,763	3,584	2,570	3,225	3,713	3,450	3,076
Sugar (refined)	2,348	3,075	4,280	5,466	657	2,791	3,355	4,252	5,759	5,316
Wood (rough or sawn)	1,002	1,364	2,268	3,990	3,099	3,167	4,109	3,900	5,178	6,873
Wool (manufactures of)	2,522	2,860	4,596	4,241	3,202	4,029	4,585	5,065	5,886	6,291

TABLE VI. TRADE WITH PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES. IMPORTS

TOTAL VALUE IN THOUSANDS OF FRANCS (MERCHANDISE ONLY), DISTINGUISHING PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES

Countries.	*1902.*	*1903.*	*1904.*	*1905.*	*1906.*	*1907.*	*1908.*	*1909.*	*1910.*	*1911.*
United Kingdom	15,216	14,840	18,849	20,183	19,600	21,424	23,202	27,010	22,682	30,034
Austria-Hungary	18,142	22,830	38,169	33,037	27,802	34,688	35,541	38,867	47,571	48,216
Belgium	1,987	2,103	2,497	2,849	3,078	4,253	4,279	7,902	8,507	5,047
France	3,958	3,367	10,693	7,319	5,373	6,593	7,023	11,165	15,348	24,927
Germany	8,556	10,918	19,976	21,031	16,225	19,660	20,847	29,215	34,120	39,837
Greece	474	321	338	283	224	389	455	811	421	488
Italy	5,023	6,147	8,319	6,781	5,543	5,506	4,712	5,489	6,843	9,118
Rumania	1,484	2,182	3,712	5,519	3,365	3,633	4,131	5,049	6,572	8,724
Russia	3,096	3,902	6,075	3,255	4,694	4,771	5,635	5,802	6,865	6,975
Serbia	740	728	1,101	1,080	1,408	2,056	2,037	2,749	2,270	1,751
Turkey	11,077	12,325	17,025	16,872	18,052	17,548	19 153	21,084	21,024	15,986
United States	304	379	577	1,418	465	908	574	591	854	1,695
Other Countries	1,189	1,761	2,359	2,623	2,690	3,232	2,462	4,696	4,280	6,547
Total imports } Thousands of francs	71,246	81,803	129,690	122,250	108,474	124,661	130,151	160,430	177,357	199,345
Total imports } Thousands of pounds	2,850	3,272	5,188	4,890	4,339	4,986	5,206	6,417	7,094	7,974

TABLE VII

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF BULGARIA, 1906-15

Budget

	Revenue. *Thousand francs.*	*Expenditure.* *Thousand francs.*	*Excess of Revenue* (+) *or Excess of Expenses* (−). *Thousand francs.*
1906	135,456	136,702	(−) 1,246
1907	148,672	146,581	(+) 2,091
1908	150,697	153,701	(−) 3,004
1909	166,611	158,955	(+) 7,656
1910	180,927	198,121	(−) 17,194
1911	198,796	181,022	(+) 17,774

Extra-Budget Receipts and Expenditure

	Receipts (mainly provided from loans). *Thousand francs.*	*Expenditure.* *Thousand francs.*	*Excess of Receipts* (+) *or Excess of Expenses* (−). *Thousand francs.*
1906	9,030	11,735	(−) 2,705
1907	92,832	93,476	(−) 644
1908	80,175	89,504	(−) 9,329
1909	33,308	33,142	(+) 166
1910	85,018	31,082	(+) 53,936
1911	5,044	21,822	(−) 16,778

Total Receipts and Expenditure

	Receipts. *Thousand francs.*	*Expenditure.* *Thousand francs.*	*Excess of Receipts* (+) *or Excess of Expenses* (−). *Thousand francs.*
1906	144,486	148,437	(−) 3,951
1907	241,505	240,058	(+) 1,447
1908	230,872	243,205	(−) 12,333
1909	99,919	192,097	(+) 7,822
1910	265,945	229,203	(+) 36,742
1911	203,840	202,844	(+) 996
1912	170,039	158,666	(+) 11,373
1913	168,725	167,771	(+) 954
1914	224,251	247,110	(−) 22,869
			(+) 14

* Budget estimate.

AUTHORITIES

HISTORICAL

British and Foreign State Papers, vols. 67–107, 1876–1914.
Parliamentary Papers (Turkey), 1876–86.
The treaties quoted in the text are given in full in the Appendix to *The Eastern Question*, No. 15 of this series.

BRAILSFORD, H. N. Macedonia. (London, 1906.)
CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE. Report of the International Commission to inquire into the causes and conduct of the Balkan Wars. (Washington, D.C., 1914.)
ELIOT, SIR C. Turkey in Europe. (London, 1908.)
FORSYTH, W. The Slavonic Provinces South of the Danube. (London, 1876.)
GOPČEVIĆ. Makedonien und Alt Serbien. (Vienna, 1889.)
JIREČEK, C. J. Das Fürstenthum Bulgarien. (Prague, 1891.)
——— Geschichte der Bulgaren. (Prague, 1876.)
JOCHMUS. Journey into Balkans. Journal Royal Geographical Society. (London, 1854.)
KANITZ, F. La Bulgarie Danubienne. (Paris, 1881.)
LAMOUCHE, L. La Bulgarie dans le passé et le présent. (Paris, 1892.)
LAVELEYE, E. DE. La Péninsule des Balkans. (London, 1887.)
MACH, R. VON. The Bulgarian Exarchate. (London, 1907.)
MILLER, W. The Balkans. 'Story of the Nations.' (1899.)
NIKOLAIDES. La Macédoine. (Berlin, 1899.)
OFEIKOFF. La Macédoine au point de vue ethnographique, &c. (Philippopolis, 1885.)
SETON-WATSON, R. W. The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans. (London, 1917.)
VILLARI, L. The Balkan Question. (London, 1906.)

La Bulgarie Contemporaine. Official publication (Brussels, 1905.)
Nationalism and War in the Near East. By a Diplomatist. (Oxford, 1915.)

ECONOMIC

Annuaire International de Statistique Agricole (1912). (Rome, 1913.)

Annuaire Statistique du Royaume de Bulgarie (1912). (Sofia, 1913.)

British Diplomatic and Consular Reports.

Bulgaria of To-day. (Edited by the Bulgarian Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture.) (London, 1907.)

ELIOT, SIR C. *Turkey in Europe.* (London, 1908.)

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition.

FOX, F. *Bulgaria.* (London, 1915.)

HERBERT, W. VON. *By-paths in the Balkans.* (London, 1906.)

ISHIRKOFF, A. *Bulgarien, Land und Leute.* (Leipzig, 1916–17.)

JONES, GROSVENOR M. *Government Aid to Merchant Shipping.* (Washington, 1916.)

LAUNAY, L. DE. *La Bulgarie d'hier et de demain.* (Paris, 1914.)

MACDONALD, JOHN. *Czar Ferdinand and his People.* (London, 1913.)

PEARS, SIR EDWIN. *Turkey and its People.* (London, 1911.)

Shipping World Year Book, 1917.

Statesman's Year Book, 1917.

Statistique du commerce du royaume de Bulgarie avec les pays étrangers (1911). (Sofia.)

U.S.A. Consular Reports.

WOODS, HENRY CHARLES. *The Danger Zone of Europe.* (London, 1911.)

MAPS

Bulgaria is comprised in three sheets (Buda Pest, L. 34; Sofiya, K. 34; Istambul, K. 35) of the International Map (G.S.G.S. 2758) published by the War Office, on the scale of 1 : 1,000,000. For historical boundaries and ethnography see Table and note of Maps in *The Eastern Question*, No. 15 of this series.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY H. M. STATIONERY OFFICE.

To be purchased through any Bookseller, or directly from
H. M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses :—
IMPERIAL HOUSE, KINGSWAY, LONDON, W.C. 2, and
28 ABINGDON STREET, LONDON, S.W. 1;
37 PETER STREET, MANCHESTER;
1 ST. ANDREW'S CRESCENT, CARDIFF;
23 FORTH STREET, EDINBURGH;
or from E. PONSONBY, LTD., 116 GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1920.

Price 3/- net.