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A word from the Vice-President

Dear friends, dear partners, dear ISHA people,

It's a real pleasure and a great honor for me to write some words to open this 16th edition of Carnival. You have got in front of you the last edition of our annual publication which had been completed conscientiously by our Editor in chief, Flavia Tudini. I want in the opening text, congratulate and thank her for the quality of her work for ISHA and Carnival as you will see throughout this magazine. I want to thank all the ISHA International Board members and Council members, for their work during all the term 2014-2015.

The International Board appreciates the quality of articles we received. This 16th edition covers different events of ISHA. Since the Annual Conference 2014 in Budapest until the Autumn seminar 2014 in Pula; including our summer event in the Slovenian capital city and the weekend seminar in Sofia.

The discussed topics in this opus are varied and approach different fields of study, and reach far beyond historical sciences. It's a promising 16th edition which is reflecting perfectly the new direction followed by ISHA and impulsed by the International Board lead by Barbora Hruba. Furthermore, the level of the texts presented in this opus are representing a collective will to diversify the topics and improve the academic level of Carnival.

This is a representative edition because it shows the will to open toward outside. As you have seen this year, ISHA is back on the stage of international students organizations. The long-awaited partnership with EGEA (European Geography Association) finally became a reality, during our New Year Seminar in Olomouc with the presence of Nora Varga, president of EGEA European Board, to sign officially the new partnership. In our next editions of Carnival, our geography student friends will have the opportunity to published an article in our publications. The links we created together are more than just an institutional partnership, ISHA and EGEA are sister organizations; and our relations are tending to become stronger. This is just the begining of our common work.

ISHA also came back this year in ESU (European Students' Union) network, the most important student representative organization and leader player about higher education in Europe. The presence and the participation of ISHA as associate member was really appreciated in the last two board meetings in Azerbaijan and in Armenia. More than ever, ESU can count on us and count with us.
ISHA renew strong ties with other students organizations who are IFISO members (Informal Forum of International Student Organizations), and regains a certain imposing presence there. It's now time to share skills, knowledges and best practises to evolve and develop ISHA.

This term was the opportunity to work on ISHA communication, especially on internet with our new social networks and our website. It was high time to go on the way of numerical transition, in order to improve the image of ISHA with students but especially with our partners. Because they will have a lot of importance and a major role in the future of ISHA; they will be directly involved in ISHA life.

This 16th edition is double representative about the will of ISHA International Board to meet and be proactive with partners, and propose a higher academic level, better articles with readiness to search and critical analysis.

I very much welcome the good health of ISHA, this is reflected day by day with the liveliness of our sections; but also through the increase of events in our network. We've got off course our four traditional events; and the weekend seminars, they offer to participants the possibility to discover new topics and create social links between ISHA members and ISHA sections. The weekend seminars are great experiences, the International Board wants to encourage people to attend and to organize some during the next years.

Finally, ISHA is the best way to share our passion for History and for cultures; our desire to share with others students, not for their origins or their social backgrounds. We are in a period of religious, ethnic conflicts, and financial crises; ISHA is the symbole of tolerance, of the openness toward others, many people underestimate the importance of our student mobility, it's the first step of friendship among peoples. Our generation will play a major role in the future of the world. Keep on getting involved in ISHA, keep going on discovering, keep on contributing to this wonderful experience that ISHA is.

Viva History!

VIVA ISHA!

On behalf of the International Board and Council 2014-2015

Anthony Grally

ISHA – International Vice president.
The American Revolution and its Impacts on British Atlantic Trade

Manuel Reimann, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz

In 1773 the so called “Boston Tea Party” was the start of the American Revolution. The war ended in 1776 with the declaration of independence through thirteen British colonies in North America. In 1783 the Peace of Paris was signed which meant that Great Britain accepted the independence of the USA. The war also had a significant amount of influence on trade. Before 1773 it was a kind of “inland trade” between motherland and colonies. The question now is if the war led to a decrease of trade or if it had positive effects. Additionally, the situation after 1776 will be illuminated in this paper. Another query is if the products of trade had changed through the war or if there were changes immediately before or after 1773–1776. One of the main causes of the revolution was that Great Britain, and particularly the Houses of Parliament published new laws. These laws directly were concerned with the economy in the different colonies. The so called “Tea Act” of 1773 was too much. The reaction was the aforementioned “Boston Tea Party”. The question concerning the war years is what the traders did during that time. They were dependent on trade if they wanted to keep their (financial) status. Immediately after the war both parts started trading with each other again. So the American Revolution will be used as a dissociative element. The two main sections will deal with the time before and after the war, of course it is not possible to divide these phases completely. Suitable for this paper is the thesis which says that war is a strong promoter of progress. If this is right, there should be a bigger volume of trade at the end of 18th century than at the beginning. However, since this is also possible in connection to the 1770s, these two positions must be differed.

Introduction

“When in the course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of nature and Nature’s God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.” (Declaration of Independence, The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration)

These are the first lines of the American Declaration of Independence which was published on July 4th 1776. In addition, to the well-known impacts which accrued through the abolition of the former colony, for example the colonisation of Australia as an alternative to deport convicts, there were also changes in the trade of Great Britain and their former colonies. Unfortunately, this issue is often ignored in academic texts. Many publications end in 1773, the year when the revolution started, or they do not cater to the war. Another possibility is that articles start after 1776.
That is why I want to put this War of Independence to the centre of my article and I will show how the revolution interacted with the trade of Great Britain and their (former) colonies. In common sense the revolution started with the so called “Boston Tea Party” in 1773 and ended with the Declaration of Independence in 1776 or with the Peace of Paris in 1783 where Britain accepted the independence of the former colonies (Lerg 2010: 9). On both sides of the Atlantic Ocean there were traders, before and after the revolution, who did business with each other. That means for example, traders from Boston traded with persons from Liverpool and merchants from London dealt with men in Philadelphia. How these businesses developed during the 18th century, how they changed and the role of the revolution are the central issues addressed in this article.

As I said before, there are few publications which refer to the separation of the colonies and the following impacts on trade. One of the few scholars who works to this topic is Sheryllynne Haggerty. In her book “Merely for Money? Business Culture in the British Atlantic 1750–1815” she argues that trade changed during the war from a state-directed element to a private affair among merchants on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean (Haggerty 2012: 208-211). Another researcher who works to this topic is Craig Muldrew. He published the article “Atlantic World 1760–1820” in the “Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World”. In his text he also speaks about this topic, even if it is not his main question. He argues that from 1773 traders from the colonies tried to establish contacts to Non-British partners to reduce their dependence from their former motherland (Muldrew 2011: 631).

Because of the situation, I will treat the question in three main sections: firstly, the years before the start of the war, when the colonies were fully integrated parts of the Empire. After a historical overview, the question will be asked how import and export from/to the colonies looked like. What was sold in which quantity? Who were the merchants? Secondly, I will describe the years of war, 1773–1776. It will be told how and more specifically through which laws, acts and bills the government in
London tightened the situation directly before the “Boston Tea Party”. Many of these laws were concerned to the economy of the American Territories. In addition, there is the question of trade during the fights: how did the merchants try to survive in an economic sense? After the end of the war there were commercial relationships again, but now between Great Britain and the independent state. Were there also impacts on merchandise trade and what was sold? How big were these businesses? The American Revolution will be used as a separative element.

**Trade before 1773**

After 1492 an exchange of goods began to establish between Europe and the “New World”. During the first time this trade was relatively steady, but around 1765 changes appeared. The main reasons for this were contracts to support the commerce as well as regulations in three main points dealing with commerce: Shipping, Finances and Information (Hancock, 2011: 332).

The transatlantic trade needed innovations and investments related to shipping. In general ships got bigger and more expensive and also the merchant fleets itself became larger. In the field of finances, paper money was established in these days as an abstract payment instrument. Prior to this coins, primary products or commodities which were changed, were used as money. In the Anglo-American space these were primary agricultural products like tobacco, but also things like indigenous (art) works. In 17th century traders began to introduce paper money like banknotes and bills. These had to be forgery-proof, reclaimable and changeable with other parties. Shipping and financial businesses involved a lot of risks, therefore insurances appeared which were specialised to just these categories. The first of these organisations were established in London, Lisbon and Amsterdam, thus in areas which were extremely involved in this trade. Additionally the appearance of newspapers had an impact on the transatlantic trade. The usual form of communication between traders and trading companies was the letter. In 18th century, newspapers became more and more important and soon they gained an equal
importance to letters. A clearly regulated postal system appeared in these days. So these three points, namely shipping, finances and information, were essential for the changes in trade between Europe and North America (Hancock, 2011: 333–335).

The Atlantic trade was a very important component for the development in Europe after 1500. Indeed, profits were too small to accelerate economic growth in Europe directly, but these businesses had a large impact on redistribution of resources. How small these deals were becomes visible, since they had a quota of less than 4% of the national product of Western Europe before 1800 (Robinson, 2005: 562). A connection of different economic activities becomes apparent and through trade changes were set into operation which strongly modified the economic development of a large space.

The British came into these Atlantic trade very late. Portuguese, Spanish and Dutch had been active in this field for quite a long time and were finally deciding that the British were allowed to join this trade. In 1606 the Virginia Company colonized Chesapeake Bay. However these actions were only possible because of the allowance of the indigenous people. Following this example more and more villages and plantations were established, mostly through different companies. In the first years sugar was the most important product. In contrast to the Spanish, the British did not find any gold or silver, still the rise of population in the colonies and the production of agricultural products was more efficient in a long-term view. The people in power made a non-intervention policy which means that the settlers enjoyed some liberties. This policy was the essential advantage against the European rivals and an important point why Great Britain became the most important nation in the Northern Atlantic and why after Seven-Years-War it was possible to strengthen this ledge (Haggerty, 2012: 14–16).

**British exports to North America**

Trade with the new colonies in North America became very important for the British economy. In 1700 all exports to the “New World” had a worth of about 256,000
pounds, until 1750 this sum increased to 971,000 pounds. At this date more than 10% of British exports were already sent to North America. The main reason for this growth was the development of population in the colonies. During 18th century the number of inhabitants increased from about 275,000 to more than five millions. Through this increase of population trade expanded and became the most important link between motherland and colony. This dependence on British products was boosted through the circumstance of the increased living standard of the white population. In addition, industries in North America were relatively weak and manufacturing costs high. Before 1776 these conditions were fortified through imperial British legislations (Morgan, 2000a: 36–37). It becomes visible that the white settlers saw themselves completely as British before the revolution. They wanted to have British products and continue living a British way of live although they had left their home.

An enormous advantage for traders who wanted to export goods to the colonies was the fact that trade was protected through different laws. Furthermore, ships which brought products to North America had to be loaded again for the journey home, because “empty trips” would be costly and would not result in any profits. So the Atlantic Colonies became a very important part of the market of British traders. In addition to the export of goods credit business brought earnings as well. According to Jacob M. Price, it were the British who perfected this credit businesses (Price, 1996: 272–273). Each part of trade had its own credit purpose which could change depending to the market situation. Until 1775 differences in the single branches of trade vanished and the credit system became more standardised. The lenders got small assistance from the actual traders for their businesses. This is understandable today because traders got the chance to keep up their export sales through these credits (Price, 1996: 273–274).

Goods which were exported to North America were mostly textiles, metal goods or glass. They were sent to the whole east coast of America: meaning Boston, New
York, Norfolk, Charleston In the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, British trade changed insofar that the exchange of raw materials, especially wool developed into a trade with competed artefacts. That means that finished products were sent to the colonies, as I have said before. From 1700 to 1750 this capacity doubled (Morgan, 2000b: 21). The result was that in the first years of 18\textsuperscript{th} century London controlled about 80 per cent of the trade with the North American Colonies (Maw, 2010: 738). Especially exports of linen products became more and more important. They were mostly produced in Scotland and Ireland. In earlier times they were basically exported to continental Europe, but by 1740 this changed completely. The “New World” became the most important consumer of these goods. Therefore, the British wool exports descended. In the years just before the independence of the USA, provincial manufacturers became more and more autonomous. Liverpool or Bristol became very important harbours for this trade. In areas like Lancashire or Yorkshire trade relations to the “New World” arose and London lost its central role for British exports (Maw, 2010: 238).

**British imports from the colonies**

Before the revolution sugar was by far the most import product which was brought to Great Britain from the American colonies. No other product including tobacco, coffee, rice or indigo which was roughly as important as sugar. In the last years before the war of independence, sugar imports from North America to Great Britain had a volume of about 2.5 million pounds. In comparison, the imported tobacco was worth less than 1 million pounds, coffee and rice each was about 500,000 pounds and indigo less than 100,000 pounds. Many of these products were retailed by the British. Only indigo, which was imported from South Carolina, had no impact on the labour market in the motherland aside from the textile industry and the following dyeing industry in which the colorant indigo could create employment opportunities (Price, 1996: 110). The retail of resources from the own colonies had a volume of about 66 per cent in comparison to the own exports at the beginning of the 1770s. It must be considered that these deals also created jobs in shipping. As a result shipbuilding was
the biggest profiteer of the development of trade among motherland and colonies. The essential raw materials to build a ship had to be imported as well. The dependence on foreign products brought an enormous strategic disadvantage to Britain. The profiteers of the high costs for shipbuilding were the American colonies. In these areas ships had to be built since the first days of the colonisation. The industrial leaders in London realised this and they started to let ships building in North America for a cheaper price. Sources are available from 1676 already, meaning that shipbuilders in New England achieved orders for about 30 ships from England per year. Around 100 years later about 40 per cent of all British vessels were built in the colonies (Price, 1996: 112).

Sugar became a very important part of the diet, not only in Great Britain but also in other European areas. British traders brought sugar from North America via England to Europe. The same happened with tobacco. Tobacco was retailed to France, Netherlands or the German areas sliced, rolled or as snuff. Rice was almost exclusively retailed in Europe, in Britain itself there was hardly a market for this grain (Morgan, 2000b: 21). This shows once again that the import trade from the colonies was much more than acquiring goods for personal use. Through the increasing possibilities of integration in Europe goods were sent on in a form of transit traffic via British harbours. As long as there was a market for this type of goods in continental Europe, these were, as far as possible, built or planted in the colonies and shipped to Europe. The best example for this is rice, which was hardly sold in England. However the plant was cropped and sold by British traders. This shows that there must have been a market in Europe. Consumers were apparently willing to pay a higher price otherwise the transit agents would not have gained profits. If this business would not have been profitable, it’s sure that it would have been stopped. Most of the rice imports came from South Carolina. After 1720 there were many changes for rice traders because the grain market in Europe changed. By trend, prices decreased until about 1740, after that prices increased again until the late 1860s. This changes were connected to the expanding population in European states.
As I said before, rice was rather unimportant in Great Britain so an entire expanding population in Europe had also impacts on rice trade among the North American colonies and their motherland (Nash, 1996: 362–363).

**The American Revolution**

During the War of Independence American traders started to deal directly with Continental Europe. The most important partners came from France, Spain and the Netherlands. After gaining independence the trade routes were opened completely in 1783 (Maw, 2010: 740).

Already in 17th century, the first of the so called Navigation Acts was passed through. Protection of the British Atlantic trade was the main point in addition to the economic weakening of the opponents France and Netherlands. Only British ships or ships from the producing countries were permitted to transport goods which were imported to England. In 1745 British traders began to act in an aggressive way to enforce the Navigation Acts also in the opposite direction. Firstly, they began to sell their products directly to shop owners in the colonies, secondly they started to purchase huge amounts of goods on auctions and resold them with little surcharges. Through these activities British exports to North America strongly increased. From the 1760s, traders in the colonies started to resist the British monopoly position and they boycotted British products (Sawers, 1992: 270–271). In my opinion, it shows that the majority of the colonists did not feel as British as they did in the middle of the 18th century. They wanted to trade with opponents of the crown as well. These possibilities were strongly restricted through the Navigation Acts. The boycott on British products shows that the point of view must have been changed. The primary ambition was no longer a limitation of opponents of London but rather profit. Who the commercial partners were did not matter for the North American traders. On the other hand there were processes after the revolution which show that the settlers in the new USA partly wanted to continue living a “British way of live”.
In the ten years before the so called “Boston Tea Party” of 1773, which was the beginning of the revolution, the relations of motherland and colonies changed essentially. In 1763 the so called Proclamation was issued. That means that buying land west of the Appalachian Mountains was prohibited. These areas were bought directly by the Crown, the colonies Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and New York were particularly concerned by this (Schroeder, 1982: 42). In 1764 the Sugar Act was a first dramatic intervention to the economic affairs of the colonies. The law indicated that taxes had to be paid for the import of sugar and treacle into the colonies. The reason for this law was the smuggling of sugar, respectively rum. Contraventions should be sanctioned through marine courts of the navy. Sugar which was not cultivated in the colonies already was partially brought directly from the Caribbean Islands to North America. British Prime Minister Grenville realised that the government lost oodles of taxes through this. In 1765 the Stamp Act passed which meant that every official document in the colonies had to be endued with revenue stamps (Lerg, 2010: 14–15). The Stamp Act was so important because it was the first law which arranged direct tax collection in the colonies. Until that point Great Britain refused to levy direct taxes. The law pertained to all colonies similarly and generated big displeasures by the settlers. One of the main reasons for the Stamp Act was that Great Britain planned to setup a standing army of 10,000 men after the Seven-Years-War. Of course this army had to be financed. The Stamp Act led to big riots, the principle of them was “no taxation without representation”. Shortly after the passing of the law there was a governmental change in London. Because of this, the colonies proclaimed a trade embargo and the Stamp Act was cancelled in 1766 (Schroeder, 1982: 43–44).

Already in 1767 new taxes were introduced in the colonies. They were called Townshend Duties according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer Townshend who was responsible for the realisation of the law. It was an import duty for tea, colours, glass, paper and plumb. Furthermore this measure would lead to a boycott of English goods and the houses of parliament had to withdraw it in 1770. However taxes on tea
persisted as a symbolical act. These taxes on tea were the ultimate provocation of the revolution. In the 1770s, the British East India Company had the problem that loads of tea were not sellable. The Tea Acts were passed to prevent the collapse of the Company, because many members of the British houses of parliament were involved in the company through shares. That meant that the Navigation Acts could be ignored regarding to tea and tea could be imported directly from the eastern colonies to North America. Although tea became cheaper, the colonists saw the law as a new attack to their sovereignty. In late 1773 three large tea ships arrived in Boston. The assembly of the city prohibited to unload their goods, but the captains stayed at the harbour and on December 12th 1773 around 50 to 100 men sidled on board. They threw all the cases with tea in the ocean. The total loss was around 10,000 pounds which would be about 700,000 euros in today’s currency. Through this action the public meaning in the motherland changed definitely and the war could not be averted (Lerg, 2010; 28–29).

**Trade during the revolution**

From 1775 onwards British traders could decide for themselves if they wanted to do trade with the North American colonies. American ports were occupied by troops and the markets were blocked. Trade with the thirteen colonies did not stop completely but was reduced in a drastic way. One possibility to transport goods was private ships. In the years of the revolution around 400 private ships were registered in Liverpool and about 100 in Glasgow. Traders on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean used this possibility also. Through these private activities another problem emerged. The merchant fleets had to be saved by other (war-) ships and smuggling boomed in these days, mostly these businesses were processed via the French colonies in the Caribbean Sea. All in all the revolution had one essential advantage for traders on both sides. The armies had to be supplied with goods. For this traders from the own territories were obligated. Through this it was possible for a trader called Thomas Mifflin to gain a profit of more than 6,000 pounds due the conquest of Philadelphia.
by the colonists. These traders also profited of the bankruptcy of their, mostly smaller, rivals in business. Because of this the offers decreased what means that the prices increased (Haggerty, 2012: 208–211).

In Great Britain the war achieved many support for the own army, but in the rest of Europe the British were quite isolated. Until 1781 they got no support from other European states. At the beginning of the 1770s a big part of the British exports to the North American colonies were still delivered, but from 1773 there were big incisions in these spheres. Therefore, the whole British Atlantic trade was whipsawed (Armitage, 2011: 525–526). On the other hand, North American traders started to strengthen their contacts to their French partners. Through blockades this was more a matter of imports than exports which started to stress the North American economy. Because of the fighting the economic performance of the colonies decreased by about 46 per cent and a quick inflation established. Exports from the former motherland into the colonies dropped from more than 1.8 million pounds in the years of 1771 to 1775, to about 264,000 pounds in the time between 1781 and 1785 (Muldrew, 2011: 628–629).

**British Exports after the American Independence**

On July 4th 1776 the American Declaration of Independence was published. Thirteen former colonies in North America dissociated themselves from the motherland. It took until 1783 that Great Britain respected this act in the Peace of Paris. An important question in this context is how the trade between Great Britain and the newly established USA changed at the end of the 18th century.

In case of the British exports to the US traders started to commute between their home and North America, because of the rigorous market situation and the associated more aggressive market strategies. They tried to sell their products directly in the destination area. This trend became visible especially in the 1780s. The destination port was mostly Philadelphia which was the biggest city with a harbour in the US in these days. Different to before the war when North American partners resold the
products, British companies tried to sell their goods directly to the final customers. On the other hand, there were also persons who purchased merchandises on credit in Great Britain, to bring them into the US and tried to make profits. (Morgan, 2000a: 45–46).

Although British traders faced some problems during the war of independence, exports to North America increased during the second half of the 18th century. After 1770 about 50 per cent of British exports were sold to North America. These were different goods. After 1783 product range became smaller, primary textiles and metal goods were sold. Between 1784 and 1796 the export volumes of textiles increased on 57 per cent and that of metal goods increased on 20 per cent. But this was not the end, until 1806 these values increased again at 82 respectively 7 per cent. Reasons were the enormous growth of population in the US, the enlargement of the settlement area directed towards west and the rise of the living standard. From 1770 onwards about 30 per cent of the income was invested in imported products (Morgan, 2000b: 65).

After 1783 the US became the most important single market for British textiles. Approximately 34 per cent of the textile exports of Great Britain were brought to the former colonies. Since about 1780 British traders tried to restart the now non-state trade with the USA. In these processes Liverpool became the most important export harbour. At the end of 18th century about 60 per cent of the exports to North America were sent via this city. Traders in the cities of New York and Philadelphia managed the American orders and took over the goods (Maw, 2010: 740). Most of the textiles came from the northern parts of England, namely from Yorkshire and Lancashire. The most important reason for this was the mechanical production in factories. This advance in the North-English areas secured their predominance in the textile exports in the last twenty years of the 18th century (Maw, 2010: 751–752).

A production which was exactly aligned to the requirements of the market became particular for British exports to North America. This was particularly valid for
textiles which were the most important British export goods. British traders had the advantage that there was hardly any European competition. Although the USA was an independent state at this point, the trade with the former motherland dominated. Different colours were demanded in different areas. According to that, different cities with harbours were supplied which then resold the products to the hinterland. This attention to colours was a very important point for trade with the US, because next to the quality colour was the most important thing. The mentality of the population was like this, that after the revolution they wanted to annex their way of live to that of the British. Clothes that were unsellable in London could neither be disposed in Philadelphia nor New York (Morgan, 2000: 56–59).

**British imports from the USA**

Not only exports but also imports continued to rise after the revolution. This becomes visible especially compared to Asia. The total capacity of the Asian imports was about 7.3 million pounds in 1795 by contrast with 11.1 million pounds of the Atlantic trade (Muldrew, 2011: 631).

One of the most important import products was indigo. Indigo was basic colouring matter for European textiles in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. In the ten years after the American Revolution, indigo from South Carolina, along with other goods from this area, dominated the British import deals. Thus the thesis exists that British traders were forced to buy, the substandard indigo by the government. Indigo from French or Spanish colonies was much more favoured because it had a higher value. Through this, rivals of the British had an advantage. However, fact is that not until 1790 indigo from North America was replaced by indigo from India as most important import product (Nash, 2010: 385–386).

Scotland was a very important reloading point for intercontinental carriage of goods during the whole 18\textsuperscript{th} century, like tobacco from Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina. Usage in Scotland itself as well as the secondary purchase played an important role. The relevant traders became very rich. This process had not changed
after the revolution. From the 1770s onwards an elitist group of traders emerged which dominated other sectors of Scottish industry, because of their financial possibilities. Also these products were resold which led to even higher profits for the mentioned traders (Devine, 1996: 299–302). It is clearly visible that the abolition of British control of North America had hardly any consequences, at least related to the Scottish tobacco trade. The traders even had the advantage to do their businesses with a now independent partner. Of course this partner produced those goods which were most needed. Thus it was possible for all involved parties to maximise profits. It is also obvious how closely imports and exports were linked. Traders who became rich through imports were also able to intervene in the export trade in their homeland.

The British West Indies were influenced by the secession of the North American colonies also. In the years before the revolution the climax of production was reached. These goods were partially shipped to North America directly. This practice changed because of the loss of the sea highness of the Royal Navy and the British defeat in the later USA, and the products had to be delivered to Great Britain. Through the lapse of sugar from North America, prices for sugar from the Caribbean increased fast. The now smaller quantity was responsible that sugar was hardly resold. The rise in price were just short-lived, because American sugar was soon imported again (Crouzet, 2000: 279–282). By this last example it becomes clear how close linked British colonial trade was already in 18th century. Different goods, mostly sugar, were traded among different colonies without the “detour” London already before 1776. With the independence of the USA this changed. When sugar imports form the North American colonies were reduced, the prices for Caribbean sugar boomed. This was a problem as buying of crude sugar became more expensive for the British customers. In addition to this there were hardly any overruns for the European market, because of little total volume. Yet these resell deals were an important source of income for British traders in the years before the revolution. So the lapse of the colonies not only had political consequences, but also concrete economic implications which were also noticed by the man in the street.
Summary

In the course of the American Revolution the trade changed in a big way. From 1492 onwards, when America was “discovered”, commerce began to establish between Europe and the colonies in the “New World”. Essential were the innovations in shipbuilding: ships had to be bigger and especially safer. Also the fleets of merchant-ships became bigger because of a general increase of the trade volume. It is quite interesting, that Great Britain, which would later on be the big superpower, started very late with transatlantic trade and the setup of colonies. Other countries like Portugal or Spain started such actions much earlier. It was not until 1606 that Chesapeake Bay was colonised and other settlements soon followed. The British never found noble metals, which is why they started specialising in producing agricultural commodities. The total capacity of trade increased continuous until 1773, but it was just a small part of the entire gross national product of Western Europe.

At the beginning of the 18th century, the British colonies in North America were established. Therefore a fast rush of British exports in these areas started, also because of the big rise of population in the colonies. This trade was secured and supported through different legislations. Another advantage for British traders was, that the white population of North America tried to imitate the way of life of the motherland. Therefore textiles were the most important export product. In addition also glass and metal goods were sold. In the 18th century this export trade changed, henceforth finished products were merchandised. Furthermore provincial traders started to trade independently and London lost its central role for the British export economy. Before the revolution sugar was the most important import product, but also tobacco, indigo or rice was bought. Many of these products were resold in Europe so the British motherland was just a reloading point. Great Britain was addicted to imports for shipbuilding. To reduce the costs they also started to fabricate ships in the colonies.
Especially in the 1760s, the government in London started a harder line in the association with the colonies. Laws were established which claimed direct taxes, smuggling should be hindered and British traders should be protected from rivals. Examples for this are the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act or the Tea Act. This Tea Act led to the so-called “Boston Tea Party” in 1773 which was the beginning of the revolution. In the years of war the trade changed completely through the blockade of ports and markets most of the traders on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean concentrated on supplying their own army. The trade between motherland and colonies nosedived dramatically. Private trade respectively smuggling via French territories in the Caribbean Sea were the primary types of transatlantic trade until 1783. In North America inflation developed through this economic retracement.

In 1776 independence was declared by the colonies which was respected by Great Britain in 1783. When the war was finished, commercial relationships between the two territories recovered. The trade itself had changed and the routes of trade were opened for all in 1783. Textile products were by far the most important things which were exported to the USA, metal goods had just a subordinated position. The textiles, mostly originated in North English areas, were exactly aligned to the requirements of the target market. Especially the colour of the clothes was an important point. Also the imports changed after the revolution, however their volume increased. Sugar was brought decreasingly from North America and the necessities had to be covered with products from the Caribbean. Therefore, sugar became very expensive. From the US primarily indigo was imported. Indigo was needed as a colouring matter. A trend which began to show before the war already became fully visible, namely London was not the most important trans-shipment centre anymore. This trend was boosted because now it was trade between two independent states.

If the British Atlantic trade of the whole 18th century is examined it becomes clear that the trade volume increased continuously. During the years of war there was a market break indeed, but after the peace agreement the trade rose further. This is
valid for British imports as well as exports. What varied were the traders because of the abolition of governmental defaults. It seems like profits were more important than ideology. This is obvious through the fact that first transactions were made with settlers in colonies and then with revolutionists in the USA. As long as the trade volume increased and the price was right, everything else was obviously secondary-rank.

Another point is that it seems that after 1776 the residents of the new USA saw themselves still as British. They worked together with the former enemies in trade and they wanted to live a British way of life. This becomes visible in the fact that they wanted to wear the same clothes like the population in Great Britain did. Also the certainty that the most important commercial partner, also for imports, was Great Britain is a point that shows this feeling of affinity. It seems that the main point for the revolution was the problem of the different laws which were decreed by the government in London without participation of the settlers in North America and not the wish of abandon the empire. So political reasons led to a development which ended with the genesis of a new state, but in many other fields most remained the same like before the war and was just interjected through the revolution.
Sources

Declaration of Independence of the United States of America


References


“Temporary. For Ever.”\textsuperscript{1} Turkish Guest Workers in West Germany. Remembering Migration in 1961 - 2011.

Nina Kraus, Freie Universität Berlin

By narrating a common identity through a common history, commemorative events have the objective to enable a society of a sense of belonging to a collective. Who is wretched away from oblivion by public remembrance becomes part of the self-understanding of a society. In reverse this would mean that anyone who does not belong is also not remembered. This is challenging the question whether the rules of commemorative culture are also applying for the “guests” of a society. Instead of creating a feeling of collectivity commemorative events often push the inclusion of “Us” and the exclusion of “The Other”. In pluralized societies statements about history seldom deal with a common remembrance of migrants and locals but with a divided memory. This is creating per se a doubled gap of historical knowledge and remembrance culture, and leads to a peculiar situation in immigrant countries – while migrants have a reduced knowledge of historical narratives in the country of residence, locals for example in Germany have only little awareness of the migration history of their own country. “The Other” becomes a person without history.

I. Introduction

Labor immigration has been a consistent aspect of Germany’s economic history in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Especially in urban spaces, which have always operated as meeting and negotiation spaces between groups and facilitated a high degree of overlap between immigrant groups and locals, the marks of migration can be found everywhere. What do we know about the historical culture of migrants coming to Germany? What historical context on migration history do we remember and commemorate?

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Germany was a country of emigration with Germans following the waves of trans-Atlantic migration to the New World. At the turn of the century, a larger numbers of Polish workers came to work in the mining sector, the so-called “Ruhrpolen”. The term “Fremdarbeiter” (foreign worker) was used to describe the forced labor that was brought from occupied Europe to work on German farms and factories during the Second World War. In post-war Germany a new word was

\textsuperscript{1} The title is taken from a compilation of contemporary witness accounts from Turkish Guest Workers and their descendants. The book was published by the Federal Agency of Civic Education (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung) to mark the occasion of the 50\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of the bilateral recruitment agreement between Germany and Turkey in 2011. As the majority of literature used for this article is in German, direct quotes that have been translated by the author will be complemented with the German original quote in a footnote.
created to name workers coming from abroad: in the Federal Republic of Germany the term “Gastarbeiter” or “guest worker” was coined to describe the migrants coming to Germany through the recruitment agreements for foreign labor forces. Since the mid-1950s, Germany has become one of the most important destination countries for immigrants in their search for work abroad. In the year 2011 Germany and Turkey celebrated the 50th anniversary of their bilateral recruitment agreement. When the agreement was signed in 1961 the purpose was purely pragmatic – as the consequences for the German society as well as the Turkish immigrants were unpredictable. On May 9th, 2011 the Federal Statistical Office of Germany estimated the German population to be 80.2 million – including 15.3 million people with a “migration background”. Out of that group a little over three million people in Germany are of Turkish origin. (see Statistisches Bundesamt, 2014a and 2014b)

In the second section of this article, I will give an introduction to the role of historical narratives within the construction of a commemorate consciousness and community, while stressing the function of “the other” in order to achieve a sound definition of “the own”. In the third section, I will summarize the assumed “unknown” history of Turkish guest workers in the time between 1961 and 1973, with emphasis on the individual journey and experiences of guest workers from Turkey both to and in Germany. In the fourth section, I will concentrate on the decades following the recruitment ban during which Germany’s political leaders were indulging the political sentiment of “not being an immigration country” although while pursuing a pragmatic, increasingly continuing integration policy for immigrants already living in the country with secure residence status. In the final part I will summarize the conclusions of the article by looking at the aspect of how migrant history is represented in German remembrance culture.
II. Memory, identity and “The Other”

Historical narratives are one instrument to create a sense of collectivity and maintain a national identity. Historiography has steadily distanced itself from the notion of Leopold von Rankes’ *Historismus*, to tell history “how it actually happened”, but now takes into account the effect of history upon memory, construction upon commemorative practices. By recreating historical events with the objective of interpretation; the role of actors, categories, narratives and plurality have taken greater precedence. The debate on historical culture is shaped by terms such as memory, memory culture and collective memory, coined by Maurice Halbwachs and the “lieux de memoire” of Pierre Nora. The German equivalent, the “Deutsche Erinnerungsorte“ (places of remembrance), represent a space which helps constructing national and collective identity. In the introduction of the 2001 published book of Etienne Francois and Hagen Schulze on German places of remembrance however, the editors regret a lack of such places for migrants in Germany:

Like any observer the historian mainly notices expressions of collective memory which have already existed for some time and are fully formed. The newly emerging ones, however, like the collective memory of young German-Turks, of repatriates, war refugees and asylum seekers are necessarily beyond our view. Nothing is more difficult than an even account of what disintegrates, what endures, and what is still emerging. (Francois/Schulze, 2001: 22)

By forging a common identity through a common history, places of remembrance and commemorative events possess the objective to give a society a sense of belonging to a collective. Those who are wretched away from oblivion by public remembrance become an integral component of a society’s conception of itself. In reverse this would mean, that anyone who does not belong is also not remembered. The question

3 German Original: „Wie jedem Beobachter fallen schließlich auch dem Historiker hauptsächlich Ausdrucksformen des kollektiven Gedächtnisses auf, die bereits seit einiger Zeit bestehen und völlig ausgeformt sind. Das Neuentstehende dagegen, etwa das kollektive Gedächtnis der jungen Deutsch-Türken, der Spätaussiedler, der Kriegsflüchtlinge und der Asylanten, entzieht sich notwendigerweise unserem Blick. Nichts ist schwieriger als eine gleichmäßige Berücksichtigung dessen, was sich auflöst, dessen, was Bestand hat, und dessen, was erst im Entstehen begriffen ist.”
remains whether the rules of commemorative culture are also applied to the “guests” of a society.

“Migration” (lat. migratio) stands for “move” whereas “integration” (lat. integrare) refers to a process of merging and unification into a whole. Emigration, immigration and migration have shaped the face of Europe on all areas including political, social and cultural structures. And they have been important headlines for political debates in Germany and Europe in the second half of the 20th century up until today. Yet, migration is in most countries still regarded as a profound problem, origination in a history of conflict and causing social segregation and ethnic-religious discrimination. Despite an increasing “Europeanisation”, historical consciousness is still mostly conceptualized along national lines (see König/Ohliger, 2006: 11-19; Leggewie, 2011: 40-42).

What bothered me was the negative image that the Germans had of the Turks. It often occurred to me that they would see us as uncivilized beings who had come out of the wilderness into civilization. I felt that many Germans behaved arrogantly and overbearingly towards us. It bothered me that in the perception they had of me, my nationality has always played a major role [...] I always encountered the same idea: that nationality is something that connects or vice versa different nationalities represent something divisive.[...] The Turks don’t get along with the lifestyle of the Germans and the Germans don’t get along with the lifestyle of the Turks. (Mesut Ergün, after Goddar/Huneke, 2011: 60f.)

---

4 German Original: „Was mich störte war das negative Bild, das die Deutschen von den Türken hatten. Es kam mir oft so vor, als würden sie in uns kulturlose Wesen sehen, die aus der Wildnis in die Zivilisation gekommen waren. Viele Deutsche empfand ich uns gegenüber als arrogant und überheblich. Es störte mich auch, dass in der Wahrnehmung, die sie von mir hatten, meine Nationalität immer eine große Rolle spielte. [...] Auf diese Vorstellung bin ich immer wieder gestoßen: dass die Nationalität etwas Verbindendes ist beziehungsweise umgekehrt unterschiedliche Nationalitäten etwas Trennendes darstellen. [...] Die Türken kommen mit der Lebensweise der Deutschen nicht klar und die Deutschen nicht mit der Lebensweise der Türken.“
Stakeholder competing narratives often have a destabilizing effect on commemorative events. Instead of creating a “sense of us” the result is an “us” and “them” feeling of inclusion and exclusion.

The notion that Germany is “no country of immigration” has held a steady position in German social consensus well into the 1990s and was especially influenced by the politics at the time of the recruitment of guest workers for post-war German economy from the 1950s onwards. In pluralized societies, statements about history seldom merge the remembrance cultures of migrants with those of the locals, leading to a divided memory. Instead of creating a feeling of collectivity, commemorative events push the inclusion of “us” and the exclusion of “the other”. Debates about historical memory and the controversies of immigration and integration refer to the question of membership and participation within a nation-state and its public spheres. And within these spheres, historiography can be more open to ambivalent, twisted historical narratives that are emphasizing the in-betweeness of groups, populations, and nations, thus recognizing the fact that national communities are and have been under transformation. (König/Ohliger, 2006: 12)

Yet, both topics remained largely detached from one another: the migrant communities in Germany do not yet constitute a part of the German “Erinnerungs- und Erzählgemeinschaft” (remembrance community consisting of shared memories and narratives), but marks a symbolic segregation of the migrant country from its immigrants. (see Motte in König/Ohliger, 2006: 159) This is creating gaps of historical knowledge and remembrance culture per se and therefore leads to a peculiar situation – whilst migrants are exposed to certain historical narratives in their country of residence, the local population has only little awareness of their own countries’ migration history: “As long as migration remains a stranger to history, the
history of this country will remain strange for the migrants.” (Eryılmaz in Eryılmaz/Lissner, 2011: 244)⁵ “The other” becomes a person without history.

III. Unknown History? – Turkish Guest Workers in West-Germany, 1961 – 1973

In response to the rapid economic growth of the German “Wirtschaftswunder” (economic miracle) during the 1950s and the resulting acute shortage of labor, the German government began to negotiate bilateral agreements for labor recruitment. Starting from 1955, the recruitment treaties were signed with a number of mostly Mediterranean countries: Italy in 1955 followed by Greece in 1960, Turkey in 1961 and other countries until the last agreement was completed with Yugoslavia in 1968. Due to these agreements people from the aforementioned countries were allowed to enter Germany for the purpose of work. The building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 reduced the large-scale flow of East German immigration virtually to zero overnight and West Germany moved to intensify its recruitment of labor forces from abroad. Up until 1973 when recruitment was halted, the number of foreigners living in Germany increased in terms of both numbers and their share in the labor force. During this period of time the dominant source countries also changed: the most important country of origin was no longer Italy, but Turkey.

In the 1960s Turkey was an economically and politically unstable country with around twenty-nine million inhabitants. Military coups in 1960, 1971 and 1980 put pressure on the rate of unemployment, plus it led to frequent outbursts of repression and violence – especially against the population which was neither Sunnit nor Turkish. When the recruitment agreement with Germany came into force in 1961, most applicants came from those rural areas marked by poverty and unemployment. For the Turkish administration the rationale of the recruitment agreement was as simple as it was compelling. For the desolate Turkish economy following the military

---

⁵ German original: “Solange die Migration für die Geschichte fremd bleibt, bleibt den Migranten auch die Geschichte dieses Landes fremd.”
coup in 1960, sending their countrymen abroad to work, was an instrument of economic planning. Migrants leaving the country for a short amount of time was a relief for the domestic labor market, whilst at the same time the same workers were supposed to gain professional skills to support the industrial development in their home country upon their return. It was the hope of the Turkish administration that via a controlled inflow and professional training of workers, the potential for investments in Turkey for foreign companies would increase. (Hunn, 2002: 151 – 165)

In the end, however it was Germany’s needs that decided who would be allowed to migrate. The provisions of the contract with Turkey – as the first country which was not part of the European Economic Community (EEC) with whom Germany arranged a recruitment agreement (Hunn, 2002: 147-150) – required the worker to leave after a maximum of two years, with recruitment being based on rotational principle and restricted to mostly unmarried persons between the ages of 18 and 45:

By chance Turkish interests were met by the German government that advocated that the migrants should keep their affiliation with their homeland […]. Both countries questioned an over-all integration because for a long time both conceived of it not only as an adaption to social life but also as a cultural adjustment. Considering the fact that both departed from a concept of an ethnically homogeneous nation state, and that the cultural differences between Turkey and Germany were manifold, the idea that “Turks” could become “Germans” was scarcely acceptable in both countries. (Hunn, 2001: 8)

This policy had a double rationale: on the one hand preventing settlement and on the other hand extracting the largest possible number of workers from sending countries to industrial work. Most of the guest workers arriving in Germany were male; but women played a significant role in the tightly regulated work-migration as well. Guest workers were employed primarily as unskilled and semi-skilled laborers in sectors with piece work, shift work and assembly line positions. They took on jobs that German laborers considered unattractive.⁶ To gain access to the promised land in

---

⁶ This made it possible for many Germans to move up into more favorable or more qualified positions.
the first place, the Turkish applicants had to endure a long series of different assessments such as reading tests, vocational skills tests and health checks:

Before it was my turn, a colleague rushed up to me, who had just been examined: “Hey, Ali. My urine is super. Do you want some?” he asked. It would have been a good deal for him – you could get 15 or 20 Turkish Lira for good urine. One nurse and two, three doctors were present at my examination. I was examined from head to toe: tapped, scanned, x-rayed. It was all alright like that. Because if someone had been sick the health insurance would have had to pay for it in Germany. (Ali Başar, after Goddar/Huneke, 2011: 42) 

Those who had passed had to spend about 50 to 70 hours in the train from Istanbul to Munich:

The train ride was endless. We were traveling three days and three nights. Sleep was impossible. It was much too narrow. And then, in the middle of the journey, we suddenly stopped. The rear wagons had some kind of damage. Then, all the men who sat there had to come to us. We were supposed to travel in separate cars. That was the custom in Turkey. But then we were all crammed into one car. It was too crowded and too stuffy. (Saliha Çukur, after Goddar/Huneke, 2011: 123)

Platform 11 was the first stop for every Turkish guest worker arriving by train until the 1970s. At the Munich central station the German employment agency established a branch office in a former bomb shelter. The guest workers were registered and within the space of a few hours or one night, they could continue their travel to the destination of their assigned location of employment.

The recruited workers massively boosted upward mobility among the German core workforce, without enjoying the same level of benefits. Although foreign workers were formally considered equal to their German counterparts, lack of training, non-
recognition of foreign certifications and language deficiencies limited the guest workers to the lowest wage categories.

You cannot imagine how lonely I was! I cried for weeks. The gray weather, the 4-person bedroom, working in three shifts! I wanted to learn German and study! I thought: Where the hell am I? Berlin consists only of work! Siemens would not even offer us a German course, which would have helped us to cope with everyday life. When I rode the bus, I just gave the driver my wallet. I did not even know what a ticket cost. (Sevim Celebi-Gottschlich, after Goddar/Huneke, 2011: 80)⁹

While the guest workers labored in the factories, they were housed in little, uncomfortable dormitories with shared bedrooms, whilst their families in Turkey waited for their return. Due to linguistic and social isolation, the guest workers mainly relied on themselves and their countrymen for the little remaining free time they had:

The main train station remained for us the gateway to the homeland, even long after our arrival at platform 11. Every Sunday, before lunch, after lunch, we Turks, or guest workers from all countries, gathered there together. There we heard our language, exchanged the latest news from the Turkish villages [...] no one asked why we were doing this – we had no other places. There were no Turkish, no Greek cafes. These were hard times for us as well. (Mahir Zeytinoglu, after Goddar/Huneke, 2011: 132)¹⁰

The oil crisis in 1973 and the recession which followed halted the recruitment of foreign labor. The standing employment contracts of foreign employees remained intact, however many feared they would not be able to return to work in Germany and chose not to leave the country at all. This change of plans on the part of many guest workers transformed their anticipated short-term stay into permanent

---


residence. Of the approximately 14 million labor migrants who had arrived in Germany under the recruitment agreements, around 11 million returned to their home countries. Those who remained settled in Germany.

IV. “No Immigrant Country” - From Guest Workers to Immigrants

To talk about migration and immigration in Germany, it is necessary to distinguish three major terms which are reoccurring in the debate: the foreigner, the migrant, and the bureaucratic term “person with migration background”. The “foreigner” is a person who holds a foreign nationality or none whatsoever and who is not a German within the meaning of the basic law (Article 116, paragraph 1). The “migrant” is a person who has no German background but moved to Germany for living and working purposes and can either hold a foreign nationality or an adopted German citizenship. Meanwhile the term “with a migration background” describes “all non-natives immigrated after 1949 to the present territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as all foreigners born in Germany and all born in Germany as a German with at least one parent who is an immigrant or born as a foreigner in Germany”. (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2012: 6)

The recruitment ban in 1973 marked not only the end of an era but also the accidental launch of a slow and clumsy integration policy, which remained focused on concepts of limited, short-term social integration and moved the ability and willingness for the integration of the immigrants to the center of public debate:

In terms of foreign policy, the Federal Republic of Germany should not be regarded as a country of immigration, since most sending countries - particularly Turkey, Yugoslavia, Greece - are strongly interested in the return of their dispatched workers. It is the opinion of the department [of the Foreign Office – authors note] that the

---

11 On legal basis of the first Aliens Act in 1965, which allowed guest workers to apply for permanent residence after the expiration of their working contracts.

12 German original: „[…] alle nach 1949 auf das heutige Gebiet der Bundesrepublik Deutschland Zugewanderten, sowie alle in Deutschland geborenen Ausländer und alle in Deutschland als Deutsche Geborenen mit zumindest einem zugewanderten oder als Ausländer in Deutschland geborenen Elternteil“.
established wording ‘not an immigration country’ remains hollow as long as there are attempts to integrate foreign employees in practice.” (Political Archive Foreign Office Berlin, meeting protocol, topic: foreign employees, from 26.2.1973, cited after Knortz, 2008: 23)\(^\text{13}\)

The task of integration was not clearly formulated until 1979 in a memorandum by the First Commissioner for Integration of Foreigners, Heinz Kühn (Social Democratic Party of Germany, SPD). Kühn stressed the actual immigration of the workers from abroad: “[…] the future policy towards the foreign employees and their families, who are living in the Federal Republic today, must assume that an irreversible development has occurred and the majority of those affected are no longer ‘guest workers’ but immigrants.”\(^\text{14}\) (Kühn, 1979: 17) In this memorandum he challenged the illusion that Germany was not an immigration country, but the political decisions of the administration fell short of his demands.

The first Aliens’ Act of 1965 had offered the possibility of permanent residence and family reunion for migrants. On a case-to-case basis this also extended to Guest Workers coming to Germany through short-term working contracts. After a thorough examination they could receive a temporary or permanent residence permit and arrange the successive immigration of their family members. After 1973 the family reunion was now the only permissible form of migration. Following the military coup in Turkey in 1980, a surge of asylum applications fueled into an increasingly politicized and emotionalized debate around the issue of “foreigners” in Germany. By this time a growing share of the foreign population consisted of the so-called second and third generation.\(^\text{15}\) Unlike in “immigration countries”, like the United States for example, these children were not granted German citizenship at birth and were

---

\(^\text{13}\) German Citation: “Auch aus außenpolitischen Erwägungen sollte die Bundesrepublik Deutschland nicht als Einwanderungsland angesehen werden, da die meisten Arbeitnehmer-Entsendestaaten – besonders Türkei, Jugoslawien, Griechenland – stark an der Rückkehr ihrer entsandten Arbeitskräfte interessiert sind. Nach Auffassungen der Referate [des Auswärtigen Amtes – d.Verf.] bleibt jedoch die Formel ‘kein Einwanderungsland’ eine Leerformel, solange in der Praxis nach Kräften versucht wird ausländische Arbeitnehmer zu integrieren.” (emphasis in original)

\(^\text{14}\) German Original: “[…] muß die künftige Politik gegenüber den heute in der Bundesrepublik lebenden ausländischen Arbeitnehmern und ihren Familien davon ausgehen, daß hier eine nicht mehr umkehrbare Entwicklung eingetreten ist und die Mehrzahl der Betroffenen nicht mehr ‘Gastarbeiter’ sondern Einwanderer sind […]”

\(^\text{15}\) The sociological term distinguishing between first, second and third generation: the first generation that immigrated as adult, the second generation that immigrated as child or was born in Germany and the third generation that was either born in Germany or has one parent who was born in Germany.
therefore treated as foreigners in a legal sense, meaning that they were just granted the right to reside. Today, it is possible for all immigrant generations to either possess a foreign passport or adopt the German nationality, though only the second and the third generation have been able to receive a German passport at birth since the new Nationality Law was introduced in 2001. However, in these cases they also must decide before the age of twenty-three whether to keep the German passport or to take on the nationality of their parents’ home country.\textsuperscript{16}

The geo-political changes of the era following in the 1990s led to a rising number of migrants and asylum seekers. In particular, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the wars in the former Yugoslavia and the human rights crisis in the Kurdish region of Turkey boosted the inward flow of people. After the reunification, it was characteristic of the Federal Government under Helmut Kohl to consistently and clearly deny the immigration situation: “We have to be aware that we cannot accommodate all who want to come to us. The Federal Republic of Germany is not an immigration country. But we want to promote the integration of those who live together with us.” (Government Statement on the 12\textsuperscript{th} legislature period of the German Bundestag. See Deutscher Bundestag, 1991: 84)\textsuperscript{17} At the same time xenophobic resentments grew during the German Reunification. A rising wave of racism and xenophobia culminated in several incidences of mob violence in the early nineties – for instance the arson attacks in Mölln in November 1992 and in Solingen in May 1993. Both incidents had an extreme right-wing background and were directed against Turkish families, causing the deaths of some of the family members. Mölln and Solingen are among the most severe instances of xenophobic violence in modern Germany, leading to multiple mass-demonstrations against racism and for more tolerance in their aftermath. Yet, the view that Germany is „not an immigration country“ prevailed in the integration policy in Germany in the 1990s as well as at the

\textsuperscript{16} Only in April 2014 a draft bill was passed that grants children from immigrant families a dual citizenship under certain circumstances.

\textsuperscript{17} German Original: „Wir müssen uns dabei im klaren sein, daß wir nicht alle aufnehmen können, die zu uns kommen wollen. Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland. Aber die Integration derjenigen, die bei uns leben, wollen wir fördern.“
beginning of the 21st century. So it not was until very recently that Germany has started to see itself as a country of immigration, by both the majority of its political leaders and its population.

Two thirds of the Muslim population in Germany consists of people with a Turkish migration background. Of the around 2.5 to 2.7 million Turkish Muslims, around 40 percent have German citizenship (see Haug/Müssig/Stichs, 2009: 330). Especially since 9/11 the debate about the non-Christian component of German society has gained traction as “Turks” have become “Muslims”. In public discourse this has been correlated with an equation of Islam with Islamic fundamentalism, with Muslims considered to be a menacing religious and cultural community which has developed a parallel society “unwilling” to integrate and unable to conform with German democratic principles. (see Meyer/Schubert, 2011) Yet the Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration (SVR) stated in 2011, that “migration realism prevails among the population” – although public debate in late 2010 and early 2011 suggested otherwise. (see SVR, 2011a: 1) It had become apparent that the debate about migration and integration in Germany is as much about fear as it is about facts. The controversial book “Deutschland schafft sich ab/Germany abolishes itself” written by the former Berlin finance senator and Bundesbank Executive Board member Thilo Sarrazin (SPD) in which he vents about false immigration policy and Muslim immigrants unwilling to integrate themselves into German society, dominated the bestseller list in 2010 for weeks. Eventually it helped to kick-start a debate on successful and failed integration. The Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration stated in its annual report for 2011, that

18 In 2001, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Christian Social Union (CSU) published a paper with their position on control and limitation of Immigration to Germany as a response to the Green-Card-Initiative of the Social Democratic Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, stating that “Germany is a cosmopolitan country, which had in the course of its history - like many other states - accepted and integrated migrants” but „Germany is no classical immigration country and because of its historical, geographical and social conditions will never be one.” (CDU/CSU, 2001: 1) - German Original: „Deutschland ist ein weltoffenes Land, das im Laufe seiner Geschichte – wie andere Staaten auch – immer Zuwanderer aufgenommen und integriert hat. […] Deutschland ist kein klassisches Einwanderungsland und kann es auf Grund seiner historischen, geographischen und gesellschaftlichen Gegebenheiten auch nicht werden.”
(...)after the issue of immigration had been treated calmly and politically pragmatically, the controversial bestseller “Germany abolishes itself” [...] catapulted it back in the political arena. The book generated a journalistic and political discussion about the “immigration from alien cultures”, which was rarely issue-oriented and partly hysterical, culturalistic and partially latently racist, and implored again the terrible vision of the “opening of the floodgates of immigration” which was believed to be a thing of the past. [...] Thilo Sarrazin's book in the late summer of 2010 resulted in a new debate on integration and a greater political and public attention on the issue of immigration.” (SVR, 2011b: 29)¹⁹

Today, the term “Gastarbeiter” is no longer accurate, since the former guest worker communities – assuming they have not returned to their countries of origins – have become permanent residents or citizens, and therefore are no longer “guests” in the sense of the word. A new word has been used by politicians since the new Immigration Act of 2005: “Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund“, “people with a migration background”. In 2013, Chancellor Angela Merkel (Christian Democratic Union, CDU) opened the Sixth Integration Summit in Berlin with the words: “We want to be an integration country.” (Bundesregierung, 2013)²⁰ Yet federal reports – like the 2009 study on Muslim Culture in Germany or the 2011 Annual Report of the SVR – still stress the deficiencies in structural integration, especially in the context of education and job opportunities. Immigrant communities utter the criticism themselves that some people with a migration background are indeed born in Germany, may have German citizenship and may have graduated from school and studied at the universities, but in reality they often get the impression that they still do not really belong.

¹⁹ German Original: „Nachdem das Thema Zuwanderung seit einigen Jahren zunehmend unaufgeregt und pragmatisch politisch behandelt worden war, katapultierte der umstrittene Bestseller ‘Deutschland schafft sich ab’ [...] es zurück in die Kampfbahnen der politischen Arena. Das Buch erzeugte eine publizistische und politische Diskussion über „Zuwanderung aus fremden Kulturkreisen“, die selten sachorientiert, teilweise hysterisch, kulturalistisch und bereichsweise latent rassistisch geführt wurde, und beschwor erneut das Schreckbild von „geöffneten Schleusentoren für Zuwanderung“, das längst überwunden geglaubt war.[ …] Thilo Sarrazins Buch im Spätsommer 2010 bewirkte neben einer neuen Integrationsdebatte auch eine stärkere politische und öffentliche Aufmerksamkeit für das Thema Zuwanderung.”

²⁰ German Original: „Wir wollen ein Integrationsland sein.“
V. Remembering Migration – Conclusion

To talk about “Australopolitik” or immigration policy in Germany is to talk about a two-sided social reality from the end of 20th century and beyond. On the one hand there is a startling continuity of xenophobia and racist motivated repression and violence – most recently is the series of murders between 2000 and 2007 by the “Nationalsozialistsicher Untergrund” (NSU), a far-right terrorist group which was uncovered in November 2011. However on the other hand there are more than eight million foreigners living in Germany with – in large parts – a secured legal status, access to social welfare and high living standards at their disposal, and a high degree of acceptance among the German population. (Herbert, 2001: 335f.)

It is clear that in the last decade, migration history as a topic has become increasingly present in academic debates as well as in public and political discussion. Yet an impact on the collective memory and on the historical and cultural public space is still broadly invisible. (Motte/Ohlinger 2004, 21) The most iconic picture of the “Gastarbeitergeschichte”, the history of guest workers, was taken during the arrival of the millionth guest worker at the Köln-Deutz station in 1964. Armando Rodrigues de Sá of Portugal was welcomed in a festive celebration and received a moped as a gift, which is today exhibited in the Haus der Geschichte in Bonn. The focus on his arrival in 1964 instead of his background story – the poverty that fueled into his decision to come to Germany in the first place, his experiences during the episode of his life he spent in Germany, the health issues that caused him to return to Portugal and his family in 1970 – reduced him to a one-dimensional representative for all guest workers in public representation (see Motte/Ohlinger 2004, 18f.). It seems that the controversy surrounding the debate on migration and integration in the public and political spheres is only matched by the rudimentary nature of public knowledge about the origins of migration, and its stages. Part of this is accounted for by an insufficient coverage of migrant history in important historical and cultural institutions like museums and archives, which are instrumental in the construction
and maintenance of commemorative narratives. There are a number of institutions which are trying to break this singular perspective about migration history. For example the FHXB Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg Museum in Berlin, which states in the exhibition “Ortsgespräche” and “Stadt – Migration - Geschichte” that urban history is migration history (see Website FHXB), or DoMid, the Documentation Center and Museum for Migration in Germany e.V. in Köln. Since its foundation in 1990s, the latter association ran a number of events, publications, projects and travelling exhibitions\(^\text{21}\) to give at last a face to the defining phenomena of work migration, and furthermore, to promote their goal of preserving the legacy of migrants and laying out the groundwork for a possible museum of migration in Germany:

"It was and is our goal to integrate the already-forgotten history of migration in Germany into academic discourse. That has always been the most important point and it is still. A museum is only one medium among many others fulfilling this purpose, a place of learning, promoting awareness. We are pursuing the plan to establish a migration museum. If the historians in Germany had seized the issue at the right time, and if history museums had integrated the topic into their permanent exhibitions there would be no need for such a museum now." (Eryılmaz in Eryılmaz /Lissner, 2011: 242f.)\(^\text{22}\)

At the 50\(^\text{th}\) anniversary celebration on November 2, 2011 and in presence of the Turkish President Erdogan, Chancellor Angela Merkel said that the commemorative celebration was an expression of thanks and gratitude to those who came and made Germany “richer and more diverse”. (Bundesregierung, 2011)\(^\text{23}\) Guido Westerwelle (Free Democratic Party, FDP), at that time German Minister for Foreign Affairs, called the integration of Turkish citizens a “German success story”. No one, neither German nor Turk, assumed that the temporary hired workers from Turkey would

\(\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\) Like “Foreign Home” (original title: “Fremde Heimat – Yaban, Silan olur”) in 1998 or their most recent project “Divided Home / Shared Home. 50 Years of Migration from Turkey” (original title: Geteilte Heimat – Paylaşılık Yurt”).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\) German Original: “Unser Ziel war es und ist es immer noch, die schon vergessene Geschichte der Migration in Deutschland in der Geschichtsschreibung zu integrieren. Das ist immer der wichtigste Punkt gewesen und ist es immer noch. Das Museum ist lediglich ein Medium unter vielen, um diesen Zweck zu erfüllen, en Lernort, um Bewusstsein zu schaffen. Das Thema Migrationsmuseum beschäftigt uns immer noch und wir verfolgen den Plan, ein Migrationsmuseum zu gründen. Wenn die Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland das Thema rechtzeitig aufgegriffen und die Geschichtsmuseen es in ihre Dauerausstellungen integriert hätten, gäbe es heute keinen Bedarf an einem solchen Museum.”

\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) „Wir müssen endlich verstehen […] dass Vielfalt auch Bereicherung bedeutet und dass Deutschland reicher geworden ist, weil es vielfältiger geworden ist.“ Angela Merkel on November 2, 2011.
permanently remain in Germany. Today, migration and integration are topics that make tempers boil. “[…] the foreign labor, which turned out to be people […]”24 – The quote from Swiss author Max Frisch has become a dictum to express with irony how Germany is still struggling to come to terms with involuntarily becoming a country of immigration as well as dealing with the issues of segregation and discrimination that its immigrant communities still experience in their day-to-day lives.

Despite a various number of exhibitions and festive celebrations to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the involuntary genesis of a multicultural German-Turkish society, it is questionable whether a commemorative “sense of us” was created at all. It seems that the frequently invoked parallel society influenced by the commemorative culture in Germany and there is indeed a separate remembrance of the same history when there should be a feeling of inclusiveness from sharing a common past. It seems that commemorating the history of immigrants in Germany is still an ahistorical space within Germany’s remembrance culture, in which “the other” is again a person without history.

24 German original: „[…] ausländische Arbeitskräfte, die sich als Menschen entpuppten[…]“. Frisch, 1967: 134.
VI. Annex

Timeline of German Migration History

From 1880s  „Ruhrpolen“: Polish workers come to the Ruhrgebiet to work in mining, industry and farming

1929  Great Depression

1933 – 1945  Nazi-Regime in Germany, World War II

1948  Monetary reform; start of the so-called “Wirtschaftswunder” (economic miracle) in West-Germany

1949  Foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic

1955  First "Agreement on the Recruitment and Placement of Workers" with Italy

1960  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Spain and Greece

October 30,  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Turkey

1961

1963  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Morocco and South Korea

1964  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Portugal

1965  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Tunisia

1965  First German Aliens Law

1968  Bilateral Recruitment Agreement with Yugoslavia

1973  Recruitment ban in the Federal Republic; at this point 600,000 Turkish workers live in Germany

1979  Kühn-Memorandum

1990  German Reunification

1991  New Aliens Law

1991/92/93  Series of xenophobic violence, arson attacks and homicides

1999  50 year anniversary of the Federal Republic of Germany

2000  New nationality law

30 August 2010  Thilo Sarrazin publishes his contested book “Germany abolishes itself”

2011  50 year anniversary of the German-Turkish Recruitment Agreement

April 2014  Draft bill for dual citizenship under way
VII. Literature and other Sources


DOMiD – Dokumentationszentrum und Museum über die Migration in Deutschland e.V. Köln (URL: http://www.domid.org/en)


Statistisches Bundesamt (2014a): 15.3 million people have a migrant background, 03.06.2014, Wiesbaden. (URL: https://www.destatis.de/EN/PressServices/Press/pr/2014/06/PE14_193_125.html)

On March 27th, in the year 1623, at the settlement of Wessagusset, two local Native American leaders and their company – including many women – assembled with some English colonists in a house, which was used as accommodation for Native visitors. The other Native leaders had no suspicion; they lived in relatively peace with the English settlers, especially the inhabitants of Plymouth ever since their arrival in 1620. The Natives knew their host, Miles Standish, very well as he was the leader of the militia at Plymouth and one of the “Pilgrim Fathers”. Even if they were a little suspicious, it faded away when the English greeted them favourably and presented a table with different dishes, even pork, which was one of the Native’s most favourite dishes. Just after they started the meal, the English attacked them, and the Natives’ leader, Pecksuot, was killed by Standish with the chief’s own knife, while others killed the chief’s war leader. Later they executed – hanged – other four members of the Native entourage, and others were thrown to prison.

If we look at the previous three years, until 1620, we can see that the settlers always tried to avoid confrontation, fight and war with the Natives, and tried to solve problems with diplomatic methods. Now, however, they killed two chiefs, of high rank, and other Natives, meaning that the conflicts became deeper and worse than before. It is hard to reconstruct the events; the greatest problem is that we can only use sources written by the European settlers. However, if we will not only examine the parts of the sources about the events, but focus on the earlier times and parts which seem unimportant at first sight, so we can get closer to the solution.

We will see, that this conflict started in May, 1622, and grew slowly as the increasing number of the population, the unfertile soil, the weather and the mistakes made by the settlers together generated a massive crisis in the winter of 1622-23. It was known to be one of the coldest winters at that time, when even the Bosporus and Golden Horn
Bay had been frozen. The crisis ended with a solution, which, compared to earlier ones, was different and had long term consequences.

In my text, with the use of earlier literature and the sources, I will present the events leading to the collapse of a peaceful relationship. I will speak about the complex reasons for this crisis, such as the weather, diplomatic manoeuvres, the mistakes of the settlers. I will also speak about the consequences. I will consider the sources, and explain the decisions of the settlers and their leaders, and why they chose this solution for the crisis.

**Prelude**

Where should we start to build up our story? It is unnecessary to look back at the time of Adam and Eve, but we cannot miss out on earlier events.

The very first is the colony of Roanoke, founded in 1585. This was the first encounter and contact between the Natives and the English settlers, as well as the first cooperation and diplomatic manoeuvres between them. It was the first time, when the English settlers tried to handle the Natives, and give an answer to the question: how to live with them? Their answer, however, was brute force, originating from the solutions they had used in Ireland for decades. Their leader, Ralph Lane, and most of the members of the group, were veterans of the “pacification” of Ireland, and they treated the Natives the same way they treated the Irish. In Ireland, they used extortion to make short-term alliances with rival fractions, kept Irish persons of higher-standing hostage for their own security. They robbed and looted the countryside, and heavily punished even the smallest defiance. They continued this treatment in America. In response to a stolen cup, they plundered a Native village. Later, they kidnapped a high-ranking Native chief, kept him and his son as hostages, and

---

25 In short, the most important books about Plymouth, where we can find something about the events: **CARPENTER 2004: 67–72, PHILBRICK 2006: 140–157, VAUGHAN 1995: 82–88.** In 1905 Charles Francis Adams wrote a book about the town, which is nowadays Weymouth, MA. The sources, connecting to the events were collected and published by Jack Dempsey in 2001. Recently, Craig Chartier wrote an essay about the topic, using written sources and archeological evidences.
extorted from him an oath to Queen Elisabeth. Later they killed their former ally, Wingina, because they became suspicious that he no longer wanted to be allied with them. With the dead of Wingina, however, they were encircled by hostile Native tribes, and a week after Wingina’s murder, one year after the start of the colony, they left the settlement on the ships of Francis Drake. The bad luck however put some more settlers on shore at Roanoke, this time families, including John White’s daughter and her newborn daughter. They knew that the Natives were hostile, but only John White was able to sail back to England, mostly because the transport ships abandoned them just after they went ashore. When White was able to return in 1590, three years after his depart, he found the colony empty, but not destroyed. The settlers were missing, and still nobody knows, what their fate was.26

The Roanoke episode was well-known in England, stories and sketches were published in great numbers, and later adventurers learned from it. We know writings from Jamestown, what say that it was a necessity to avoid the same situation, meaning the open hostilities with the Natives. Many sources suggest that they should not be treated as natural enemies, but have to be handled as a “European” country. They realized that a war with them, even with the use of gunpowder and firearms, would end the colony. They also realize a very important thing: during the first few years, the Europeans heavily depended on the food supply from the Natives (Bitterli 1985: 177).

At the time of Jamestown, Europeans realized that at the beginning gifts and gestures were more effective than cold steel and brutality. But it is not Jamestown, however, that shows us the importance of the Natives’ help and good will, but a parallel foundation, at present-day Maine. It was the Popham (or Sagadahoc) colony, named after the main financer. It was founded at the same time as Jamestown, but launched by another company, the Plymouth Company. The settlement was built on a rocky, unfertile and cold seashore, close to a Native settlement, but not in its neighbourhood.

The settlers were able to make contact with one of the Natives, but later the Natives disappeared, moving more inside the continent. Historians have developed many theories as to why the Natives moved away. The most acceptable one is that they had previous contact with other Europeans, perhaps English cod fishers. The meeting was not peaceful or a positive experiment for them, so they treated the Europeans with suspicion and tried to avoid contact with them. Without fishing ships and with lack of food, the settlers abandoned the colony after one year, and sailed back to England.27

We have seen how crucial the Natives’ role was in the settlement’s success, so it is time to introduce the conditions of the settlers, and the first years of Plymouth.

The average settlers: unprepared or “unprepareable”?

In the texts about Wessagusset, we learn that the settlers were ill-prepared and had no idea how to live in the new world (Carpenter 2004: 68. Philbrick 2006: 140). However, if we look over the situation and the conditions, we can say one thing: all settlers are unprepared.

The very first settlers at Roanoke, were soldiers combined with a few labourers (such as carpenters, farmers), and failed.28 At Jamestown, we found an equal number of soldiers and labourers, and they were successful, however at Popham the same structure was not. Plymouth was a settlement of farmer families, while Wessagusset were specialized in fur trade. So it seems that soldier settlements were less successful, but “civilians” could have problems either.

Our main problem is the lack of information, and, to go back to previous statements, the incapability to prepare. At that time, there was little information about the New World. And, to make matters worse, this information was mostly propaganda and a “recruitment”, but not a representation of the conditions. Writers and drawings pictured a rich, fertile land, a new Eldorado, with rich vegetation,29 diverse fauna, and

27 More about Popham: THAYER 2012.
29 The greatest propagandists are Richard Hakluyt and Thomas Hariot
fertile soil, and this whole heavenly land was only habituated by unintelligent, animal-like humans (savage, at this time, means forest-dwelling “monkeyman”) (Bitterli 1982: 48. and 177). This was untrue, but the truth was not the thing which attracted people to be early settlers, because the reality was not as nice as the propaganda writings, sketches and speeches described. The truth, which was “come over and maybe survive,” would not be attractive, but because the too positive imagines of the New World, the newcomers were met with negative surprises.

The preparation, in the strictest meaning of the word, was impossible. In New England, the weather was different, there was a harsher winter, colder spring and autumn and a shorter agricultural positive term in a year. Their sources mention only a few things about this. The planting and growing of corn was also hard to learn, because of the lack of information about it, and they could not “practice” before arriving in the New World (More about maize: LaCombe 2012: 12–18: and 55–63).

The greatest scripts describe the land as fertile; however the new inhabitants realized that it was not the case.30 Jamestown was a swampy, unhealthy area where even drinking water was a problem,31 Popham was a rocky wasteland,32 and Plymouth also had unfertile soil. It is important to mention, that the first describer of the land, John Smith writes many pages about the importance of fishing as primary food source.33 It was rich of vegetation and fauna, but if we read through the sources carefully, we can see that hunting was not so common, they would mostly eat game when they bought it from the Natives. Foraging berries and oysters were not uncommon, but it was only enough to give some extra protein and vitamins, a colony could not survive with this. A strong agriculture and self-sustaining farming would be necessary. But their grain supply could not survive the cross on the Atlantic, it would rot or become infested with maggots. So they needed to get corn seeds to produce corn. But getting seeds was not simple, but if they were lucky, the Natives might give some and show them

30 See SMITH 1616.  
32 See THAYER 2012.  
33 SMITH 1616: 25–31
how to plant it. There were some writings even from Roanoke, written by Thomas Hariot, about corn and how to plant and use it, but, we can say, the settlers enjoyed limited success with it in the first two-three years.

Protein was another problem, since greater livestock animals, such as cows were unable to get transported. Pigs, however, can survive the travel. A bigger problem would be their feeding, because in the first or second year, the food was barely enough for the colonists. Despite this, we see in the sources sometimes the presence of pigs.

So as we can see, the necessity of food turned the colonists to the Natives. A question arose: how to get the corn? It would be tempting to simply kill them and take what they wanted, but, staying in Plymouth, it would not be easy. Firstly, because they were not soldiers, and secondly, they may have realized that it would solve the problem for only a year, and thirdly, the Natives surely might become hostile, and in that case, as the history remarks, the colony would be doomed.

So they depended on the Natives, but it was not simple to cooperate with them. As remarked earlier, Natives were viewed with massive negativity. The Natives were, on the one hand, barbarians, ready to kill, but possessing little military power and easy to conquer and enslave them. This view came from the combination of a kind of superman-self-image and the despise of the Natives because of their slightly primitive life, unintelligible language and different religious and ceremonial rituals. The Spanish scripts and their translations also pictured a slightly barbarous Native, worth no more as an animal. The easy conquest of their great empires with several hundred Europeans also gave the view that they were weak and barbarous, and God sided with the Europeans if they wanted to take their gold, land, and life.

However, from the puritan view, they were potential Christians, waiting for baptism. They believed that their task was to build a new, Christian society with the Natives,

34 Hariot 1586: http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/hariot/hariot.html
35 For example the settlers presented pork for the Natives before they killed them at Wessagusset.
and their divine task to baptize and apostolate them. They invented the term “salvage”, a wild man, who must be saved, salvaged, through Christianity. Some years later, a new company, the Massachusetts Bay Company promoted this mission with its seal, a painting of a Native American with the words “Come over and helps us” (Middleton 1994: 55. and Tindall 1984:62). It seemed that a new page of the Native-European relations had been opened. This new view made the contact with the Natives easier, however, we cannot say that it meant treating them like equals; they were more like “adorable stupid people”, but not “noble wild man.”

The first years of Plymouth

And now, finally, we can start our story, and show the events in their complex reality.

Our settlers were called “Pilgrims” – a Calvinist denomination, emigrated to the Netherlands, because the English authorities were less tolerant towards them (Chadwick 2003: 194–199). Their leaders were afraid that in their new home they would merge with the Dutch, so they decided to borrow ships from the Plymouth Company and England. The arrival of the colonists was pretty unfortunate – they arrived in late autumn 1620, so they spent their first, below-zero weeks onboard the Mayflower, and later in small wooden houses (Philbrick 2006: 83-84). Nearly half of them died in the first year, and death toll remained high during the first years. However, luck later appeared when a Native, Squanto, who spent years in England as a slave, came and introduced them to his chief Massasoit, and later worked as translator-interpreter, until his death of smallpox in November 1622. Squanto was useful, not just as translator, but he showed them how to grown corn and fertilize the soil with dead cod.36 It is time to say that the settlers earlier found abandoned corn fields there, and as they started to use them, they get most of their first seeds there.

Now let us take a look at the settlement’s geographic position. It was actually on the sandy seashore, quite far from any Native settlement. According to a few of the

36 BRADFORD 1622: http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/mourt2.html
sources, the settlement was surrounded by mixed forest, not so dense, and some fields. These fields had previously been corn fields of the Natives. Natives used a forest-burning method with which they created a field using it for some years, then abandoning it and creating new fields (LaCombe 2012: 60). Now the settlers used these abandoned and more or less exhausted fields. Even with the cod-fertilization, it is hard to imagine that these fields had good crop.

It became a necessity to trade with the Natives. However, in the first years, the goods that the settlers could give was nothing but promises; they promised that in case of survival and development, they would honour the Natives’ good intentions. The Natives, especially Massasoit, seemed to accept this deal. But it was not so easy with other tribes; hazardous manoeuvres were needed to establish a peace with some of the Natives.

The first conflict happened when a boy, John Billington, got lost in the forest and was captured by Natives from the Nausset people. An expedition, led by the organizer of the militia Miles Standish and governor Bradford – were set out to recover him. When they arrived at the Native settlement, the leaders of the tribe agreed to give back the boy, but in exchange the settlers needed to give back earlier stolen goods. To make their offer more irrefutable, the tribe summoned – according to the English sources – nearly a thousand warriors. There was no fight, and the settlers returned home, but realized that a possible Native attack would be more severe and irrefutable than it had seemed earlier.37

Some months later a new threat appeared; the Narraganset tribe started a war against the tribe of Massasoit, and the enemies captured Squanto, their translator. The council made the following decision; they would try to free Squanto, or, if he was already dead, they would avenge him. Some fifteen men, led by Miles Standish, marched to the village of the Narragansets, and tried to find Squanto. During this, they shot into the air with their rifles, and beat those who resisted. They soon realized that Squanto

had already fled, so they approached the tribe’s chief. They apologized for the trouble, and asked the chief to stop the attacks against Massasoit’s tribe. They even offered medical treatment for the wounded Native warriors. This act is definitely different from what we have seen for example in Roanoke or Jamestown in similar situations. There were no killings, and – if we believe the English sources – the “misunderstandings” were handled not only with power demonstrations, but also with humanitarian acts. The settlers tried to avoid same situations later. And, to prevent siding with one Native group over another thus resulting in war, they signed a treaty with the nine surrounding tribes – including the Massachusetts (Philbrick 2006: 116). They hoped that this would prevent one of the Native tribes using them as allies in local conflicts.

The way to the crisis

A half year passed in peace, and the colony slowly started to grow. New settlers came in every spring, constantly keeping the population around two hundred people, with a small growth every year. However, in spite of the relative success of the colony, in England the investors were less happy. The colony constantly had a deficit, mostly because the trade with the Natives was not as good as they would have hoped. The settlers still bought mostly extra food from the Natives, instead of starting the fur-trade. They still owed debt for the transportation, so the company decided to get back its money. The leaders of the company, especially Thomas Weston, decided to send some fifty-sixty men to Plymouth. They would have the task to collect furs and sassafras, and cooperate with the settlers of Plymouth.

However, the settlers of Plymouth did not know the plan, and they did not expect the newcomers. It was a serious problem, because the settlers did not count these people when they planted their corn. And, for an unexpected growth, these sixty men were huge in number, compared with the other two hundred inhabitants. At first, it seemed

---

38 BRADFORD 1622: http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/mourt4.html
39 About population see: http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/townpop.html
that there would be no problem. The work of these sixty men made agricultural works and harvesting easier and quicker. After the harvest, the newcomers moved north on the shore and founded Wessagusset colony, some 25 miles away from Plymouth (Philbrick 2006: 140).

Soon, however, it became clear that there would not be enough food in Plymouth for these unexpected newcomers. Settlers of Plymouth accused the new colonists many times with the theft of food.\(^{41}\) When the new settlers left for Wessagusset, they took a certain amount of products from the harvest. We do not know how great the amount of food was, but at the end of the autumn, they ran out. At first, they tried to get some from Plymouth, but the settlers, constantly being on the edge of their supplies, turned them away. Thefts from Plymouth by the Wessagusset settlers reappeared.

Another problem was, that the settlers of Wessagusset quickly found a new food source; a settlement of the Massachusetts tribe, which was close - only a mile away - to the settlement. It was one of the indicators; as others point on it, the temptation is greater, as the accessible food was just in the neighbourhood (Philbrick 2006: 141). And there was another problem; – which is not mentioned in the earlier writings – the settlers had a very different food-acquiring method than the settlers of Plymouth. While the Pilgrims visited nearly a dozen of Native settlements to acquire food\(^{42}\) – through stealing, and later, through trade – the settlers of Wessagusset visited only this Massachusetts village. We do not know the exact amount of the stolen goods, but it is obvious that constantly stealing from one village rather than from nine has greater impact. The Natives quickly realized that their food amount was running out and the nightmare of starvation came into their mind. The primitive agric methods, described earlier, only sustained their needs. The settlers of Plymouth realized at the “Billington-affair” that food-stealing could be dangerous; and, perhaps because of this, tried to get food from more Native settlements, to avoid major impact on the Native’s food-storage.

\(^{41}\) Winslow 1624: http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/goodnews5.html

\(^{42}\) Based on Winslow’s and Bradford’s account.
The conflict and the solution

At December of 1622, the situation of Wessagusset became seriously dangerous. The Natives tried to prevent the settlers to get food from their stores – but starving English settlers continuously tried to steal. The leaders of the Massachusetts said to the settlers that it was highly intolerable, and to try and stop the stealing, or they would. To calm down the Natives and terrify the stealers, the leaders of the colony made a public punishment in the presence of Native chiefs. One man was hanged and others were whipped in public. But hunger proved to be a greater power; sometimes it overwrites moral codes and laws so badly that people are eating dead humans, or they kill each other and eat the victim. Whipping or threatening therefore is not a power which can hold back someone to fight of his hunger through stealing food from someone.

The consequences of the ongoing stealing were two-fold; the first was that some English settlers moved to the Native village, where they started to work for food (Philbrick 2006: 153). The second was a kind of blockade; according to the English sources, the Natives encircled Wessagusset and constantly kept watch to prevent the settlers from leaving the village (Pratt 1662: 3. Carpenter 2004: 69). Soon the settlers were forced to forage for oysters, but some of these oysters were handed to the Natives. Even so, the leader of the village, Phineas Pratt managed to escape, avoiding the Native patrols, and arrived at Plymouth where he presented the unbearable situation (Pratt 1662: 4). He said that the settlers were very weak, on the edge of starvation, and the Natives were planning an attack against them. He asked for immediate support and active intervention from Plymouth; some food and militiamen, in order to avoid starvation and resist a Native attack. However, this was denied by the leaders of Plymouth. They thought that the situation was still solvable through diplomacy, and perhaps on the other hand they did not want to take a risk for

a settlement which had been a source of problems ever since its foundation. The decision of the aggressive actions happened later.

The way to the decision

Here, we must speak about three reasons. At first, the Pilgrims were not so merciful and peaceful as they seemed. Until that time, the Pilgrims avoided violence, because, as some people think, they looked to the Natives as potential Christians, and they were also refugees, who only wanted peace. However, there are a sources that state that Pilgrims were not exactly what they seemed. The writings of Thomas Morton give us a view of the other side of the Pilgrims. Morton was a really interesting figure of the early New England history; his and his settlers’ “extravagant” lifestyle at the neighbour Merrymouth settlement caused many quarrels with the residents of Plymouth. He was banished by the Pilgrims later, and published about his experiences under the title “New English Canaan.” In this work we are met with a different way of thinking about the settler-Native relations. He wrote that the whole situation was a kind of struggle for power, and one group must become the overlord and the other group the subject; and, obviously, the Natives must be the subjects and the English settlers the rulers. He wrote that the English had to avoid a situation where the Natives could feel that the “upper hand” was theirs, and where the English settlers depended on them; a situation like this must be avoided, even through hostilities. And according to Morton, the settlers of Plymouth felt the same (Morton 2011: 77). So if we accept Morton’s view, the settlers, who moved to the Native settlements to work for them for food, became slaves; and the dependency of the English on the Native food supply became clear to the Natives. If they had the same ideas as what Morton described, then this was maybe the point when they thought that the events must be turned. We also have to take into account that maybe news reached the settlements about the events at Jamestown; in 1622, the Natives attacked the settlers, and killed 300 inhabitants. John Smith wrote that one of the reasons for the attack was that the settlement lost its self- sustaining ability because of the
tobacco monoculture, and depended more and more on Natives’ food supply (Kupperman 1988:193–195).

The previous part explains why the Pilgrims were at this time more aggressive towards the Natives than earlier, but as I mentioned before, when Pratt arrived with the news, they refused to help him. It seems that later the Pilgrims got the information from a more trustworthy source. This source, as others state as well, was Massasoit. Massasoit was very ill in the early spring of 1623. He probably got some kind of typhoid, and Edward Winslow gave him treatment. When Massasoit recovered, he told Winslow about the “conspiracy” of the Massachusetts tribe. Massasoit told him that the tribe was planning to attack not only Wessagusset, but Plymouth as well, and they wanted to exterminate all of the English. Did Massasoit tell the truth? It is doubtful because of an earlier episode. In 1621, with the guidance of Squanto, the settlers visited a Massachusetts settlement. There, Squanto tried to convince them to attack the village and take away what they could. The settlers refused, but it shows us that the tribe of Massasoit earlier tried to use the English against the Massachusetts. The situation of Wessagusset gave him an opportunity to depict the Massachusetts as a hostile tribe, and convince the settlers to take actions against them, breaking the power of his old enemies (Philbrick 2006: 149). It seems that the English believed what their oldest and most important ally said, and decided to take the actions against the Massachusetts. Now we only have to clarify why they chose to kill those people; Pecksuot, the chief, seems to be a clear decision; the leader of the tribe would surely be the leader of the conspiracy. But the more symbolic death was given to his war leader, Wittuwamat, who was not only killed, but his head was cut off and taken back to Plymouth, where it was set on a pike before the gate.

A quiet popular answer is a mostly “romantic” episode about vengeance and personal duels. According to this, the “war leader” of the Massachusetts, Wittuwamat, had a quarrel with Miles Standish, the leader of the Plymouth militia (Philbrick 2006: 141. Stratton 1986: 355–358). When Standish was on a visit at another tribe (months
before the events), Wittuwamat arrived and presented to him and the other chief a
knife, which was taken from a killed French sailor of a ship, wrecked some years
earlier on the shore. According to this, the Native told the other chief – but not
Standish – that he killed many “whites” and was able to do it if necessary.44
However, it is hardly acceptable as the only and main reason of the killings. And we
have to mention, that according to Pratt, the Massachusetts’s chief, Pecksuot, was a
friend of the English settlers, and even could speak a little bit of English (Pratt 1662:
2). He hated the French, because they took many of his tribe members as slaves, but
he felt no hostility toward the English settlers – at least not until the beginning of the
stealing (Pratt 1662: 2). And we simply cannot find any evidence that proves that
Wittuwamat hated the English and wanted to kill them. But then why he was killed,
and – which makes his death more important – why was his head cut off and put into
a pike at the gate of Plymouth? The order, to cut off his head and bring it back, was
given to Standish and to the militia before they departed. It can be argued that it was
the common treatment of traitors at that time. But then, why his head was cut off and
not his chief’s? The answer can be found above; Wittuwamat, in the eyes of both the
English and the Natives was a man who was a fearsome warrior, who could kill white
men with a certain ease, and maybe even invulnerability.45 So I think his head was
not cut off because it was the punishment of traitors, as some suggest, or because of
the quarrel with Standish, but to terrify the other Natives with the message: even your
best warrior can be killed easily, so do not try to attack us.

Conclusions and consequences

The aftermath has already been described shortly; Standish and his militia set out to
Wessagusset, where they met with the Native leaders. The Natives were not
suspicous – maybe they did not know that their conspiracy was known by the
settlers, or they were simply innocent, which seems more plausible. The killing was

44 Only mentioned at Winslow’s writting, nobody else have a word about it. see WINSLOW 1624:
http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/goodnews3.html

45 Pratt says that in the eyes of Natives, Wittuwamat is invulnerable, see: PRATT 1662: 5
quick; the Natives were surprised, and according to Morton, they got drunk before getting killed (Morton 2011: 75–76). The Natives took revenge; they killed the three English men who lived with them in the village – the earlier mentioned “slaves”. But after that they quickly fled from the area; the tribe abandoned its early habitats, and moved to swampy, hidden areas, and tried to avoid contact with the settlers in the future. Future impact was that the fur-trading deceased (Philbrick 2006: 154–155). It happened because after the killing – in spite of Standish promising the men at Wessagusset that there would be safety – the settlers of Wessagusset boarded a ship and returned to England, with empty hands and in bad condition (Philbrick 2006: 153. and Carpenter 2004: 71). At first they tried to move to Plymouth, but the leaders did not allow them – so we can derive from that that Plymouth already had enough “hungry mouths to feed.” After their return, the settlers of Plymouth still remained farming people with moderate trade. The events also had a small impact on Plymouth; the food amount, what they got from the Natives became fewer, and they were forced to fishing more than before (Carpenter 2004: 72–75).

Massasoit was also not the winner. Even if he finally got rid of the Massachusetts, his warriors and allies were also terrified by the settlers’ actions. Natives were terrified by the brutality of the settlers, so some of them moved from the area, or became more closely allied. This situation was perfect for the English settlers; with most of the Natives as their allies, they were undisturbed and could establish more and more new villages.

In the end, let us quickly summarize what is our conclusion. At first, there was a relative small population of English settlers, among tribes whose population was around two thousand. The number of inhabitants grew slowly at the first years. The land was able to sustain this population; however, the English settlers depended on the Native food gifts. Later, however, there was a quick increase in the English population with the arriving of the settlers of Wessagusset. The main problems were

---

46 Winslow 1624: http://www.histarch.illinois.edu/plymouth/goodnews5.html
that the settlers were unprepared for the conditions, they had not enough food for so many people, and they had wrong methods about acquiring it from the Natives. At Wessagusset, the settlers used only one village as an extra food source, while earlier the settlers of Plymouth used ten villages. This made an impact on the Natives’ food amount, threatening them with starvation for the winter. When they became more and more hostile because of the continuous stealing, the English felt that the Natives were ready to attack them. However, the final blow was the information of Massasoit about an upcoming attack. When the English were informed by Massasoit, – an enemy of the Massachusetts – they decided to strike. To send a message to the other Natives, they beheaded their best warrior – after killing him and his chief, and many others – and set his head on a pike before the gate of Plymouth. The effects were mixed; on the one hand, the Natives were not hostile for decades, which allowed the settlements to grow. On the other side, the fur trade became less effective, and for a short time, the settlement was barely self-sustaining. But the greatest impact was, that the Natives did not take actions against the English for the next decades, until it was late.
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I. Introduction

“Hitler is an instrument of destiny. He embodies the revolt of Germany against the hard fortune of war [...] Riding forward on this tide, he rules Germany today. Signor Mussolini belongs to a rarer type. He is not the prisoner, nor the instrument, of forces outside himself. He followed no path but his own.” (Churchill, Collier’s Weekly, 1938: 17)

As the future Prime Minister of England, Winston Churchill, sat down to write the article cited above in September 1938, as the two subjects of his reflections were meeting with the current head of the English government, Neville Chamberlain, to sign the now infamous Munich Agreement, resulting in Germany’s annexation of the Czechoslovakian Sudetenland. It was the last attempt to prevent the outbreak of yet another military conflict on European soil, only twenty years after the end of the devastating First World War. At the same time that Chamberlain followed this ultimately futile line of appeasement, Churchill, who would take over as Prime Minister only two years later, was looking back, trying to understand how and why these two men could have established dictatorships in two of Europe’s largest countries.

It might come as a surprise to the contemporary readers hat Churchill rather favourably compares Mussolini to Hitler: A “rarer type” is what he calls the “duce”, not an “instrument of destiny”, but someone who makes his own path. This evaluation contrasts with the picture we now have of Mussolini as Hitler’s “junior partner” (Hansen, 2007: 17) both during the Second World War as well as the holocaust. Churchill, much closer to the actual events and without the knowledge of what was yet to come, naturally has a more neutral perspective on the earlier stages of Hitler’s life.
This is especially true with regards to Hitler’s experience as a soldier in the First World War. His status as a decorated war veteran was one of the key aspects on which the Nazi propaganda built (Sösemann, 2010: 53-76). Hitler himself heavily contributed to the idea of him being an “old soldier”, who remained “calm and collected” (Hitler, 1943: 181) in the face of death and fought bravely for his fatherland, as he lets us know in “Mein Kampf”. And indeed, for the longest time the depiction of Hitler emerging from the war as the up-and-coming leader of the most radical völkisch party of post-war Germany, unrelenting and unbending on his views on anti-Semitism, German nationalism, anti-Marxism and life as a continuous struggle was widely accepted by historiography (Hoeres, 2011: 1). While later parts of his life, like the take-over of the leadership within the NSDAP in 1921 (Tyrell, 1975), have been thoroughly scrutinized, it was only with Thomas Weber’s ground-breaking account on Hitler’s regiment and his experience in the war (Weber, 2011) that 80-year-old beliefs were finally debunked.

But while Weber’s findings shine a much needed light on Hitler’s experience in the war and his relations with his comrades of the List regiment, they fall short on integrating Hitler into the larger fabric of the German society. This essay aims at closing this gap by taking a more detailed look at the society and atmosphere Hitler was subjected to, integrating his experience and choices into the growing agitation and crisis of the Germans in the course of the war. In short: how and why did the atmosphere in Germany during and immediately after the war affect the mind-set and choices of the coming dictator? Let us find out.

**II. Just another Face in the Crowd – Adolf Hitler and the “Spirit of 1914”**

Spirits were high in Germany in the summer of 1914. Following a period of growing escalation in the July Crisis (Clark, 2012), the German government declared war on
Russia and France, prompting the British government to join its allies in the fight against the middle powers, Austro-Hungary, Germany, and their allies. Pitted against three of the five European great powers, the odds, it must have been obvious, were not on the German side. And yet this first chapter of what was to become an all-encompassing four-year struggle with previously unimaginable personal losses as well as economic costs, has remained a fond memory in the mind of many Germans.

Retrospectively dubbed as the “Spirit of 1914”, the month following the outbreak of the war was hailed as a precious moment of national unity, bringing about a (temporary) end to the class and political struggle in the face of a common threat in August 1914. This idealized narrative, ignoring the numerous anti-war demonstrations taking place at the exact same time (Verhey, 2000: 227-260), was accepted from all sides of the political spectrum and became synonymous with a desirable state of social peace and national unity. The “Burgfrieden” among all the parties in the German Reichstag, which unanimously agreeing to budget changes in favour of war debts, fed into this idea, as did the spontaneous patriotic rallies taking place in various German towns (Kershaw, 1998: 88).
The iconic picture of Adolf Hitler attending a patriotic rally on the Leopoldplatz in Munich, August 2nd 1914 (Süddeutsche Zeitung Photo [URL: http://polpix.sueddeutsche.com/polopoly_fs/1.2069627.1407065564!/httpImage/image.jpg_gen/derivatives/860x860/image.jpg] Last access: 17.10.2014)

The iconic picture of Adolf Hitler cheering at the declaration of war against Russia during a patriotic rally in Munich on August 2nd 1914 has become a prominent part of the myths and half-truths surrounding the month following Germany’s declarations of war. It should therefore not come as a surprise that – as has been convincingly laid out by recent research – Hitler’s prominent forehead was only later edited into the photograph, in a successful attempt by the Nazi propaganda machine to profit off of the popular ideas of national unity synonymous with the “Spirit of 1914” (Weber, 2011: 30f). And yet, the picture also holds a grain of truth when it comes to Hitler’s very real enthusiasm at the outbreak of the war.

Growing up in an Austrian province on the Bavarian border, Hitler had held an unfettered admiration for the German Reich - the “great German Motherland” (Hitler,
1943: 1) – since childhood and soon became an ardent follower of pan-German Austrian writers such as Georg Ritter Freiherr von Schönerer (Kershaw, 1998: 81). The circumstances surrounding his eventual move to what in his eyes constituted the promised land, however, were somewhat less grandiose. Having failed to attend the compulsory military service in the Austrian army in 1909, 24-year-old Hitler was on the run from the Austrian conscription department when he settled down in Munich in the summer of 1913. Despite his pan-German predisposition Hitler portrayed no inkling to become politically active and rather claimed to pursue a career as an architectural painter, though seemingly both without success or energy for that matter (Kershaw, 1998: 83). The opinions that he held were quite typical for the radical nationalist groups organized in large mass organizations like the Pan-German League, and yet Hitler did not join. As he had in Austria, Hitler seemed content to live below the radar, seemingly without any interest of becoming politically active, and might have continued this way if the war had not come along.

When it did, Hitler was among the first to join the German army in mid-August, the ongoing investigation from the Austrian authorities concerning him and obvious lack of a German passport somehow escaped the attention of the German conscription office in Munich (Kershaw, 1998: 90). His regiment, the 16th Bavarian “Reserve-Infanterie-Regiment List” (RIR 16), left for France a few weeks later to join the “heroic fight of our people”, where Hitler allegedly experienced “best time of his life” (Hitler, 1943: 179). At least this is how he chose to remember the following four years in the biographical part of “Mein Kampf” ten years later.

What actually happened amounts to a less heroic story but which may be quite a bit more relatable. First of all, Hitler spent the least of his time fighting on the frontline (Weber, 2011: 125-145). Hitler’s actual assignment as a messenger in the regiment’s headquarters, which he held from November 1914 until the end of the war, is never mentioned in “Mein Kampf” (Weber, 2011: 75). While not entirely out of danger, this occupation kept him in close proximity to the regiment’s headquarters, located a
couple of miles off the frontline and therefore mostly out of the direct line of fire (Weber, 2011: 126). Even the war decoration Hitler received in 1916, allegedly for fighting and capturing four English soldiers on his own, probably had a lot more to do with his close personal contact with the officers of his regiment than actual bravery on the frontline (Weber, 2011: 132f). One might have been tipped off by his unusually vague and short account of the next four years: “And so it continued year after year […]” (Hitler, 851-855 1943: 181), which is all we get in “Mein Kampf”.

When Hitler finally did end up in the line of fire during the last months of the war, it did not lead to him embracing the ideology of struggle and violence but rather to a nervous breakdown with a psychologically induced blindness rendering him unfit for fighting (Weber, 2011: 294f). He was sent to the psychiatric department of the Pasewalk hospital near Berlin, where he experienced the end of the war with the German lay down of arms on the 11th of November – “horrific days” (Hitler, 851-855 1943: 225), as he would describe them later. And at least on this occasion one is quite tempted to believe him: The failure of the previously idealized German state surely must have been a crushing experience, possibly one of the few actual true accounts in “Mein Kampf” (Hitler, 851-855 1943: 223f).

It is followed up by the one of least truthful passages of all: Hitler’s experience in the chaotic first months after the war (Hitler, 851-855 1943: 226). Until very recently his own version of this story has been accepted and retold by historiography: Hitler emerged from the war as the up-and-coming confident leader of the nationalistic, anti-Marxist, and anti-Semitic forces in the German Reich, ready to go out and indoctrinate the frustrated masses (Kershaw, 1998: 59f, 104). But from what we have learned about his character so far, we might find this origin story slightly too good to be true. Especially as it fits in exceedingly well with the ideal portrayal of the war within the ranks of the völkisch movement which Hitler had become a part of by the time he wrote “Mein Kampf”: It is the idea of the war as the great educator, hailing in the true calling and rebirth of the German people, uniting them in a sacred
“Frontgemeinschaft” (front community) (Der Ring, no. 34, 1919: 5f, in: Mohler/Weissmann, 2005: 29, 91). So instead of taking Hitler’s own account on face value, we might want to take a look at what was actually going on in Germany at the time.

III. Taking about a Revolution – Adolf Hitler and The Socialist Temptation

If one were to look for a turning point in the still largely optimistic mood at the beginning of the war – in its first year supported by huge advances on the Eastern front – it would be the year 1916. Even before the entry of the US army by joining the opposite side and ultimately deciding the outcome of the war, thus tipping the scale for the Anti-German allies, frustration was notably growing, especially in the German cities (Nipperdey, 1993: 856). Already these sentiments were finding an outlet in street fights and demonstrations, the latter were at first only protesting the shortages in food supplies but soon also taking on a political undertone (Feldman, 1993: 63; Nipperdey, 1993: 855-858, 876). Both tendencies were to cause a rift in the fabric of the German society that would only grow the longer the war went on. City dwellers accused farmers of holding back food supplies and black markets were popping up throughout the state, installed because the state-organized food supply system was from the start insufficient. Meanwhile rumours and accusations spread that Jewish merchants were making huge profits off the misery of the German people (Feldman, 1993: 61, 77). Anti-Semitism in general was on the rise following the army’s “Judenzählung” in 1916, counting all the Jewish Germans in the armed forces. The result of the study, which would have shown an over proportional number of Jews in the German army, were never published and instead led to accusations of “Drückebergerei” (cowardice) from various anti-semitic pressure groups (Lohalm, 1970: 73).

While the War Department for Food Supplies still believed the ubiquitous suffering would unite the people instead of increasing social conflicts (Feldman, 1993: 64f), the fragile political peace of 1914, the “Burgfrieden”, came under attack from the radical left (Kolb, 2013: 10f). The workers’ short alliance with the state and
government was questioned after the worsening of conditions in the German Reich, mostly due to the state’s concentration of industry and resources on fighting the war abroad instead of feeding its people at home. Instead, the newly founded, radical left party “USPD” sought to build an international alliance of workers to end the war as well as the capitalistic system which was believed to have caused the war in the first place (Kolb, 2013: 10).

Things finally came to a head on the 29th September of 1918, when the Supreme Army Command reached out to the American president Woodrow Wilson to negotiate conditions for a lay down of arms from the German side (Kolb, 2013: 3). The public was shocked. The optimistic war propaganda it had been fed until this very month had still promised a glorious victory to make up for the suffering and losses the people had endured (Feldman, 1993: 86). What followed was an ubiquitous break down of moral, with revolutionary Workers' and Soldiers' Councils springing up all around the country, taking over city governments and even entire states. Soon after, the abdication of Wilhelm II ushered in the end of the monarchy and made way for the proclamation of the second German Republic on the 9th of November (Kolb, 2013: 7). Two days later the unconditional surrender of the German army finally put an end to the war.

It did not, however, put an end to violence. Instead, many Germans must have felt like the first months of the German Republic brought the war back home (Evans, 2003: 72). The radical socialist Workers' Councils protested against what they felt to be an unfinished revolution, as it kept the capitalist system in place, and even arranged itself with the heads of the army and administration (Kolb, 2013: 7-15). Moreover, the still catastrophic food shortages contributed to the general chaos. In 1919 alone, authorities counted 117 hunger strikes in Berlin, as well as six large demonstrations with an explicit political motivation, rallying up to 400,000 participants altogether (Wirsching, 1999: 89). The growing fear of a second
revolution, echoing the October Revolution in Russia, were spreading and further separating the German people along political lines.

Those fears had already come true in the Bavarian capital of Munich. Two days before the proclamation of the German republic in Berlin, the USPD politician Kurt Eisner declared the Bavarian king as abdicated and declared himself the head of the new Socialist government. Into these chaotic circumstances stumbled the war veteran Adolf Hitler, who returned to Munich in December in search of his comrades of the List regiment (Weber, 2011: 303). But instead of fighting the new government or just laying low for a while, as he claimed in “Mein Kampf” (Hitler, 851-855 1943:226), Hitler joined and supported the revolutionary movement. In retrospect, given all our knowledge about his career as an anti-Marxist, anti-Semitic demagogue, this decision is simply baffling.
Adolf Hitler (indicated) attending the burial of Kurt Eisner, the murdered leader of the Bavarian Communist Party in Munich in 1919. He can be seen wearing a red wrist band as a symbol of his membership in the Communist party. (Historisches Lexikon Bayerns: "Beisetzung Kurt Eisners, München, 26. Februar 1919", http://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/document/artikel_44676_bilder_value_6_beisetzung-eisners3.jpg, Letzter Zugriff am 24.03.2013.)

When we look at Hitler not from what we know he was going to become but what he was at this moment: a part of the profoundly confused and scared German society, trying to find their place in a country they did not recognize (Weber, 2011: 332). And while we might never know for sure what was going on in Hitler’s mind at the time, it seems worthwhile to bring forth some of the more likely assumptions.

First of all, it seems only logical to assume that Hitler, at least to some extent, was pragmatically adapting to the new situation, hanging his head in the wind, as he had
done in the years prior to the war. At the same time, the profound disillusionment, which followed the defeat of the old Kaiserreich, might have made him question or amend his long-held pan-German believes. This assumption becomes more likely when we acknowledge that Eisner did not plan for the abolition of the German state as such but rather sought to address social problems and improve the position of the working class within a national framework (Weber, 2011: 335). This mixture of social and national aspects of Eisner’s program might actually have agreed with Hitler.

It should also be noted that in the first couple of months following the founding of the Weimar Republic, an overwhelming consent with the new state and its liberal-democratic government was expressed by the German people. The elections to the National Assembly in January 1919 brought about the new founded Weimar coalition a gratifying 72.4% of votes (Kershaw 1990: Appendix Table I). Along with the majority of the German people Hitler might have just decided to give the young Republic a chance.

And yet, Hitler was just as quick to denounce these newfound loyalties. By April 1919 the moderate Socialist government had been replaced by a Bolshevik-style Council Republic, whose short reign was ended by the military intervention of the German army in May 1919. The high number of casualties on both sides only contributed to the growing hatred and fear of the Marxist revolutionaries. And while the leaders of the revolution faced death and life-long sentences, Hitler found himself re-employed into the services of the army, ironically now tasked with finding socialist spies in the ranks of the army (Weber, 2011: 338). His new occupation would soon also include following the activities of local radical nationalist organizations including the “Deutsche Arbeiter Partei” (German Workers Party) which he joined in September 1919.

Once again we scratch our heads in confusion at our ever-changing protagonist. And while this turned out to be the last in line of his ideological detours, it once again asks
for an explanation. And yet again we might find it by taking a closer look at the prevalent atmosphere in the newly founded German Republic.

IV. The Rise of the Völkisch Movement

While the first German revolution in November 1918 found approval in the eyes of many Germans as we have seen earlier, the thought of a second revolution after the Russian example – including the end of private property and the abolishment of the state – found a lot less support. Especially the German bourgeoisie was on the brink of panic when mass demonstrations continued well into the second half of 1919 and Kurt Eisner’s assassination prompted the erection of an outright Bavarian Soviet Republic by April 1919 (Jacob, 2010: 63-82). The Communist threat seemed more real than ever (Weber, 2011: 329). The liberal-democratic government led by Friedrich Ebert was still struggling whether or not to use military force against their socialist comrades and therefore was deemed unable in the eyes of many to prevent this revolution from spreading throughout the country.

This presented an opportunity for another group that was less indecisive. The “völkische Bewegung” (völkisch movement), a radical nationalist, racist, and anti-Semitic movement compiled of a vast array of different organizations and counting about 10,000 members before 1914 (Puschner, 2003: 446, 460), used the heat of the moment to start an anti-Marxist propaganda campaign built on the so-called “Dolchstoßlegende”. This widely popular myth equated the anti-War demonstrations taking place in Germany and the Revolution of 1918 with a “stab in the back” of the German army which only lost the fight due to this lack of support from the “home front”. This myth was originally crafted by the German military leaders trying to shift the blame for the defeat to the socialist parties and had already gathered a huge following, on which the völkisch ideology could build (Tyrell, 1975: 21; Feldman, 1993: 84). By claiming that the German defeat was part of a world-wide conspiracy masterminded by the international Jewry to reach world domination, the völkisch
radicalists successfully integrated their anti-Semitic prejudice into the “Dolchstoßlegende” (Lohalm, 1970: 73). This was facilitated by the unfortunate fact that Kurt Eisner as well as leading figures in the Russian Revolution were in fact Jewish by religion (Weber, 2011: 329).

The same anti-Socialist and anti-Semitic conspiracy theories had failed to take hold with the public before the war (Lohalm, 1970: 45), but now they fell on fertile ground. As we have seen, anti-Semitism had grown in the wake of the accusations of Jewish merchants profiting from the war, fitting only too well into the völkisch narrative (Lohalm, 1970: 73-75). All in all, the völkisch right had managed to offer an attractive explanation for the on-going crisis and confusion after the war and pointed out a scape-goat that had made it possible to ignore the uncomfortable truth: by 1918 the German army was far outnumbered, the state had reached the end of its economic capabilities, and the population was slowly starving. All of these problems were either home-made – like the disastrous decision to finance the war exclusively by war bonds (Feldman, 1993: 38) – or a product of the stubborn refusal of the General Army Headquarters to end the war when it was clear that defeat was inevitable. The Jewish population, as we have seen was strongly represented in the army and suffered losses like any other German families, had nothing to do with the defeat.

And yet, supported by a massive propaganda campaign, the year 1919 marked the turning point for the völkisch movement which had struggled with censorship and paper shortages during the war (Breuer, 2008: 149f). Soon its organizations reached and exceeded the public support and membership numbers they held before 1914 (Puschner, 2003: 460). Their new founded organizations and parties soon grew into a threat to the new Republic, far succeeding the danger from the radical left (Jasper, 1982: 171f). It was at this point that Adolf Hitler chose to switch sides and join one of the new upstarts: The German Workers Party, founded by the railway engineer Anton Drexler in February 1919 and secretly backed by the Thule-Gesellschaft, an elitist völkisch group seeking to rally the working population to their cause (Large,
It is not without irony that this was the exact same organization responsible for the murder of Kurt Eisner, the USPD leader whose burial Hitler attended only a few months earlier.

V. Conclusion

The rest of the story is well-known and can only be summarized shortly. One year later, at Hitler’s request, the German Worker’s Party was renamed to National Socialist German Workers Party, the NSDAP. The founder, Anton Drexler, withdrew as chairman in 1921 and ceded all authority to Hitler (Tyrell, 1975: 125-131). And while the road to power, especially against competing voices within the party, was not as smooth and easy as “Mein Kampf” would later have us believe (Bräuniger, 2004: 61-65), it seems very much straight compared to the winding voyage through the whole political landscape of post-war Germany which Hitler undertook in 1919.

This brings us back to Churchill’s early evaluation of Hitler’s character: An “instrument of destiny” (Churchill, Collier’s Weekly, 1938: 17), we remember, is what he called the “Führer” – the embodiment of the German frustration and anger after the lost war. Before taking on this role, however, Hitler also shared the overwhelming and yet anxious joy at the outbreak of the war, the profound disillusionment and confusion of the German people, overwhelmed by the monumental changes posed by revolution and defeat in 1918, and finally the growing anti-Marxist and anti-Semitic sentiment, in its most radical form uttered by the völkisch movement from 1919 onwards (Mommsen, 2003: 67-72). Unquestionably, the lines of Hitler and the German people were intimately crossed long before he became their Chancellor in 1933.

Nevertheless, it would be quite misleading to understand Hitler as a political chameleon; seamlessly adapting to whatever surroundings he was put into (Kershaw, 2000: 72). As we have seen, he was not a blank slate before volunteering to fight in the German army. Upon his move to Munich, Hitler already held a pan-German disposition that was in some ways similar to that of the völkisch movement, at least in
their nationalistic outreach (Kershaw, 1998: 150). This is quite possibly the reason why, when he did come across the German Workers Party in 1919, he decided to stay for good.

In the end we can quite confidently say: it was not the war itself that created the “Führer” Adolf Hitler. It was a combination of his own personal disposition and the imprint left by the mentalities of the German society in 1918 and 1919 that set him upon his path. In its wake Hitler would take over the leadership of the völkisch right and ultimately the German state in its entirety. By that time, his perceptiveness and ability to channel mentalities had turned into his greatest strengths. More than anything else, they explain his staggering rise from soldier to the dictator in a mere fourteen years.
Bibliography

I. Primary Sources


Hitler, Adolf (1938-1943) *Mein Kampf*, Eher-Verlag, München.

II. Literature


This paper looks at various nations that participated in World War I and how they remember, commemorate, or forget (intentionally or unintentionally) their involvement in the conflict. It is interesting to note the differences among the ‘winners’ and how they affect nations’ reactions and historiography of the war. Primary sources and historiography will be examined to see how various European nations and the United States choose to commemorate the world’s first war.

I: Introduction

The Great War has been researched now for literally one hundred years, and yet, historians are still trying to piece together the complexities of the struggle. How was the war won; what novel technological advances were introduced; was the Great War truly the first war to rightfully receive the name ‘total war?’ (Chickering, 2004: 10-300) The list of questions has filled scores of books and has been the focus of many scholarly articles. However, what has ironically been left in the shadows is the memory of the Great War itself. “The sheer quantity of writing about the war in the decades [following the conflict] evinces the need to remember and by remembering, come to terms with the traumatic event.” (Wurtz, 2009: 211) How do people commemorate the conflict? Is it perceived in the United States as a happy memory because they won? Is it taught and written through an experience of guilt, shame, and melancholy in New Zealand because of the sheer number of seemingly trivial casualties? Or is it repressed and concealed from the public eye? (Siegel and Harjes, 2012: 370-403; Petrone, 2011; Fussell, 1975) The commemoration of the war depends on a variety of factors but none as important as the nation itself. Said another way, “National identity and [sic] honour depend upon the recitation of selective histories (Bourke, 2004: 474; Mayo, 1988:73).” The identity of the participants plays a monumental role in determining how the history is written, because without a unified set of beliefs, the story could be apathetic and brief, while with an identity present, the story could be heroic and valiant. In the words of Leonard Smith, “Memory clearly has demonstrable cultural, political, social, and economic
significance (Smith, 2001: 244).” The stories of the Great War continue to unravel themselves more and more each year, yet the collective memory remains a seemingly unknown, ever-changing opaque variable that continues to pique historians’ interest in the first war of the world.

Simply put, there are many ways to remember a war. Some veterans decided to leave behind valuable, personal memoirs. However, “not all veterans wish to write about their experience. Many, in fact, prefer not to talk about it and, it would seem, even think about it as little as possible (Smith, 2001: 248).” Despite these feelings, some feel the need that the story needs to be known, so they emerge from the shadows much later and recount their stories. As Belinda Davis would argue, experience and identity are two of the major reasons why national governments decide to build monuments, preserve cemeteries of the fallen, and open the battlefields to the public so we can only begin to understand the horrors and struggles of the conflict. However, when a nation decides to confront its past, “battlefront, home front, and even any combination thereof do not comprise the full range of wartime experiences (Davis, 2003: 118).” These efforts to commemorate the Great War are done with respect in some countries, blown out of proportion in others, and in a small contingent of nations, it is a clearly contrived effort (Trumpeter, 2000: 1096). The irony of memory is that even the winners do not always enjoy facing the past reality, and thus occasionally make their history more nationalistic and better-sounding to conjure up a sense of modern patriotism. These curtains of deceit and disillusionment affect every country under study here, but is most notable in France (Shapiro, 1997: 111-130).

II: France

France was arguably one of the most influential powers in World War One. Several battles, including the battles of the Somme and Verdun, were decisive moments which required hundreds of thousands of men and heavy artillery to fend off the Central Powers. The driving force behind the Entente, France joined the
conflict shortly after Belgium was overrun and invaded by the German Empire [Reich in English is traditionally linked to the Third Reich, Empire is generally used as metaphor for the pre-Nazi Reich](Meyer, 2007). The alliance soon succeeded in including England and Russia, and the Allies were thus able to create a formidable defense against the Central Powers. After four long and tough years battling on the Western and Eastern Fronts, the Allies won but France still felt as though there was a void, even in victory. This empty blackness soon crept into its education. Though rather patriotic and unified with a certain set of heterogeneous qualities, the French teachings of history had always been missing a so-called ‘it’ factor (Shapiro, 1997: 111-116). In other words, after the Great War, “[There] was a crisis of historical thinking . . . seeming to unravel dominant beliefs about French national identity and the legacy of French history. While France did emerge victorious . . . an anguished reexamination [was needed] . . . of the specific history that ought to be taught (Shapiro, 1997: 117).” The compulsion to re-teach the history of war was primarily driven by a small band of veterans, yet why was it needed? France felt that the enormous loss of men in the conflict prompted an overhaul in primary and secondary education (Doughty, 2008: 1,2,28,45,66,75,134,143,149,165,201,209,267,284,309,310,354).

France commenced her educational overhaul on how her citizens should understand and remember the Great War. Textbooks of that era presented their own views of the events leading to the war, and concluded that the crisis in the Balkans was entirely the fault of the Germans (Siegel and Harjes, 2012: 376). The blame game continued to be hotly debated throughout the years, but like most accounts of history, it is often written by those who won and their attempt to answer the following: who instigated it all? The historian Ann-Louise Shapiro elaborates on this history of the historiography recorded in her article *Fixing History: Narratives of World War I in France*. Shapiro argues that France tried in earnest to find the right language to explain the invasion of Belgium, but tensions became heated and bias appeared frequently, hence, such efforts for an objective account failed. The reason
for the war’s origin that prevailed was that Germany wanted to exert her power in an attempt to dominate the world (Fischer, 1967; Shapiro, 2012: 119-120). In the public Allied eye, with little to disprove such a thesis, the argument became a pillar of modern historical knowledge until an influx of sources appeared on the Great War, contradicting these views. However, in the 1920’s and 1930’s, many French war veterans supported this view and added their own stories about how ruthlessly Germans had treated their Belgian neighbors. The first signs of pride came from a poem entitled *La Joie*. The poem expresses joy at victory and taunts the Germans. “A jealous man is a despicable man . . . I thought that William would devour us . . . All the Allies have covered themselves in glory, yes that is a pretty sight (Jennings, 1998: 570-571).” This poem highlights the range of memories in French society. Some recollections were open and jubilant, while other chapters remained closed in the minds and souls of the participants. Regardless of form, there was an attempt to formulate an agreeable consensus that could satisfy as many veterans as possible (Bourke, 2004: 477). Despite the ubiquity of subjectivity in French history books, finding collective pride in such a costly conflict was rather difficult to find, and when discovered, it was oftentimes quite conflicted.

In the same time periods referenced above, France simultaneously experienced a nationwide mourning about the events that transpired on the battlefields. “The cost of the war in material destruction and in human lives was simply too high to justify triumphant remembrance (Siegel and Harjes, 2012: 377; Doughty, 2008).” Keeping spirits high and sanguine after the loss of hundreds of thousands of men was rather difficult because they, too, had killed thousands of men, but they emerged as victors – and were “rewarded for it (Bourke, 2004: 477).” The memories of some soldiers became dark, repressed, and generally unseen by the public because the citizens as a whole experienced feelings of jubilation; since, after all, they won an extremely arduous war. Throughout the decades, the French and Germans have collaborated on how the history of the war should be written for students, and they made little headway. In addition to Franco-German problems, French historians had trouble
confronting their own history with the number of men lost in the Pyrrhic victories at Verdun and Somme. Tensions remained high and attitudes were remorseful, and after the first revision of the textbooks, they could only come to agreeable terms on the path that led to war, excluding Sarajevo, and what happened after the Armistice (Siegel and Harjes, 2012: 380-385). As a result, the history taught in the years leading to World War II was widely considered to be inaccurate, misleading, and in some instances, fiction (Shapiro, 1997: 129).

Given the subject matter, the textbook debates could not have been more fitting: many ended in little to no progress, just like many battles in the Great War. Realizing this, some teachers diverted from the main controversial topics and focused on other ways to remember the fallen. The easiest consensus reached was the needed erection of war memorials. These memorials can serve many purposes, aside from a novel form of visual aesthetic that serves to help the average man remember. In James Mayo’s article *War Memorials as Political Memory*, the various forms and functions are discussed. For example, “shrines and commemorative rituals are war memorials that emphasize sacredness . . . A nation can commemorate the persons who fought its wars . . . Governmental support and dedication of all monuments clearly convey honor . . . War memorials can purport identity, service, honor, and humanitarianism (Mayo, 1988: 63-67).” Mayo would argue that in doing proper justice to those who served, a country can feel a sense of pride amidst the feelings of guilt and sadness. The French have done a considerable job trying to keep the memory of World War I alive and well. Battlefield tours are commonplace; historiography is active and frequent; and memorials serve their purpose. They exhume a majestic yet reserved feeling, and are filled with the unspoken reverence necessary for the loss of men (Mayo, 1988: 66). The lines between ignoring, remembering, and extravagance are very blurry and hard to define. Consequently, countries have a difficult time in attempting to achieve this intangible equilibrium. For some countries involved, the process does not matter because the memory still
haunts them now as much as it did during the conflict. A prime example of this is in Russia.

III: Russia

Karen Petrone discusses that for Russia the memory of the Great War has been literally buried into the ground, and that not much has resurfaced since the Russian Revolution (Petrone, 2011: 1-6). She does concede that such an action is abnormal: “As the successor state to the Russian empire, the Soviet Union was unique among the combatants in the virtual absence of public commemoration of World War I at the level of the state, community, and civic organizations, or even individual mourning (Petrone, 2011: 5; Cohen, 2003: 70, 72).” None of the official days of the war are celebrated either. If this is the case, where can Russia find closure for one of the most cataclysmic events of the twentieth century? How can this immense chapter of modern history be explored? Russia’s experience of the Great War was difficult and filled with suffering because of the war itself and their own revolution in 1917.

As stated in Mayo’s article War Memorials, “strengths and weaknesses of a society are demonstrated in war, and these qualities are often mirrored in the memorials to its wars (Mayo, 1988: 62).” Mayo’s insight summarizes the past and present Soviet attitudes regarding the Great War. Although it was a key player for the Allies on the Eastern Front, Russia had a war on another front: the home front. The Russian Revolution occurred in 1917, right during the military climax of the war. Orlando Figes called the revolution a people’s tragedy, and indeed it was – it complicated everything for the Russians from mobilization of troops to attempts for remembrance afterwards. “In the chaos of revolution and civil war, it became virtually impossible to bring home the bodies of the dead, and millions of families were denied this comfort. In Europe, local war monuments served as physical spaces to mourn the dead who could not be recovered. Such monuments did not exist in the Soviet Union, denying Soviet citizens both spiritual and material processes of
mourning (Petrone, 2011: 42).” However, there was one public site of remembrance created, and that was the Moscow cemetery.

The site chosen was rather large and in the heart of the capital city of Moscow. Its goals were simple: boost patriotism, enlist more men to take up arms against the Axis powers, and remember the dead. It also had deep religious undertones, suggesting that people should sacrifice themselves for the motherland, just as Jesus had sacrificed himself for the good of mankind. For a while, this idea proved to be successful. The municipal governments established a regular train schedule for people to see the graves of the fallen and to bring together the citizenry on a wide-ranging national level. After the completion of the cemetery, people looked for more avenues to remember the war, such as the construction of a museum, but this never materialized. Instead of public displays of remembrance, the war had turned into something rarely discussed openly and became an event that was only described in private print forms with the rise of memoirs, literature, and poetry on the horrors and war experiences on the front.

Similar to France, Russia emerged from the war victorious, but the number of casualties combined with an uncertain future following their civil war left them confused and feeling hollow. Because of these feelings, private writings emerged in great numbers from veterans and the generations that followed. “Soviet representations of wartime killing, raping, and marauding during World War I revealed the toll that violence took on the perpetrators as well as the victims (Petrone, 2011: 18, 20).” Although the aforementioned quote paints a grisly image of the events of war, Russians tried their best to make the Great War seem like a positive, triumphant success – an actual victory as opposed to a victory which had been acquired through shameful and brutal means (Cohen, 2003: 71-74). The Russians never experienced the nationwide ‘collective memory’ phenomenon that most other countries in the Great War had or have already undergone. Alan Confino describes the intangible effect of how this can either enhance or destroy a nation’s morale and how it approaches sensitive subjects like war. “Collective memory is an exploration
of a shared identity that unites a social group, be it a family or a nation, whose members nonetheless have different interests and motivations. And of the fact that the crucial issue in the history of memory is not how a past is represented but why it was received or rejected. For every society sets up images of the past (Confino, 1997: 1390).” Confino’s last idea is very important for understanding the Russian mindset because most images and representations of the Great War have appeared in literary forms rather than historiography.

One of the most prominent examples of veterans’ remembrance came in the form of short songs and poetry. Many of these contained graphic details about the war experience, ranging from depictions of people dying via bayonet to various limbs dispersed on the battlefield. They also alluded to the arduousness of the struggle and how myriad men died to win back or defend a little chunk of land (Rayfield, 1988: 70, 88). The thoughts and ideas highlighted in these songs also contained patriotic ideals among the horrors and ubiquitous death on the front. Some examples of the lyrics read as follows: “dying for the motherland . . . soldiers’ heads falling off their soldiers . . . get up you widow, there are strangers . . . leading your husband’s black horse . . . You armies of Germany, may God’s might rage with you (Rayfield, 1988: 70,88).” As the war wore on, death was seen as imminent and was ultimately accepted as the only result that could come of the conflict. Russian letters written back home to families and wives gave instructions to not mourn their loved ones’ death and to move on with their daily lives. Death in combat was expected by the soldiers who often wondered who was going to bury them, if anybody. Most of these thoughts became popular and commonplace through World War 1 literature and memoirs but especially after the publishing of All Quiet on the Western Front (Krimmer, 2010).

Erich von Remarque’s book All Quiet on the Western Front was very well received in Russia and many veterans gave laudable commentary.

“In a 1931 letter, a Soviet veteran wrote: ‘Finally I am satisfied that I found a person who recounted to the world the suffering, the torments of the gray trench soldier of the 1914–1918 war. . . . [Remarque] has become valuable not
only to me, but I think to the million-strong mass of frontline soldiers whom he reminded about the horrors of the meat-grinder of the human body.’ Another Russian veteran stated that the novel made him ‘live through the war a second time,’ and a younger writer acknowledged that the book confirmed his father’s war stories. The World War I veterans living in the Soviet Union were paradoxically grateful to Remarque for reminding them of the horrors that they had experienced (Petrone, 2011: 232).

Soon after the book’s publication, the number of World War I novels and memoirs skyrocketed everywhere but especially in Russia (Wurtz, 2009: 212). However, one has to be careful when reading fictitious accounts of war because they can be misleading and glorify horrible things, and this can lead to a corrupted view of the war. Such was the case everywhere, but memoirs in other nations quickly reversed that trend; in Russia, however, veterans didn’t attempt to correct the mistakes and hyperboles in the fiction. Because of this inaction, the real story of the Russian war is relatively unknown and buried with those who fought in it. This scenario is the complete antithesis of what Mayo argues should be done to preserve the spirit of a terrible conflict (Mayo, 1988). Consequently, the Great War is a huge gap in the knowledge of the Russians. Aaron Cohen provides the details:

“Individual Russians today scarcely remember World War I as an important event in modern history. In a recent poll, 23 percent of 1,500 people questioned cited World War II as the "event of the century," 9 percent named the flight of Jurii Gagarin, and another 9 percent the revolution of 1917, whereas World War I was not mentioned (although 3 percent did suggest the creation of the internet and 1 percent the 2000 U.S. elections). Even when Catherine Merridale asked Russians in personal interviews to name the three most deadly wars in the twentieth century, almost no one thought of World War I, and her prompting about the conflict that killed almost two million Russian people elicited expressions of surprise - ‘Oh, that!’” (Cohen, 2003: 82-84)

These numbers reveal the troubling reality of the Russians coming to terms with World War I and its aftermath. However, in contrast, Australia and New Zealand remember the war like it happened yesterday and commemorate it respectfully and as often as possible.
IV: Australia and New Zealand (ANZAC)

The ANZAC armies in the Great War endured much suffering, loss, and hardship on and off the battlefield. They were sent in thousands to the Gallipoli coast and the battlefields of the Somme and faced death much more frequently than their Allied counterparts (Meyer, 2007; Hart, 2010; Hart, 2011). The loss of men was ubiquitous for every country, but given the population of these two countries, the war affected their postwar demographics more profoundly. Despite these facts, Australia and New Zealand have a collective sense of pride in the way their men fought. Fighting in the Great War was perceived as valiant and heroic, and because of this, the Great War is remembered and celebrated as an achievement that helped Australia and New Zealand earn their place in the modern world. It wasn’t too long before the outbreak of the war that these countries were under British control and had large pockets of aborigine tribes. Leonard Smith provides an important note about memory as it pertains to the aforesaid countries, “By definition [memory is] constructed rather than absolute and fixed, and often carefully managed by public authority, memory leaves a long paper trail behind [in the form of private documents or memoirs]. It also leaves behind large physical structures such as monuments. Memory clearly has demonstrable cultural, political, social, and economic significance (Smith, 2001; Fussell, 1975: 244).” All of the facets listed above are commonplace in these countries and in other Allied nations such as France, and writing of their men has filled scores of books and personal memoirs. Why then do these countries celebrate these war days triumphantly despite great losses, while Russia, an ally to the ANZAC troops and the Entente in general, tries to forget it ever happened? (Petrone, 2011) The answer is not as clear cut as people may think; the joy is subdued; but the memory is well-preserved and alive.

One of the most well-known Oceanic public holidays is called ANZAC Day. Held on the 25th of April each year, ANZAC Day remembers the fallen and pays tribute not only to the men who served from these countries, but also to all the victims of the war. April 25th marks the day that the troops stormed the Gallipoli
beaches, and it also marks the day they pushed back the German advance on Amiens exactly three years later in 1918 (Stevenson, 2011; Hart, 2011). This day has been celebrated since 1919, and it brings the nations closer to each another because their days on the front helped establish their place in the world. With all of the anguish and bloodshed in the war, it is no surprise that it took time for veterans to come to terms with the horrors experienced in battle. The first private papers and thoughts on the Great War appeared in New Zealand in the late 1920’s and early 1930’s, with Australia following suit a few years later. Veterans in New Zealand, however, were somewhat reluctant to discuss the war and in some cases, wished that it had never happened (Jones, 2007: 67). This underscores a key difference between the mentality of the Russian and New Zealand veterans. Neither wished the war had happened, but while Russians suppressed the memory, New Zealanders were somewhat more open to efforts to understand the nature of the conflict.

The growth of World War I poetry and other forms of literature peaked in the midst of the global depression. “New Zealand's real literature of World War I appeared in the second half of the 1930s, in a group of works all written from the left, [sic] coloured by pacifism and the tendency to view the military as a great [sic] dehumanising machine that was the end point of capitalism . . . (Jones, 2007: 68)” These themes, i.e. pacifism and war is evil, are commonplace in postwar memoirs. Many soldiers became mentally unstable after the war and suffered from then-unknown Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and became peace-seekers in life. There are numerous accounts from well-known veterans such as American Paul Fussell to German Ernst Jünger that illustrate this trend. Another common theme found in New Zealand personal papers discusses how the men wish that they had never taken up arms, fought, and killed, because many of them were merely teenagers and the experience was traumatizing for everyone, especially for a seventeen year old boy (Harrison and Crane, 2014; Sheftall, 2009). The literature that emerged later on morphed into more narrative storytelling and psychological approaches to the conflict to make it more accessible to a broader audience. The last form of New Zealand
remembrance writing was patriotic in nature. After the events of Gallipoli, one
veteran recorded his feelings about New Zealand’s emergence on the global scale,
“When the August fighting died down there was no longer any question but that the
New Zealanders had commenced to realize themselves as a nation. The process was
not complete, but it was well begun.” (Jones, 2007: 70)

In Australia, the Great War is remembered in many similar ways to that of
New Zealand. This should not be surprising, given the name of their fighting corps
combined both of the countries in its name, ANZAC. The memoirs of veterans are
very reminiscent of Fussell’s *The Great War and Modern Memory* in that they give a
candid overview of the events, nature, and brutality of the war and its total effects on
the human body. They are also rather subdued, reserved, and peace-laden, the latter
being a common theme in New Zealand works. Their biggest battles often produced
the largest number of casualties and by extension drove the largest amount of
personal papers on the attack at Gallipoli. It would appear that the Australian war
experience, more so than other nations, was a truly Hobbesian experience, i.e.,
brutish and short. The number of men who fought and died in vain at Gallipoli is still
unfathomable to its citizens today, and these feelings are also echoed extensively in
Consequently, ANZAC Day is a day of respect and reverence in Australia. “Anzac
Day, is at the very [sic] centre of national identity and civil religion. First world war
rituals and monuments anchor the Australian ceremonial landscape, their reference to
overseas death reaffirming the sacrifices made.”(Hoffenberg, 2011: 114)

There has also been a large rise in the number of print materials becoming
available in Australia in recent decades, because its citizenry is interested in learning
more about the conflict that put them on the world stage. The resurgence is also due
to openness on the part of the veterans to come out with their stories and be willing to
explain the horrors they endured, which, as stated previously, is a reality that has yet
been acknowledged in countries like Russia (Ziino, 2010: 126-127). Nearly half of
these records have appeared in the years 1990 to present, indicating that the trend of
spreading awareness and war memory is growing throughout the country. It is also helping people to understand their main event of the twentieth century in a broader context, with other nations contributing to the project as well (Ziino, 2010: 127). The interest in these extensive primary sources dispels Bourke’s assertion that nations who won the war are ashamed to talk about their history because they were rewarded for killing thousands of people (Bourke, 2004). Overall, the war experience of ANZAC troops is very well-documented in personal papers and historiography. Memorials to the fallen are done with respect, and ANZAC Day is a day filled with sadness while also being a day of reflection, reflecting on how such a tiny country with a limited population changed the course of history with the outcome of the Great War (Ziino, 2010). In some of the other Allied nations like England and the United States, the recollection of the Great War is a well-known event that is remembered in similar ways to ANZAC countries, unlike Russia, where it is just another footnote in the timeline of their history.

V: United States

Although the United States entered the conflict in a later stage, it didn’t deter them from remembering their involvement. The war was never fought on American soil, but its impact was felt immensely on the home front. Boys turning eighteen were shipped off to the horrors of the trench life, and the tides of war began to slowly change. The Americans supplied the crucial man and technological power needed to defeat the Central Powers. This is not to say the other members of the Allied Entente were not important, but rather, to illustrate that new, energized reinforcements aided in fending off the fatigued Germans. Many Americans joined in arms against the enemy because it was perceived to be the right thing to do, and it exhibited qualities such as loyalty and manliness (Wingate, 2005: 28). It is fair to say that Americans received a warm welcome abroad and at home for their efforts, and coming home was truly a joyous occasion. As a result of the Armistice, Americans decided to proclaim 11 November as Veteran’s Day. However, it was not exclusively for Great War
veterans – it was for veterans of all conflicts the U.S. has endured up to and including the Great War. Some soldiers considered this to be a bit demeaning because there were and still are no days to remember the lives lost in the Great War alone (Fussell, 1975). However, on the whole, many were content not to have their actions publicized. “After all, as combatants insisted time and again, for them, combat was 'not war, but murder' - their memory of killing did not match their pre-held scripts of what war was 'about'.” (Bourke, 2004: 478)

In the U.S., the war is more commonly remembered in historiography than with monuments, but there are still some visual reminders of the war in sporadic places. Most of the statues contain the following common themes: an attention to detail, an emphasis on heroic values such as bravery, and a soldier always standing at the ready, aiming the gun at an enemy (Wingate, 2005: 29-33). The soldier with the gun is often referred to as part of a theme called over-the-top. The title is misleading, as some people think this means that the United States has over-glorified itself and boasts about its prowess in the Great War. Rather, ‘over-the-top’ refers to the scores of men charging out of the trenches to fire at their enemies (Wingate, 2005). In addition to these monuments, a few films have been produced, and a very large and notable mural was painted in the early 1920’s. John Sargent was commissioned to paint the mural for Harvard University, and he started and finished his work in the early 1920’s. He called it Death and Victory. It has a very American bias to it, depicting them as a superior people who are doing things for glory (Dini, 1999: 76). The work is grand in scope and vision, and it does a decent job of capturing the various sides of war, from death, to trench life, to the home front; however, it was also criticized. It did show the horrors of war, but it appeared as though the U.S. soldiers were happy dying for a just cause, and dying is seldom considered a joyous occasion (Dini, 1999: 79-82). Others said that it was on the whole just too much, and that it is misleading, suggesting that the U.S. always come out on top, regardless of the means it took to attain that status.
VI: United Kingdom

British wartime remembrances bear similarities to those of the U.S., and they have various elements of ANZAC commemoration as well. Davis begins her article elaborating on the large body of work that has been dedicated to the Great War, and that we have only begun to understand its complexities. However, there are always new interpretations published and they affect how we read, learn, and remember a war (Davis, 2003: 112). These statements summarize the wide-ranging thoughts and actions of the British with regard to commemorating the conflict. In some cases the British are political when assessing the war’s toll, while others are more personal and candid in memoir form, and surprisingly, some accounts have appeared in comic book and/or graphic novel formats (Egerton, 1988: 55-94; Wurtz, 1986: 395). By having a multifaceted approach to remembering the war, the British take great pride and progressive steps to keep the memory alive. As we will see, some of these efforts are welcomed with open arms and enthusiasm, while others cause people to shake their heads and wonder how we can even begin to contextualize the horrors of the world’s first global war.

Unlike the Russian process that Petrone describes, the British collective memory is open and very well-documented, starting with the memoirs of British politician Lloyd George. George was one of the most important figures in World War I for the Allies, oftentimes out-maneuvering his opponents with his rhetoric as his men fought on the battlefield. However, George did not decide to write about all of his own prowess, but rather, he examined everyone under his authority with a very critical eye, which helps non-historians and historians alike understand the true nature of war as it was happening and its effects in the aftermath (Egerton, 1988: 72-73, 79). By seeing things through both a subjective and objective eye, George was able to convey to his readers the tension, pressure, and strain of the war on the soldiers themselves, and how these factors played a role in his decision-making. The memory of the Great War is alive and well because of the raw spirit George evokes in his texts. Seeing the war from the eyes of a politician in the Great War is very unique and
almost unprecedented, making his work all the more valuable for understanding the
world from 1914-1918. This is not the only place where such themes exist in British
remembrance; they also appear in various other forms of writing and later in
television.

In the 1920’s, it was hugely popular for the veterans of the Great War in
Britain to write down their experiences and publish them. There was a strong
movement by British women to encourage the men to write more and to become
more open with their writings, though this was easier said than done (Gullace, 1997:
178-206). The large numbers of diaries and memories that came with them formed
the modern day TV series The Trench. Aired in 2002, The Trench was one of the first
documentary series to try to recreate the horrors and hellish life endured by a British
from the city of Hull as they re-experienced elements of what members of the 10th
Battalion East Yorkshire Regiment had done prior to the Battle of the Ancre in the
autumn of 1916 (Hanna, 2007: 531-532).” On the surface, this seemed like a good
idea because it allowed modern day viewers to see what the First World War was
like. Many members of British families served bravely in the conflict and the families
have no memory of them other than a name and if lucky enough, a picture or two.
The program received some praise, but it was also met with some vicious criticism.
Professors, authors, and others commented that the program is highly insulting to the
memory of the nearly one million British soldiers who died because the hell endured
cannot be recreated (Hanna, 2007: 533-534, 541-545). For those who found the
material too demeaning or otherwise, there were other unique ways to create an
image of the war – through veterans’ short stories and modern graphic novels.

“At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the First World War’s standing in
British cultural memory continues to be high. Literature has made a significant
contribution to the war’s long-term commemoration (Korte and Einhaus, 2009: 54).”
The short story was able to connect with a wide range of audiences and express the
thoughts of the soldiers simultaneously. “The analysis of this corpus, roughly 400
stories to date . . . proves the popularity of the short story as a vehicle for expressing war experience (Korte and Einhaus, 2009: 56).” When paging through these sources, common themes appear of a hellish life, fear of the unknown, facing probable death at every turn, and vicious attacks on the enemy. These adventures take on a whole new dimension with the rise of Great War graphic novels, most notably with Charley’s War. Though the same themes and ideas are present as in other written material, graphic novels allow people to link a description of an ‘evil’ German to the face of one. This can be done in full-color, too, as opposed to the thousands of photographs we have now of nearly every soldier looking the same. This graphic novel follows British troops along the Western Front and brings the action to the reader as close as he or she can get without actually being there (Wurtz, 2009: 207-212). Similar to the TV series The Trench, this graphic novel received lots of criticism for mostly the same reasons. Despite the criticism, amongst the nations that participated in WW1, the United Kingdom has the most diverse and multifaceted approaches to remembering the conflict and has done a better job than most to remember the Great War.

VII: Conclusion

The fighting on the fronts of WW1 lasted a long four years, but of course the time to heal would take much longer. Remembering the sacrifices of those who fought is thought to greatly aid in this healing process, both for individuals and for a nation as a whole. The Allied nations all chose to remember the war in various ways - some with books and memoirs, some with monuments and ceremonies - and others, like Russia, seemingly chose to hardly remember it at all. The countries each chose ways that have special meaning to them and that reflect their collective history and national character. At times the remembrances, or lack of them, represent a conflicted view of a country's role, since despite the fact that the Allies won the Great War, the conflict and its aftermath paved the way for another global war only twenty years
later. Nonetheless, most countries continue to collect the remaining stories of their heroes, lest they forget the great souls who lived and died in the Great War.
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Ireland 1912-1923: An exploration of Irish History through the Cypriot Press

Michalis Stavri, University of Cyprus

The present article’s purpose is to examine the historical aspects of Ireland in the period 1912-1923 through the Cypriot Press. In 1912, the third Home Rule Bill was introduced in the British Parliament and by 1923 the Irish Civil War ended. Irish History is not examined in depth in the present article as the paper essentially seeks to present the references of the Irish matters in the Cypriot newspapers and the position Cypriots held in regard to the Irish struggle. The Third Home Rule Bill will be explored, as well as the 1916 Easter Rising, the Anglo-Irish war to the Treaty of 1921, and finally, the Irish Civil War of 1922-1923.

INTRODUCTION

The perspective in which one part of the Empire confronted the matters in the opposed edg of Great Britain is considered to be interesting. The examined period was an exceptional one for Cyprus, for it was just after the Balkan Wars and annexation of Crete to Greece which resulted in the expansion of the Greek state. In 1915 Great Britain officially offered the island of Cyprus to the Greek government in return of her alliance during the First World War (Παντελή, 1986: 115-116 and Καταλάνος, 1918: 68, 75-77). On the 12th of November 1914, Britain annexed Cyprus. The Greek Cypriots considered this as the final step for Enosis, the union with Greece. In this context, the Cypriot population watched the Irish matter with special interest, whilst they assumed that their future was connected to the North European edge of the Atlantic Ocean.

During the period we are examining, the Cypriot Press was in the fourth decade of its lifespan, ever since the island’s first published newspaper in 1878. The names of the papers indicated the island’s atmosphere; names such as Πατρίς [Homeland], Ελευθερία [Freedom], Νέον Έθνος [New Nation], Ένωσις [Union], Ζήνων [Zeno] etc. reveal the national consciousness of the Greek Cypriots and their attempt to create a bond with their past.47

47 See more at Σοφοκλέους, Ανδρέας (2003) Συμβολή στην ιστορία του κυπριακού Τύπου [Contribution to the history of the Cypriot Press], Intercollege, Nicosia.
THE IRISH NATIONAL MOVEMENT AND THE HOME RULE BILLS

In order to understand the Irish national movement we have to examine some facets of Ireland’s past along with some historical events that led to the conflict-ridden period of 1912-1923.

Ireland has had a long tradition of rebellion. From the late 18th until the beginning of the 20th century, a considerable amount of agitation took place in the country, which was not irrelevant to the ideas that were appearing in Europe after the French Revolution (Killeen, 2012: 125). Many of them occurred as the aftermath of social and financial crises. It is noteworthy that the Irish national movement was of dual character, with political and cultural aspects.

Concerning the cultural aspect of the national movement, the Gaelic League, the Celtic Literary Society and the Gaelic Athletic Association played a vital role. Their main purpose was the revival of the Gaelic language (Killeen, op.cit: 227-229 and Foster, 1989: 446-455). In their perspective cultural independence was more important than national autonomy.

The technological progress regarding the railway was also very important for the development of a national consciousness. The distances kept shrinking, whilst the population felt closer to each other, thus becoming more united. The first Irish railway opened in December 1834. Consequently, the national press developed, widely spreading the national idea (Killeen, op.cit: 156 and 177).

As for the insurgencies and the political aspect of the movement, we shall mention the ‘United Irishmen’ rebellion of 1798 under the leadership of Wolfe Tone. The insurgency took place on the 23rd and 24th of May 1798, mainly in Dublin, but without any popular support it failed (Ibid: 125-149). The rebellion resulted in the union of Ireland with the British Kingdom in 1800. The endeavor for the repeal of the

48 For the cultural aspect of the national movement, see Kee, 2000: 426-437. Arthur Griffith and William Rooney, the founders of Sinn Féin, also emphasized in the revival of the Gaelic language, for they considered that language could protect Ireland from the English influence (Boyce, 1995: 296). When ‘Young Ireland’ was founded (1848), the language’s revival was directly connected with the national movement (Killeen, 2012: 183-184).
Union was the main characteristic of the 19th century’s national movement (Ibid: 152).

In 1848, the ‘Young Irelanders’ attempted an insurgency, but again, due to the social apathy evoked from the famine that blighted Ireland, they failed (Cronin, 2001: 147). Later, in 1858, the ‘Fenian Brotherhood’ was founded, which was commonly known as the ‘Irish Republican Brotherhood’ (IRB). After a decade, the Fenians counted more than 50,000 members (English, 2004: 8). Because of their military structure and mentality they were led to believe in a violence movement, which would ideally establish the Republic of Ireland (Killeen, op.cit: 201). Lots of Fenians took part in the American Civil War and gained a lot of experience, which was favorable for the Irish cause. On the 5th of March 1867 they revolted, and during their struggle they attempted to set free a prisoner from London. The explosions caused by the Fenians destroyed many houses in the area surrounding the prison, and the British Government hosted a big operation that resulted in the reduction of Fenian action (Cronin, op.cit: 149-153).

Isaac Butt founded ‘Home Government Association’ in 1870 in order to fight for the Home Rule of Ireland. The Home Rule movement attracted a lot of Fenians and other Nationalists, such as the prominent Charles Stewart Parnell. The movement took political shape under the name of the ‘Irish Parliamentary Party – IPP’. It was founded during great momentum for the Irish, for William Ewart Gladstone led the Liberals and confronted the Irish Question with sympathy. During the elections of 1885 the IPP cooperated with Gladstone and the latter introduced the first Home Rule Bill in 1886. The Bill was rejected, but the Irish Question had made its way into the British political issues and remained in the public discussion until its solution (Killeen, op.cit: 218-219). The second Home Rule Bill was introduced again by Gladstone in 1893. It was then accepted by the House of Commons, but was rejected by the House of Lords (Cronin, op.cit: 160-165).
FROM THE THIRD HOME RULE BILL TO THE ‘EASTER RISING’

The third Home Rule Bill introduction occurred after the electoral win of the Liberals, whose leader now was Herbert Henry Asquith, in 1910. Even though the liberals had a small majority in the Parliament and they had to rely on the IPP again in order to gain control. The leader of the IPP by that time was John Redmond. The House of Lords was still the only obstacle for the successful cooperation of the Liberals and the IPP. Hence, Asquith made a constitutional arrangement which suggested that if a bill was accepted for three successive years by the House of Commons, the Lords would have no authority to veto (English, op.cit: 9 and Foster, op.cit: 462-466). Thus the Home Rule for Ireland seemed closer than ever. There was reaction however by the Unionists of the North, especially from the Loyalists of Ulster. The Protestants of the area founded the ‘Ulster Volunteer Force – UVF’ in 1913 in order to prevent the Home Rule of Ireland. They had connected their prosperity with the maintenance of the status quo (Cronin, op.cit: 170-171). The prospect of a partition was proposed for the first time (Ibid: 180-182).\textsuperscript{49} To protect the Home Rule, the Nationalists formed their own paramilitary organizations. In 1913, the ‘Irish Volunteers’ were founded, who would later shape into the ‘Irish Republican Army – IRA’ (Cronin, op.cit: 184).\textsuperscript{50}

In this atmosphere, the discussion in the British Parliament about the third Bill was proceeding. Details of the Bill, such as the taxes, the trading and an annual funding for ten years, were published in \textit{Eleftheria} (Eleftheria, 10 Feb. 1912). A few days later, the same paper commented on Winston Churchill's visit to Belfast, mentioning specifically his speech about Home Rule. At the end of the article there was a Redmond’s comment in which he applauded Churchill for his statements (Eleftheria,

\textsuperscript{49} The proposal suggested the exclusion from the Home Rule of Ulster’s 6 counties with a future union of the rest 26 counties with the excluded, based on the consent of the people (Bew, 1999: 732). It seems that Asquith pledged to the Unionists that his Cabinet and his Party would support that proposal. At the same time, he assured Redmond that neither he, nor his Cabinet would approve any exclusion from the Home Rule (Kee, op.cit: 480-481). Tim Pat Coogan claims that the partition question evoked because of the 'plantation' of the counties of Ulster, which took place under James I, with English and Scottish Protestants (Coogan, 1995: 4).

\textsuperscript{50} Regarding the foundation of the ‘Irish Volunteers’ see details in Mitchell, 2013: 182-187. Also see Killeen, op.cit: 242 and English, op.cit: 9-10.
24 Feb. 1912). *Salpinx*, a paper in Limassol, and *Neon Ethnos* in Larnaka, mentioned Asquith’s introduction of the third Home Rule Bill (*Salpinx*, 6 Apr. 1912 and *Neon Ethnos*, 6 Apr. 1912). Details of the subsequent discussion were written in *Kypriakos Phylax*. The Mayor of Belfast threatened the Parliament that if Home Rule was applied, the inhabitants of Ulster would conduct a militant struggle to repel it (*Kypriakos Phylax*, 5 May 1912). The *Phone tes Kypru* paper was questioning the ability of Asquith to sail his ship where Gladstone crushed it. In the article, the geographical, national and financial aspects of the question are mentioned. The latter is supposed to be the source of Ulster Unionists’ reaction, who are presented as industrialists and being of English origin (*Fone tes Kypru*, 12 May 1912). The vast majority of the parliament that accepted the Bill (368 to 258) caused great surprise to the paper *Patris*, which described the atmosphere during the voting process; the supporters of each side had either green flags or the ‘union jack’, depending on the side they favored (*Patris*, 6 Feb. 1913). In July 1913, *Eleftheria* presented the lurking dangers in case that the Home Rule was applied (*Eleftheria*, 5 Jul. 1913).

Proceeding to 1914 and the outset of the First World War, the Cypriot Press kept engaging with the Irish question. *Kypriakos Phylax* published a translated article analyzing the situation in Ireland (*Kypriakos Phylax*, 24 and 31 Jan. 1914), and during March of the same year, *Eleftheria* informed its readers about Asquith’s intention of the six counties’ exclusion from the Home Rule after a referendum, as it is afore-mentioned. A few days later, *Eleftheria* published rumors that the King George would resign due to the tension of the Irish problem. It also stated that a group of military officials resigned, refusing to lead their soldiers against people who just wanted to stay loyal to the British Empire (*Eleftheria*, 28 Mar. and 11 Apr. 1914). Remarkable for the Cypriots’ perspective of the Question is an article published in *Kypriakos Phylax* in May 1914; the author sets the Unionists’ struggle as an example for those peoples who fight for their freedom. Their resistance could inspire all oppressed people (*Kypriakos Phylax*, 2 and 30 May 1914). In the same

---

51 The information regarding the military officers’ resignation was published in *Phone tes Kypru*, 18 Apr. 1914.
manner, *Salpinx* noted ‘we do not know if the Irish demands are fair’ (*Salpinx*, 7 Jun. 1914).

Though the Home Rule question was approved by the Parliament on the 18\textsuperscript{th} of September 1914, Republicans perceived that no progress had been made and therefore the whole question seemed to be at an impasse. On the outset of the First World War, the Home Rule was suspended until the end. Unionists willingly served during the war in the British military, whilst discord occurred amid the Nationalists. Some members of the Volunteers saw the war as the opportunity to hit a vulnerable British Empire. Led by the doctrine of friendship with the enemy's enemy, they got in touch with Germany in order to be supplied with armament and conduct a rebellion against the British (English, op.cit: 5). Responsible for the contact with Germany was Sir Roger Casement. Casement, as most of the IRBs, thought that a defeated Britain could be the way for the secession of Ireland, which would then shape an independent state, keeping its coasts safe for Germany (Kee, op.cit: 539-543). Casement travelled to Germany for a dual purpose: to find the requested armament for the insurgency and to gather the Irish captives who were kept in Germany in an Irish Brigade to fight against the British army. As for the latter goal, his failure was so remarkably unexpected, that some German military officers considered him to be a double agent (Mitchell, op.cit: 243). He managed, though, to receive the requested armament, which was necessary for the planned insurgency. In April 1916, a ship filled with weaponry, followed by a submarine which transported Casement, sailed to Tralee, Co. Kerry. The plan was that about 12,000 German soldiers would land in Ireland and the Volunteers would destroy the transportation system and occupy Dublin. Subsequently, the British officials and officers would be arrested and a military commander would be appointed. Ideally, the whole of Ireland would have followed them in a state of mass agitation (Foy & Barton, 2011:26). The Royal Navy found out about the ship however, which was scuttled by its captain to avoid the discovery of the armament. Next, Roger Casement was arrested upon his arrival in Ireland (Killeen, op.cit: 247).
Despite this, the military council of IRB and Irish Volunteers decided to proceed with the rising. Thomas Clarke and Sean MacDermott played a vital role in the insurgency, while ‘[Patrick] Pearse was to be the public voice of the rising’ (Ibid: 246).\textsuperscript{52} On Easter Monday the rebels occupied the General Post Office (GPO) in Dublin. On the stairs of GPO, Pearse read the proclamation of the Republic of Ireland (Kileen, op.cit: 248).\textsuperscript{53} In our attempt to interpret the text of the proclamation, we can discern the pursuit of a connection to the specific rising with the Irish struggle of the past centuries. Hence, the Easter Rising appeared to be a continuance of a series of Irish battles for freedom.

The proclamation was signed by Thomas Clarke, Seán MacDermott, Patrick Pearse, James Conolly, Thomas MacDonagh, Eamonn Ceannt and Joseph Blunkett (Bell, 1972: 13). The British were surprised, for they thought that after the Casement case, the Nationalists would be frustrated. The rebels occupied several buildings and waited for the British attack. When the GPO was occupied, two flags were raised; a green one with a gold harp and the inscription ‘Irish Republic’, and the green-white-orange flag that is currently used by Ireland (Kee, op.cit: 549). The battle of 26\textsuperscript{th} of April between Éamon de Valera’s men and British troops is noteworthy. In this battle, De Valera’s nationalists destroyed more than half of the troops that were killed during the whole period of the Rising. The rebels had 64 casualties by the end of the Easter Rising (Ibid: 568-570). The main operation against the GPO was held on the Easter Friday and Saturday. By Saturday noon, the building was under British possession, and the rebels were captured and imprisoned.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} Pearse introduced the ‘mythic’ in the collective conscience of the Irish. See more in Moran, 1989: 625-643. He thought that self-sacrifice was the path that Ireland should follow in order to achieve its goals and give pride to the new Irish generation (Ibid: 637). He was the orator at O’Donovan Rossa’s funeral in August 1915. His obituary is a sample of his manner of thought regarding this subject. It is considered to be his blueprint for Ireland’s fate, similar to Christ’s; Ireland would revive from the graves (of its heroes) after a lot of sacrifices (Foster, op.cit: 477). For O’Donovan Rossa’s life see Coogan, op.cit: 15. For Pearse’s obituary see Adous, Richard (2007) Great Irish speeches, Quercus, London.

\textsuperscript{53} For the proclamation see Coogan, op.cit: 19-20.

\textsuperscript{54} There is a big discussion about whether the rebels knew that there was no scope for a successful rising (at least after Casement’s failure) and, thus, tried to act in a symbolic way. See for example Bell, op.cit: 23, Kee, op.cit: 551-552 and Foy & Barton, op.cit: 27.
The first article published in the Cypriot Press with regard to the Easter Rising is hosted in *Kypriakos Phylax* of the 26\(^{th}\) of April 1916 which ends with the information that the Rising was suppressed and that its leaders were imprisoned (*Kypriakos Phylax*, 26 Apr. 1916). After a few days, *Alithia* informed its readership that the rebels would be examined in a martial court and that the fate of the women who took part in the Rising would be separately examined (*Alithia*, 29 Apr. 1916). The same information is quoted in *Neon Ethnos* (*Neon Ethnos*, 6 May 1916). A few weeks after the Rising, *Kypriakos Phylax* republished an article that described the insurgency as a ‘silly operation’ that took place due to the ‘criminal apathy and cowardice of the Irish Government’, while Sinn Féin was blamed as being the one responsible for the Rising. The author also notes that many ‘Sinn Féiners’ who lost their lives did not even understand the reason of their struggle (*Kypriakos Phylax*, 10 May 1916).

After the Rising’s suppression, martial courts were organized and the leader of the rebellion was convicted to death. Fifteen of the prominent Nationalists were shot. Casement was the last one to be convicted and was hanged as a traitor (English, op.cit: 6). Killeen states that with these executions, the British actually created martyrs for the Irish people and the Irish were then feeling sympathy for the rebels (Killeen, op.cit: 248-249). The executed leaders were: Thomas Clarke, Thomas MacDonagh, Patrick Pearse, Joseph Plunkett, Éamonn Ceannt, Seán Mac Diarmada, and James Connolly. The first three leaders were executed on the third of May, and the rest on the twelfth of May. In reference to the executions, *Patris* published Asquith’s announcement that the first three people who signed the Proclamation were executed. A congratulating telegram from the King to his soldiers was also published on the same sheet (*Patris*, 10 May 1916). *Salpinx* also hosted the announcement of the executions of Pearse, Clarke, MacDonagh (*Salpinx*, 10 May 1916) and in *Fone tes Kypru* we can find the proclamation of the surrendered rebels, in their attempt to ‘prevent further deaths of unarmed people…’ (*Fone tes Kypru*, 27 May 1916). The Cypriot journalists were impressed by the ‘trick’ used by the British troops so as to avoid the hostile shots: ‘Boilers of steam engines were placed on a car and on the
sides of the boilers they opened holes for shooting’ (Salpinx, 27 Jun. 1916). Finally, reports on Roger Casement’s execution can be found in *Fone tes Kypru*. The paper particularly portrays Casement as a ‘big traitor’, and provides details of the trial, and the announcement of his death (*Fone tes Kypru*, 5 Aug. 1916).

The Easter Rising of 1916 is a turning point of the Irish independence struggle. According to Richard English, the executions of the Rising’s leaders attained everything the Rising failed to accomplish: revival of the Irish national movement and enhancement of the Nationalists’ groups who fought for independence. The executed became heroes and martyrs of modern Irish history. Another effect of the Rising was the adoption of its principles by the majority of the Irish society, namely the sympathy for the secession / independence and for armed struggle instead of the political, or at least a more radicalized political struggle (English, op.cit: 4-7 and 10-11).

FROM THE ANGLO-IRISH WAR TO THE IRISH CIVIL WAR

As mentioned before, Sinn Féin was responsible for the Rising. Sinn Féin was founded in 1905 by Arthur Griffith and by the time of the Rising it followed a separate path regarding its purpose for the Irish problem (Foster, op.cit: 489). After the Rising, the British escalated their actions and a lot of Republicans were imprisoned. Their policy resulted in an Anglo-Irish (or Irish-British) dispute. Under these circumstances, in 1917 Sinn Féin was reorganized and turned to the solution of an independent Ireland. In October 1917, De Valera (who was not executed due to his American citizenship) was elected as the leader of the Party. At the same time, the IRB and the Volunteers (now known as IRA) were also reorganized under Michael Collin’s supervision (who took part in the Rising) (Bell, op.cit: 28 and Cronin, op.cit: 198).

---

55 In its first steps, Sinn Féin did not support the struggle for an independent Ireland, but for a dual monarchy similarly to the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Bell, op.cit: 19). It seems that the Hungarian pattern had influenced Griffith a lot. In this spirit, Griffith suggested the ‘Abstentionism Policy’ in the Parliament, in a manner of passive resistance (Boyce, op.cit: 297-298. See also Μάρφη, 1993: 593-619.
The British were informed that another rising could take place under Sinn Féin which, according to an anonymous source of ‘absolute reliance’, was in contact with Germany and had sent the message that another insurgency might be successful and had found funds from the USA (TNA, Letter 2). In any way, the popularity of the party was high and rose even more after Lloyd George (who had succeeded Asquith as Prime Minister in December 1916) tried to implement a conscription bill that included the Irish, who until then were excluded from the conscription. The *Saplinx* paper published parts of L. George’s statement. The Prime Minister stated that there was no good reason for an Irish exclusion from the conscription (Salpinx, 24 Apr. 1918). Sinn Féin led the campaign against the conscription bill. In the subsequent elections in December 1918, Sinn Féin gained a thrilling victory (73 seats). Its members followed the ‘Abstentionism Policy’ and declared their own Parliament, Dáil Éireann, based in Dublin. Upon its first meeting, two constables were shot dead by the IRA. This was the prelude for the Anglo-Irish war. Michael Collins led the Irish side while de Valera was in the USA (Bell, op.cit: 31 and Cronin, op.cit: 200-201). The foundation of Dail was announced in *Eleftheria* during March 1919, with the information that British reaction was yet to be decided (Eleftheria, 8 Mar. 1919).

R. Kee separates the Anglo-Irish war period in three phases; a. January 1919 - March 1920. The main characteristics of this period are the attacks conducted by the IRA against the police. b. March – October 1920, a period of anarchy in Ireland. c. October 1920 until the end of the war. In October, Black and Tans were transported to Ireland by the British administration in order to enhance the local police force (Kee, op.cit: 698-699). *Alithia* commented on the situation in Ireland:

‘The crimes succeed one another in Ireland, where agitation has never paused. Lately, the Lord Mayor of Cork – Ireland – was murdered and every now and

---

56 In response the Headquarters in Dublin assured Lt. Colonel Kell that there was no such possibility, for Sinn Féin was completely disorganized (TNA, Letter 4).
57 The bill evoked after the battle at Somme – France, where the British and the French were defeated from the Germans (Cronin, op.cit: 197 and Foster, op.cit: 498-490).
58 The IRA had made the Irish police too vulnerable with its attacks and the constables were afraid to act (English, op.cit: 21-22 and Bell, op.cit: 33).
then series of crimes are announced, until the Irish achieve what they desire.’  
(Alithia, 10 Apr. 1920).

In *Neon Ethnos* it was written that the House of Commons considered the Irish to be as dangerous as the Bolsheviks, for England (Neon Ethnos, 13 Aug. 1920). *Kypriakos Phylax* reported that Lloyd George, referring to the 150 murdered constables in Ireland, stated that their patience was exhausted and that they were about to take action against that ‘gang of assassins’ (Kypriakos Phylax, 6 Oct. 1920).

In reference to the hunger strike of the imprisoned Cork’s Mayor in 1920, which was set as an example of struggle, an author of *Eleftheria* wrote and revealed his perspective on the Irish problem:

‘…we are not ashamed to confess that we are looking to the Irish struggle with the hope that it will eventually fail. […] As Greeks and as Cypriots, who rely on the support of a big and mighty Britain for our present and our future, we wish for the failure of a struggle indirectly harming the safety of our own homeland.’ (Eleftheria, 9 Oct. 1920).

In 1920, Lloyd George introduced a bill in the Parliament for the government of Ireland, known as ‘The Partition Bill’. Ireland would be separated with two autonomous administrative areas in the North and the South, with the Home Rule to be implemented separately in each area (Bell, op.cit: 33).

In July 1921, a truce was declared for negotiations to take place. Even though the IRA had not overcome the British, it managed not to be defeated and forced the British to negotiate. During the truce, the IRA was reorganized and pursued new recruitments (Killeen, op.cit: 252-254 and Bell, op.cit: 40-45). *Patris* stated that the day the truce was declared, even the ships celebrated at the ports (Patris, 20 Jul. 1921). *Eleftheria* assumed that the negotiations would be the last section concerning the Irish question and informed that L. George’s gesture was applauded by the USA (Eleftheria, 30 Jul. 1921).
The day the negotiations were announced, King George gave a speech in Ulster’s Parliament, which was established by the Bill that L. George had introduced. According to Eleftheria, the King mentioned that the purpose of the Parliament was to implement peace and tranquility to the country (Eleftheria, 9 Jul. 1921).

The main part of the negotiations took place from October to December 1921. Initially, De Valera was present at the procedure, but later a delegation under Collins and Griffith was sent. Information regarding the process of the negotiations can be found in the Cypriot Press. Eleftheria informs its readership about the correspondence between De Valera and L. George. The latter informed the Irish about Britain’s main requirements; free entrance in the Irish ports, military defense cooperation, free trading etc (Eleftheria, 3 Sep. 1921). Information about the Treaty's content appeared in the Cypriot newspapers during the last days of the negotiations (Patris, 7 Dec. 1921).

The Irish delegation accepted the Treaty on the sixth of December 1921. According to the Treaty, 26 of the 32 counties would shape the ‘Free State’ of Ireland, under the British crown, after swearing the oath of allegiance. The terms of the Treaty were presented in Ireland the next day. The Nationalists who desired full independence reacted. After sharp discussions in Dail, the Treaty was approved at the beginning of 1922 (64 votes against 57) (Killeen, op.cit: 29-33). Eleftheria considered the Irish question to be solved; the solution was not the most desirable one and the constitution seemed more like a freed colonel state but, according to the author, the solution was pleasant for the Greek Cypriots, for Britain was relieved from a complicated internal issue and the Empire could now take care of the Cypriote question (Eleftheria, 17 Dec. 1921). The terms of the Treaty were published by Patris and Kypriakos Phylax (Patris, 21 Dec. 1921 and Kypriakos Phylax, 12 Jan. 1922).

As a result of the Treaty, the IRA repudiated Dail’s authority and took over several buildings in Dublin. That was the beginning of the Irish civil war, which officially began on the 28th of June 1922, when the ‘Free State’s’ army attacked the IRA anti-
treaty troops (English, op.cit: 34-35 and Kee, op.cit: 733-734). The anti-treaty attitude of the IRA formed after the idea of the Republic got a 'mythic dimension' in the minds of the Irish Nationalists. They had set it as the unique purpose of their struggle. It also resulted from the losses of their IRA comrades, from the hunger strikes and from their remarkable deeds against a powerful enemy. They assumed that by compromising in anything less than the Republic, they would betray all of the above (Boyce, op.cit: 325). In June 1922, Collins and De Valera agreed to form a coalition government under the Sinn Féin, in order to end the civil war. Because of the British reaction, the idea was abandoned (Coogan, op.cit: 32).

The first mention in the Cypriot newspapers regarding the civil war, dates to the 18th of July 1922 and informs the readers for nineteen deaths and 111 injured soldiers of the ‘national army’ (Patris, 18 Jul. 1922). Next, in the context of the brutality, there are articles about the murder of Field Marshal Wilson. Sir Henry Wilson, an adversary of the Irish national movement and Chief of the Imperial General Staff, cooperated with the Unionists, giving them military guidance and advice (Coogan, op.cit: 10-11 and Bell, op.cit: 49). R. Kee claims that his murder was ordered by Collins, but it is not specified whether the orders were given before or after the Treaty, as a response to the brutality which the Nationalists of Ulster suffered (Kee, op.cit: 738-739). The assassination took place on the 22nd of June 1922 and it was a result of Wilson’s appointment as a military consultant of Ulster, as Fone tes Kypru states (Fone tes Kypru, 22 Jul. 1922).

Patris newspaper, under the title ‘Unlucky Ireland’ blamed De Valera and his ‘stubborn men’ because they did not accept the British peace. In contrast, it described Collins as the:

‘strongest personality of Ireland, a fighter, a politician with virtues and a truly legendary braveness, who deserved to be portrayed by Homer or Milton’. He

---

59 The article is about the relationship of Wilson with the Greek Prime Minister, Eleftherios Venizelos. Wilson’s assassination is noted in Paphos, 4 Aug. 1922.
‘was a victim of his former comrades’ bullets, who were now rebels against their former leader’ (Patris, 27 Sep. 1922).

In March 1923, De Valera announced to the IRA volunteers that it was no longer possible to protect the Republic and that their sacrifice would not contribute to the Irish cause. The civil war was still going on, affecting the national interest and the future of their struggle for an independent Ireland. Frank Aiken, the leader of the IRA, ordered the resignation of the volunteers on the 24th of May 1923 (Ball, op.cit: 54-55 and Coogan, op.cit: 35).

CONCLUSION

The number of articles found in the Cypriot Press regarding the Irish matters is remarkable keeping in mind the geographical distance of the two countries and their different regional areas of interest. Specifically, in the beginning of the 20th century, the access to foreign news required time and money, since it was uneasy and substantially out of interest in an area with a high level of illiteracy (Σοφοκλέους, 1994: 88 and 103). Despite those facts, the articles indicate that the Cypriots were aware of the Irish matters, for they were directly interested since they considered there was an affiliation of the Irish question with the Cypriot question. In retrospect, from what we have seen, it is indicated that the Greek Cypriots were opposed to the Irish struggle due to the impression of the Cypriot collective conscience that Britain was interested for a solution in regard to the Cypriot problem and they wanted the British Administration of the island to be free of the burden of internal problems. In any case, the Cypriot journalists supported the Unionists’ side.

It is a fact that significant events of the Irish history are absent from the Cypriot Press, like ‘Bloody Sunday’60 of November 1920, or the recruitment of Black and Tans, the Truce of 1923 and the end of the civil war. Despite this fact, the researcher can get a good picture of the Irish history of 1912-1923 through the articles of the Cypriot newspapers, and this is impressive given the lack of bibliography for the

---

60 For ‘Bloody Sunday’ see English, op.cit: 19, Foster, op.cit: 498, Cronin, op.cit: 201.
specific subject in Greek. It is important to be able to study the historical aspects of a
distant area through a foreign press in spite of the conclusions regarding the press’
perspective.
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Anglo-German Relations in the Late XIX and Early XX c.
Ivana Nikolova, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Nowadays when we talk about Western-Central European relations we mainly think of the Western and Eastern blocs and the second half of the XX c. It is important, however, to look back to the source of one of the most important conflicts of the XX c. – the Great War. Britain and Germany played an essential role in the outbreak of the conflict which shaped the whole century. It is crucial to note the differences between the two nations which stood in the way of cooperation and peace. The relations between the two empires went through different stages: cooperation in the 1880s, progressive cooling in the 1890s and complete antagonism in the first years of the XX c. If at the end of the XIX c. “in English and German veins run the same blood”\(^{61}\) (Carter, 2010: 193), in the beginning of the new century “[Germany] is our worst enemy and the greatest threat for us”\(^{62}\) (Mulligan, 2011: 52). The following questions are the main subject of this paper: what happened during this short period and why did Germany and Great Britain experience a progressive worsening of their relations and was a union between them possible or not. I shall mainly focus on the diplomatic contacts between the two, presenting the main events in Europe as well as in Africa and Asia.

Introduction: a little Historiography

Whenever scholars look for reasons behind the sudden changes in Anglo-German relations, they find them in various factors. Author Paul Schroeder concludes that the economical rivalry is among the main reasons for the progressive worsening of relations between Germany and Britain (Schroeder, 2000: 197). He rejects the idea that the naval program of the Reich must have been the source of the antagonism with London, since in the discussed period most great powers had ambitious fleet programs (Schroeder, 2000: 196). Shannon goes even further in stating that the arms race does not constitute a valid reason to start a war (Shannon, 1974: 414). Kissinger blames the short-slightness of German diplomats after Bismarck, and especially during and after the Second Boer War. He sees the Tirpitz program as “incompatible with the British Empire” (Kissinger, 1997: 166). And while Kissinger considers German foreign policy as one of the main reasons for the decay of the balance of power and the following World War, inevitable events after the birth of united Germany (Kissinger, 1997: 145), authors like Mulligan agree that there was a significant shift in the balance of power after 1870 but they deny that World War I

---

\(^{61}\) Quote by Wilhelm II.

\(^{62}\) Quote by Edward Grey.
was inevitable (Mulligan, 2011: 38). Most authors agree that the Anglo-German disagreements began with the Second Boer War. The debate between them is focused on whether a union was possible after the announcement of Weltpolitik. For Kennedy and Kissinger a union cannot be compatible with an aggressive German foreign policy (Kennedy, 1973: 610; Kissinger, 1997: 158). Schroeder, however, does not regard an Anglo-German union as impossible; he just sees Germany as a secondary ally of Britain compared to Russia or France (Schroeder, 2000: 197). Pension concludes that economical rivalry is the most popular reason for the decay at the time, the Kruger telegram is an enormous factor but the German irritability with the lack of engagement on the continent, a characteristic of the British foreign policy in that period, is one of the most fundamental obstacles both in the good relations between the two powers as well as in the imperial rivalry (Penson, 1943: 123; 126-128).

**Neoimperialism or how the Great European powers divided the World between themselves**

The new imperialism was a dominating factor in international relations in the 1890s. (Schroeder, 2000: 188) The old Great Powers, such as Great Britain, France and Russia, and the new colonial empires, like Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA, clashed at various remote places outside Europe. In an extremely short period of time, those countries divided whole continents between themselves. Great Britain played an important role in the colonial redistribution in the world. In Africa its main rival, after the occupation of Egypt in 1882, was France. In Asia the main colonial confrontation was between Britain and Russia. Similarly France and Russia began to emerge as Britain’s central enemies, especially after the Treaty of 1892, while Germany appeared to be its natural ally or at least until it started exhibiting colonial claims. While Otto von Bismarck was chancellor, he put great effort into consolidation with the European concert without endangering the vital interests of the other great powers outside the Old Continent. His famous line „My map of Africa lies
in Europe” (Hyam, 2010: 123) was forgotten after he stepped down in 1890. Wilhelm II took a new course in German foreign policy, he almost immediately announced his Weltpolitik (which literally translates as ‘world policy’) which was met with both understanding and fear among ruling elites in Europe.

The first step in the direction of Weltpolitik was the occupation of Kiao-Chow in November 1897. Diplomatically, the campaign was poorly defended and led to a long-lasting distance in Russian-German relations (Otte, 1995: 1159-1160). Although the official cause of the occupation was the murder of two catholic missionaries, but in reality, its actual purpose was the allocation of spheres of influence in China (Monger, 1963: 103). Britain, whose policy was to maintain the unity of the Chinese empire as long as possible, kept its distance at first. The British government realized that in order to retain their influence in China, they needed to overcome their isolation in the Far East. Initially, it turned to Germany and after long negotiations on October 16th, 1900 the two European countries signed a treaty which advocated an open-door policy in China and the protection of the integrity of the Asian empire. However if a case of interference by a third power arose, each of the sides would protect their own spheres of influence (Stefanova, 1958: 247-248). The new realities in the Far East proved to be one of the main reasons for the first Anglo-German union negotiations, which in the end failed miserably and seized to be of great importance after 1902 when an Anglo-Japanese treaty was signed.

The truth is that the Second Reich did not have vital interests in the Far East and most importantly its diplomacy relied too much on good relations with its neighboring Russia. The main area of colonial discord between Britain and Germany was Africa. When the Reich set foot in South-Western Africa in 1884, it was bound to lead to confrontation with the British (Bury, 1968: 118). In the 1890s, the Germans progressively manifested appetites towards the Portuguese colonies in Angola and Mozambique. However, they were not the only ones: the British Empire, which had a long tradition of good relations with Portugal, had come to Southern Africa a century
earlier and looked upon the area as its own. In the late XIX c. the Iberian country had great financial and political problems. While the British carried on their traditional policy of maintaining the unity of one of the oldest colonial empires, the Germans awaited its dissolution with anticipation. After a number of German threats to diminish the British position in the ongoing Second Boer War (Langhorne, 1973: 363), the English government entered into negotiations with the Reich about the fate of the Portuguese colonies. On August 30th, 1898 a treaty was signed which contained two components, one public and one private, secret part. Publicly, the two countries promised joint financial aid to Portugal, but secretly Mozambique, Angola and Portuguese Timor were practically divided between the two Great Powers in case the Portuguese Empire collapsed (Gavrilov, 1995: 125). In spite of German expectations, however, the Iberian colonial empire did not fall apart and in 1911 the Anglo-German negotiations were renewed. While the German side wanted a territorial upgrade of the old treaty, the British were looking to improve the relations between the two powers after the Second Moroccan crisis of 1911. Since the reasons for the renewal of the negotiations were so different, the talks remained in a deadlock for years. An understanding was reached in 1914 but a document was never ratified because of the beginning of the Great War.

The scramble for Africa extended further than just remote areas. The Ottoman Empire became a victim of European imperialism after France took over Tunis in 1881 and Britain occupied Egypt in 1882. Abdul Hamid II decided to turn towards a Great Power which had no territorial claims towards Ottoman territories in order to deal with the growing threat which he saw for his country. That country was Germany. Subsequently, the Germans began construction of the Berlin – Istanbul – Bagdad railway. Through it Wilhelm II hoped to strengthen his presence in the Near East. That policy, However, threatened the balance of power in the whole region and mostly Britain’s interests in the Persian Gulf area. The British not only declined to participate in the building process, they simply did not want the segment leading to the Persian Gulf built at all. Marshall, the German ambassador in Istanbul, in a report
from 1906, expressed his concerns that any negotiations with the British were groundless since no compromise could be reached regarding the Persian Gulf (Gavrilov, 1995: 143). He turned out to be correct; when the two countries eventually reached an understanding in June 1914, it was decided that the segment of the railway from Basra to the Gulf would not be constructed at all, at least not without the consent of all interested parties (Stefanova, 1958: 274).

The Fleet – the Main Conflict

The growth of the German colonial empire was simply one aspect of Weltpolitik. The concept assumed the coming of the Pax Germanicum (Carter, 2010: 267) which was impossible without a strong fleet. When talking about the end of the XIX and beginning of XX cc., it is important to take into account the great influence of two political trends – Social Darwinism and Navalism. The first one, inspired by the theory of Charles Darwin, proclaimed the survival of the fittest on the political arena. A lot of advocates of Social Darwinism assumed the avoidance of a struggle between the Great Powers as inevitable (Steinberg, 1966: 27). Navalism, on the other hand, was a doctrine which put great significance on naval power and deemed it the primary measurement of state influence and power (Kennedy, 2003: 260). These two conceptions were the essence of political thought in the discussed period: a strong fleet went hand in hand with an abundance of colonies which guaranteed the strength of a given country, in turn assuring its survival. Weltpolitik was the German answer to the challenge set by the other powers. While its diplomatic side was represented by the Kaiser and Bernhard von Bülow, his foreign secretary since 1897 and later chancellor between 1900 and 1909, the military side was covered by Alfred von Tirpitz, fleet secretary in the years 1897 – 1916. The Admiral did not regard his ambitious fleet program as a sign of aggression; he believed a strong fleet was a "political power factor" (Kennedy, 1973: 608). Two Naval laws, passed in 1898 and 1900, guaranteed the execution of the Tirpitz plan. The buildup of the German navy was gradual and more or less secretive in the first years. The main purpose for that
was to keep the Tirpitz plan a secret from Great Britain. In the European courts, German diplomacy explained its newfound naval strategy with the growing need for security in their newly acquired colonies but the construction and range of that fleet did not keep the truth hidden for long – it was directed against Britain.

The policy followed by Tirpitz did not become a main obstacle for the positive Anglo-German relations until 1906. That was the year in which British renovation of the fleet began. Britain also started strengthening its fleet in the North Sea. The debut of the ships the “Dreadnaught” and “Invisible” was also in 1906. The Germans viewed these new battleships as a direct threat that marked the beginning of the arms race. Influence of naval ideas in London and Berlin progressively increased, for example the idea that for every German ship, the British should build two, was discussed in the Asquith cabinet (Shannon, 1974: 421), while Bülow was stern about lowering the naval capacity of the Reich. The naval race quickly became an enchanted cycle – the worsening Anglo-German relations were a pretext for the enlargement of naval forces and vice versa. The first negotiations related to naval policies began as late as 1909. For three years, the diplomats could not reach an agreement – the Germans only offered to slow down the buildup of ships which was unacceptable to the British.

**European Concert and the Balance of Power**

What are the results of Weltpolitik? So far, they seemed relatively successful – compromises were reached on colonial disputes, the German fleet continued to increase despite British reserves. Ironically the doctrine designed for the world outside of Europe mostly affected the European balance of power. In 1890, Germany was allied with Austro-Hungary and Italy and a step away from including Great Britain in the Triple Alliance, Germany’s neighbors, however, – Russia and France – were in isolation. Just 17 years later Germany was surrounded by an alternative coalition of three powers, Great Britain, France and Russia. The Entente brought together three countries which spent the whole XIX c. in confrontation. The
incorporation of Britain to its greatest adversaries on the continent has even been called a diplomatic revolution. How this revolution happened and whether German threat was among the leading factors in it are questions still disputed between scholars.

The policy which the Foreign office followed after 1887 is correctly defined by Salisbury, then Foreign secretary, as: "to lean to the Triple Alliance without belonging to it" (Howard, 1967: 86). This policy served Britain well especially after the Franco-Russian alliance. In a letter the Russian foreign minister, Nikolay Girs, wrote that the situation in Europe demanded diplomatic support between Russia and France, isolated from the Triple alliance “and the probable joining of Britain” (Stefanova, 1958: 293). Wilhelm II apparently also assumed that Great Britain would join the Alliance but what he failed to calculate was that the British would not enter into a continental union without an immediate threat hanging above their heads. Rosebery and Salisbury, both foreign secretaries in the 1890s, relied on the Triple Alliance, though for them „Isolation is a much less danger than the danger of being dragged into wars which do not concern us”63 (Howard, 1967: 79). This nuance of British foreign policy obviously escaped Berlin, Paris and Petersburg’s notice.

After 1894, Wilhelm II embarked on a new tactic to get Britain to join the Triple alliance – “We need an alliance with England and if they refuse, we have to get them in with fear” (Carter, 2010: 190). The first act of this policy was the Kruger Telegram on January 3rd, 1896. Wilhelm sent a telegram to Paul Kruger, president of Transvaal, in which he congratulated him on the successful defeat “against the armed hordes that invaded your country … and to preserve the independence of the country against outside attacks”64. The “invasion” was the Jameson Raid into Boer territory which was located in the heart of the extremely important Cape colony. The Kaiser’s goal was to scare the British into joining the Triple Alliance, but to them this was a

63 In a letter from Lord Salisbury to Queen Victoria.
64 Quote from the text of the Kruger Telegram, January 3rd, 1896.
diplomatic slap in the face. The Kruger Telegram is often defined as a starting point of the mistrust between Britain and Germany and a factor for the permanent deterioration of their relations. Although this seems somehow exaggerated – there were still pro-German voices in London. The Second Boer War and the Far Eastern crisis made Britain step out from her “splendid isolation”. The first country to which the British turned their attention was indeed Germany. Joseph Chamberlain, secretary of the colonies, was the main pro-alliance politician in the period; he introduced the idea of a “natural union between us and the Great German Empire” (Gavrilov, 1995: 57). The negotiations took place between 1898 and 1901 but yielded no results. Lansdowne, the successor of Salisbury in the Foreign office, managed to get Britain out of the isolation in the Far East by concluding an alliance with Japan in 1902. The biggest problem of Wilhelm’s policy of intimidation is that the British never understood whether he desired to conclude a treaty with them or if he was purely aggressive. Little did Wilhelm know his tactics would make Britain look for alternative allies – firstly Japan and later France.

In the text of the Entente Cordiale, signed on April 8th, 1904, there is not a single word about Germany or Europe (Stefanova, 1958: 300-304). The two countries settled their differences in Northern Africa. The Kaiser viewed their agreement as an overt challenge and immediately attempted to show the French side how unreliable the British were. Thus he caused the First Moroccan Crisis of 1905. The result of the crisis turned out to be unfavorable for Germany – the Entente Cordiale not only stood its ground but the crisis helped lower the antagonism between France’s allies, Britain and Russia, and a period of isolation began for Germany. The Entente was finalized in August 1907 when the Anglo-Russian Convention was signed. In this document there is no mention of Germany or aggressive actions in Europe (Stefanova, 1958: 307-309) but for Germany the union concluded between the two greatest rivals on the continent provoked fear.
The Entente caused serious setbacks to German foreign policy. On the one hand, two doors were closed to Weltpolitik – the Middle East and North Africa. On the other, Germany could no longer attempt to exploit the differences between the three countries for its own personal gain. Germany began to feel surrounded. In 1909 Bethmann-Hollweg became chancellor of Germany and immediately defined his country’s situation as “unstable” (Morwat, 1931: 425), a potential war would be hard to avoid. He decided Britain was the key to lowering the pressure in Europe. From 1909 onwards, various negotiations continued both in Berlin and London about such things as naval policy, the fate of the Portuguese colonies, the Bagdad railway. While the Germans sought a political agreement for neutrality in exchange for concessions on certain disputed questions, the British wanted a naval treaty ensuring a stop to the enormous German naval growth. In the end the talks failed and, although the door for negotiations was left open, neither country was prepared to make a serious compromise.

Conclusions

The development of Anglo-German relations was a result of many interlacing factors. There was not one single reason for their estrangement. It was not a result of a premeditated policy but of the spirit of the age. Neoimperialism, economical competition, the downfall of the European concert – all of them helped to clear the differences between two models for the future of Europe and their aggressive collision in 1914. One of them was led by the powers which wanted to keep the status quo, and the other by those that sought changes in the balance of power. Under the sound of machine guns Old Europe had died, the principles of the Congress of Vienna – legitimism, the principles of compensation – forgotten. Britain and Germany were right at the center of these processes; their failure to understand each other helped the collapse of the balance of power. The root of these misgivings was the different historical background of the two empires. They persistently failed to realize the position of the other.
All started with Weltpolitik which had completely opposite interpretations in Berlin and London. For Germany, acquiring a vast colonial empire was essential both for social-economical reasons as well as prestige. The only alternative the Kaiser saw was expansion in Europe (Kennedy, 1973: 609) which he figured was prone to lead to conflicts. Germany’s interest was not to destroy the British Empire itself but the weaker colonial empires such as the Portuguese, the Spanish, the Danish, the Dutch where Britain also had interests (Kennedy, 1973: 608). However wherever the Germans went to look for their “place under the Sun”, they encountered the British flag. To them the fact that the British attempted to stop German expansion looked absurd coming from the Giant who held 1/5 of the land in the world (Black, 2008: 247). What the German politicians failed to realize was that there were a few British territories of strategic importance where there would be no compromise for territorial gain. Those were mainly the areas which provided access to India like the Persian Gulf or Cape Colony. Germany’s chaotic expansion in those areas awoke worry in London. The Foreign Office never understood why Germans suddenly initiated action in the Ottoman Empire or in the Transvaal. To the British, who built their colonial empire in the course of centuries, the German mania for quick expansion anywhere in the world was deeply confusing. The aggressiveness of Weltpolitik gradually convinced London that Wilhelm II aimed for world domination which threatened the British Empire.

Even though negotiations were hard, after some compromises the two countries managed to reach an agreement on various colonial disputes such as the fate of the Portuguese colonies, China, Samoa islands. This proved that there was common ground for future understanding. The question why after those colonial treaties no alliance treaty was signed is complex but its roots lay in the different vision and analysis of the situation in the two capitals. In 1898-1902 London was looking for a way out of isolation in the Far East, so they could concentrate on the war in South Africa. Salisbury wanted a treaty for local cooperation; he definitely did not want to engage Britain in a continental alliance which carried the danger of dragging his
country into unwanted wars. Berlin was looking for the opposite – they needed an ally they could count on to help them against the Franco-Russian alliance. For Bülow anything less than an alliance would just anger Russia without the guarantee of British support in case of Russian military action.

British pacifism and German militarism contributed to the chasm between the two countries after 1902. The Foreign Office would gladly reach an understanding with any country as long as it guaranteed the peace which Britain needed to prosper. To the Germans things looked differently – war created their country. The faith in the armed conflict as an easy and quick solution to problems which diplomacy could not solve was strong in Berlin especially after the Franco-Prussian war. The only type of armed forces in which the British exceeded was the navy. The naval race remained one of the impossible conflicts to solve. The Germans never understood why the British were so obsessed to be masters of the sea and the British in turn never grasped why, after Germany established its hegemony on the continent, it still desired to be the greatest naval power. If the Reich lost its fleet, it would still be the biggest continental country. But if the British lost their fleet, their empire would fall apart. England did not have a great army or resources, it depended on exports and imports for its economical but also physical survival – 80% of the grain and 42% of the meat on the island came from the colonies (Pantev, Gavrilov, 1994: 440). Germany which had enough resources on their mainland, regarded British fleet policy as “egoism”. What failed to reach the British was the sentimental value of the German military glory – thanks to Prussian militarism the Reich was united but only recently. Old powers such as France or England had centuries to naturally form vital interests; Germany did not have this advantage. In the beginning of the XX c. their policy may have seemed so chaotic in London but it was simply due to the fact that they did not have any common long-term traditions or diplomatic doctrines. Wilhelm II never backed down from the Fleet laws; he believed the strong army (and navy) was his only defense against invasion. He regarded naval supremacy as a sort of elixir to fix any problem in his foreign policy. Sir Edward Grey, foreign minister from 1905,
never backed down from the wish to stop the German fleet program because it was directed against British foreign interests and a danger to the Empire itself. The uncertainly of the two countries, the German fear of encirclement and the British fear of collapse of their empire were the main reasons for the lack of understanding of naval policies in 1909-1914.

The negotiations after 1909 were bound to fail because of the wish of Bethmann-Hollweg to gain British neutrality in the event of a possible war. Britain refused to promise neutrality because Germany offered them too little but also because they understood they could not stand back and watch a war on the continent. Their need to discuss German offers with their allies deepened Berlin’s fear of encirclement which was valid as early as 1904. However, the conclusion that the Entente Cordiale was an anti-German union is a little far-fetched. Until 1905, Russia was the greatest and most dangerous enemy of Great Britain. That was precisely one of the main reasons why Britain decided to conclude an alliance with Russia. To Berlin the Treaty of 1907 was yet another proof of encirclement but to London the Anglo-Russian alliance was concluded in the same spirit as that of Vienna and it was far more important from a strategic point of view than any talks with Germany. Hardinge, the second man in the Foreign Office, supported the decision for the Treaty of 1907 by stating that only a single naval agreement with Germany was required whereas Anglo-Russian relations were vital for the future of the entire Asian continent (Steiner, 1967: 419).

The Germans concluded that the Entente was pointed directly against them in the same way they concluded that “Dreadnaught” and “Invincible” were targeted against their fleet. This more or less showed the insecurities within the German foreign policy. Wilhelm II was as much “a true catastrophe” (Pantev, Gavrilov, 1994: 462) to his country as he was the perfect Kaiser. His own behavior, sometimes resembling that of a grumpy teenager, suited his new-born empire which jumped from cause to cause, looking for and building its own traditions. On the other side, lay the long tradition of the British monarchy and its Parliament. These vast differences in the
historical background led to the incompatibility and quite the opposite foreign interests of the two empires which was the direct reason for their failure to understand each other. Even their geographical location dictated differing experiences. The security of the island contrasted with the insecurity of the continent. Impossible is the alliance of two countries which look for the exact opposite qualities in a potential ally. For Germans loyalty and support in any situation stood first. The British looked for common grounds and interests in the first place. The goals of their policies were completely different – while the British wanted to save the status quo in the world, the Germans looked for changes in it. The only condition Britain needed to get out of the “splendid isolation” was as little commitment as possible, something that was among the few things Germany could not accept. In the end it turned out that a simple local colonial agreement was enough for Great Britain to send its boys to rot in the trenches in France but Germany had no way of knowing that before 1914.

R. B. Mowat wrote that the fate of Europe depended on the Anglo-German relations (Morwat, 1931: 423). He was not far from the truth. The fatal demise of the Vienna system was reminiscent of her birth – from the ruins of a horrible war in Europe. The reason for it was not so much imperialism in Africa or Asia but the death of the balance of power in Europe. That was the cause Britain was prepared to defend and Germany was ready to fight against even if it meant total war.
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Operetta as mirror

Eszter Hadobás, Eötvös Lóránd University Budapest

The Habsburg Empire was a special type of formation in Europe. This was the state form in which several ethnic, cultural and lingual divisions lived together. While the Austro-Hungarian Empire (AHE) can be seen as a big union of cultures, ethnicities, languages, it was, in fact, an inhomogeneous and plural state. During the existence of the AHE we can talk about a mixed, very plural society which possessed some analog cultural codes. The Habsburg Monarchy’s special cultural product was the Wiener Operette. The Viennese operetta tells us about the empire’s world, intellectual and multicultural social life. In these musical products we can learn about political and social relations, such as the cultural and musical mood of the era or the mentality of the people. The operetta can be interpreted as a mirror: it faced the public with the political and social situation of the empire through irony, jokes and music. On the other hand, the operetta helped the public to forget their problems at least for a night, like an inward valve. With the help of some of the most famous operettas of the era, I would like to reveal in this paper how these operettas can be used as historical sources, and why should we use them. Furthermore I would like to focus on the mentality of the people, how the common men and women of the era felt about the other nations within the empire, and how was it represented in these musical products. And finally, I want to point out how the empire handled its multiculturalism and what kind of a picture it tried to present to its inhabitants.

The historiography until the end of the 19th century tried to reconstruct the history through political, social and economic written sources. Meanwhile, the research of the everyday life was basically left out. Everyday life as a research problem in the 20th century appeared in the work of Johan Huizinga (Huizinga, 1976), but it became more popular thanks to the so-called second generation of the Annales School historians like Ferdinand Braudel or George Duby. Their new perspective can be called historical anthropology, micro-history, new narrative history writing or Alltagsgeschichte. The subjects of this type of research were the everyday life, the common man, their lifestyles and mental universe, which were all considered to be banalities before. (Gyáni, 1997:1) Although, this kind of information could be both relevant as well as important in the case of history writing, the so-called classic historical sources tell little about the mentalities, the everyday experiences or the cultural self-interpretations of the individuals during previous centuries. If we want to get a fuller, more representative picture of the mental state of the common man in general, we should subject to research the type of activities that were widely enjoyed. For example the way in which individuals and social groups entertained themselves,
reveals a lot about their interests. One of the most popular forms of entertainment among the urban population in the 19th and the early 20th century was the operetta. 

In this paper we would like to focus on one of the most important entertainment forms of the era – i.e. the second half of the 19th century and the fin de siècle - the operetta. The operetta was the most popular leisure activities amongst the urban population in its own time and later. Even though it was often mentioned as “inferior art form”, it was still more popular than the so-called “high art” of the opera. (Csáky, 1999:13) Considering this, we could gain a better knowledge about the mentalities of the social strata. Today, for people this kind of entertainment may seem outdated, even banal or not understandable. The operetta as a genre has not been an object of a deep academic analysis either by social sciences or by musicology. This applies especially to the wiener Operette.65 The wiener Operette was a special cultural product of the Habsburg Empire. The wiener Operetta tells us about the world of the monarchy, its intellectual life, and of course its social and political affairs. Not to mention the cultural and musical mood of the era, or the individuals’ mentality. So we can use the operettas when constructing the history of mentalities.

Imre Kálmán told a Viennese newspaper in an interview the following in 1913: ”I know that a half page of Liszt’s score is worth more than all of my operettas I’ve written and those which I will. But I also know that half a page requires a highly intellectual public, which is still a small fraction of the theatergoers.” (cit. Batta, 1992:7)

So the operetta openly and deliberately was intended to focus on the present and its “simple and ordinary” people, who were the major part of the society. The operetta has always been popular with the less musically educated and even amongst the more educated middle class and intellectuals, musicians, artists, and writers, although undoubtedly they did not make up the majority of the theatergoer crowd. So it can be said, that the operetta is an international and interpersonal genre, which crosses social and political strata, such as the borders of countries and regions. All of these elements suggest that the operetta should be the subject of more academic research. And the question presents itself: why has the operetta not been the subject

65 The exception is the work of Moritz Csáky, on whose research this paper relies.
of this research? The opinions about the operetta have been ambivalent ever since the birth of the genre. Some scholars even deny that the genre of operetta exists. There are academics who would erase the operetta from the music history, while others merely think of it as a musical slip. The contemporary critics were condemning both the ideological content and the musical standards of the operetta. Émile Zola, the famous French writer said the following about Offenbach and his works: “The operetta is a public disgrace. It should be wiped out like a pest” (Zola, 1881) His further dislike towards the operetta was described more in detail in his novel Nana, in which he showed the world of the operetta, especially the works of Offenbach, through the life of a coquette.

The stern Viennese critic Karl Kraus called the operetta “a chaos without reason” and a “seriously taken nonsense”. (Kraus, 1919) In his works, he was not just against the operetta as a genre, saw it as a cultural fall, which he was blaming on the Viennese operetta – amongst others. Though we have to add that Kraus held Offenbach on high regard, and his works were the benchmark for the critic. Furthermore, Theodor Adorno, a sociologist and musicologist ranked the operetta as an inferior genre and held Johann Strauss the son- responsible for the “idiotism of the popular music” (Adorno, 1980:35-54). The Viennese operetta got most of its criticism because it was different from the Offenbachien, which was undoubtedly the standard for the genre. It was said that the wiener Operette was not either not critical enough, or it even lacked the directness of the political and social criticism of the French example, and therefore could not achieve its primal function: showing a mocking glass to society. (Batta, 1992:59) Since Offenbach’s works can be interpreted as an expression of the second empire, the Viennese operetta can be seen as a representation of the “historical culture” of the last decades of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire.66 (Csáky, 1999:30) And that is why we cannot expect it to show the same characteristics as its French predecessors.

66 This ’historical culture’ originated from the unique pluralism and multiculturalism of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
The operetta itself has French origins. The new genre made popular by Jacques Offenbach had novel elements both in literature and music. The Offenbach operettas mocked the French society, especially the political system of Napoleon III, through satire and irony. The new musical genre soon conquered Vienna as well, where the present historical situation and tradition presented itself in the operetta. (Batta, 1992:61-62) After the success of the French operettas in Vienna, the *wiener Operette* soon appeared on the stages of the Habsburg Empire. We should point out that the success of the French operettas was mainly due to the translated librettos, which were adapted to fit the Viennese gusto. It was understood in theatrical circles that these operettas born from French humor in their original forms could not be understood by the public of the Monarchy. (Csáky, 2005:59) In Paris the public was more open to the criticism of the emperor than in Vienna. The multinational and multicultural population of Vienna was rather cosmopolitan, and the bourgeoisie was more loyal to the empire; but although they admired the world of aristocracy, they mocked it as well. That is why the social and political criticisms in the two types of operettas were a bit different.

The roots of the Viennese operetta have led us to the birth and rise of the bourgeoisie. Industrialization and modernization in the Habsburg Empire created a similar life environment, and the bourgeoisie had similar or analogue cultural codes. This ethnically and culturally inhomogeneous bourgeoisie was both the recipient and the reflection of the operetta at the same time. (Csáky, 2005:56) This musical product was the manifestation and reflection of the social reality in the *fin de siècle*. It was like a mirror, facing the public with the political and social situation of the empire through irony, jokes and music. At that time there was a term to describe the people’s mentality: the *biedermeier* feeling. It came from a well-known Gracián citation: “Happy is who is able to forget the unchangeable”, which was adapted by the contemporary German philosopher Schopenhauer, therefore making it widely known. The operetta helped the public to forget their problems at least for a night. In the

67 In the German language the expression *Gemütlichkeit* describes this feeling best.
theatre the people could laugh at anything, even at themselves. It worked like an inner valve. (Klotz, 2007:279)

With the help of the operettas we could have a look at the history of the Habsburg Empire as well, and the social and political changes throughout its existence. Let us look at some examples to prove this point. In the case of the *wiener Operette* we have to distinguish three different categories. The first one is the period so called the *golden era* of the operetta, which basically means Johann Strauss, the younger, and his contemporaries. This era was the birth of the *wiener Operette* and also the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The famous Strauss operetta *Der Zigeunerbaron* (The Gypsy Baron-1885) tells the story about the adaptation of the Austro-Hungarian relations after the settlement (1867), placed in the 18th century. It was based on a well-known novel of the famous Hungarian writer Mór Jókai. The plot points out the liberal minority policy of the empire through the misrepresentation of the gypsy life. The operetta shows the public a positive picture about Hungary and the multiethnic population with the help of the romanticized story and the *czardas* and *verbunk* music. The Gypsy Baron is Hungarian, but monarchy-Hungarian, which was accepted by both the Austrian and the Hungarian public. (Batta, 1992:102)

The era’s most successful operetta was *Die Fledermaus* (The Bat-1874). The Bat is also called as the most Viennese operetta. The world of The Bat is a tale: a few hours of fun, a New Year’s Eve amusement. It gave the bourgeoisie of the Monarchy what they needed: a little delusion, self-deception, some reality, more illusion, a little criticism and enchanting, catchy melodies. (Hanák 1997) Basically the public of Vienna could see an idealized and nostalgic version of their city in this operetta, something which Richard Taubner pointed out. (Taubner, 1983:243.300)

During the party in the operetta something occurs which in the real life would be impossible: the (theeing) seeing and fraternization between strangers, between aristocrats and citizens. The multiethnic population of Vienna became brothers and
It was like Beethoven’s *Ode to Joy* in the form of waltz melodies. Within the music of the operetta the whole of Europe appears: Russian, Scottish, Spanish dances are followed by Czech and Hungarian music, and then finally the Viennese waltz. The finale of the Bat is like the apotheosis of the multiethnic Monarchy. (Batta, 1992:64) It advertises that it is great to live in this colorful, big happy family. The nationalities could live together side by side, and everybody has a home in this Monarchy. But what is home and what is fatherland? These questions were often asked at the end of 19th century and during the fin de siècle, our 2nd period of the operettas.

In the Monarchy fatherland meant something else to everybody. Patriotism became practically acceptable among the interests of the empire, which very often led to national conflicts. When the Monarchy became more and more fragile, the fatherland and patriotism became only empty words. This problem appeared in the famous operetta, *Die Lustige Witwe* (The Merry Widow - 1904) by Franz Lehár. In the opening, Danilo, the main protagonist, who is portrayed as a true monarchy citizen, sings: “Oh fatherland, you cause me by day, already enough trouble and trial-than I go to Maxim’s, There I am very at home. I address all the ladies with ‘Du’, Call them by nicknames, Lulu, Dudu, Froufru. They allow me to forget the dear fatherland.” He advertises with cynicism that he lives within an operetta, moreover in an Orpheum world. The play itself takes place in Pontevedro, which is very probably Montenegro. We can assume that the public also knew that, and were familiar with the foreign policy of the empire. So in Pontevedro they could recognize the political and social situation of the Monarchy. For example Hanna Glavari calls Cetinje her home, which is a town in Montenegro. Also her famous Vilja song was based on a well-know Croatian-Dalmatian folk song, which implies furthermore that the operetta takes place in a Balkan country.

---

68 The original chorus from the operetta is called „Brüderlein und Schwesterlein”
Because the play was a success, very much loved by the public, we can assume that they agreed with its content, or at least with most of it. For example, the operetta mocks the official foreign policy, the so-called Zweibund and Dreibund (dual and trial alliances) and the politics of the open doors. In the operetta Danilo so argues against marriage: “A pact for two it should always be, but soon a pact for three will supervene, Which is often counted, but only after weak moments! From the European balance of power, when person gets married, of him there is soon not a single trace. The reason lies mostly in this: Madam too readily gives in to the politics of open doors.”

70 In the script, written by Victor Leon, the private and the political-social spheres are mashed up and, with the help of -the politics, were mocked. Probably that is why it was such a great success and could cheer up the public who very much needed the entertainment.

One of the critics of the ‘Hét’ wrote that Lehár’s play was not an operetta, but a historical event, almost a concept such as the manifestation of the spirit of the times. (Fábri-Steinert, 1978). Most of the modern operettas showed the public the Monarchy’s current situation. And as the time went by the problems in the empire increased more by the day and eventually they became unsolvable. This leads us to the First World War and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire; and in a way also the fall of the operetta. After the First World War and the collapse of the empire everything changed. Political and social systems became totally different, the new states tried to create new systems which were nothing like the old ones. After the fall of the Monarchy the operetta lost its social basis, because the social strata of the supporters of the genre disappeared. 71 Everything that made this genre and what it was meant for, had radically changed or disappeared. Not just the state form fell apart, but the socio-cultural system as well.

The old type operetta had lost its meaning: the public did not understand anymore what it was about, the jokes, the subtexts the references, etc. So it merely

70 i.m.
71 In consequence of that during the First World War a whole generation of men were basically wiped out, and after that the Spanish flu took more lives than the war in Europe.
became subject of nostalgia. The political regimes tried to use this nostalgic feeling for their own purposes. They wanted the people to think about the Monarchy as a bad and unwanted conception. The new use of the operetta was supposed to alienate and sour the past. Nevertheless the operetta did not lose its charm and popularity, resulting in a new era.

Two kinds of operettas conquered the stages of Vienna after the war. The first one was still connected to the silver era of the operettas. These operettas were happy of tone, and their aim was primarily to entertain and make people forget their problems. The positivity was also mixed with great deal of nostalgia. Most of these plays were set in the former empire and often contained even the figure of the old emperor, Franz Joseph. Of this kind of operettas the works of Imre Kálmán and Rudolph Benatzky are great examples. Benatzky’s famous operetta the *Im Weißen Rößl* (The White Horse Inn – 1930) had the old emperor himself as a character. The original play’s adaptation showed the public, the old empire with great nostalgia and romanticism. Most of the operettas of Kálmán had a similar content. In the most successful plays the public could always find some references to the ‘happy peacetime’ which often led to a longing for the ‘good old’ pre-war times, and for the Monarchy. This was especially true in the case of the Hungarian public. The Viennese operetta was always successful in Hungary, in many forms such as the Hungarian operetta. The famous composers Lehár and Kálmán were both Hungarians and their works were very popular in all parts of the Monarchy, including Hungary. After the empire collapsed, some of their operettas were used in Hungary not just for entertainment but for propaganda purposes as well. The operetta *Gräfin Mariza* (Countess Mariza – 1926) is a perfect example for this. The original script had references to the Monarchy and a sort of longing for it, but the Hungarian version put them into a revisionist form. One of the duets in the operetta ‘Komm mit nach Varasdin’ was rewritten as ‘Nice town is Kolozsvár’. So it changes the location of the song to a town in Transylvania (Cluj-Napoca), which was no longer part of

72 in English: Come to Varasdin
73 The Hungarian script written by Andor Gábor says: „Szép város Kolozsvár, majd ott lakunk a Szamosnál.”
Hungary after the war. The Hungarian revisionist public cheered this version of the operetta on and most of the shows basically became a protest against the Trianon Treaties. (Rátonyi, 1984: 263)

It is worth drawing the attention to a new concept: the sad operetta. After the fall of the Monarchy mostly some work of Lehár could be part of this category. The librettos of these operettas were mostly about real life, though without a happy end. They had serious contents, and less jokes and irony. With the collapse of the Monarchy the link between so many cultures, which made the Empire what it was, disappeared, and that was where the melodic world of Lehár came from. The Friederike (1930) and Das Land des Lächelns (The Land of Smiles-1929) are practically about the tragical, experienced incompatible social and ethnical-cultural situations. (Csáky, 1999:264) The plot of the The Land of Smiles can be considered as the fall of the multicultural empire. The love of Sou-Chong and Lisa represents a tragic venture; they tried to get over their cultural differences, but did not succeed, just like the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As Sou-Chong sings in the third act: “Smile always and be happy, satisfied with whatever the future holds for you.” It can be interpreted as another form of the Gracián quote and as the sign of resignation. (Csáky, 1999: 265)

One more aspect of the operetta is worthy of our attention. The wiener Operette along with the Waltzer became the synonym of Vienna, just like the polka were associated Bohemia and the czardas and the world of Der Zigeunerbaron with Hungary. Moreover, social groups got certain connotations, which infiltrated the common knowledge and were used by operetta adaptation to satisfy certain ideological views. (Csáky, 1999:90) It can be said therefore, that the operetta became the place of the ‘memoire culturelle’ (cultural memory – Assmann, 1999) and remained to be even after the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The operetta passed on the social and cultural codes, which were specific to the monarchy and helped the formation of identity of its viewers. The operetta, whether directly or throughout the hidden literary texts and musical quotes, recalled to the public the
multicultural nature of the region, which further strengthened in them the knowledge of ethnical and cultural diversity.

Simultaneously, however, the cultural attributions got additional connotations as well and often expressed more than their original meaning. Take, for example, the waltz, which could have expressed joy, lightness, happiness, but also could have indicated the city of Vienna and its population as well. Such typology was impossible to avoid, however they were transferred into the public awareness and created the so-called "invented tradition". According to the English social historian Eric Hobsbawm the main characteristics of the invented tradition is that continuity is greatly fictitious, so their meaning was relevant only to the present, because it was said that they were genuine and originated from the past. (Hobsbawm, 1983) The invented tradition, mainly because of a social amnesia, becomes “real” after a time, and lives further as a genuine national, folk tradition, its real origin forgotten. A great example of this is the birth of the gypsy operettas. In these operettas the gypsies are portrayed in a romantic, almost exotic way, which created a false picture about them. Not just the librettos were able to transfer these false pictures and memories, but the music as well. An example of that are the Hungarian folk songs played in a gypsy style, staged as originals and therefore the Hungarian folk music was identified with gypsy melodies. These kinds of music alterations were meant to please the urban population’s crave for authentic folk music, but they were very far from the truth. The operetta could allow itself to not acknowledge the ‘real’ folk music, let alone use it. (Csáky, 1999:237)

The operetta was aimed at the wide ranges of urban public, so it had to use musical and literary codes understood by these people. It had to create a world on the stage which the viewers could recognize, even identify with it. In the case of the Viennese public a waltzer, a czardas, a polka or even a mazurka was a musical code which represented their own world. These musical codes were represented in the operettas both separately and also mixed, which led to a musical acculturation. The

74 Examples of these operettas are Der Zigeunerprimas by Imre Kálmán or Die Zigeunerliebe by Franz Lehár.
Theatergoers were introduced to an unknown world, which later became part of their own, so a kind of cultural exchange took place. The composers were fully aware of the fact that the viewers of their operettas lived in a multicultural and multiethnic world, and used that to their advantages. Precisely this is what led to the short decline of the operetta after the fall of the monarchy. With the collapse of the multiethnic empire not just a state form, but a social and cultural system disappeared as well. So the old type of the operetta lost its ‘meaning’. The new, so-called “revue operettas” appeared, whose primary function was to distract the public’s attention from the everyday problems and propagate the ‘cheerful mood’. Despite of the sometimes greatly nostalgic, almost cheap productions, the operetta has been remained one of the places of the cultural memory. (Csáky, 1999:262)

It can be said, that despite of its era dependent themes and musical expressions the operetta has an across the ages valid message. Although the ironic-critic nature of the operetta was applied to concrete social and political conditions, these pilloried situations like the social inequalities, out-of-date social institutions and the abuse of power could easily be transplanted into another eras. (Csáky, 2005) Besides that the plots of the operettas were light toned and ended happily - almost without an exception, which satisfied the theatergoers who wanted to be entertained and have fun in every historical era. In sum the *wiener Operette* is a kind of work of art, from which a context of an historical era can be revealed. The analysis of the operetta not just opens the way to past complex cultural system, but it can show connection with the present, and can help to understand our identity as well. (Csáky, 1999:267)

75 The operettas of Pál Ábrahám or Mihály Eisemann can be put in this category. The most famous ones are *Ball im Savoy* (1932) and *Miss Amerika* (1929)
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Democratic reform through war and crisis? Britain 1914-1918

Helge Jonas Pösche, Humboldt-Universität Berlin

Despite being often cited as a role model for democratic constitutional development, Britain did not introduce universal male suffrage and some form of restricted female suffrage before February 1918. Why was this highly controversial issue, on which politicians had so far been unable to agree, solved – at least partly – at a time when the country was fighting the First World War? Historians have offered different explanations: some claim that the war created a spirit of patriotic unity; others refer to rational party interests or argue that the war had no impact on the question. This article concentrates on debates in the House of Commons in the years 1916-1917, but also takes the economic and social impacts of the war on British society into account. It argues that by posing a threat to the political system, the war fundamentally changed the framework in which questions concerning the right to vote were discussed. While in the years preceding the war, campaigns for female suffrage had dominated the debates, it was now the claim for the “vote for soldiers and sailors” which turned out to be a driving force for reform. However, not patriotic unity, but controversial debates and hard bargaining paved the way for a reform that was maybe less inspired by democratic universalism than by the idea that fighting for their country ought to enable men to participate politically.

As modern-day public interest focuses mainly on its horrible human costs and on its causal connection to the later rise of totalitarianism (and, therefore, the Second World War), the First World War is rarely mentioned as a driving force for democracy in Europe. However, from the perspective of the early 1920s, this viewpoint seemed reasonable: the war had overthrown several autocratic empires and instead given birth to new democracies (e.g. in Germany). Interestingly, one can observe a comparable development towards more democratic participation in a victorious nation that is usually mentioned for its relatively progressive political system at the time. In 1918, Britain, where so far only men of a certain income had been allowed to vote, passed the “Representation of the People Act”, also known as the “Fourth Reform Act”, which for the first time granted the vote to all men and at least some women – “one of the greatest achievements of constitutional reform in the twentieth century” (Blackburn, 2011: 33). Blackburn’s article asks why this reform was adopted at that point in time and to what extent it was caused by the war and its political and social consequences. In contrast to most of the research which has been done on this topic, the article focusses not so much on the question of female suffrage but on universal male suffrage – arguing that this aspect, which attained new significance in wartime,
has to be considered as a driving force for democratic reform. Firstly, the article deals with suffrage debates in Britain in the years preceding the First World War. Secondly, explanations for the genesis of the Fourth Reform Act offered by research are discussed. Thirdly, parliamentary debates on this issue during the years 1916 to 1918 are analysed, thereby taking a closer look at the dynamics of discourse and how they changed from 1916 to 1917. Finally, the article discusses which factors in the end led to the reform.

The pre-1918 British franchise was determined by the Representation of the People Act of 1884 (Third Reform Act). Even though this reform had doubled the size of the electorate, the right to vote, besides being granted only to males, was still “a privilege purchased through property” (Blackburn, 2011: 36). To qualify for registration as a voter, one needed to own residential property or rent living space as a tenant for at least ten pounds a year. Men who could only afford a lower rent or lived in an area where the usual rent was lower, and men who were not independent tenants – for example, because they lived with their parents or as domestic servants or farm workers on their employer’s property – were excluded (Tanner, 1983: 207). Moreover, requirements regarding the minimum duration of residence and complex bureaucratic procedures for change of residence discriminated against people who moved frequently. Around 1914, about 40 per cent of adult males were still unenfranchised (Pugh, 1978: 29).

In the 1900s, it was the women’s suffrage movement, claiming the vote for women, which posed the greatest challenge to the electoral system. In contrast, “the unenfranchised men seem to have raised little attention.” Pugh explains this by the circumstance that these men included “the least organised, least politically conscious and least articulate sections of the population” (Pugh, 1978: 29, 30). From 1905 onwards, the British government was formed by the Liberal Party, the Conservatives (Tories) and the newly founded Labour party being in opposition. One could assume that liberalist ideology is relatively open towards the idea of political participation for
everyone. Between 1906 and 1911, however, the Liberal government’s unsuccessful attempts to reform the franchise sought only to abolish plural votes, but did not include any widening of the suffrage, neither to men nor to women (ibid.: 31). In 1913, the government was close to bring in a bill that would have connected restricted female suffrage and a lowering of registration restrictions for men. The combination of these two issues, however, was highly controversial even for many Liberals. After lengthy debates, the Conservatives, who were critical of any form of franchise extension, managed to dissuade the government from bringing the bill to parliament. In turn, many progressive Liberal and Labour politicians committed themselves to the conviction that a future reform had to contain fully democratic male and female suffrage, but not the former alone, and no limited version (ibid.: 42-44). As 1913 had shown, however, such a reform was much too uncertain in its outcome to be proposed by the Liberal government under Prime Minister Herbert Henry Asquith.

What influenced the positions of political parties on this issue? Matthew et al. argue that “the ideologies of both the Labour and Conservative parties made them much better able to exploit a fully democratic franchise” than the Liberals (Matthew, McKibbin, Kay, 1976: 740). Under the pre-1918 franchise, they explain, Labour suffered from the franchise’s bias against the working class. After the franchise had been extended in 1918, Labour ‘automatically’ gained far more votes, while the Liberal share of votes declined dramatically, and the Conservative share remained stable (ibid.: 723-725, 740). From this perspective, the Liberals must have had an interest in avoiding franchise reform in the pre-war period, while Labour had an interest to support it. Consequently, Matthew et al. interpret the pre-1914 behaviour of the Liberals as being in line with that rational interest. Even though there was a lot of liberal talk about reform, they argue, “actions and priorities are what in the long run matter; on this test the Liberals were not a franchise reforming party” (ibid.: 746). Questioning these conclusions, Clarke claims that before 1914, the Liberals were seen by many as a working-class party (Clarke, 1977: 584). Moreover, Tanner
emphasizes that not only workers, but also many middle class men were excluded by the pre-1918 franchise, which gave both the Liberals and the Conservatives an incentive to promote a reform. However, even Tanner admits that the pre-war franchise had a strong bias against the working class (Tanner, 1983: 213, 216).

In any case, Blackburn’s conclusion that around 1914, the “argument for extending the male suffrage, and behind it the case for democracy itself, had been accepted across the political parties” (Blackburn, 2011: 35), seems to be at least incomplete. Only the Labour Party, which exclusively addressed workers, certainly had strong reasons for expecting to benefit from suffrage extension. For the other two parties, it was not clear at the time whether a more democratic franchise would support or harm their success in future elections. They were potentially able both to support and to reject a reform. Before 1914, support for suffrage extension existed among all political factions, but it was not strong enough to succeed under the given political circumstances.

This existing suffrage extension raises the question in which ways the war might have affected the discussion on the franchise, thereby creating new circumstances more in favour of a reform. First of all, one could argue that in times of industrial warfare and conscription, the state becomes more dependent on the working class. The latter, in turn, might seek to earn more bargaining power. This could explain the remarkable rise of trade unionism in Britain during the war: union membership doubled from four million in 1913 to eight million in 1920, which, of course, increased their ability to run campaigns (Reid 1988: 227-228). Moreover, during the war, state authorities not only increasingly interfered in industrial production, but also introduced social policies in areas such as housing, which gave the state a more interventionist role (Thorpe, 2001: 36). These factors might have increased workers’ interests in influencing political affairs (Fenley, 1980). In turn, politicians may have found themselves unable to exclude a large social group from political participation. Wartime economy – to be more precise, full employment and rising relative wages
combined with a high inflation – reduced wage differences between workers and created a more homogenous working class. At the same time, it was the middle class who suffered the most from the war in economic terms and lost a part of its income and fortune relative to workers (Hinton, 1983: 97; Reid, 1988: 23). One might argue that in a socially more levelled society, it becomes more difficult to legitimate the exclusion of one group from the vote.

Against such arguments, however, Pugh states that “it seems unlikely that Britain’s long and peculiar approach to modern democracy was vitally affected by war.” The effect of the war on social structures and welfare policies, he states, has been exaggerated. Moreover, he argues that the views of the political parties on franchise reform did not change substantially because of the war (Pugh, 1978: 179-180). Instead of the war, he claims, rather ‘technical’ factors led to the reform. Many MPs, Pugh explains, agitated in favour of a renewed voter’s register to enable the country to have an election in wartime, or shortly after the war. Setting up such a register, however, was very complicated, as due to the war, residence and income of many people had changed. In this situation, it was the easiest option to introduce universal franchise which, according to Pugh, had not been a very controversial issue anyway. Pugh concludes that the reform was not “a war measure in inspiration but rather [...] an accident of wartime” (ibid.: 181, 183).

Blackburn, on the other hand, describes the war as an important factor. Wartime, he states, created “a spirit of co-operation” among politicians, uniting them with regard to a “common spirit among the political spectrum” for “the principle of political equality” (Blackburn, 2011: 33-34, 47). According to Blackburn, wartime conditions led to patriotism connected with democratic ideals. In contrast to Pugh or Matthew et al., he identifies some newly emerging ideology, instead of rational party interests, as the crucial factor behind the reform.

To pursue these questions, let us take a closer look at the relevant parliamentary debates on the issue of suffrage reform.
In August 1916, the Prime Minister Herbert Henry Asquith proposed a bill to set up a new register for a future election. He explained that due to the massive “replacement of population” caused by the war, the old register was totally out of date. Moreover, men who had had the vote already and served in the forces now “should not be disenfranchised”. Instead, they should be included in the new register, even if they did not fulfil the formal requirements anymore (lxxxv, 14 Aug. 1916: 1448-1449). He also expressed sympathy for the idea of giving the vote to all soldiers and sailors serving in the forces – including those who did not have the vote so far – as a reward for their service (ibid.: 1450). However, he stated, such an attempt would inevitably lead to the question of whether all munitions workers should have the vote, too, because “they are rendering equally important and effective service.” Moreover, “the moment you begin a general enfranchisement on these lines of state service, you are brought face to face with another most formidable proposition: What are you to do with the women?” (ibid.: 1451-1452). He concluded that “nothing could be more injurious to the best interests of the country” than having a franchise debate at that time, and that the best solution was to set up a new register that did not “in any way modify, either by way of enlargement or contraction, the qualification for the franchise.” (ibid.).

During the discussion on this and the following days, there were two groups who claimed, in opposition to Asquith, a widening of the franchise instead of only setting up a new register. First of all, there were those Liberals and Labour MPs who argued in favour of a universal franchise for all men and women. They claimed, as the Liberal Winston Churchill put it, “much larger resolutions than those within the scope of this bill.” (lxxxv, 16 Aug. 1916: 1952). The Liberal Willoughby Dickinson argued that if “service and sacrifice” mattered, women’s contribution to the war effort qualified them to get the vote (ibid.: 1917). In the words of the Liberal John Simon, “women should have the vote because they have been brave women” (ibid.: 1903).

76 All quotes from parliamentary debates refer to Hansard, Commons Debates, 5th ser. The Latin number indicates the volume.
Also pointing to the war efforts, the Irish Nationalist Stephen Gwynn claimed universal male suffrage, stating that “when you admit conscription, you admit universal suffrage for men.” (ibid.: 1931). Additionally, they argued, introducing universal suffrage for male and female adults would be much less difficult in a technical sense than setting up a new register under war conditions (ibid.: 1918-1919).

The second group opposing Asquith’s proposal were mainly Conservative MPs who rejected universal male or female suffrage, but wanted all men who served as soldiers or sailors in the forces to get the vote. One of them was the Irish Unionist Edward Carson, who argued that the franchise should not any longer be based on residency or property only, but on “the fact that they are the men who are preserving the lives and property of the people of this country.” He continued to say that “the question of whether women should be enfranchised… is a question apart; it has nothing to do with this question.” (ixxxv, 14 Aug. 1916: 1461). The Conservative Ronald McNeill argued that the “sacrifice” by soldiers and sailors qualified them – but not women – to get the vote (lxxxv, 16 Aug. 1916: 1913). Following the same logic, the Liberal Unionist Rowland Hunt claimed that, in contrast to soldiers and sailors, people who stayed at home had no right to claim the vote (ibid.: 1933). According to the Conservative Carlyon Bellairs, only those “who have risked their lives” should be newly enfranchised. Stating that “women would repudiate the idea” of being “used to prevent soldiers and sailors from being given the vote” (ibid.: 1960), he tackled Asquith’s statement that any change of the franchise would inevitably lead to a large reform.

The government and its supporters reacted in two ways. Against the advocates of a large franchise reform including women, they kept stating that, as the Conservative Bonar Law put it, “raising the whole question of the suffrage at this time [...] would

---

77 Irish Unionists, who advocated their homelands remain within the United Kingdom, were usually associated with the conservative camp.

78 Being the result of secession from the Liberal Party caused by disagreement on the question of Irish home rule, the Liberal Unionists had strong ties to the Conservatives.
[...] be one of the most absurd things that could be done”; something that was simply not appropriate in the midst of a war (lxxxv, 16 Aug. 1916: 1960). To discourage those who claimed the vote for soldiers and sailors, they argued that there was an inevitable connection between the vote for soldiers and universal suffrage for men and women. Therefore, claims for giving the vote to soldiers would certainly lead to a larger franchise discussion and, perhaps, even to a universalist franchise reform. According to the government, however, this was certainly not what the advocates of the vote for soldiers and sailors had intended (lxxxv, 14 Aug. 1916: 1452).

However, opposition against the government’s register bill was too strong and threatened to deadlock parliament. Moreover, other issues connected with elections, such as proportional representation (PR) and redistribution of seats, were put up for discussion (lxxxv, 16 Aug. 1916: 1904). In this situation, the Conservative president of the local government board Walter Long proposed to “set up a Conference” to discuss the issues connected with elections and to “produce an agreed system [...] upon which the great mass [...] of the people of this country could come together.” (ibid.: 1949). Pugh speaks of “a desperate expedient” to solve questions which had proved unsolvable so far and to preserve a government which would have split otherwise (Pugh, 1978: 69). Long’s proposal was accepted, and on 1 October 1916, Asquith announced a Conference, chaired by the Conservative Speaker of the House of Commons James W. Lowther, to deal with “everything related to elections”. The Conference consisted of a “cross-section of the parliamentary parties”, most of the thirty-two members being back benchers. There were thirteen Conservatives (including Unionists), twelve Liberals, four Irish Nationalists, and three Labour MPs. The composition of the Conference was designed to include both supporters and opponents of the crucial issues (ibid.: 71, 73). The literature does not explicitly mention how many of the Conference members were explicitly in favour of suffrage reform. However, as the Tory members were rather from the right wing of their party (ibid.: 74), they were not genuine supporters of a universalist suffrage.
The Conference had 26 meetings between 12 October 1916 and 26 January 1917 (Blackburn, 2011: 41). As no transcripts of the debates exist, there is little knowledge about how the final agreement was actually achieved (Hart, 1992: 180). Pugh states that “there can be no doubt of their determination to reach an agreement” (Pugh, 1978: 75). However, three Conservative members dropped out in protest, and one member initially assumed that there was no chance to come to any unanimous agreements. One member stated that he “consented at the Speaker’s Conference to a large number of things which I did not like, in order that I should get certain things that I did like.” (ibid.: 77). This indicates that the atmosphere at the Conference’s meetings was not one of concord, but of negotiation.

On 27 January 1917, Lowther presented the proposals of the Conference in a letter to Prime Minister Lloyd George, who presided over a coalition government since December 1916 (for the proposals see Pugh, 1978: 192-193). Unanimously, the conference agreed on a simple registry procedure based on residency which, as the requirements of a minimum rent and of being an independent tenant were abolished, effectively meant universal male suffrage. By majority decision only, they proposed to give the vote to all women over thirty or thirty-five. On 28 March 1917, the Lloyd George government proposed that “this house [...] is of the opinion that legislation should promptly be introduced on the lines of the resolutions reported from the Conference.” (xcii, 28 Mar. 1917: 462).

The following debates in March, May, November, and December 1917 saw considerable opposition by Conservative MPs who still rejected universal male and any form of female suffrage. Arnold Ward stated that during the war, “the work of men has been decisive and the work of women has been auxiliary” and, therefore, “men [...] should continue to be the masters in time of peace.” (ibid.: 497, 498). Pointing to the fact that three Conservative members had dropped out, some doubted the legitimacy of the Conference’s unanimous recommendations (ibid.: 554-555).

79 They also agreed on some other issues, such as redistribution of seats, which shall not be discussed here.
Claud Hamilton argued that the proposal included too many controversial issues and that the vote for soldiers and sailors was still the only common denominator (xciii, 15 May 1917: 1498). Arthur Salter, too, criticized the idea of a large franchise reform, instead of only settling “the position of the sailor and the soldier.” (xcii, 28 Mar. 1917: 472). Richard Barnett pointed out that universal male suffrage would also give the vote to many who had managed to avoid military service, so that returning soldiers might be confronted with “the sleek pacifist stealing into the polling booth” (c, 6 Dec. 1917: 679).

However, there were also many Conservatives who supported the bill. Some expressed their unease about it but stated that they would rather support the government than cause another lengthy discussion (xcii, 28 Mar. 1917: 512, 547). Others argued that the proposals were not generally against Conservative interests or, as Walter Long put it, “every party who joins in the compromise is getting something and giving up something.” (ibid., 520). Most importantly, many Conservatives admitted that those soldiers and sailors who had not been enfranchised so far would in any case appreciate the reform (ibid., 503).

Moreover, in contrast to 1916, those in favour of universal male and female suffrage were now supporting the government. The Labour MP John R. Clynes emphasized that everyone should have “the same rights of citizenship.” (ibid.: 530). The three groups of reform supporters – those who argued for universal suffrage, those who saw the proposals as a fair compromise providing the vote for soldiers and sailors, and those who simply decided to vote with the government – were now clearly stronger than those who opposed the reform. On 28 March 1917, 341 MPs voted in favour and only 62 against the proposal to implement the Conference’s compromise soon (ibid.: 566). After May 1917, discussions shifted from the franchise question to PR and minor technical questions. Finally, in February 1918, the bill was passed (xxx, 5 Feb. 1918: 2198). It granted the vote to all men over 21, no matter what rent they paid, and to women over 30.
Comparing parliamentary debates on the franchise in 1916 and 1917, one can observe two major changes. Firstly, the claim for the vote for soldiers and sailors had been transformed to the claim for universal male suffrage. Secondly, male suffrage was now strongly connected with female suffrage. As a result, those who wanted franchise extension for soldiers and sailors only became a minority. It shall be argued here that this development was not inevitable in 1916, but resulted both from inner-parliamentary arguments and from extra-parliamentary factors connected with the war.

If the Asquith government had agreed to introduce the vote for soldiers and sailors in 1916, this could have been the end of the parliamentary franchise discussion during the war. Instead, as an argument of deterrence, the government repeatedly emphasized that there was an inevitable connection between the vote for soldiers and sailors and a larger franchise debate. This does not necessarily mean that this connection had existed from the beginning. Once it had been established, however, it shaped the debate. This meant that the advocates of the vote for soldiers and sailors were confronted with two alternatives: a large universalist franchise reform, or no extension of the franchise at all. The claim for the vote for soldiers and sailors, it seems, was so strong that many of its supporters were willing to prefer the former version. If this claim was the decisive factor, however, it is hard to imagine how a compromise could have been reached in peacetime.

Moreover, support for the franchise extension may have also been amplified by other developments resulting from the war. Both the rising number of casualties, due to the Battle of the Somme (July-November 1917), in particular, and the falling numbers of volunteers since summer 1916 forced the government to enhance conscription (Adams, Poirier, 1987: 173-175). This measure, was controversial among the working class (Thorpe, 2001: 29). In winter 1917, the increasing conscription of skilled workers caused strikes under an almost revolutionary atmosphere (Hinton,

---

80 Of course, it is difficult to estimate how the public, most notably the suffragette movement, would have reacted.
Moreover, shortages of food and other goods led to the “conscription of riches” campaign (Fenley, 1980: 57). In addition (and probably as a consequence), 1916 and 1917 saw a remarkable rise of trade unionism (see also above), which became an ever more considerable political force outside of parliament (Hinton, 1983: 96). These factors may help to explain why in 1917, reform supporters were even keener to reward those who had not been enfranchised so far for their participation in the war effort and to ensure their ongoing loyalty to the political system. Some MPs who had originally opposed a reform changed their mind, admitting that the unenfranchised, who should “work out their own salvation”, had “worked it out during this war.” (xcii, 28 Mar. 1917: 469). This tendency of offering the suffrage to ever new groups because of their growing engagement in the war was visible, too, among those who still argued against universal suffrage. In May 1917, the Conservative Claud Hamilton admitted that due to submarine warfare, the franchise should be granted not only to sailors serving on warships, but also to sailors of the mercantile marine (xciii, 15 May 1917: 1498).

Finally, one must also take into account that since December 1916, the Labour Party had been part of Lloyd George’s new government; thereby being granted many concessions for their participation (Thorpe, 2001: 29). It certainly influenced the government’s position to contain the party most strongly in favour of universal suffrage.

As mentioned above, Pugh describes the Fourth Reform Act as driven by rather ‘technical’ factors. It certainly played a role, reinforcing how the Asquith government’s original plan to set up a new register seemed to be technically difficult and error-prone. However, very few MPs argued exclusively on that basis. Most MPs who mentioned these problems also claimed universal suffrage or the idea that soldiers deserved the vote (e.g. lxxxv, 16 Aug. 1916: 1900, 1918, 1926). ‘Technical’ arguments, it seems, were used to support ideological aims. In addition, Pugh’s

81 Asquith referred primarily to female suffrage here though.
conclusion that the war did not play an important role is highly questionable. The claim for votes for soldiers and sailors, which was crucial for the development of the reform bill, had been clearly triggered by the war.

Blackburn, as mentioned above, describes the Reform Act as resulting from a “spirit of concord” among MPs. Indeed, there was a large majority in favour of the reform in 1917. In 1916, however, things stood very differently: debates were characterised by controversy and disagreement. In this phase, words such as “concord” or “unity” were rather used by those who rejected a suffrage reform for being too controversial (xcii, 28 Mar. 1917: 482-483). The “concord” of 1917, moreover, did not arise inevitably, but was a consequence of certain political choices and strategies, which were not primarily intended to create unity. In addition, it is questionable whether concord with regard to the franchise question was driven by democratic ideals, as suggested by Blackburn. Only very few MPs justified their claim for universal suffrage with the right to vote on the basis of pure citizenship. In the debates that have been analysed here, much more MPs instead pointed to the common war effort. Granting the suffrage was not justified by citizenship itself, but by “fitness”; instead of income and residency, participation in the war effort was now seen as an indicator for being “fit to vote” (ibid.: 1900, 1918, 1926; lxxxv, 14 Aug. 1916: 1450).  

Regarding the relation between the claims for female suffrage and extended male suffrage, a change took place in comparison to the pre-war situation. Before the war, it may have seemed likely that a future franchise reform would be driven by the claim for female suffrage, an issue that raised much more public attention. Instead, during the war, it was the claim for an extension of the male suffrage which made the introduction of female suffrage possible (c.f. Gullace 2002: 134). It is noteworthy that both female suffrage and PR, issues which used to get more public attention as well as support by pressure groups, were less important as driving forces for reform than the extension of the male suffrage. This, again, indicates that wartime had

---

82 Quotations from the Scottish Unionist George Currie and the Labour MP Will Thorne respectively.
considerably changed the conditions under which franchise questions were debated in parliament.

Altered discourse might be interpreted as a reaction to the threat which the war posed to the political system. In a society that has to bear the burden of large-scale industrial warfare, unease within one important social group can have fatal consequences. Conservative MPs reacted to this new situation not by adopting the liberal vision of universalist democracy, but by developing a new framework justifying political participation – one that emphasized the efforts and merits of the individual and was brought forward by claiming the “vote for soldiers and sailors”.

Under the given political circumstances, however, this claim finally allowed a rather universalist franchise – for the first time including the vote for (some) women – to be put into practice.

One might conclude that the reform of 1918 was not caused by ‘technical’ factors, a common democratic spirit, nor rational party interests, but by the specific way in which the war with all its economic and social consequences shaped the thinking about the legitimacy and justification of the right to vote – especially among a decisive group of Conservatives who had so far opposed suffrage extension. This development, however, was not inevitable. It was made possible by the challenges which the war posed to the political system, but also by certain arguments and strategies of political debate in parliament.
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The big earthquake in Dubrovnik and its consequences for the town and influence on literature in the 17th century

Anamarija Bašić

The small Republic of Dubrovnik existed from medieval times until 1808. During the early modern era Dubrovnik's government paid taxes to the Ottoman Empire, but it was actually independent. On 6th April 1667 early in the morning Dubrovnik was wounded by the big earthquake and a big fire afterwards, which caused large damage to the town and its infrastructure. However, some brave people decided to stop the chaos in the town and attempted to rebuild it and save its independence. Thanks to them and the town's diplomats who were 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 status of Dubrovnik's trade. These events had some influence on literature in Dubrovnik. Some of the writers were also diplomats so they described their life experience. In this article I will write about The big earthquake in Dubrovnik and its influence on literature.

1 INTRODUCTION – “BETWEEN THE LION AND THE DRAGON”

If we want to describe the history of Dubrovnik in the 17th century, we can use one phrase: “between the lion and the dragon” or we can say that its existence was always influenced by 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 a blessing for Dubrovnik’s trade because the Turkish government stopped their trade to the ports in the Venice property on the Eastern Adriatic coast so they could not get the money from their opponents. After that, they directed their caravans to the Dubrovnik’s port. But, the Republic of Venice disturbed and caught their ships trying to stop the development of their main trade enemy, Dubrovnik (Krasić 1987: 184-185).

That position changed after the big earthquake which happened on 6 April 1667 early in the morning. The town was damaged, a lot of people died and the records of the survivors tell us the ugly truth of the cataclysmic moments of the ruined and burned town which reminded the poet Petar Kanavelić of “Troja or Rome” (Kanavelić 1841: 176).
2 THE BIG EARTHQUAKE IN DUBROVNIK – „THE FIRST DEATH OF THE TOWN“83

2.1 Facts about The big earthquake

The southern part of the eastern Adriatic coast is a very unstable area, but the big earthquake was the strongest one that ever happened there. It occurred on Wednesday before Easter, on 6 April 1667, between 8 and 9 a.m. The land was not only quavering 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 damages in the towns of Boka kotorska: Perast, Kotor, Herceg-Novи and Budva and also in Herzegovina, in Mostar and Trebinje. Some houses were damaged even in Split, Šibenik and Zadar. Yet the damage was nowhere as severe as in Dubrovnik (Samardžić 1983: 258-259; Harris 2006: 337).

During this earthquake the archbishop of Bar and primate of Serbia, Andrija Zmajević84, was serving the mass in the church on the island St. George in front of Perast. He was buried under the ruins for two hours after which 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 a poem Slovinska Dubrava in which he described his experience of the earthquake and he glorified Dubrovnik: “It is not dead/it could not die…it will be more beautiful” (Samardžić 1987: 259; Novak 1999: 527-528).

83 This phrase was used for the first time by Croatian historian Lujo Vojnović (1864.-1951) who wrote it in his essay „The first death of Dubrovnik“in 1912.; (Samardžić 1983: 229).
84 Andrija Zmajević was the archbishop of Bar and the primate of Serbia. He was born in Perast, but he spent his educational period in Rome. That was a period when Swedish queen Kristina came to Rome after she has converted to the Catholicism. She took some of his classes when the students who were coming from different part of Europe did her the honour by making speech on their mother tongue. So, he talked in Croatian in front of her. He was also a writer of the chronicle Ljetopis crkovni and poem Slovinska Dubrava. His nephew Matija Zmajević established the Russian navy on the Black Sea.; (Novak1999: 527-528., 734-735.)
When we talk about Dubrovnik, we can say that this event changed its history forever. The earthquake did not last long but the land was quavering several times for several days.

The Duke died under the ruins of the chapel in his palace, as well as a big part of the aristocracy, who were waiting the end of the mass so they could make some decisions in the council when the earthquake happened (Foretić 1980: 133-134).

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 and a lot of churches too, but new ones were built afterwards.

Luckily, the Walls of Dubrovnik and some buildings survived the big earthquake, like the St. Saviour Church next to the Franciscan monastery. This church is votive and it was built in 1520 after one earthquake. Also, The Palace Divona/Sponza survived that disaster (Harris 2006: 328, 336-337).

Just after the event, some of those people who survived the earthquake were committing robberies, especially the servants of the aristocracy. Also, a lot of people from their neighbourhood there with the same reasons (Foretić 1980: 133-134). (? Means what?)

In that insecure period the Bosnian bash tried to conquer “the rich town“ and the main Venice's general in Dalmatia, provveditore generale Catarino Cornaro, was sailing to Dubrovnik.

We cannot know the precise number of the people who died in Dubrovnik during the earthquake. Catarino Cornaro wrote the number of 4000 dead people in his letter to the Council in Venice. The Dutch diplomat Van Dam said that 5000 people died and

85 Today Dubrovnik's Archive is settled there, op.a.
the archbishop exaggerated with the number of 14 000 dead people. Dubrovnik’s leading politicias were hiding the right number of victims to protect their interests. But, we know the precise number of dead aristocrats, 57 nobles. Robin Harris supposed that 2000 people died in the town, and 1000 more on the whole territory of the Republic (Harris 2006: 335-336). In his article „Population of the Dubrovnik Republic in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeen century“, Nenad Vekarić brings us a table with demographical data about Dubrovnik and assessments from Croatian historians (Vekarić 1998: 10).86

2.2 The big earthquake in records

There are some written sources from that period which help us reconstruct the atmosphere in the damaged Dubrovnik. Most of them are private letters of the aristocrats, letters of diplomats and their diaries, descriptions written by priests, archbishops, and foreigners who were in Dubrovnik when the disaster happened. For example, an unknown priest wrote that the earthquake was as long as the one sentence of a pray: “Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi secundum“. Other said that the earthquake was so strong that the hill Srđ above the town quavered and its rocks were falling on the town. In some space earth split open and entire houses were falling into holes. They heard thunder and one of the fortirications was divided in two parts and merged after it. The sea withdrew and consecutively rushed back into the port on several occasions. Many ships were destroyed as a consequence (Samardžić 1983: 224-225).

The priest and writer Vlaho Skvadrović, who was a chaplain in the archbishop’s chapel, described the earthquake in a letter he wrote to his uncle in Napoli: “During the mass the archbishop's palace was crushed in two parts. We were running from one part to another. When we went out of the palace, we did not see houses and churches, we saw only the ruins that used to be houses or churches. The Walls were quavering and after the tremor, the big fire damaged the buildings that were not damaged in the

---

86 The table with demographical data you can see at the end of this article, op. a.
earthquake. The Dominican monastery was not damaged by the fire but by the earthquake… in the beginning everybody tried to ran away, but after a couple of days the army of 300 people was on the Walls and the government decided to get things into order.” (Samardžić 1983: 327-329; Novak 1999: 415-416). This priest was in the archbishop’s suite and they were on the same place when the earthquake happened. But, the archbishop Pietro Torres described it differently. He escaped to Ancona by ship and nuns went along with him. In his description of the earthquake he proclaimed to be a saint: “while I was running everybody who touched my habit had been blessed. When they touched my habit, some people who were half buried in the ruins, died in peace.” (Samardžić 1983: 236-237). The journey to Ancona lasted almost a month because of the bad sea conditions. When they arrived, there was a great celebration and the archbishop’s description of the earthquake was published in a book. He did not maintain a good relationship with Dubrovnik’s government because they always tried to halt the influence of the church. After the big earthquake Dubrovnik’s citizens were complaining because of his act and they accused him for taking nuns with him (Samardžić 1983: 234-236).

Another priest, Vido Andrijašević had also published his description of the earthquake in Ancona. But, he was exaggerating. He said that “the sky was covered by the human blood and the smoke.” Also, he testified about some true events: “Wells were dried...people were running across the dead bodies, others were pulled out from the ruins a couple of days after the earthquake…one mother spent four days holding her dead son in her arms.” (Samardžić 1983: 238-239).

A nobleman Brno Đurđević wrote about the big disaster to his friend in Rome, Stjepan Gradić. In that letter he described the people who were pulled out of the ruins and died soon after the salvation because they were exhausted. This description was also published in Ancona (Tatarin 2004: 112-113).

Letters of one other Dubrovnik’s nobleman, Frano Bobaljević provide good descriptions of the earthquake. He was writing to his cousin, Marko Bobaljević, and
his letters are honest and very emotional. He experienced the biggest tragedy of his life. Frano had left his house just before the earthquake. After the tremor, he went home, but he could not find it. Luckily, the house of his neighbour was not damaged and he found the ruins of his house. Many members of his family died. He saved two of his children, their nanny and one of his cousins, who was crying because his debtors were dead. His wife and his other five children all died. He could not forgive himself for not saving his youngest daughter Anica. He did not only describe his family tragedy, but also the robberies and the court sentences of those who were carrying out this criminal offence. He asserted that many servants, but also members of the nobility, committed similar crimes. Some survivors, for instance, denied help to injured people, unless the wounded could give them some valuable things, such as jewelry, gold, money or valuable clothes, in return. His letter also contains a list of damaged things and a description of the recovery of the destroyed town (Samardžić 1983: 238-242).

This disaster also affected foreign Dutch diplomats who stopped in the neutral and liberal town of Dubrovnik on their way to the Ottoman Empire where they were going to change their colleagues on their position in Istanbul and Izmir (sorry, don't understand this sentence). They arrived in Dubrovnik a few days before the earthquake hit the town. Their names were Joris Croock and Jacob van Dam. There also were a few French people who were going to the Ottoman Empire with them, but they were travelling for fun. They stayed in different houses. The wife of Joris Croock was pregnant when they both died under the ruins of the house in Dubrovnik where they were spending their time. “Van Dam felt big tremor and he was ejected from his bed. He ran out of the house and saw robbers on the town and on the Srđ, the hill above the town. He saw women and men who were jumping into the sea because they were afraid of robbers.” (Samardžić 1983: 232-233).

The only French people who survived the earthquake were Harden, his servant and his friend. Harden described shocking moments of the 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 so, unless I was willing to pay them. 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 had remained stuck under the ruins for three days and two nights and we had to drink our urine twenty times to survive. We were walking through the ruins and we saw the most shocking sights in the world and we needed to step over the dead bodies so we could reach the port. When we reached the port we saw that a few ships were damaged and we saw a big fire.” (Samardžić 1983: 2334-235). They walked to the other part of the town, to Gruž where they slept in a garden. A few days later, a ship came to port and they sailed to Venice (Samardžić 1983: 234-235).

3 THE RENOVATION OF DUBROVNIK

In spite of the bad and cathaclismic situation in the town, there were some people who decided to react. Those were noblemen who gathered around Luka Džamanjić/Zamanja. They resolved to rebuild the damaged town and to create the new council that was supposed to make decisions until the end of recovery. So, they composed a council of ten people and after a couple of days they added two more members: Nikolica Bunić and Marojica Kaboga. When Bunić joined the council, they moved the republican treasure into the fort Revelin where it was safe. Also, Bunić moved gunpowder to the safe place. Members of the Council were not just noblemen, but also a few rich citizens. When the situation was better, those citizens were in the highest selection for the new families that could enter into the old reconstructed councils (The Small Council, The Great Council and Senat) and they could replace the families that died. They signed letters with „The Duke and Senat“ even though these did not exist in that period. Their first decision was putting a halt to the emigration from the town. Then they ordered Marojica Kaboga to organise an army which would guard the safety of the town and they urged their diplomats to protect their interests in Rome, Istanbul and Bosnia. Two noblemen (members of The
Council) were also judges and some robbers were found and punished (Samardžić 1983: 250-257).

4 THE STORY ABOUT MAROJICA KABOGA

Marojica Kaboga, also called Marin Špaletin was a very interested person. Before the earthquake he was disturbing the peace of the town. He had a very bad temper, but he was a nobleman and a member of the council and even a diplomat. During the period when Dubrovnik was in bad relationship with the Turks in Herzegovina he was in friendship with some of them. That happened in Rijeka dubrovačka, above Dubrovnik. He got a letter in which Dubrovnik’s government ordered him to come back to town. But, he arrived a day later and they were accusing him of bad behaviour. The man who accused him the most was his father-in-law, Nikola Sorkočević and he tried to imprisoned him. Since he was very angry, Kaboga pulled out his sword and hit Sorkočević three times. The old man passed away soon after that. Marojica escaped and hid in the well of the Franciscan monastery. In spite of the agreement which said that the government could not arrest someone if he was in the monastery, they came and arrested him. That happened in 1662. His great friend and a writer Vladislav Mančetić wrote a poem about him. In that poem Kaboga is writing a letter with his blood. Unfortunately, the great Croatian writer of the poem Trublja Slovinska died a year before the big earthquake, so he could not see this big change (Samardžić 1983: 213-217; Radulović-Stipčević 1973: 175-182). He could not see how his friend organised an army which guarded the safety of Dubrovnik and how a man who was a criminal became a hero.

5 DUBROVNIK'S DIPLOMATS AND THEIR ROLE IN KEEPING SAFETY OF THE TOWN

Thanks to the Council and Dubrovnik's diplomats, Dubrovnik held on to its status as an important port on the east coast of the Adriatic Sea. Also, thanks to them the Republic of Dubrovnik kept its freedom. First of all, I will mention Nikolina Bunić. He used to obtain the diplomat mission of negotiating with Venice. When the
provveditore generale Catarino Cornaro was in front of Dubrovnik, the government sent Nikolica Kaboga to convince him that they kept their freedom but they could help Dubrovnik by sending money or food and not entering into the town. So, Catarino Cornaro sailed to Kotor. The other mission was in cooperation with Jaketa Palmotić Dionorić who was ten years older than him. After the earthquake, Bunić sent his sisters to Ston and after that to Ancona. But, Palmotić was not that lucky. He was just coming back from one mission and his whole family, a wife and their four children, died in the earthquake.

After some time, he got remarried. Then the Council made the decision that they had to travel to the Ottoman Empire in order to convince kajmakam Kara-Mustafa that they did not have to pay more than regular taxes. At first, they refused to undertake the mission, but after a few rounds of negotiation they did decide to go. Their mission was very successful that they even spent a year there and after Palmotić’s great speech they convinced the sultan to release their predecessors and they went home together. After some time, Bunić undertook another mission to the Ottoman Empire with Marin Gučetić. But, they were imprisoned in Silistria and Bunić died there (Samardžić 1983: 312-344). So, he became a hero and Dubrovnik’s government built him a memorial plaque in the Duke’s palace with the inscription: “He died in prison for the freedom of his country and he deserved to be celebrated and his name should be immortal.” (Tatarin 2004: 155).

The other nobleman who was also a diplomat was Marin Gučetić. His mission was to convince the Bosnian bashaw Ćor Ali-bashaw not to attack Dubrovnik because they did not have as much money as the bashaw thought. His second task was to stop the opening of the ports in Neretva. A long period of negotiation ended successfully and bashaw stayed alive only because he was the husband of sultan’s sister, but kajmakam ordered the murder of his servants (Krasić 1987: 189; Samardžić 1983: 264-276).
The diplomat who deserved the name of the “Father of the Homeland“ was Stjepan Gradić. He spent the most of his life in Rome where he was a papal librarian and sometimes he obtained the function of diplomat for his homeland and for the Pope. In his memoirs he described his reaction on the „First death of Dubrovnik“. He was walking with his friend Ivan Lucić near the river Tiber in Rome, and when they heard about it, they cried together (Krasić 1987: 111). Stjepan Gradić was a good friend of popes Alexander VII and Inocent XII who took some effort in helping Dubrovnik and sent some money. Stjepan Gradić also sent a lot of letters to Dubrovnik's government with useful advice on the use of new machines, the production of their own money, and the expansion of the territory of the town. He advised them to ask for help from powerful states like France because he had some connections with them. But, the King of Sun refused their request. Spain confirmed their privileges, the vice-king of Napoli (which was part of Spain) sent food and the Republic Lucca sent 10 000 libars of gunpowder and 500 guns. Stjepan Gradić sent the architect Andrea Buffalini from Urbino whose ground plans of the cathedral were accepted by Dubrovnik’s government. The construction works were done in 1713 and they put a memorial plaque with the name Stjepan Gradić on the cathedral (Krasić 1987: 150-182).

6 INFLUENCE ON LITERATURE

This event also influenced some writers from Dubrovnik who wrote about it. The small book called Grad Dubrovnik vlastelom u trešnji was published in the same year that the earthquake happened. This book consists of a few poems with the same name, written by Nikolica Bunić, Petar Kanavelić and Baro Bettera. The aim of those poems was to inform Europe about the disaster that happened in Dubrovnik. They also had something in common: they saw this disaster as God's punishment for the wicked people in Dubrovnik. Nikola Bunić mentioned Dubrovnik's patron St. Vlaho who was „the great warrior and protector on the sky“ (Bunić 1841: 168), Petar

87 Father of Croatian historiography, op.a.
Kanavelić formed his poem like 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“ (Kanavelić 1841, 176). In the end she told him that Šiško Gundulić should write about the disaster. Bettera said: „that we should be better and than the better days will come...and we could reach the heaven“ (Bettera 2004: 124).

On Stjepan Gradić's appeal, one other poet from Dubrovnik who spent the biggest part of his life in Rome, Benko Rogačić, wrote the poem Prosecutio de terraemotu quo Epidaurus in Dalmatia anno 1667. prostrata est in which he described the sight of a damaged town: “the town is buried with the stones/..../it is an easy target for the enemies/..../I see dead people everywhere/..../they are sad, injured and covered with blood” (Rogačić 2008: 131-133).

Nikolica Bunić also wrote an epic Feniče aliti srećno narečenje grada Dubrovnika po trešnji in which he again described the earthquake and also the return of nuns from Ancona. He believed that Dubrovnik “will be born again like Phoenix” (Bunić 2004: 187-203).

The last writer who was also a diplomat, Jaketa Palmotić Dionorić, wrote an epic Dubrovnik ponovljen where he literally 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 in which he described the big earthquake to the sultan: “Everybody escaped/..../friends do not recognise each other/..../everybody is screaming”(Palmotić Dionorić 1967: 165). That epic is not finished but it is very important because the writer described the event he took part in (Pavličić 2007: 205-207)
7 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 get things worse.

But, thanks to some brave people that I have mentioned in this article, the town was safe and it was recovered. Diplomats made efforts to protect Dubrovnik’s trade. The main consequence of the big earthquake was the opening up of the Council to ten unaristocratic families who were seen as equal members a century later. Like many other historical events, this one also had an influence on literature. Some of the writers were in the town during this event. A lot of them said that the big earthquake was God’s punishment which was not an unusual reaction after great natural disasters.

But one thing we can be sure of, namely that Dubrovnik rose up from the ashes like the phoenix in their literal expressions.
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<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</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>8-10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Božo Cvjetković</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>mid 16th c.</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Jireček</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorjo Tadić</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>end 15th c.</td>
<td>5-6,000</td>
<td>20-25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijo Mirković</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zdravko Šundrica</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>mid 16th c.</td>
<td>35-40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorjo Tadić</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>end 15th c.</td>
<td>6-7,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante Marinović</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>25-30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogumil Hrabak</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1540 - 1570</td>
<td>40-50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogumil Hrabak</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>end 16th c.</td>
<td>30-40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinko Foretić</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Stulli</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</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1450 - 1650</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Krivošić</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>on the eve of 1667</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijoš Blagojević</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 1998: 10.)

Dubrovnik during the earthquake (Samardžić 1983: 407.)
Saint’s Savior Church

The first page of the book *Grad Dubrovnik vlastelom u trešnji* that was published in 1667 in Ancona (Tatarin 2004: 253.)
Some Notes on the Changes and Transformation Age of the Ottoman Empire: Problems and Proposals of Solutions

Tayfun Ulaş, Ankara University

As of the late 16th century, some radical changes occurred in the structure of Ottoman government and society. These changes having an influence on subsistent conditions had a major impact on the overall state. For example, the higher society of Ottoman, especially bureaucrats, starting to consider the reasons of these changes and the subsistent structure of the government, displayed their determination about problems and offered solution suggestions to the concerned authority. People, who determined that, particularly assumed the resolution of Ottoman, which had started in the second half of 16th century, interpreted that aforementioned change was a threat against the existence of the empire. These works are illustrative of how the contemporary Ottomans perceived the problems of the imperial system and what they suggested to solve them.

Introduction

During the classical era of the Ottoman Empire, which was between the 1300s and 1600s, the reflection of ancient Persian government and society had a major effect. This makes it easy for us to understand the background of the submitted solution suggestions, as bearing in mind that this situation had a considerable effect on Ottoman bureaucrats and they were the ones who made aforementioned decisions. These people, first and foremost, believed in the absolute difference in social spheres and the necessity of these spheres remaining the same. The idea behind this concept was ancient Persian political theory. It is known that the Indian-Persian tradition, which is found in Kutadgu Bilig, had a major impact on the Turkish states. The main impact was experienced in the classic era of Ottoman and left a great influence on both state organization and general structure.

The bureaucrats, who are in charge and the functionaries of the government were in a position to make first-hand observations on events and developments affecting central authority; they were, in general, accurate in their findings. However, their conclusions about the causes and their predictions about the effects of these developments were often misleading. The reason is that they interpreted their findings within the framework of the traditional notions of Oriental statecraft. Their primary concern was the preservation and revival of old regulations and intuitions, to
which they attributed the past greatness and prosperity of the Empire. Historians of our time have not really questioned their way of thinking and, in most cases; have been content with simply reproducing their arguments (İnalçık, 1980: 284).

According to traditional scholarship, this empire, too, began to “decline”, beginning in the late sixteenth century. Attributed to this idea of what might be termed the decline within the decline, are two further assumptions: that any alteration of the original Ottoman system of administration must necessarily have been for the worse, and that any diminution of Ottoman authority in the provinces must also have been harmful.

**Ottoman Risâle’s or Proposals of Solutions**

Following Central Asian, Persian and Islamic traditions, Ottoman scholars (‘ulemâ) and statesmen from the beginning of the empire had written numerous nasihat-nâme and lâyiha/risâle works to provide guidance and advice to the members of the ruling class. The quantity of the accounts dramatically increased, particularly, in the second half of the sixteenth century. The authors of these works discussed mainly the reasons for the “decline” of the imperial system and provided a number of proposals to prevent this trend. Many of them were aware of the fact that the basic institutions of the Ottoman classical system were in change (Öz, 2010: 63).

Written in 1541, Ấsafnâme of Lütfî Pasha, who is the grand vizier of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566), was regarded as the first account in the declinist genre in Ottoman literature (Kütükoğlu, 1991: 49-120). Moreover, the Koçi Bey’s risâle that he penned for Sultan Murad IV on “the reasons of the tribulations and changes of this world” was the most famous account in this tradition. In his work, Koçi Bey first described the state of affairs during the “golden age”, that is, the reign of Sultan Süleymân, emphasized the reasons of the decline in the imperial system, and then provided suggestions to reform it in the most traditional way. According to him, the reasons for the Ottoman decline were clear: After Sultan Süleymân the Magnificent, the power of the grand vizier became limited with the
involvement of other higher officials and residents of the palace (which included women) in imperial administration. The Ottoman classical *devşirme* and *timar systems* became defunct when “foreign” elements –that is Turks, or those not from *devşirme* origin- began to be welcomed into ruling positions (İnalcık, 1973: 48, 78). The land and the offices were granted to the newcomers not in return for their abilities and services but because of nepotism and corruption. Scholars who had judicial responsibilities and powers were also corrupted (Tezcan, 2007: 74-75).

Furthermore, *Risâles* written in the latter parts of the seventeenth century had no significant changes in terms of describing the current state of the imperial system and in their proposals to solve the problems. After a meeting in the *Divân-ı Hümâyûn* on the budget deficiency issue, Katip Çelebi, penned his *Düstûrü’l-‘Amel li-Islâhi’l-Halel* around 1653 (Gökyay, 1985: 82-83). In this essay, Katip Çelebi formulated his ideas on state, society, subjects, military and treasury. In addition to the aforementioned causes, bribery and corruption in the ruling elite were the two main problems for the decline of the system in the perception of the author (Gökbilgin, 1985: 197-218).

In his memorandum written at the request of Sultan Mehmed IV, *Telhisü’l-Beyân fî Kavânîn-i Âl-i Osmân*, historian Hezарfen Hüseyin Efendi repeated the previous formulas while he considered the reign of Sultan Selim instead of Suleymân the Magnificent as the “golden age” (Anhegger, 1953: 370-371). Putting a significant emphasis on “the rule of law”, Hüseyin Efendi proposed that merit should be the only basis for distribution of offices and lands, dignity of the scholars should be restored, and judges should observe justice in their decisions (Murphey, 2009: 89-119).

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, these works are illustrative of how the contemporary Ottomans perceived the problems of the imperial system and what they suggested to solve them. It should be kept in mind that medieval historian Ibn Khaldun’s theories on predetermined courses and life-spans of the states were influential to these authors.
and are visible in their writings (Fleischer, 1983: 198-220; Fındıkoğlu, 1958). One may argue that the decline notion in Ottoman history, long before the modern period, was the creation of the Ottomans themselves. The zenith of the Ottoman power, as these authors generally argued, was the start of the imperial decline (Öz, 2010: 63-64). The pictures the authors draw were highly selective and, as modern scholarship has proven, the proposals these declines writers suggested were not compatible with the internal and external developments of many occasions. There was not a “golden age” as these authors had described, but their “ideal orders”, and therefore all these have potential to be contextualized within the political philosophy, rather than in the political history.

Notes


Recently, for a modern Turkish transcription of the works see Yılmaz Kurt (1994): Koçi Bey Risâlesi (Eski ve Yeni Harflerle), Ankara.
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Consolidation of the Authority of Ferdinand II in the Czech Lands after the Rebellion of the Estates (1618-1620)

Tereza Lyckova, Univerzita Palackého Olomouc

The history of the Czech Lands was turbulent during the 15th and 16th centuries. One of the main problems during these centuries was the religion of the inhabitants of the Czech kingdom. Since the era of John Huss, most of the people followed a Protestant confession, for example Hussitism and Lutheranism, with the minority remaining Catholics. There were some tensions between those groups, although their main interest lay in the prosperity of the kingdom. The situation changed after the death of Luis II of Hungary, whose successor became Ferdinand I (later Holy Roman Emperor). Luis was a devoted Catholic, like the whole Habsburgh family. Since 1526, when he became a Czech king, tensions between Habsburgs and especially the Czech Estates increased. The situation started to escalate during the reign of Rudolph II and Matthias, Holy Roman Emperors, who had different attitudes towards the Czech problems. The turning point came with the choice of Ferdinand of Styria as Matthias’ successor. All the problems and tensions resulted in the Rebellion of the Czech Estates and the election of Friedrich, Elector Palatinate, as the Czech king. However, Rebellion was defeated, Frederick fled from the kingdom and the new king, now also as a Holy Roman Emperor, Ferdinand II could start re-establishing his position and the position of the Habsburgs in the Czech kingdom. These activities were characterised by Catholicism and had an enormous impact on the kingdom. He made a few steps which established a basis for the Recatholization of the Czech kingdom and influenced its history and society for many decades on.

Introduction

For the Czech kingdom the 15th century meant very unsettled and complicated times. After the burning of the John Huss and the succession Sigismund of Luxemburg, Holy Roman Emperor, at the Czech throne, most of the century was filled with the crusades against Hussites and also with other conflicts and problems, mostly connected with the Hussite movement. The situation was mollified with the choice of Jagellonian dynasty as a new Czech ruling family. However, this did not lasted for long - in 1526 Louis II of Hungary, king from the Jagellonian dynasty, died in the Battle of Mohács without sons.

There were a few applicants for the Czech throne, among them was Ferdinand, at that time Austrian archduke, who was married to Louis´ sister, Marie. He made a claim based on his wife´s relationship with the dead king, but the Estates refused to
acknowledge this claim. Eventually, he had to accept the election of the new king at the assembly. He was elected on 23\textsuperscript{rd} October 1526, of course with some demands from the Estates.\textsuperscript{88} During his reign, Ferdinand at first hand had to deal with resistance of the Estates in 1547\textsuperscript{89} - after their defeat, he punished only Czech cities and left out the nobility (with some exceptions). And despite the increasing power of the king, the Estates were still considered to be bearers of the Czech identity. Ferdinand also started the way to the restoration of Catholicism in still utraquist and Protestant Czech Lands. This was common to all Habsburg Czech kings until Ferdinand II (Mikulec, 2013, 58-64).

Under the reign of Rudolph II the confessional tensions were even more intense. Because he decided to move his capital to Prague, all the papal legates, Spanish ambassadors and other Catholic representatives had a clear image about Czech affairs and pressed Rudolph to push through more Catholic interests (Mikulec, 2013, 66-67). He did recatholized Czech Land Officials, but this did not provoke any reaction from non-Catholics. Maybe because he was careful in this matter despite the pressure from the Spanish king Philip II, his uncle. On the contrary, political events and conflicts with his brother Matthias forced him to make some compromise with the non-Catholics. This had an outcome in the toleration act called “The Charter” (or sometimes The Rudolph´s Charter) in 1609 and had a disposition as a Land Law. With all its rules it was the most tolerant religious law in Europe, although it was just temporal. “The Charter” was the biggest achievement of the Estates opposition, despite the fact that it had limited success. (Čechura, 2003, 18-19; Mikulec, 2013, 68-70; Kilián, 2007, 30-38).

This situation did not last for a long time. Childless emperor Rudolph was forced by the inner family rivalry to abdicate and his brother, at that time Holy Roman Emperor, Mathias succeeded him. The contacts between him and the Czech

\textsuperscript{88} These demands included the acceptance of Böhmischem Kompaktaten, respecting the freedom of the Estates and moving his capital to Prague. These demands were just partly fullfilled.

\textsuperscript{89} Estates rejected to support Ferdinand in the Schmalkaldic War between Holy Roman Emperor Carl V, Catholic, and the Schmalkaldic League, Protestants, in the Holy Roman Empire.
Estates were even worse than between Rudolph and the Estates. Mathias ascended the throne thanks to compromises to the Estates and was aware that he needed to strengthen his power. The Estates posed some claims on Mathias, but he did not confirm them and this started strong tensions. Czech Estates held a conception of a State of Estates found on the confederations and based on theoretical grounds of West European theoreticians. Influenced by the confessional separation of Europe, the Czech Estates’ opposition related their protection against Habsburgs and centralism on their confession (Čechura, 2003, 19-28; Petráň, 2004, 121).

**Spark of the Problems – Emperor Matthias and Ferdinand of Styria**

The whole period of rule of the emperor Mathias was full of conflicts with the Czech Estates. During that time many parliaments and assemblies were held which tried to solve some of the problems. Probably the biggest conflict situation emerged with the question of Mathias´ successor. This matter was problematic even with childless Rudolph II, but Mathias, thanks to his cooperation with the Protestant Estates before his election as king, weakened the already unstable position of the Habsburgs in the Czech kingdom. This would cause a dangerous precedent because he was accepted without any consideration of the hereditary claims. After long-time reflections Mathias decided to adopt his young cousin, Ferdinand of Styria for the purpose of his succession, definitely in 1617. Now he had to face the defiance of the incoherent Czech Estates (Čechura, 2003, 35-57; Kilián, 2007, 39-50; Petráň, 2004, 123-124).

In Ferdinand´s favour worked Some of the most prominent Czech Catholic noblemen worked in Ferdinand’s favour. They helped him through promises or frightening to gain votes for the king’s election in the middle of 1617. Before this assembly, opposition did nothing to prevent Ferdinand´s election. They did not even have their own candidate as an alternative to Ferdinand. In connection with the whole situation before the electoral assembly there was a question if the Estates had a right
to elect a king. Was the Czech throne elective or hereditary? Big question, not just at that particular time, because in the Czech history these two aspects usually worked together (e. g. line up of the Habsburgs on the Czech throne) (Čechura, 2003, 52-53).

After long negotiations and acceptance of the Charter from 1609 (that was one of the main problems for the future king), Ferdinand was proclaimed as a Czech king on 9\textsuperscript{th} June 1617. Most people in the kingdom accepted this situation indifferently. However, it was a sign of a crisis of the Estates which was slowly showing since the rule of Emperor Mathias (Čechura, 2003, 59-62; Čechura, 2004, 25-27). The Estates probably did not fully recognized what kind of man Ferdinand was. One rule, which became a credo for him, could gave them a hint: ‘as is the Triple God ruler of the eternal land and he constantly controls all doings on Earth, so are the anointed Habsburgs entitled to carry out his will on Earth’ (Čornejová, Rak, Vlnas, 1995, 97).

Since Ferdinand´s proclamation there was unrest and tensions in the country. It all escalated on 23\textsuperscript{rd} May 1618. On that day, three men were thrown from the windows of the Czech Office in the Prague Castle – it is known as the Third Prague´s Defenestration. It was a manifestation of a revolt against the monarch. This action basically started the Rebellion of the Estates. Before all this the Czech Office issued several acts which ordered censorship and also tried to limit some of the articles from the Charter from 1609 (Čechura, 2003, 62-68; Petráň, 2004,141-171).

---

90 Did the Estates in 1617 have the right to vote and elect the king? There is a question if the opposition had a chance to impede this election within the Land Laws. And also to what extend was Ferdinand’s claim to the Czech throne indisputable. There was an uncertainty in this question since 1526 when Habsburgs ascended the Czech throne.

91 In Bohemia was still functional so called luxemburgh principle – Estates had full right to elect the new king but in the cast when an old dynasty died out. If the new king was a member of current dynasty, then there was a combination of the right to vote and hereditary law. In this case we can call the way to the throne hereditary votion. But in today’s way of speaking this was not an election/votion but mere a recognition of a hereditary claim of the member of rulling dynasty. Nevertheless, without this approval from the Estates the heir of the throne could not ascend the Czech throne. Based on this, Ferdinand II as a grandson of Ferdinand I and adoptive son of Mathias had the hereditary claim to the Czech throne and the Estates could not just ignore him.

92 His election at the assembly and also the coronation beared all sings of proper and legal proclamation of a new king. These were one of the reasons why was most of the Europe in shock when the Estates dethroned Ferdinand in 1619.

93 All three men who were thrown out of the window survived. Their survival was later used during the Recatholisation as a proof of a help of a Maria, mother of Jesus, who was one of the symbols of Recatholisation in the Czech Lands later on.
The old emperor Mathias did nothing to pacify the situation. Even the relations between him and his successor Ferdinand and the situation in the Czech kingdom did not make the atmosphere easier. Catholics in the kingdom started to act more and more carelessly. After Ferdinand´s election, the Catholic´s self-confidence increased (Čechura, 2003, 68-70).

Rebellion of the Czech Estates

All this was not just a domestic affair, e. g. the Estates negotiated with abroad for a long time. Even the Habsburgs tried to gain some help from their allies; their situation in the Kingdom was quite bad. In the Kingdom, the elected Directorium was not able to rule effectively; they were not able to secure enough resources (financial and of weapons) during the Rebellion (Čechura, 2003, 71-81; Pánek, Tůma edd., 2009, 223-224).

To secure the whole situation, the Czech kingdom needed a new king as soon as possible and it was not easy to choose the most suitable candidate. After all, they decided to elect the Elector Palatinate. This was still in negotiation when Emperor Mathias died. When the Estates found out about this, they decided not to swear an oath to Ferdinand (and so did the Austrian Lands) and speeded up the negotiations

---

94 Czech kingdom was divided into three lands – Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. In the Rebellion were involved Estates from all three parts of the kingdom, but most of them were from Bohemia. In Moravia has Catholicism, thanks to Bishopric of Olomouc, still quite strong position and they participated a little in the Rebellion. Protestantism had strong position in Silesia and one of the main leaders of the Rebellion in the east parts of the kingdom was John George og Brandenburg, Duke of Jägerndorf. Nonetheless, other members of the Silesian Estates were not that involved in the Rebellion. The main part played the Estates from Bohemia with some help from the other Estates.
with the Palatinate. After all, the Estates dethroned Ferdinand (he was legally elected two years earlier and they had to prove to Europe that he was dethroned because of his violation of law, not theirs; dethroned on 19th August 1619) and Frederick V, Elector Palatinate became the Czech king – elected on 26th August 1619. Two days later, on 28th August, Ferdinand was elected as an emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (Čechura, 2003, 93-117).95

Their fight for legitimacy and rule over the Czech Lands is one of the best documented parts of the Thirty Year’s War. They both also used ideological weapons. Ferdinand II insisted that he had a hereditary right to the Czech throne (Louthan, 2011, 23). During the conflict, Palatinate diplomats insisted that the Rebellion was just a local problem and that it was not connected with any general question about religion.96 The whole conflict escalated on 8th November 1619 when the Battle of White Mountain near Prague took place. It this battle, Frederick’s army was defeated. He and his family left Prague and the kingdom. The rebellious Estates had to swear an oath to Ferdinand II with humiliating formulations (Čechura, 2003, 151-167; Čechura, 2009, 176-197; Petráň, 2004, 71_75; Ryantová, Vorel, 2008, 390-391).

**Battle of White Mountain, 8th November 1620**

95 There were also some problems concerning Ferdinand’s election as an emperor. This was because the Czech king was also one of the Prince-electors in the Holy Roman Empire. He was not the Czech king for two day in the time of the election but he voted for himself on grounds of him being a Czech king. Czech delegation presented to the election protested against it but without any results.

96 This was also claimed by the Habsburgs and the Czech Catholics. But Directorium claimed that it is based on religious matters.
How to re-establish Ferdinand´s Authority?

After the Battle of White Mountain Ferdinand II had to make every effort to consolidate and secure his authority, and to support his rights to legitimate his rule in the country. Habsburg’s hegemony and recatholization of the Czech Lands was built on a range of measures taken after the Battle, mostly political, economic and social. First of all, in 1621 the Confiscations started and there were also changes in religion. In the political field, he started aggressive political programme which resulted in a long-term centralization process.

In the heart of the matter Ferdinand II was a conservative ruler who endeavoured to keep traditional structures within the empire. In the Czech Lands his acts were based on a conviction that the Czech Estates lost their rights because of the rebellion. There were also changes within the Estates themselves and massive emigration. The Czech kingdom became a hereditary monarchy under the House of the Habsburgs (Louthan, 2011, 25-27).

Ferdinand II was different from his predecessors. He identified himself with the Church, he acted like a big fighter for a Catholic thing. This face was very well indulged. He paid artists to depict him as a trustful ally of the Church. In the Czech Lands, Ferdinand II used also the public ceremonies. Religious rite was one of the first and main means used by Ferdinand II to return the Czech Lands to the Catholic world and also to consolidate his power and authority. To get over mutual differences and to connect the Czech past and the future associated with Ferdinand and Habsburgs, religion was one of the best tools to use. Catholicism was present in every step he took (Louthan, 2011, 27-28).

Verneuerte Landesordnung

Soon after the Battle of White Mountain Ferdinand decided to move all Czech Land Offices to Vienna to strengthen the central position of Vienna, and in 1627 he
issued Verneuerte Landesordnung for the Bohemia\textsuperscript{97}, which ended a process of reallocation of political power in the Czech Lands. This document did not deal with all possible problems which could emerge from the new organization of the country. It came very close expressing the idea that rebellious lands should lose all rights and everything left is ruler’s charity (Evans, 2003, 234-236). In the Verneuerte Landesordnung Ferdinand also renewed the clergy and the Estate and placed them at the first place among all other Czech Estates (cities, noblemen). With this act, he strengthened the position of the clergy in the kingdom and gave them the right to particap in the Czech political life (Louthan, 2011, 23-24; Mikulec, 2013, 74).

\textit{Old Town’s Execution}

After the defeat of the Estates in the Battle of White Mountain, Ferdinand decided that the leaders of the rebellion had to be punished. He decided that they would be executed at the Old Town Square in Prague. Execution was a perfect scene for the Emperor to demonstrate his power. Everything was carefully prepared in the cooperation with the proconsul and vice-regent of Bohemia Karl of Liechtenstein and this act gave a framework to the whole recatholization programme in the Czech Lands. King Ferdinand had chosen the Old Town’s Square by intent. This town square was the heart of the profane and religious life of the capital. Ferdinand perceived this town as a place situated at the heart of the Czech defiance which he needed to get rid of. Ferdinand also did not care about making an enemy from the aristocracy because many of the men who were getting executed were noblemen. All of this was supposed to demonstrate the power and authority of the ruler. The whole ceremony was under strict supervision and carried out with high precision (Louthan, 2011, 33-35; Petráň, 2004, 9-10).

Old Town’s Execution on 21\textsuperscript{st} June 1621 was a quite elaborated and highly important ceremony for Ferdinand and his supporters. It was meant as a measure used

\textsuperscript{97} For Moravia issued the same document in 1628. There the whole situation was a little different – the Moravian Estates were not involved in the Rebellion as much as were the Czech/Bohemian Estates, and Protestantism was not as widespread and strong as in Bohemia.
to support Ferdinand´s rights on legitimate political rule in the Czech Lands. All 27 men were officially executed because of high treason committed against their rightful ruler, officially there was no connection to religion. Some of the played an important part in the Rebellion, some of them more marginal. Most of them were from Bohemia because the real centre of the Rebellion was situated there (Čornejová, Kaše, Mikulec, Vlnas, 2008, 79-81).

Old Town´s Execution, 21st June 1620

Execution was from its beginning to the end planned as a tool to support Ferdinand´s claims of the legitimate political rule in the Czech Lands. But if Karl of Liechtenstein had not interfered in the preparations of the execution, for sure the whole ceremony would have been much more extreme. Later on, the Emperor´s party started to emphasize the religious side of the execution with a bigger accent. Ferdinand II perceived rebellion in 1618 as a part of a long conflict about faith. Old Town´s Execution could also be seen as a last and most formalized act of ritual violence within the long-lasting religious conflict in the Czech Lands since the burning of John Huss (Louthan, 2011, 36-38; Petráň, 2004, 254-258).

98 It is probable that without Carl of Liechtenstein the whole ceremony might be more like auto-da-fé in Spain, which were under the rule of his Spanish relatives.
**Confiscations**

Already in 1622, Ferdinand announced confiscations of properties of men participating in the Rebellion. This was a rather common tool of sanction in Central Europe in cases of crimes against the ruler, the so called *crimen laesae maiestatis*. Confiscations after the White Mountain was divided into a few parts – first affected those who ran away after the battle before the tribunal took place, then there were confiscations after the “general pardon” which gave those, who were guilty, time to own up to the participation in the Rebellion. Confiscations also took place in Moravia and Silesia, but because these parts of the Czech kingdom participated in the Rebellion just partly, the whole process here was not as hard as in Bohemia.

This whole process was not without problems, to a certain extent it depended on the officials and their honesty. Later there were big cases with fraud. Nevertheless, thanks to the confiscation, the authority of the central offices, and through them that of the Ferdinand II, was strengthened (Čornejová, Kaše, Mikulec, Vlnas, 2008, 84-89).

**Recatholization**

It is not possible to cover the whole Recatholization process in a few sentences. But this too can be considered as one of the ways used by Ferdinand II to strengthen not just his position. In the first place it was a way of re-introducing Catholicism into the Czech kingdom. The return of Czech Lands to the Catholic Church was a logical step for Ferdinand II as he was a really devoted Catholic and believed that the Catholic Church was the only way to salvation (Mikulec, 2005, 18). And, he followed one of the rules of the Piece of Augsburg, negotiated in 1555, *cuius region, eius religio.*

---

99 There were and are a big discussions whether we can talk about recatholization of the Czech kingdom or if we should rather use term „reformation“ or just „Catholization“. This question is not fully clear and I think it depends at one’s point of view how he/she looks at it. Can we call it Recatholization if the Catholics lived beside the Utraquists and Lutherans even in the 15th and 16th century?

100 Whose realm, his religion.
In 1627, the same year Ferdinand II issued Verneuerte Landesordnung, he ordered to issue another official patent, probably with even bigger impact on the Czech Lands. On 31st July 1627 an official patent was published which proclaimed that all non-Catholic inhabitants of the Czech kingdom should leave the land within given time or convert to Catholicism. The patent argued that the Emperor Charles IV issued a law against “sects” for the bigger prosperity of all and that the patent is just following this old law. It also used the argument that the king is responsible for the souls of his people and that the Recatholization would be in the interest of the king and also people. In the end, part of the people chose to convert and stayed in the country, part chose to go into the exile and to stay with their religion. Those who left were given a chance to sell their property, but the terms were often not very propitious. This patent also summoned a reformation commission to supervise the Recatholization and also the conversions (Mikulec, 2005, 9-24).

Not all the measures taken during this process were peaceful, like, for example the dragonades.¹⁰¹ There was direct violence against non-Catholics in confirmed cases, however, official powers mostly used missionary work, teaching of catechism, support of parish system and many more. These peaceful ways of persuasion were most successful (Čornejová, Kaše, Mikulec, Vlnas, 2008, 90-102). One of the first big steps was banning of the Utraquist Church in 1622 and the start of the Recatholization which began in the royal towns and then continued in the smaller towns and in the country. Nevertheless, even if the towns and people converted, this situation was not yet secured.

**Conclusion**

The position of the Habsburgs in the Czech kingdom was from 1526, when they ascended to the throne, until the defeat of the Czech Estates at the White Mountain an uneasy one. They had to take the Estates into account, which was a significant player in the Czech political life. Habsburg kings did not always fully

---

¹⁰¹ Billeting Catholic soldiers in non-Catholic households.
manag the dealings with them, but the Estates too did not always act wisely, as we could see in the case of the election of the rigid Catholic Ferdinand of Styria as a Czech king. The Rebellion of the Estates was an attempt to change the new and complicated situation, and their defeat gave Ferdinand a chance to restore his and Habsburgs´ authority. He used various ways to do it; the Verneuerte Landesordnung, the Old Town´s Execution, confiscations and Recatholization were just the main and most visible of them. These moves were used as a proof that the new Catholic ruler was aware of the limited options of a physical and psychological pressure. With his advisers he also used culture to connect his new kingdom with himself and his other lands into one structure.

All the measures taken by Ferdinand II strengthened not just his position as a Czech king. For him personally, it was also important that his new subjects would be Catholics and almost all steps he took were also connected with the restoration of a sole position of the Catholic Church in the Czech kingdom. The already mentioned Recatholization was the tool used to achieve this aim and, because of the violence sometimes used during this process, this period is perceived in the Czech history as a “dark age”, as they called it in the 19th century.

However, as a whole, the entire situation was not that easy to judge. According to his believes, Ferdinand II acted as a rightful ruler of the Czech kingdom and took steps to punish and discipline those who rebelled against him. After all, they accepted and elected him as a legitimate Czech king. Some of the ways he used to restore his power in the Czech kingdom were not peaceful, but he had to show that he was the legitimate king and they were not that much different from the ways other kings and rulers used to strengthen their position in their lands.
Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor
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The First French Republic had to fight for its entire life since its establishment in 1792. The international issues, in military terms well known as the Revolutionary Wars with the First and Second Coalition, brought almost every of European country to alliance against France. However, the problems of the Republic were not only about the outside enemies. Not all inhabitants of France were satisfied with the government of National Convention, which quickly changed the noble ideas from year of 1789. In conjunction with the efforts of exiled nobility, supported by other European countries, it could be easily said, that there was a time-bomb in the heart of France, which needed just one spark to explode. It happened in the spring of 1793 and the explosion took almost three years and resulted in a terrible number of victims. It also opened up painful questions of French history, especially the one about the reprisals – Was it genocide? The aim of this paper is to explain the story behind this question and let the reader think about the problem, which has occupied French historians for a long time.

Introduction: Characteristic of the Vendée before 1793

Before the French Revolution, the Vendée was a typically French countryside department. Its most important attribute was agriculture and the people who were not farmers worked in some sort of manual skill or trade. There were no factories, no other industry. Not even anybig towns, because „The greater number of peasants lived on detached farmhouses scattered over the country, ensconced in all sorts of out-of-the-way places...And there they carried on their farming operations, continuing in monotonous routine...Growing grain where grain would grow, the vine where it would thrive...Almost entirely self- supplying, self-supporting.“(Jephson, 1899: 7) So, we could note that the first important feature of the Vendée before the Revolution was its common lifestyle. Of course, it is not true, that Vendée in the 1780s was like living in the Dark Age, but in opposite to other parts of France, this region was one of the most conservative, which was connected with the next typical characteristic of it.

It was strongly influenced by the Catholic Church. Again, we can compare this attribute with the big cities, where the life was more secular. (Anderson, 2007: 256) But in Vendée, the influence of the Church, with the deep and frank belief of people,
became the important characteristic. So, if we want to capture the Vendée region at the end of the 18th century in one short sentence, it should be: One of the most conservative (politically and practically) and religious departments of France.

Despite this characterisation, the Vendeans (inhabitants of the Vendée) were not antagonistic to Revolution and like most of the French population in 1789, they entered in opposition against the Ancien Régime – the old order. Yet, between the years 1789 and 1792 there was nothing much bigger than the sterile resistance of angry peasants. No organisation, no results, just hungry peasants trying to fight for a living. Not only in Vendée, also in all parts of France during the birth of the Revolution. (Štovíček, 2013: 12)

**Reasons of uprising**

The first stronger resistance against the revolutionary government began in 1793, after the National Convention made a decree about levée en masse – the mass mobilization. (Cartrie, 1906: 12)

Lots of men rejected the mobilization, and showed their decision loudly and clearly by organising a big public demonstration. But we need to say, that it was not just happening across the Vendée department or other countryside in France, the protests were held even in the main cities of France, like Bordeaux, Toulouse, Marseille or Lyon. (Štovíček, 2013: 21)

Marquise de La Rochejaquelein, wife of marquis de Lescure, one of the leaders of the uprising, described the protest like this in St. Florent:

„The young men assembled there almost determined to resist. When the administration saw they were so ill-disposed they attempted to harangue them. The resistance was increasing, they came to threats. The republican commander had next a cannon pointed, and soon after fired on the young men; none of them were killed. They rushed on the piece, and it was abandoned: the gendarmes and the administrators fled. The municipality was pillaged, the papers burnt, and the cash distributed. The rest of the day was spent in rejoicings. The young men then returned
home, without well knowing what would become of them, or how they would escape the terrible vengeance of the republicans.“(Rochejaquelein, 1816: 56)

To form a better understanding of the following events, we need halt considering the events of March 1793, with its revolt against mobilization, and should go back to 1790.

The reason for this is obvious. Lots of important things happened during the four years from the Revolution in 1789 to March 1793. The change of mind of Vendeans (and not only them) was not an act of the moment, it was a long process. As we said in the beginning, people from the west region of France were politically and religiously very conservative, and the events of the Revolution were day-by-day much less attractive for them. The Revolution, which promised better tomorrows for common people, began to ruin lives of these people.

Out of a big number of unlucky changes, there is one, which will illustrate everything and which we could describe as the main reason of the starting civil war – an attack on the Catholic Church.

On 12 July 1790 the National Constituent Assembly proclaimed a law called *Constitution civile du clergé* – Civil Constitution of the Clergy. According to this law, the Roman Catholic Church in France was subordinated to the French government. There was no more real power for the Pope in the French Catholic Church; lots of episcopates were canceled, there was just one bishop for each department etc.(Jephson, 1899: 14)

One of the most controversial parts of this document, and the part, which caused many problems was Article XXI from Title II.

„Before the ceremony of consecration begins, the bishop elect shall take a solemn oath, in the presence of the municipal officers, of the people, and of the clergy to watch carefully on the faithful of the diocese entrusted to him, to be loyal to the nation, the law, and the king, and keep all his power to support the constitution decreed by the national Assembly and accepted by the king.“(Sciout, 1887: 44)
Thanks to this act, the clergy of France split. One half accepted and vowed - jurors, while the other half, which contained almost all bishops, refused. They were called non-jurors and the majority of them worked in Vendée. It was not a major problem for a few months, but then, the situation started to turn and laws from November 1791 and May 1792 prohibited the service of non-jurors. Despite this, most of non-jurors (with powerful support of dissatisfied Vendeans) did not worry about the laws and continued in service.(Štovíček, 2013: 26, Anderson, 2007: 256)

So, now we can account for the situation in 1793: there appeared a long massive attack on the Church, which is especially a sensitive topic for faithful Catholic Vendeans. There was no longer any support or belief in Revolution from Vendée and similarly for the new decree of the National Convention – mass mobilization. Plus, do not forget, the execution of Louis XVI. in January 1793, which resulted in the common strife of almost all European governments to fight with France. And the war was not only the subject of battlefields, but the government of Great Britain came with a smart idea to support the resistance from inside the First French Republic.(Taylor, 1913: 133, 152, 154)

According to these circumstances, we could say that the possibility of open resistance was just a question of time, or the question of another wrong step from the French government.

**The civil war begins**

It happened on 3 March 1793, when the National Convention ordered to close all churches, banned crosses on graves, confiscated property of the Catholic Church etc.(Jephson, 1899: 147, Štovíček, 2013: 41) This total offense against the Catholic Church was an act which definitely separated the religious society of Vendée from the government of the First French Republic and immediately launched the aversion.

There was also another incident during this day, which happened specifically in the Vendée region, in the town of Cholet. Here a group of young men from all parts of
the county rejected the mobilization and organized the mass demonstration against the *levée en masse*.

The rebellion started. Not practically, real outbreak began few days later, but the 3th of March 1793 was theoretically the starting line for events happening over the next three years. As the real outbreak of the rebellion is considered to be the bloody massacre in Machecoul, on 11 March 1793. About five to six thousand angry peasants armed with everything they could find (shovels, hammers, scythes or hunting weapons) rushed to the small town in Lower Vendée and demanded to stop mobilization. When the small unit of the National Guard saw that the situation could not be calmed, they decided to retreat. Yet they did not expect a heavy counterreaction. Peasants chose to attack the retreating National Guard and massacre began. Everybody with any connections to the Republic was killed and the Machecoul was plundered. This was not a sole event, the rebels built up something like a local government and the rampage lasted for an entire month! It was ended by an attack of the National Guard, but what soldiers found could be described as the town of ghosts, not Machecoul before 11th March. (Petitfrère, 2005: 697-698, Jephson, 1899: 42)

For good illustration of cruelty, just one special way to kill:

„The Republicans were handcuffed together, and this human chain, called a rosary, was pushed to the edge of the moat to the castle courtyard. Insurgents then wounded few of them with shoot from rifle and the others, whose fall down with the dead ones, were killed by halberds.“ (Štovíček, 2013: 35)

Few days after the start of Machecoul massacre, another group of rebels from the Nantes county captured the town of Savenay and actually went to the gates of Nantes, but did not try to attack it. During this time, the several units of insurgents were created, each of them with their own leader. On 14 March the unit led by Jacques Cathelineau met the unit of Stofflet and both groups attacked Cholet, a city of 7000 inhabitants and 500 to 800 soldiers of the National Guard with 10 cannons. (Štovíček, 2013: 52) The defence of the city was organised by Marquis de Beaveau, captain of
the National Guard. He refused to surrender, even after the messengers of insurgents promised the safety of the people and the town, and as a real nobleman, paradoxically in service of Republic, chose to fight:

„Citizens,“ he cried indigantly, „one does not fly before the enemy like cowards. True republicans go where duty calls them. They move forward to meet rebels. Let us march.“ (Taylor, 1913: 31)

His plan to fight outside the city, based on belief that peasant would be freaked out when they saw the regular army, did not work, and the Beaveau himself was killed by a gun shot. The city of Cholet then surrendered and the day ended with great victory for the Vendeans.

Another important battle was fought on 19 March, when the army of insurgents met the army of the First French Republic. The events of the 11th of March met almost immediately with a reaction from Paris, and a regular army crossed the borders of Vendée as soon as it was possible. But the Battle of Pont-Charrault became a big disappointment and maybe the bigger shock for the National Convention, because the regular republican army was forced to retreat and aspiration to quickly destroy the revolt was definitely broken. From this moment, the right name for events in Vendée should be civil war. War between the French Republic and the Armées catholique et royale – the Catholic and Royal Army (on next pages just CRA).(Petitfrère, 2005: 33)

**Catholic and Royal Army**

The insurgent army was not royalist by nature. Yes, if we are reading about the Vendée war today, the typical adjective that you can find in articles, books and other sources, is royalist. But it is not true that royalist ideas had something to do with the birth of the uprising. Just remember the 3th of March and the order to close the churches. An attack on the Catholic church was the trigger that started rebellion. And of course, there were other reasons, which we mentioned in previous pages. One of the best explanations of how the royalist ideas merged with the Vendean rebellion
can be found in the memoirs of the Count de Cartrie, a royalist who fought under the flag of CRA and after the Vendée war emigrated to England:

„The rising in La Vendée was not—as it has been said to be—the outcome of loyalty to the Monarchy; otherwise it would have burst forth immediately after 10th August (Assault on the Tuileries); it would have been re-vindication by faithful subjects of the royal authority. But such was not the frame of mind in the West... The revolt became royalist for the same reason as the revolts of Lyons and Toulon; because the rebels were forced to seek leaders among men who, having been officers in the Royal Army, and belonging to the sole military class—the nobility—had remained royalists.“ (Cartrie, 1906: 49-50)

These men brought to CRA not only its royal side, they also brought the order and rules, so important for army forces. Their practices and experiences were irreplaceable for units created from common peasants and there is no doubt about why some of these men reached the rank of commander in chief of the entire army.

François de Charette - descendant of an old Breton aristocratic family, who lived in exile after the Revolution, and maybe was even defending the King during the 10th of August. Maurice d’Élbée - originally the lieutenant of cavalry. Marquis de Bonchamps - captain of the royal army. Louis de Lescure - born in Versailles and graduated at the famous École Militaire and the youngest of them, just twenty two years old Henri de La Rochejaquelein.

On the other hand, not all of them were from nobility. Jacques Cathelineau or Le saint d’Anjou – saint from Anjou - worked before the Revolution as a salesman and the father of Jean-Nicolas Stofflet was just a miller. And yet, Cathelineau and Stofflet had their time as commander in chief of the CRA. (Štovíček, 2013: 63)

The rough reality of the Vendée war is definitely proven by stories of these seven notable commanders, because when the war came to an end, none of them were alive. Four were killed during battle, three were caught by Republicans and executed. Perhaps the most famous execution was that of Maurice d’Élbée, who was shot in his chair because was unable to stand as a results of fourteen battle wounds. (Rochejaquelein, 1816: 469-470)
So, after this short description of some leaders, we should now focus on their army. As we have already explained, the armed forces of insurgents were named CRA. The flag of these units was white with a blue filled circle at the center of it. The circle contained three golden lilies – a sign of the Bourbons - and a crown over it and twigs under it. Under the circle was the inscription *Armée Catholique et Royale* and over it another one with the cry *Vive le Roi* – Long live the King.

The situation of the equipment of soldiers was bad. Pragmatically, it is always nice to look at a beautiful and honorable flag, but it cannot not win the war, the soldiers do. Of course, not without all necessary components like weapons, supplies, horses for cavalry and many others. The quickly rising count of insurgent units in the first months of rebellion was maybe positive at first glance, while the reality looked different. In June of 1793 there were almost 42 000 soldiers in the CRA, with all three elements of army – infantry, cavalry and artillery. (Baszkiewicz, 1989: 141) However, the cavalry was mixed from all kind of units, there was no training to cooperative attack and some men did not even know how to ride a horse. The technical condition of the artillery was terrible, and the situations in which cannons instead of shot towards the enemy just exploded and killed the artillery unit was nothing unusual. For a better image of the diversity, the memoirs of Marquise de La Rochejaquelein:

„Their horses were of all colours and sizes ; some had pack-saddles, with ropes for stirrups ; wooden shoes for boots, pistols at their girdles, with guns and sabres, suspended by pack-threads!...All of them, however, had a consecrated heart sewed upon their coats, and a chaplet hanging at their buttons...The officers were a little better equipped than the soldiers, but had no distinguishing mark.“ (Rochejaquelein, 1816: 102)

In the first stages of the war, there were no big matters about this disunity of army. It was caused by some valuable victories of rebels in the first place and in the second, but not less important place, there was the ideological character of the CRA, which was the same for all fighting people – from commander in chief to the last peasant, who kept fighting for his small part of the field.
Yet, if we look at the ideas of the CRA from a wider context, we can easily say that it was in its nature absurd. The people, who fought for their personal freedom, were supported by the brothers of the executed king and led by officers with a desire to bring back the *Ancient Régime*. It was a useful connection in the beginning, when both groups needed a strong ally, but as the war continued, it became more and more absurd. And not only absurd in theoretical sense, the diversity of the CRA was then a real problem, which was practically touching the real army forces. The peasants who chose to fight against *levée en masse* had no will to fight outside their own village or county. This was an uprising against mobilisation, against the banning of the Church, and in the places where the CRA won, there was no more mobilisation, nor banned Churches. Peasants lost their will to fight and the nobility alongside few groups, whose were still willing to fight, was immediately in a big disadvantage.

Despite all these disadvantages, which caused the internal fall of the CRA, the first months of civil war were really successful for royalists. Like we said, their army was victorious and everything else just did not matter in these times.

**The key moments of war**

After the Battle of Pont-Charrault, the CRA earned victory in the Battle of Chemillé on the 11th of April 1793. This battle or rather the case after it, is linked with remarkable behaviour of commander d’Élbée. The celebrating Vendean soldiers wanted to kill all of the 400 republican prisoners and they did not react to d’Élbée’s rejection. When he saw the misery of the situation, he just shouted: „Soldiers, on your knees! Firstly, we will pray the Lord’s Prayer,“ everyone obeyed without a word and when they reached the part, „forgive us our trespasses as we forgive,“ d’Élbée stopped them. „Enough! Do not lie to God! Do you really want to forgive you as you forgive?“ The deeply religious Catholics were ashamed and nobody touched the prisoners.(Štovíček, 2013: 125)

The CRA won the Second battle of Fontenay-le-Comte, likewise the important Battle of Saumur was a victory for them, and the commanders of the army were brought to
the most crucial question of this military campaign. How to use the benefit of winning in Saumur and what would be the best next step? Stofflet was in favour of attacking Paris, La Rochelaquelein spoke about Tours and believed that the whole of central France would display the standards of the CRA, for example Lescure would choose the way to the ocean and La Rochelle.

The decision-making was not an easy process. Everybody realised the meaning of their next step and the pressure was enormous. The discussion was even so hot and sharp that in the middle of it the angry Jean-Nicolas Stofflet challenged Marquis de Bonchamps to fight a duel.

„No, monsieur,“ he answered courteously, „I will not accept your challenge. God and the King can alone dispose of my life, and France would be too greatly the loser were she to be deprived of yours.“ (Taylor, 1913: 109)

Bonchamps refused to fight and rather focused his mind on an idea, which was chosen in the end. The next target of the CRA would be the city of Nantes. It is no surprise that this plan had so many supporters and on the other hand so many opponents. In this place, we decided to not judge the plan or its realisation, because the aim of our paper is something else, not the deep examination of military aspects of this war. But, for a better illustration of the strategic importance of Nantes, we could use an explanation from Napoleon Bonaparte:

„Control of this great town, and assured of the arrival of English ships, the royal armies could safely maneuver on both banks of Loire. If, profiting by their amazing successes, Charette and Cahtelineau had then united their resources and marched on the capital, it would have been all over with the Republic. Nothing would have stopped the triumphant progress of royal armies. The white flag would have floated from the towers of Notre Dame before it would have been possible for the armies of the Rhine to come to the help of their Government.“ (Taylor, 1913: 109)

However, nothing of this happened. The CRA, with a strength of 33 000 men and 20 cannons, was marching on the city with just 12 000 defenders, but that was not enough. The republican general of division Jean Baptiste Camille de Canclaux was able to smartly use the weak sides of his opponents, like slow advance, poor military
synchronization or chaos in the CRA when Jacques Cathelineau was mortally wounded and gave the royal army tough defeat. (Guin, 1993: 111)

As it turned, the siege of Nantes was not just an ordinary battle, it was one of the key moments of the civil war. The National Convention finally understood the reality of the problem and ordered to reorganize the army of the Republic. With the new decision, there were four armies of the Republic: the Army of the Coasts of La Rochelle, the Army of the Coasts of Brest, the Army of the Coasts of Cherbourg and the Army of the West. These four reorganised armies were ordered to cooperate to reach the final target – to destroy the CRA and to end civil war. (Clerget, 1905: 26, 28-30)

The changes in the army were not the only ideas which were presented after the victory in Nantes. There were people, like general Westermann, who wanted more. Not just the military victory, they wanted Vendée to be punished, to send a message to inhabitants not only from Vendée, but from all parts of France, that no rebellion would be tolerated. It is not a lie, that also the civil inhabitants were suffering during the first months of civil war, yet the suggestions which were coming from a group of radicals were something different. The actions of mentioned general Westermann are a clear example:

„He announced to all that he would burn and deliver over to pillage all the communes which should furnish recruits to the rebels, or give them any other assistance. "That will make the peasant tremble," he wrote; "this terrible example is necessary to stop the torrent which will destroy the Republic."...On the 1st July he attacked the village of Amailhou, and as a reprisal for some Vendean pillage at Parthenay he delivered it up to pillage. (Jephson, 1899: 95)

Anyway, the four Republican armies started to advance and gained more and more superiority. They won the three battles of Luçon and on 17 October 1793 the French Republic earned a massive victory in the Battle of Cholet. The 26 000 men of the army of the Republic led by famous generals like Jean Baptiste Kléber or François Séverin Marceau-Desgraviers defeated the main part of the CRA with 40 000 men. The result for the CRA was shattering. 8000 men were dead, wounded or missing.
During the retreat the army was divided, what brought lots of problems later, and further two of the leaders were lost. Marquis Bonchamps was killed and Maurice d’Élbée wounded, captured and later executed. (Clerget, 1905: 27) As we mentioned earlier, he was shot sitting on a chair because of his wounds from the Battle of Cholet.

„It was eight o’clock in the evening – dark October evening – when, at the head of 400 volunteers, Bonchamps, d’Élbée, La Rochejaquelein, and others made their last desperate effort to redeem the fortunes of day...then, as d’Élbée and Bonchamps still fought on, the two received almost simultaneously what was in each case to prove their death-wound. D’Élbée in addition to thirteen lesser wounds, was shot through the chest, Bonchamps struck by a ball, fell from his horse...“Let us die with them,“ cried La Rochejaquelein as he saw it, „not retreat.“ But in spite of himself he was swept backwards by the fugitive torrent.“(Taylor, 1913: 209)

The CRA was in a really bad shape, yet insurgents did not want to stop fighting or surrender. After the catastrophe in Cholet, Vendeans crossed to the north shore of the Loire river and started a new campaign called Virée de Galerne (from the old Breton word gwalarn – northwest wind). The name describes the goal of this plan – support the royalists tendencies in Brittany and Normandy and start the open rebellion there.

At the beginning of the campaign, it was not pointless at all. Henri La Rochejaquelein as a commander in chief of the CRA led his army to some great victories, like in the Battle of Entrammes or the Battle of Dol, but even these achievements could not boost the decaying morale of his units.(Taylor, 1913: 279-282) This was the time, when the peasants refused to fight outside their homes and the absurdity of ideas, of which we spoke earlier, was totally showed. The army itself, with support of commander Stofflet, decided to return home, instead of attacking Rennes, which was the plan presented by Rochejaquelein. The return was, however, complicated by diseases (typhoid, dysentery, cholera), the cold weather with first snowfalls, and of course by the republican army, particularly by general Westermann, who ordered his cavalry to chase the CRA. Insurgents who surrendered or were captured were killed immediately or executed within twentyfour hours according to a law from 19.3.1793.(Štoviček, 2013: 126) This misery of the CRA culminated in the bloodiest
battle of civil war – the Battle of Le Mans. The casualties of insurgents lay between 10 000 to 16 000 people, plus another 5 000 to 10 000 Vendeans were captured. Especially the second day of battle (it was fought on the 12th and 13th of December 1793) was highly cruel, because the fighting republican soldiers entered the city and massacred the inhabitants without any distinction - women, children, old people, the ones who were or were not fighting against them, everybody was in danger and thousands of innocents were killed. (Thiers, 1859: 379) None of the desperate republican generals, Marceau and Kléber, were able to stop this rampage, so at least they tried to save as much people as the could. (Taylor, 1913: 304)

The military strength of the CRA was almost broken. La Rochejaqueulein and some other leaders were forced to become fugitives and just ten days after the Battle of Le Mans, the rest of the CRA was surrounded and defeated in Savenay.

**Genocide – sensitive point of French history**

But, the Battle of Saveny did not bring peace. Finally, it brought something at least as bad as war itself – the reprisals.

Disgusted general Marceau asked for withdrawal and we can describe his feelings from the letter addressed to his sister:

> „What! My dear sister, you congratulated me to these two victories or rather these two carnages and you want to be proud with my laurels. Do not you know, that they are stained with human blood, the French blood. I will not stay in the Vendée, it disgusts me to fight against the French. I want to use my weapons against other countries. Only there is honor and glory. I am seeking a position at the border. I hope my friends will help me get it.“ (Parfait, 1893: 176)

On the other hand, there were numbers of republican commanders with different attitudes than Marceau's noble rejection of reprisals and departure. The example itself is found in the person of general Westermann. After the Battle of Savenay, he sent to the National Convention one of the most infamous letters of French history.

> „The Vendée is no more...I have buried it in the woods and marshes of Savenay...According to your orders, I have trampled their children beneath your
horse's feet, I have massacred their women, so they will no longer give birth to brigands. I do not have a single prisoner to reproach me. I have exterminated them all. The roads are sown with corpses. At Savenay, brigands are arriving all the time claiming to surrender, and we are shooting them non-stop...Mercy is not a revolutionary sentiment.”(Levene, 2005: 104)

While the actions of Westermann and his men were cruel, the tragedy which came later should be named as infernal. On 21 January 1794 the French Republic launched an attack of the army with 60 000 to 100 000 men, divided in twelve-columns under the command of general Louis Marie Turreau.(Clerget, 1905: 40) The task of these forces was ominously simple – systematical elimination of the entire region.(Levene, 2005: 104) The plan to attack the Vendée as a region, not to focus only on the CRA, was not a spare of the moment idea. Proposals to violent encroachment into the region were presented in the National Convention by July 1793. On 1 August 1793 the Convention even made an act about destroying Vendée, but during unstable situations of war there was no real time to think about something else then fighting with the CRA. However, after they won at Savenay, the rebel army was defeated and the radical republicans were again calling for revenge. Despite these voices, general Kléber was trying to apply his moderate plan, which should be reasonably diplomatic in relation to common people and fight only against the rest of the insurgents. But the new head commander of the republican army, general Turreau, refused this plan, and ordered to realise his radical ideas of twelve-columns, which would be known to history as *Colonnes Infernales* – the Infernal columns. (Rochejaquelein, 1816: 482-483, Thiers, 1838: 48, Jephson, 1899: 293-296)

The reason why these columns are described as infernal is ominously simple such as their task – because they really brought an inferno to Vendée. „You are ordered to burn all the houses of the rebels, to massacre all the inhabitants, and to carry away all the food,” said the order sent by general Turreau to his subordinated general Haxo.(Jephson, 1899: 295) The operations of the Infernal columns took place from January to May 1794 and its results can be expressed in the following numbers. Soldiers captured almost 47 000 of farm animals, 62 000 pounds of iron, 800 pounds
of iron from graves, 1900 barrels of wine etc. (Štovíček, 2013: 291) Still, there is not an exact number in the most important and the most sad of these statistics – burned villages and human victims. The last researches are talking about 30 000 to 50 000 killed people. Most of them were civilians, not excluding women and children. One of the turpitudes of this cruelty was recorded and written by Marquise de La Rochejaquelein:

„Some republican columns, calling themselves the Infernals, has scoured the country in every direction, massacring men, women, and children. It happened more than once that a republican general, after sending word to the mayor that he would spare the inhabitants of a commune, if they would return to their dwellings, had them surrounded, and slaughtered to the last man. No faith whatever was kept with these unfortunate peasants.“ (Rochejaquelein, 1816: 483)

The truth is that the Marquise was royalist and her husband was commander of the CRA, but there were also witnesses from the other side.

„What did I find there?“ wrote a republican officer who had seen some of these places in the wake of the republican troops.

„Fathers, mothers, children of every age and both sexes, bathed in their blood, naked and in attitudes which the most ferocious person could not look at without shuddering.“ (Jephson, 1899: 302)

To stay objective, we need to clarify that there were differences between the twelve-columns. The units under the command of general Haxo focused on chasing François de Charette and Haxo ignored the previously mentioned order, which he received from Turreau. Some of his subordinated officers plundered villages on their own, but the final results of this units were in comparison with other, very slight. Another side of the table was Column number three, which raided at least twenty villages and the number of its murdered was accounted to thousands. There are no better descriptions of their actions, than the speech of general Grignon, commander of this column: „Comrades, we are entering the land of rebels and I am giving you my command to burn everything, which can burn and to use your bayonets to kill all the inhabitants, you will find. I know, there are still some of our allies, but it does not matter, we need to sacrifice all.“ (Štovíček, 2013: 304)

Looking back at the facts from previous paragraphs, it is no surprise, that the actions of Infernal columns belong to the most obvious neuralgic points of French history.
Was it really Franco-French genocide as we can read in works of famous French historians like Pierre Chaunu or Reynald Secher or does the other group of historians who say it is just mythological problem have the truth in store? Two hundred and twenty years after this gruesome episode, there is still no uniform answer to this question. French historians are split on the question like the people of 1794. Blues are advocating the behaviour of Republic, and try to refute the arguments of Blancs, the historians, who are talking about genocide.

Mark Levene brought an interesting analogy in his book *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State: The Rise of the West and the coming of Genocide*, when he compares the order of National Convention from 1st August with the Cromwellian Act for the Settlement of Ireland (1652). This proclamation declared commitment to turn rebel areas into free-fire zones, but still seems to have planned the evacuation of women, children and the old. Levene also worked with information which says that the Convention was thinking about the same idea and as the place, where evacuated people should be shipped, Madagascar was chosen. (Levene, 2005: 107)

We know that neither of these really happened, but the interesting thing in this analogy is the view of the Cromwellian Act. Like in the Vendée case, there are historians (for example Tim Pat Coogan) who came with the problem of genocide. And with this analogy, we would like to present one different way of how to deal with this historical problem.

There are some differences which we cannot overlook, like the engagement of two nations – English and Irish, however contrary to the Franco-French character of Vendée massacres, nevertheless, the help of this analogy is not in the historical actions in Ireland or France. From our opinion it is about the historians. According to the researches made by some of the most brilliant French historians, we cannot deny the catastrophe of Vendée and rampage of the Infernal Columns (neither events in Ireland), but what we could do, is turn the attention to historiography. From this point of view, we could find some other important attributes of this controversial problem.
The significant fact, which we have to realise, is that the historians who wrote or who are writing about genocides, either in Ireland or France, are the people from twentieth century. The reason why this is relevant, is because if historians talk about genocide in the eighteenth, seventeenth or even in the eleventh century, they use the optic of the present – of the twentieth/twentyfirst century. We should then ask if it is a proper decision to look at the historical events, even the most cruel ones, and then judge from our position, with the optic of the twentyfirst century.

**Agreement of La Jaunaye and the real end of war**

Despite its brutality, the actions of the Infernal columns did not bring the desired result. As a fact, the cruel plundering prompted the rest of the insurgents to reopen the war. Jean-Nicolas Stofflet and François de Charette became the leaders of these new units, though their armies were separated and remained only in the shadow of the CRA. Its operations looked like the armies itself. Just some local conflicts with republican soldiers, but nothing really relevant. (Rochejaquelein, 1816: 478, 482)

Then more important things happened in Paris and by this line also in the the Republic army in Vendée. General Turreau was dismissed and the Infernal Columns stopped. General Alexandre Dumas (father of the famous writer) became the new commander in chief of the republican army in Vendée (Clerget, 1905: 40). Soon after that, he wrote a letter to Paris, in which he expressed the chance of a quick end of the war. Besides this he asked to get rid of the command and the Republic then sent to the Vendée a new army commanded by general Louis Lazare Hoche. (Jephson, 1899: 382, Clerget, 1905: 41) General Hoche made a team alongside general Canclaux (the same one who led the successful defense of Nantes) and their politics of composing was more than rewarding. The reason is really simple, the main insurgents’ motivation in the last months was the effort to save their homes, their families against the Infernal Columns. When this problem was erased, most of the rebels did not need to fight and returned to their homes.
Thanks to this peaceful behaviour, Canclaux even persuaded Charretete to start negotiations in Saint-Sébastien near Natnes, which resulted in the peace agreement, signed on 17 February 1795 in chateau La Jaunaye, in Saint-Sébastien. Besides the other points, the Peace of La Jaunaye contained amnesty, freedom of religion and restoration of assets (Thiers, 1838: 161).

Despite this conciliatory agreement, Charette and Stofflet, supported by brothers of Louis XVI, tried to start another rebellion just a few months after the Peace of La Jaunaye. Yet, their attempt ended really soon, when both of them were captured and executed. François de Charette, the last commander of the CRA, was shot on 26 March 1796 in Nantes. (Thiers, 1838: 364) After his death, the were no more efforts to fight.

A report of the Directory from 15 June 1796 can be considered symbolic to the end of the civil war in Vendée: „The rebellion on West finally ended.“

**Conclusion**

The appropriate completion of this report would be: „For now.“ The peace was not permanent, because rebellion in Vendée had started three more times. A first time in 1799 as a reaction to the Coup of 18 Brumaire and the establishment of a French Consulate. Then again, contra Napoleon during the Hundred Days, in 1815. The last uprising came alive with the July Revolution in 1830.

But none of them left such a deep mark in French history as the events between 1793 and 1796.

In the end an unbelievable number of 30 regular battles and over 700 minor fights were delivered in less than three years in an area of about 25,000 km². A clash of two different mentalities and ideologies, even in the middle of one nation, brought tragic episodes, but at the same time stories of boundless courage and grace.
This paper could not cover all of the reality of War in the Vendée, and after all, it was not our goal. We rather focused on the significant points and important questions, which cannot be ignored in any historical research, not even about Vendée, but also about the French Revolution itself.

Finally, the main reason why we opened the questions, which cannot be answered sufficiently in this paper, is to attract readers to think about it and form their own opinion on this controversial side of French history.
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Many people would agree that the enmity between England and Germany dominated European relations in the first half of the twentieth century. Even though the abilities of European diplomacy at the turn of the century seemed endless, and the prospects of peaceful future bright, 14 years later the situation couldn't have been more different. The First World War, also referred to as The Great War, was the biggest, bloodiest and most devastating war ever fought to that date. Today we see The First World war as an inevitable outcome of the European politics, diplomacy and relations which had been in the making for decades. Anglo-German rivalry was the one which seemed to shape all the others and therefore it has been an interesting area of research for many historians. But why and when did Britain and Germany really start to be so at odds? This is the author's main question and to answer it James Hawes decided to take a fresh look and a different approach regarding the enmity between Britain and Germany. For him it wasn't so much the governments and the politicians of these nations who represented that hatred, but rather the 'common people'. To be able to thoroughly research and present this topic the author starts the journey in 1864, exactly half a century before the outbreak of the World War I when the situation in both countries could not have been more different to the more familiar one 50 years later.

James Hawes, an Oxford graduate, worked briefly as an English teacher in Spain, as well as a professional archaeologist in Wales, before taking a Ph.D on Nietzsche and Kafka at UCL in 1987. He specialised in German literature on the eve of World War I and held lectureships at three universities. To this day he has published six novels, two of which were adapted as screenplays. *Excavating Kafka*, published in 2008,
caused an outrage in Germany but was praised in England as an 'utterly brilliant and absolutely infuriating book'. Englanders and Huns was published in February 2014 by Simon & Schuster in the United Kingdom and was also hailed by Lucy Hughes-Hallet in The Times as '...a book of full of enlightening suprises'. Although the book's title and the main question suggest the book can be categorised as political history because of the author's layered approach, it goes far beyond that. In fact I would say that aspects of social and cultural history were the foundation for the enmity Hawes explored. Hawes's discoveries while writing this book will be the subject of an exhibition in Bonn City Museum which opens in May 2015.

Other than trying to see when and how Britain and Germany became enemies the author embarked on a difficult mission to answer the great question of our modern history, why Britain took the side she did in the war which led to be the defining cataclysm of our times. The author's main thesis is that this was not a random occurrence - a fight between rival European empires - as many masterful storytellers see it. Hawes does not agree with the popular opinion in today's historiography which states that things were essentially fine between England and Germany at least until the 1890's. Hawes takes a different approach and attempts to examine the roots of this rivalry which he believes dates back to 1864. Therefore he does not agree with the view of many who blame Tirpitz's naval plan for initiating Anglo-German hostility but thinks that Germany deliberately used already existing hatred in their propaganda. To support his claim Hawes shares the opinion of Christopher Clark in The Sleepwalkers „it was above all the sequence of peripheral clashes with Britain that triggered the decision“.

Therefore Hawes's main task was to show, and support with evidence, an opinion that Anglo-German enmity didn't arise as a factor of a merely political situation, but also as a consequence of the growing mass media and its influence on the public. He shows the co-relation between the power of state and mass media: ways in which politicians controlled and tested public opinion and the media's anti-reaction - the later influence of mass media on politics. In other words once the hatred towards one nation was established, and deeply
rooted, the government could not act against the will of its voters. The author also makes a point that a reason for this was the fact that most of these voters were young men raised on anti-German or anti-British propaganda. Thus their deeply rooted dislike of one another could not have been easily erased. Consequently this played a significant role in the events which led to the War.

In order to establish where the enmity between Britain and Germany began, Hawes started his „uncomfortable excavation“ exactly half a century before The Great War began. The author's research was mostly based on primary source material. Chiefly German and English newspapers, personal correspondence and documents. His knowledge of German literature and press was very important and played a major part in his research. Hawes also uses this knowledge to present literary works that have been influenced by Anglo-German enmity. It is interesting to see the parallels he draws between fiction and reality as well as the influences these books had on a wide audience, as another way of enhancing Germanophobia and Anglophobia. Other than this he also used American newspapers, primarily The New York Times which helped him gain an external perspective on the rivalry. On the top of that he consulted a selection of English and German literature on the subject dating from 1860's to 2006.

The book is conceptualised in 8 parts and a prologue in which author explains his motives, methods, the main goal of this research, as well as a different perspective on the problem which defined the entire book. Eight parts cover a period of 50 years, more specifically between 1864 and 1914, but in order to support his case the author uses examples from the past and the future. In the interests of setting the scene and explaining the Anglo-German relationship, state, and society before the actual clash, the first few chapters cover a shorter period of time until the 1870's, before German Unification. In these parts the author explains the role of Prussia in the German Unification, the German view of the Englishman and vice-versa. It was important for the author not only to establish a historical background for this enmity, but also to
offer readers personal accounts as supporting evidence because the relationship was soon to change. Afterwards each part covers a period of a decade, with the exception of the seventh part which is fully dedicated to the understanding of Anglo-German enmity at the turn of the century, when Fear and Loathing, which is the title of this part, seemed to be fully developed due to propaganda on both sides in the Boer War. In each chapter the author opens up a new problem with a brief and critical overview of historical reality at that point as an introduction leading to a new theme. He concludes the chapter by highlighting the main points and current state of things. These introductory parts not only cover German and English history, but also present the situation in the rest of the Europe which helps a non-historian to fully understand the historical context. Hawes occasionally stops the narrative to reflect on the changes, draw conclusions and point out the main problems and questions. Thematically the book covers many political, social and economic aspects of both countries, highlighted by confrontations such as colonial clashes and the navy race. On the other hand the book is also packed with long-forgotten stories: the murder of Queen Victoria's cook in Bonn, the disaster to Germany's ironclads under the White Cliffs, bizarre early colonial disputes and the precise, dark moment when Anglophobia begat modern anti-Semitism.

Hawes demonstrated his brilliant analytical skills as well as his ability to explain the relationships between the many different political, economical, social and cultural factors. During his research he used a wide range of methods, such as biographical and causal, but as the title and prologue suggests the main characteristic of the book is a comparative approach which allowed Hawes to distinguish and understand specific trends and contexts. Namely contexts of European politics and economy where Hawes clearly shows a connection between the political and economical reality and how it influenced society and international relations. To develop a deeper understanding of diplomatic alliances, especially in the later chapters of the book, the author tries to unravel the hidden personal motives of historical figures and the stories behind them further demonstrating his fine
biographical and analytical skills. Probably the most crucial aspect is the mass media and the ever growing role of daily newspapers in the formation of public opinion. In this instance the author tries to unravel how the antagonism was supported by mass media and how it grew, changed and shaped the society. And last, but not least, through the personal eye of Germans and Englishmen. Travel guides, memoirs and personal experiences of regular people enrich the story of Anglo-German enmity and add a whole new dimension to it. By using illustrations, newspaper articles and personal correspondence the author can explain the cultural and social gap between Germany and England and how it changed throughout 50 years. For example, this is what an Englishman thought of new Germany in 1870's: 'With the kindest of hearts and the best of intentions, a German omits the little courtesies, and even decencies of life, without which civilised life as we understand it in England, is intolerable. His mode of eating, even in good society, is on a level with that of our agricultural labourers.' (Hawes, 2014: 212). In other words, everything in Germany just seemed so much less civilised. Personally I found these accounts refreshing, easy to read and also necessary to develop an understanding of Anglo-German relations. It was fascinating to see how their view of one-another had been changing through different areas of life and also how their experiences as tourists in the other country remained very similar due to stereotypes formed long before Bismarck's time. The author also explains ideological differences between the two countries, the origins of these doctrines, the reasons for them, as well as the impact they had on society and state. Through this layered approach, which does not only focus on the political sphere but also cultural and social history, Hawes exceeds many other scholars and answer's his question completely. It is this different interpretation of Anglo-German antagonism is what makes this book an interesting read and a worthy contribution to historical science.

Most of the newspaper articles, illustrations and letters are brought to us in an original form which makes the book visually more attractive and makes easier to understand the author's main ideas as we can read ourselves some of the most
relevant primary sources Hawes used in his research. The author mentions when his opinion differs from other scholars, likewise instances when a certain problem or an edge to the story has been forgotten examples. When doing so Hawes tries to validate his opinion and approach with relevant quotations from primary sources or other scholars in order to support his claims and strengthen his argument. Because of his critical analysis and synthesis as well as a wide range of methods and sources used Hawes has proved himself to be a great historian.

On the negative side, as I had a chance to look at the Kindle version of this book I noticed that these extra features are not as visible as in the printed version, so I would definitely recommend buying a physical version of the book. At the moment the book is only available in hardback, but a cheaper paperback edition is due to come out in the next few months. Apart from this the only real criticism I found is a lack of background when it comes to less known historical figures, such as statesmen and diplomats. It would be helpful if there was an index explaining people's positions and relationships with other more famous figures such as the German chancellor or British prime minister. This lack of information makes some parts of the book more difficult to understand in terms of historical context, but it does not adversely affect the main plot.

In the last chapter Hawes concludes that by 1897 it was already common in Britain to view Germany, and vice versa, not only as a direct economic competitor, and not even merely as a potential enemy in the field but as a fundamentally alien polity whose triumph of values would mean little less than national-cultural extinction. For Hawes it is remarkable that this view is still prevalent in both Germany and Britain today. Contrary to what many believe today this is not the product of the twentieth century's great disasters but was one of the causes. As I mentioned earlier the author often correlates the past with the present in order to exemplify or support his ideas. In conclusion he offers his own thoughts on the Anglo-German relationship today and mentions the importance of it for the future of
European Union. He expresses concern and gives a warning for the future stability of the EU, suggesting that both nations should learn from the past otherwise his „analyses“ shall likely persist. This observation shows that Hawes does not just think one-dimensionally but that he can also see the repercussions this enmity has had on both global and European history and that there is potential too for future conflict.

This book stood out from the masses because of an unusual cover which catches one's attention instantly. After reading the book I would say that the cover reflects the book's content completely. As I went through newly published literature about the War, I can say that this book will definitely increase understanding of the War and therefore benefit this popular field of research. I found out that Anglo-German rivalry had so much more to it: it didn't start just because of the German atmospheric industrial rise and aggressive foreign policy. I think the author successfully conveyed his main idea that the roots of this hatred were planted much earlier, before German Unification, and we are to find them in social and cultural differences between the two nations which were clear to both Germans and Britons in the 1860's. Finally I would definitely recommend picking up Englanders and Huns. It is a great read for all those interested in historical non-fiction and the Long 19th Century. This book offers a brilliant portrait of two nations and their relationship, enriched by many forgotten stories which will surely broaden one's understanding of this historical period. For a reader less familiar with the subject this book can be a great way to learn more about how this clash arose and an uncomplicated way to find out more about European history prior to the World War I.
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Teaching Big History: The institutional goals, technological and intellectual cooperation

Interview with Cynthia Brown

César Augusto Duque Sánchez, Universidad de los Andes

Cynthia Stokes Brown (1938) is a professor of the Dominican University of California. She has studied history at Duke University and has got a Ph.D. at John Hopkins. Professor Brown has wrote and taught about a new historiographical phenomenon called Big History.

Big History is a recent historiographical school that was born in the World History Association, although eventually adopted its own historical stance. The purpose, partly founded by the reflections of David Christian (Macquarie University-Sidney, Australia-), is to reconstruct the history since the Big Bang to our time. The Big History take into account the most important scientific explanations –of both natural and social sciences-, in order to apply this knowledge to the humanities. The texts of Big History provide a theoretical, methodological and pedagogical development about space and time; more over, they offer the opportunity to reorganize the core of the administration work and the investigation process of the scientific community itself.

Any general appreciation about Big History give us two general notions: explanatory writing and intellectual cooperation. Firstly, the narrative of the texts of Big History develops- in the framework of explanatory writing. The texts of Big History are more near to historical manuals or text books –I.e. it puts more emphasis on pedagogical certainties- gather to list sharp questions about the reader that the text of historical research, funded in some historiographical schools of twentieth century interested to open inquiries to discuss simple versions of the social universe that come to the common sense and simplify its complexity.
But this explanatory feature to the genre does not detract content. The texts use renewed theoretical notions, highly relevant to the historiographical community. This is the case of the concept built by David Christian for naming “the very long durations”. Under this perspective also shows interest in the study of “futurology” or complexity.

This subjects not only redefine the “temporal regime” of actual historians, but also speak about differential scales of analysis - eight scales in total-. In this scales the scanned object alters the causal relation in the narrative and leaves emerge new problems for study, to overcome the duality of agency and structure.

However, the reflection futurological of Big History books gives a programmatic wind to text content, linking closely with the dimension of the social sciences that handles variables - in this case on a practical controllables - highly political horizon: reading historical trends social structures to mitigate some risks - ecological, economic, technological , warlike.

On the subject, Professor Brown has published in 2007 the book *Big History: From the Big Bang to the Present*. It brings human history to animal and mineral history through a narrative that remains outside the academic genre, but she also provides some theoretical and methodological reflections on the matter, as in the article: *What is a civilization , Anyway?*102

Brown has also written books on history teaching manuals and oral history. The following interview develops topics as institutional situation of Big History, on its raiding process in the universities and some reflections on the application and teaching of gender.

---

Interview:

1. [What was your first oncoming to the work of Big History?]

My mother was a high school biology teacher. I majored in history as an undergraduate and then taught high school world history while I studied a Ph.D. in the history of education. After my sons were old enough, I went to work at Dominican University of California training high school teachers and keeping up with the field of world history.

In the fall of 1991 I read an article by David Christian in the *Journal of World History*. It was called “The Case for Big History.” This was the first time I had encountered the term. I knew at once that I wanted to teach Big History. Two years later I was able to held, at my university, a course in world history that was designed for students who were going to be teachers. I just added the first 13.8 billion years without asking permission. I gave a copy of my syllabus to my department chair, so she must have known what I was doing, although we never spoke of it.

2. [I knew of your work as professor of Big History. What has been your experience with students to teach this approach?]

My first class loved this approach, even though we didn’t have a suitable textbook. (I used Clive Ponting’s *Green History of the World.*) All my classes since then have loved it, and everyone I know who has taught Big History has found it the most satisfying teaching of their career because many students become deeply excited. Students are amazed, engaged, and often transformed by discussing the content of Big History. A few students find it conflicts with their religious beliefs, and they have to find room for science along with their religious beliefs. It helps that the Catholic church now supports science.

3. [Big History is also a project of international scale. What role do you believe than you has had on the implementation of Big History as a project?]

I was very fortunate to become involved with Big History just at the moment when it was starting to take off. In 2006 I met David Christian and Craig Benjamin at a conference near Los Angeles, sponsored by the World History Association. At that time David had been promoting Big History for 15 years without getting much positive response. David’s book, *Maps of Time*, came out in 2004, but it seemed a bit too difficult for students in a beginning course. So the three of us, after just meeting at this conference, agreed to write an undergraduate textbook.

Meanwhile, my book came out in 2007. It is now in second edition, and my press has sold it to 9 or 10 publishers in other languages, including Arabic, Chinese, Korean,
Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and Rumanian. We call it Big History “lite”---it is easy enough for the general public to enjoy.

Even before I met David Christian he introduced me to Walter Alvarez, the famous geologist who was teaching at UC-Berkeley, a few blocks from my home. I gave him the manuscript of my book, which gave him the courage to start a Big History course. He saw that big historians were not putting enough geology into our big history accounts, so in the summer of 2010 he invited seven of us to his geology institute In Coldigioco, Italy. There, we learned geology and we also formed the International Big History Association (IBHA). I have been on its board until just a month ago, and now I am one of the associate editors of the new journal that it is launching soon. IBHA has held two conferences in the U.S., and the next one will be in Amsterdam in mid-July ’16. The website of the IBHA has much interesting information: www.ibhanet.org.

For the past few years I have traveled quite a lot, to Moscow, Beijing, Seoul, and Minneapolis, giving talks about Big History. But the main thing I have done to implement Big History has been to write the new textbook with David Christian and Craig Benjamin---Big History: Between Nothing and Everything (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2014). Now everyone who wants to teach big history has a wonderful textbook to use. So far it is only in English, but our publisher---McGraw-Hill---is international. If you would like McGraw-Hill to translate a Spanish edition, please tell our publicity rep, Alexandra Schultz, at: alexandra_schultz@mcgraw-hill.com. You can buy a used copy in English from Amazon.com.

4. [The approach of "very long term" proposed by Big History require any cooperation or training, it covers the natural sciences and the social sciences: What experience have you had with other teachers who teach knowledge of natural sciences, humanities or social sciences ?]

When I started teaching Big History, I just taught myself, or more accurately, I learned along with my students. Some 50 or so other professors have done this, and now, with our new textbook, it is easier than before. Of course, you have to be willing to admit that you don’t know the answer to many questions, which some professors have a hard time doing.

It is lots more fun, and more professors are able to do it, if a group of professors from various fields work together. They can either give one course, managed by one of them, with guest lectures by others, or they can give the same course, designed collaboratively by all of them, in multiple sections, with each one teaching the whole course.
Here at Dominican, after I taught my course for several years, the faculty voted to create a similar one to use as the freshman year experience. This is a course required of all entering freshmen in the first semester, one that gives them a common experience together as they begin their university work. The faculty was not happy with the course that they had been using for this. But to teach a big history course meant that we needed 10-13 teachers ready to teach it because we had about 300 freshmen coming, and the university wanted to keep the sections to 22 students each. What could we do? See the next answer.

5. [When you proposing a Big History course at the institution in which you work, what opportunities and obstacles you noted?]

Of course, we were faced with both a wonderful opportunity and a great obstacle: how could we get 13 professors ready to teach big history in 6 months? We were very fortunate to be a small university (about 2000 students), with a small faculty who knew each other. No one could be too highly specialized and isolated because teaching was the most important part of our job.

We were also lucky to have a young assistant English professor, Mojgan Behmand, who quickly realized the implications of teaching big history and who had the administrative skills to lead those who wanted to teach it, even though she had never tried administration before. Mojgan asked faculty to volunteer, and Mojgan and I agreed to hold a ten-day institute in the summer to go over all the material with the professors who wanted to teach and to create a common syllabus that everyone could agree to use. The provost provided $50,000 for this, so the faculty could be paid for their time in attending.

The faculty felt this was the most exciting “training” they had ever received, and they grew to appreciate each other much more. Each person presented the part of the material that they knew best, plus we invited a few outside speakers. Since that first summer we have held three more summer institutes. The successive ones have not focused on content, but rather on methods of teaching that can make the content concrete for non-abstract thinkers.

The big history program at Dominican has a website with essays by students and faculty and lots of information that will assist others who want to teach big history. The link to the website is: http://www.dominican.edu/academics/big-history.

I am proud to say that the big history faculty at Dominican has been able to collaborate sufficiently to write a book together. It will come out this November from the University of California Press. It will be called Teaching Big History, edited by Richard B. Simon, Mojgan Behmand, and Thomas Burke. You can order advance
copies (in English!) already from Amazon books. This book will be an enormous help to anyone who wants to teach big history. It even has sample exam questions.

At every university there will be people who are opposed to big history or who themselves are not able to teach it. Post-modernists in general don’t think it is possible to construct a coherent story that is not biased to enhance the power of those writing it. We agree that total objectivity is impossible, but we believe it is important to get as close as possible. We are not trying to replace specialized history, just to work at a different scale.

6. [Which is the basic text or a group of classical texts used to teach this approach for your students?]

The first year that we taught big history we used both my book and David Christian’s book. We thought that his book was too difficult for most of our students and that my book was too slight, without enough pages for assignments. So we asked teachers to choose their own balance of assignments from each book. This didn’t work too well, and David’s book did prove beyond many of our students.

The next year we used the manuscript for our textbook, printed up in a preliminary edition by Mc-Graw-Hill without any illustrations or maps. You can imagine that this was difficult for students, but it gave us important feedback that we used to improve the text in the final editing stage. This year we have found that our textbook works much better than anything else we have tried. Fred Spier’s book, *Big History and the Future of Humanity*, also works well. It is more concise, with less human history, and more scientific in tone. Spier is revising it to come out soon in textbook format; then there will be two good choices.

7. [One of the most innovative components of the project is the use of technologies as tools to help classes and teaching. This certainly has the attention of students: Do you think you could teach "Big History" in schools, without necessarily employ the help of informatic technologies -as internet, etc.-?]

This is a good question. The images available on the Internet are fantastic. But I am old-fashioned enough to have taught before the Internet, and I know very well you can teach big history without it. Now, of course, our textbook has many wonderful images in it. Abstract thinkers, let’s say the ones who chose a big history class as an elective, can usually grasp the ideas from the text alone. But if you’re trying to teach all your students, you need concrete activities like the ones described in the new book, *Teaching Big History* (above). You can also use DVDs like “Journey of the Universe” by Brian Swimme and Mary Evelyn Tucker, and “Cosmos” by Neil DeGrasse Tyson.
Of course, if you have Internet, then you can use the amazing big history curriculum called the Big History Project (www.bighistoryproject.com). This contains short videos on all the subjects, games, essays, and assorted materials to engage students and help them learn to think.

8. [In future, how you look in the project and what do you think that awaits to "Big History"?]

I feel certain that Big History will transform the content of schools from kindergarten to university around the world, at least in nations with functioning governments. It is a movement that is just beginning because the challenges that everyone around the world face can only be dealt with by people who understand the big picture. These challenges are pushing the curriculum in the right direction.

In addition, big history engages students with the big, most interesting questions; it keeps them from being lost in a sea of information. It gives them a framework for all of their studies, so that the specialized pieces make sense in terms of the big picture of the puzzle. It also helps to fill in basic information from every discipline that students may have missed in their earlier education.