

BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL STUDIES

SECTION "HISTORY OF THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL QUESTION AFTER 1878"

RUMEN VASILEV KARAGANEV

The Danube, the international Danube commission and Bulgaria
1919-1940

(With continued until 1944)

The thesis for the awarding of the scientific degree

DOCTOR OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

Sofia, 2019

The dissertation work "The Danube, the International Danube Commission and Bulgaria 1919-1940 (by 1944)" aims to follow initially the problems associated with the post-war device in the swollen space, referred mostly to the work of The International Danube Commission (IDC) during the peace period, in this regard, and the personal participation in it of Bulgaria. Subsequently, the developments in the same geopolitical structure changed immediately before and after the beginning of the Second World War; The Commission's secondary version in 1940, with its political stakes, coercion and the results of the Kingdom's participation in the combination in question in the years to 1944. Due to the revelations of a long-term and prolonged-time range of events, problems and processes, Dominant tied to the rhythm of international relations and the inevitable of the IDC with them, arises the need to follow the most significant, predetermined character, dynamics, and fateful challenge...

The final status of the Danube (FSD) – the statement act between the tied in the international system. Further on – The practical application of the document – the IDC with the events exhibited through its prism of the key for the old continent, the activities undertaken by the institution in this regard, alternation of successes, difficulties, less often misunderstandings. An integral part of the study is aimed at tracing the Bulgarian participation as a constituent unit of the IDC and its subsequent replica, passing from the inherited traditional distance to the northern natural phenomenon, through the belated Awareness of its value characteristics, to the forced initiative of the country in its bitness of the link of the urban geopolitical schemes in the perimeter of the river space and the standard economic requirements.

On 29. XI. 1919, onboard the yacht "Sofia", standing on the Belgrade port, one after the other was picked up: The French Admiral Furtu, the Italian senior officer D. Di Faso, the Serb F. Vilfan – Captain of the Corvette, Czechoslovak diplomat H. Irzhik. British Admiral Tragbridge greets them. Each separately regrets the absence of the Romanian representative Karp and the American Smith. This meeting can be considered symbolic for the management of the Danube to be carried out in a new, different way, as well as revealing whose presence and voices will be decisive in the river system in question

(without the participation of the United States because of their receding from European affairs).

Ten days earlier, according to the Treaty of Neuilly, it became known that the Danube system would be made up of the former "European Commission for the Danube" – from the delta of the river to Braila, led by the UK, France, Italy, and Romania. From this point, upstream competencies are assumed by a new entity "one international commission". Bulgaria is designated as its member, together with the other coastal: Germany with the double representation of Bavaria and Wuertenberg, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania, as well as the three non-coastal of the EDC – Britain, France, and Italy.

The Danube Coastal Commission (DCC) was 1856 also used for the prototype, due to the obsession with its functions by Austria-Hungary. The river navigation is about to be radically converted. In this system is associated and suffered defeat in the world armed conflict Bulgaria.

Objectives, tasks, and motivations in the proposed study.

In connection with the functional significance of the established comprehensive international institution, the character markers left, and to a large extent the almost unknown participation in it of Bulgaria, derive the main motives that determined the need to disclose Their interconnected activity, the ways of functioning, the opportunities, the real achievements, the stratification in their development, the answers to the emerging challenges, the messages conveyed, etc.

Also, taking into account the relative weight of the EDC in the vision of the geopolitical categories and constructors in the mixed international relations, especially after the mid-1930s onwards, together with the place in Bulgaria, constitute additional grounds to focus attention on the subject stated.

Also, there is a need to fill in the characteristics and definitions with similar geographical or non-relative identification as a year of publication of surveys, reviews or chronologies. We are talking about track events, factors and trends that led to the familiar formulations in the Treaty of Neuilly in 1919, as well as in accordance with the revealed concrete forms of the Bulgarian

diplomatic reciprocity and the foreign towards Bulgaria for a period of 110 Years – from 1878 to 1988 In both cases, the authors' aspiration to the material's complexity or any other views that led to the subject of the matter in question. The study of HR. Hristov is centred on the Peripetias who led the commissions of the Paris Peace Conference to the decisions to modify the territorial configuration of Bulgaria for the benefit of the neighbours. In this way, the provisions regarding the Danube remain outside the author's sight. As for the book of M. Mateeva and Hr. Tepavicharov, in her ECD, does not find a place among the representative entities in the diplomatic relations and practice of the Kingdom of Bulgaria.

Bulgaria's participation in the IDC with its assigned powers in the accepted order of power to the fullest extent determines the country to be the bearer of the attributes of official border representation in the diplomatic relations of the old continent and a legitimate entity in this high Honored occupation. The unit in question operates following the traditional rules, requirements and subordination definitions of the diplomatic service of the Kingdom, as well as the valid international agreements, understandings and other conditions of political and protocol Character. However, it has a specific profile, way, and style of operation, as well as the application area. A complex of factors and circumstances influence the Bulgarian historical research to be wandering from such inclusiveness of the kingdom as a recognizable form of complicity among the richly nuanced palette in international reciprocity during the interwar period and a few years afterwards. Putting similar diopter shortsightedness in the same problem decades after the previous, obviously in no way helps to clarify the interlinkages on significant topics of the national past. However, this is undoubtedly a speech, not only for the empathy of Bulgaria towards a large-scale business, communication and navigation project but also for its inclusion in the challenges that over time occupy leading positions in International relations with their geopolitical preorders, as well as in order to model the fate of the countries in the Danube valley.

Therefore all taken together will provide opportunities for revealing some unknown, as well as further specified the number of little known facts and events of a national, regional and international nature. Also to establish a range of dependencies and relationships, to give a particular direction or

nuance, occupied or abandoned position according to the conclusions, manner of conduct and the articulated choice of the circle of countries geographically belonging to the Danube communication, Former members or others, called ' non-coastal '. It is also important to be able to determine how many political configurations of agreements and gravities in international relations resonate with the representatives of the IDC and to what extent they influence the decisions taken by the institution. For the same reasons, it appears that the part tracing the political incarnation of the IDC after September 1940, expressed in the full "immersion" during the next four-year period of the Danube system in the "German water". The preconditions in the distinguished circumstances are the main points of the issues in question, with a clear deviation to focus on the causal searches in relation to the wide palette of the political manifestations of the IDC/Bulgaria in international level, as well as dimensional in terms of correlations the Kingdom/IDC and the Kingdom/Danube. Similar is the scheme and after the change in its identity. In general, several thematic rounds are outlined:

- The definitions of the Treaty of Neuilly to the Danube and subsequent events in this regard;
- The IDC as a regulatory factor in the localized area of contractual-legal definitions, internal state, objectives, difficulties, decisions, nature, periods, achievements of The collective institution;
- Bulgaria as a personal participant in its affairs; Central government, participations of directly related institutions; Guiding definitions, public sentiment, lost profits, available insights, objective realities;
- The Commission in contact with the political situation of the old continent; Bulgaria in the same his pedestal with the extrapolations to the resulting international upheaval consequences and final results.

In this sense, the considerations, parameters, and focus of the specific topics should be focused on the following aspects:

- Bulgaria – in its orientation to the Danube area;

- The Neuilly judgments according to the country's positioning in the Danube System;
- IDC, EDC as basic definitions and messages for Danube navigation in the post-war status quo;
- Elaboration of the main regulatory law of the Danube Commercial shipping – FSD (1920/1921) IDC – structure, functions, participants, activity (1919 – 1933/1934);
- Bulgaria in the partnership of the IDC; Opportunities for favourable economic orientation, state-political visions on the topic;
- International relations and their malicious interference in the work of the IDC (1934 – 1938), the IDC at the crest of its challenges (1938 – 1940), Munich' 38 Danube variant;
- The big change of the Danube and the replaced foundations- IDC/"Temporary Rules" (IX. 1940);
- The Bulgarian hard changed order, participants, new definitions, expectations, etc. ...

The formulated objectives, tasks and motives in labour also predetermine the method of investigation – identification and selection of the necessary factual material, its consistent, comparative and critical analysis, leading to synthesis and summaries as a result.

In the introductory part of the dissertation, attention is focused on the overview, condition, and characteristics of the Historiographic massif and its interpretation, as well as revealing the springs on the subject. As regards the national historiography studies with the orientation of the river and it's related navigable, economic, political, social, etc. Activities and relationships after 1878 onwards, expectations should not be large. The reasons for such forethought are based on: the inherited markers transmitted, the symbolic initiative to the water navigation of the indigenous peoples, the country's relative attitude, the

uncoordinated rules of the commercial navigation between Countries in the region, etc.

The lack of solid material to attract the attention of researchers, and especially the political aspects provoking a marked interest, gives the theme fleeting rebranding. The Reave testimonies with such a focus can be found in the deferred documentation of some ministries – most notably the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Religion (MFAR), some structural units with profile railway and ports, among certain Entrepreneurial associations, in the edition of Engineers and architects – Magazine BIAD, but not on the pages of historical or thematic profiled titles. It was only after nine decades that such an important event, like the London Danube Conference of 1883 – Bulgaria's position was commented and intertwined in the event history of the foreign policy of the country.

The large scale measures are taken by Bulgaria in the national emancipation and territorial transformation during the years of the Balkan Wars and subsequent the World military conflict attracted a solid number of native researchers, participants in the events. There is also a wide palette of chroniclers in this militaristic triad – politicians, military, palace entourage, row members under the flags, etc. Their revelations relate to areas where the Danube-related theme is, to a large extent, largely lateral. In the penultimate military year, a study is printed on the aspects of the valid river-law provisions for the Danube, which only after a very short time have changed and begin to obey a different contractual basis, philosophy, and rules. With regards to the interest in general to the topic outside the country, it is impressive that in the end year of the conflict, the address of the publication is too distant from the old continent.

As for the modern explorers, with a clearly defined orientation to the events on the Danube in connection with the political challenges of Austria-Hungary, as well as the separately identified complications on the Bulgarian section of the river during the years of the First World War, should undoubtedly be related to the name of V. Lechev.

Ozone-targeted impulses to the realm of international river commercial shipping with the conclusion of peace contracts after the Great War and the

accompanying processes, gradually orienting the attention of authors, contemporaries and participants in these events, as well as researchers during later periods. With the ensuing movement and the creation of a multinational composition in coordinated activities on the Danube, including with Bulgarian participation, such as the IDC mainly, also the EDC, interest in the system being practised, the mechanisms of its functioning, the past Stages, etc., with the ultimate aim of making this available and commented on by specialists with a broad professional orientation. In this connection, a very diverse register of titles appears.

According to the stated issues, the leading position should be assigned to the work of the Bulgarian representative in the IDC G. Lazarov. Rather, it is a history of assessment on an extremely important event in the Danube law-making as far as possible. It is mostly about the Paris conference (1920/1921) on the drafting of an agreement on the basic rules of river navigation, known as the final status of the Danube (FSD). D. Lazarov is an active participant in the forum, as an official representative of the Kingdom.

Another Bulgarian author, but already research followed on a European scale the formation, developments and practical implementation of the phenomenon "international river Shipping" is B. Morfov. Especially valuable is the fact that it also covers the processes in maritime navigation, in symbiosis with the international rule of this two-compact material. Work is the fruit of the author's multi-annual studies, very current sounding in its European dimensions for its time, that it has not lost its importance and currently. The economic results of the "stir" on the Danube fall in the sight of the eminent Bulgarian economic research. Chakalov, slightly different aspects offered to the attention of specialists another contemporary of the events St. Kashev Geographical and anthropologic – are significant for Ann. Ishirkov The low – for B. Kissiakov.

The publications of the Italian author Rossetti and the Hungarian specialist Kvasai should be noted for the foreign representation, according to the Mirror phenomenon of works by the active figures in the institutional units in the Danube after 1919. They both at different times perform the representative functions of their countries in the IDC and are in close relationship with their colleague G. Lazarov.

Research fields of the tracked topic are enriched thanks to the interest of many foreign authors. Although the focus in their labours is to be determined on aspects of international law and approach the throne in this sense, in particular with the EDC, the references to the 'impressive activity' of the IDC cannot be left unchecked. Also, there are some landmark publications that, either directly or indirectly, reveal the intentions, judgments or positions of certain countries concerning the Danube region in cross-road for international relations years between the two World Wars. The state of play of Danube shipping in the post-war years was evaluated in the specialized report of the American emissary in the League of Nations (LN) D. Walker. With a double, more extensive period is the Jubilee edition of the IDC since 1930

Even the less refined review of publications published on the Eve and the beginning of the Second World War, mostly among the leading countries of the European democratic Community, clearly reveals the dominant thesis of the authors. It states that the managing political initiatives and moves in the two decades of this round pursued a single objective – the economic prosperity of the Danube region. They have, however, faced conceptual categories, subject to a very divergent value system. The German writers, they express markers of the castable ideological beliefs, during the same period, in turn, printed the writings, which helpfully serve the imperial doctrine of the Third Reich.

After the Second World War newly formed consecutively in the history of the Danube the self-titled Committee (DK) changed its composition, ways of management, philosophy, political commitments. The fashionably presented and modern-sounding study on the topic by a colleague should be smelled. However, the dominant team of researchers is outlining the quarrels. Their diligence, which has become a peculiar fashion in the early post-war decades, is motivated by the ever-increasing legal cases between the Danubian States in connection with the utilization of river resources – power plants, industrial sites, Environmental arrangements, fishing, etc. The names of their works, with variations and some exceptions, follows the same centre – International law/status, regime, management.

It is not specified that it is essentially a speech about the current version of Danube navigation along with with the fitting "side" circumstances of the use of the water phenomenon. Regardless of the misleading element, for the

reason that the pre-history of the phenomenon can not be omitted, there are brief references in this regard – previous management structures, legislative acts, prerogatives of commissions, etc. In this sense, the past regulatory attempts are revealed in the swollen space – between them the FSD, the IDC, but as a professional temptation for the authors – mostly the vicissitudes around the EDC.

Bulgarian researchers also follow the described framework. The compiled collection is titled in the traditionally established way and focus its efforts on the current aspects of the same issues. This is the international regime adopted on the Danube after 1948 and its shipping. What is new is that real landmarks acquire non-ordinate sounding for their time topics – measures related to river pollution, fishing regulations, etc.

The host of authors in the country, indicative of two dozen years after the end of the Second World War, definitely intensified their interest in the Danube related topics, which is still valid to this day. We are talking about most general writings as content, as well as strictly profiled – ecological, hydrological, engineering, industrial, fishing, etc. Particularly in (local) Bulgarian dimensions. Also, there are not a few tourist guides, as well as a short survey of cities, villages, reserves, isolated areas of the Bulgarian part of Danube. All this enriches the knowledge and contributes to the even more established perception of the natural phenomenon in its complex perception such as care, diligence, preservation, mutual trust.

In comparative terms, the contemporary specialized national historical literature is significantly "silent" about principle to the Bulgarian presence on the Danube during the interwar period and subsequently to 1944, as well as the characteristic for the natural system of international commitment. In tracing the foreign policy relations of Bulgaria in the years in question, the sporadic mention of the IDC rather appears under the "cap" of the "Danube" in its respective wide variations-Danube region, equatorial, geopolitical configurations from the Danube countries, neighbours of Bulgaria with the identification of geographic identity, bilateral and multilateral political and business arrangements among the community and with factors outside it, variants of Danube agreements, technical Facilities across the river, etc.

Somewhere in the pages of this relatively small volume of literature, the rarely articulated name "IDC" or, more precisely, the predominantly indirect susceptibility to the availability of such an institution. Thus, in a piecemeal way, it becomes known that such important innovations are due to it, such as the placing of odometer and warning signs on the river, the country's initial steps in hydrological readings, the navigable standards, Special facilities in jetties, ferry connections, some enrichment interventions on the Bulgarian coast, etc. After all, her involvement in the solid trade exchange of the country on the Danube, the securing of the tourist voyages, the various forms of communication between the countries in the valley.

During the inter-war period, for reasons of different circumstances, generation followed inclinations and the valid then public and political preorders against the Danube, except after the mid-30s, the IDC and the share of the Bulgarian Presence in it, their activities, their initiative, their relations with a wide range of counterparties in view of their assigned coordinating functions, etc., in the country are largely poorly known and veiled. In the subsequent years after the mid-1940s with the heavy stamp of the royal status and the new realities, the interest is even weaker. In this way, as well as in the purely regional general definition, the traces are left in the specifics of the national administrative, metrological, economic and political realities. Of course, this is the situation concerning the extrapolated treasure events from the international political calendar, with their assigned sector of presences, tendency, including Bulgaria.

In the wide range of the theme, the historiographic interest manifested outside the country after 1945 is spread in several directions. One of them refers to experience and theoretical material is given legal statements on natural phenomena, the other – specific studies for the Danube region in its foreign policy and business aspects, and finally – more summary policy writings Of countries and coalitions centred around peaceful, military and other types of situations. Understandably, the specific expectations should not be excessive, as every national historiography on his own is jealous and, as a priority, deals with his cares, his problems, and his horizons.

The specially selected approach to the presentation of historiography in a comparative plan national/foreign, and in sequential order for separate

periods, clearly demonstrates the very few titles from the Bulgarian side on the topic, in the same dependence and authors, tempted by it. That finding is one more motive for the orientation of such a study.

As for the used spring base, which, incidentally, is the main building in the proposed study, it consists of different composition, character and authorship documents. The most valuable testimonies in compiling the picture of the problem circle around the topic are stored in the massif of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Religion (MFAR). Among its kilometric and towering folders It is located and the dedicated collection of the IDC. It is an irreplaceable source concerning the basic information on the comprehensive activities of the Commission or those that are susceptible to its ownership of events, particularly relevant because of the swollen regional area. We are talking about a partial set of minutes of its sessions, some of its Jubilee editions, established relations with a number of international institutions League of Nations (LN), chambers of Commerce, Permanent Court in The Hague), status of the institution in the Prestates, Organized international conferences or meetings on the theme of Danube...

The other part of the deferred information refers to the personal commitment, initiative, behavioural attitudes and presence of Bulgaria to the IDC and separately to the country in the system of the multinational institution. This range of topics and dependencies becomes discoverable by the archive material, representing the file of the Bulgarian delegate in the IDC with the MFAR and vice versa; Decisions and resolutions of the Ministry itself; Exquisite, provided also by the specific fate of the expert opinions in accordance with the recommendations made by individual or a group of specialists on certain problems; Final conclusions from the responsible figures in the sphere of foreign policy relations of the Kingdom (Foreign minister, Prime minister, political director or secretary-general of the Ministry of Finance), etc.

An irrevocable part of such a type of documentation represents the deliveries and the drilling carried out by the Bulgarian diplomatic representations abroad and of the foreign people in the country. Therefore, through the whole complex of testimonies, it becomes possible to determine the attitude of the rulers in Bulgaria in principle to the northern natural phenomenon as such, and to how much under the specific conditions between

the two world wars they tend to rely on the characteristics, advantages, and opportunities that are provided.

Of special importance to follow the main aspects of the topic are the materials of the international legal nature – the Treaty of Neuilly, FSD, Parliament in this sequence, "Acord's", "Modus Vivendi". In this case, the documentary applications that have added to their creations the foreign researchers Fandikov, Rossetti, Buhach, Pochkaveva, etc. are proving extremely useful.

Finally, to this very colourful picture of archival media on the subject, the documents should be added, deposited in the specialized institutions of the country-the Department of Shipping to the Main Directorate of Railways and Ports, the high railway and Port Council, the Directorate for Accommodation of Refugees, as separate collections in the State Archives – Ruse, personal testimonies, etc.

The nature of the chosen theme, its specificity, and the fact that the period up to the formation of the IDC in no way represented a "naked field" imply the obligation to trace the roots of modern interstate In the Danube navigation. The beginning is set at the very end of the 18th century, gradually filling in with specific content the terms "international rivers" and "free shipping regime" in the years after the Vienna Congress (1815), when regulations on the Rhine, Meuse (Moz), Moselle, The shelter was subsequently covered by the Vistula, the Dnieper and the Prut, and in 1831 – Elba, Weser and Elms.

At the same time, the large Danube remains outside any such agreements. The reason is that Turkey is not a party in the Vienna Congress, but also visibly in any way and is not found to participate in the process in question. Only a few tens of years later, at the Paris Congress 1856, the eastern Empire had to join the Viennese River rules, but in a specific way. Under the agreements of the French capital and in connection with the announcement of the Danube for an international river, completely free for wide shipping access, is a serious problem with the sand-like sea part.

It is about the approaches to its delta and the carelessness of The Porte's to make technical efforts in connection with the cleaning of the sand sediments

that have been formed there. Despite the inconveniences, formal rules for free shipping remain valid for the Danube countries. As an exception, the temporary care to provide the necessary conditions for the restoration of the river's movement at its confluence in the Black Sea, -marked by the port town of Sulina, respectively, to Issakcha, is entrusted to a specially established committee. It is named the European Danube Commission (EDC), which includes representatives of France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey. For the management of the rest is foreseen the Danube Coastal Commission (DCC) in the composition: Bavaria, Wuerttemberg, Austria, Turkey, accompanied by an option for the participation of the Danubian Principalities Serbia, Moldavia and Vlachia. Incumbent her rights under the same contract, defined to take over the function of EDC.

The main purpose of the DCC is held to ensure undisturbed international traffic from the beginning to the end of the navigable Danube. This, however, proves to be a fiction, as it is not given the opportunity to be constituted and to enter into its role. The reason is that a year later, in 1857, when the quadruple regional format prepared the documents of the Committee, Austria's explicit insistence staging Danube shipping to be a trademark only of the coastal States. The other European arrangement as opposed to the restrictive definition and does not reveal a sanction for its operation. The main purpose of the DCC is held to ensure undisturbed international traffic from the beginning to the end of the navigable Danube. This, however, proves to be a fiction, as it is not given the opportunity to be constituted and to enter into its role. The reason is that a year later, in 1857, when the quadruple regional format prepared the documents of the Committee, Austria's explicit insistence staging Danube shipping to be a trademark only of the coastal States. The other European arrangement as opposed to the restrictive definition and does not reveal a sanction for its operation.

The planned intentions of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1856 in respect of free international navigation on the river are realized in reverse of the predictions (in inversion) – with international sea part (real practice, aside from the design), and Limited in timetables meaning the rest of the way (also acting but reverse of the prescriptions contained in the contract). In the case of an otherwise permanently established scheme, the Danube monarchy creates

undisturbed possibilities for the consolidation of the Imperial fleet and the river removal of all possible competition in this regard. The delineated picture changed after the First World War, and not in a radical way.

The introductory part includes some clarifications regarding the contract-law terminology. For the reason that the Danube is unthinkable to return to the bosom of its previous palliative, the realities of its newly constructed international (international) river status require some clarification. In its more neutral nuances, figuring as "international waterway", the term "Fleuve International" is defined by G. Corneju as "a water flow which in its natural navigable part divides (border river) or crosses (river, passing) territories of Countries, and which is subject to a special legal regime of international governance ". International rivers are an integral part of the territories of the countries through which they pass. The water heater between two or more non-withstanding located countries should be determined along the centerline of the river. However, the need to secure fault shipping, both for themselves and others, replaces the distinguishing outlines of the most deepwater indications of the mid-channel.

There are no discrepancies in the understanding that, since these are rivers that enter into dependencies with variants of territorial divisions between coastal States, there is a need for international legal regulation in terms of their use. International river Law is not subordinate to a particular codification. The specific content that is supposed to reconcile its norms is based on three basic criteria. Political – the boundaries between the coastal States; Geographical – the waterway to reach the sea; and functional – introducing clear conditions for undisturbed shipping.

Undoubtedly, in the present case, the third factor is the most important. Understanding it becomes possible after passing through a period of drafting rules, with subsequent promulgation by involved states to schedules in the OSD international law regime. Thus, a free and secure movement of vessels is established, both between the counterparties in the regional communication and beyond. For illustration, data from the Romanian Statistical Yearbook may be indicated. According to their testimony, in Sulina in 1937. For example, the passage of the following number of ships by nationalities/flags/: Of Great

Britain – 46; Belgium – 2; Bulgaria – 1; Germany – 59; Holland – 3; Greece – 163; Denmark – 1; Egypt – 12; Yugoslavia – 10; Italy – 125; Norway – 1; Panama – 1; France – 4; Hungary – 12; USSR – 12; Turkey – 13; Sweden – 1.

The FSD remains the universal decisive agreement in the legal world within the meaning of international law until its replacement in September 1940. Episodic reinsurance acts on subjects unaffected by the statute until declared void, in most Cases remain only on paper. This circumstance means that we are talking about a precisely crafted international document. In the next four years, the navigable regime (where it is possible to be carried out) is determined by the so-called "Temporary rules". The predicate of Germany in the initiative in their drafting and implementation, as well as later in the exercise of managerial functions and practices until 1944, is undisputed.

After the Second World War, a fundamentally different regulation of the navigation on the Danube was conducted, resting on a mono institutional structure. In 1949, the Danube Commission (DC) was constituted based on the Convention on the Danube navigation regime adopted in the previous year. Several objective factors determine the quantitative age of the legal basis in terms of Danube issues. It became a centre of attraction for a large number of lawyers researchers. At the end of the introductory arrangement is a brief overview of the Bulgarian participation in the international Danube events from 1878 to the final of the First World War (October 1918). These actions are based on the insistence of official Sofia for the shared inclusion of the country to the composition of the EDC. The two cases of the ambitions in this respect are examined. The first concerns the London Danube Conference, which took place at the beginning of 1883, which gathers to extend the functioning of the Committee by more than two decades. The second is related to the treaty between the Quartet of May 1918, according to which the SPD was renamed into the Danube Estuaries Commission (DEC) with unchanged perimeter, but with a new composition, including with a participating Bulgaria. The recent finale of the war frustrates the intentions of a reconstruction of the EDC in the DEC. In the international and military circumstances formed during the period from the liberation to the end of the First World War, the Bulgarian state was to rank among the participants in the SPD in vain.

The dissertation consists of two separate parts, each of them comprising several thematic headings. Part one is entitled: "Danubian Cases, post-war regulations and Bulgaria (1918-1933)" and stop at the starting point of the contractual legal basis with its subsequent application of the European project in practice. That is, we are talking about examining the provisions of the Treaty of Neuilly concerning the Danube and the drafting of the FCD at the conference in Paris (1920/1921) with the participation of a Bulgarian representative. It is followed by a text which reveals the activities of the IDC in the years until 1933, a period marked by the most serious and constructive introductions and achievements in the work of the IDC, partly due to the personal Bulgarian presence in it in the face of G. Lazarov.

Unlike the people who were moving before and during the Paris Peace Conference (1919), the unfortunate forecasts for Thracian and Macedonian territories, the case in line with the Bulgarian Danube border undoubtedly seemed incomparably calmer. After the conclusion of the truce in November 1918 on the Danube, the agreed military authorities were accommodated. The main force command from the Anthanta introduces the appropriate order in the river navigation. At the conference in the French capital, the specially composed body "Commission on internationalization of ports, roads, and railroad" is united in the understanding to disclose the founding principles on which to later base the overall Spatial system. First of all, it is about the internationalization of the navigable rivers of the old continent; Follows full freedom of navigation, the equality of flags and respect for the sovereign rights of coastal States. In such a spirit are the clauses relating to the defeated and the coastal countries of the Danube, including Bulgaria. Section II of chapter II of the Treaty of Neuilly refers to the traced matter. The section is entitled 'Danube clauses'. The first of these members with order number 219 proclaims the international character of the Danube from the German city of Ulm to the Black Sea, together with "any navigable part of this river network". "Full equality" is proclaimed on the international roads, the sub-estates, properties, and flags of Allied and corporated forces. It is further written that the same applies to coastal States and those benefiting from the most favoured clause. The following clauses set out the agreed vision of vision for the post-war institutional structure of the Danube. The principles are fully valid for Bulgaria as well. Her name in the "visionary" part is twofold, moreover in business and

engaging for Danube cause functions – as representation in the International Danube Commission (IDC), as well as in the elaboration of the final status of the Danube (FCD). In a reassuring tone, the texts of the number of fees levied and the rules of transit are also sound. It is pointed out that the criteria for the number of fees will be determined 'in a fair manner', solely concerning the costs of maintaining and improving the river'. And further – the transit of goods, cargo and passengers will be carried out according to internationally valid rules, contracts and agreements. In the case of advertised intentions, it is necessary to note that, according to the obligations imposed under the peace treaty by Neuilly, the reductions of the Bulgarian border outlines from the south and from the west to the interior of the country, accompanied by the unconditional economic sanctioning of the country is in no way comparable in view of the Danube part. Such destructive postulates do not befall it and there are no reasons to be expected in the future. The following text refers to the drafting of the FCD in Paris in 1920/1921, also with the participation of the Bulgarian representative in the course of several conference meetings on this occasion. In early August 1920, the first round of debates was held, followed by a temporary interruption. The hosts offer text and document structure to serve as a baseline for the discussions. Considering, however, the short time to prepare the original of the Danube status, some of the positions offered in it are coordinated among the great powers of the victorious coalition; Another – should be customized as a genuine French initiative. Moreover, it is not to be bypassed that the conference involved full five smaller countries than the winner's cohort, with coastal domination of the river. The overall composition of the institution is complemented by a further 4th with the same geographical ownership, however, with political sanctions imposed under the recently signed peace treaties, but either way with the relative weight of the deliberative vote.

Regardless of the controversy, misunderstandings, and confrontations that have arisen in the course of the conference, they still managed to make a working version (prototype) of the FSD. Its texts are regulated by a vote at first reading. As already had the opportunity to note, the procedure in question takes a long time. At the autumn meeting approximately the spirit of the prepared status, its type, and content, clears up the structure of the document, the regulatory mechanisms of the shipping regime on the river, and more

importantly the structure, prerogatives and To synchronize the levers of the intended organization. It should be noted that the representative of the official Sofia does not hide his excitement from the perceived sincere and business tone of the meeting in Paris, to the extent that the participation of his will become a contagious Example for other colleagues.

In November 1920, the conference was provisionally dissolved with an accepted exemplary version of the FSD and possibilities for a more detailed reflection of the final appearance of the document. The International Forum in April 1921 gathers in its third session. The draft OAD is about to be examined, corrected and supplemented at second reading.

The third and final session of the Conference on the Danube device in Paris, just like the previous ones, was accompanied by heated disputes and the existing real opportunity at some point not to end successfully. As already noted, many delegations renew their previous proposals, some of which are entirely contrary to the compromises reached in first reading options. In a business, order follow specific remarks about the replacement of terminology, word order, etc. Taking into account that the regulation itself at second reading is sufficiently wasteful, the reasons for the duration of the meeting and its attendant difficulties are clarified. As in the past period, the Romanian delegation did not divide with its squabble. This behaviour at certain times places the conference in front of the possibility of a new interruption. Such an undesirable finale was prevented by the efforts of the representatives of the great Powers and some of the other participants.

The FSD was signed by all the delegations of the Conference on 20. VII. 1921, and entered into force on 1. X. 1922 the Bulgarian representative defined it as "Magna Carta" for the Danube, and in the other classical language it would sound like "catechism". In contrast to the stylistic and exemplary tone in the territorial, economic and war-restrictive clauses of the Treaties of Versailles, Neuilly, Saint-Germain, Trianon, also Sever, FSD as a profiled integral part of the post-war agreement Perceived as their conceptual, practical, linguistic, even political counter version. Along with the orderly and reshaped territorial outlook of parts of the old continent and the inconsistent fate of the affected populations, the economic doom of States and peoples, and the pervading political counter version, in precisely certain clauses of the four contracts listed

and their fixed continuation – The Statute, launched a different philosophy, there are other types of ventures.

The participation of the great consensus triad in the combination does not go beyond the regulated general contractual process. On a personal level, they are not charged with any extraordinary credentials, they are equal to everyone else, and in their action in the not Danubian countries are with the mission to be regulators and balancing artists in the design intent.

It is undoubtedly a bold intention to implement new and changed expectations from the international negotiating practice. The principles, rules, and orders set out in the newly adopted FSD are fundamentally different from the previous relations, especially between the Danubian and in general involved in the case in question. A certain prerequisite for this is the placement of a much more efficient and facilitated basis for navigation, finance, customs rules, communications, etc. The document has a genuine desire to form a unifying climate between countries.

It should be noted that the FSD is a document as democratic as possible in spirit and content among the range of similar agreements for other international rivers. There are no discriminatory clauses that harm a coastal State to a certain extent at the expense of another. For example, in the Rhine agreement, it is regulated the possibility for France to use the water force of the river around the border German-French zone, as well as to deviate from its current irrigation needs. Belgium is given the right in the same way to feed the Rhine-Mosel canal. Similar asymmetry in the FSD in any form was not present on its agenda.

The following text concerns the activities of the IDC until the end of 1933. The Commission representation shall be collected twice during the year, respectively, in the summer and winter sessions, seats being established in different Danube towns. It is briefly in Budapest, and then it follows Bratislava, Vienna, etc. The institution's management is changed over half a year to the rotation principle in alphabetical order among the participating countries. The presiding figure prepares and conducts the sessions, heads the Enforcement Bureau, which assists him in the overall work.

The aim is to gradually introduce a complete reconciliation of the activity carried out on the river. The Commission started by drafting rules of Procedure (1921), later clarifying the rules of Navigation (1924) and Transit (1923), introducing unification in the standard's apparatus and the Metrological Standards (1922), Police Regulations (1924), and another number of others. Understanding of cooperation with other international organizations – the League of Nations (LN), The Hague Court, various chambers of commerce, and communications companies is achieved. On the tides goes the negotiation process measure under the regulation of the ship regime through the neuralgic point of the River – Iron Gate. On this subject, it is necessary to conduct several extraordinary sessions, but this problem always remains delicate for the MAC and takes a lot of its energy in the late 20s and early 30s. If the Committee during the initial period with all the conditionality arises friction between winners and defeated, after the mid-20th century.

In the early 30s, the "romantic" period of the existence of the IDC goes to its final due to excessive "saturation" of international relations with political growth. Germany's gaining economic potential clearly states its interest in the Danube-Balkan region. Berlin leaders skillfully use the situation of the fading global economic crisis to become the age-exchange capacity of the Danube in an expertly followed strategy. With the gradual imposition of such tendencies, the Commission is sweeping the global political turmoil on the old continent. In her activity she is involved in the other reality – trials, dramatism, and difficult articulation.

The conditionality of the chronology, the nature, the location, the consistency and the content of the material being traced, requires that after the end of the first part the attention is focused specifically on the Bulgarian mostly political views on Danube issues in its diversity. The unifying title is "notes on Bulgarian Danube policy". The subheadings illustrate the missed opportunities for the full enjoyment of the country from the advantages that the Danube provides, the participation in the IDC, the inclusion of profitable economic schemes. It is about "Danube – the opportunity for encouragement orientation", "Danube – the Bulgarian action". The factors for such a neglected attitude towards the North Underrun natural granted are numerous. The eminent Bulgarian geographer An. Ishirkov in his studios draws attention to the

predicate in this regard. "We Bulgarians are land people, for us the water surface is a bogeyman, the ship – a tree without root... Floating water instead of expanding our movement, it stops... We are slaves of the Earth; she feeds us... But it keeps us at the same time jealous of strong seals; we have closely linked our destiny to it. The lack of the fleet and the fear of the sea transmitted a distinctive imprint on all our history and anthropogeography."

Part Two of the dissertation is entitled "The dramatic International Danube Commission; Bulgaria not so... (1934-1940)" The starting studio "from stress to erosion" looks at the difficulties experienced by the MAC after Hitler's arrival in power, his revisionist crusade against the Versailles system, including the Danube. It all starts with the territorial-administrative reorganizations from January 1934. All the existing provincial provisions in the legal framework pass under the supreme jurisdiction of the central institutions in Berlin. In this situation, the question of the double representation of Bavaria and Wuertenberg in the IDC is raised. Germany insists on preserving the status quo by relying on the Treaty of Versailles, the Western forces adhere to the "each country with one representative" principle. The Bulgarian Foreign Ministry is also included in the controversy. A large number of opinions are sought, reaching the palliative opinion in voting the kingdom to join the "incompetence vote". This means transferring the matter to other international institutions. That is also the decision of the IDC – given that the ' internal ' options for an agreement are exhausted, the case is forwarded to the on-line. If Berlin does not agree with its conclusion, the next instance is the standing court in The Hague. In the meantime, in the summer of 1936, Germany, in turn, announced a complete transformation of the type of river commissions, its participation in the ECD, etc. Her stubborn efforts in this direction and the unfavourable international climate for their realization led to the cardinal measure of Berlin.

The Reich involves the Danube to the community of rivers that are deprived of internationally bound bonds in the national territory of the State. On 14. XI. 1936, Germany denounced the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles on International rivers, which fully reversed the political, economic and spatial picture in the Danube region. On 41-Watt (winter 1936) session IDC is collected with a reduced composition – instead of 11 – 9. This raises debates around the quorum. In general, however, its composition is favourable to the fact that the

deficit of kilometres in the uppermost part of the river is in no way threatening for the remainder of the internationally regulated regime.

The Bulgarian delegate, in addition to his current work in the Commission and the Presidency, is too often required to submit his expert conclusions to the MFAR case. The foreign policy department, due to the rather circumstances surrounding the revisionist actions of Germany, as opposed to its indifferent behaviour during the previous period, is currently visibly increasing attention around the Danube theme.

"Gradual cutting off the international Danube 1938/1939" is the next topic in the second part of the dissertation. In 1938, Germany, as the prime cause and the induced impulsive phenomena in European international relations, persistently possessed the daily life of the continental political calendar. If in the year the emerging political trends and the incoming realities are likely to be classified as very disturbing and worrying, they are extrapolated to the MHP without caveats-shaking. On 12.III.1938, the German Wehrmacht entered Austrian territory to bring about the famous Anschlos of the country neighbouring the Reich. This unprecedented act of political reality has immediate consequences for the coming of the ice and reentry in its usual business rhythm the Danube. Germany extends its national possessions of the river by 343 km., as a total they become 708 km., and under this indicator ranks second only after Romania. The terminological definition of the case is "German state waterway". The forced relocation of the seat from Vienna is imminent. The German authorities declared that they would not create difficulties, but would cooperate, including the holding of the summer session in the Austrian capital. It is the representation of the IDC with another participant, it is assumed that its headquarters to move to Belgrade. Following the regulation by the IDC of the withdrawal of its headquarters from Vienna in Belgrade, Germany landed from a possible, even most formal, relationship with the symbolism of the Danube organization. This change fully releases the initiative of the Nazi leadership concerning its plans and intentions towards the geographical vector in question.

In this sense, on his part in the summer of 1938 was organized an exploratory mission of Marcius and Baur in the capitals of the Danubian States, including in Sofia, regarding their readiness ECD to change. It refers to this the

Covenant Triad – Britain, France, and Italy to be removed and Germany to head the Danube communication. The countries visited are sceptical about the plan launched by the Reich's functionaries. In essence, however, the completed tour of the tandem represents a clear warning of the planned offensive process in the region, the mechanisms of which are proper. In anticipation of the trend in question, the democratic Western states are making concessions to Romania on the EDC line, and as far as Bulgaria coincides with the Thessaloniki agreement of the summer of 1938 on the abolition of the restrictive arms clauses.

By revealing the direction of the territorial transformations of the old continent, it follows its fast-paced metronomically measured rhythm. It passes only a month and a few days from the quadruple Munich collusion for the Czechoslovakian Sudetti and their passage to the Reich when the "artistic" solution in its double-reduced composition (Germany, Italy) for the first Viennese arbitration was followed. On 2.XI.1938 the tandem regulates Czechoslovakia, or as far as it is left, to "allocate" in favour of Hungary the territories of Zakarpatska Ukraine and southern parts of Slovakia. This circumstance in the most direct way afflicts the situation along the Danube.

The change is linked to the mileage changes along the Danube trajectory between two neighbouring countries in the valley. Both Czechoslovakia and Hungary must be participants in the MAC, but now with a differencing "profile" in this community. Czechoslovakia remains with the port of Bratislava and another 20 km. from the river, but all the rest of the coast passes to Hungary. In the layout of the situation, understanding between them cannot be expected either in a bilateral plan or within the framework of the IDC.

The Commission, at another gathering in its new residence in Belgrade, was placed in a very delicate situation. Full of trials and orderly nebulous should look at its next collections, as well as difficulties in carrying out its regulatory functions on the river.

Germany, on the other hand, too little excites the dilemmas faced by the MHP. She steadfastly follows her interests and her destined path, regardless of the way of their realization. On 1.III.1939 in Bucharest, under a completely legitimate procedure and supported by Italy, Germany became an equal

participant in the EDC. The event is accepted by the international community as a reassuring tone in the action of Berlin, and especially by the participants in the IDC. It should be noted immediately that the elevated mood in the MAC lasts less than two weeks. On 15. III. 1939, the Nazi military formations entered Czechoslovakia, and for the day occupied the few lefts of the sovereign State. The Slovak part, through the territory of which passes entirely "Czechoslovak Danube", formally on the same date proclaimed "Independent and independent", three days later is now located under the Protectorate of Germany. In such a case, Berlin, in the instant, dispels the consideration of the situation with the non-Danubian states in the form of the IDC, whether to enter into a tone with the political inclinations of the Organization's coastal States.

Undoubtedly, for Germany, it is irrelevant to what workload is its presumption against the countries of the Danube River – arrogant, decent, impactful, and forced, etc., more importantly, to control the aquatic areas. As far as its territorial reach is concerned, the desired effect is achieved with stronger measures, while the opposite, the distant, requires a much more patiently attitude, sometimes even gallant manners.

The next consecutive part is titled "The International Dunajská Commission among pre-war, military and Neutralistic turbulences (1939/1940)" After mid-March 1939; the MHP was relegated to an acute crisis. Initially, for the reason that the Czech Holeva ovations the president's place and who to be his successor. It follows long-lasting fights around the quorum and the legitimacy of decisions. Through many complex interventions, moves and arrangements, the summer session for 1939 reach difficult decisions only for delaying issues.

The aggressive act of Germany from 1. IX. 1939, with the invasion of sovereign Poland, puts the international relations of the continental States in a very renewed situation. For all, it is clear that this will not be the only "stop" of Berlin. By befitting the challenging way, they respond from London and Paris – a state of war. The overall displacement of political and military layers require their current answers with subsequent readjustment and adaptation. Similar is the case with the IDC. As an organization uniting the interests of not a small number of countries, this is not very easy to do with geographic, political and conceptual characteristics.

There is an urgent gathering in Belgrade at the enforcement bureau due to a multitude of the disorder. The Iron Gate sector is stripped of its specialized staff due to the habitation of sets in the military racketeering of Yugoslavia and Romania. Notified notifications to the relevant military authorities meet their rapid approving reactions. The "warring/non-warring" print creates relevant debates and corrections regarding the establishment of an IDC from a national affiliation. The current political status of the Commission is the most important issue. The participants unanimously unite in understanding the completely neutral image of the organization. In practical terms, it means unbiased and equal treatment of all flags and ships of nations traversing the Danube.

The Bulgarian representative G. Lazarov is about to preside over the Commission at the end of 1939 in a very tense environment between the participants in it. Regardless of the tângostnata situation, the representatives of the UK and France are divided with their posts in the IDC. The session approves measures to reinforce the protective measures in the section of Iron Gate, and most importantly, confirms once again the neutral appearance of the institution.

During the first months of 1940, the Danube area controlled by the IDC was relatively calm. In April, however, the indirect manifestations of military opposition are noted – experience sabotage actions of British special parts on the river, in response – drilling from the German side for taking under her leadership the security of the Danube area of the IDC. The representatives of the Commission themselves shall endeavour to secure its allotted space, but without tangible effect.

The sequence of material in the chronological order of Labor is titled "Volens Nolens * or the replacement of an identity" [* you want something (lat.)] and reveals the way of "closing" the IDC and passing the form under the leadership of Germany. By the end of the summer, the central and lower Danube are relatively quiet regions due to the focus of warring in other geographical directions. The current composition of the coastal system of the IDC, regardless of the recurrent intrigues and friction between them, succeed in a balanced way to maintain their joint interests. Moreover, although with certain nuances, the principles of neutrality remain attached.

In the emerging situation of relative calmness in the aquatic environment, although predetermined and inevitably the moving trend in the direction of the apparent un distant obsession on the part of the Reich, the surprising intervention of a significant factor becomes possible. It introduces a speed shuffle in the reasonably functioning cadence of the system. The impulses of the cast provoke actions and process thoughtless and unpredicted, at least because of the recent event development. The factor is named the USSR.

At the very end of July 1940, after an ultimate application to Bucharest, the socialist country occupied Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. The adventure in question provides an opportunity for the great territorial power to settle at the mouth of the Big River. In this sense, there should be a claim for appropriate claims, to a degree close to its knowledge as an equal competitor of Germany in the region.

With the complicated situation, with the emergence of a powerful competitor in the south of the south, Germany has been forcing its plans in the geographically directed direction. For this reason, in mid-August 1940, Berlin circulated to the four co-coastal and IDC countries a special note. It shall specify in detail the uncertainties currently found to the Commission. Mostly related to being ruled by English and French, and Berlin could not stand for surprises. For these reasons, the managing authority believed "to stop the activity... non-decision-making "commission. On the following are the concrete proposals for the meeting place, the composition of the invitees, etc. The Bulgarian side carefully examines the conditions of the note, judging the inconvenience, but considers the refusal to be impossible. The meetings take place in Vienna from 5 to 12 September 1940. The basic productions with the leading role of Germany are discussed sequentially, the procedures for winding up the MHP, financial issues, administering the Iron Gate, etc.

In the competition that appeared, Berlin plans to take its own from the rest along the river. For this reason, he prepares his vision for the new device on the Danube and convenes the conference in Vienna. Meanwhile, by exercising pressure on Romania, the Reich has contributed to the volume realization of the Second Viennese arbitration and the corresponding benefit of

Hungary with Transylvania. Romania is a state of collapse, dividing with the received generous dividends from its participation in the First World War.

The theme of the return of southern Dobrudzha to Bulgaria is undoubtedly also part of the components in the Romanian territorial issues, subject to the renewed political vision and corresponding transformation in the Formirata war situation. The recent realizable version of a change in the status quo is agreed on 27. VII. 1940 in Salzburg at a meeting between the Bulgarian and German countries. The Reich is about to exert another influence on Bucharest, and the final chords on the act of return agree between the direct counterparties. At last 19. VIII. The real negotiations begin in Craiova, however, accompanied by many difficulties. On 2. IX. The Bulgarian side turns to the German and Italian foreign policy headquarters with a call for rescue. Meanwhile, Romania on 5. X. was shaken by a deep internal political crisis, including accompanied by the abdication of King Carol. The intervention of Berlin and Rome gives its effect to 7. IX the Krajova Treaty is signed for the return of South Dobrudzha to Bulgaria. The matches on the dates of the Vienna meeting make an impression. It should be added: The final of it's first-round – 8. IX.; Follows a two-day stay on the text of the "temporary settlement"; On 9. IX. The Council of Ministers of a special meeting in the case with its Telegram No 9 "loaded" G. Lazarov "To sign the agreement made in Vienna"; On 11. IX. The second reading is held and the next day at 16 o'clock the arrangement is signed by all those present.

Restoring a long-awaited justice against a change in the status of a country with neutral behaviour – an extremely easy to answer the question demonstrated uniquely by the population of Bulgaria, as well as in the new Area. This seems to be the price of the deal, and if in detail its parameters were not even considered "in four Eyes", the stakes of self outline their contours, along with the vectors on the undertaken endeavours in these guidelines.

In "in MEMORIAM" a retrospective exchange on the activity, achievements, and traces is proposed, with which the ICD is bound by its creation to its final chords. The quality of achievements are the characteristics:

- authoritative and recognizable name and activity among the international community;

- professional expression in a specific area with a multiplied commitment of participants from national affiliation;
- "iron" requirements for strict adherence to the underlying normative rule of law documentation – peace contracts, FSD, LN, etc.;
- an effective rotation principle of national representations in the senior management bodies and periodic consultative and coordinating meetings;
- geographically identifying the extension of the activity to be bound by tested and effective technologies and Projects in the same direction;
- precise and rigorous selection of competent collaborators;
- detachment with international political schemes, organizations, alliances and thoughtful approach in the voting of final decisions;
- despite some altruistic requirements for the revenue and expenditure side of the Commission's activities, a similar amount of the residual amount brings conviction, predictability, and stability to the subject of its activities;
- The respectful attitude of external counterparties with ample opportunities for reconciling interests;
- respectful signs of the ICD's attention to the subjects of the political kaleidoscope of the old continent, and the back-spreading of activities in a self-sufficient circle;
- from own, democratically-based and justified rules, applications, guidelines, procedures, etc.

Against the backdrop of the methodically desecrated, politically passionate and force triumphant ripple of the continent, they push the prerequisites that their own for a very short time manage to ruin one with a lot of love raised and glowing flower like the IDC. Until the last moment of its existence, the IDC makes desperate attempts to resist such tendencies, mainly through the levers of its primordial democracies. While this was possible...

The component of the IDC is followed by a text relating to the place of Bulgaria in the international system in question. It is pointed out that the country is not gazing properly in the North Underrun border full-water river artery – the Danube. He, at that initial post-war stage, represents the eruption of the kingdom with the Outworld. But the transition from national dyed prigrasâniâ to excessive equivalent punishments, in the direction of focusing on some stabilizing economic conditions of the country, proves to be completely fanciful. In addition to public sentiment, state references to this effect are also added. Bulgaria does not foresee the creation of its merchant fleet, with which it foreshadows a lot of a bit restricted, so as not to be defined as symbolic, reliance on the functions, the real potential and revealing the IDC perspectives. "Compensation", if it can be presented in this way – the return of southern Dobrudzha, – The saga in general on another line, for "convenience" moves in parallel with the developments of the Danubian incarnations.

"New formats and challenges" represents the last text in work. It traces the other bitness of the IDC, etc. "Temporary settlement", the integration of new representatives, as well as recovery occurred in Bulgaria after its acquisition on several modern river vessels.

The negotiation format around the sub-departmental space of the SPD area drawn up by Germany, Italy, the USSR and Romania did not provide an opportunity to reach any result. Moscow's excessive claims cannot fit into Berlin's plans. Reaches the freezing point of the dialogue. The planned session of the Committee on "Provisional rules" for mid-January 1941 on Berlin's signal was postponed for "technical reasons". A month later it was said that the USSR insisted on the form of the "temporary rules" and the time for preparation of the necessary documentation. The leaders in Moscow have judged that the better option in the binding legitimate order to seek fulfilment of their intentions.

In his first regular session of 20. II. 1941, the newly established Commission "is mined" with another participant – the USSR. Her business is related to procedural and financial details. The coming months for the region are extremely dynamic – the accession of 1. III. 1941 of Bulgaria to the Tripartite Pact; The inclusion of Yugoslavia to the group of the same pact on 25. III. 1941, A complete surprise was, however, the government coup of Gen. D.

Simonvich two days later, which placed the region and in particular the Danube in an unusual situation; A little later the emergence of the new State entity – The independent Croatian state. Its border outlines include the part of the river between the estuaries of the Drava and Sava rivers.

In this situation, it is evident that the NHL ' accession to the ' Interim agreement ' of 12. IX. 1940 is imminent. This was the case on 15. IX. 1941 during the second ordinary session of the new international River Organisation. For the first time in the existence of the ICD and its tracker, delegates split without specifying the date of their next collection. The next sessions take place over an increasing period and with the invariably absent of someone's delegate. The last collection was in May 1944.

For Bulgaria the period after September 1940, extrapolated to the Danubian cases, is inspiring. Above all, for the reason that the Danube and coastal outlines are extended by about 80 km., as there are both solid ports – the Tutrakan and the Silistra. With this same act on the return of South Dobrudzha, the Kingdom includes within its borders a unique natural combination – a large international navigable river and sea. The initiative of the population and the timely assistance of the State onwards alone can lead to the beneficial adaptation of the valuable natural phenomenon to the familiar past conditions and structures. However, this is imminent.

Particular enthusiasm the activities of the New Danube Commission do not provoke. All key functions of the institution are under the control and management of Germany. The predominant part of the joint initiatives with the other participants in the international organization is rather a dummy and a demonstration.

Long-term, albeit with nuances, postponing intentions to form the own River commercial fleet, in 1939/1940 finally found its realization. The problem received its final legislative definition from the XXV-Session of Parliament in May 1940, and before that, in February-March 1939, an order was placed in the Regensburgskata shipyard for four cargo ships. Two of them landed on the Bulgarian Danubian Coast in July 1940, the rest a little later. During the same period, the fleet was supplemented in stages with three more passengers, delivered by Budapest and a ferry for connection between Rousse and Giurgiu.

There is a visible inclusion of the population in the region towards the activities that are typical of it. The most tenable and accurate answer to the question gives Prime Minister B. Filov in his diary.

In mid-October 1941, certain official engagements took him to Vidin. Upon arrival in the Danube city, the Prime Minister noted: "... We went on foot to the harbour. There were extremely many barrels of apple pulp and crates with grapes. They loaded them with our fast-to-go steamers, which were going to Vienna in four days. The Viinchani are very satisfied now by the export and the great animation of the port. There was no unemployment...".

However, the neglectfulness attitude of the responsible factors in Bulgaria to the wide range of opportunities that the Danube reveals, and from there the mirror consequence – the marginalized presence of the country in the affairs of the MAC, ultimately deprives it of Accumulation of sound economic advantages. Indicative for the mentioned period Bulgaria has separated more than 1 Billion Lv. For the payment of freight, 700 Million and more. As have gone to foreign shipping companies for the goods and goods transported on the Danube. Regardless of everything comes the moment when the kingdom becomes the proud owner of its commercial fleet. Behind the indication of whether the period is appropriate, not there, or inconvenient, because of the external circumstances, will be a form of subjective assessment. In turn, the desired acquisition fulfils its attributed functions in good synchronize and optimum capacity. In any case, however, its implementation marked by excessive delay. For its part, this means no experience. Thus, hand in hand will coexist the discovery, satisfaction, and excitement, along with misadventure and negligence.

Dissertation work ends with a bibliography.