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Editorial

The special edition of the student historiography journal Klio has come to life as a consequence of the International Summer Seminar organized by ISHA Ljubljana in July 2014. More than 50 participants from 19 sections and 14 countries had an opportunity to enjoy a week of fruitful historical debate and tempting sights of Ljubljana in summer and to learn about the history and culture of Slovenia.

The main purpose of the seminar was to offer the participants a space for constructive cross-cultural discussion and exchange of opinions and experiences. Taking into consideration the current socio-political circumstances, we chose the topic Crises and development. We tried to search for parallels between the past periods of depression and the present critical momentum. Crises have always been decisive moments in history, moments of condensed action. Therefore, we thought it would be interesting to explore whether there were any periods that were not considered critical by the contemporary reports.

The participants were divided into six workshops and were encouraged to present their original papers and discuss various aspects of the main topic. The first workshop Crises and Politics (moderated by Neja Blaj Hribar and Aljoša Vuksanović) examined to what extent the political system can be held (co)responsible for crises, if any form of crisis necessarily leads to a political crisis and elicits a political change, and at last, the role of radical political movements in crises. The second workshop Crisis and Material Determinism (moderated by Dragan Nikčević) reopened the question of material determinism – to what extent are crises a direct result of material preconditions; and to what extent is development a direct result of the ability to overcome the aforementioned preconditions. The third workshop Crisis and the Pre-Modern Era (moderated by Izidor Janžeković and Mitja Rous) approached the problem of crises in the Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era. It took a closer look at how the contemporaries searched for the causes of crises and their solutions, considering various economic, environmental, ideological, and cultural aspects. The fourth workshop Culture in Crisis (moderated by Irina Lešnik and Jermnej Kotar) explored the question whether culture has to end in a crisis in order to successfully develop further and reviewed the relationship between economy and culture – does the economic prosperity provide greater
resources for art or does it gradually intervene with cultural freedom? The fifth workshop *Woman and Crisis* (moderated by Martin Nedoh and Saša Zvonar) focused on the moments of transition that represent availed or missed opportunities in the emancipation of the other sex. Every time of crisis represented a certain change in the status of women, which was not always negative. As a consequence, an approach appeared that sees crisis as a product of a man’s world and therefore calls for more women getting involved in the decision-making process. The sixth workshop *Development and Crisis between Modernity and History* (moderated by Miha Šoba and Boris Cesar) dealt with the relationship between crisis and development in different historic situations, asked if someone’s crisis can be someone else’s progress and discussed which elements allow us to compare crises and what methods we use for comparison.

The common theme of all workshops was the question of the role of historians in the time of crisis – are we simply objective reporters providing the society with historical data or should we use our knowledge and experience to actively influence current events?

At the end of the seminar, we did not want all the meaningful words and original ideas expressed by the participants to fade away. This is why we decided to publish selected papers in a special edition of our publication. During the editing process we tried to keep our interventions within the texts as small as possible, so that the historical interpretation of the chosen topics would solely be left to their authors. However, we tried to make all the titles, subtitles, footnotes and bibliographies follow the same pattern in all published papers. We apologize in advance for any mistakes or omissions you might find while reading the publication.

Every great story must come to an end. In conclusion, we would like to express our gratitude to some very important people. A special thanks goes to two incredible persons who put the most effort and energy into making the summer seminar an unforgettable experience. The first is Maja Lukanc, the seminar coordinator, head organizer and motivator. The second person who deserves a special mention is Patricija Kunštek, the long-time president of ISHA Ljubljana. During her presidency and under her supervision, ISHA Ljubljana developed even further; its members organized various extracurricular activities for the students of our department and set up the groundwork for our most important challenge thus far: the 2014 Summer Seminar. We would also like to thank the organizing team – each of you contributed an important piece to the incredible puzzle we created together. Thank you, Neja Blaj Hribar, Martin Nedoh, Lara Kren, Miha Šoba, Saša Zvonar, Irina Lešnik, Dragan Nikčević, Aljoša Vuksanović, Izidor Janžeković, Mitja Rous, Jernej Kotar, Boris Cesar, Maja Piuzi, Nejc Kunštek, Jože Glavič, Grega Mejak, Ivan Žgavec.

Another group of people we would like to extend our thanks to are the reviewers, who took the time to comment on the papers and improved their quality even further. Without our sponsors we could not publish this publication; thank you. The last, but not the least important contributor to our work is the Department of History, which has offered us both financial and moral support throughout our journey. We would like to extend a special thanks to the current Head of the Department asst. prof. Danijela Trškan, PhD, for her unwavering support.

*Editors*
Russia 1905-1917: The constitutional experiment

Victoria Buck, University of Kent
ISHA Kent, vb208@kent.ac.uk

According to recent and traditional historiography, there was widespread agreement that the Russian autocracy was unworkable in a society that was rapidly modernising. In 1905, Tsar Nicholas II had the choice to create a constitutional monarchy, and give the Russian people real representation, or he could let the revolution continue its course and endanger his position as Tsar. For Nicholas, there was only one solution: to create a constitutional monarchy. There was very little agreement among the prominent intellectuals of the time about how to achieve this. The necessity and possibility of creating a constitutional monarchy which had seemed palpable in 1905 became impossible by 1917.

INTRODUCTION

This article will focus on the reasons why it was so difficult to establish an effective constitutional monarchy in Russia under Nicholas II and the successive Provisional Government. I will do this firstly by examining how the tsarist regime responded to the revolutionary crisis of 1905. It became clear as Russia slid into disarray by 1905 that something had to be done by the government to alleviate the crisis. This leads on to the second point I will examine: whether or not the Tsar was sincere about creating an effective constitutional monarchy. Indeed, the failure to create a fully-functional constitutional monarchy can be attributed to the Tsar’s lack of conviction in creating a more democratic style of government. Another point of focus will be the irreconcilable differences and conflicting opinions between the State Duma, State Council, Stolypin, Nicholas II, the Octobrists, and other political groups. Autocracy was the only system which had existed in Russia; therefore no one had experience in creating and maintaining a constitutional monarchy.

NICHOLAS II’S RESPONSE TO THE GRIEVANCES OF 1905

In the event of crisis, the autocracy had always resorted to outdated and oppressive means of restoring order. Following the revolution of 1905, oppression was no longer a solution to the disorder; there was widespread agreement that “Russia must become a constitutional and parliamentary monarchy”.¹ When the Provisional Government came to power, one of their first actions was to remove the tsarist police and general police; which evidences the fact that Russian people viewed these as remnants of the autocratic system they wanted to remove. Zuckerman states: “the political police behaved vis-a-vis dissent as they had always acted. Thus, their actions contributed to the end of tsardom”.² Therefore, the political police, as

¹ Tyrkova-Williams, “The Cadet Party,” 175.
² Zuckerman, “Political Police,” 295.
agents of the autocracy, had always resorted to oppression to put down dissent, but had not realised that it was too late for oppressive measures after 1905. For the Octobrists, the prominent party in full support of the October Manifesto and the concessions it guaranteed, a constitutional monarchy meant a system whereby the people of Russia were represented by an elected assembly who were responsible to the Tsar. Hosking and Waldron argue that despite appearances of change, Nicholas was still committed to autocracy. Likewise, Pinchuk states that the Tsar interpreted the Manifesto in a different way to the Octobrists. Nicholas gave Russia a written constitution called the Fundamental Laws, which supposedly ended arbitrary rule. However, the rhetoric of the Fundamental laws suggested otherwise. Article 4 explicitly states that the Emperor of all Russia had “Supreme Autocratic power”. This suggests that Nicholas was still dedicated to maintaining the autocratic system, which is incongruous with a democratic system. Nicholas’ ambivalence to the concessions he had granted can be seen in a diary entry just days after the October Manifesto was issued:

“Through all these horrible days, [speaking of the days before issuing the October Manifesto, following the Revolution] I constantly met Witte [...] There were only two ways open; to find an energetic soldier and crush the rebellion by sheer force. That would mean rivers of blood [...] The other way out would be to give to the people their civil rights, freedom of speech and press, also to have laws conformed by a State Duma - that of course would be a constitution. Almost everybody I had an opportunity of consulting, is of the same opinion. [...] We discussed it for two days and in the end, invoking God's help I signed. This terrible decision which nevertheless I took quite consciously.”

Here, the Tsar admits that he felt pressured by those around him and felt remorse at his “terrible decision”; his favoured solution was brute force, not granting concessions. In 1905, he had crushed the Gapon protest with the army, and again, Hosking asserts, in 1906-1907 the regime resorted to oppressive measures instead of integrating the peasants into civic institutions. He also relied on the police to supervise trade unions in 1907 following a coup. Nicholas II’s use of force to suppress opposition and his diary entry from 19th October attest to his commitment to the autocracy. These factors make it easier to understand why contemporary and recent historiography has questioned the sincerity of the concessions of 1905 and 1906. Indeed, many have questioned how much power Nicholas was actually willing to compromise. Waldron asserts that it was by its very nature that the autocratic regime was built to dismiss popular opinion as invalid and incomparable to his own. Furthermore, all laws had to go through both chambers of the parliament in order to be signed off by the Tsar, and he had every right to veto them. Article 8 of the 1906 Laws state: “The Sovereign Emperor possesses initiative in all legislative matters”. In addition to legislative power, the Tsar alone reserved the right to revise the Fundamental Laws. This indicates the extent to which the Tsar held onto the majority of power, with the chambers of parliament the image of a working constitution. Medushevsky attests that these chambers did not limit the

---

5 “Tsar Nicholas II.”
autocracy through constitutional means. He believes that the chambers were instead: “advisory bodies exercising some functions of public control”, suggesting they had very little real power.\(^8\) Similarly, Waldron states that the Tsar was incapable of managing the war effort effectively, yet all the power rested in his hands, rendering the elected representatives of the Duma in impotent rage while Russia slid into disarray.\(^9\)

**SINCERITY OF THE CONCESSIONS PROMISED BY TSAR NICHOLAS II: REAL CHANGE?**

Hosking, Clowes, Williams, Ferenczi, Waldron, Kennan, Stone, Pinchuk, and Medushevsky support the liberal viewpoint that Russia was progressing towards a more complete constitutional system after 1905. For the first time, the obshchestvennost, or civil society, became a significant part of Russian politics.\(^10\) According to Tyrkova-Williams, the nation was faring better than ever socially and economically.\(^11\) There were also new freedoms granted in the April 1906 Fundamental Laws, including: “freedom of religion”, the “right to organise meetings” provided there were no weapons, freedom of expression and the dissemination of ideas “by means of the press”, and the right to “form societies and associations”.\(^12\) This laid out the basis for the new constitution and complemented the October Manifesto. Political parties, which had formerly existed underground and illegally, were henceforth incorporated into the legal framework in Russia, and censorship was relaxed. Suffrage was expanded in December 1905 and two chambers of parliament were created to represent the narod. Hosking and Waldron emphasise the extent to which the post-1905 reforms touched every part of Russian society: every family and individual felt real change.\(^13\) Hosking states that Stolypin’s reforms were relatively successful, granting 2.5 million households the title deeds to their land by 1916. However, he only had a short time to implement the reforms before his progress was halted. Waldron corroborates this view; stating that Stolypin was faced with too short a period to implement change before conservatism was able to mobilise its forces. Likewise, Kennan and Stone had high hopes for the autocracy’s evolution into a more complete constitutional system had the war not intervened.\(^14\) The liberal viewpoint generally follows the gradualist approach that “the nation needed more time in peace to recover and continue progressing, but the war intervened”. This is what Christopher Read calls the “optimist” approach; one that held out high hopes for the tsarist regime and the hopes of reform. Liberal historians acknowledge the fact that the constitutional system was newly-established, and therefore had some way to go; all it needed was time in stable conditions. Conversely, Read opposes this view, believing that the autocracy was incapable of reforming itself. He states that the majority of historiography, traditional and recent, supports his viewpoint. Certainly, many historians are of the opinion that the autocratic system was a hindrance to Russia’s hopes of becoming an effective constitutional monarchy. Read condemns the tsarist autocracy as “appallingly repressive”, stating that there has been a rise in
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\(^8\) Medushevsky, *Russian Constitutionalism: Historical and Contemporary Development*, 125.

\(^9\) Waldron, “Late Imperial Constitutionalism,” 40.

\(^10\) Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire*, 398.


\(^13\) Waldron, *End of imperial Russia*, 69.

\(^14\) Read, “In Search of Liberal Tsarism,” 195.
recent revisionism painting the tsar in a more positive light despite widespread agreement that the autocracy was harmful and needed to be abolished.\textsuperscript{15} In the words of Leon Trotsky:

\begin{quote}
“We are given a constitution, but absolutism remains. All is given and nothing is given. The proletariat knows what it wants and what it doesn't want. It doesn't want the police hooligan Trepov.”\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

This supports the widespread belief that the autocracy was seen as an obstacle to democratisation and modernisation of Russian society and economy.\textsuperscript{17} Few historians acknowledge the post-1905 system as the prototype of a constitutional monarchy, yet, due to the unique situation in Russia, perhaps a comparison to a western constitutional monarchy is insufficient, and the system was effective for Russia because there was real positive change.

**Crisis of the Autocracy?**

Another interpretation of the failure of the constitutional system is that Tsarism was becoming increasingly unpopular. Hosking states that Nicholas II was a victim of processes much larger than himself. Lievan corroborates this view, stating that no human being could have been chairman of the Russian government in the twentieth century because it was unworkable. Petrunkevic, who wrote to his son in 1905, explained that the regime was in crisis:

\begin{quote}
“One has to be Russian and live permanently in Russia in order to understand the degree of helplessness of the regime, [and] the strength of the resentment which has accumulated over the ages against legal and economic oppression […]”\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

This was mostly due to the inherent flaws with the system Nicholas had inherited, and partly his own undoing. The crisis of the regime was exacerbated by the humiliation of the Russo-Japanese war, Bloody Sunday of 1905 and the loss of Poland in 1915, along with the ordeal with Rasputin and “treason in high places”, which irreparably damaged his reputation.\textsuperscript{19} The Tsar saw that a dangerous gap had opened between the masses and the government institutions, and sought to bolster the reputation of the regime through elaborate ceremonies. Both Waldron and Hosking agree that the tsarist regime was becoming increasingly out of touch as Russian society was rapidly progressing.\textsuperscript{20} The Russians needed more than just ceremony to restore their faith, if that was even possible. The ceremonies were ineffective because they favoured the wealthy and disregarded the ‘lesser’ people. Waldron argues that the Tsar became complacent, believing that he had recovered his pre-1905 position of strength. Yet, if the regime had been in crisis since the 1850’s, then it seemed inevitable that it would eventually break down if it did not reform itself. Stolypin realised the extent to which Tsarism was falling out of favour, while it seemed that Nicholas did not.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Read, “In Search of Liberal Tsarism,” 195.
\item \textsuperscript{16} “The First Days of the Freedoms.”
\item \textsuperscript{17} Medushevsky, *Russian Constitutionalism*, 185.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Shmuel, “The Tragic Dilemma of Russian Liberalism,” 11.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Hickey, “Pavel Miliukov, Stupidity or Treason,” 34-38.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Waldron, *Imperial Russia*, 102.
\end{itemize}
Although historians have stated that anti-monarchist feelings were rife, many individuals were, although sometimes critical of the tsarist government, still supportive of it. Certainly, in 1917 at the Moscow councils, Tsarism still held its appeal to the Provisional Government, who wanted a constitutional monarchy similar to Western (English and French) models:

“There is a strong and growing movement in Russia to model its future government on that of England; that is, a democracy whose head is outside all political parties, and who, therefore, acts as a balance-wheel, to steady the sway of partisan government, and as a symbol of national life; in a word, a limited monarchy, with Grand Duke Michael at its head.”

This evidences the fact that the Duma leaders who brought about the abdication of Nicholas did not intend to end tsarism altogether; instead they wished to replace the ineffective Tsar with a more suitable candidate. Furthermore, Pinchuk believed that Shipov and the Octobrists cooperated with the government post-1905 not because they were forced to, but because they were genuinely loyal to the regime.

Both the Charles Johnston document and Hosking state that Grand Duke Mikhail declined the throne yet differ on his reasons for doing so. In “The Two Moscow Councils”, the Duke would only accept the throne if the nation expressed it as their will in a Constitutional Convention, which the Provisional Government had agreed to. This “carried the necessary implication” that discussions and plans to establish a constitutional monarchy would ensue. In contrast, Hosking states that the Grand Duke recognised anti-monarchist sentiments which were hardly secret: imperial symbols had been defaced and destroyed in Petrograd. The account of “The Two Moscow Councils” is heavily critical of the socialists who dominated the Provisional Government and states that the movement towards a constitutional monarchy in Russia aroused fears for the socialists, who were opposed to this movement. This illustrates that after the abdication of Nicholas II, the “appallingly repressive” autocracy had become a non-issue, yet the difficulties in forming an effective constitutional system still existed.

**Stolypin: how successful was he in establishing a constitutional monarchy?**

When Stolypin was appointed Prime Minister of Russia, he had a lack of ministerial experience, which, Waldron suggests, was an advantage because it gave him breathing space to implement reforms. This was because he was seen as having a ‘blank slate’ by the conservative elements of government. He was favourable because he was not affiliated with any factions or political parties and had a good reputation for opposing rebellion, thus he was portrayed as loyal to the regime. However, Waldron, Hosking and Read are in agreement that Stolypin’s reforms were frustrated by the conservative elites in the State Council and the tsar. Evidence of this can be seen in 1911, when Stolypin’s bill to introduce zemstvos in the western provinces was blocked because the State Council was authorised by the tsar to veto it. This illustrates that Stolypin also had the problem of the autocracy to contend with. Waldron

---

says his main failure lay in his poor judgement regarding Russian power politics. To complement this view, Lieven states that the elites still had a significant influence on the tsar. Stolypin had chosen to work with the Octobrists and other Duma members, rather than the elites, to carry out his reforms. Hosking believes the period that Stolypin and the Duma worked together, especially in 1908-1909, was largely successful. However, the Third and Fourth Dumas proved more difficult to cooperate with because he had alienated the conservatives at the beginning of his premiership, and they were the ones who dominated these Dumas because of the amended electoral laws. Furthermore, historians also attribute Stolypin’s ultimate failure to his abuse of power. Hosking agrees with Waldron that Stolypin had largely isolated and alienated members of government, stating that he abused article 87 which allowed the government to issue new legislation when the State Duma was not in session: “If extraordinary circumstances require legislative action whilst the State Duma is in recess, the Council of Ministers may make recommendations direct to the sovereign emperor.” 22 This action demonstrates both Stolypin’s realisation that the Duma held no real power, and the fact that Stolypin abused his role as prime minister. This only served to further isolate him, because the Octobrists joined the bitter denunciation of his high-handed use of the emergency article. 23 Therefore, Stolypin faced a number of setbacks, and had overlooked the fact that ultimate power still rested with the tsar. Therefore, his efforts for reform were largely inhibited by the tsar and the conservative elements of government whom he had overlooked. He, unlike the Tsar, had learnt from the 1905 crisis, realising that the only hope of creating stability was through reforms, yet was impotent to prevent the disarray Russia was faced with.

THE OCTOBRISTS: WHAT ROLE DID THEY PLAY IN TRYING TO ESTABLISH A CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM?

The Octobrists were also a significant part of post-1905 Russian politics. They were the main party who wanted to bring about a new constitutional style government, yet Brainerd believes, in opposition to Pinchuk, that they had limited impact. 24 This was because “none of their aims were achieved” and Stolypin’s failure to deal with the reactionary forces at work meant that the Octobrists were “bound to fail”. 25 He agrees with Birth that “the Octobrists were never a progressive force”, and according to Hosking they were conservative more than liberal, often siding with the government to avoid conflict. 26 He continues: “they lost the government’s respect without gaining support among the electorate”, and there were also internal divisions within the party which led to their ultimate demise in 1913. 27 These factors taken together outline that there were not only inter-party conflicts within the Duma, but also intra-party conflicts within the Octobrist party. They did not act as a unified Party on most issues raised in the Third Duma, despite having similar general aims. Here it is clear that a fundamental reason for the failure to create an effective constitutional monarchy was the lack

23 Acton, Rethinking the Russian Revolution, 14.
of unity and drive within the main groups that wanted reform. Despite this, the Octobrists, although ultimately not achieving their aims, highlighted the widespread wish for change. Stolypin worked closely with the party, attempting to carry out the much-needed reforms in Russia. The party dissolved before the First World War, so it is difficult to say whether they would have continued to work with Stolypin and bring about further changes had they remained a party throughout the war. By 1914, Stolypin had been out of office for three years. He had been the main instigator of change in the post-1905 years, and it seems that without him the Octobrists had very little influence or power. The war became a major focus for the Russian state, taking precedence over internal issues which had not yet been resolved.

**WORLD WAR I**

Key figures such as Witte saw that Russia needed to stay out of the war in order to stabilise the country:

“Count Witte never swerved from his conviction, firstly, that Russia must avoid the war at all costs, and secondly, that she must work for economic friendship with France and Germany to counteract the preponderance of England. Nicholas detested him.”

One of Stolypin’s priorities was re-establishing peace, order and stability during his premiership. Some historians believe that Stolypin needed more time in peace to carry out his reforms. Although the autocracy was abolished in 1917, the Provisional Government still struggled to create a constitutional monarchy, which was their initial plan. The debate over how to deal with the war also overshadowed the short rule of the Provisional Government. The international war was prioritised before anything else, including internal reforms. In 1917, the Bolsheviks promised to liberate Russia from the war and carry out the long-awaited reforms, with no intention of sharing power or establishing a constitutional monarchy. When the Bolsheviks seized power, it became impossible to establish any kind of constitutional monarchy. The optimal chance, which was during the reign of Nicholas, had passed. His brother, the Duke, could no longer be utilised. The Bolsheviks became a dominant force because of their response to the war. Had the Provisional Government promised an end to the war, perhaps they would have had the stability liberal historians believed was needed to create a constitutional monarchy. Certainly, without the war effort, the Provisional Government’s primary focus could have been within Russia, and the creation of an effective constitutional system would have been an easier task.

---

28 “Sergei Witte.”
CONCLUSION

The ambiguities of the post-1905 regime have confounded scholars since its inception. Few can agree that it was a fully-fledged constitutional monarchy, yet few can pinpoint an alternative definition for it. Certainly, historiography agrees that it was not a constitutional monarchy because the Tsar remained a staunch adherent of the autocracy. This hindered Stolypin’s hopes of reform and the Duma’s hopes of participation. Even after the fall of the autocracy, a constitutional monarchy was difficult to establish because of the Provisional Government’s focus on the war and its myopia regarding the rising popularity of the socialists.
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„I have to be smarter than these bastards“
Police reflections on organized crime from 1980’s until the regime change

Tamás Bezsényi, Eötvös Loránd University
ISHA Budapest, tamasbezsennyi@gmail.com

In the Interior Review during the 1980s, numerous prosecutors and police investigators carefully brought up the possible existence of organized crime in Hungary. The police interpreted organized crime as a network of offenders and perpetrators committing crimes against private or state property. At the end of the communist regime, organized crime appeared as an unwanted phenomenon of modernization rather than a symptom of the crisis of the capitalist society as experts in previous decades interpreted it. This research seeks to show that during the Kádár era, from the 1960s onwards, the majority of crimes were crimes committed against state property. However, in the 1970s crimes against private property increased due to the measures of the economic reform.

From the 1980s, organized crime gangs were held responsible by the police for most of the priority crimes against property. But how did they create a sustainable criminal structure independent from state power? In my opinion, examining the relation between organized crime and corruption within the state structure could provide possible answers. The division of labor made organized criminal networks very similar to state farms and cooperatives in many aspects. The tipsters, the bailiffs, the touts, the receivers worked together and all of them were parts of the criminal structure. According to researchers and police investigators, a large proportion of touts and receivers worked in the private sector during this period.

Illegally gained valuables by organized criminal groups became investable into the private sector, linking corporate crime to organized crime. Therefore it was possible not only to gain wealth through the illegal selling of valuables but also to invest in the legal market. Due to their good economic conditions, the criminal networks could establish different kinds of private ventures, e.g. restaurants, pubs or tobacco shops. At the time, various police investigations were dealing with illegal investments that served as funds for several businesses in the catering industry. All in all, the research proved that organized crime during the socialist era could exist “thanks” to the measures of the economic reform.

INTRODUCTION

In this study I am researching the development of organized crime during the socialist period in Hungary. At the end of the communist regime, organized crime appeared as an unwanted phenomenon of modernization rather than a symptom of the crisis of the capitalist society as it was interpreted by experts in previous decades. My research deals with the closed up investigation of the crime conditions of the 1980s. According to Endre Bócz, former Attorney General, most of the criminals left the country in the beginning of the communist era, right after the revolution of 1956.
In Hungary, police investigators had to face the problem of organized crime from the beginning of the 1980s. The investigating authorities found a new enemy, the illegal organizations, and organized crime gangs. Many gangs appeared in the capital Budapest and other big cities. These groups collaborated with each other, and slowly but surely created a whole network in the country. The organization required new defending techniques, which were more efficient than the work of police investigators, such as production of evidence. Therefore, the police had no other option than to collaborate with the criminals.

In my research, I have interviewed 22 former and current police officers who worked with organized crime gangs. During the socialist period, the state power wanted to deny the existence of organized crime, and after the regime change, the new democratic system tried to neglect the problem. However, the investigators were forced to solve the cases.

During the 1980s, numerous prosecutors and police investigators carefully brought up the possible existence of organized crime in Hungary in the Interior Review (a monthly magazine for internal circulation among the administration of justice). The police interpreted organized crime as a network of offenders and perpetrators committing crimes against private or state property.

According to historical sources and interviews, the police investigators were successful when they collaborated with various kinds of informers within the crime gangs. What was the cost of that and did the detectives accept the cooperation with the criminals to carry out their work against them?

THE POLITICAL VIEWPOINT ABOUT ORGANIZED CRIMINALITY

The Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party’s (MSZMP) Party Committee of Békés County held a board meeting on 1st November 1978. According to the regular police report, the council stated that crime rates were low. Based on the number of registered offences, the county was the 15th or 16th among the 19 counties. At the end, as a short comment, the author of the report noticed that organized crime did not exist. The text focused on Békés County, so the meaning of this short sentence could be interpreted as indicating that organized crime was an existing problem in other parts of the country. Otherwise, the comment did not make any sense. The Party Committee of Békés County mentioned organized crime in 1972. This was the first time the protocols of party committees from any county or the capital mentioned organized crime as a possible threat (a political document first mentioned organized crime in 1969, when the Party Committee of Nógrád presented the well-known capitalist crime situation to its members). In this document, which was written by the chairman of the county court, the phenomenon was described as something not present in that county. The judge noted multiple offenses that were committed by occasionally organized groups. He also affirmed that these cases were not numerous. The judge denied the existence of organized crime and galeri crime at the same time. Galeri means gang in Hungarian criminological terminology. This type of crime was typically seen in the socialist period as an existing threat.

1 MSZMP Party Committee meeting of Békés County, 1 November 1978, 117.
2 MSZMP Executive Committee meeting of Békés County, 26 May 1972, 10.
3 MSZMP Executive Committee meeting of Nógrád County, 24 June 1969, 131.
therefore the two activities mentioned together indicated the possibility of the appearance of organized crime.

Two years later, a report of the Party Committee of Békés County declared that the struggle of party organs against crime is a political question. According to the text, the lawful and effective functions of the justice system were treated as a political issue. In this sense, the investigative and judicial parts of the county carried out their job in a problematic way. In order to prevent such problems, the council noted that they had to handle these cases as political questions.4

Presumably, many things were regarded as a political question among the problems of the judicial system. Why did they admit that this became a political question? To answer this question, we have to look through other party committees. In 1982, the Party Committee of Heves County declared that organized crime is not a typical criminal activity there.5 From the 1980s, the party committees of different counties already stopped denying the presence of organized crime, but rather tried to present it as an irregular type of crime in their territory. With this kind of approach, they implicitly accepted the existence of organized crime in Hungary, although the committee excluded the county from this kind of threat.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party’s Party Committee of Budapest discussed current problems of public safety and dealt with the question of an effective action plan against crime. Ferenc Markovics, the secretary of the Budapest Party Committee, presented the case. He highlighted the importance of Budapest, which is a metropolis; therefore the prostitution and other tourism-related crimes seemed inevitable. After his speech, he answered the comments. One of the remarks mentioned the possible existence of a Hungarian underworld. Because of this Markovics drew an important distinction. First, he admitted that he argued many times about the existence of organized crime with other experts. In his opinion, there was no such thing as organized crime, because the existence of this would presuppose illegal organizational power-related background, which would control the crime activities. However, he insisted that organized crime, as a loose cooperation of different groups already existed in Hungary. Markovics pointed out that the criminals only planned their next actions, but they did not care about their long-term goals. According to this argument, the gangs worked independently from other gangs. He only emphasized the role of tipsters as helpers of organized crime gangs. The text did not mention any kind of receivers of stolen goods. Fundamentally, the division of labour constitutes organized crime; in this sense the tipsters only represented the starting part of this mechanism, which usually ends with the receivers.6

The second suggestion highlighted that social interest preceded everything else, which meant that the state had to regulate the opening hours of stores, alcohol sale and working of taxis around Budapest. These regulations can be understood as prevention against organized crime, but they are actually a sign of inefficient ideas for coping with organized crime. The Executive Committee of Budapest admitted in 1984 that organized crime was an existing phenomenon. They corroborated on its existence by explaining that the number of short supplies had increased, together with corrupt practices in different kind of trades. The above-

4 MSZMP Party Committee meeting of Békés County, 18 January 1980, 32.
5 MSZMP Executive Committee meeting of Heves County, 13 April 1982, 44.
6 MSZMP Executive Committee meeting of Budapest Capital, 11 January 1984, 10-17.
mentioned aspects indicate that organized crime was covered up through several related trade branches and the catering industry, in other words through second (or shadow) economy. After the acknowledgment of organized crime by the Executive Committee of Budapest, another party committee recognized the existence of organized crime. The Party Committee of Somogy County admitted the presence of organized crime in 1986.7

Two different ideas can explain the sudden acknowledgement of organized crime. First, organized crime affected the economy through second economy. Second, the position of the above-mentioned countries is significant – they were all border counties. Békés County was located on the border of the Socialist Republic of Romania; Heves County lay next to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, while Somogy County bordered on the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. In these three neighbouring countries, the Hungarian minorities were significant, and these countries were considered friendly. The mentions of organized crime in these counties implied the possibility of smuggling as a typical organized crime activity. This implication was confirmed by the county seat of Heves.

CRIMES THAT THREATEN THE LIVING STANDARDS

In this paper, I claim that organised crime existed in socialist Hungary. We will investigate why the signs of this type of crime only appeared during the 1980s. The criminal organisations formed at that time specialized in the possessions of those who came to wealth mainly by participating in the so-called second economy and by smuggling. Before and after the so called ‘proletarian revolution’ of the criminal groups, social scientists tended to present the second economy as a subsystem, which was clearly separate from crime. However, the criminals of the 1980s could rob the profiteers of the second economy for the very reason that they knew these people personally. Many of them worked in a proper division of labour with the tipsters, tradesmen and also with the receivers of stolen goods.

Social scientists and criminologists already pointed out that organized crime existed in the socialist period; nevertheless, they made no attempt to show how it could be able to work during the period of planned economy.

In the mid-60s, in the cultural review entitled “Budapest”, an interview was made with the chief commissaire of the Budapest police, who admitted to the existence of a criminal underworld. After this statement, the phenomenon of organised crime disappeared from the public discourse; it was not until the 1980s that it appeared again, first in criminal records, and later progressively in the public. It is possible that during the 1970s, no one talked about it; however, its rapid and powerful appearance in the next decade implies that only the words and terminology to describe the processes of criminality changed.

In 1970, in the Review on interior affaires (Belügyi Szemle), a new notion appeared and was removed as rapidly as it emerged. Police officer József Szilágyi published an article under the title Remarks on the investigation of crimes that threaten the living standards, a title which implies that the article was supposed to contribute to a discourse that already existed or at least had begun earlier.8 However, the conceptual framework he operates with had never before occurred in the review.

7 MSZMP Party Committee meeting of Somogy County, 10 September 1986, 74.
8 Szilágyi, “Megjegyzések,” 34-38.
In December 1969, György Aczél, who was in charge of cultural politics, published an article entitled On some ideological questions, which treated the main transformations that occurred due to the ‘new economic mechanism’. According to Aczél, the new economic mechanism aimed to make the living standards of the middle class more dependent on the social utility of their work and on individual achievements, but foremost, on the efficiency of these achievements. The results could be achieved by respecting socialist laws; the transformation of some of these laws and regulations did not mean that evading them was possible.

However, articles published in the very same review prove that some organised groups did in fact aim at doing just that. At the beginning of the following year, a study, which was originally presented at the VIth International Symposium of Criminology, was published, entitled The methods of evading and abolishing smuggling and speculation of smuggled goods. Additionally, the lawyer Isván Diczig discussed the possibility of evading crimes committed against public property in the January edition. In both articles, the expression ‘evasion’ gained a central role. Both in the case of crimes committed against public property and in that of illegal trade, this was the first year that evasion of these crimes was put in the centre of attention. Both cases have an indirect effect on the living standards as they influence it by trading with goods, for which the obligatory prices approved by the public authorities were not paid, and also by manipulating with state property. The standard ideological explanation of these crimes was the ‘reactionary conscience’ of the perpetrators, which hindered them in recognizing the values and goals of socialism. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the consideration of macro reasons in the explanation of crimes was rather rare.

In the article entitled Considerations on criminality József Lázár, a Transylvanian publicist, managed to sketch out much deeper, regime-specific reasons for crimes in Romania in the 1960s. In his description, the notion of relative deprivation appears, though only implicitly. According to this idea, the individual does not measure his or her living standard in absolute numbers, but evaluates his or her situation in comparison with a referential group. According to Lázár, when it comes to everyday comparative environment (such as the procurement of domestic and technical goods), the possibility of an increase in the living standards results in the devaluation of moral principles, even in the case of people who do not commit crimes. Citizens become more susceptible to criminality because due to the socialist regime changed ownership relations. Lázár affirms that a part of those people who would never steal from another person would much easier commit the same crime against the state, as they consider it an “abstract notion” about which “one can speak and hear things, but one can never experience it empirically.”

10 No Author, “A csempészés és,” 90-94.
12 This was in fact the first time that the notion of smuggling appeared in the review of internal affaires.
15 Lázár, “Elmélkedés a bűnözésről,” 994.
THE QUESTION OF SHADOW ECONOMY

In the socialist state-organization, due to the drastic change in the work and ownership conditions, certain features appeared on the macro level, which can give an explanation for the crimes. Certain new state regulations can be accepted among people through the introduction of certain laws; however, without society’s sanction of these laws, common societal norms can lose their control over the individual. The conflict, which lies between the values accepted by the society and the fact that it only has restricted means to assert these values, is solved differently by individuals. They can very well respect the norms and regulations, but they also have the possibility to evade and reject these regulations.

In socialism, due to proprietorship, the scale of public property is larger than elsewhere. Accordingly, the offended person is an abstract personality, who can only establish the shortage through another person who was charged with the task of looking after state properties. However, in the case of the two personalities being the same, the criminal behaviours do not manifest as intended, and undertaken criminal behaviours only seem as a particular use of state property. Caroline Humphrey, who examined the behaviour of ordinary citizens during the transformation of the Soviet Union into Russian Federation, stated that the majority of the people who committed certain crimes did not consider themselves criminals. The non-formalised, and in many cases, not legal methods of purchasing goods were in fact used on a much wider scale than actual criminal behaviour happened. As Péter Galasi and Gábor István R. pointed out, in the nationalized economy, there was excess demand for different kinds of goods and services. According to the dichotomised differentiation between systems of limited sources and those of limited demand, elaborated by János Kornai, in capitalist economies, the demand of the consumers marks the frontier of productivity, whereas in the more fixed structure of socialist economic systems, it is the frontier of the rational exploitation of the sources, which creates the excess demand.

Thinking along with the concepts of Kornai and of Gábor R. and Galasi, we can state that people in shortage economy created illegal relations with different levels of the state sectors not because of their personal needs but also because of the demands of larger-scale productions. The means of production (such as vehicles) and consumer goods (such as clothes, jewellery and drinks that counted as status symbols) were obtained not only for personal use, but in order to transfer them and exchange them illegally.

Aczél’s article, published after the introduction of the new economic mechanism, discusses crimes, which threaten the living standards. The article confirms that due to the changes in economic life the new company regulations could cause bigger danger for criminality. Crimes such as violation of the law on foreign currency and smuggling are forms of illegal activity typically committed by groups and not individuals. This was the reason the Review of internal affairs (Bűnügyi Szemle) of 1970 focuses mainly on possible prevention of these crimes.

---

17 Galasi and Gábor, “Korrupció és tulajdon,” 415-421.
18 Kornai, A hiány, 110-134.
In their book, published in 1981, István Gábor R. and Péter Galasi defined the second economy without including illegal acts, such as fraud, peculation or acts against concrete property.\textsuperscript{20} They proposed that the phenomenon of the second economy had to be analysed according to three basic dimensions: the source of the income (work, capital – money, position, relations); the legality (legal or illegal); and the integrity (integrated, autonomic). The names of the main dimensions are already revealing as two of them settle the dichotomy in favour of legality (legal, integrated). According to the authors, the cross section between the second economy and socialist economy should lie in the meeting points of work, legality and integration. However, the ideal typical crossing point of legal and second economy was refuted by corruption studies carried out by the very same researchers and also by the following researches performed by Böröcz and others. Though Gábor R. and Galasi were perfectly correct in affirming that the laws changed over time, in later researches – such as the one described by Magdolna Stein\textsuperscript{21} – of the second economy, acts such as fraud and peculation were still present; these acts still fall under the category of illegal actions today. Lajos Szamel, a professor of economics, conducted researches on the influence of the second economy on corruption. According to him, the second economy stood behind the scrapping methods of state-owned companies, since in many regions, the goods were transported with trucks that were formally out of use. Using state-owned devices to help establishing private businesses became more prevalent. Supervisions and investigations on economic delinquency were shut off due to elaborated bribery techniques.\textsuperscript{22} In many cases, the perpetrators paid off their partners with status symbols, such as fridges, televisions or other products.

In 1990, Iván Szelényi published a study in which, following the concepts of Ferenc Erdei and Pál Juhász, he claimed that Hungarian history can be interpreted as a process of emergence of the middle class, a process which develops and then suddenly stops, depending on the historical situation. According to Szelényi, this process slowed down after 1948 because of the nationalization; in 1960 it speeded up, and in the mid-1980 it had a major effect on the structure of society.\textsuperscript{23} A considerable number of Hungarian scholars discovered the “bourgeois ethos”, the entrepreneur spirit in the second economy. This might be the reason why they neglected its relations to illegality. Nevertheless, Kornai argues that the informal economy, i.e. the private enterprises, had two options as they were constantly pursued by the bureaucracy: “they could function without a permit, finding the possibilities not yet prohibited by the law, or they could risk disregarding the law”.\textsuperscript{24} The latter option does not use the notion of the second economy in the same sense as Galasi and Gábor R., since they excluded illegality from their definition. With the expression “informal economy”, Kornai referred to the very same phenomenon without accepting the frontiers drawn by the above mentioned authors. As Kornai put it: “This is a collective notion referring to the illegal, the tolerated, the forbidden, though only softly pursued, and the severely pursued actions in the same time.”\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{20} Galasi and Gábor, A „második” gazdaság, 20.
\textsuperscript{21} Stein, “A bűnözés és a vendéglátóipar,” 89-92.
\textsuperscript{22} Szamel, A korrupció, a protekción és a többi, 99-101.
\textsuperscript{23} Szelényi, “Új osztály, állam, politika,” 42.
\textsuperscript{24} Kornai, A szocialista rendszer. Kritikai politikai gazdaságtan, 18.
\textsuperscript{25} Kornai, A szocialista rendszer. Kritikai politikai gazdaságtan, 18.
The conceptual framework of Kornai is closer to that of the presumed founder of the notion of “second economy”. As Endre Sik pointed out as well, Gregory Grossman was the first who used the term second economy for describing informal trade relations in the Soviet Union. Grossman severely criticized those researchers who used terms such as counter-economy, not-official economy or parallel markets. The strictness concerning the use of notions can be explained by the transformation of the socialist proprietorship, of legal situation, which was already discussed in the Cambridge research on Soviet citizens. During the Soviet period, a regime-specific system emerged, which was based on informal relations and corruption.

Grossman’s theoretical basis, namely the affirmation that there was a certain number of channels between the first and second economy, implies that this was not a complementary, and certainly not a counter-economy, but a necessary part of the political, legal and social change. Grossman’s notion does not reflect on the issues; however, it still remains the “most exact”: “All production and trade activity can be considered as second economy if it fulfills the following conditions: a) aiming at individual gains b) being in some significant respect in knowing contravention of existing law”.

We have already mentioned that several scholars wanted to distinguish the second economy from criminality. We do not intend to imply that Endre Sik neglected scientific accuracy in order to hide the relations of the second economy to illegality; however, his manner of translating Grossman’s definition is quite revealing. In Sik’s translation, the two conditions are the following: “a) it aims at individual gains b) it violates the existing law and order.” The part that says: “being in some significant respect in knowing contravention of existing law” is missing from the second point of Grossman’s definition. Sik’s translation in fact implies that the entrepreneurs of the socialist period could not possibly evade breaking the law, and when they actually broke the law, they only committed minor offences.

This minor slip in translation points at two phenomena. On the one hand, the people who committed crimes did not consider themselves criminals; this can be seen in sources from the Soviet period and still presents a problem in the post-Soviet countries. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult for the entrepreneurs who played an important role in the post-Soviet free market economy to present their past activity as legal.

We are not claiming that those who participated in second economy were all criminals. Moreover, we do not consider the speculation that every one of them violated the regulations valid, either. This would be no less naïve than stating that second economy had absolutely no relations with crime.

**Practical Application of the Theoretical Concepts**

Considering the internal discussions and Grossman’s definition, it is not surprising that in 1978, the Central Committee of the Worker’s Party (MSZMP KB) ordered the Planning
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Office (OT) to make plans for a new economic reform. For this reform to succeed, the Planning Office was told to work on the question of legalizing the second economy. Sik emphasises that putting the expression “legalization” (whitening of black money) into inverted commas was the last phase of censorship. According to Péter Róbert, it would have been more accurate to speak of a demi-legalization (másfelesítés), because the legalization can only relate to the first economy, while the state wanted to regulate the black market with this idea.

Ironically, the notion of organised crime appeared again in the first half of the 1980s, just when the Political Committee of the Worker’s Party accepted the proposal of the Planning Office on the second economy and sent it to the government. The material, which became public caused great debates and fears. Many feared that “socialism threw in the towel”. However, on 1st January 1982, the law on small entrepreneurs came into force. In the very same year, the National Police Headquarters took over and united the robbery cases treated separately by different police station of the Pest region.

On 1st November 1982, the investigation in the so called Prestige case was completed, the accused were judged the following year. The prosecutors proved them guilty of 170 criminal offences, including forgery of documents, illegal journeys abroad, car stealing, and receiving stolen goods.

Sándor Pintér, one of the investigators of the case, published the article entitled The elimination of a criminal organisation, in which he described the course of the investigation. He also presented a detailed chronological order of the investigation, which made it possible for the readers, foremost the professionals, to see how fortunes could emerge by outwitting the state control. According to the terminology of the period, one could only speak of a criminal organisation. However, in the debates that followed, this was the first case where the possibility of organised crime emerged.

László Tonhauser, the chief of the detectives charged with the case, recalled that from the end of the 1970s, the number of crimes committed against personal property increased, especially the number of burglaries. “The crime scenes lacked trace. The amount of damage increased. It was not too rare for the losses to reach 4, 5, even 10 million forints. It was impossible to close the cases. Even if we managed to find a suspect, he refused to speak with the police.” Tonhauser suggested that a new form of criminality became common in Hungary. The offenders acted according to a method, they worked with sure information. Investigations were made impossible due to the reinforcement of criminal networks. If one of the members got arrested, these networks supported his family. The arrested still received information through his family. Every member of the organisation had really good layers, who were available any time during the day.

37 Tonhauser, Nem kérek bocsánatot, 100.
The Secretary of Administrative Affairs of the Central Committee of the Worker’s Party, the Head of the Department of Public Administration, the Minister of Justice, the Interior Minister, and the President of the Supreme Court organised a council hidden from the public. The council held extensive informal power from 1957 to the political transformation in 1989. It became a practical solution that various leaders of state-organizations and the representatives of the Party collaborated through this forum.

The Committee of Coordination was in session every month. They discussed the most pertinent questions concerning criminal cases and justice. On 7th February 1983, Jenő Szilbereký, the president of the Supreme Court, presented an informative account concerning the “timeliness of most significant crimes committed by many offenders”. The account was made because of the Prestige case. According to Tonhauser, the leaders of the Internal Affairs department only supported the investigators’ concept of organised crime until the end of the investigation; in fact, after the case was closed, the team was also dissolved. Accordingly, Szilbereký’s presentation avoided using the term “criminal organization”, though according to the legal terminology of the period, this meant committing the crime in an organised manner. Instead of this, the president of the Supreme Court used the term “committed by many offenders”. In this sense timeliness got its importance, because the complicated criminal cases treated as committed by groups were more difficult to be closed quickly than the divided, separately judged cases.

In his memoirs, Tonhauser supposed that certain leaders of the state security supported these organizations in order to gain information about foreigners. Later, in order to restore good relations, an officer of the state security allowed the team to arrest one of these tipsters. Tonhauser, however, did not trust the officer, and requested closing the border for this person who wanted to leave the country for Austria. After the arrest of this person, officers of the state security monitored all interrogations. On one of these occasions, the accused asked Tonhauser what his chances were on the trial. Tonhauser replied saying that “as much as Szálasi on his main trial”. For this incident, the state security officers lodged a complaint against him. The police chiefs also had trouble with the fact that Tonhauser’s team wanted to investigate the origin of the wealth of the victims. The police chiefs did not want to expand the investigation to these fortunes of unknown origin.

Criminals involved with the Prestige case personally knew most of the people involved with the second economy, or they could easily gain information on them through their connections. The question arises: why did the police not want to investigate the wealth of the people connected with the second economy? Ervin Tamás gives a possible answer in his book, in which he interviewed the Police Superintendent of Siófok about the workers in the catering trade, which was a big part of second economy. “In the case of contractual shops, one has to be cautious about one thing: the receiving of stolen goods. Stolen goods exchange owners quite quickly, and the danger of getting caught is much smaller.” Supposedly, it
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39 Protocol of Coordination Committee on February 7, 1983. Reminder for the meeting.
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would have caused many political problems if the person who was prosecuted in 1981 was to be investigated further.

At the beginning of 1980, Tonhauser was the editor of the criminal programme entitled Blue light (Kék fény). Some interesting details of the Prestige affair could be shown to the public, e.g. the cars used for the robberies. Stories referring to the Hungarian underworld without admitting its existence explicitly were deemed appropriate for the public. However, the formation of organized crime could not be presented in the same programme.

**Conclusion**

Though the Review on internal affairs (Bűnügyi Szemle) was a professional forum for a limited number of readers, the question mark after the title (Organized crime?) was still obligatory. In the first paragraphs of the article, Tonhauser stressed the importance of the Prestige case. Everyone of the accused was asked what they thought of organized crime and if it existed in Hungary. One of the suspects opinion was taped. R. J., a main culprit of the Prestige case admitted that organized crime already existed in Hungary, especially in Budapest. According to the author, the offender’s answer, “demonstrates the opinion of the criminals perfectly”. This affirmation provoked several attacks, mainly from the lawyers of the defence. From the historical perspective, however, it is impossible to prove how many changes László Tonhauser made to the text. It is very likely that he changed the text only slightly, as the leading officers who aimed to refute the existence of organized crime would have surely pointed them out.

However R. J., confirmed the existence of organized crime in Hungary, he said that it had not yet reached the level that people considered as mafia activity. This reference to everyday people’s knowledge and concepts indicates that even the offender thought of organized crime on the basis of western and American movies and books.

Concerning the robberies, the offender had detailed information: “When it comes to robberies, they select the culprits and assure an alibi for them for the time of the crime.” The leaders of the organized crime against property were never sentenced. We will never learn the real position of these leaders inside the organizations. A well-built network of people bought the goods, while another group quickly cleaned up the evidence.

In the world of organized crime, lawyers played an important role. According to R. J., this was not only his opinion, since the “big shots” thought the same. Lawyers took advantage of the “back doors”, but always proceeded according to the regulations. They used tricks which could “lead the investigation into an impasse”. Tonhauser admitted the reason why he made the confession public was the behaviour of the defenders, specifically the reference made to the big shots. The offender added that the knowledge of the lawyers was very highly valued, so these lawyers gained enormous profits.

“I was a part of the so called underworld. I have some connections which are personal, friendly – in quotation marks – connections, so I got to know one or two things.” In this quote, the term “so called” references the fact that he put friendship in quotation marks indicates that relations developed in the illegality resembled those made in working places; meaning that they were only maintained out of interest. Instead of some kind of romanticism, the description of the accused presented a well-organized informal world.
According to the accused, during the 1970s, several groups, foremost at the Keleti Railway Station, gained profit by smuggling goods, which were considered status symbols, such as quartz watches and jeans. After the upswing of the black market, the smuggling groups started deals with profits of five hundred thousand forints. At the end of the 1970s, “the small entrepreneurs and others who participated in this business made fortunes, which was more than irritating. In the meantime, a generation grew up which got nothing from all this […]. If these people have as much money and they did not even get it legally […]. We can only get some of it if we rob them.”

R. J. basically summarized the class conflict of the informal criminal underworld during the Kadar-era, which, figuratively speaking, ended with the victory of proletarian robbers. The international aspect of the revolutionary change was caused by the fact that dissident Hungarians or other foreigners served as receivers of stolen goods. They cooperated with the robbers and later on gave direct suggestions about what was precious for them. The western countries served as a useable acquirer market for the stolen jewellery and art treasures.
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Does conceptual framework of the dependency theory and world-system analysis – devised to capture underdeveloped economies in the longue durée – apply to East Central Europe in the Age of Empire as well? This paper compares the economic development of partitioned Poland in the eastern provinces of the German Empire, the crownland of Galicia of Habsburg Monarchy, and Congress Poland under Tsarist Russia during the late 19th century. While Austrian Poland seems to validate a sustained status of periphery, both Prussian and Russian Poland reveal ambiguous and changing relationships between the centres and margins. The origins and effects of dependency, as well as the link between dependency and backwardness, are often not as straightforward as theories suggest.

INTRODUCTION

The process of modernization and the problem of backwardness occupy a central theme in the economic history of Eastern Central Europe. In 1950s, Alexander Gerschenkron compared the latecomers to industrialization, such as imperial Germany and Russia, to characterize the stages of catching-up.¹ The point of contention lies not only in the roots of success or failure in developing capitalism in a given region, but also in the question of how certain evidence and explanations helped or failed to illuminate the overall social, economic, and political transformations. This preoccupation finds a similar expression in the scholarship on the Global South, with much contestation as to the origins and extent of underdevelopment.

Dependency theory and the world-system analysis, first emerged in the study of Latin America in mid-20th century, come in as a relevant device to analyze Eastern Europe. Andre Gunder Frank, in his seminal work The Development of Underdevelopment, proposes that economic integration between advanced centres and backward peripheries prevents the convergence of the two and leads to structural dependency.² Building upon this centre-periphery model, Immanuel Wallerstein elaborates on the existence of semi-peripheral zones and the relation of unequal exchange.³ Putting on such theoretical lenses, it seems that a large part of East Central Europe had assumed a familiar role of periphery long before the Industrial Revolution.

In addition to other justified criticism of the theories, the particularities and diversity of Eastern Europe demand further conceptual re-evaluation. In the early 1980s, L. S. Stavrianos

¹ Gerschenkron, Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective and An Economic Spurt that Failed.
² Frank, “Development of Underdevelopment”.
applied the world-system approach to Eastern Europe as the “first Third World.” 4 Iván Berend and György Ránki remarked that “the weakest point [of the literature dealing with the relation between core and periphery] seems to be its failure adequately to account for the relationship between the developed and underdeveloped parts of Europe”. 5 What, for example, is the causal relationship between dependency and development, if Eastern Europe was “in some sense economic backward long before it was absorbed into the broader Western world market”? 6 How was dependency created and reinforced, if, for example, “paradoxically it was only after Poland was finally divided and absorbed into other empires that parts of it began to progress”? 7

In this light, the partitioned Polish lands provide a fitting context to cross-examine the grand narratives of dependency theory. The long 19th century – the so-called Age of Empires, the First Wave of Globalization and the Second Industrial Revolution – brought the very first attempts of modernization to the region. I set out to explore the cases of agricultural progress in the Prussian East, the oil industry of Habsburg Galicia, as well as the textile metropolis in Russian Poland. The three regions differed in terms of material resources, local and imperial politics, financial institutions, ethnic communities, and market orientation. Together they offer distinctive units of analysis that transcend national and imperial boundaries, and allow for a comparative appraisal of the merit and limits of economic theories.

**PRUSSIAN POLAND: SUGAR BEET AND INTERNAL COLONIZATION**

“The Poles have a tendency to congregate in the stratum of the population that stands lowest on the economic and social scale...Economic well-being, relative superiority of standard of living, and German culture are in West Prussia one and the same thing.”

*Max Weber, 1895*

The eastern territories of imperial Germany, including the provinces of Posen, Silesia, East and West Prussia, constituted themselves as an amalgam of socioeconomic differences. Agricultural and industrial production, “the coalition of rye and iron”, varied from region to region, and between rural areas and urban centres. The case of sugar beet cultivation is nonetheless instructive, since the policy of internal colonization and the phenomenon of Ostflucht (flight from East) intertwined closely with the operation of sugar beet industry, profoundly shaping the process of migration, industrialization, labour control, and ethnic tensions within the empire.

If development is defined in terms of technological progress and material output, the sugar beet industry played an instrumental part in the agricultural modernization of Imperial Germany. The provinces of Posen and Silesia, along with Saxony and central Germany, hosted the labour-intensive production and procession of sugar beet. While the empire was at the same time an important producer of other types of grains, it was the root crop, sugar beet in particular, that has truly industrialized agriculture. 8 The expansion of sugar beet industry
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stimulated scientific research and production of artificial fertilizers, enabled a breakthrough of rotational farming and the elimination of fallowing, and gave Germany “the most advanced European farming of the mid-19th century”.9

To the extent that sugar beet production elevated agricultural development in Prussia Poland, it also prompted human and material resources to fuel the core sectors of steel and railway in the centres of industrialization such as the Ruhr Valley. Towards the late 19th century, the agricultural output of Germany gradually lost its competitive advantage. Protectionist policies were adopted consequently. Meanwhile, massive internal migration and influx of seasonal labourers formed a “flight from the East,” constituted of ethnic German, Polish, and other workers. A majority of the willig und billig (willing and cheap) labourers led lives that resembled “purgatory or even hell”.10 In this case, Andre Gunder Frank’s characterization stands valid, that “underdevelopment was and still is generated by the very same historical process which also generated economic development: the development of capitalism itself”.11

Against this backdrop, the German sociologist Max Weber delivered his 1895 inaugural speech, invoking a “Slavic threat” that was inflated by a simultaneous absence of competent elites to advance German interests. Weber was representative in his nationalistic sentiments, as economic transformation in Germany not only catalysed class conflicts, but also ethnic antagonism. The traditional landowners, the Junkers, were on the decline in terms of their wealth and influence. Meanwhile, Bismarck had initiated the Settlement Commission to strengthen Germanization in the east. Along with the Kulturkampf against Catholic cultural identity and institutions, the policy of internal colonization was both a politically and economically charged measure to consolidate the newly unified German Empire.12 The goal of developing a “national economy”, according to Weber and many of his contemporaries, can only be a nationalistic one.

Illustrative of an imperialistic world-system economy, the subjugation of the Prussian East set templates for Germany’s overseas expansion. As Andrew Zimmerman argues, the fact that the German empire looked for lessons from the American South demonstrated a mutual borrowing of colonial practices in labour control and resource extraction.13 In the 1880s, the German government employed similar techniques in its Western African colony of Togo. Colonization transformed Togo into “an economically and politically dependent” region and “helped to create the network of economic disparities that characterizes the global economy to this day”.14

The eastern periphery of Imperial Germany, however, did not entirely conform to the image of industrial underdevelopment and economic dependency. With large coal and mineral deposits, Upper Silesia experienced rapid industrialization and emerged as a leading centre for mining, iron and steel industry. What became modern Poland from the Prussian, Austrian, and Russian territories, contingently and in steps, reveals that industrialization and development at

---

10 Braudel, Aftetthoughts on Material Civilization and Capitalism, 82.
11 Frank, “Development of Underdevelopment”.
13 Zimmerman, Alabama in Africa.
large cannot be analysed only from the perspective of national history but rather as a regional and border-crossing phenomenon.\textsuperscript{15}

**AUSTRIAN GALICIA: OIL ADVENTURE AND POLISH AUTONOMY**

“The soil is rich; the inhabitants are poor.”

*Joseph Roth, 1924*

In contrast to the heavy-handed political control in Prussia East, Habsburg Galicia represented a curious case of core-periphery dynamics, as the region wielded expansive autonomy after the 1867 Compromise. The discovery and development of the oil industry in late 19\textsuperscript{th} century became an enterprise of multiple contradictions, with imperial and regional tensions embedded in the world of market force, capital network and technological transfer.

Out of the three partitioned Polish lands, the economic reality of Galicia provides a model case for the prepositions of dependency theory. The region’s incorporation into the monarchy after 1772 broke its former ties with Western Europe and the Baltic. Throughout the period of 1772 to 1914, Galicia’s per capita income stood behind half of the monarchy’s average level.\textsuperscript{16} Trading patterns, investment level, and living standard all pointed to the consequences of imposed economic integration, namely a structural exploitation instead of benefaction. Typical of a peripheral zone, Galicia’s trade relations were increasingly dominated by exports of primary goods to, and imports of finished products from Austria and Bohemia.\textsuperscript{17}

Despite the trends towards urbanization and the spread of capitalist enterprise, the ruralisation of economy in Galicia resulted from anti-development policies pursued by both the Habsburg and local ruling elites.\textsuperscript{18} Vienna poured little resources into Galicia’s infrastructure, investment and institution building, until much later in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and clearly lesser than those into Austria’s constitutional equal, the Hungarian Kingdom. Although the Polish aristocracy used self-rule to secure benefits for Galicia, they were more vested in their agricultural estates to the extent of ignoring or even resisting industrial initiatives. The resulting poverty precipitated economic emigration, seasonal and permanent, further depriving the region of valuable human capital. Economic dependency did not take the form of outright predation, but purported policies of unequal exchange and neglect.

Observing the legacy of underdevelopment, the Austrian Jewish writer Joseph Roth, however, alluded to a finer point in dependency and development: could human agency and historical contingency have shaped the history of this resource-rich region differently? The rise and fall of Galician petroleum industry embodies a case in point. Galician oilfields flourished in the second half of 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Despite the modest amounts of oil, they made Austria-Hungary the third largest oil producer in the first decade of 20\textsuperscript{th} century. In the poor areas of eastern Galicia, extracting and refining the “black gold” was imbued even more with symbolic meaning. The contemporaries championed that “oil was the carrier of light and progress, part of a civilizing mission that would illuminate Europe’s darkest regions”.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} Torp, “Great Transformation: German Economy and Society 1850-1914,” 1-2.
\textsuperscript{16} Kaps, “Civilizing Galicia 1772-1914”.
\textsuperscript{17} Kaps, “Civilizing Galicia 1772-1914”.
\textsuperscript{19} Frank, *Oil Empire,* 6.
Rather than a success story, the oil adventure in Galicia ended as a development failure. It is inhibiting that Vienna discouraged the expansion of Galician industry in order to protect the refineries in the Austrian heartland. The greatest irony is that, while the Galician ruling elites enjoyed substantial political autonomy, the oil industry with its feature of vertical integration required centralization and standardization. Instead of a central monopoly of mineral rights and land ownership, decentralization and self-determination gave rise to miscalculation and mismanagement. This irrational system of oil exploitation led to waste and pollution, overproduction, price collapse, and even disruption of delivery during WWI.20

If the uneven development in Prussia Poland suggests the regional nature of industrialization, then the oil industry in Galicia underlines the transnational ties above and multinational elements within an imperial economy. Alison Frank, in her Oil Empire: Visions of Prosperity in Austrian Galicia, captures the intersection of foreign entrepreneurship, capital flow, and technological spill-over: “[T]his national Austrian industry was financed by the French, British, and Belgians, legislated by Germans and Poles, inspired by North Americans, and worked by men and women speaking primarily Ukrainian, Polish, Yiddish, German, and English, but also a host of other languages.”21 While Dutch corporations and Canadian investors participated in a more globalized market with their oil business from Galicia; Bohemian chemists, local entrepreneurs, and Jewish labourers – those who defied clear national and class categories – paved way for the economic modernization on the imperial margin.

In exploring the relationship between development and dependency, Austrian Galicia offers more than just a footnote to the centre-periphery asymmetry. Ethnic and class antagonism, incarnated in the relationship between Ruthenian peasants and Polish landowners, suggests a double colonial framework at work: the Poles both as the colonized and the colonizer in Galicia. 22 The tandem and tensions of imperial oversight and local self-determination produced a distinctive dynamic between Vienna and Galicia, cementing economic disparity and peripheral underdevelopment.

**RUSSIAN POLAND: TEXTILE METROPOLIS AND EASTERN MARKET**

“Exchange and the division of labour have strung thousands of threads between Russia and Poland...The capitalist fusion process between Poland and Russia also has an important dialectical side.”

*Rosa Luxemburg, 1898*

Unlike Austrian Galicia, Congress Poland under Tsarist Russia stands as a convincing exception to the centre-periphery model. The great leap of industrialization put the region ahead of Russia in the last quarter of 19th century, as the gross output of Congress Poland exceeded that of the St. Petersburg area and followed closely after St. Petersburg. 23 As shown in the case of the textile centre Łódź, Russian Poland not only reverses the ideal type of periphery, but also questions the economic cost of dependency.

---

20 Frank, *Oil Empire*, 1-24, 140-173.
21 Frank, *Oil Empire*, 7.
22 Kaps and Surman, “Postcolonial or Post-Colonial?”
23 Kochanowicz, “Polish Kingdom: A Periphery as a Leader.”
The development of capitalism and industrialization in Congress Poland incorporated three prominent features: a visible hand of the state, the presence of foreign capital and ethnic entrepreneurship, as well as the importance of Russian market. The earlier period of the 1820s and 1830s paved way for the Polish industrial spurt. The finance minister of the Polish Kingdom, Prince Drucki-Lubecki, led efforts of economic invigoration, such as establishing the first Polish State Bank and the Warsaw-Vienna railway line. From the mid-19th century, the arrival of foreign entrepreneurs brought along technological and institutional innovations, including the modern loom machines and joint-stock investment. One indispensable factor that enabled “the struggle between Łódź and Moscow” was what Rosa Luxemburg recognized in her doctoral thesis: a vast “eastern market” crucial for the economic growth of the Polish Kingdom. By the mid-1880s, the Russian market consumed half of the products exported from Congress Poland, a territory which made up less than ten percent of the total population, but produced one-quarter of the steel, two-fifths of the coal, one-fifth of the sugar, and one-fifth of the textiles in the Russian Empire.

The exponential growth of Łódź, the “Polish Manchester”, benefited from the top-down programs of modernization as well as the laissez faire environment of entrepreneurship and free labor. The population of the city ballooned from less than one thousand in 1820 to over half a million in 1913. From the mid-19th century, more than half of the dwellers worked in textile manufacture. With increasing mechanization, Łódź’s biggest factories belonged to German and Jewish owners, while the Poles made up the majority of the work force. This unprecedented rate of urbanization led to massive proletarianization. The lines from the poet Julian Tuwin, a native of Łódź, can be read both as a sarcastic and genuine articulation of Lodzermensch: “its dirt and smoke/are happiness and bliss to me”.

Timing of events, as much as choices of people, shaped the fate of Lodz and the fortune of its textile industry. Władysław Reymont, Polish novelist and Nobel laureate, recounted the ruthless and risky race of capital accumulation in the supposedly “Promised Land” of Łódź. The disruption of American cotton supply during the Civil War and the military demands of the Crimean War contracted certain sectors of commercial branches. The Polish revolt in 1863 set back the clock of development, while the favourable trade policy with Russia in the 1870s again attracted foreign capitalists, primarily Germans. At the turn of the century, this advanced periphery reached its zenith and accounted for over half of the textile output within the Russian Empire.

This reversed dynamics of core-periphery between Russian and Congress Poland changed, when the Russian government embarked on an aggressive state-led industrialization. From the late 1880s onwards, Russian economic policies displayed active involvement of the state in development, unparalleled by Germany, Austria-Hungary, or any Western country. Such interventionist policy represented Russia’s ambition to break away from the incorporation to the West-dominated world-system of economy as a subordinate player. Under the Minister of Finance Sergei Witte, railway trackage doubled, financial institutions

---

24 Luxemburg, “Industrial Development of Poland”.
25 Rieber, Merchants and Entrepreneurs in Imperial Russia, 66.
26 Puś, “Die Berufs- und Sozialstruktur”.
27 Tuwin, “Łódź”.
29 Stavrianos, Global Rift, 333-348.
improved, and the output of coal, steel and petroleum skyrocketed.\textsuperscript{30} As Russia experienced the great spurt, the Polish Kingdom began to lose its leading position in production and market share. This would confirm Andre Gunder Frank’s description of the satellite, that is, by design and intent the development of a subordinate metropolis will be limited eventually by its subordinate and satellite status.\textsuperscript{31}

For Congress Poland, another question that the dependency theory poses is whether the intensity of ties between the satellite and the metropolis influences the development trajectory. Andre Gunder Frank hypothesizes that “satellites experience their greatest economic development and especially their most classically capitalist industrial development if and when their ties to their metropolis are weakest”.\textsuperscript{32} This remains a conjecture, however, given the importance of the Russian market and the presence of foreign enterprises that put Congress Poland at the crossroad of capital and population transfers. In all the three Prussian, Austrian, and Russian cases, the economic dependence of the partitioned Polish lands cross cut the lines of political domination. The structures of dependency were orientated fundamentally toward centres of capital, be it English, French or American, less so to the German, Austrian, and Russian states.

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

The comparison of German, Austrian, and Russian Poland shows that while Habsburg Galicia corresponds better to the status of an economic periphery, the Prussian East presents a mixed picture and Congress Poland subverts the ideal type of imperial borderland. Across the three cases, the dependency theory accounts only partially for the spatial variations and temporal changes in the relationship between central and peripheral types of development. Though not exhaustive, the world-system analysis does bring to light some structural undercurrents beneath the descriptive realities of the three imperial peripheries. Looking at partitioned Poland helps us to contextualize the concepts of dependency and development in at least three aspects: the ambiguous consequences of dependency, the uneven spatial and social differentiation in economic development.

Contrary to the deterministic predictions of dependency theory, it is difficult to generalize whether structural dependency, as a rule, facilitates convergence or reinforces backwardness. For many parts of East Central Europe, the roots of backwardness stemmed from “the very distant past”.\textsuperscript{33} In all three cases, narratives based on quantitative and qualitative sources have hardly produced a satisfactory consensus on whether economic ties with the centre are categorically beneficial or detrimental for the periphery. Prussian and Austrian Poland indicate that despite the diffusion of capital and technology, the political leverage and economic absorption exercised from the imperial centres were of negative, if not damaging, influence on the aspirations of development in the abject provinces. Russian Poland, on the contrary, embodies the case of beneficial access to the new market, with some provincial latitude and a tight bond with St. Petersburg coexisting on the ground.

\textsuperscript{31} Frank, “Development of Underdevelopment”.
\textsuperscript{32} Frank, “Development of Underdevelopment”.
\textsuperscript{33} Chirot, \textit{Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe}, 3.
Instead of simply portraying a widening divide between “Western” growth and “Eastern” underdevelopment, what pertains particularly to the region is Immanuel Wallerstein’s concept of semi-peripheral zones. During the long 19th century, the three empires in focus exemplify an in-between economic zone, where old and new modes of production existed together, people and capital movement came into interaction and competition, and the transition to core or to margin appeared possible.34 The three partitioned Polish lands echo with the world-system analysts’ attempt to shift focus from national to historical systems. Against the typical images of Prussian heavy industry and the agrarian half of Austria-Hungary, the history of sugar beet cultivation in Posen and petroleum enterprise in Galicia call to attention a parallel yet less acknowledged side of the development story. It is important to stress the enclaves of industrialization, such as the sizable mining in Upper Silesia and the brief oil boom in Austrian Galicia, that indicate the existence of inner differentiation even within a seemingly peripheral space.

While the world-system analysis envisions the relationship of dependency primarily in horizontal and geographical terms, the three Polish cases – as well as many other colonial societies – highlight the vertical and societal dimension of dependency. As capitalist development took roots, dependency and inequality manifested not only along the spread from core to periphery, but also along the ladder from high to low classes. There was, indeed, a dependence of political and economic elites upon those whom they oppressed and exploited.35 The seasonal labourers in the sugar beet fields, peasants in poverty stricken Galicia, and proletarian workers in Łódź factories experienced a heightened social differentiation, if not absolute and comparative downward mobility during the transformative phrase of modernization in the late 19th century. What’s more, the three cases show ethnically stratified patterns in the division of labour and social wellbeing. Hence, there are more ambiguities to the characteristic of dependency across geographic and social boundaries.

However, the world-system theory tends to de-emphasize certain institutional and social forces that are of crucial importance in modernization. With regard to the structural and material determinist undertone of such theories, the Polish cases foreground two supplementary accounts: the changing role of the state and the embeddedness of institutions. In line with the critique from state-autonomist theorists, the underlying rationale and shifting policy of Berlin, Vienna and St. Petersburg towards their inner peripheries must be placed in domestic and international contexts of their own.36 Governance practices responded to economic imperatives, but also to various objectives and constraints in a nationalizing or multiethnic empire. In addition, the significance of ethnic entrepreneurship in times of economic transition was especially apparent in Congress Poland and Galicia.37 Neither modernization nor dependency theory fully comprehend economic institutions as the mobilization of resources through particular networks. Institutional embeddedness shows that neither material nor social structure would solely determine the economic outcome, but that they combine to produce different interactions.38

37 Rieber, Merchants and Entrepreneurs in Imperial Russia. Frank, Oil Empire.
38 Granovetter and Swedberg, Sociology of Economic Life, 9-12, 29-52.
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The big earthquake in Dubrovnik and its consequences for the town and influence on literature in 17th century
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The small Republic of Dubrovnik existed from the medieval times until 1808. During the early modern era Dubrovnik's government paid taxes to the Ottoman Empire, but the republic was actually independent. Early in the morning of 6th April 1667 Dubrovnik was wounded by a big earthquake and a big fire afterwards. Both caused major damage to the town and its infrastructure. However, some brave people decided to stop the chaos in the town and tried to rebuild it and save its independence. Thanks to them and the town's diplomats dealing with diplomatic issues Dubrovnik saved its independence even though it was surrounded by two powerful states: the Republic of Venice and the Ottoman Empire. The diplomats tried very hard to improve the importance of Dubrovnik's trade. These events had some influence on literary works in Dubrovnik. Some of the writers were also diplomats and they wrote about their life experience. In this article I write about the big earthquake in Dubrovnik and its influence on literature.

INTRODUCTION – “BETWEEN THE LION AND THE DRAGON”

If we want to describe the history of Dubrovnik in 17th century, we can use one phrase: “between the lion and the dragon”. Its existence was always in the balance between the Republic of Venice and the Ottoman Empire. That position was very important during the Candian war between those two states. That period was really fruitful for Dubrovnik’s trade. The Turkish government stopped their trade to the Venetian ports on the Eastern Adriatic coast so they would not get the money from their enemies. After that, they directed their caravans to the port of Dubrovnik. However, the Republic of Venice caught these ships in their attempt to stop the development of their main trade enemy, Dubrovnik.¹

The situation changed after the big earthquake that happened in the early morning of 6th April 1667. The town was damaged, a lot of people died, and the preserved records of the survivors tell the ugly truth of the cataclysmic moments of the ruined and burned town which reminds the poet Petar Kanavelić of “Troja or Rome”.²

¹ Krasić, Stjepan Gradić, 184-185.
² Kanavelić, Grad Dubrovnik, 176.
THE BIG EARTHQUAKE IN DUBROVNIK – "THE FIRST DEATH OF THE TOWN"³

Facts about the big earthquake

The south part of the eastern Adriatic coast is a very tremulous area; the big earthquake was the strongest that happened there. It happened on the Wednesday before Easter, on 6th April 1667, between 8 and 9 a.m. The land was shook not only in Dubrovnik, but also in Ston on the peninsula of Pelješac and in Konavle, on the territory of the Republic. On the other side of the border, the earthquake caused damage in the towns of Boka kotorska: Perast, Kotor, Herceg-Novci and Budva, and also in Mostar and Trebinje, in Herzegovina. Some houses were damaged even in Split, Šibenik and Zadar. However, Dubrovnik was damaged the most.⁴

During the earthquake, Andrija Zmajević⁵, the archbishop of Bar and the primate of Serbia, was serving mass in the church on the St. Georg island in front of Perast. He was buried under the ruins and only after two hours the local people pulled him out. Before the big earthquake happened, he planned a trip to Dubrovnik. But, after the disaster, he cancelled it and wrote the poem Slovinska Dubrava, in which he described his experience of the earthquake and glorified Dubrovnik: “It is not dead/it could not die […] it will be more beautiful”.⁶

This event changed Dubrovnik’s history forever. The earthquake did not last long but the land shook several times during the next couple of days.

The Rector died under the ruins of the chapel, together with a large part of the aristocracy. They were waiting for the end of the mass when a council meeting was supposed to happen. That is when a ground shook.⁷

After the earthquake, many buildings were destroyed by the big fire. Unfortunately, the great library of the Franciscan monastery, which was not damaged in the earthquake, burned down in the fire.

The cathedral was completely destroyed together with a lot of churches, and new ones had to be built afterwards.

³ The phrase was used for the first time by the Croatian historian Lujo Vojnović (1864. – 1951.), who used it in his essay “The first death of Dubrovnik” in 1912.; Samardžić, Veliki vek, 229.
⁴ Samardžić, Veliki vek, 258-259.; Harris, Povijest Dubrovnika, 337.
⁵ Andrija Zmajević was the archbishop of Bar and the primate of Serbia. He was born in Perast, and finished his education in Rome. That was the period when the Swedish queen Kristina came to Rome after she has converted to Catholicism. They took some classes together. The students from different parts of Europe honoured her by presenting a speech in their mother tongues. Therefore, he talked in Croatian in front of her. He also wrote the chronicle Ljetopis crkvnji and the poem Slovinska Dubrava. His nephew Matija Zmajević established the Russian navy on the Black Sea.; Novak, Povijest hrvatske književnosti, 527-528., 734-735.
⁶ Samardžić, Veliki vek, 259.; Novak, Povijest hrvatske književnosti, 527-528.
⁷ Foretić, Povijest Dubrovnika, 133-134.
Dubrovnik during the earthquake (Samardžić, Veliki vek, 407.)

Luckily, the walls of Dubrovnik and some buildings survived the big earthquake. One of those was the St. Saviour Church next to the Franciscan monastery. This church is votive and it was built after an earthquake in 1520. The Palace Divona/Sponza\(^8\) survived that disaster as well.\(^9\)

![Saint’s Savior Church](image)

After the first surprising moments, some of the people who survived the earthquake, especially the servants of the aristocracy, turned to robbery. Same reasons led many people from their neighbourhoods as well.\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) Dubrovnik's Archive is settled there today.

\(^9\) Harris, *Povijest Dubrovnika*, 328., 336-337.

In the insecure period that followed, the Bosnian pasha tried to conquer “the rich town” and the main Venice general in Dalmatia, provveditore generale Catarino Cornaro, sailed to Dubrovnik.

We do not know the precise number of the people who died in Dubrovnik during the earthquake. Catarino Cornaro mentioned 4000 dead people in his letter to the Council in Venice. The Dutch diplomat Van Dam said that 5000 people died, while the archbishop gave an exaggerated estimation of 14 000 dead people. Dubrovnik’s main policy was to hide the correct number of victims to protect the city’s interests. The precise number of dead aristocrats is however known: 57 nobles. Robin Harris supposed that 2000 people died in the town, and 1000 more on the whole territory of the Republic. In his article “Population of the Dubrovnik Republic in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century”, Nenad Vekarić provides a chart with demographical data about Dubrovnik and assessments of Croatian historians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate's Author</th>
<th>Released in</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dubrovnik (town)</th>
<th>Dubrovnik Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lujo Vojnović 13</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>8-10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Božo Cvjetković 14</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>mid 16th c.</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Jireček 15</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorjo Tadić 16</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>end 15th c.</td>
<td>20-25,000</td>
<td>5-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijo Mirković 17</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zdravko Šundrica 18</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>mid 16th c.</td>
<td>35-40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorjo Tadić 19</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>end 15th c.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante Marinović 28</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>25-30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogumil Hrabak 21</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1540 - 1570</td>
<td>40-50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogumil Hrabak 22</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>end 16th c.</td>
<td>30-40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinko Foretić 23</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Stulli 24</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>mid 16th c.</td>
<td>up to 10,000</td>
<td>up to 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Krivošić 24</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1450 - 1650</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Krivošić 25</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miloš Blagojević 26</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>17-18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table with demographical data of population in Dubrovnik (Vekarić, “Population of Dubrovnik“, 10.)

---

11 Harris, Povijest Dubrovnika, 335-336.
12 Vekarić, “Population of Dubrovnik”, 10. The chart with the demographical data is enclosed at the end of the article.
The big earthquake in records

There are some written sources from the period in question which can help us reconstruct the atmosphere in the damaged Dubrovnik. Most of them are private letters from the aristocrats, letters from the diplomats and their diaries, descriptions written by priests, the archbishop and foreigners who were in Dubrovnik when the disaster happened. For example, an unknown priest wrote that the earthquake was as long as a sentence of a prayer: “Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi secundum”. Another wrote that the earthquake was so strong that the hill Srd above the town quavered and rocks were falling down. The land opened and whole houses fell into holes. People heard thunder and one of the fortifications was divided into two parts and merged afterwards. The sea withdrew from the port and when it returned (this repeated a few times) a lot of ships were destroyed.13

The priest and writer Vlaho Skvadrović, who was also a chaplain in the archbishop’s chapel, described the earthquake in the letter he wrote to his uncle in Napoli: “During the mass the archbishop’s palace was split into two parts. We were running from one part to the other. When we went out of the palace, we did not see houses and churches: we only saw the ruins of what used to be houses and churches. The walls were quavering and after the tremor, the big fire damaged the buildings that were not damaged in the earthquake. The Dominican monastery was not damaged by the fire but by the earthquake […].

In the beginning, everybody tried to run away, but after a couple of days the army of 300 people was on the walls and the government decided to put things in order.”14 This priest was in the archbishop’s suite and they were in the same place when the earthquake happened. However, the archbishop Pietro Torres described the disaster differently. He escaped to Ancona with a ship together with nuns. In his description of the earthquake he proclaimed himself a saint: “While I was running, everybody who touched my habit had been blessed. When they touched my habit, people who were half buried in the ruins; died in peace.”15 His journey to Ancona lasted almost a month because of bad weather. When they arrived their destination, there was a great celebration and the archbishop’s description of the earthquake was published in a book. His relationship with Dubrovnik’s government was not friendly because they always tried to diminish the Church’s influence. After the big earthquake, the citizens of Dubrovnik were complaining about his escape and accused him of taking nuns with him.16

Another priest, Vido Andrijašević, also published his description of the earthquake in Ancona. His depictions were greatly exaggerat. He said that “the sky was covered with human blood and smoke”. However, he also wrote about some true events: “Wells were dry […] People were running over dead bodies, others were pulled from the ruins a couple of days after the earthquake […] A mother spent four days holding her dead son in her arms.”17

13 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 224-225.
14 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 327-329; Novak, Povijest hrvatske književnosti, 415-416.
15 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 236-237.
16 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 234-236.
17 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 238-239.
The nobleman Brno Đurđević wrote about the big disaster to his friend in Rome, Stjepan Gradić. In the letter he described people who were pulled from the ruins and died of exhaustion soon after their rescue. This letter was published in Ancona as well.18

Letters from another nobleman, Frano Bobaljević, contain accurate descriptions of the earthquake. He wrote to his cousin, Marko Bobaljević, and his letters are honest and very emotional. He experienced the biggest tragedy of his life. Before the earthquake he had just gone out of his house. After the tremor, he went home, but could not find it. Luckily, his neighbour’s house was not damaged and he found the ruins of his house. A large part of his family died. He saved his two children, their nanny and one of his cousins who had been crying because his debtors were dead. His wife and his other five children died. He could not forgive himself for not saving his youngest daughter Anica. He did not only describe his family tragedy, but the robberies and the sentences of the robbers as well. He listed many servants as well as noblemen who acted dishonourably. For example, many survivors did not want to help their injured neighbours unless they received some valuable things: jewellery, gold, money or valuable clothes. His letter also contains a list of damaged things and a description of the recovery of the wounded town.19

The disaster also affected foreign Dutch diplomats Joris Croock and Jacob van Dam who stopped in Dubrovnik, a neutral liberal town, on their way to the Ottoman Empire. They were sent there to replace their colleagues on the posts in Istanbul and Izmir. They came to Dubrovnik a couple of days before the earthquake hit. A couple of French people were on their way to the Ottoman Empire with them, but they were travelling for fun. They stayed in separate houses. Joris Croock’s wife was pregnant. They both died under the ruins of the house in which they stayed in Dubrovnik. “Van Dam felt a big tremor and he was ejected from his bed. He ran out of the house and saw robbers in the town and on Srđ, the hill above the town. He saw women and men who were jumping into the sea because they were of afraid of robbers.”20

The only French people who survived the earthquake were Harden, his servant and his friend. Harden described the shocking moments of chaos in Dubrovnik. “There were some nuns passing by and I called them to help me and my friends. But they did not want to do that unless I gave them a prize. Then I remembered that I had two rings and I gave these rings to them and they started cleaning the ruins and pulled us out […] Then they left […] Finally, we got out. We spent three days and two nights under the ruins and had to drink our urine twenty times to survive. We walked through the ruins and saw the most shocking sights in the world. We had to skip over dead bodies to reach the port. When we reached the port we saw that a couple of ships were damaged and spotted a big fire.”21 They moved to the other part of the town, to Gruž. They slept in a garden. A few days later, a ship came to the port and they sailed to Venice.22

18 Tatarin, Feniks, 112-113.
19 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 238-242.
21 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 234-235.
22 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 234-235.
THE RENOVATION OF DUBROVNIK

Despite the bad and cataclysmic situation in the town, there were some brave people who decided to react. Those noblemen gathered around Luka Džamanjić/Zamanja. They decided to rebuild the damaged town and to create a new council that was supposed to make decisions until the end of the recovery period. They formed a council with ten people and added two more members after a couple of days: Nikola Bunić and Marojica Kaboga. When Bunić joined the council, they moved the city’s treasure into the fort Revelin where it was safe. Bunić also moved gunpowder to the safe place. Not only noblemen, but also rich citizens could vote in the Council. When the situation improved, those citizens were favoured to become the new additions to the old reconstructed councils (the Small Council, the Great Council and the Senate). Their families replaced the aristocratic families that died.

Their first task was to stop the emigration from the town. Then they ordered Marojica Kaboga to organise an army that would keep the safety of the town and urged their diplomats to protect their interests in Rome, Istanbul and Bosnia. Two noblemen (members of the Council) were judges. They made sure as many robbers as possible were found and punished.23

THE STORY OF MAROJICA KABOGA

Marojica Kaboga, also called Marin Špaletin was a very interesting person. Before the earthquake, he was known for disrupting the peace of the town. He had a very bad temper, but he was a nobleman, a member of the council and even a diplomat. When the relationship between Dubrovnik and the Turks in Herzegovina was bad, he befriended some Turks in Rijeka Dubrovačka above Dubrovnik. The government sent him a letter ordering him to come back to town. After arriving a day late, he was accused of bad behaviour. His father-in-law Nikola Sorkočević was the most insistent and even tried to imprison him. In his anger, Kaboga pulled out his sword and hit Sorkočević three times. The old man passed away soon after. Kaboga escaped and hid in the well of the Franciscan monastery. Despite the agreement that a person in the monastery could not be arrested, Kaboga was arrested. This incident happened in 1662. His great friend and writer Vladislav Mančetić wrote a poem about him. In the poem Trublja Slovinska Kaboga is writing a letter with his own blood. Unfortunately, the great Croatian writer died a year before the big earthquake, and he could not see Kaboga's big transformation.24 He could not see how his friend organised an army that secured the safety of Dubrovnik and how a criminal became a hero.

DUBROVNIK’S DIPLOMATS AND THEIR ROLE IN PRESERVING SAFETY OF THE TOWN

Because of the Council and Dubrovnik's diplomats, Dubrovnik held on its position of an important port on the east coast of the Adriatic Sea. Also, it was their accomplishment that the Republic of Dubrovnik kept its freedom. First of all, I will mention Nikolina Bunić. He was sent to negotiate with Venice. When the provveditore generale Catarino Cornaro was in front of Dubrovnik, the government sent Nikolina Bunić to convince him not to occupy Dubrovnik.

23 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 250-257.
24 Samardžić, Veliki vek, 213-217; Radulović-Stipčević, Vladislav Menčetić, 175-182.
The town was able to keep its freedom, while the Venetians helped by sending money and food. Catarino Cornaro sailed to Kotor. Bunić cooperated with Jaketa Palmotić Dionorić, who was ten years older, on another mission. After the earthquake, Bunić sent his sisters to Ston and after that to Ancona. Palmotić was not as lucky. He was coming back from a mission and his whole family, a wife and their four children, died in the earthquake. After some time, he got married with another wife. The Council then decided that they have to go to the Ottoman Empire. Their task was to convince kajmakam Kara-Mustafa that they did not have to pay more than regular taxes. At first, they refused to accept the mission, but after a couple of revotes, they went there. Their mission was very successful. They spent a year there and Palmotić’s great speech even convinced the sultan to release their predecessors. They all went home together. After some time, Bunić went on another mission to the Ottoman Empire with Marin Gučetić. They were imprisoned in Silistria and Bunić died there.\textsuperscript{25} He became a hero and Dubrovnik’s government built him a memorial plaque in the Rector’s palace with the inscription: “He died in prison for the freedom of his country and he deserves to be celebrated and his name should be immortal.”\textsuperscript{26}

Another nobleman who was also a diplomat was Marin Gučetić. His mission was to convince the Bosnian pasha Ćor Ali-pasha not to attack Dubrovnik because the town did not have as much money as the pasha thought. His second task was to stop opening of the ports in Neretva. After a long period of negotiations, he succeeded and the pasha was kept alive only because he was the husband of sultan’s sister, but kajmakam ordered his servants to be killed.\textsuperscript{27}

The diplomat who won the name the “Father of the Homeland” was Stjepan Gradić. He spent most of his life in Rome, where he was a papal librarian. Sometimes he performed the function of a diplomat for his homeland and for the Pope. In his memoirs, he described his reaction to the “First death of Dubrovnik”. He was walking with his friend Ivan Lucić\textsuperscript{28} near the river Tiber in Rome and when they heard about the earthquake, they cried together.\textsuperscript{29} Stjepan Gradić also sent many letters to Dubrovnik's government with useful advice on using new machines, producing their own money, and expanding the territory of the town. He advised them to ask a powerful state such as France for help because he had some connections there. However, the King of the Sun refused their application. Spain confirmed their privileges, the vice-king of Neaples (which was a part of Spain) sent food and the Republic of Lucca sent 10 000 of libras gunpowder and 500 guns. Stjepan Gradić also found and recommended the architect Andrea Buffalini from Urbino, whose ground plans of the cathedral were accepted by Dubrovnik’s government. The construction works were completed in 1713 and a memorial plaque with Stjepan Gradić’s name was put on the cathedral.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{25} Samardžić, Veliki vek, 312-344.
\textsuperscript{26} Tatarin, Feniks, 155.
\textsuperscript{27} Krasić, Stjepan Gradić, 189; Samardžić, Veliki vek, 264-276.
\textsuperscript{28} The father of Croatian historiography.
\textsuperscript{29} Krasić, Stjepan Gradić, 111.
\textsuperscript{30} Krasić, Stjepan Gradić, 150-182.
**Influence on Literature**

The disaster influenced some writers from Dubrovnik to write about it. The small book called *Dubrovnik and its aristocracy during the big earthquake* was published the same year the earthquake happened. The book consists of a couple of poems with the same name, written by Nikoća Bunić, Petar Kanavelić and Baro Bettera. The aim of those poems was to inform the Europe about the disaster that happened in Dubrovnik. They also had something in common: they saw the disaster as God's punishment for the wicked people in Dubrovnik. Nikoća Bunić mentioned Dubrovnik's patron St. Blaise who was “the great warrior and protector on the sky”\(^{31}\) Petar Kanavelić formed his poem as a conversation with a fairy who told him about the big earthquake and who was crying because of the destiny of the town: “mothers with their daughters/fathers with their sons […] everyone was buried under the ruins”\(^{32}\) In the end, the fairy told him that Šiško Gundulić should write about the disaster. Bettera said “that we should be better and then better days will come […] and we could reach heaven”\(^{33}\)

![The first page of the book *Dubrovnik and its aristocracy during the big earthquake* that was published in 1667 in Ancona (Tatarin, *Feniks*, 253.)](image)

On Stjepan Gradić’s appeal, another poet from Dubrovnik who spent most of his life in Rome, Benko Rogačić, wrote a poem *Prosecutio de terraemotu quo Epidaurus in Dalmatia anno 1667. prostrata est*, in which he described the sight of the damaged town: “the town is buried under the stones […] it is an easy target for the enemies […] I see dead people all over […] they are sad, injured and covered with blood.”\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{31}\) Bunić, *Grad vlastelom*, 168.

\(^{32}\) Kanavelić, *Grad vlastelom*, 176.

\(^{33}\) Bettera, *Grad vlastelom*, 124.

\(^{34}\) Rogačić, *Prizor potresa*, 131-133.
Nikolica Bunić also wrote the epic *Phoenix or Dubrovnik after the big earthquake*, in which he described the earthquake again and mentioned the return of nuns from Ancona. He believed that Dubrovnik “will be born again like the Phoenix”.\(^{35}\)

The last writer and also a diplomat Jaketa Palmotić Dionorić wrote the epic *Dubrovnik in Renew*, in which he described his life. The main character Jakimir returned home and his whole family died in the earthquake. He married again and went on a diplomatic mission with Bunić. He described the earthquake to the sultan: “Everybody escaped […] friends do not recognise each other […] everybody is screaming.”\(^{36}\) That epic is not finished but it is very important because the writer described the events he took part in.\(^{37}\)

**CONCLUSION**

The big disaster that happened in Dubrovnik changed its history forever. Its progress was stopped, the town needed reconstruction and its neighbours tried to make things worse. However, thanks to some brave people I have mentioned in this article the town was kept safe and it recovered. Diplomats made effort to protect Dubrovnik’s trade. The main consequence of the big earthquake was the opening of the Council for ten non-aristocratic families; they were seen as equal members of the Council a century later. Just as many other historical events, this one also influenced literature. Some of the writers were in Dubrovnik during this event. Many said that the big earthquake was God’s punishment, which was not an unusual reaction after great natural disasters.

After all, Dubrovnik rose up from the ashes like the phoenix in their literary works.
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The article argues that the Italian states achieved a “balance of power” during the 1452-1454 War of Milanese Succession. This may be described as equilibrio Italiano. It enabled the states to limit the manifestation of crises on a certain degree of contained warfare and uneasy truce. But it also stood against a general pacification of Italy, which was desired by the Italic League of 1455.

INTRODUCTION

1492 has often been suggested as one of the landmarks at the ends of the Middle Ages and the beginnings of modernity. But whereas the momentous discovery by Cristoforo Colombo opened a new chapter of European history, the death of one of his compatriots closed another. On 4th April, 137 days before the Santa Maria left the port in Palos de la Frontera, Lorenzo de’ Medici, called il Magnifico by his contemporaries, died. He gave in to a painful disease in the Medici fortress-villa at Careggi near Florence, the same place where he was born forty-three years earlier. The task which the de facto ruler of the weakest of the five Italian powers had performed so elegantly – balancing the fragile equilibrio on the peninsula – soon proved too difficult for his successor. The unluckiness of the diplomacy of twenty year old Piero was instantly answered by the Florentines shaking off the Medici shadow rule and banning the family. However the absence of the great compromiser contributed even more to the disintegration of the Italian diplomatic system.

In his Florentine History the hapless politician and seminal philosopher of the ragione di stato Niccolò Machiavelli celebrated Lorenzo de’ Medici as a statesman, commemorated his death and connected it with Italy's doom:

“[…] nor was there ever in Florence, or even in Italy, one so celebrated for wisdom, or for whose loss such universal regret was felt. As from his death the greatest devastation would shortly ensue, the heavens gave many evident tokens of its approach; among other signs, the highest pinnacle of the church of Santa Reparata was struck with lightning, and great part of it thrown down, to the terror and amazement of everyone. The citizens and all the princes of Italy mourned for him, and sent their ambassadors to Florence, to condole with the city on the occasion; and the justness of their grief was shortly after apparent; for being deprived of his counsel, his survivors were unable either to satisfy or restrain the ambition of Lodovico Sforza, tutor to the duke of Milan; and hence, soon after the death of Lorenzo, those evil plants began to germinate, which in a little time ruined Italy, and continue to keep her in desolation.”

The *Istorie fiorentine* was a commissioned work for Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, who had been elected pope (Clement VII) before Machiavelli presented him the final version in March 1525. The text concluded in the year 1492, mourning the death of Lorenzo de' Medici, quoted above. Three decades passed between the event Machiavelli had chosen to end with and the moment he finished his work. During that time Italy had been devastated by almost constant war, facing three more decades of unleashed force to come. The last sentences of Machiavelli's work bound the finale of his book to the current events in Italy, displaying a contemporary narrative for the explanation of the crisis.

The universally accepted beginning of the chain of events leading to over six decades of constant crisis and steady armed conflicts is the invasion of the Kingdom of Naples by King Charles VIII of France in 1494. Charles had been invited to this enterprise by Ludovico Sforza, called il Moro – the same Machiavelli refers to at the end of his Florentine History. Starting there, the “invitation” of additional foreign powers, unfortunate dynastic events and the absence of a unified Italian power, which would have enabled Italy itself to become an agent again, perpetuated the crisis, which manifested itself in the ugly face of war. So far one explanation of the contemporaries, for which Machiavelli may stand as one of the mostly stressed examples. This logically connected chain of events is a widely accepted narrative, which was especially comforting for the Italian historiography since the late 19th century, when the nation was seen as the endpoint of an eschatological development. Also Machiavelli was interpreted according to that narrative.2

Additionally this project of national history saw itself confronted with the obligation to provide a suitable explanation for the period of sustained peace and tranquillity in which Italy had been before. While Machiavelli, who wrote for a member of the Medici family3, could provide an easy and flattering explanation, setting Lorenzo de' Medici as the great counsellor, modern historiography added a more systematic explanation. It presented the idea of an Italian *equilibrio*, which balanced the Italian states and shielded them from foreign oppression. This concept has been discussed thoroughly in Italian historiography and Renaissance studies in general. The mere existence of a “balance of power” itself was challenged by Simeoni, arguing that no Italian power actually acknowledged the status quo.4 Mattingly dismissed this concept as an idealisation of the past by those suffering under the Italian Wars,5 while Valeri argued in favour of the concept by restricting it to an analytical level, thereby, against Simeoni, rendering the consciousness of the contemporaries redundant.6

With this article I want to provide an analysis of the system of Italian states and the “foreign relations” between them. Therefore a description and evaluation of the Italian states as well as Italy as a whole shall be given. A comparison of the concepts of the Italic League and the Italian equilibrium, after an initial definition of those concepts within the boundaries of possibility, shall lead to a close look on Italy and its “international” political system. A

---

2 Especially the last chapter of Machiavelli’s condemned and celebrated *Il Principe* was emphasised. Entitled *Exhortatio ad capessendam Italiam in libertatemque a barbaris vindicandam* (Exhortation to seize Italy and to avenge it from the barbarians), it provided an easy link to the 19th century national narrative.

3 Lorenzo de’ Medici had been Clement's VII uncle.


detailed analysis of the particular polities of the Italian states, which is a fruitful task on its own, can be given to a certain degree of depth, insofar as it is of concern to the diplomatic activity between those political communities. The policies between these states and the interests behind them, which can be observed, shall remain the main frame of my interest.

ITALY 1494

When Charles VIII crossed the Alps with his army, the Italy he entered was politically divided. While the island of Sicily already belonged to the Iberian Kingdom of Aragon, the very south of the peninsula was ruled by Alfonso II, who in January 1494 had inherited the Kingdom of Naples, which stretched over Calabria, Apulia, Campania and Benevent. He was the son of Ferdinand I, who himself had been an illegitimate son of King Alfonso V of Aragon, thus rendering Alfonso's II claim to the Kingdom legally doubtful. The close ties of the Italian south to the kings of Aragon were a consequence of Alfonso's successful invasion of Naples, which had dethroned the ruling house Valois-Anjou. The legal doubts about Ferdinands claim and the fact that Charles VIII of France himself was from the same family as the former monarchs of Naples gave France enough pretext to legitimise a French invasion of the kingdom. Though the passing of inheritance to illegitimate sons had become custom in Italy; besides many other forms of obtaining rule by legally dubious methods; it still seemed uncertain enough to Alfonso V of Aragon to search for another source of legitimisation.

He found it in the pope, to whom he formally submitted the newly conquered kingdom. The King reasoned, that if the crown was given to his bastard son by the higher authority of the Holy See, the formal ceremony would outshine the stigma of illegitimate birth. As it becomes obvious by this arrangement, it was still an accepted custom to recall to the pope as a higher moral authority – the elected German kings desired to be crowned Emperors of Rome by him as well. The pope, or at least his office, was still the unchallenged head of the “Christian Commonwealth” and received his authority from the same source as for example all medieval law. The practical range of this authority might have decreased since the days of the exile in Avignon and acceptance of this authority was of course far from automatic; as is shown by the appearance of up to three each other simultaneously excommunicating popes, backed by different rulers; but the general reference to his power as ultimate was still intact.

A more concerning issue at hand is the other side of the pope's rule, which installed the elected religious head as the sovereign of a territory. Since the days of Innocent III, the Holy See might have had lost political influence and moral authority, but his notion that the pope was to have an independent demesne to fulfil his international role had become accepted. Thus the Papal States were an independent realm in Italy stretching around Rome and claiming the supremacy about Lazio, Umbria, Marche, Emilia and Romagna. During the papacy's exile to Avignon, regional city governments under rulers without any legal claim to their titles – signoria – practically gained independence from Rome especially in Emilia and

---

7 The house Valois-Anjou, which had ruled the Kingdom of Naples before, was a branch line of the house Valois. Charles VIII had inherited their claim after the branch line had died out.
8 Naples was considered a papal fief, at least by the Holy See, since Clement IV had bestowed the House of Anjou with the kingdom in 1265. Mallett and Shaw, *Italian Wars*, 8.
10 Abstracted concept, from “Lordship”; de facto sovereignty.
Romagna. When the popes returned to the the holy city the Papal States were thus in constant quarrel within themselves, with the popes often having to rely on military strength rather than on the authority of a feudal lord over his subordinates. The practice of installing members of their own family, often nephews – in the case of Alexander VI also his son – as vassals in the re-conquered dominions, naturally set the succeeding pope before the same task, his predecessor had just accomplished.\textsuperscript{11} The problem lay not so much in the nepotism of the popes as feudal lords itself, but in the mismatch of this feudal system and the mode of succession. While in power, the members of the family of the pope awaited their share of the reign as much as the family of every other European monarch, but with the death of the sovereign the family bounds were cut, since another member of the same family rarely followed directly as successor.\textsuperscript{12}

To the North and West, with the somewhat less important Republic of Siena tucked between them, the Papal States surrounded the city-state of Florence. Formally still part of the Holy Roman Empire it had gained independence to a vast extent since the authority of the Empire in Italy had been undermined to the degree of an empty phrase. In the struggle that followed the Imperial disintegration in Northern Italy, the commune had prevailed in Tuscany against other \textit{signoria} and communes that had sprung up since the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. After swallowing Arezzo it had finally conquered its nearest threatening rival, Pisa, in 1409, thus stretching its ability to dominate over other powerful cities to the limits. While the strength of the Papacy lay in its moral authority, the strength of Florence lay in commerce and especially banking. In the city itself cloth was manufactured in enormous quantities and the Florentine merchant banks, such as the Bardi, Peruzzi, Buonaccorsi and of course the Medici, span their network all over Europe. Their economic success had been the result of commercial innovation on the one hand and successful crusades on the other. The crusaders had fought the sea routes free and therefore enabled trade in the Levant. The continuation of the struggle against the infidels needed to be financed and organised as well. Lastly we also have to mention the crusaders and merchants, as far as they can be separated, who were in need to save the spoils of their fights.\textsuperscript{13}

While Florence lay on the Arno, with its port Pisa facing the Western Mediterranean, the other grand city state which emerged independent of the struggles of the late Middle Ages, Venice, lay at the top of the Adriatic, thus facing east. This position, the Alps to the north, the sea to the south-east and the near delta of the river Po connecting it via the easiest accessible route with the riches of Northern Italy, predestined the Serenissima as the trade knot of the Mediterranean. Consequently, what was said about the Florentine trade and banking applied even more to Venice. Similar to Florence the Most Serene Republic had conquered many little \textit{signoria}, expanding its dominion north of the river Po as far as Bergamo. In the second half of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century it faced the powerful Duchy of Milan directly. Additionally Venice held a chaplet of possessions in the Eastern Mediterranean, stretching over Istri a and Dalmatia to Crete and Euboea, later even to Cyprus. This chain of naval bases enabled it to project its enormous sea power to protect its trade and preserve its interests.

\textsuperscript{11} So Julius II heroically conquered the Romagna; a task which Cesare Borgia some years earlier successfully had accomplished for his father, the above mentioned Alexander VI.

\textsuperscript{12} Goez, \textit{Geschichte Italiens}, 210-226.

\textsuperscript{13} Münkler, \textit{Machiavelli}, 131-135.
Its constitution has been celebrated for stability. While the Florentine Republic was constantly divided and absorbed in inner struggles – Dante had compared it to "a sick woman twisting and turning in bed, uncomfortable in every position"14 – Venice followed the ideal of tranquillity. As the contemporaries saw it, the constitution consisted of the most stabilising mixture of the three elements: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. The harmony of the government was the official ideology of the ruling class, despite the already discovered difference of 'dignified' and 'efficient' offices inside the constitutional system.15

Facing the Serenissima from the west, on the headwaters of the Po, lay the Duchy of Milan. Initially established as a city republic, like its chief rivals Venice and Florence, it gained the dominating position in Upper Italy as a feudal monarchy under the Visconti. After Matteo Visconti had been elected capitano del popolo in 1287, he drew out his rivals and gained official legitimisation as Imperial Vicar by the German King Adolf seven years later. After he had won another struggle for the signoria of the city, he recovered the office from Emperor Henry VII. While the Luxembourg Emperor died shortly after, Matteo Visconti was able to retain his office as well as the actual political power, laying the foundation for the most potent family in Northern Italy until 1447. During this period the Visconti were able to gain the signoria over many of the cities in Lombardia, ruled Genoa and Bologna for a while and finally obtained the title of Dukes of Milan in 1395. Ruling by force and fear, they were able to pacify their holdings and prevent any challenge to their rule.16

When Filippo Maria Visconti had died without a male heir, the Milanese established a republic again, which only lasted a short time. The ruthless Francesco Sforza, who was employed as condottiere, used his military power to overthrow the Republic and establish himself as Duke of Milan in 1450.17 The family of the usurper stayed in power until the early stage of the Italian Wars, which had been triggered by a good part by Ludovico Sforza himself. The strength of the Duchy was not in the wealth of the country itself, but in the constitutional gain the dukes had acquired during the sustained military struggles. The duchy itself and its capital Milan were very rich comparable to Florence, even if dwarfed by Venice, but the dukes held an incomparable advantage in the prerogative of directly fixing and spending the taxes of their demesne. In the 15th century, as it is probably the case at any time, this was a huge advantage and enabled the dukes to finance and therefore conduct their military campaigns without interference from any other constitutional entity.18

14 Burke, Italian Renaissance, 210. (Dante, Divine Comedy, Purgatorio, Canto VI) Burckhardt described Florence as “the city of steady movement” (“die Stadt der ständigen Bewegung”) and Venice as the “city of apparent stagnation and political silence” (“Venedig, die Stadt des scheinbaren Stillstandes und des politischen Schweigens”), “the strongest contrast which can be imagined, and neither can be compared to anything in the world” (“Es sind die stärksten Gegensätze, die sich denken lassen, und beide sind wiederum mit nichts auf der Welt zu vergleichen.”). Burckhardt, Kultur der Renaissance, 44.
15 Burke, Italian Renaissance, 209.
16 Goez, Geschichte Italiens, 207-209.
17 Burckhardt, Kultur der Renaissance, 19-20.
18 While especially the republics, but also most feudal lords in Europe, were bound in their spending to the will of the estates or other constitutional restrictions. Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 63.
DOMINATION AND BALANCE

For a thorough analysis of the Italian equilibrium we shall focus for a moment on the history of the duchy at the North, concentrating on the end of Filippo Maria Visconti and the rule of his family, especially with its connection to the rise of Francesco Sforza. Not long before his death, Filippo Maria tried to give the idea of pacifying Italy an institutional form, by more or less accepting the status of its division. 1443, during a war between the pope and condottiere Francesco Sforza, the Visconti duke suggested a congress; firstly to end the ongoing war, secondly to settle the enduring disputes between the major Italian powers and lastly to exchange mutual guarantees to stabilise the political situation. This attempt might have failed miserably, but it can still be said, following Mattingly, that the Italian rulers, especially the duke himself, became conscious of their inability to establish any kind of dominion over the whole peninsula. Therefore they started to accept the idea of Italy as a system of coexisting independent states.19

This attempt to pacify Italy and therefore secure each Italian state through stability rather than expansionism may be explained by the Milanese duke's wish to remain in control of his succession. Even before the rise of Francesco Sforza in Romagna, where he succeeded in gaining the control over a part of the country, Visconti had married his natural daughter Bianca, his only child, off to Sforza. When he died on 13th August 1447, there was great uncertainty about who was to rule and there were many claimants to his inheritance. Besides Sforza also Charles, the Duke of Orleans, desired the duchy legitimately, since he was Filippo Maria's nephew through his mother Valentina Visconti. Albert and Sigismund of Habsburg, great-grandsons of Bernabò Visconti20, had a claim as well. Furthermore the Emperor, Frederick III, suggested that the duchy had reverted to him because of the extinction of the male line of the family. Filippo Maria's testament at last stated that the duchy was to go to Alfonso V of Aragon.21 In this thicket of claims no claimant was able to gain the power immediately. The power vacuum surprisingly led to the establishment of a republic, the so called Ambrosian Republic, which succeeded in repulsing the immediately acting agents of Alfonso V. However, the young republic was still engaged in a war with Venice that had started under Filippo Maria.22

The short-lived Ambrosian Republic thus gave a military condotta to Francesco Sforza. In 1445, Pope Eugenius IV, still ruling Filippo Maria, Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, and the Kingdom of Naples had joined in an alliance to repulse Sforza from the Romagna. Therefore, he first sought alliance with Venice or Florence, the remaining neutral powers. Finally Venice backed him, which angered the pope and led him to declare war on Venice.23 To convince Sforza to take up the cause of the destabilised Milan would therefore not only strengthen the republic, but also take an ally away from Venice, which had advanced deeply into the territory of the former duchy. On the one hand Sforza was desperate to end the conflict because he was severely pressed by the alliance, but on the other hand the Republic had to offer him something in return for his betrayal of Venice. The prospect of being installed

19 Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 71.
20 Ruling in Milan 1354-1385, first together with two brothers, later with the son of one of them.
21 Ady, History of Milan, 35-37.
22 Ady, History of Milan, 35-37.
23 Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 72.
as count of Pavia, which had declared independence from Milan, as well as the signoria over several other cities, including Lodi and Piacenza, proved convincing enough. But soon after he had conquered what he was promised, the first quarrel between him and the republic happened – Milan started to fear his power.\textsuperscript{24} The first conflict broke out about Tortona, in the very south of the republican-held territory. Tortona had declared Sforza its ruler, rebelliously disrespecting Milan's direct sovereignty over it. The Milanese captain Bartolomeo Colleoni recaptured it for the republic, while Sforza still did not dare to openly act against his employer.\textsuperscript{25}

The grand condottiere prevailed in the war against Venice with formidable victories, such as the destruction of the Venetian fleet after the relief of Cremona and in the battle of Caravaggio. But the Milanese, afraid of the power he would have if he was to hold on to what he had conquered, started to negotiate a secret peace with Venice. Additionally, rumours about him were spread, trying to provoke unrest among his troops. But Sforza quickly reacted and changed sides once again. On 18\textsuperscript{th} October 1448 he signed a contract with Venice, restoring some possessions to the Serenissima and becoming employed as its commander. In return, Venice was set to back his claim on the Duchy of Milan.\textsuperscript{26} Thereupon he engaged in re-conquering large parts of the duchy as a Venetian condottiere. But when he finally stood in front of the city of Milan itself, ready for the mortal blow on the shattered Ambrosian Republic, Venice abandoned him, signing a peace with Milan and ordering him to accept it or face being regarded as an enemy of Venice. Boldly he continued war, now against the republic, Venice and Savoy, which had launched his own campaign for Milan. He defeated Venice and Savoy as well and finally the city of Milan surrendered to him on 24\textsuperscript{th} February 1450.\textsuperscript{27}

While the war with Venice continued, its character changed. Sforza had declared himself capitano del popolo and duke on 22\textsuperscript{nd} March\textsuperscript{28} and thereby started to consolidate his position in Lombardia. The Serenissima allied with Naples, but Sforza found a new ally in Florence, therefore revolutionising the foreign diplomacy of the Signoria. Florence had been traditionally allied with Venice against Milan. After Sforza had employed permanent ambassador agents to Florence and also Venice\textsuperscript{29}, they constantly worked on convincing the Florentine Republic that Milan under the distinguished condottiere was less threatening to their interests than Venetian rule over the duchy. Cosimo de' Medici held amicable feelings toward Francesco Sforza and therefore influenced the Florentine public opinion towards this alliance. When in 1451 Milan and Florence formally entered the alliance, it “meant abandonment of an alliance which had been the cornerstone of Florentine policy for a generation”.\textsuperscript{30} While the war, which now divided Italy in two equally balanced camps – both finally engaged in stable alliances, as well the result of as the condition for a stalemate in force – continued until the Peace of Lodi in 1454, the preceding critical turmoil precisely shows the mechanics of the balance in the Italian system of states.

\textsuperscript{24} Ady, History of Milan, 42.
\textsuperscript{25} Ady, History of Milan, 43.
\textsuperscript{26} Ady, History of Milan, 47.
\textsuperscript{27} Ady, History of Milan, 58.
\textsuperscript{28} Ady, History of Milan, 60.
\textsuperscript{29} To the latter probably only until 1447.
\textsuperscript{30} Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 73.
Already before the desire to institutionalise the status quo in Italy was presented by the Italic League following the Peace of Lodi, foreign policy inside Italy followed the system of balance. This somewhat stabilised the status quo and enabled, as we have seen from the example of Ludovico Sforza, the losing side in a conflict to completely turn the tables around with the help of diplomacy. Since alliances were fluid and every ally was also a potential enemy, allies quickly became wary of the victories, fearing a potentially strengthened enemy. Therefore the prevailing side in a critical conflict (one that might annihilate one of the five Italian powers) could quickly be betrayed by its former allies. In Sforza's case this happened twice when he seemed to become too powerful to be controlled by his allies. Venice also experienced betrayal when its success became a threat to its former ally Florence. Thus the balance in the Italian system of states, the equilibrio, was firstly created by the notion that permanent alliances were unsuitable to maintain the interests of the Italian states as single entities. The powers had grown aware of the fact that they were all striving for dominance, or at least would not dismiss the chance for dominance if it was provided, as well as the practical inability to finally reach this objective. Because of the envy and the awareness of the competitors' powers the states started to develop a system in which to keep a competitor in his status quo became a desirable objective. Needless to say that a balance manifested in that way was as much stabilising the Italian states in a certain position – which was not necessarily connected to a peaceful way of solving conflicts – as it was providing a constant threat for the same stability. The peace of Lodi seemingly provided an exit from this situation.

TENSE TRANQUILLITY AND FRAGILE EQUILIBRIUM

During the 1452-54 War of Milanese Succession, the immediate threat of an outside enemy to several Italian states became obvious. The French accession to the Milanese-Florentine alliance from 1453 increased the possibility of a French intervention in Italy. While the Holy Roman Empire remained hamstrung, Mehmed II had captured Constantinople. Consequently the Ottomans now seemed to pose a threat to Italian soil, while the Venetian overseas empire was directly and immediately intimidated. Venice was engaged in war with the Ottoman Empire between 1463 and 1479. The Turks invaded Friuli in 1469 and the 1470s and also captured Neapoli Otranto in 1480-81.\(^{31}\)

While Florence traditionally tried to bring itself closer to France to ensure its own security, Pope Nicholas V, who was bound in legal struggles with France and the Empire and therefore unable to find a foreign ally, was the first ruler to try to provide another solution to achieve security and retain freedom of action in his foreign policy.\(^ {32}\) He was also the first to promote the idea to form a league aimed to hinder foreign invasion on Italy. To that goal he organised diplomatic encounters between the belligerents as well as the remaining neutral powers in June 1451 and October 1453.\(^ {33}\) Rome had already become a centre of diplomatic

\(^{31}\) Marino, “Italian States,” 338.

\(^{32}\) The pope's interpretation of his position in Christendom opposed the idea of accepting protection of another power. May he practically be extradited to the influence of other powers – e.g. through the composition of the College of Cardinals as well as the compulsion to accept decisions of councils – to transform such relationships into binding treaties was impracticable due to the attributed dignity of the office.

\(^{33}\) Fubini, “Italian League,” 167. The Papacy had already repeatedly tried to establish similar general Italian defensive alliance-systems. By the pacification of Italy it aimed to secure its ambitions to regain control of its
activity, first on the occasion of the celebrations of the Jubilee of 1450, which was attended by a so far unseen number of European and Italian envoys, and second because the Papal States had remained neutral in the conflict over Milan. While permanent embassies were exchanged between the members of respective alliances, everyone had embassies in Rome, which enabled this place to serve for unofficial talks as well as to provide a good chance for reconnaissance about the enemy.\textsuperscript{34}

Initially, Nicholas V had partly been pushed to form an Italian league by Alfonso of Aragon, who on the one hand arrogantly looked down on the papacy and on the other hand feared the looming French intervention and the Ottomans. While the opposition in Florence was in favour of this \textit{lega generale}, aiming to re-establish the alliance with Venice and loosening the ties to Sforza-Milan, Cosimo de' Medici stood against this idea. As a consequence of Cosimo's successful opposition, the alliance of Florence and Milan was officially established in 1451.\textsuperscript{35} Nevertheless Pope Nicholas V pursued in his scheme, while increasing his independence from Alfonso V of Aragon. He became the second Italian power after Florence to recognise Francesco Sforza as duke of Milan, thus ignoring the Imperial prerogative on this action. At the same time he also developed closer ties with Naples, trying to solidify his mediating position to prevent a Neapolitan-Milanese joint action into his unstable holdings.\textsuperscript{36}

This was everything that could be achieved towards the pope's goal of a pacified Italy, since Naples and Florence opposed his idea because of their conflicting interests against the Holy See. Especially Florence saw a possible agreement between Nicholas V, Francesco Sforza and Alfonso of Aragon cutting the state geographically off from its traditional sphere of influence in Romagna. But Naples also felt that its influence in the Papal States was endangered by a general pacification, since the unruly and uncertain situation steered by the constant inner quarrels of the Papal States served its interests in the region. Finally the pope pragmatically resigned from his plans. But nevertheless we are left with his clear observation on the character of the peace:

“[He said,] that no peace could be forever, because the things of the world were not stable. […] He thought that in the future things would continue like this or worse[,] But he believes that peace can be lasting, if achieved because each power is aware of being unable to subjugate the other and because all are tired of wars. The powers will be like two horses that after attacking and hurting each other must just stare each other down without further action.”\textsuperscript{37}

After the papal initiative to pacify Italy was unable to prevail, peace was finally reached between the belligerents on 9\textsuperscript{th} April 1454 in Lodi. Venice had taken the initiative, willing to settle for much less than the domination of Milan because of fears of a Turkish invasion.\textsuperscript{38}
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Soon thereafter the three Northern Italian powers borrowed the papal idea and entered the Italic League. On 30th August it was solemnly signed in Venice. Ambitiously it entered the signatory powers into a defensive alliance for the following 25 years with the prospect of subsequent renewals. The powers agreed to defend each other's territory in Italy – none of them wanted to be involved in the defence of Venetian overseas territories – as well as to maintain a fixed amount of military forces\(^{39}\) and a program for joint military action to that objective. While the reserved right to include subsequent allies of the signatories did not differ as much from the previous attempts to install an international league in Italy, the declared intent to include the still opposing Alfonso of Aragon as well as the pope gave the treaty a perspective for the whole of Italy. A formal invitation for the Italian neutrals to join was attached and furthermore the treaty was open to all powers present in Italy. This deliberately included Aragon with its Italian holdings. While the pope expressed his will to join at the next dignified moment – even if he had not been the initiator of the treaty, accession would finally give him the desired security – the king of Aragon was the last to join. In addition to the listed provisions the members of the league renounced the rights to conclude prejudicial treaties and to conclude treaties not sanctioned by the members. The practical range of this agreement might be questioned, keeping the unchanged divergent interests and still remaining ties to foreign powers in mind, but nevertheless it shows that there was consciousness about the danger of such ties for the peace in Italy. Furthermore provisions were added on how to deal with internal threats to peace. If a member was to be found to attack another without any provocation, he was to be immediately expelled and afterwards disciplined by a joint military action. The Italic League provided the first theoretical guarantee of the status quo in Italy and aimed to pacify Italy by closing and therefore shielding the system of the Italian states from foreign intervention.\(^{40}\)

This \textit{sentissima lega}, compared to its august aspirations, proved to be of limited practicability in the following four decades. Nevertheless hostilities were also very limited in comparison to the first half of the Quattrocento.\(^{41}\) Six wars were fought on Italian soil.\(^{42}\) As Rubinstein convincingly argues, the patterns of alliances in the subsequent conflicts followed more or less the same basic pattern, the one we have observed in the 1447-54 Sforza-ascension conflict. Triple alliances as well as alliances between two powers were frequently established as ad hoc answers to conflicts which should have been solved by the Italic League according to its provisions.\(^{43}\) The Italian powers constantly favoured to follow their respective interests by entering and leaving alliances only bound by time and circumstance. References to the Italic League or another Italian wide systematic alliance remained intact, but obviously followed special interests rather than a wider perspective of Italian pacification.

While in the first occurring conflict about Siena in 1455-56, the League's actions can be interpreted as somewhat efficient\(^{44}\), a triple alliance between Milan, Florence and Naples

\(^{39}\) In times of peace: Venice, Milan and Florence each 6000 to horse and 2000 to foot, Florence 2000 soldiers, the Papacy 1000; in times of war: 8000 and 4000, resp. 5000 and 2000. Rubinstein, “politisches System,” 105, footnote no. 7.

\(^{40}\) Mattingly, \textit{Renaissance Diplomacy}, 74-76. See also: Münkler, \textit{Machiavelli}, 196.

\(^{41}\) Rubinstein, “politisches System,” 106.


\(^{44}\) While most signatories of the League according to its statutes defended Siena, Aragon supported \textit{condottiere}
began to shape. Its first task was to defend the succession of Ferdinand of Aragon against the claim of John II of Anjou, Duke of Lorraine. While the pope tried to re-establish the Italic League in 1466, arguing it had been broken with Milan swallowing Genoa, Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza stated on that occasion that the League was still intact despite the existing triple alliance. Officially Milan, Florence and Naples joined in an alliance for 25 years in 1467, which led to the establishment of an alliance between the Pope and Venice two years later. Conflict broke out because Pope Paul II had tried to gain effective control over Rimini after the death of Lord Sigismondo Malatesta in 1468. The triple alliance was defending his indirect successor Roberto Malatesta, opposing the pope's right to punish his legal vassals.

After peace was reached, the triple alliance was officially renewed for another 25 years, this time taking the Italic League as an example, for an option to be expanded into an Italian league. While the pope saw a chance to gather support for a crusade against the Turks and to secure his position in Italy, Milan finally opposed the idea, therefore successfully hindering its establishment. In the end its allies favoured the triple alliance more than the prospect of a renewed Italic League. But soon thereafter the pope succeeded in undermining the triple alliance by gaining Neapolitan support in his efforts against Niccolò Vitelli, Lord of Città di Castello, therewith consequently isolating his former ally Venice. While the now isolated Venice first tried to convince the other Italian powers to renew the Italic League, it ultimately refrained from entering because its attempt to gain recognition of its alliance with Burgundy was rejected. This was hardly surprising, since the acceptance of that alliance would have contradicted Florence and Milan in their amity with France.

What was achieved was a new triple alliance between Venice, Florence and Milan, now joined against the pope and Naples. This was the third time the prospect of an alliance lasting for 25 years did not even achieve a quarter of the proposed time. Nevertheless the triple alliance of 1474 was again at least on paper open to all other states in Italy. But instead of joining, Sixtus IV and Ferdinand of Naples officially entered their own alliance in 1475 and stood together in the war that followed the Pazzi conspiracy.  

Italy was again divided into two camps during the war. Peace was reached in 1480, mainly following the initiative of Lorenzo il Magnifico to settle things with Naples. This contributed a great deal to the image of Lorenzo de' Medici as the pacifier and balancer of Italy. The peace was followed by the last attempt to form the Italic League. In an answer to the problem which arose from the internal ill-organisation of the Papal States, Florence had even been willing to accept the inclusion of the general right of a power to punish its vassals to lure the pope into the agreement. But the idea was doomed to fail since it faced the opposition of Venice, which again saw itself isolated by the Florentine-Neapolitan agreement. All that was achieved was a shift of alliances, with Venice now standing with the pope and the remaining powers bound together again. Those alliances became obvious during the defence of Ferrara in 1482, and the defence of Naples in the revolt of the barons in 1485. In both conflicts the Papal States fought together with the Most Serene Republic against the triple
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45 An attempt to murder Lorenzo and Giuliano de' Medici in 1478. The two brothers were de-facto ruling in Florence since the death of their father Piero il Gottoso in 1469. Giuliano was successfully assassinated, but Lorenzo escaped and survived to lead Florence alone thereafter.
alliance of Milan, Naples and Florence. Taking those conflicts and the recurrent organisation of Italy in two opposing camps into consideration, it can be said that the Italic League had failed in practice. Nevertheless the idea of establishing such a league reoccurred several times during the period. However, after the first, somewhat successful attempt, following the peace of Lodi, such a league was never contractually achieved again. It seems to have been desired after more serious and more tiring conflicts. The *equilibrio italiano* was therefore practically brought into existence by a system of triple alliances opposing internal enemies that aimed for domination of Italy or were feared to aim at. It replaced the Italic League despite the often reproduced references and evocations to it. Obviously it must have come to some degree of consciousness that a radical change in the status quo by implementing one of the five powers in a dominating position in Italy was opposing the interests of the other Italian powers.

**Crisis and Collapse**

While this policy aimed to maintain the status quo in Italy, the chief mean to achieve that goal was not contractual acceptance, but the establishment of a balance that would prevent domination through tiring warfare. Therefore Italy was frozen in a stage of systemic inherent, but limited crisis that retained Italy in a stage of relative stability. While this system was suitable from the point of view of the individual states during that period – because their respective interests were easy to follow in this system – it proved very problematic for the Italian states during the invasion of Charles VIII.

His invasion was not faced by any considerable or even mutual opposition at first. Until he occupied Naples, no major battle, especially not a joint military action of several Italian states, occurred. Only when he had taken Naples and the prospect of French domination in Italy became obvious, the paralysed Italian states began to take action. Since a common military alliance, an Italic League, already did not seem powerful enough to expel French power from Italy, the League of Venice of 1495 sought protection outside of Italy's borders. The King of Aragon as well as the Emperor were therefore included. The system of balance was unable to defend Italy, but again not an Italic League, but the extension of the system of balancing alliances was favoured by the Italian states. However the inclusion of the two external powers widened this balance on the European level. This of course dwarfed the Italian states and made them dependent on much more terrific European powers.

The idea of balanced power had ultimately prevailed also on the European level. However, Italy was doomed to become the battlefield where the new equilibrium was constantly tested until 1559. While the success of the preserved status quo in Italy may be attributed to the *equilibrio italiano*, it cannot be ignored that the temporal inability of the foreign powers, which had claims and interests in Italy, bestowed the condition under which that policy was enabled to sustain. In Mattingly's words: “Actually, in the forty years after the peace of Lodi, Italy owed its freedom from foreign invasion less to statesmanship than to sheer good luck. More than once the politics of tension precipitated a crisis which invited
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foreign intervention. But no power was ready to intervene."49

**CONCLUSION**

Generally it can be observed that an all-Italian league was favoured only, when the proposing party was threatened or felt threatened by a superior outside power, while it could be successful only if other powers were threatened too. If an Italian league would have been able to resist a foreign invasion, such as the one of Charles VIII, shall be left undecided here, but it can be argued that it was not established because Italian powers were referring to external threats rather overbearing, not being able to take them seriously.

“There was a certain complacency among Italian politicians about their ability to make use of other powers to serve their own interests. Italians were slow to credit the persistence and the seriousness of intent of the kings of France and Spain and the emperor, the fact that they were coming or sending their armies to claim territories and states that they regarded as theirs and that, once gained, they intended to keep."50

While a complete analysis of the preconditions of the *equilibrio* would have to include the proof of the inability of foreign powers to launch an invasion on Italian soil and therefore press their claims, it must be said, following Fubini, that a balance of alliances superseded the Italic League that had appeared after the peace of Lodi.51 Rubinstein's claim that both systems existed simultaneously52 cannot be approved at least on the analytical level which takes the actual alliances in enduring conflicts between the Peace of Lodi and the invasion of Charles VIII into account. Still it must be said with him that at least on the idealised, diplomatic level of the stated ambitions in many subsequent treaties reference to the Italic League was still alive. Certainly the policies of the Italian states were obviously more motivated by respective interests than a sense of unity, which had already come to life in the intellectual as well as the political elite, at least in Northern Italy. Still this sense was not strong enough to mobilise effective political support for a joint allied repulsion of a foreign invasion before it finally occurred.

The *equilibrio italiano* was a concept that essentially opposed the concept of the *lega generale* despite the references to an Italic League in the treaties which established the equilibrium.
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The main target of the article is to show the connection between the most violent riot in the history of Constantinople (the Nika riot in 532 AD) and the development of sports in the Byzantine Empire. It traces the origin of the chariot races, their role in the Ancient Greek and Roman society and their political influence in the Byzantine Empire. It also indicates the main circus factions, their social base and role in the political life. In the conclusion, the reasons for the fall of chariot races and the parties of Hippodrome after the end of the Nika riot are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The description of sporting events as a social phenomenon is correct for almost every historical era. That applies both to the ancient Olympic Games and their regulatory role for the Greek poleis with the holy truce (*ekeheiria*), as well as modern major tournaments, in which each country has an opportunity to impress the whole world. The Byzantine Empire used the same model with the chariot racing tournaments, which were held at the Hippodrome of Constantinople. The sporting event was used by the emperor as a barometer of public attitudes. He continued the trend of the Roman Empire to give people “bread and circuses”. In the Byzantine Empire the political influence of the circus parties - the Blues, the Greens, the Reds and the Whites, rose steeply and soon the emperor became dependent on their wishes. In 532 AD, the supporters of the Blues and the Greens (the most powerful parties) were united against unpopular administrators and began to assault the palace of the emperor Justinian I. More than 30,000 rioters were killed. This event marks the beginning of the end for the games of Hippodrome.

THE ORIGIN OF CHARIOT RACING

The origin of the most popular sport in the empire came from the legend of Pelops and Oinomaos. According to the legend, King Oinomaos of Pisa had a daughter, a girl of great beauty, who went by the name of Hippodamia, which means Horse Tamer. Oinomaos had no sons, so whoever married Hippodamia would inherit the rule over the land. A great many unsuitable men asked for the hand of the beautiful Hippodamia. In fact, the process soon became bothersome. Oinomaos developed a way of discouraging his daughter's suitors. He challenged them to a chariot race. If Oinomaos won, he killed the foolish suitor with his shiny spear. But if the suitor won, he would marry the girl and become heir to the kingdom. Many men died in the pursuit of beauty and wealth. When the hero Pelops asked for the hand of Hippodamia, she fell in love with him. She bribed her father's charioteer, a man named Myrtilus, to remove the linchpins from the wheels of her father's racing chariot. His reward would be half of the kingdom, and the first night in Hippodamia's bed. And so the race was
arranged. Pelops surged to the lead. But the chariot of Oinomaos made up ground. As they raced, Oinomaos raised his spear to slay Pelops at the exact moment the wheels of his chariot flew off. Oinomaos was dragged to his death and Pelops seized the kingdom. When Myrtilos came seeking his reward, Pelops treacherously threw him into the sea.¹

The chariot racing event was first added to the Olympics in 680 BC with the games expanding from a one-day to a two-day event to accommodate the new event. This means that it was not, in fact, a founding event of the Olympics. Chariot racing was not as prestigious as the 195 meter foot race (*stadion*). It was, however, more important than other equestrian events, such as racing on horseback, which were dropped from the Olympic Games very early on.² For example, the mule-car race lasted for only fourteen Olympiads. The influential Greeks from Sicily were probably responsible for this innovation at Olympia, as that country was famous for its mules.³ In most cases in chariot racing, the owner and the driver of the chariot were not the same person. In 416 BC, the Athenian general Alcibiades had seven chariots in the race, and came in first, second and fourth. Obviously, he could not have been racing all seven chariots himself. Philip II of Macedon also won an Olympic chariot race in an attempt to prove he was not a barbarian, though if he had driven the chariot himself he would likely have been considered even lower than a barbarian. However, the poet Pindar did praise the courage of Herodotos of Thebes for driving his own chariot. This rule also meant that women could technically win the race; despite the fact that women were not allowed to participate in or even watch the Games (the only woman to attend the games was the priestess of Demeter).⁴ This happened rarely, but a notable example is the Spartan Cynisca, daughter of Archidamus II, who won the chariot race twice. Chariot racing was a way for Greeks to demonstrate their prosperity at the games. The case of Alcibiades also indicates that chariot racing was an alternative route to public exposure and fame for the wealthy people.

The prestige of this sport continued in the Roman Empire. Chariot racing was the most popular sport in the empire, even more popular than gladiator fights. The races were held in the circus (such as the Circus Maximus in Rome) and were also important social events. It was one of the few places where Roman citizens could legally play betting games and one of the only public places where men and women could freely mix and sit next to each other. Fights between rival teams are well recorded, particularly the famous race in Pompeii that caused several deaths and the participating teams to be disqualified for ten years. During the second century, chariot racers were the sports heroes of their day and one in particular had a bankroll that dwarfs all salaries of modern-day athletes. Peter Struck, associate professor of classical studies at the University of Pennsylvania, points to an illiterate charioteer named Gaius Appuleius Diocles who earned 35,863,120 sesterces in prize money (about $15 billion) – more than any sportsman in the modern era.⁵

**THE SOCIAL ROLE OF THE HIPPODROME OF CONSTANTINOPLE**

In 394 AD, Theodosius I banned all pagan festivals. That means that the Ancient Olympic
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Games came to an end. However, chariot races, the most popular sport in the Byzantine Empire, were still held. The Hippodrome was one of the most important structures in Constantinople and a central feature in the life of its citizens. Originally built by Septimius Severus at the end of 2nd century AD, it was enlarged by Constantine The Great after he inaugurated his new capital in 330 AD. Races were conducted in the same manner as those in Rome. Four cars (quadrigae) participated in each race, representing the four colours - Red, White, Blue, and Green. Charioteers drew their starting positions with balls placed in a revolving lot-casting urn, and then raced seven laps around the hippodrome. The Chariot races took place sixty days of the year, and for each race, there was a capacity crowd. Approximately 30,000 people attended each event, so it is very evident that the chariot races were an extremely important social gathering. Seating arrangement at the Hippodrome depended on one's social or political affiliation in Constantinople. Those associated with the akta (acclamations), the hecklers (krachtes), occupied the first row. The second row was occupied by the faction spectators. Above them, in the third row, were the faction leaders (demarchs) and assistant leaders (democrats). The common people occupied the fourth row, called anabathra, and other open seats of the Hippodrome. Most of the seats on this side of the building were wooden. In the Eastern grandstand the kathisma - the imperial box - was located. The Emperor, his family, and important members of the imperial household sat there to watch the races. The kathisma was directly linked by a spiral staircase and internal passageway to the Sacred Imperial Palace, adjacent to the Hippodrome. The front of the box was an open balcony looking down on the track. From the hall immediately behind this balcony, the kathisma could be sealed off from both the hippodrome and the palace.

The circus factions (demes) always consisted of four separate colours: the Blues (Venetoii), the Greens (Prasinoi), the Reds (Rousioi) and the Whites (Leukoi); except for a short period, beginning around 84 AD, when Domitian added the Purple and Gold colours. The fans typically divided into the Blue and Green factions, though the charioteers were not loyal to a specific colour. The 6th century's charioteer Porphyrius was known to have regularly switched colours. Evidently, the Blues and the Greens were the dominant factions and the Reds and the Whites partnered with the other two factions to assist them in the races.

Typically, the Blues worked with the Whites and the Greens teamed up with the Reds, though there are some examples of other factions working together in certain areas. Many historians discuss the social role of the circus factions. While Alan Cameron believes that the circus factions only served a ceremonial role in Constantinople, it is clear that they served a social and political role as well. John Bagnell Bury determinates the demes as „urban populace organized as a local militia“. Dimitar Angelov supports this thesis with a particular example – the demes were used as a army during the Visigoth invasion in 400 AD. The most important demes were the Blues and the Greens. The Blues represented old, Greco-Roman aristocracy . The Greens were the team of merchants and craftsmen. and people from the east part of the empire. The Blues defended the Greek orthodox idea, while the Greens supported
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monophysites and doctrines from the East. In 602 AD there were around 1500 Greens and 900 Blues. In later years both parties were around 8000 people strong. Emperor Anastasius I supported the Greens and caused major problems to the Blues during his reign.

Because the Hippodrome was the most important gathering-place for large numbers of spectators, other events that required a large audience were also staged there. The most significant of these was held in connection with the accession of a new emperor, whose inauguration was not complete until he had been ceremoniously acclaimed by the people of Constantinople assembled at the Hippodrome. If the triumph of a victorious emperor or general was celebrated at the time of a race-meeting, these ceremonies also took place at the Hippodrome. Less pleasant, but no less popular, were public punishments and executions held at the circus; here, some emperors were even executed by their successors, and certain criminals were beheaded or branded in front of large crowds gathered to witness the spectacle.

**THE NIKA RIOT**

The Nika riot began on Tuesday, 13 January 532 AD. Three days earlier, several members of the Blue and Green factions, who had been arrested for an earlier disturbance, were to be hanged. But the execution was botched; two men survived and found shelter in the Church of St. Laurentius, which then was put under guard. During the races at the Hippodrome, the crowd called on Justinian I to show them mercy, chanting until the twenty-second race (of twenty four). But there was no response. Then, unexpectedly, another exclamation was heard: “Long live the merciful Blues and Greens!” That evening, with “Nika” (“conquer”; an exclamation used to encourage the charioteer) as their watchword, the two united factions demanded that the city prefect release the prisoners, and then set fire to the Praetorium when he refused. The fire spread to the Senate and the Church of St. Sophia. These buildings burned down.

On the following morning (Wednesday, 14 January), the Emperor ordered the races to be renewed. But the Blues and the Greens were not in the mood for witnessing races. They set the buildings at the northern end of the Hippodrome on fire, and the conflagration destroyed the neighbouring baths of Zeuxippus with the portico of the Augusteum. It is probable that on this occasion Justinian I did not appear in the kathisma, to face the multitudes that were now clamouring at the Hippodrome, no longer interceding for the lives of the two wretches who had escaped the hangman, but demanding that three unpopular ministers be deprived of their offices. The protest was directed against Eudaemon, Prefect of the City, Tribonian the Quaestor, and John of Cappadocia. The situation had become so serious that the Emperor decided to yield. Tryphon was appointed Prefect of the City, Basilides Quaestor, and Phocas, a man of the highest probity, was persuaded to undertake the office of Praetorian Prefect. In an ordinary situation, these actions would calm the mob, but the Blues and the Greens felt that it was their chance to use their power to change the policy of the empire. On Thursday,
Probus, the youngest nephew of the late Anastasius, was declared emperor but he, prudently, was not to be found, and his palace was burned down in his absence. The incendiariam continued for the next two days, and aggravated during the fighting with the Thracian troops.

Finally, on Sunday, 18 January, Justinian I went to the imperial box and acknowledged his errors, promising to redress the grievances of the populace and pardon the rioters. But they were not to be pacified and declared Hypatius, another nephew of Anastasius, as ruler. As Justinian and his counsellors thought over whether to leave the capital (if only to avoid the unpopularity of being present when the insurrection was put down), the empress Theodora counselled resolve. The following speech is likely a rhetorical set-piece. “My opinion then is that the present time, above all others, is inopportune for flight, even though it brings safety. For while it is impossible for a man who has seen the light not also to die, for one who has been an emperor it is unendurable to be a fugitive. May I never be separated from this purple, and may I not live that day on which those who meet me shall not address me as mistress. If you wish, O Emperor, to save yourself, there is no difficulty; we have ample funds. Yonder is the sea, and there are the ships. Yet reflect whether, when you have once escaped to a place of security, you will not prefer death to safety. I agree with an old saying that “Empire is a fair winding-sheet.”15

Justinian I created a plan that involved Narses, a popular eunuch, as well as the generals, Belisarius and Mundus. Carrying a bag of gold given to him by Justinian I, the eunuch entered the Hippodrome alone and unarmed, and turned towards the mob. Narses went directly to the Blues' section, where he approached the important Blues and reminded them that Emperor Justinian supported them over the Greens. He also reminded them that the man they were crowning, Hypatius, was a Green. He then distributed the gold. The Blue leaders spoke quietly with each other and then they addressed to their followers. In the middle of Hypatius's coronation, the Blues left the Hippodrome. The Greens were stunned. While Narses fulfilled his mission, Belisarius and Mundus prepared to attack. At first Belisarius thought it would be feasible to reach the kathisma directly from the Palace and pluck the tyrant from his throne. Mundus had left the Palace another way, and he now entered the Hippodrome through the gate known as Nekra. The insurgents were between two fires, and carnage happened. It is said that the number of the slain exceeded 30,000.16 The usurper Hypatius was executed the next day.

In the following centuries, the role of circus parties and chariot racing tournaments progressively decreased. The emperors tried to limit the influence of the Hippodrome games, because they understood how dangerous it might be for them. At the same time aristocracy preferred different sports, such as hunting and polo (imported from Persia), which further led to the decline of chariot racing.17

CONCLUSION

After the end of Ancient Olympic Games in 394 AD, the chariot racing tournament in the Hippodrome of Constantinople was the most important sporting event for the next few

16 In Procopius “more than 30,000”, “35,000 more or less” in John Malalas.
17 Schrodt, “Sport of the Byzantine Empire, 52.
centuries. The circus factions (demes) in the Byzantine Empire continued the tradition of the Roman Empire and had strong influence on the social and political life. Many emperors observed the Roman principle “bread and circuses” and financed the races. The rivalry between the Blues and the Greens (the two main factions) represented the battle between old aristocracy and the new citizen of the Constantinople from the East between orthodox Christians and monophysits. The Nika riot on 13 January 532 AD showed the potential danger of united factions for the emperor and his reign. This is the reason the games in Hippodrome lost their importance in following centuries. In the modern era, we can see a similar process with the influence of football hooligans in many countries around the world and the presence of rivalry based on religion and political beliefs (e.g. between the Scottish teams Celtic and Glasgow Rangers).
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Ecology crisis in Ancient Greece: The influence of olive production on the disappearance of Greek landscape
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The olive was a crop with unmatched importance in the Ancient Greek world. It was consumed, used in medicine, traded and looked upon as a symbol of glory. The Athenians, in particular, were so dependent upon it that they associated the olive with the gods. The economical importance of olive oil export was immensely large; therefore many fields were converted for its production and the crop itself was planted excessively. This led to erosion of the high Greek terrain and the once luxuriant landscape of the peninsula was changed forever.

INTRODUCTION

The majority of history is looked upon from a single perspective: the human one. Sole actions of this species and the decision-making of its leaders are history’s main focus. Ecology is not considered a key factor influencing the Ancient History. This is probably due to the fact that today we connect ecology-related problems with the notion of overpopulation, which is characteristic for the Modern Era. However, even in Antiquity ecological crises emerged, although they were largely unrecognized at the time. The Greeks were no exception, and their intensive agriculture, and extortion of a single crop, significantly contributed to the makings of Greek history. The importance of agriculture in the Ancient Greek poleis was without question. Several studies of the subject estimate the number of people involved in agriculture to be as high as 80% of all working people. Such a high number of people involved in agriculture was common in most of cultures at the time. However, the conversion of fields for olive tree planting, large export of olive oil and the general importance of the olive as a symbol are somewhat specific to the Greeks.

The cultivation of the plant started in the Bronze Age, viz. the Early Minoan period. The olive they cultivated is commonly known as the “wild olive” – *Olea europaea oleaster* or *Olea europaea sylvestris*. During the Mycenaean civilisation the cultivation continued and reached its peak in the Archaic and Classical Greek period. Although these two cultures preceded it, it was not until Ancient Greece that the olive plant was produced and exported in large quantities. To understand the reasons behind the excessive olive production and its plantation, it is necessary to stress the importance this crop held in the Ancient Greek life.

PRESENCE OF OLIVES IN THE GREEK LIFE

For Greek city-states olives were an ideal crop: the trees were reliable, long lasting and very fertile. The usage of olives themselves and their by-product olive oil was common in

---

1 Ancient Greek city states (pl.).
different spheres of the Greek life. The first and most obvious usage is in nutrition. Olives comprised a fairly large part of the Mediterranean diet (as they still do today). They were accessible to virtually anyone and were not considered a luxury: “He that yesterday loathed eggs and cakes of finest meal and purest bread will today eat eagerly and with appetite coarsest bread with a few olives and cress.” However, it is important to note that even the diet of the wealthy may appear dull in variety for modern standards, namely because many vegetables that we consider common today were imported later in history. Typical meals consisted of: “bread, eggs, cheese, soup, cooked cereals, fish (especially dried and salted fish) but rarely meat; garlic, onions, beans and lentils, nuts and olives; olive oil (also used for frying); for dessert, figs and other fruits, and cakes, sweetened with honey [...]”

In addition to consummation, olive oil was also used in various medical or decorative concoctions, a number of which can be found in the collection of “Hippocratic Writings”. Furthermore, olive oil was used for skin care in different Greek gymnasia. Before exercise, men applied olive oil and dirt on their bodies. The mixture kept them warm and made it difficult for opponents to get a good grip on them during wrestling. Afterwards, they scraped the oil off with a strigil. Moreover, olive oil was given as a prize to the victors of athletic contests: “For the prizes for those winning inmusic are silver and gold, for those winning the male beauty contest the prizes are shields, and for those winning the athletic contest and the horse race, oil.”

Olives were not just literally important to the Greeks; they also had a tremendous symbolic value. The book “Znakovi i simboli” (Signs & Symbols) states that the olive is: “an ancient symbol of peace, glory and immortality in the Ancient and Judaeo-Christian symbolic.” Its non-literal significance is frequently embedded within Greek myths and tales of the gods. The very origin of the plant is divine. According to myth, the Greeks first encountered olives when the goddess Athena produced one in a contest for the patronage of the city of Athens. With the production of the olive tree, she defeated Poseidon which was an event “witnessed by gods, goddesses, horses and chariots, and families prominent in the legendary origins of the city”. A plant with such an origin must have been important, especially to the city of Athens. In addition, olives are mentioned throughout many other adventures of Greek heroes, who can be found “resting against an olive-tree”, “bound to an olive tree”, “in the shade of an olive tree”. Odysseus even uses Cyclops’ own olive-staff to defeat him. Olives are rarely at the centre of attention in such tales, but are frequently

---

3 Plutarch, Moralia, 1. 8. 140. 
4 Gates, Ancient Cities, 280. 
5 A collection of Greek medical writings, which became attributed to Hippocrates (c. 430 BC), although none of the texts is confirmed to be written by him. 
6 Chrisp, Antička Grčka, 43. 
7 A special curved bronze tool used for scraping olive oil off one’s skin. 
9 Žderić, Znakovi i Simboli, 95. 
10 Berens, The Myths and Legends of Ancient Greece and Rome, 32. 
12 Keightley, The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy, 226. 
13 Keightley, The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy, 406. 
14 Keightley, The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy, 419.
encountered as a marker of location or as a guarantee of the power of an object made from or of them.  

**ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF OLIVE EXPORT**

Trade and taxes form another large field where the importance of olives is observable. Victor Duruy in his “Histoire des Grecs” states: “Greek land, unsuitable for grain production, is very suitable for grape and oil production which are a trade produce. Nations wealthy in grain and cattle supply can be left without anything and seek to trade nothing; hence the slow increase of arable communities. But, the other nation, which has only wine and oil, is to be starving, if it trades none of its produce with another.”  

16 Athens was among the first Greek poleis which converted its land to olive and grape production only for the sake of export. It exported manufactured goods, and with the money earned bought the grain it needed.  

17 The cost of import of various necessary foodstuffs was levelled with the monetary gain of the olive oil export: “Profit from the export of wine and olive oil sufficiently compensated the costs of cereal import.”  

18 We can trace the trading activity of various cities to some degree by studying the production and distribution of their pottery fabrics. For example, certain amphorae, containers for oil or wine, recognizable by individual shape and fabric or stamp of origin, mark Chios as an early shipper of wine and Athens as a producer of olive oil.  

19 The lack of food in the growing cities demanded an even greater production of the most valuable export. Selling the oil earned money used to buy the main foodstuff they lacked.  

**CULTIVATION STRATEGIES**

There is no record that the olive let the Greeks down as a crop, but their increased dependency upon it combined with the conversion of more land to its production created a crisis. Ever since the invasion of DORIANS in 12th century, the landscape of Greece was described as rich and ample. However, the land was considerably mountainous and hence difficult to cultivate. Cultivation was possible through a system of terraces, i.e. through terracing and trenching the fields.

16 E.g. Caduceus is the name of the herald's staff carried by Hermes. It was a staff made of an olive-tree and thought to be extremely powerful.  


20 An event later described by the ancient Greeks as an invasion, although there is no concrete evidence for that it was so violent.  


nutrients from beneath the rocky foundation. These characteristics enabled the olive to become more and more widespread. However, this did not come without a cost.

**Erosion of the Land**

Xenophon’s dialogue between Socrates and Critobulus reveals the principle of determining the land’s fertility: “But he has only to look at his neighbour's land (he answered), at his crops and trees, in order to learn what the soil can bear and what it cannot.” By looking at the neighbouring terrain and the types of crops planted there, the Greek farmers chose what arable crops to plant there (i.e. they planted olives on higher ground).

Since the land was cleared for the requirements of such olive cultivation, the surface layer of the ground became unstable. In the plains that presented no issue, but in the hills the land eroded and the ability of vegetable cultivation was diminished. This was known to the Greek farmers in the Classical Period, who were aware that “regular cultivation of sloping hillsides required well protection of the soil since the rate of erosion in the cultivating hillsides was much higher than in the flat areas.” Hesiod’s view of the future in agriculture was quite pessimistic as well. Being but a poor farmer, he was in the centre of the problematic nature of soil regulation. In his work “Work and Days” he advises farmers to plough the soil in autumn: “When the Pleiades, daughters of Atlas, are rising, begin your harvest, and your ploughing when they are going to set.”

Ploughing the land removed the surface root needed for the soils stabilization. Terrace building prevented the unstable land from moving, but it was considerably time consuming as it needed constant maintaining. It is evident that this whole system of cultivation, as it is documented in Greek written sources, needed: “a tremendous amount of continuous labour throughout the year.” Even the terraces that were built needed to be continuously maintained to prevent erosion, and the land itself needed constant attention to prevent the regeneration of scrub growth.

The maintenance of arable fields was frequently interrupted by wars. Greek poleis constantly came into conflict making such maintenance extremely difficult. Equally problematic was the requirement for farmers to go to war. If fields were left unattended even for a few weeks, the land would begin to slide away. A common practice was even to let the goats graze in the fields but they demolished the terrace rocks and barriers as well.

**Conclusion**

All things considered, olive’s importance was indisputable in the Ancient Greek world. The special position it held cannot be matched by any other crop at the time. Everything connected with the olive had a positive value, i.e. it was nutritious, healthy, symbolic and

---

valuable. However, nobody realized the destructive power of its cultivation. Deceived by its immense economical importance, the Greeks overplanted and overproduced the crop. The maintenance of production in the mountainous landscape was very difficult; for the most part, even impossible due to the unstable political dominion over the land, and the frequent wars the situation sparked. The following erosion of land took away with it the top layer of the fertile Greek soil hence changing the landscape of the peninsula for the times yet to come.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


The Dispute between Andreas, the Bishop of Prague, and King Ottokar I of Bohemia as the Crisis of Church and State
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In 13th century, the situation in Bohemia was quite uneasy. In those times, the Christianity was just spreading in Bohemia and the Church was beginning to gain power. Ottokar I of Bohemia was on the Czech throne. He was a member of the Přemyslid dynasty, one of the most famous dynasties of the Kingdom of Bohemia. He is nowadays considered one of the best and beloved kings of the Přemyslid dynasty. In the early years of governance, he managed to choose his loyal friend and counsellor to be the new bishop of Prague. That was probably one of the biggest mistakes he ever made. A couple of years later, his loyal friend Andreas turned against him and tried to change the Bohemian church and even the way that Ottokar ruled his kingdom. The conflict between King Ottokar and Bishop Andreas is described as one of the biggest conflicts between Church and State in the Middle Ages in Bohemia. The conflict led to some important changes and it affected the following development of both Church and State in Bohemia.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, we are confronted with several examples of conflicts between the Church and the State. Most of them somehow determine the following development. The dispute between Andreas, the bishop of Prague, and King Ottokar I of Bohemia is no different. We find ourselves in the Kingdom of Bohemia in 13th century. On the throne in the Prague Castle we can find one of the greatest kings in Czech history – Ottokar I of Bohemia. He was a member of the Premyslids dynasty. During his governance, the Kingdom of Bohemia reached its glory and international acceptance. However, his position and efforts were put in danger during the great dispute with the bishop of Prague.

In this article, I will describe the dispute between the two most powerful men of their time in the Kingdom of Bohemia and the consequences of their actions. Primary sources for this topic are mostly the agreements that are connected to the dispute and of course the chronicles from that time. Unfortunately, the mentions of the dispute are rare and as far as we know not exactly correct. For example, the Czech Chronicle of the “so called” Dalimil mentions the dispute but places it in the wrong time and even mistakenly names the bishop Prokop instead of Andreas.

THE CHURCH IN BOHEMIA IN 13TH CENTURY

The situation in the Kingdom of Bohemia in 13th century was different than in e.g. Italy or France. In Bohemia and, even before, in Great Moravia, Christianity was the state religion. Nobody wanted to change the customs. This was also the reason why the second bishop of
Prague, Saint Adalbert of Prague, failed in his quest. He tried to convince the Czech clergy to accept the rules from Rome, which was against Czech customs. Eventually, he decided to leave Bohemia for Poland, where he died. The Czech chronicler Kosmas wrote about the situation in 11th century: “in many places [the duke Břetislav] cut down and burned trees that the common people honoured. Half-pagan people honoured many superstitious habits. They brought gifts on the Tuesday or Wednesday of the Pentecost. They made sacrifices to evil spirits at wells and springs. Their funerals took place in the woods or fields. They also played games at the crossroads and in the fields, where they playfully ran over their dead.” It is known that the position of the Church in Bohemia was not stable for a long time. The Church depended on the dukes and was unable to develop according to canonical theories.

In 973, the episcopacy in Prague was established, and in 1063, the episcopacy in Olomouc was re-established. The bishop was present more at the court and acted as the personal priest of the duke. The bishops of Olomouc were more independent than the bishops of Prague, because Olomouc was farther from the court and the sight of the duke. Until 12th century the bishops were appointed by the Czech dukes. The candidates were mostly clerics from the duke’s court and most of them were inappropriate for the office; some of them were not even consecrated. The other problem was that the duke also appointed bishops for the diocese in Olomouc, which was mostly not kindly accepted by the aristocracy in Moravia. They felt that the duke was interfering in their rights and was trying to take over their part of the kingdom. Another difference was the question of administration. Most of the parishes developed from the private chapels of aristocracy. Therefore, the aristocrats felt that they had some owner’s rights above the parish. The Czechs did not understand the tradition that what was given to the Church was from now on property of the Church, and they demanded their rights as founders.

In the Kingdom of Bohemia the Church was not homogenous. It was a varied mix of churches, chapels, monasteries and episcopal offices, each of them following its own aim. They took care of their property, lands and people. Nevertheless, the wealth and self-esteem of the Church were increasing. In 11th and 12th century the number of private chapels increased. Later, these chapels received the rights of parishes. In 12th century, the first monasteries were established as well. They also were dealing with the fact that clerics were considered laymen in the court matters and were therefore judged by the dukes and by secular courts. Married priests were common and celibacy was mostly ignored. In the Czech Chronicle, the chronicler Kosmas wrote: “Božetěcha, who was my inseparable partner, died...
the same year.\textsuperscript{9} Kosmas was a cleric and the dean of the church on Vyšehrad in Prague. To follow the canonical prescriptions was complicated and annoying for the Czech clergy, so they ignored the rules most of the time. As we can see from the example of Kosmas, they did not even try to hide their behaviour.\textsuperscript{10}

The Church tried to enable their priests to focus only on their service to God. The dukes and aristocracy in the Kingdom of Bohemia often gave lands, people, money etc. to the churches and monasteries. But these gifts were mostly considered as necessities that should provide for the basic needs of the clergy and were not their property. They presented more a loan than a gift. The supervision was still provided by the duke or the secular donor. They had the so called foundation rights.\textsuperscript{11} The church tried to manage the whole situation by transferring the property to God himself or some saint – in 1183 Kralovice and other estates donated their properties to “domino deo et beatae Mariae et fratribus in Plazs”.\textsuperscript{12} Not before 12\textsuperscript{th} century, the situation of the property of the Church began to change and the idea of the seigniorial rights started to spread from monasteries. The Church understood that the key for increasing its position in the kingdom are good relationships with the ruling dynasty. Establishing those was not an easy task, mostly because the duke and the bishop did not have the same purpose and they were trying to reach different goals.\textsuperscript{13} Since 12\textsuperscript{th} century, the dukes could not overlook that the clergy in their kingdom was a part of a transnational organisation and that the curia began to pay attention to the Czech area.\textsuperscript{14} One of the Church’s ways to interfere with the kingdom was through “immunities”. These were used for removing the episcopacy, monasteries and churches from under the influence of the duke and aristocracy. The first mention of the immunity was when the Czech ruler used immunity on behalf of the bishop of Olomouc and at the expense of Moravian aristocracy.\textsuperscript{15} In this situation, the reformist emancipation of the program of the Czech clergy slowly began. King Ottokar I of Bohemia realized the danger of the Holy Roman Empire. Therefore, he suggested in 1198 that the investiture of his bishops should be his decision. His proposal was confirmed in 1212 in Golden Bull of Sicily, where the emperor agreed that the question of appointment of Czech bishops was from then on the matter of the king himself.\textsuperscript{16}

We can say that immediately before Andreas was announced as the bishop of Prague, the secular power was strongly interfering in religious business and that most of the clerics lived as laymen, not as consecrated people.

**Andreas as the Bishop of Prague**

Andreas was probably a younger son of some aristocrat. Sources about his early life do not exist. The first mention of Andreas places him in Stará Boleslav, where he was the provost. After that, he became the canon of Prague, then he was the provost of Mělník and in

\textsuperscript{9} “[...] téhož roku zemřela Božetécha, jež bývala nedílnou družkou veškerých osudů mých [...]” Kosmas III, s. 217.

\textsuperscript{10} Žemlička, Přemysl Otakar I, 220.

\textsuperscript{11} Vaněček, Základy právního postavení I., 11-12.

\textsuperscript{12} Codex Diplomaticus Bohemiae I, 300/270.

\textsuperscript{13} Žemlička, Přemysl Otakar I., 224-225.

\textsuperscript{14} Žemlička, “Spor Přemysla Otakara I. s pražským biskupem Andreasem”, 707.

\textsuperscript{15} Medek, Osudy moravské církve do konce 14. věku I, 54.

\textsuperscript{16} Codex Diplomaticus Bohemiae II/3, 2.
1207 he became the provost of the St. Vitus chapter on the Prague Castle. The office of king’s chancellor was connected with this post. As it was known that Andreas was a good friend of King Ottokar I of Bohemia, it was no surprise when the king appointed him the bishop of Prague.\(^\text{17}\)

Until the year 1215, Andreas and Ottokar were friends and they coordinated their efforts to rule the Kingdom of Bohemia. But in 1215, Andreas left Prague to participate in the 4\(^{th}\) Lateran Council. The Council is considered today as one of the most important councils in history. When Andreas came to Rome, he saw an absolutely different world. As it was said at the beginning, the situation of the Church was quite different in the Czech Kingdom than in other, mostly southern and western, parts of Europe. Lateran was the biggest expression of the confidence of the Church and its plans to “rule” all over the humanity up until that point in history. When Andreas saw the contrast between the position and situation of the Church in Bohemia and elsewhere, he was disappointed. He came back to Prague with a clear goal: to reform the Czech church. His devotion was confirmed when he was consecrated as the bishop by Pope Innocent III himself. After he came back to Prague, he was still in touch with the curia and kept them informed about the situation in the Czech Kingdom. In 1216, Andreas left Prague in apprehension of the conflict with the king. Ottokar was surprised. All actions from Andreas were unexpected and he was confused. Ottokar tried to defend himself against accusations and he had strong support in aristocracy and even in most of the clergy.\(^\text{18}\)

**THE DISPUTE**

Andreas fought his fight against secular power in times when papacy was in the offensive – “Laicis, etiam religiosis, super ecclesiis et personis ecclesiasticis nulla est attributa facultas, quos obsequendi manet necessitas, non auctoritas imperandi” said Innocent III.\(^\text{19}\)

Andreas was trying to force a number of new rights. He accused the king that in the Czech Kingdom the tithe was mostly taken by aristocracy and never reached church; that the clergymen are appointed by the duke and they are mostly laymen; that the clergy is judged by secular courts etc. After some time his accusations grew more serious. He accused the king that he led the Czech church; that he imposed unjust taxes and fees etc. Ottokar I of Bohemia first refused all of these accusations, but later on admitted that some things might have been true, and therefore rectified the situation. The weakness of the Czech church showed during the interdict. The interdict announced by the bishop was mostly ignored by the clergy on all levels. Most of the Prague chapter refused to respect the bishop of Prague. The same happened with the head of monasteries and Robert, the bishop of Olomouc. Most of the natural allies of the bishop of Prague eventually turned against him. Andreas disrupted the traditional relationship between the king and the provincial church. Most of the aristocracy and clergy were simply surprised with Andreas’s performance. Andreas expected that he would have support from the Czech church, because he fought mainly for their rights. But he underestimated the fact that most of their offices were run by the king and their future depended on their king, so naturally they did not want to fight against their own ruler. They

^{18}\) Žemlička, “Spor Přemysla Otakara I. s pražským biskupem Andreasem”, 711.  
\(^{19}\) Genicot, *Le XIIIe siècle européen*, 259.
were against Andreas’s attempt to change the traditional way of the church in the Czech Kingdom and to force them to change their way of living.\textsuperscript{20} Meanwhile in Rome, the Pope decided that he would profit if he remained friends with Ottokar. Therefore, he wrote a letter in which he said that he was glad that Ottokar was still loyal to the Holy Church. He also wrote that he listened to the king’s chancellor Benedikt, who was sent to Rome in the name of Ottokar, and assured him that, if justice and dignity allowed, he would remain friends with the Czech crown. He asked Ottokar to stay loyal to the Holy Church. Another letter was sent to the Czech aristocracy. In this letter, the Pope wrote that he was glad that they were still loyal and promised the aristocrats some advantages if they remained loyal.\textsuperscript{21}

However, Andreas acted by himself and announced an interdict above the Prague diocese, which aroused a storm of protests. Ottokar turned to the Pope and reminded him of all the things he had done for the church and how loyal he was. The Pope refused all Andreas’s accusations and asked if Andreas’s actions were blessed by the Holy Father. In the meantime, Andreas flooded the curia with his problems and complaints. The Pope had to believe his bishop, so on 12\textsuperscript{th} March 1217 he ordered Andreas that he should force the guilty into obedience with all ecclesiastical punishments. Ottokar saw that the Pope would not end the interdict, so he asked the bishop of Meinz, who was his friend, to cancel the interdict; and the bishop complied. But this only made Andreas and the Pope himself angry. The interdict was announced once more on 12\textsuperscript{th} May 1217. The following years were filled with many letters between the Pope and the king. King Ottokar I of Bohemia tried to convince the Pope that the accusations were not true.\textsuperscript{22}

The first attempt to solve the dispute happened at the meeting in Kladrub by near Prague. At the beginning of year 1219, Konrád, the bishop of Regensburg, and other abbots, bishops etc. met to discuss the future. Ottokar promised that Andreas and his successors were allowed to appoint clerics, but “\textit{salvo iure patronatus}”, and that they could judge their own people, but “\textit{in spiritualibus}”.\textsuperscript{23} The meeting in Kladrub did not solve anything, neither side of the dispute was satisfied and the solution for the problem was still unknown. The whole conflict culminated at the meeting on Monte Scach, where the papal legate met with King Ottokar and Andreas, the bishop of Prague.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{The Meeting on Monte Scach}

The end of the dispute happened in 1221/1222. The first official step was made by Pope Honorius III on 11\textsuperscript{th} January 1221, when he addressed all “abbots, provosts, deans and all clergy in Bohemia”.\textsuperscript{25} The Pope informed these people about the agreement between Andreas and king attorney Jan de Scacario. In the name of the king, he confirmed all liberties and competences given by the Pope or the king. Most of the problems that Andreas was dealing with were solved. The final solution was supposed to be a great meeting of church and secular dignitaries from Bohemia and Moravia and also from abroad. The place was set on Monte

\textsuperscript{20} Žemlička, \textit{Přemysl Otakar I}, 227-229.
\textsuperscript{21} Novotný, \textit{České dějiny} 1/III, 459.
\textsuperscript{22} Novotný, \textit{České dějiny} 1/III, 487.
\textsuperscript{23} Hledíková, \textit{„K otázkám“} 245.
\textsuperscript{24} Novotný, \textit{České dějiny} 1/III, 475-479.
\textsuperscript{25} “[…] opatům, proboštům, děkanům a všemu kléru v Čechách […]” Žemlička, \textit{Přemysl Otakar I}, 230.
Scach on the border between Moravia and Austria. In June and July 1221, King Ottokar I of Bohemia and Andreas, the bishop of Prague, met on Monte Scach with the papal legate. Andreas was rightly worried that if the meeting would be somewhere else than in Rome, it would be under the influence of the Czech king, but he had to accept the decision of the Pope. It was clear that both the king and the papal legate wanted to end this dispute. The king was willing to make some concessions and this attitude was in strong contrast with the attitude of the bishop, who was firm in his opinion and unwilling to make any concessions.27

After a long conversation, the bishop and the king made a proclamation and the king confirmed all the rights of the Czech church and forgave many of the fees. The question of judges was solved as well – if anyone from the clergy committed any crime, he was to be judged by the secular power, but his property fell to the Church.

After this success, Andreas was only disappointed with the development of the Church. Some of his accusations were ignored and once again the Czech clergy was not supportive of their bishop. After the meeting on Monte Scach, the whole dispute was heading to its end. The Pope and the king were trying to end the dispute. The curia received many profits: the influence of the clergy increased in the Czech area, the bishop received some approval of his actions and requirements, and it seemed that the authority of canonical regulation would increase and that the relationship between the Pope and the king would stay intact. The only one who remained disappointed with the end of the dispute was Andreas. His constant complaining was a burden to the Pope. Even though the Pope remained loyal to his bishop, he also wanted to maintain a good relationship with the Czech Kingdom. Therefore, he chose compromise and that was not what Andreas wanted. Andreas felt betrayed and never came back to Prague. After the meeting on Monte Scach, he went to Venetia.

**The Great Privilege of the Czech Church**

The Czech king Ottokar I of Bohemia was willing to show the world how easy it was to agree with him. Therefore, he released The Great Privilege of the Czech Church on 10th March 1222. The privilege was addressed to “*universis monasteriis et conventualibus ecclesiis Pragensis diecesis et omnium ecclesiistarum et ecclesiasticorum personarum*”.28 With this privilege, Ottokar I granted the monasteries, the chapter and churches the same privilege he granted the bishopric and the Prague church. With the privilege, the king gave the bishop and the Prague chapter all liberties and pardoned them from all fees. In secular matters, the clergy would only be judged by the secular power, but in ecclesial matters, they would be judged by the ecclesial power. In both cases, the property would belong to the Church. All the property belonging to the bishop and seized by the king during the dispute was returned. After that the bishop could not prolong anymore and decided to cancel the interdict. Everybody expected that Andreas would return to his diocese. But he announced that he was still worried about his life and went to Rome, where he remained until his death.29

---

26 Šacká hora.
Most of the literature sees the privilege as the end of the dispute. But as we can see, the bishop himself had nothing to do with the privilege since he lived in Italy and had no interest in confirmation of privileges to the monasteries which left him without their support. There are two basic ideas in the privilege: the effort to secure the autonomy of religious institutions and at the same time to consolidate the king’s power where it was limited by local offices.

THE RESULT OF THE DISPUTE

The dispute from 1216 to 1222 was not a conscious fight of the whole Czech church for social superiority and economical privileges. It was more an individual effort of one bishop, who pointed out some difficulties. Andreas’s effort was a catalyst for future development. When Andreas died, the Pope tried to establish his candidate as the new bishop of Prague, but it was Ottokar who filled the empty post with his own candidate Pelhřim, the canon of Prague and provost of Mělník. The Pope ignored this and asked the Prague chapter to carry out new elections. The Pope forced Pelhřim to resign and a new bishop was elected. Unfortunately, the new bishop Budivoj died soon and the situation was the same again. After a couple of years they finally managed to elect the new bishop of Prague, Jan II (1227–1236).

Even though the Great Privilege of 10th March 1222 was supposed to cover all religious institutions in the diocese, the monasteries and chapters were still trying to get their own immunities and privileges. The denouement of the dispute was the effort of the royal power to communicate with the Church in the hope that the Church would become a great supporter of the royal power.

CONCLUSION

The dispute between Andreas, the bishop of Prague, and Ottokar I of Bohemia was a crisis in many ways. The dispute showed that the position of the Church in the Kingdom of Bohemia was terrible in comparison with its position in southern Europe. It also revealed that the clergy in Czech lands was not following the regulations of the 4th Lateran Council. All those things were clear to Andreas and he decided that it was the right time to change how things went in his bishopric. Unfortunately, Andreas underestimated the power of Ottokar and even more the power of his influence. Ottokar I of Bohemia was one of the most influential rulers in Europe and his position was strong. Most of the clergy in Bohemia was also appointed by Ottokar and they were aware of the fact that their careers were in his hands.

After all crises, development follows. Indeed, the same thing happened with Andreas and Ottokar. The dispute between the bishop of Prague and the King of Bohemia was a great crisis between the Church and the State. And when they finally managed to solve the problems and end the crisis, the time of development came. The dispute changed the situation of the Church in Bohemia. It became an independent unit and an important player at the international scene. The position of the Church in the kingdom was improved and the clergymen received many rights. The situation of the Church in Bohemia slowly became similar to its position in Italy or France. The only one who actually lost in the conflict was Andreas, even though he in iure

30 Žemlička, Přemysl Otakar I., 234-236.
31 Žemlička, Přemysl Otakar I., 236-238.
won. Most of his requests were eventually approved by king and he managed to help the Church become more independent. But after all, he died alone in exile thinking that everybody, even his own people, betrayed and left him.
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Hungarian female writers after the Revolution and War of Independence of 1848–1849
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This study explores the impact of the printed press on the literary careers of female writers (especially on the career of Júlia Szendrey) from the social historical perspective. I will use diaries, different types of unpublished manuscripts and press products, collected in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the National Széchényi Library and the Petőfi Literary Museum.

This paper concludes that contemporary media had a significant impact on individual’s life strategies, on the interpretation of literary texts and on the changes of cultural life patterns.

INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this paper is to briefly sketch the relationship between the transformation of Hungarian printed press after the Revolution and War of Independence of 1848–1849 and the appearance of numerous female writers. The analysis is based not only on the texts which were published by female writers in contemporary press, but also on the research of the manuscript archives of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the National Széchényi Library and the Petőfi Literary Museum. The focus of my analysis is the literary career of Júlia Szendrey, who is known as the wife of one of the most famous Hungarian poet, Sándor Petőfi.1 Only a few people, however, are aware of the fact that she started her own literary career after her husband disappeared in 1849 during the Revolution and War of Independence.

The utilization of the methods and outcomes of literary history and social history intertwined in my approach. My argument will focus on the impact of mass media on each literary career with a special emphasis on different approaches to the notion of crisis.

DISCOURSE ABOUT MULIEBRITY IN THE HUNGARIAN PRINTED PRESS OF THE 1840s

The birth of modern Hungarian printed press was connected to the political effervescence in the first half of the 1790s.2 Especially from the 1840s, the flourishing fashion journals

1 Basic information related to the biographical data, editions, bibliographies, biographies and criticism of Petőfi: Tezla, Hungarian Authors. A Bibliographical Handbook, 463 – 480.
Petőfi met Júlia Szendrey in 1846 and married her on 8th September 1847.
played an increasingly important role in writers’ literary careers. Discourse on muliebrity presented a continuously controversial issue in Hungarian press in that time. The prevailing opinion was that women were inscrutable and mysterious. The issues of self-knowledge and self-analysis played an important role in several diaries written by women. For instance, Etelka Slachta wrote the following text: “I am an enigma for myself, I don’t understand myself; those emotions which flow through in my bosom – I cannot denominate, I don’t understand.” Men thought that esprit and communicativeness were typically feminine features. At the same time, it was thought that women were ingenious, but inconsiderate, digressive and that they were not able to perform serious, intense mental labour. The concept of the “special circle” for females was widespread among male authors. Jácint Rónay remarked in his series of articles about female features in 1847: “[W]e should find the woman where she is destined by nature, and in her own circles she will be no lesser than the man in his gorgeous endeavours.”

In the 1840s, one of the most famous and important journal was the Pesti Divatlap (Pest Vogue) edited by Imre Vahot. Vahot was an excellent manager of several newspapers and the first manager of Sándor Petőfi. The main feature of the Pesti Divatlap (Pest Vogue) was that it was not only a fashion journal, but literary as well. It published literary works along with pictures of fashionable dresses. That is why it was very popular and successful in female circles.

The other important fashion magazine of the decade was the Életképek (Life Pictures), which was edited by Mór Jókai, who later became the richest and most popular writer in Hungary. In 1847, he established a special column for women called Lady Salon in his fashion magazine. The column contained Júlia Szendrey’s diary items, what Jókai started to


3 „Én magamnak rejtvény vagyok, magamat nem értem, azon indulatokat, melyek árként dagadnak s apadnak keblemben, meg nem nevezhetem, nem értem!” Slachta, kacékodni fogok vele, 2004, 11.

4 Rónay Jácint (1814 – 1889) was a propost from Bratislava, a bishop, a Benedictine master, a natural philosopher and a writer at the same time. He was also the instructor of the Crown Prince Rudolf and the Archduchess and Princess Marie Valerie, children of the Emperor Franz Joseph. He is sometimes mentioned as a Hungarian émigré living in London who published a book on the subject of Darwin’s theory in 1864.

5 „Őtt keressük fel a’ nőt, hova a’ természet rendelé, és saját körében bizonyosan nem leend kisebb, mint a’ férfiu nagyzerű törekvéseiben.” Rónay, “Millyen a’ női?”, 1847, 319.

6 Petőfi was employed by Imre Vahot as a sub-editor of Pest Vogue, which provided him with a literary platform. He also met his first love, Etelka Csapó, within the Vahot family. She was an innocent, child-like young girl, who died in 1845. Petőfi wrote about her in the volume of poetry entitled Cypress Leaves from the Grave of Etelke. Details: Czigány, The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature, 186.

Social historical approaches to the editorial career and social network of Imre Vahot: Demmel, „Az irodalom (szoziátis) hálója”, 253 – 268.

7 Jókai began his friendship with Sándor Petőfi during their studies at the Református Kollégium in Pápa in 1841. He undertook the editorship of Életképek in 1847, with Petőfi as his best known associate. He married the actress Róza Laborfalvi in summer 1848. In 1849 he fled to Debrecen because of the Kossuth government and in 1850 returned to Pest, where he devoted himself to political, editorial, newspaper, and literary activities. He became a member of the Academy in 1858. He is considered the most distinguished writer of romantic fiction in Hungary. Many of his novels have been translated into Armenian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, Russian, Serbian, Slovakian, Slovenian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Ukrainian. Basic information related to the biographical data, editions, bibliographies, biographies and criticism of Jókai: Tezla, Hungarian Authors. A Bibliographical Handbook, 238 – 255, Fábi, “Mór Jókai”, 114 – 127.
publish when she got married to Sándor Petőfi, who was not only a very popular poet, but also the editor of the journal Életképek.

As the general editor Jókai reported on the marriage of the young couple and wrote the preface to the diary of Júlia Szendrey, which was published as Petőfiné naplója (The diary of Mrs. Petőfi). The title, the preface and other editorial methods largely influenced the reception of these texts. The readership was interested in the details of the marriage and Jókai’s editorial gestures and manoeuvres aimed to satisfy this curiosity. From the diary entries which originally based on self-analysis, he created a love story. He changed the order of the diary entries and published only those related to the emotions and events connected with Petőfi. The other parts of the diary, such as the descriptions of nature and the introspective entries (e.g. the first three entries, which would be decisive during the interpretation of the whole diary), stayed unpublished.

Jókai’s preface suggested Júlia Szendrey’s text was the sketch of Petőfi’s love and happiness. During the editing process, he emphasized the romantic elements related to the relationship between them. This strategy proved to be successful, Júlia Szendrey was celebrated as a female writer and Der Ungar published the German translation of her texts as well. This was a special experience for the readership, because it was unusual to publish a woman’s diary. Some people even regarded the publication as norm-breaking and gave utterance to their confusion in their private letters.

For instance, Pál Gyulai, the subsequent famous critic and literary historian who wrote a series of articles about female writers ten years later, in 1858 – regarded the publication of the diary as a profanation of female feelings in order to achieve success. In addition, in the 1840s the presence of female writers in Hungarian press was firmly low. This case shows that there was a very thin borderline between the public and the private sphere during the publication process of texts written by women. On the one hand, this can lead to success by satisfying the curiosity of the readership; on the other hand, it can be regarded as norm-breaking.

Analysing the reception of Júlia Szendrey’s diary, the different approaches of

8 Szendrey, „Petőfiné naplója”, 561 – 568, 593 – 597.
9 As the later editions of the Júlia Szendrey’s diary were based the Életképek, the text which was edited by Jókai was published again. Therefore, his interpretation has a significant influence on the reception of the diary of Júlia Szendrey. Most people still regard it as the product of the Petőfi love story nowadays. Nevertheless, it would be important to reflect on the impact of Jókai’s manoeuvres and to handle Júlia Szendrey’s text as an autonomous literary work.

The first edition based on the original manuscript of the diary was Mikes, Szendrey Júlia ismeretlen naplója... 10 About the methods of editing: Gyimesi, “Iparlovagok Szendrey Júlia életműve körül”, 2014.
13 In 1858, he became a professor of Hungarian and Latin languages at the Református Kollégium in Kolozsvár and a member of the Academy. In 1862 he moved to Pest, became a teacher at the Reformed gymnasium in Pest and assistant editor to János Arany on Szépirodalmi Figyelő. He became the Secretary of Section on Language and Aesthetics of the Academy in 1870. Basic information related to the biographical data, editions, bibliographies, biographies and criticism of Pál Gyulai: Tezla, Hungarian Authors. A Bibliographical Handbook, 198 – 203.
female writing and publication practices are observable. This publication can be regarded as a prelude of a longer process.

My assumption is that there are connections between the assessment of female writers, the phenomenon of mass press, the multitude of authors and the different aspects of and approaches to literature. Hungarian literary life has changed around 1850 and 1860, and the appearance of female writers happened with the appearance of mass media. In the background of the debate about female writers, there are different kinds of concepts about literature. On the one hand, Pál Gyulai and János Arany had elitist concepts and they wanted to publish only high-standard works. They did not want to accept the appearance of female writers. On the other hand, Jókai took into consideration the commercial aspect of literature and supported female writers, because he discovered that their works were able to amuse the readership and thus could be profitable.

**FEMALE ROLES IN THE AFTERMAITH OF THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848**

Private crises and public crises

The printed press had a significant role during the Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence of 1848 – 1849. Petőfi and Jókai, who were the leaders of the young revolutionists, organized mass demonstrations on 15th March 1848. The crowd gathered in front of the printing office and they started to print the Twelve Points of demands written by Jókai and the National Song written by Petőfi. The first point of the Twelve Points demanded the freedom of press and the abolition of censorship.

Sándor Petőfi participated in the fights not only as a poet and the author of the National Song, but also as a member of the national army. He served for General Józef Bem, who regarded him as his own son. The national army was developed during the War of Independence and was named the Honvédésg. This name was immediately elevated to a level of greatest honour by Petőfi, who wrote: “After God it is the most beautiful and sacred word – honvéd; why wouldn’t I try to deserve this beautiful, great name?...”

---

14 Arany received the Kisfaludy-Társaság Prize in 1846 for Az elveszett alkotmány, a narrative poem. He was awarded the prize again the following year for Toldi, which placed him at the centre of literary interest. He began his friendship with Sándor Petőfi in 1847. He was one of the most appreciable authors of the Hungarian literary life during the 1850s and 1860s. Between 1863 and 1865, he edited Koszorú, which was connected to the debates about female writers. He became a member of the Academy in 1858, its secretary in 1866, and was its general secretary between 1871 and 1877. Basic information related to the biographical data, editions, bibliographies, biographies and criticism of János Arany: Tezla, Hungarian Authors. A Bibliographical Handbook, 36 – 52.

15 About the antecedents of the revolution: Dobszay, „Political struggles before the revolution”, 375 – 381. About the history of the revolution and war of independence: Hermann, „Revolution and war of independence” 381 – 392.


Petőfi disappeared during one of the last fights, on 31st July 1849 in Segesvár.21 It was assumed that he was dead. Júlia Szendrey tried to find any traces and leads, but her endeavours were not successful. She and her little son, Zoltán Petőfi, were in a desperate situation.22 She was threatened by the authorities, who wanted her to leave the capital. In addition, she did not know how to make both ends meet. In this situation she married the historian Árpád Horvát,23 who claimed that he admired Petőfi and her as well. The image of the remarried widow, who was able to forget her husband’s memory, has determined the public attitude toward Júlia Szendrey until nowadays.

A counter-example could be Antónia Zichy, the wife of the first Hungarian Prime Minister Lajos Batthány, who was arrested and executed in 1849.24 The execution was a part of the greatest wave of reprisals, which began on 6th October 1849.25 She had the appropriate financial background and she could play the role of the widow of the nation: she often participated in public events and she always wore mourning clothes. We can observe, at first, that after the revolutions of 1848 more and more women tried to modify their roles within their families; and secondly, that this tendency influenced people’s life strategies and careers. In the 1850s and 1860s, several married couples participated together in the Hungarian cultural life and tried to use the news value and success of each other as well.26 Usually, the husband was an editor and/or a writer and the wife was a poet or a writer. Widows who have chosen a literary career emerged as well. The aim of making money is more vigorous in dealing with literature than earlier, in the 1840s. To sum up: the private crises had influenced the transformation of the public sphere.

Although there are strong connections between the media of 1840s and 1850s (such as the phenomena of the freshly born mass media, the angles of the assessments of female writers etc.), the Revolution and War of Independence brought significant changes. Literary institutions, periodicals and fashion magazines ceased, and the careers of poets and writers based on these serials were in trouble. Nevertheless, the editing job presented a good opportunity to achieve appropriate financial background for both male and female authors. The first periodical founded after the revolution in Hungary was called Hölgyfutár (Lady Express). It was a daily literary paper which aimed to amuse the female readership. Although at the beginning of the 1850s the majority of the authors were male, there was a debate about female writers in 1851.

21 About the details of the battle of Segesvár and the Transylvanian Army: Hermann, „The Summer Campaign”, 409 – 412.
23 Árpád Horvát was the son of Horvát István who was a librarian, an amateur linguist, a historian and a friend of Ferenc Kazinczy. More details about Horvát: Vermes, Hungarian culture and politics on the Habsburg monarchy, 1711 – 1848, 158, 187 – 191.
During the discussion, beside the foreign female writers such as George Sand, only Júlia Szendrey was mentioned as Hungarian female writer.

The media-historical and gender researches traditionally intertwine in foreign literature. The methodology used in essays on the journal culture can also be considered from the viewpoint of Hungarian debates about female writers, as these processes took place in other cultures as well. As a consequence, comparative outcomes about similar phenomena in the international literary life could be useful. Analyses of female magazines of 18th and 19th century try to follow the reflections on distinct female roles. Their main question is how these roles were promoted or rejected by different journals and how these journals were used by female editors and authors for their own purposes. Ann B. Shteir explored the appearance of scientism in three distinct female journals: in the Lady’s Magazine, in the Lady’s Monthly Museum and in the Ladies Companion.27 In 1817, the Lady’s Magazine corresponded about the establishment of the Green-Stocking Club. Grace Greenwax, the secretary of the club, called educated women miserable spinsters, who disclaimed the privileges of their sex. The corner point of the argumentation in the Green-Stocking Club was that a Newton in the children’s room, a Locke doing laundry and a Pope in the pantry would be absurd and ridiculous figures. At the same time, beside the opinion of Grace Greenwax, there were efforts during the Enlightenment aiming to bring Newton into the children’s room and the science to female life through the medium of the journals.

In Hungary, the debates about female intellectuals were heating up later, at the end of the 1850s. The discussion revolved around production and construction of literary texts rather than scientific activities.

**DEBATES ABOUT FEMALE WRITERS AT THE TURN OF THE 1850S AND 1860S**

In Hungarian media in the 1850s and 1860s, the almanacs and annals aimed especially at women – which combined useful, practical information and literary texts – were pervading and popular. In these, women could read advice about hair care, skin care, different kinds of shops, and poems as well. One of the journals was the Almanac of Hungarian Women (Magyar Nők Évkönyve), edited by Emília Kánya,28 who was the first female editor in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. She edited her literary paper the Családi Kör (Family Circle), which was the favourite weekly paper among families and women for 20 years, from 1860 to 1880.

In 1858 – when numerous female writers started to publish their works – the most extensive debate about female authors was happening. Pál Gyulai, who was a critic and literary historian, wrote a series of articles about female writers.29 He argued that women who wrote could not be happy, could not be good wives or good mothers, because they denied their female roles with their writing process:

“They are nor men, or women, but still they claim the rights of women there, those of men here. They can feel themselves at home neither in public careers, nor in the family circle; the

---

former is too broad, noisy and dangerous, and the latter too narrow, peaceful and prosaic. They become public persons and everybody has the rights to access them.”

According to Pál Gyulai, writing and any other public activity made women vain and unhappy. He accused the editors of fashion magazines for this phenomenon, because they gave limitless opportunities for dilettante women to publish their works regardless of their quality in order to achieve success by the profanation of female feelings. In his opinion, the editors were pursuing profiteering and sensation-hunting practices, which brought down the literary life. “Our female writers are created by fashion journals,” he wrote in his article called Írónőink (Our female writers), which was the starting point of the whole debate.

Some male and female writers objected to his approach and the discussion lasted for years. Mór Jókai supported the presence of female writers because he ascribed particular importance to amusement of the readership. He regarded the market-based publishing processes as an indispensable mode of existence of modern literature.

Some participants of the debate questioned the actual position of the writing trade – the discussion therefore also reached the question of professionalization. The first sentence of János Erdélyi’s essay on female writers exemplifies the discussion:

“Writing has not been an honourable trade a long time, even for men. Before, it was considered a pleasurable, but not a noble or serious activity.”

During the debates, the distinction emerged which writing roles could be acceptable and what was more profitable for a female writer; for instance a mother role in poem writing, tale writing, and translations were more accepted than novel or drama writing. Although Pál Gyulai did not accept the presence of numerous female writers, he approved of the merits of Júlia Szendrey, who translated the tales of Andersen and became the first Hungarian translator of Andersen.

A lot of expectations in connection with female literature persisted for a long time: for example, female writers should interpret those feelings which men cannot experience, such as motherhood. This was the only point of the debate which was accepted by the all participants. As a result, the mother role was the most acceptable for a female poet. Júlia Szendrey recognized this when she started her own literary career in 1857. The title of the first poem she published was Három rózsabimbó (Three rosebud), and it was an introduction of her three children. During my research, I found her poem collection at the manuscript archives of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences which still remains unpublished. In this booklet, every
The central question of the debate was whether female writers could be good wives, mothers and housewives. Pál Gyulai’s answer was ‘no’ and female writers struggled to disprove this approach. Emília Kányá emphasized that women were able to fulfil their maternal and marital duties as well as male writers could undertake other jobs, such as being a teacher, priest, doctor etc. As a result, the importance of the working female emerged as an interesting topic. At this point, the debate connected to questions of other professions, because it was emphasized that: if women work as actresses, why could they not be writers? At the same time, the female writers did not regard writing as a part of the emancipation of women. Emília Kányá highlighted that they accepted the traditional female roles: mother, wife and housewife. In their eyes, Gyulai’s biggest fault was the connection of the notions of emancipation of women and female writing. The main arguments of the female writers and the protective authors were based on the separation of the two notions.

CONCLUSIONS

The literary career of Júlia Szendrey exemplifies the features of mass media, which emerged in these decades and had a serious impact on female and male careers. At the same time, it exemplifies the different approaches to crisis. As the revolutions of 1848 brought about several changes, a very significant change occurred in literary life as well.

Whereas in the first half of the century, male intellectuals supervised the press, after the revolution, the structure of the media transformed and they lost their control above the rampant press. As a result, the debate about female writers becomes comprehensible within this context. In the middle of the 1850s, many derivative poets and female writers appeared in mass media and the readership enjoyed their works. Pál Gyulai struggled against this process: he wanted to supervise the taste and the reading and consuming habits of the readership and he did not want to accept the presence of numerous periodicals, serials, newspapers, fashion magazines, which in his opinion published female texts in order to achieve financial advantages.

To sum up: in the aftermath of the revolutions of 1848, many women (just like Júlia Szendrey) became widows and were expected to accommodate to the new circumstances and find their new roles. On the one hand, the revolution meant a private crisis for them; while on

Library and the Petőfi Literary Museum keep Júlia Szendrey’s manuscripts as well: OSzK Kt. Fond VII/206. PIM Kt. V. 663.
the other hand, it became a public crisis because of the transformation of the press. The revival of media in the 1850s offered new opportunities. The utility of these formed the public crisis for new optional career models. Most of the female writers started their publishing process around 1857. It seems that they recognized these opportunities. At the same time, the Gyulai debate as a crisis mentioned many problems related to contemporary literature and society, such as the relationship between female writers and the emancipation of women, the questions of amateurishness, the professionalization of (both male and female) writers and the differences between the commercialized and aesthetic, elitist approaches to literature.
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The development of political peacekeeping has always been related to the experience of war as fundamental crisis. How close is this relation of peace and war and does the former really depend on the latter? In this paper I take a closer look on the effects of war on political dedication to peacekeeping based on the example of the General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy (Kellogg-Briand Pact) of 1928. Based on the analysis of original documents it is shown that the experience of war is not the only factor that determines developments in political peace keeping.

**INTRODUCTION**

The historian Ian Morris argued that war contributed to the development of human societies. Without war humans would not live in the relatively secure and prosperous societies (of the Western world) most of this paper’s readers grew up in. Periods of peace and stability would consequently be widely unknown.¹ But do or did humans really need war to develop further and to foster a peaceful world? Of course one could, as in the case of Morris, argue that without war men and women would not have reached today’s level of development, where peace appears to be more profitable than war² – but is war really linked inseparably to (peaceful) human development?

This fundamental question determines the interest in the topic of war as motor of peaceful development. As Morris also states, this claim is a paradox,³ but still I invite the reader to take this paper as an impetus to reflect upon the nature and underlying factors of war and peace rather than as a concrete answer to the question stated above.

Two definitions are central to this paper. First of all, war is understood in a very broad sense as a state of (inter)national affairs where the protagonists take up arms against each other and confront their adversary violently. War is seen as an element that brings out the worst of us, leads to destruction, to billions of deaths and victims and can therefore be considered to be the fundamental crisis of humankind.

On the opposite side of this intentionally chosen black-and-white scheme is peace, which is considered to be a state of (inter)national relations where conflicts of any sort are to be solved only by pacifistic means without the employment of firepower – be it through negotiations, arbitration or else (positive peace).⁴
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¹ Morris, Krieg, 14-17.
² Morris, Krieg, 17, 475-476.
³ Morris, Krieg, 14, 18.
⁴ Clemens, International Relations, 35.
This kind of peace was desired by the statesmen who signed the General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy in August 1928. This treaty is amongst others also known by the terms Pact of Paris or Kellogg-Briand Pact, either referring to its place of signing or its main promoters.5

Based on this example the paper presents a case study that tries to shed light on the paradox question whether war is the driving force behind peace. Can or does development in political peacekeeping only come from the outburst of violence and war? Are or were these fundamental crises really necessary to achieve a peaceful world?

Most insights gained in this work are based on a content analysis of primary sources, especially of speeches and letters composed by either French or United States officials, and is backed up with literature. Chapter one will focus on the evolutionary history of the pact and its final outcome, before its eventual failure will be dealt with in chapter two. But before I get to the case study, it is necessary to further elaborate on the intertwined and interdependent relationship of peace and war.

According to the historian Margaret MacMillan, 19th century is characterized by an until then unknown and unseen thriving variety of peace movements all over Europe.6 One of the advocates for peace was Bertha von Suttner, who first published her antiwar book “Lay Down Your Arms!” in 1889.7 The book tells the story of a semi-fictional character Martha, who turns from a pro-war adolescent, ideologically blinded by the prospect of honor, into a woman with no greater desire than the abolishment of war. The development of this character’s opinion is based on the experience of loss caused by war. In other words, the consequence of the indirect experience of the horrors of war is the root of her desire for peace.8

In her book which focuses on the events of 1914, MacMillan most thoroughly explains that despite these various advocates for peace, such as von Suttner, the political decision makers did opt for war. Eventually this turn of events not only devastated the peace movements of 19th century – most protagonists rallied behind the respective national cause in correspondence with the so called Burgfrieden in Germany and Austria or the Union sacrée in France – but also laid the cornerstone of the instable post-war system in Europe.9

The peace conferences of Paris following the end of the First World War can be considered as attempts to install and/or keep peace based on the previous experiences of war, aiming at the prevention of another outburst of violence of that scale.10 According to the historian Jay Winter “this was a time of hope, some of it utopian, about the way the war had opened up the possibility of an enduring peace”.11

In this spirit further steps were taken in post-war Europe to ensure that the peace constructed in Paris at the end of the First World War would last. The foundation of the League of Nations and the Locarno Treaties are only two main examples to be named.12

---

5 Roscher, Briand-Kellogg-Pakt, 96–97.
7 MacMillan, War that ended Peace, 267.
8 von Suttner, Waffen nieder.
10 Winter, Dreams of Peace, 48–49, 74.
11 Winter, Dreams of Peace, 48.
12 Nye, International Conflicts, 81–86.
Development resulting from the Great War and the experience of the harsh brutality humankind is capable of was that certain (groups of) people had come to (further) develop their ideas of a peaceful world. One of these concepts in the political sphere was the attempt to render war illegal by drafting a pact that would renounce war as an instrument of national policy.

**PREVENTING WAR POLITICALLY – THE KELLOGG-BRIAND PACT**

The General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy was mainly shaped by French and US interests, represented by Aristide Briand on behalf of France and Frank B. Kellogg on behalf of the US. Aristide Briand (1862–1932) was a French statesman who had “served 11 times as premier of France” and held the post of foreign minister from 1925 to 1929. He had been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1926 for his efforts concerning Franco-German reconciliation and the negotiation of the Pact of Locarno. It was him who first approached the United States of America with the proposal of a bilateral treaty ensuring eternal peace between both countries in April 1927 – the 10th anniversary of the entry of the US in the First World War.

His proposition was taken up and evolved into a multilateral treaty by Frank Billings Kellogg (1856–1937). This US lawyer had entered national politics in 1917 and served as Secretary of State under the presidency of Calvin Coolidge from 1925 to 1929. Although he was known to be more in favor of the isolationist policy in regard to European politics, Kellogg eventually took up the proposal of Briand and transformed it into a more general proposal. The process of negotiation between France and the US in this matter, respectively between Kellogg and Briand, lasted for several months.

During this time both sides elaborated their own concepts of a pacified world order in the light of the common experience of World War I, which generally determined international politics in the 1920s. After having concluded the various peace treaties to which I cannot refer in detail here, the states were occupied with keeping the peace and/or preventing another war like the one all European states had suffered from severely. One of the steps that should be seen in the light of post-war conflict prevention policy was the already mentioned Pact of Locarno. This series of treaties issued in fall 1925 amongst others provided a guarantee of Germany’s Western frontiers fixed at Versailles and contributed to the reconciliation between France and Germany.

---

17 Nobel Media AB, “Aristide Briand.”
This so-called spirit of Locarno, however, was not enough to satisfy the security needs of France in the light of Germany’s regain of strength at the end of the 1920s.\(^{24}\) Although the Kellogg-Briand Pact is commonly viewed as “a significant complement to the Locarno system”\(^{25}\) in the tradition of post World War I peacekeeping,\(^{26}\) Briand’s proposal of perpetual friendship to the US also has to be understood as an attempt to strengthen France’s own position in Europe.\(^{27}\)

On 6\(^{th}\) April 1927 Briand proposed a bilateral peace pact between France and the United States. This proposal was voiced that day in his famous address to the Associated Press.\(^{28}\) He elaborated that both countries, as they were already “morally bound together”\(^{29}\) by their desire for peace and freedom, should set an example for the whole world to follow by signing a treaty that would render war illegal as a means of policy between these two states.\(^{30}\)

Another interesting detail in this speech is that Briand clearly saw and/or displayed both nations as role models in terms of freedom and promotion of peace.\(^{31}\) This corresponded with the French self-perception of their country carrying the burden of its (politically) self-ascribed mission civilisatrice, which was a quite common notion in the Third Republic.\(^{32}\) A similar self-presentation of the French is made by Briand in his speech of 27\(^{th}\) August 1928 at the ceremony accompanying the signing of the Pact.\(^{33}\)

This French self-image and its representation in Briand’s speeches might be related to the European power struggles of the 1920s, which strongly influenced the hidden agenda of France in the issue of perpetual peace proposal.\(^{34}\) To think this argument further, by presenting the French Republic as deeply in favor of the eternal promotion of peace, Briand automatically stated that there were certainly other forces lining up against peace. Assuming that war – based on the experience of the Great War – was considered a bad thing, these other players, which he did not name, were to be considered not as good a nation or state as France was.

In the aftermath of Briand’s speech, negotiations concerning this proposed agreement started in June 1927.\(^{35}\) In the same month, Briand also sent his proposal for a “Pact of Perpetual Friendship between France and the United States” to Kellogg.\(^{36}\) The initial draft envisaged that both signatory countries would in the future “condemn recourse to war and renounce it respectively [as] an instrument of their national policy towards each other”.\(^{37}\)

\(^{24}\) Siebert, Briand, 452.
^{25} Cohrs, Unfinished Peace, 419.
^{27} Cohrs, Unfinished Peace, 449.
^{28} Siebert, Briand, 452–453.
^{29} Briand to Associated Press, statement, 6 April 1927, 611–613.
^{30} Briand to Associated Press, statement, 6 April 1927, 611–613.
^{31} Briand to Associated Press, statement, 6 April 1927.
^{32} Bancel, Blanchard and Vergès, République coloniale, 27–33, 67–75; Walsch, Afrikapolitik, 90.
^{33} Briand, address, 27 August 1928, 254.
^{34} Roscher, Briand-Kellogg-Pakt, 55.
^{35} Cohrs, Unfinished Peace, 448.
^{36} Miller, Pact of Paris, 10.
^{37} Briand to Secretary of State, draft pact, 20 June 1927, 160-163.
Half a year later, after having discussed the issue thoroughly with the respective US political agents, Kellogg finally replied to Briand’s draft pact with a counterproposal on 28th December 1927.  

Instead of signing a bilateral treaty, Kellogg therein proposed to enlarge the pact and design it in a more universal way so that other countries could adhere to it as well. Kellogg presented that step as an even stronger commitment to the cause of world peace. This proposal, however, also served the US isolationist policy, as Kellogg and president Coolidge feared to be drawn too much into European politics by signing such a pact only with one of the European powers. Kellogg and Coolidge also attempted to use this modified pact as a means of improving their image in the international sphere in order to appease the critics not in favor of the emerging power across the Atlantic, the USA.

Besides these two agendas relating to international relations issues, Kellogg’s move was rather determined by national politics – the upcoming elections and the war-outlawry movement. The war-outlawry movement had evolved in the US as a strong anti-war movement after the end of the First World War. This was not a simple peace movement, but an influential group of people demanding the prohibition of war by international law and asserting quite some pressure on Kellogg ever since Briand had voiced his initial proposal.

After Kellogg’s counterproposal, both countries engaged in negotiations about the eventual design of the treaty. France initially tried to insist on first coming to terms only with the US and on signing a bilateral treaty that could be opened for the adherence of other nations afterwards. Kellogg, however, did not step down from trying to get all major powers to sign the treaty at once. In the light of such a multilateral agreement Briand – the communication between him and Kellogg was transferred via the French ambassador in Washington, Paul Claudel – had proposed to limit the treaty to the renunciation of wars of aggression only, but the US in turn wanted to stick to the more vague but general proposition of the outlawry of all war. In response to that France brought up the Locarno issue, stating that the adherence to a treaty that would forbid all war against all powers that were part of the pact would interfere with the obligations resulting from the Locarno Treaties signed in 1925, which in fact would justify war under certain circumstances. However, it seems that this was just a pretext to protect France’s own national interests in European geopolitics.

In an address to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on 15th March 1928, Kellogg promoted the ongoing negotiations between the US and France as being in service of the eventual achievement “of the great ideal of world peace” and presented all US efforts in
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this matter as directed at the prevention of another world war.\footnote{Kellogg, “War Prevention Policy,” i.} Concerning the reservations of France stated above, Kellogg elaborated in this speech that he thought it impossible for a multilateral pact outlawing war to interfere with the interests of the League of Nations or the Locarno Treaties.\footnote{Kellogg, “War Prevention Policy,” i, x.} Referring to the agreement of the American Republics to abandon war in international relations with each other, which was concluded in February 1928,\footnote{Kellogg, “War Prevention Policy,” i, vi–vii.} Kellogg outmatched Briand by stating that “a Government free to conclude such a bilateral treaty should be no less able to become a party to an identical multilateral treaty”.\footnote{Kellogg to Claudel, 27 February 1928, 24–26.}

After this it was up to Kellogg to come up with another draft of the new multilateral pact and to distribute it to those countries that were supposed to sign the pact at first together with France and the US – Great Britain, Germany, Japan and Italy.\footnote{Miller, Pact of Paris, 51.} He did so on 13th April 1928 by providing them with the draft as well as with the necessary correspondence that had happened beforehand between France and the US. He encouraged the participating states to comment on the suggested endeavor.\footnote{Schurman to Stresemann, 13 April 1928, 4–6.}

Kellogg did not intend to draw all nations of the world into negotiations at the beginning, as in his opinion it would have been simply too difficult and complex if all states had to agree upon one draft in a relatively short time.\footnote{Kellogg, “Paris Pact,” 688–689.} His choice of nations was explained by the need to further pacify Europe – the site of the Great War – and therefore having to include the biggest powers of the continent as well as Japan to have a voice from the Far East contributing to the discussion.\footnote{Kellogg to Claudel, 27 February 1928, 24–26.}

One week later, on 20th April 1928, France added a draft of its own to the discussion and distributed it to the other five states.\footnote{Kellogg, “Paris Pact,” 689.} The dedication to pacific means was comprised in both,\footnote{Kellogg, “Paris Pact,” 689.} but the French draft very clearly illustrated the special interests France had concerning the pact, as it would have outlawed war only in cases where self-defense or responsibilities resulting from other treaties would not apply.\footnote{Miller, Pact of Paris, 57.}

Following the comments of the addressed countries, the initial circle of supposed original signatory states was enlarged to include the British dominions, India and the remaining states subject to the Locarno Treaty – Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia.\footnote{Miller, Pact of Paris, 38.} Altogether, these states finally signed the General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy on 27th August 1928.\footnote{Kellogg-Briand Pact, 27 August 1928.}

The pact itself was based on Kellogg’s second draft dating back to 23rd June of the same year. In this last draft he added one clause to the preamble that would allow the adhering parties to take aggressive action against one fellow signatory state if the latter had violated the
pact beforehand. This way the French and British concerns voiced in the discussions between April and June were sufficiently met.64

“Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind”65 the initial members of the pact certified with their signature in Paris that they would do everything in their power to ensure the adherence to the following.66

“ARTICLE I
The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II
The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.”67

The third and last article of the Treaty regulated the way it would be ratified and more importantly that it should “remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the other Powers of the world.”68

In his speech held at the signing of the treaty on 27th August 1928 Briand referred to the First World War, the recent experience of which in his opinion made the pact even more outstanding than it already was, because all the signatory states had been combatants and adversaries only ten years before.69

However, the renunciation of war through the pact was not total. The signatory states could still wage war against those who had not signed the treaty or against a fellow signatory state that had violated the conditions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Additionally, the conditions of the previously signed agreements such as the Locarno Treaties or the Covenant of the League of Nations, which might under certain circumstances demand or allow aggressive actions, were not touched by the pact that should have abolished war forever, neither was the right to self-defense. All those loopholes made the treaty quite vague, which also contributed to its failure.70

BACK TO THE ROOTS? – THE FAILED DEVELOPMENT OF LASTING PEACE

The Kellogg-Briand Pact was subsequently ratified by all its initial signatory states and eventually became effective in July 1929.71 By 1934 the pact counted more than 60 signatory states in total, which can be labeled a success.72
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It was Kellogg who got most of the credit for the accomplishment of the treaty; amongst others he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1929. In his acceptance speech he referred to the First World War as the experience that had served as a warning to all nations that signed the Pact in order to prevent this kind of crisis in the future. In his words, the pact "was inspired by the memory of devastated lands, ruined homes, and the millions of men and women sacrificed in that awful struggle".

Even in the light of the economic crisis unraveling at the end of 1929, Kellogg remained optimistic in regard to the potential of the pact and continued to appeal to humanity’s common sense. His ultimate goal of lasting peace, as he further elaborates, was to be reached not only by the adherence of all nations to the pact but by sanctioning those who would not comply with its rules through public opinion only.

Public opinion was supposed to be the key to world peace, as in the concept of Kellogg and his US counterparts the governments of the world would sooner or later have to bow to its pressure in all their decisions. The fear of being outlawed by the international community alone should suffice to make states refrain from taking up arms against each other.

The same idea was elaborated further by Henry L. Stimson, the successor of Kellogg as Secretary of State. Confronted with Japanese aggressions in Manchuria in 1932, it was Stimson who justified the wait-and-see attitude of the international sphere with the Kellogg-Briand Pact. He took up the above mentioned Kellogg’s concept that the pressure of public opinion would rather force Japan to back down and resort to peaceful means than any aggressive reaction from other countries.

In case of any violation of the pact, as in Manchuria, consultation with all other signatories and their joint or separate expression of their respective “moral judgment” was considered absolutely necessary for the power of world opinion to effect and alter any war-like situation.

Stimson, bound by the US isolationist policy, tried to use the treaty and the notion of the possible worldwide impact of public opinion as a kind of a loophole not to engage in any war-like situation with another country by interfering in the territorial or political struggles of others. Instead of taking action, he simply called upon the ascribed moral power of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. This was in line with the United States’ desire to keep themselves out of the territorial or political issues that did not affect them directly. The design of the pact itself had made this perfectly possible as its conditions did not require any steps against a
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violator, all actions taken to keep the peace or not were subject to the very vague concept of the signatories’ moral obligation.\textsuperscript{87} The only sanction present in the treaty was the denial of “the benefits furnished by”\textsuperscript{88} in case one party would violate its conditions, but the contracting parties failed to elaborate in more detail how this denial should look like.\textsuperscript{89}

Besides the US, other signatory states found their own loopholes, as the pact did not alter any obligations that had arisen by previous contracts, such as the Covenant of the League of Nations or the Locarno Treaties.\textsuperscript{90} The unclear definition of what was to be understood as war of aggression also weakened the pact severely. The already mentioned Manchuria conflict was only the first incident to challenge the pact in all these matters.\textsuperscript{91}

With the idea of a world where the possibility of war no longer existed, the states comprising the international sphere would also – in theory – no longer be in need of weapons. Therefore the eventual failure of all attempts to limit armaments at Geneva in the first half of the 1930s is also considered a failure of the Kellogg-Briand Pact,\textsuperscript{92} which apparently was not strong enough to satisfy the security needs of all signatory states.\textsuperscript{93}

This weakness in guaranteeing peace and security is of course related to the unclear definition of what kind of war was to be forbidden\textsuperscript{94} as well as to the definite allowance to fight a war in self-defense. At the time the pact was awaiting its first round of ratification; critical voices already claimed that the right to self-defense weakened the impact of the treaty.\textsuperscript{95} Kellogg defended this choice by again referring to the power of world opinion, which would decide whether the choice of one state to take up arms under the label of self-defense was justified or was to be considered an act of aggression. In case the latter would prove true, the international community would sanction the respective agent automatically.\textsuperscript{96}

But why, after having agreed upon the dedication to outlaw war, was there still a need for aggressive self-defense? A potential answer to this is that all signatories have had their own agenda and that it had been national interests that made them sign the Kellogg-Briand Pact in the first place.\textsuperscript{97}

Based on these national interests, the 1930s were shook by many crises, culminating in the outburst of the Second World War in 1939.\textsuperscript{98} This constituted the ultimate failure of the Kellogg-Briand Pact as the fundamental purpose of its coming into force had been to prevent another worldwide war, as it was already exemplified many times in this paper.

However, this failure also led to the revival of the treaty in the wake of the horrors of World War II. Instigated by Stimson, the Allies took up the conditions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact to penalize Germany’s aggression and convict it of having committed a crime against
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peace in the form of the treaty at the end of 1944.\textsuperscript{99} These intentions were carried on at Nuremberg, where the prosecutors referred strongly to the General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy.\textsuperscript{100} Nevertheless the attempt failed as the treaty did not comprise any real and definite sanctions for those breaking it.\textsuperscript{101}

Despite this weak influence the Kellogg-Briand Pact eventually had on international politics, its principles were taken up after 1945 and were integrated into the Charter of the United Nations. In order to mend the weaknesses of the initial pact, the UN Charter outlaws violence in general, not just war. It also forbids the employment of violent means against non-members, which was a novelty compared to the Kellogg-Briand Pact. The only restriction to the outlawry of violence in the sense of the United Nations is made in reference to its missions, in which violent actions may be necessary in order to prevent a general spread of violence.\textsuperscript{102} However, if one takes a look at the world’s development after 1945, at all the small wars, aggressive confrontations and failed UN peacekeeping missions, this part of the UN Charter appears to be as decrepit as the Kellogg-Briand Pact when it comes to the preservation or installation of world peace.

However, it is also Morris who argues that the technological development of 20\textsuperscript{th} century – including the possibility of nuclear overkill – and the fear of future wars with the potential to wipe out humankind in total or to completely destroy (western) security and prosperity (might) contribute(s) to the eventual establishment of lasting world peace.\textsuperscript{103}

**CONCLUSION**

The crisis of the Great War gave the impetus to construe a pact that would outlaw and abolish war for all eternity. This intention was strongly nurtured by the experience of the horrors of war, as were all other peace movements and/or attempts to preserve peace in general.

Its eventual failure in preventing another large-scale war resulted from the unwillingness of the political decision makers to subordinate their respective national interests to the cause of world peace. The two main examples in this paper were the interests of France and the United States.

Both nations stated repeatedly and publicly that they were only concerned with the preservation of world peace. However, the negotiations between these two countries about the design of the pact showed that France was more concerned with the strengthening of its position in Europe and its defense against a resurging Germany than it was with the outlawry of war in general. The latter was apparently just considered a means to achieve the former.

As for the United States, instead of complying with their stated goal of fostering peace around the world by pressing for a more tight and binding pact, they tried to keep themselves out of any agreement that would demand their immediate action, which was done in complete accordance with their isolationist policy favoured by the political decision makers of the time.
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The usefulness of the pact for the United States resulted from the perfect loophole it provided. To put it more bluntly: instead of taking up arms themselves and risk money and lives in another war far from their own soil, the US could now keep their self-ascribed role as guardians of peace by just pointing a finger on those violating the pact and stating that they were the *bad* aggressors to be outlawed by the world public.

The main occupation of the respective states with their own national interests in negotiating the treaty resulted in its vague and unbinding nature, which in turn made it easier for each party to undertake war-like measures without in fact violating the pact. The final result was the pact’s eventual failure in preventing the outburst of the Second World War as well as of all the minor wars and aggressive confrontations of the 1930s.

However, especially the Second World War in turn also led to a revival of the pact’s intention and a reconfiguration in political peacekeeping. But does this mean that war is and always has been necessary to achieve a peaceful world? If so, how many wars or war-like confrontations has humankind yet to face in order to reach this stage of development?

The failure of the Kellogg-Briand Pact was determined by too strong national interests, which – in Morris’ sense – comprised the understanding of war as a useful and/or necessary measure. From this example one can draw the conclusion that the advancement in political peacekeeping is and always has been boosted by experiences of war, but the effectiveness of these developments never fully depend on the crisis itself. At the end it appears that humankind’s potential to learn from history and its crises over all depends on the willpower and dedication of human beings. Therefore the experience of war is NOT the only precondition for a (politically) peaceful world.
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The latest global economic crisis triggered an ongoing debate on how to manage current problems and avoid further economic crises. But does this crisis differ so much from past economic crises that there is a need for new economic theories now? At first glance it seems that the mania for bulbs of tulips, the so called "South Sea fever", the dot-com boom and the real estate bubble do not have much in common. Even though almost 400 years lie between the tulip mania in the Dutch Golden Age and the United States housing bubble, all mentioned economic crises share common characteristics. To outline the similarities between historical economic crises, two of the most popular speculation bubbles, the South Sea bubble, which peaked in 1720, and the dot-com crises at the turn of the millennium, will be compared.

INTRODUCTION

What defines an economic bubble and what else do we have to keep in mind when comparing historical events of different centuries? In plain terms, an economic bubble is: "A market phenomenon characterized by surges in asset prices to levels significantly above the fundamental value of that asset. Bubbles are often hard to detect in real time because there is disagreement over the intrinsic value of the asset".¹

But comparing the sums of money invested and subsequently lost in the stock market crashes of 1720 and the early 2000s is very difficult. We can only make a rough estimation considering the cost and standard of living now and then. For example, in the 18th century, one was comfortably off with an income of around a hundred pounds² a year.³ Keeping that in mind, the sums invested in the two crises can be put in relation.⁴

THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE

One can imagine the London of the early eighteenth century as a lively and joyous but at the same time dirty and brutal city. Amongst the most popular places and centres of social life were the coffee houses. They were the centre of the financial life as well. Therefore, in more than two-thousand coffee houses the interested public could hear the latest rumours about new investment opportunities and take their chance.⁵

¹ "Financial glossary, Economic Bubble."
² Until the decimalization in 1971, there were 20 shillings per pound and twelve pence per shilling. Thus there were 240 pence in a pound.
³ In comparison, a domestic servant earned about 10 pounds a year, a soldier about sixpence a day. So an investor who at that time made more than 100.000 pounds would be a multimillionaire today.
⁴ Balen, English Deceit, xi.
⁵ Balen, English Deceit, 4-7.
In the eyes of a modern observer it must have looked quite odd when “a fellow in shabby clothes selling ten or twelve thousand pounds in stock, though perhaps he may not be worth at the same time ten shillings, and with as much zeal as if he were a Director [...].”\(^6\)

Besides gambling with stocks there were many real lotteries, quite a few of which were initiated by the government for debt repayment. For example, in 1694 the Whig\(^7\)-government launched a national lottery to partially repay the national debt. Unlike today the gambler could not lose in these state lotteries. When a person purchased a ticket, they were automatically entitled to an annuity paid by the government. The lottery prizes were just an addition and a means to attract people to lend the government their money. So it was not a game of luck, as it is today, it was more of a long term investment with a gambling feature as bonification.

So paradoxically at that time the state lottery was a safe investment, whereas the stock market was even more a game of luck and fraud than it is today. There were, however, many other lotteries that were actually frauds or at least close to that. Some lotteries claimed to have 5,000 prizes out of 10,000 tickets or that it was "impossible [...] to lose all [the] money"\(^8\).

Hence the financial business could be described as a place where lottery and the stock market often merged seamlessly and created a culture of gambling.

One could also say that this was a time where invention and inspiration could exist alongside downright fraud, and one could seldom distinguish between the one and the other.

At the point when the whole lottery system got unregulated and most lotteries were completely fraudulent the government was forced to ban them altogether. However, the damage had already been done, with the lotteries initiated by the state amongst the biggest causes. With the lowest return on investment (ROI) at 60%, the state lotteries simply generated a cash flow and ceded the financial trouble to future generations.\(^9\)

That being said, the government debt was way above seven figures, with estimations ranging between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 pounds. Because of the crippling debt, Queen Anne dismissed the Lord Treasurer and replaced him with Robert Harley, a Tory.\(^10\) Harley only found 5,000 pounds in the Exchequer’s kitty. With land taxes at more than 20%, the rumour on the street was that the government had mislaid their money, with the sum total as high as 35,000,000 pounds. Although these rumours were false, they seemed just too plausible not to be true.

In this situation it was clear to Harley that he immediately needed a plan to bail the country out, otherwise he would have lost his position as fast as he got it. Though the government was in the hands of the Tories, with all the key positions in the hands of the Whigs, the Tories were in office but not in power. For example, if the government needed another loan, the first place to go would have been the Bank of England or the East India Company, both almost completely in the hands of Whig directors. The executive board of the Bank of England consisted of 24 directors, all of them Whigs; the same goes for the East India Company, where 20 out 24 directors were Whigs. Subsequently, Harley could not get another loan from these institutions.\(^11\)

---

\(^6\) Peller Malcolm, *Anecdotes*, 278.

\(^7\) The Whigs were one of the two political parties in the parliament; their counterparts were the Tories.


The popular writer Jonathan Swift noted: "The ministry is upon a very narrow bottom, and stands like an Isthmus between the Whigs on one side, and violent Tories on the other. They are able Seamen, but the tempest is too great, the ship too rotten, and the crew all against them". 

Among the men who claimed to have another solution was John Blunt, a scrivener by trade. Blunt was said to be loud and overbearing but not without charisma. With his glib personality and his talent for persuading people, he proved himself quite successful as a promoter of companies. He was also desperately seeking a chance to make a fortune and he found the idea in the successful Captain Phipps’s mercantile expedition, which made a profit of more than 10.000 % for its investors. This expedition went to the Hispaniola Island in the West Indies. Blunt’s way to power and riches was through a company called the Sword Blade Company, where he was a companion. Through the purchase of debt securities and, most importantly, insider trading the company made five figure profits. By lending money to the government, the company came into business with them. However, a problem soon appeared: the banking monopoly was enshrined with the Act of 1697 and the Bank of England would not allow competitors anymore. But the bank struggled to deliver the amounts of money the government needed for the ongoing war.

At that time Harley noticed Blunt, his business associates and the profit they made.

A new alliance was formed, but its first approach to solving financial problems was a somewhat traditional one. Again lottery was the favoured way to raise the money the government needed as a loan. However, Blunt thought bigger than his predecessors and on 3 March 1711 the lottery was launched. 150.000 tickets at 10 pounds each were sold. The bonification through the prizes was over 650.000 pounds, the largest single prize at 12.000 pounds. The lottery turned out to be a huge success and subsequently a second, even bigger lottery was launched. With only two lotteries Blunt and his ally raised 3.500.000 pounds.

Backed up by the tremendous success of their joint efforts Harley and Blunt went on for their most ambitious plan: reducing the national debt with a single blow. For that purpose Harley wanted to found a new trading company. Their aim was to get a piece of the tremendous profit that Spain made with their trade in South America. Harley and Blunt were convinced that huge profits could be generated in a ready market for English products, and gold as well as silver would be the reward. So far it was also a traditional approach, but Harley’s next step proved to be quite radical. He intended the new company to become a financial institution similar to the Bank of England and the East India Company. His plan was that the company would take over the floating government debt of approximately 9.000.000 pounds and in return the creditors would be shareholders in the new company. To pay the interests on the debt, the government paid the company more than half a million pounds a year.

---

12 Hawkesworth, The works of Jonathan Swift, 261.
13 Today's Dominican Republic and Haiti.
14 van Dillen, History of Public Banks, 209-211.
The optimism of Harley and the new shareholders was based on a trade monopoly which was granted to the company by the government. This was a potentially lucrative monopoly, but in an area which was controlled by Spain, with whom Britain was at war.\textsuperscript{16} Nevertheless the company was granted the "sole trade and traffick, from 1 August 1711, into unto and from the Kingdoms, lands etc. of America, on the east side from the river Aranoca, to the southernmost part of the Terra del Fuego, on the west side thereof, from the said southernmost part through the South Seas to the northernmost part of America, and unto, into and from all countries in the same limits, reputed to belong to the Crown of Spain, or which shall hereafter be discovered".\textsuperscript{17}

As mentioned before, to make this trade possible a peace deal had to be made with Spain and France. To make their scheme known to the public, two of the most popular writers of that time, Daniel Defoe and Jonathan Swift, went into action. In the end Blunt and Harley’s propaganda was successful and the imagination of investors was stimulated. In this phase of excitement almost everybody saw a chance to make money and an inhomogeneous group of investors announced their interest in purchasing the shares of the company. During that time Harley was promoted to Lord High Treasurer, and from this position he started secret peace negotiations with France.

The South Sea Company (SSC) was founded formally in September 1711. The executive board consisted of 30 directors, nine of them politicians and five from the Sword Blade Bank itself. But not one of them had experience in trade with South America.\textsuperscript{18} The first few years the share stagnated. The much needed peace was not concluded until 1713 in Utrecht. Though the agreement is widely seen as favouring Britain the most, it was not as favourable for the SSC, mostly because the Spanish privileges in South America had been restrained but not completely removed. The SSC was only granted to send one trading vessel per year to the Spanish colonies, with one quarter of the profit reserved for the King of Spain. The first ship sailed in 1717 and did not make much profit.

Though the war ended, the government debts still increased at a high rate and in 1720 the SSC again declared that they would take over the debt of now more than 30.000.000 pounds. In return the government granted the SSC the right to reinforce capital at any rate and to an unlimited amount. To assure the success of their proposition the SSC offered many members of the parliament shares on concessionary terms. Most of them complied and declared their support for the SSC and their offer publicly. Amongst the few members of the parliament who saw the danger was Robert Walpole; he warned that the inexperienced investors would be in imminent danger of losing all their money.\textsuperscript{19}

When the so called South Sea Bill was passed, the share price did not gain much contrary to expectations. To change that Blunt spread wild rumours of new treaties with Spain, which would allow profits on an unprecedented scale. He succeeded and the share price rose. Now the Company offered one million new shares. To prevent a decline in prices after the increase in capital, a dividend of 10 % was paid to the new shareholders as well. In the wake of this news another one and a half million shares were pushed to the market.

\textsuperscript{16} Carswell, \textit{South Sea Bubble}, 52-54.  
\textsuperscript{17} Balen, \textit{English Deceit}, 37.  
\textsuperscript{18} Balen, \textit{English Deceit} 37-40.  
\textsuperscript{19} Götte, \textit{Finanzkrisen}, 24-25.
Now things turned completely irrational: the so called South Sea fever broke out and spread fast through the streets of London. Everybody saw their chance to make quick money. From the servant to the lord, everybody tried to get shares of the SSC. Attracted by the tremendous success of the scheme, new stock companies appeared out of thin air. These companies dealt with different trades and had titles such as the "company for carrying out an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is". There were companies for extracting silver from lead, for trading in hair or for insuring and increasing children’s fortunes, even for building the wheel of perpetual motion. To prevent this kind of fraud the so called Bubble Act was passed, stating that no new companies could be established without the permission of the government. 86 companies were declared illegal and abolished. The Bubble Act had no major impact on the SSC; due to ongoing rumours about the riches from the South Sea and the money to be made in the future, the share price increased steadily. By the end of April it reached the 500 pound mark, and only two months later its all-time peak at 1050 pounds.

At this time, the SSC market capitalization had reached twice the value of the British real estate. The share price stagnated for a few weeks at this level and at first glance most of the investors had multiplied their initial investment. The rumours spread by Blunt and his allies had worked incredibly well, but rumours could be spread by everyone. Suddenly, rumours started circulating that directors of the SSC had started to sell their shares. Some of the shareholders relied on this new rumour and sold their shares as well. Therefore, almost every shareholder followed and tried to sell their shares. An avalanching event started to take place at the stock exchange and the share price crashed within days below the 200 pound mark. In December 1720 the stock had lost more than 80 % of its all-time high and was worth less than 130 pounds. Many investors lost nearly everything and many companies had to declare bankruptcy.

Amongst the investors who lost most of their investment was the famous Sir Isaac Newton. In the end he lost approximately 20.000 pounds and it is said that nobody was allowed to talk to him about that incident.

The consequences of the bubble burst were the start of a recession and the following search for scapegoats. The directors of the SSC were the most obvious to blame for the whole situation. The aforementioned Robert Walpole subsequently prosecuted and convicted most of them. They lost their real estate and their fortunes were withdrawn as well. Walpole became one of the most powerful politicians of the decade, while the economy struggled for several years before the crisis was over.

---

20 It is hard to believe that someone would invest in a company such as this but, as Mackay notes: "Next morning, at nine o’clock, this great man opened an office in Cornhill. Crowds of people beset his door, and when he shut up at three o’clock, he found that no less than one thousand shares had been subscribed for, and the deposits paid. He was thus, in five hours, the winner of 2000 [£]. He was philosopher enough to be contented with his venture, and set off the same evening for the Continent. He was never heard of again" (Mackay, *Extraordinary Popular Delusions*, 53-54).


22 “How (not) to invest like Sir Isaac Newton.”

23 Lists of the confiscated assets and their estimated value can be found in: (Lambert, *House of Commons*, 257-315).


25 A few months before, France had the same experience with speculation based bubbles when the so called Mississippi Bubble burst and the French economy found itself in crisis as well. For further information: (Emmett, *The Mississippi scheme and bubble*).
It is often said that the financial business has a rather short memory.\textsuperscript{26} The next example illustrates this fact very well. One could at least have heard of some of the most spectacular economic bubbles of the past.\textsuperscript{27} This should be even more the case when one is thinking about investing in the stock market. But during the late 1990s, the rise of the internet and the increased number of mobile phones and handheld devices in private life led to a rapid growth of companies in or related to the internet sector. The climax of this period was marked by the establishment of many new companies with a wide variety of business concepts. The stock market was on the verge of the next bubble.

\textbf{THE DOT-COM BUBBLE}

At the end of the 1990s, low interest rates helped internet-based start-ups to increase their capital. It is very common for most start-ups that they do not make any profit in the first years, while they try to establish a certain market share and to eliminate most of their rivals. Afterwards, the first profits can be generated with a higher price level. But most of the "dot-com" companies took an even more radical step and offered their services for free or at such low prices that they needed a steady supply of new capital to compensate for their losses. Therefore huge amounts of capital were wagered on shaky foundations.

The guideline for "dot-com" companies was to expand their customer base and their brand awareness as fast as possible or they would not survive the first years. Catch phrases such as "get big or get lost" or "get big fast" demonstrate the spirit of those times.\textsuperscript{28}

During that time it was not uncommon that companies that never made any profit made an initial public offering (IPO). Therefore these companies often had a lot of starting capital but due to their business model they had to cover immense losses. The lifetime of a company was thus measured by its burn rate, i.e. the time in which the company had used up its capital. A big part of the capital was used for marketing and the expenditure on advertising. For representational purposes many companies invested in extravagant company headquarters.

Though it was obvious that most of the companies were grossly overvalued, they still found investors for their purposes. For a while this system seemed to work and many investors made instantaneous huge profits, at least on paper. At some point, it was sufficient enough if a company announced an update for their website to gain more than 1000% within two days.\textsuperscript{29}

So even if the business plan was not viable and there was no real chance to make profit, it was sufficient enough to participate in the booming sector of the economy. This is quite often the case and is associated with the aphorism "a rising tide lifts all boats", which is attributed to John F. Kennedy.

This is especially true when considering acquisitions at this time. A good example is the takeover of Broadcast.com by Yahoo! for $ 5.7 billion although the company had neither sufficient network infrastructure nor enough users (570,000) to justify that sum. The decisions of the Yahoo! executives were not the best at that time, as it is illustrated by the next example

\textsuperscript{26} Another phenomenon is called the "This-Time-Is-Different-Syndrome" and is also very common in the history of financial folly (Reinhart and Rogoff, \textit{This Time is Different}, 208).
\textsuperscript{27} Kindleberger and Aliber, \textit{Manias, Panics and Crashes}, 9.
\textsuperscript{28} "Tech Bubble 2.0: Get large or get lost."
\textsuperscript{29} "Google Finance, Companies Historical Prices, Books-A-Million, Inc."
as well. Just before the Broadcast.com takeover, Yahoo! had acquired a web hosting service named GeoCities for $3.57 billion. By 2014 the Broadcast.com site is defunct and GeoCities was closed in October 2009.

There is one acquisition which is widely seen as the worst in the new economic period: the merging of AOL and Time Warner. In January 2000 AOL announced the purchase of Time Warner for $164 billion. The companies merged into a new entity with AOL holding 55% and Time Warner 45% of the new company. The expected synergies never really materialized and in 2009 the company split up again.  

The bubble was about to burst and put an end to this period of spectacular takeovers and illusive profit promises. The interest rates had not remained at a low level, from November 1998 until May 2000 the Federal Reserve (FED) increased the interest rates six times. This meant that much needed new capital was not acquired as easily as before, due to the enormous burn rate, in which many companies had used up their shareholder capital. If a company is not able to get new funding, only two options remain: either the company starts to make profit or it closes down. Since most of the companies had neither a viable business plan nor any tangible assets to back up for the losses and they were far from making any profit, they were in imminent danger of bankruptcy. As soon as the first companies had to revise their profit expectations, rumours occurred about inside trading, falsified balance sheets and other illegal accounting practices. And again an avalanching event started to take place. The NASDAQ began to fall from its peak of 5048 (intra-day 5408) and started a volatile downward trend, hitting the bottom in October 2002 at 1108. The same effect can be observed for other big stock indices, e.g. the German stock index (DAX) peaked at more than 8000 in March 2000 and bottomed out at nearly 2500 in October 2002.

The stock exchange phenomenon of falling prices and widespread pessimism causing a self-sustaining negative effect is called bear market. The dot-com crisis was one of the worst of its kind. Many companies had to declare bankruptcy after they burned their shareholders’ capital; some had never even made any profit. In the aftermath, many executives were accused and convicted of fraud and investment firms were fined for misleading investors. To illustrate the whole effect of the crisis a look at the market value combined in the NASDAQ proves helpful. It peaked at $6.7 trillion in March 2000 and bottomed at $1.6 trillion in October 2002.

Just as the burst of the bubble in 1720 had plunged many other companies into ruin, the crash of the new economy affected solid companies as well. During that events amazon.com, one of the biggest companies of today, was in serious trouble as its share price dropped from over $100 to $7 within a year. Amongst the dot-com companies that survived the crisis are the brand leaders eBay, Google and the aforementioned amazon.com.

30 "5 worst Internet acquisitions of all time."
31 "Monetary Policy, Open Market Operations Archive."
32 Götte, Finanzkrisen, 178-179.
33 "Google Finance, Index Historical Prices, NASDAQ Composite."
34 "Historische Kursdaten, DAX 2002."
35 "Staying calm during a bear market."
36 Götte, Finanzkrisen, 181.
37 "Fears of Dot-Com Crash, Version 2.0."
38 "Amazon, Aufruhr in Seattle."
Most of the investors lost their money, almost $5 trillion in market value had been burned during the crisis and many small investors lost their stock investment almost completely.

CONCLUSION

Though almost 300 years lie between the two crises, they evolved in a similar fashion. In both cases a few pioneers exploited a rather untapped market and in the beginning their business ideas proved profitable. This resulted in many copycat companies, which adopted the scheme and altered it for their purposes. The result was that even ridiculous ideas attracted investors. In 1720 one did not even need to explicate the idea and in 1998 online pet supplies did the trick.

In both cases the companies had very low equity ratios and were thus dependent on debt financing. On the other hand most of the investors were inexperienced in the new markets and could not estimate the risks properly. With the rising interest of the media the system got out of control, thus opening the doors for bad investments and fraud. So called stock exchange gurus and other self-proclaimed experts persuaded the potential investors that immediate profits with almost no risk of losing could be expected. Many inexperienced small investors followed, losing most of their investments as a consequence. Many companies got grossly overvalued due to the greed of the investors, resulting in the creation of the bubbles.

Both cases are good examples for misguided expectations resulting in an irrational behaviour of the masses. Though there are efforts focusing on developing methods to detect bubbles, there is none that was able to reach consensus amongst economists. But one thing is for sure: the next bubble is in the making. An actual proof of this thesis could be the IPO of GoPro Inc., now valued at $10 billion, which is actually more than market capitalization of the German Lufthansa AG. In the end it is likely that economic bubbles are cyclic events, which only correct the mistakes that have been made before. As far back as 1841, Charles Mackay included economic bubbles as a mass phenomenon in his history of popular folly. He was right; as history has shown, the "madness of crowds" is still omnipresent.
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39 For example, the German Telecom advertised its shares as "Volksaktie" (people’s shares) and even people who had nothing to do with the stock market in their whole life invested into these shares.

40 "Überflieger GoPro."
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The Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU) embarked on its independent research path more than three decades ago and has developed into one of Slovenia’s leading research and education centres. The main mission of its eighteen research institutes and three research stations (in Nova Gorica, Maribor, and Petanjci) includes the following:

- Carrying out basic and applied research on natural and cultural heritage;
- Publishing research achievements in scholarly works issued by ZRC press;
- Promoting nature protection and sustainable development planning;
- Playing a role in national development and raising ethnic awareness;
- Carrying out studies and providing expert opinions for infrastructure construction;
- Interpreting satellite images and developing new artificial intelligence techniques.

A ZRC SAZU Graduate School has also been established.

For more on ZRC SAZU achievements, go to http://www.zrc-sazu.si. You’ll be surprised to learn about the range of activities we’re involved in.
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