SMALL NATIONS ON THE BORDERLINES OF GREAT POWERS

SPECULUM HISTORIAE DEBRECENIENSE 14.
(A Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézete Kiadványai)

Series Editor:

PAPP KLÁRA

Small Nations on the Borderlines of Great Powers

EDS.
ATTILA BÁRÁNY – SATU MATIKAINEN

Multiplex Media–Debrecen Kft.
Debrecen – Jyväskylä, 2013

A Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézete kiadása
Publications Of The Department Of History, The University Of Debrecen

Refereed by
János Barta, *professor emeritus*
and two anonymous referees (Finland)

Proofs read by
István Vida

Sponsored by:
University of Jyväskylä, Department of History and Ethnology
University of Debrecen, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Graduate School in History
University of Debrecen, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Department of History

The work is supported by the TÁMOP-4.2.2/B-10/1-2010-0024 project.
The project is implemented through the New Hungary Development Plan,
co-financed by the European Social Fund
and the European Regional Development Fund.

Cover design by
Rajmund Fekete

Technical editor
Zsuzsanna Hermán

ISBN 978-963-473-604-2
ISSN 2060-9213

Printed by Kapitális Kft., Debrecen
Managing Director: József Kapusi

Cover illustration: a contemporary engraving about the Congress of Vienna.

CONTENTS

SMALL NATIONS IN COLONIAL CONTEXTS

RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION OF SMALL STATES AND GREAT POWERS DURING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Small Nations on the Borderlines of Great Powers

Introduction

On October 6–7, 2011 an international conference took place in Debrecen entitled "Small Nations in between Great Powers". The conference was organized jointly by the Institute of History, University of Debrecen and the Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä. Altogether twenty speakers participated in this two-day event, eleven from the University of Debrecen and nine from the University of Jyväskylä. All presentations concentrated on the main topic of the conference, the historical role of small nations vs. great powers, and the majority of them approached the theme from the perspective of Finnish and Hungarian history. The articles in the present volume are based on the presentations given in the conference.

Both Finland's and Hungary's history provides examples of many interactions between these two states or nations and their neighbouring great powers. Both countries have long been under the influence or under direct rule of neighbouring great powers and thus have had in many respects similar historical experiences.

However, this volume also addresses histories of other nations and states besides Finland and Hungary. The relationship between small nations and great powers is thus explored from a broader or even global perspective and in a wide chronological span, ranging from early medieval times to modern Europe. As for the perspective, the relationship between small and great powers can be discussed, on the one hand, on a concrete level when the states share a common frontier. On the other hand, several articles in this collection discuss interactions and cooperation in international arenas or transnational influences between states that do not border each other. The present volume has several sub-themes investigating empires and powers as well as small nations through medieval and early modern times, also discussing their relationship in colonial contexts. It aims to explore issues of the relations and international co-operation of small states and great powers during the twentieth century, too.

It is impossible to find a common theoretical approach or method to all articles in this book, as the individual texts cover such a wide thematic, historical and geographical area. However, from the title of this volume, a number of key concepts can be distinguished. First of all, there is the highly controversial term

"nation". In relation to this, what kind of nations can be counted as "small"? On the other hand, there is the concept of "great power", which is not unambiguous either.

There is an abundance of scholarly literature on nations and nationalism[1], and it is not the intention of this volume to delve into that complicated question. However, some basic definitions are in order. One of the main debates relating to the definitions of nations and nationalism is the question whether nations are products of the modern age or if they precede it. Can the forms of pre-modern national consciousness be linked with the modern forms of nationalism? There has been general consensus between the main scholars of the subject that nationalism is a modern phenomenon, forming around 1800.[2] This is interesting also from the viewpoint of the present volume, since many articles discuss the pre-modern period.

The definition of nation has several dimensions. It is often emphasised that a nation has common national characteristics, above all common language, as well as common history, culture and ethnicity. Secondly, there is the political aspect of a nation, which leads to an implication that a nation equals an independent state. In addition, there is the element of cultural construction, such as in Benedict Anderson's view of "the imagined communities".[3] All these elements are manifest in a number of articles in our collection.

Great powers can be understood as countries which can rely primarily on their own resources when defending their existence and interests.[4] As Vesna Danilovic has noted, history of international relations has traditionally been presented as history of the great powers, or "major powers", which according to her has come into more common use recently. However, the term great powers came into diplomatic and scholarly discourse only in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the political system of Europe was reorganized after the fall of Napoleon.[5] Danilovic distinguishes three criteria in defining a great power. The first is the size of a state's power potential or capacities. The second relates to the spatial dimension, i.e. the geographical size. Thirdly, there is the issue of status: the state is recognised as a great power and it also sees itself as such and, moreover, is willing to act as one.[6]

---

1 See, for example, Anthony D. Smith, Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism, Routledge, London, 1998, ix.

2 Oliver Zimmer, Nationalism in Europe, 1890–1940, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 4–5.

3 For an overview of the subject, see Zimmer, Nationalism, 7–15.

4 Paul W. Schroeder, "Did the Vienna Settlement Rest on a Balance of Power?", The American Historical Review 97: 3 (1992) 688.

5 Vesna Danilovic, When the Stakes Are High: Deterrence and Conflict among Major Powers, University of Michigan Press, 2002, 26–28.

6 Danilovic, When the Stakes, 28, 225–230.

As for the definition of small nations, the adjective "small" can be understood here as referring to the relative size of a nation or a state. The main criterion is usually population, although the geographical area or the size of national economy are also used. Nowadays, small states sometimes refer to very small or micro-states. However, any exact figures or dividing lines are not very useful, especially in a historical context.

Some authors have addressed the theme of how small nations or states fare when interacting with great powers. A useful analysis of the definition of a small nation in a historical context, albeit primarily referring to the situation during the twentieth century, has been made by Madelon de Keizer and Ismee Tames. They note that due to the lack of objective criteria, some scholars have argued that there is no definition of a small state. Like in the present volume, for Tames and de Keizer, a nation does not necessarily equal to a state. Tames and de Keizer argue, according to a definition made by Annette Baker Fox, that small states are local powers whose interests and demands extend to their own geographical area and to the immediate area. In contrast, great powers wield their influence over wider areas. Small states are limited in their policy choices and can often feel a threat to their existence. Therefore, survival strategies are essential.[7] Baker Fox points out that the general assumption as to the relations of the great powers and small states is that "the great powers determine the course of world politics and that the small powers can do little but to acquiesce in their decisions".[8] Baker Fox, however, notes that the reality is not always that straightforward, and based on the case studies included in the present collection, we can surely agree with her..

At the beginning of the 21st century the issue of small nations and great powers has a peculiar relevance, since it can be observed that larger structures have been shaping beyond the traditional frames of nation-states, and the smaller states getting integrated into them are reluctant to abandon certain elements of their historical sovereignty and yield them over to supranational formations. For instance, the dilemma of the relationship of the member states and the European Union is very much similar to the one smaller states – existing within imperial structures throughout their history – experienced in the past, when they had to give up certain elements of their national sovereignty. The historical experience gained in this way could raise interesting issues from which the 21st century readers can learn a lot.

---

[7] Madelon de Keizer and Ismee Tames, "Introduction", in: Small Nations: Crisis and Confrontation in the 20th century, eds. Madelon de Keizer and Ismee Tames, Zutphen, 2008, 7–24; Annette Baker Fox, The Power of Small States, University of Chicago Press, 1959, 1–4.

[8] Baker Fox, The Power of Small States, 2.

Empires and powers in medieval context

The duality of small nations and great powers already existed in the medieval world. During the Middle Ages Hungary was an independent and internationally recognized state. Furthermore, in some periods of the country's medieval history it appeared as a regional power on the political scene and was able to seize large territories from its neighbours or force its influence on them. Therefore, Hungary had some of the necessary requirements to be considered a great power and was also – consciously – aware of its status as being one. This glorious age ended at the beginning of the 16th century when the country found itself entrapped between two emerging powers, the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires. After Hungary suffered a devastating defeat from the Turks in 1526, the Habsburgs gained control over the north-western part of the country while the middle and southern territories were occupied by the Turks. Being incorporated into the Habsburg Empire meant for them almost the same as living within the Swedish Empire did for the Finns. This matter is discussed by Attila Bárány in the second chapter of the first section.

However, it was not only Hungary that lived through the conflict of small nationhood and the experience of being – or being seen as – a grand power. It was also shared by Lithuania, which was able to rise as a considerable power in the Eastern European region. Reflecting from the beginning of the 21st century, one is inclined to view medieval states in the mirror of modern, 19th century nationalism. It is obvious that the medieval empires did not have any kind of modern national "consciousness". Then what were the ideological elements that these empires were held up by? These questions are touched by Gábor Bradács in the context of medieval Germany.

Attila Bárány and László Pósán both examine great powers in a regional and geopolitical sense, namely medieval Hungary and Lithuania. Bárány gives an overview of Hungary's relationship to her neighbouring countries, from Croatia and the Holy Roman Empire in the west to Wallachia in the east. He discusses Hungarian expansions as well as examines the long-troubled relationship with the Russian principalities and Bohemia, and the warm rapports with Poland. While Hungary aspired to be a great power it had always been fighting for its own survival between the superpowers of the Holy Roman Empire and Byzantium. Bárány has a dualistic scope, analyzing the "imperial" aspects of Hungarian expansion, whereas outlining those of the defence policies against German and Byzantine expansion at the same time. He underlines the major, symbolic motive in Hungarian historical mythology, the preservation of sovereignty in order that Hungary not be subordinated to any overlordship, and its kings be of equal status to any of the Christian monarchs. In the cross-fire of two empires Hungary was to survive and sustain its independence. Hungary

became a grand power in the reflections of her neighbours, and its kings' self-recognition was also twofold.

Pósán assesses the circumstances of the birth of the "pagan great power" in the Baltic region, stressing that among the Baltic peoples only the Lithuanians were able to establish an independent state. Lithuanian statehood presented remarkable divergence compared with kingdoms that had come into existence around the millennium: statehood was not linked to the adoption of Christianity, but took place amidst the *gentilitial* structures of a pagan world. The existence of Grand Duchy was proof of the possibility of building a territorial power-structure based on heathen fundaments which was capable of significant expansion and of becoming a political factor in Eastern Europe. Pósán presents s the ever-present dilemma of converting to Christianity for the sake of national survival or fighting against the "conversion in arms" and in this way preserving national integrity. In a way, the tribal leaders were right since they could earn an independent statehood while expanding onto large areas of neighbouring Slavs as well as were able to halt the aggressive advances of the German knights, and moreover, were able to survive the aggression of the Tatars. Pósán highlights the religious pluralism based on political considerations.

Gábor Bradács discusses imperial and national consciousness in the empire of the Ottonian and Salian emperors, which, from 919 to 1125 may be considered as the first realm of the medieval Europe, which has a continuity with a nation and a state that still exists today (Germany). He discusses whether it is possible to say that this *Regnum Theutonicorum* had a "German" consciousness in its modern sense. Bradács considers what contemporary sources may contain information of this "national" and "imperial" self-awareness. He also focuses on the policy of the early "German state" towards Central and Eastern Europe, especially the Christianization aspirations. He seeks answers to the question if this policy was determined and ideologized only by the church and its endeavours to convert the heathen Slavonic, Hungarian or Danish people, or if it had a kind of "secular" ambition in this relation too. The article comes to a conclusion regarding whether the early German "state" had any sense or ambition of being a "world-power", or not.

Small nations and great powers in the early Modern period

The early Modern period had a diverse affect on European small nations, for example, on Finland or the Low Countries. Four articles look at these issues. The Netherlands, in the territorial and demographic sense, was treated as a small country, at the same time, due to its geographical position and economic development, it inevitably became a factor in the 17th–18th-century grand policy. That

is, it had the features of a small country yet had to face the threat of neighbouring powers (in the first place, France) and was a great power having remarkable influence in the European political theatre. Moreover, the small Netherlands became an empire itself as it gained control of rich and significant overseas lands. Finland, which from a geographical point of view played a much more peripheral role, had a "multiple" role in the period in a different way. The territories populated by Finns entered the era as part of the Crown of Sweden which subsequently became a decisive factor and grand power itself. The Finnish people in a way "suffered" and "made benefit of" an imperial structure, and along their eastern boundaries they were to see the emergence of another imperial frame, that of Russia, the final conflict of which was to take place during the Napoleonic wars. Finland, as a consequence, became part of the Russian empire. With regard to Finland's constitutional status this political shift had significant consequences, since the country, which never had autonomy when it was part of Sweden, finally gained some sort of independence within the Russian Empire.

Réka Bozzay discusses the birth of a "leading small nation" in Europe, the Netherlands, which rose to being one of the defining factors of the political map of the power system in certain periods during the 17th–19th centuries. Even before a new state was created in 1648 in the area of the Protestant Union of Utrecht, the Seven United Provinces had been waging a common and successful economic and foreign policy. The author discusses what contributed to the success of this little Commonwealth. First, social and economic developments which led to the emergence of a (pre)-capitalist system are examined. Then, Bozzay emphasizes the role of trade companies and the successful trade wars, which insured the Seven United Provinces a great power position in Europe.

Petri Karonen's article gives an overview of the role and status of Finland and Finns during the early modern era. He argues that Finland and the Finns had a special rank and status in the Swedish realm. During that period, "Finland" was understood and defined in different ways in different contexts. The basis of the special status was that Finland was seen as a valuable resource and a "buffer" against possible attacks from the East. The war and the relationship with Russia played a crucial role in the common history of Sweden and Finland, especially from the Finnish point of view. It is also important to note that already in the beginning of the 17th century the Swedish realm was a highly centralized and controlled state. Karonen also points out that during that period, the status of the Finnish language was not a major issue for the representatives of the three upper estates in Finland.

Two articles discuss the time period in the early nineteenth century when Sweden had to cede Finland to Russia. **Erzsébet Bodnár** examines the Russian diplomacy and the Swedish/Finnish Question and shows that the Swedish Ques-

tion was a problem successfully managed by Russian diplomacy between 1801 and 1815. At the beginning of his reign, Alexander I (1801–1825) and his diplomatic administration did everything to avoid European conflicts, particularly a war with Sweden. But in 1807 Napoleon defeated Russia, and the Treaty of Tilsit gave Alexander the opportunity to advance Russian interests in the North against Sweden and in the South against the Ottoman Empire. In the Treaty of Fredrikshamn (Hamina) – which concluded the Finnish War (1808–1809) – Sweden ceded territories of Finland (the Grand Duchy of Finland) to the Russian Empire. The treaty indicated a change which finally led to an alteration of the Northern European political system and had an influence on European policy of Russia.

The town of Vyborg is an interesting and special research subject as a result of its multicultural nature and status as a border town between the Russian Empire and Finland. In her article which offers an entirely different perspective to that of Bodnár's, **Piia Einonen** discusses how serfdom was manifested in Vyborg and how serfs were treated in the beginning of the 19th century. The main emphasis is on the cultural conflict of the Russian inhabitants' attitudes towards serfs compared to those of other residents who saw the serfdom as an abhorrent feature of Russian culture. Keeping serfs was a way of manifesting power and emphasizing Russians' status as representatives of conquering empire. On the other hand, Einonen argues that the reunion with the Grand Duchy re-enforced Vyborg's status as a Finnish town, emphasized the return to western norms, and created a space for criticizing practices of serfdom, thus, cultural collisions.

Small nations in colonial contexts

Since the dichotomy of small nationhood and grand power existence was not only a European phenomenon, some articles discuss colonial empires and colonial issues. In overseas territories it was mostly the European colonial powers that acted as great powers and the colonized peoples as small nations, but it is not that simple. There were cases when the colonizer settlers striving for greater independence turned against their parent state, which were aiming to extend its influence over them as well, seen here in articles dealing with the American Revolution (1763–1789) or the Boer Wars (1899–1902). An also interesting phenomenon is that smaller states were able to build up a colonial empire like Portugal, Belgium or the Netherlands, the latter of which is looked at in depth in an article below.

A partly-colonial field is investigated by **Csaba Lévai**, who studies the comparisons of Hungary and the British colonies in North America in the 18th century. Both territories enjoyed widespread political and economic autonomy

within their respective empires during the first half of the 18th century. However, for similar reasons, both imperial centres initiated a new policy towards the peripheries in the second half of the century, and some elements of this new policy were also similar, such as the mercantilist economic policy. The new policy of the imperial centres resulted in resistance on the part of local elites on both sides of the Atlantic, and the methods of this resistance against the imperial centres were also somewhat similar. This resistance movement led to an armed conflict in North America, but Hungary also arrived at the brink of open revolt by the end of the rule of Joseph II (1780–1790). In contrast to North America where this conflict led to the separation of the colonies from the mother country, the new ruler of the Habsburg Empire, Leopold II (1790–1792), could reach a compromise with the Hungarian estates.

Gábor Pusztai gives an overview of the development of the Dutch colonial empire during the 19th–20th centuries, and examines the issue how a "small nation" could retain such an extending and rich colonial system in the midst of warring superpowers. He stresses that from the perspective of world politics, and from the Asian one, the Netherlands still remained a great power up to the mid-20th century at the East Asian theatre.

Gábor Szabó-Zsoldos looks at Anglo-Boer relations in the 1870s, examining the British ambition to unite the colonies of South Africa under British flag, and the Boer responses. He argues that the situation had a significant impact on Anglo-Boer political relations and strengthened Afrikaner nationalism in Transvaal. He also discusses the process of the integration of the Boer, as a small nation, and Transvaal to South African Confederation.

Closely related to Szabó-Zsoldos's article**, Timo Särkkä** discusses imperial connection of the British Empire to the Boer Republics of the late nineteenth century, in comparison with the attempted Russification of the Grand Duchy of Finland by the Russian Empire. The comparison of the case of Boers to the case of Finns is mostly made in the context of the Victorian periodical press in Britain. For the British Liberals of the late 1890s, imperialism referred particularly to South Africa, where the two Boer Republics, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State waged a war (1899–1902) against the British. At the turn of the twentieth century, the dispute over the political rights of the Boers was widely compared by liberal intellectuals in the London press to minority rights questions in various other imperial powers, including the Russian Empire. The attempted Russification of Finland, which occurred simultaneously, offered the liberal intellectuals an opportunity, not only to express their sympathy for the Finns, but also to point out the inconsistency of liberal principles with imperialism. Finland's autonomous status was understood as a suitable example of the proper handling of imperial and national minorities.

Relations and international cooperation between small states and great powers in the 20th century

The Paris Peace Conference, which put end to the Great War in 1919–1920, entirely redrew the borders of Europe, changed the geopolitical structure of the continent and, besides it, radically changed the relationship between small and great nations. After the fall of the three great empires, the Russian, the Ottoman and the Austro-Hungarian, some nations successfully regained their once lost independence, for example the Estonians, the Finns, the Poles, the Latvians and the Lithuanians. Others, like the Romanians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Serbs, and the Croatians found themselves in newly created states with vast territories populated by several ethnic groups. A third group consisted of Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Bulgarians and Turks, who were among the defeated nations and as a consequence had to give up their status as great or middle powers in order to fulfil their uncertain destiny as nation-states. Post-war conditions created by the Paris Peace Treaties were far from idyllic; especially the members of the losing side were dissatisfied with them.

When boundaries were changed and new states were created in the peace settlement after World War One, a number of minority treaties were concluded and subsequently placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. It was precisely the small states between Germany and the Soviet Union that had to assume obligations on minority protection after World War One. In her article, **Satu Matikainen** compares policies of two states, Finland, a small state, and Britain, a great power, relating to the League minority protection system in 1929 when the question of altering the minority protection system came up and was thoroughly considered. Due to different positions of the two states, Britain had usually, but not always, a more central, influential and visible role than Finland which was usually content to follow the lead of the great powers. Both countries urged for moderation and were against more extreme opinions and demands of other Council members, both those willing to strengthen and widen minority protection and those willing to weaken it.

Anssi Halmesvirta shows in his article how diplomacy and semi-official cultural and propaganda organisations of Finland and Hungary viewed each other and their interests during the Second World War, in their campaign on the side of the Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union from 1941 to 1945. Halmesvirta also analyses how the realities of the war and the prospect of defeat changed the situation. During the war, both Finns and Hungarians embarked on a campaign of expansion, although from different reasons. At first, war-time optimism was running high, which led to big visions on the part of kinship activists and a strong feeling of identification between the nations, the peak year being 1942. The Hungarian Embassy in Helsinki was very active in controlling

and sorting out what information or propaganda material from Finland was to be disseminated in Hungary and vice versa to promote the common cause. However, in 1943 the mood turned more serious, and by autumn 1944 these kinds of kinship activities ceased. Both Finland and Hungary had ended up on the losing side. Kinship policies and the work of the pressure groups in kinship societies in both countries had contributed to the war-mongering, but as they were not in important decision-making positions, they can be regarded as playing auxiliary roles.

The victory of the Allied Forces in the summer of 1945 was a major turning point in great power politics since for the first time in history the power to control the Old Continent and the rest of the world slipped through the fingers of Europe. The two new superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, followed different models in their historical development than the European one. Pax Sovietica brought a new era for the nations of Eastern and Central Europe. With the exception of Finns and Austrians, they were all obliged to adopt the Soviet model, which process was of course emphasized by the presence of the Red Army. This did not only mean the Sovietization of their domestic relations, which was somewhat eased after Stalin died in 1953, but also determined their foreign, military (Warsaw Pact) and economic (Comecon) relations. Although after 1945 Finland chose the Western style in the management of its economic, political and social affairs, the Finns were very careful that their neutrality would appear in a positive and friendly light from a Soviet perspective. This is especially true for the period between 1956 and 1983 when Urho Kekkonen was the president of the republic. These abilities were acknowledged internationally when in 1975 Finland hosted the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which resulted in the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. Moreover the so-called “Finnlandization” concept, which was modelled on the special Finnish-Russian relationship, also had an effect on the foreign policy of the Kádár era. In terms of foreign policy the scope of action for Budapest was certainly much narrower than for the sovereign Finland along the northern border of the Soviet block. The small nations of the region could only follow the lead of Finland and Austria in introducing a western type of administration after the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. The peoples who live between the West and the East, which is also called “The Land Between”, hope that the adaptation of the western type of development model and their joining the close western integrations, such as the EU or the NATO, will secure their future both in the European and in the global field.

In his study entitled British Ideas on the Post WWII Europe and Hungary, **Róbert Barta** illustrates the official and unofficial notions the British Empire had with respect to post-war Europe and Soviet-occupied Hungary and how it tried to put these notions in action. The author analyzes the concepts of W. S.

Churchill and also the diplomatic dispatches of A. F. Gascoigne, a British diplomat serving in Hungary. According to the results of Barta's research, it is important to emphasize that Churchill's activity strengthened a Western European movement for unity and helped secure the Marshall Plan. He radically opposed a policy of appeasement if rooted in weakness, but he was also convinced that the West must negotiate with Moscow from a position of power. He accepted the division of Europe (and Germany) as a temporary condition, but he would render a Finland-type solution (independence, with friendship with the Soviet Union) for Eastern European Soviet satellite states. As he believed in Western democratic values, he considered that the kind of government the Soviet Union had was part of their domestic affairs. He may have been the first leader in the West to realize that rigid anticommunist propaganda and an unreasonably strong opposition against the Soviet Union would only solidify it as a police state. Since the Americans never formally accepted Europe's division, Churchill could not get Stalin to repeat the percentage distributions of political influence as he had in October 1944. As a British diplomat in Hungary Gascoigne could represent a very weak and limited British influence in the region (because of the general weakness of the post WWII British Empire). Gascoigne tried to give an objective picture on Hungary though he was keen on the non-communist parties and the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church as well. But this old fashioned British gentleman could not represent the interests of a weak and disillusioned British Empire in a country where the Soviet Red Army had an upper hand. In spite of this limited British involvement, Gascoigne's subtle analyses give us a chance to clarify more delicate focus on the diplomatic history of that period.

In his article, **Simo Mikkonen** shows how after Stalin's death in 1953, the Soviet presence in the international arena became manifold. Mikkonen's article focuses on describing the general framework for Soviet cultural diplomacy, mainly during the Khrushchev era, but also makes connections to Finland briefly. Mikkonen points out that Soviet foreign cultural operations have never been subjected to extensive scrutiny since Soviet foreign affairs have typically been examined in terms of international relations, mainly political or military. And yet, from 1953 onwards, cultural exchanges played a substantial role in Soviet international strategy. As the Soviet Union started to open up to the outside world, the ideological corrosion and alienation of the people from Soviet and Communist ideals slowly began. What this framework of cultural exchanges made possible was to open new worlds for individuals. For such a small country as Finland, cultural exchanges made it possible to receive top artists of international level in scale unimaginable without the Cold War. Thus, individuals and Finnish societies and organizations benefited from cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union.

Róbert Barta – Csaba Lévai – Satu Matikainen

EMPIRES AND POWERS IN THE ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL CONTEXT

Gábor Bradács

The empire of the Ottonians and Salians – Imperial and National Consciousness

The empire of the Ottonian and Salian dynasties between 919 and 1125 may be considered as the first realm of the medieval Europe, which has a continuity with a nation and a state, that still exists today – the present-day Germany. But is it possible to say, that this *Regnum Teutonicorum* had a kind of "imperial" consciousness in its modern sense? In order to answer this question, we are returning to those contemporary sources, historiographical and hagiographical records of the "Ottonian renaissance", which may contain several information of this "imperial" self-awereness. We focus on the policy of the early "German state" towards Central and Eastern Europe, the neighbouring countries of the Ottonians across the Elbe and Oder river (Bohemia, Denmark, Hungary and Poland). The church policy, particularly the christianization of this Central and Northern Europe has a high importance in the examination of the relation between the early German kingdom (since 962 the Holy Roman Empire) and its eastern neighbours. Was this policy determined and ideologized only by the church and its endeavours to convert the heathen Slavonic, Hungarian or Danish people, or had it a kind of "secular" ambition in this relations too (the conquest of Eastern and Central Europe)? The output of this examination should be the answer for the question, whether the early German "state" had any sense or ambition of being a "world-power" in the context of the medieval historiography, as the expression of the contemporary "public opinion" of the age. In this paper we are focus on these narrative texts with a special emphasis on the terms like *imperium*, *regnum* etc. and their different meanings in the historiographical works.

The idea of the early medieval Germany as a "major power" has a relatively long tradition in the modern German scholarship: according to Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, Emperor Otto the Great made his German kingdom and its "core", the Saxon tribal area to the center of the "Roman Empire of the German nation".[1] The notion of Giesebrecht was highly influenced by the contemporary political events, like the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71), the unification of

[1] Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Vol. 2. Braunschweig, 1875. 3.

Germany (1871) on the basis of a modern nation-state, in which the "primacy of the folk and the language" (*Primat des Volkstums und der Sprache*) played an important role.[2] This imagined "empire of a nation" had a long lasting tradition in the first half of the twentieth century: Johannes Haller, for instance, wrote about a foundation of the empire as the political action of the "emotions and consciousness of the people", the "idea of the national independence" driven by the "national uniqueness".[3] The research of the German scholarship, however, focused mostly on the emperors, the leadership and the *Führertum* of the rulers, the importance of the "military empire" (*Heerkaisertum*), particularly the "Rome free" empire (*romfreies Kaisertum*).[4] After the World War II, the accent of the scholarship shifted towards the history of ideas; ideas, such as the "renewal"[5] or the "translation" of the empire.[6] The position of the East German historical research since the 1950s was the dialectic materialism of the Marxiscm with particular interest on the social and economic aspects of the history of

---

[2] Eckhard Müller-Mertens, *Regnum Teutonicum. Aufkommen und Verbreitung der deutschen Reichs- und Königsauffassung im früheren Mittelalter*. Berlin, 1970. 8.

[3] Johannes Haller, *Die Epochen der deutschen Geschichte*. Stuttgart, 1940. 18.

[4] See for instance Edmund Ernst Stengel, "Kaisertitel und Souveränitätsidee. Studien zur Vorgeschichte des modernen Verfassungsbegriffs." In: Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters, 3 (1939), 1–56; ibid., *Den Kaiser macht das Heer. Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Gedankens*. Weimar, 1910; Albert Brackmann, *Der „römische Erneuerungsgedanke" und seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin, 1932.

[5] Mathilde Uhlirz, "Das Werden des Gedankens der „Renovatio imperii Romanorum" bei Kaiser Otto III." In: I problemi comuni dell'Europa post-carolingia. Ed. Giuseppe Ermini. Spoleto, 1955. 201–219; Percy Ernst Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit.* Darmstadt, 1962; Reinhart Staat, *Theologie der Reichskrone. Ottonische "Renovatio Imperii" im Spiegel einer Insignie.* Stuttgart, 1976; Gerd Tellenbach, "Kaiser, Rom und renovatio: Ein Beitrag zu einem großen Thema," In: *Tradition als historische Kraft. Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters [Festschrift Karl Hauck]*. Eds. Manfred Balzer, Norbert Kamp, and Joachim Wollasch. Berlin, 1982. 231–253; Jean-Marie Sansterre, "Le monastere des Saints-Boniface-et-Alexis sur l'Aventin et l'expansion du christianisme dans le cadre de la „renovatio imperii romanorum" d'Otton III. Une revision." In: Revue bénédictine, 100 (1990) 493–506.

[6] Werner Guldenfels, *Translatio imperii in Germanos. Eine Untersuchung über Entstehung und Bedeutung der mittelalterlichen Translationstheorie.* (PhD thesis) Freiburg im Breisgau, 1950; Werner Goez, Translatio imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. Tübingen, 1954 (the substantial work of the concept of the "translation of the empire"); Piet van den Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre der Translatio Imperii Romani bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Rome, 1956.

the early medieval Empire, with the accent of an archaic "nation-state".[7] Eckhard Müller-Mertens analyzed the earliest concepts and the accounts of the historiographical works of the tenth and twelfth century about the Holy Roman Empire on the basis of the "historical materialism".[8] The West German and the present-day German scholarship had and has many point of views concerning the idea of the empire, like the Ottonian empire in the medieval historiography, the comparative analysis of the imperial idea, or the theory and praxis of the imperial rulership.[9]

1. The Ottonian context

Since his coronation in 936 King Otto I, the later emperor sought consciously for the elements and key features of the royal might of Charlemagne. The account of Widukind of Corvey (ca. 925-ca. 973) says clearly, that the sword as one of the *regalia* was regarded as a sign for the king as *defensor ecclesiae*, and his royal power shall be used also to the interest of the church as well.[10] According to the researcher of the topic, Josef Fleckenstein, this is meant to be as the cooperation of the mission and the royal power,[11] while Helmut Beumann wrote even the combination of the imperial expansion and the conversion to the

---

[7] Hans-Joachim Bartmuß, "Die Entstehung des ersten selbständigen Staates auf deutschem Boden." In: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, 10. Sonderheft (1962), 359–374; ibid., "Ursachen und Triebkräfte im Entstehungsprozess des 'frühfeudalen deutschen Staates'." In: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, 10 (1962), 1591–1625; Bernhard Gramsch, *Germanen – Slawen – Deutsche. Forschungen zu ihrer Ethnogenese.* Berlin, 1969; Eckhard Müller-Mertens, "Vom Regnum Teutonicum zum Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation." In: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, 11 (1963), 319–346.

[8] Müller-Mertens, *Regnum Teutonicum*, 43.

[9] Gertrud Bäumer, *Die Reichsidee bei den Ottonen: Heinrich I. und Otto der Große, Otto III. und Heinrich II*. Nuremberg, 1946; Gian Andri Bezzola, *Das ottonische Kaisertum in der französischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. und beginnenden 11. Jahrhunderts.* Cologne, 1956; Heinz Löwe, "Kaisertum und Abendland in ottonischer und frühsalischer Zeit." In: *Historische Zeitschrift*, 196 (1963) 529–562; Hagen Keller, "Reichsstruktur und Herrschaftsauffassung in ottonisch-frühsalischer Zeit." In: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 16 (1982) 74–128.

[10] *Die Sachsengeschichte des Widukind von Korvei (Widukindi monachi Corbeiensis Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri III)*. Eds. Paul Hirsch and Hans-Eberhard Lohmann. Hannover 1935. 63–66 (II, 1).

[11] Josef Fleckenstein, "Zum Begriff der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche," In: Geschichte, *Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Clemens Bauer*. Ed. Erich Hassinger. Berlin 1974, 61–71.

Christian faith.[12] The imperial self-confidence of Otto I. was primarily determined by his role as the *propagator Christianitatis*. During his reign he also tried to meet this requirement unremitting: by the year of 948 five dioceses had been established by the will of the king: Schleswig, Ripe and Aarhus in Denmark, as well Havelberg and Brandenburg at the Elbe river.[13] The following wave of foundation occurred after the year of 955, when Otto prevailed against the marauding army of the Hungarians at the Lech, and the foundation-stone of the episcopal see of Merseburg was laid, while the third wave of the establishment of the episcopates occurred in 968 for behalf of Meissen and Zeitz, together with the upgrade of Magdeburg as the archbishopric center of the Elbe Slavic territories.[14] Except of the Danish bishoprics, the organization of the dioceses at the Elbe served for the conversion of the Elbe Slavic territories. The foundation of the episcopal seats in Oldenburg and Prague between 965 and 973 belong also to this missionary process.[15]

This expansive *Ostpolitik* combined with the mission policy was initiated already by King Henry I, known as Henry the Fowler, the father of king Otto I. About the late 920 he occupied the domains of the Havel and Dalamantian tribes living near the Elbe and expanded the German border of the East beyond the Elbe.[16] In 934 Henry engaged into a military conflict with the Danish king

---

[12] Helmut Beumann, "Imperator Romanorum, rex gentium: zu Widukind III 76," In: *Helmut Beumann, Ausgewählte Aufsätze. Aus den Jahren 1966–1986. Festgabe zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Eds. Jürgen Petersohn and Roderich Schmidt. Sigmaringen 1987, 324–360.

[13] *Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 916–1001. Teil 1: 916–961*. Ed. Ernst-Dieter Hehl. Hannover 1987 (MGH Conc. 6,1), 137–138, 158.

[14] *Papsturkunden 896–1046*. Vol. 1. Ed. Harald Zimmermann. Vienna 1984, 281, nr. 154; Rudolf Köpkem, Ernst Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Große*. Berlin 1876, 333; Walter Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens*. Vol. 1. Cologne and Graz 1962, 126–127; Heinz Wolter, *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien von 916 bis 1056*. Paderborn et al. 1988, 69–70; Ernst-Dieter Hehl, "Merseburg – eine Bistumsgründung unter Vorbehalt. Gelübte, Kirchenrecht und politischer Spielraum im 10. Jahrhundert," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 31 (1997), 96–119.

[15] Wilhelm Biereye, "Das Entstehungsjahr des Bistums Oldenburg," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte* 19 (1917) 37–50; Hans Sprangenberg, "Die Gründung des Bistums Prag," Historisches Jahrbuch 21 (1900), 758–775; Jaroslaw Kadlec, "Auf dem Wege zum Prager Bistum (Zur Vorgeschichte seiner Gründung)," *Geschichte der Ost- und Westkirche in ihren wechselseitigen Beziehungen: Acta congressus historiae Slavicae Salisburgensis in memoriam SS. Cyrilli et Methodii anno 1963 celebrati*. Ed. Franz Zagiba. Wiesbaden 1967, 29–45.

[16] Lothar Dralle, "Zu Vorgeschichte und Hintergründen der Ostpolitik Heinrichs I.," In: *Europa slavica – Europa orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*. Eds. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack. Berlin 1980, 99–126; Alfred Mirtschin, "Die Berechtigung der Rückeroberung des Meißner Erblandes durch Kaiser Heinrich im Jahre 929," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte des Stadt Meißen* 12 (1937), 7–36.

Gnupa, and defeated him; this success was followed by the forced conversion of Gnupa to the Christianity.[17] The politics of the conversion and conquest were linked in the policy of Otto I. towards Denmark more explicitly. The historiographer Adam of Bremen (ca. 1050-ca. 1081/85) reports that the German king, after he defeated king Harald Bluetooth, forced also the Danish ruler to recognize the German suzerainty and to convert with his people to the Christian faith. King Otto I. himself became the godfather of the son and heir apparent to the throne, Sven, the later king Sven Forkbeard.[18] The fact of the baptism is confirmed by the account of Ruotger in his biography about the archbishop of Cologne and brother of Otto I, Bruno (925–965), as well by the rune-stone, which was erected by Harald at Jelling, calling himself as the apostle of Denmark.[19] However it cannot be said that the German influence was of purely religious nature. The integration of the Danish bishoprics imperial church served not only for the objectives of the conversion, but these religious institutions were also important for Otto the Great, in order to wield his royal power directly over Denmark. In one of his charters issued in 965 Otto I. exempted the Danish bishoprics (*in Danorum marca with Regni*) from all the services performed for the ruler.[20] The same logic inspired the historiographer Thietmar of Merseburg (975–1018) more than a half century later, when Harald Bluetooth made an attempt to eliminate the German influence following the death of emperor Otto I.

---

[17] Widukind, *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum*, 59 (I, 40): *Cum autem omnes in circuitu nationes subiecisset, Danos, qui navali latrocinio Fresones incursabant, cum exercitu adiit vicitque, et tributarios faciens, regem eorum nomine Chnubam baptismum percipere fecit. Perdomitis itaque cunctis circumquaque gentibus, postremo Romam proficisci statuit, sed infirmitate correptus iter intermisit.*

[18] *Adam von Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte (Gesta Hammenburgensis ecclesiae pontificum)*. Ed. Bernhard Schmeidler. Hannover 1917, 56–58 (I, 57, 59): *Deinde cum exercitu ingressus Daniam, Vurm regem primo impetu adeo perterruit, ut imperata se facere mandaret et pacem supplex deposceret... Postquam vero confessor Dei pervenit ad Danos, ubi tunc crudelissimum Worm diximus regnasse, illum quidem pro ingenita flectere nequivit saevitia; filium autem regis Haroldum sua dicitur praedicatione lucratus. Quem ita fidelem Christo perfecit, ut christianitatem, quam pater eius semper odio habuit, ipse haberi publice permitteret, quamvis nondum baptismi sacramentum percepit. Ordinatis itaque in regno Danorum per singulas ecclesias sacerdotibus sanctus Dei multitudinem credentium commendasse fertur Haroldo. Cuius etiam fultus adiutorio et legato omnes Danorum insulas penetravit, euangelizans verbum Dei gentilibus et fideles, quos invenit illuc captivatos, in Christo confortans.*

[19] *Ruotgers Lebensbeschreibung des Erzbischofs Bruno von Köln (Routgeri vita Brunonis)*. Ed. Irene Ott. Hannover 1951, 43 (c. 40): *Siquidem eodem tempore et rex eorum Haraldus cum magna suę multitudine gentis regi regum Christo colla submittens vanitatem respuit idolorum.*

[20] MGH DD O I 411, nr. 294.

the Great in 973.[21] This same, a bit anachronistic concept of the "imperial logic" motivated also Adam of Bremen, as he presents the events of the uprising of the Elbe Slavs in 983 against the Holy Roman Empire, discussing about rebellious Slavs (*Sclavi rebellantes*), however, nearly about a hundred years later.[22] The Annals of Hildesheim accounts also about riotous Slavs who destroyed the churches and killed the Christians alongside of the Elbe.[23] Adam of Bremen and the major historiographer of the 12th century, Helmold of Bosau (ca. 1120-after 1177) make clear, that the rebellion against the Empire means also the break with the Christian religion and the return to their ancient heathen religious paradigms.[24] Seeing the works of historians we may establish that according to these medieval historiographers the revolt against the Holy Roman Empire is the same as the turn against the new established Christian faith, and vica versa.

2. The change of the idea about the role of the Empire under the Salian rulers

The view of Gábor Varga, a Hungarian historian, who examined the Hungarian-German conflicts of the mid 11th century, achieved new and surprising results in this topic. In his study, published in 2007, Varga challenges the conventional views of the Hungarian history claiming, that the two campaigns of emperor Henry III of the Holy Roman Empire launched against Hungary may not be considered as en expanding, conquering foreign policy toward the young Kingdom of Hungary, but rather than a peace establishing act.[25] Varga analyzed contemporary narrative sources, especially the *Annals of Niederaltaich* (written about the turn of the 11th and 12th century)[26], as well various conciliar decisions, and concluded that the emperor's political stance was primarily determined by movements of the *pax Dei* and *treuga Dei*.[27] This explains, inter alia, his conse-

[21] Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung (Thietmari Chronicon). Ed. Robert Holtzmann. Berlin 1935, 442 (VII, 26).

[22] Adam, *Gesta Hammenburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, 101–102 (II, 42)

[23] Annales Hildesheimenses ab initio mundi ad a. 1137. Ed. Georg Waitz. Hannover 1878, 24: *...et eodem anno Sclavi rebelles effecti sunt*; Adam, *Gesta Hammenburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, ibid.: *Tunc vero et Sclavi a christianis iudicibus plus iusto compressi excusso tandem iugo servitutis libertatem suam armis defendere coacti sunt.*

[24] Adam, *Gesta Hammenburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, 105 (II, 44).

[25] Gábor Varga, "Heinricus III. rex pacificus (Az Árpádok és a Német-Római Birodalom uralkodóinak kapcsolatáról)," [Heinricus III. rex pacificus. Of the Relations between the Árpáds and the Holy Roman Rulers] *Aetas* 22 (2007), 35–58.

[26] *Annales Altahenses maiores*. Ed. Edmund von Oefele. Hannover 1891[2], 34–37.

[27] Varga, *Heinricus III*, 52–57.

quent policy against the feudal wars within the empire, his engagement to end the troubles of the papacy, which culminated in the council of Sutri in 1046, where the reigning popes, Sylvester III and Gregory VI were deprived of the papacy and sent into exile.[28] In Hungary at the same year, a pagan uprising broke out, which included the reasons for the protest against the emerging feudal ties and the radical changes caused by this social transformation, as well the discontent with the reign of King Peter of Orseolo (1038–1041/1044–1046).[29] Henry III had already helped Peter to restore the power of the expelled king, when the German ruler defeated king, Samuel Aba, who was supported by both the major part of the Hungarian aristocracy and the lower classes. In 1046 the emperor had no chance to intervene in the conflict, and Peter of Orseolo was killed soon in the pagan revolt. 1051 and 1052 there were two unsuccessful military campaigns launched by Henry III against Hungary.[30] Both the traditional, bourgeois and the Marxist historical approach considered these actions as the expressions of the German imperialist ambition in order to conquest, or at least to force Hungary to pay homage to Henry III and recognize him as its liege lord.[31] Varga made possible against these topoi, that Henry III regarded the new king of Hungary, Andrew I as an usurpator, and he treated him as a disloyal subject. That was the main reason to launch the attack against Hungary – to restore the peace and to regain the seigneury over the Hungarian kingdom. The annals as well the epistles of the abbot Berno of Reichenau, which deal with the military action against Aba are consisted of a number of hagiographical features: for instance the *Annales Altaihenses* reports of the battle of Ménfő (1044), that king Henry was facing a large Hungarian army, but the Hungarians became blind suddenly by a heavy dust storm, as a divine miracle expressing the favour of God towards Henry, and God himself was the one, who has crushed the re-

[28] Engelbert Pius, "Heinrich III. und die Synoden von Sutri und Rom im Dezember 1046," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 94 (1999), 228–266; Hans Hubert Anton, "Die Synode von Sutri, ihr zeitgeschichtlicher Kontext und Nachklang. Neue Forschungen zu einer lange diskutierten Schrift," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung* 83 (1997), 576–584.

[29] Varga, *Heinricus III*, 35

[30] Ibid., 36; Henrik Marczali, *Magyarország története az Árpádok korában (1038–1301)* [History of Hungary in the age of the Árpádians]. Budapest, 1896, 7–59; Pál Engel, *Beilleszkedés Európába a kezdetektől 1440-ig* (Integration in Europe from the beginnings to 1440). Budapest, 1990, 153–154; Ferenc Makk, *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)* [Hungarian foreign policy 896–1196]. Szeged, 1993, 53–74.

[31] Gyula Pauler, *A magyar nemzet története az Árpádházi királyok alatt, I* [The history of the Hungarian nation in the age of the Árpádian kings]. Budapest, 1899^2, 78–104; Erik Molnár, *Magyarország története, I* [History of Hungary, vol. 1].Budapest, 1967^2, 54–57.

bellious Hungarian forces without bloodshed.[32] The views of Varga that III. Henry's policy towards Hungary increasingly conceived in the spirit of the *pax Dei*, can be conceived by an other case in which the prince of Bohemia Břetislav I attacked Poland after the death of prince Mieszko II, but the Czechs were later forced by the German king to retreat.[33] However, the case of Břetislav case, which cautions us that Henry's policy in Central Europe, cannot be considered only as a deeply religious, idealistic political program. After his defeat suffered by the Germans, Břetislav had to swear allegiance to Henry III in Regensburg, in the city, which has been for a long while as the center of German missions towards Bohemia.[34] The fact that the German ruler stayed there in that time, and received the homage of the Czech prince, would be difficult to be regarded as coincidental. If we consider the fact that three years later, when the kingship of king Peter of Hungary was restored, in return for the homage of Peter, the ambition of Henry III becomes more unambiguous. Furthermore, the other fact that the father of emperor Henry III, Conrad II already initiated an unsuccessful military campaign against Hungary, as well as all the rulers of the Salian dynasty, it arouse suspicion, that these military operations in Hungary were not only to restore peace in a country affected by anarchy and pagan revolts, but it has to be certainly a conscious decision of a major power in order to establish and extend the German political hegemony in Central Europe.[35] The failure of Conrad II against Hungary, but his military successes in the area between the Elbe and Oder clearly shows that it appears the the Salian dynasty was not satisfied with a mere religious influence, but also demanded the homage to the Emperor.[36] He was able to achieve this goal in the whole region with exception of Hungary. It is not a coincidence either, that one of the major historiographer of the Salian era, Wipo of Burgundy (ca. 995-ca. 1048) wrote about the Czechs as *rebelles* again.[37] But it is also true that the interests of the Empire met not necessarily the interests of the Christian faith and the *respublica Christiana*. The hagiographical works of Bruno of Querfurt (the *Lives of the Five*

[32] Varga, *Heinricus III*, 42–44; *Annales Altahenses maiores*. Ed. Edmund von Oefele. Hannover 1891, 29.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Winfried Baumann and Barbora Erbová, "Heinrich III. gegen Bretislav I.: der Kampf von 1040 im Grenzwald und sein literarisches Echo," *Beiträge zur Geschichte im Landkreis Cham* 25 (2008), 25–37; Franz Xaver Lommer, "Die Feldzüge des deutschen Königs Heinrich III. nach Böhmen," *Waldmünchner Heimatbote* 34 (2000), 106–120.

[35] Varga, *Heinricus III*, 57.

[36] Adelheid Krah, "Die Absetzung Herzog Adalberos von Kärnten und die Südost-Politik Kaiser Konrads II.," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 110 (1990), 309–369

[37] Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi II imperatoris*. Ed. Harry Bresslau. Hannover and Leipzig 1915, 51–53 (c. 33).

Friars[38] and the *Life of St. Adalbert*[39]) and his letter to the German king, Henry II,[40] in which he crabed the lay ruler, if their reign seemed to be incompatible with the interests of the church. Otto II was especially judged in Bruno's oeuvre: from the elimination of the episcopate of Merseburg, by which – according to the biography of St. Adalbert of Prague – he had provoked the wrath of St. Lawrence against himself, and on the other hand, his conquests in Italy and Burgundy, which did not serve to goals of the expansion of the Christian faith, but the territorial increase of the empire and the glory of the emperor, particularly that he led several wars against Christians, and neglected the conversion of the heathen.[41] In the *Lives of the Five Friars* Bruno condemned the young emperor, Otto III for that reason, because Otto had the aim to transform Rome, the city of St. Peter to the center of his renovated Roman Empire, although the emperor is a lay person, and the *Constitutum Constantini* does not allow him this.[42] *Iniuria* and *superbia*, injustice and arrogance – the reign of Otto III are marked by these sins.[43] Bruno of Querfurt reflects on the kingship of Henry II as well. He accusated both Henry II and Otto II with the concept of the *bellum injustum*, the unjust war, as Henry made an alliance with the pagan tribe of the Liutici against the christian prince of Poland, Bołeslaw Chrobry, and in his letter of 1008 complained Bruno of this unholy bound between the pagans and the empire.[44] Bruno asked Henry II that does he feel any sin that the empire had engaged into a war against an other Christian people (the Poles), and entered into an alliance with the pagans (the Liutici), or not? Would it be not better, if cooperated with the pagans in order to expand the Christianity and to strengthen its power, than increasing his own might? Bruno considers the war led only by secular purposes unaccaptable; the peace and war do not exclude each other mutually when the war is going in order to spread the words of the Gospels, if the

---

[38] Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita quinque fratrum*. Ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska. Warszawa 1973 (Monumenta Poloniae historica, nova series 4, 3), 1–41.

[39] Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita sancti Adalberti*. Ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska. Warszawa 1969 (Monumenta Poloniae historica, nova series 4, 2).

[40] Bruno of Querfurt, *Epistola ad Heinricum regem*. Ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska. Warszawa 1973 (Monumenta Poloniae historica, nova series 4, 3), 83–106.

[41] Knut Görich, Otto III. Romanus Saxonicus et Italicus. Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie. Sigmaringen 1993, 33–34; Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita sancti Adalberti redactio longior*, 13–14: *In tantis adversis illum (imperatorem) circumfluentibus non respiscit...quid pio Laurentio peccaverit...Ecce dum peccat (imperator), flagellatur et non emendat; plenus adversis media vita moritur...*

[42] Görich, *Otto III*, 39–40

[43] Ibid. 33–38

[44] Ibid. 35–36; Bruno of Querfurt, *Epistola ad Heinricum regem*, 104: *Nonne melius pugnare cum paganis propter christianitatem, quam christianis vim inferre propter secularem honorem?*

war is going of the interests of the mission as it had been conducted by the predecessors of Henry II.[45] Bruno of Querfurt formulated among his contemporaries the most important duties of the Christian rulers the best: *compellere intrare*, that is to lead the Liutici back to the faith, who belonged once to the church.[46]

3. Conclusion

We can say in a few words, that, the political "public opinion" of the 10–11th century Holy-Roman Empire had its own notion and consciousness about the empire, expressed by those words like *regnum*, or more occassionally *imperium*, with different emphasis. This empire was certainly not a structure in a modern sense, which is meant as an economic or political scheme, but the conversion of the heathen was regarded as its primary task, as a new, improved Roman Empire. The peaceful, consensus-building foreign policy of the Ottonian had been replaced by a more combative politics of the Salian dynasty in the turn of the 1020–30's towards the newly established and converted countries of Central Europe. This politics, however, sought of the acquisition of these territories not inevitably, but of forcing or maintaining them in feudal dependence with the empire. Of course, we can not ignore the factor of the real-politik as well. Particularly the *Ostpolitik* of Henry the Fowler was determined by the expansion of his power towards the Elbe river and the Slavic tribes living eastern of the, without the Christian mission; the military expeditions into this territory had the goal to build up a buffer zone against the Hungarian raids. A century later, Henry II ignoring the Christian duty of the mission of the Liutici also by reason of the security interests of the empire, he had entered into an alliance with them against the Christian Poles. It shows clearly that the politics in the early Middle Ages was also not dispense with the rational decisions, that often did not met the expectations of the contemporaries.

[45] Reinhard Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt*. Münster et al. 1956, 159–162; Knut Görich, "Eine Wende im Osten: Heinrich II. und Boleslaw Chrobry," *Otto III. – Heinrich II. Eine Wende?* Ed. Bernd Schneidmüller. Stuttgart 2000, 95–167.

[46] Hans-Dietrich Kahl, "Compellere intrare. Die Wendenpolitik von Querfurt im Lichte hochmittelalterlichen Missions- und Völkerrechts," In: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 4 (1955) 161–193, 360–401.

Attila Bárány

Hungary's Relationship to her Neighbours in the Age of the Árpád Kings (c. 1000–1301)

The article is aiming to provide an outlook of Hungary's relationship to her neighbouring countries. It will oversee the history of Hungarian expansions towards Bosnia, Serbia and Cumania, as well as examine the long-troubled relationship with the Russian principalities and Bohemia and the warm rapports with Poland and will also give an insight into the history of the Byzantine-Hungarian clashes in the Danubian region.

Apparently the relationship of the House of Árpád with their neighbours is full of hostilities. It appears as if the warlike rulers had been indulging in laying devastating assaults. The narrative sources report that they regularly overran foreign lands, led ravaging expeditions and laid waste to frontier territories by fire and sword.[1] It may seem as if the kings had always been indignant and retaliated only for grievances.[2] However, it will be observed that the foreign policy of the Árpáds was manifold and of more varied concerns.

A major, symbolic motive in Hungarian historical mythology is the strive for independence, the preservation of sovereignty in order that the kingdom should not be subordinated to any overlordship, and its kings be of equal status in quality to any of the Christian monarchs and not subject their nations to any foreign suzerainty. In the crossfire of two empires, the Holy Roman and Byzantium Hungary is to survive and maintain its independence. Narrative tradition, based upon the 12th-century *Legenda S. Stephani Regis* holds that St. Stephen (997/1000-1038) received a royal crown from Pope Sylvester II, which was to buttress the country's claim to independence and equal status among the Christian monarchs. However, there is only one contemporary source that mentions the grant, yet he

---

1 *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. In *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. Eds. Imre Szentpétery et al. 2 vols. Budapest, 1937–1938. [hereinafter SRH] I. pp. 217–505. cap. 152. p. 433.; cap. 155. p. 439.; cap. 153. p. 434.; cap. 101. p. 365.; *Annales Hildesheimenses*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica [a továbbiakban MGH] SS [Annales…aevi Carolini et Saxonici] Vol. 3. Ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannover, 1838.; *Annales Altahenses maiores*. MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi. Vol. 4. Ed. E. L. B. von Oefele. Hannover, 1890. 29.

2 „volens iuniuriam…vindicare": *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 155. p. 437.

does not say anything but, obscurely, that "he received a crown and benediction by the grace and upon the encouragement" of the Emperor, though does not spell it out, whether it was the Emperor or the Pope who did actually send the insignia.[3] It might have been dispatched, and the monarchy thus acknowledged by a common decision of the Pope and the Emperor.[4] Although it is a disputed issue, it seems likely that Hungary was recognized as sovereign by Otto III, as a contemporary relates that, although he received a *lancea regis*, he was not under Imperial overlordship, as Otto "allowed him a free hand to rule his country.[5] It might have been a theoretical subordination, if any, which did not bring about any practical consequences. Hungary was only subjected to the Empire in 1045, when King Peter „surrendered the kingdom" with „a gilded lance" to „his lord" Emperor Henry III.[6]

The *corona Graeca* – presently incorporated into the Holy Crown, as its lower part – was donated to Géza I (1074–77) by Emperor Michael Dukas.[7] Facing Norman, Seljuk and Patzinak threat, Byzantium was very much in need of an alliance. The grant did not mean a recognition of suzerainty in practice, only a formal acknowledgement of Byzantium as the first power in the hierarchy of Christian states. The princes treated as Byzantium's subordinated vassals did not receive crowns.[8] The *basileus* acknowledged Géza as a legitimate ruler – not equal in rank, but not subjected to Byzantine overlordship – as signified by the inscription beside the portrait of Géza on the crown as "faithful king" (*pistos kralés*).[9]

The foreign policy of the medieval kingdom of Hungary should be considered in this context. In the early 11th century the Hungarian kings were to make their

---

[3] „imperatoris gratia et hortatu… coronam et benedictionem accepit": *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon*. Hrsg. Robert Holtzmann. MGH SS rer Germn NS IX. Berlin, 1935. Lib. IV. cap. 59. p. 199.

[4] Márta Font, *Im Spannungsfeld der christlichen Grossmächte: Mittel- und Osteuropa im 10.–12. Jahrhundert*. Herne, 2008. 161.

[5] „et regnum ei liberrime habere permisit": [Adémar de Chabannes] *Ademari Historiarum Libri III* [*Historia pontificum et comitum Engolmensium*]. MGH SS [Annales...aevi Carolini et Saxonici] Ed. G. Waitz. Vol. 4. 129.

[6] „cum lancea deaurata tradidit caesari domino suo…obtulit illi auri pondus maximum". *Annales Altahenses*, 40.; Ferenc Makk, *Ungarische Aussenpolitik (896–1196)*. Herne, 1999.; *Die Heiligen Könige*. Eds. T. Bogyay, J. M. Bak, G. Silagi. Graz, 1976. 131.; Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 162–3.

[7] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 66.; Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*. Amsterdam, 1970. 70.

[8] Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 162., 166.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 68–9.

[9] Gyula Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie. Die Geschichte Ungarns von 895 bis 1301*. Budapest, 1993. 159.; Raimund Kerbl, *Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050–1200 und ihr Einfluss auf das Arpadenkönigreich*. Wien, 1979. 47.

rule unconditionally recognized.[10] For the sake of a German compromise Stephen surrendered the territories between the Enns and the Fischa as the dowry of his German consort.[11] This helped him in a war against Bolesław I of Poland since he occupied Hungarian territories, harboured a rival and instigated the Patzinaks to invade.[12] Stephen opened towards Bulgaria, his sister married the Bulgarian heir-to-the-throne.[13] She was repudiated by her husband and gave birth to a son at the Hungarian court, who was then harboured as a political factor.[14] However, since Stephen needed Greek support to consolidate his position facing the emerging Salian expansion, assisted Byzantine Emperor Basil II against the Bulgarians, using his trump, his nephew.[15] The concord was cemented with the Byzantine marriage of Prince St. Emericus.[16]

"Familiar" policy

The foreign policy of the House of Árpád has been labelled as "familiar", referring to the motivations of safeguarding the rights of members of the dynasty and a wide circle of relatives, queen-consorts, nephews etc. belonging to their "political family". This diplomacy focused on establishing matrimonial alliances but was also to maintain a level of political influence. The kings applied various techniques to secure influence ranging from organizing a league, through harbouring claimants or taking dynasty-members as hostages up to direct military interventions, preventive campaigns to sustain the positions of sponsored pretenders. Whenever they felt that a well-established alliance, cemented with a matrimonial bond was to be threatened, and a son-in-law etc. was about to lose power, they intervened to avenge insults. It did not always mean a military campaign, sometimes political pressure was satisfactory. They were only to interfere on behalf of a relative when it seemed necessary. True, the Árpáds several times found excuses in

[10] Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 179.
[11] Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 182.
[12] Attila Zsoldos, *The legacy of Saint Stephen*. Budapest, 2004. 126.; György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*. New York, 1994. 142.; *Die Heiligen Könige*, 128.
[13] Györffy, *Saint Stephen*, 143.
[14] Marie-Madeleine de Cevins, *Saint Étienne de Hongrie*. Paris, Fayard, 2004. 373., 383.; Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 36.; *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsi historiarum*. Ed. J. Thurn. Berlin, 1973. 410.
[15] Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 62.; Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 57.; 127–28.; Cevins, *Saint Étienne*, 370.; Ferenc Makk, "On the Foreign Policy of Saint Stephen", In: *Saint Stephen and his country. A newborn kingdom in Central Europe Hungary*. Ed. A. Zsoldos. Budapest, 2001. 37–48.
[16] *Legenda beatae Margaritae*, SRH. II. cap. 12. p. 689. Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 40.; Györffy, *Saint Stephen*, 146.

"the urgent necessity" of the kingdom.[17] Nevertheless, the interventions did not always involve large-scale expeditions and territorial devastation. First, they put forward political pressure, reprimanded their allies, and raised objections before having resort to force. The kings were mostly contented with the demonstration of force, deploying their armies along the borders. When it seemed inevitable, they moved in and occupied key points but sought to abstain from plunder. Stephen is seen in historical mythology as the peacemaker king, every Árpád ruler is taken as following his path as a *rex pacificus*, wishing to reinforce peace with foreign nations.[18] St. Ladislaus (1077–95) is described as "laying campaigns only in order to restore peace".[19]

In fact only few Árpád monarchs lived in peace with their neighbours, but not all of them were bellicose and most laid emphasis on making peace.[20] In 1116 King Stephen II (1116–1131) came to the border to "confirm their peace and friendship" with the Prince of Bohemia,[21] but somehow the parties burst out into hostilities.[22] Béla III (1172–96), to express his desire for peace with Byzantium, returned the formerly grabbed relics of St. Ivan of Rila.[23] Only if these methods did not bring about results were the kings to have resort to arms. They very rarely applied direct territorial rule or established military administration. This policy was to be justified by the kingdom's need to face confrontations from two empires. Problem is that historiography has been trying to find justification for the ambitions even when there was no foreign threat at all. The German expansions ceased to threaten Hungary's integrity after the late 11th century the latest, and, likewise, Byzantine aggression was not a serious menace except for the attempts for supremacy by Manuel Comnenus.[24] Nonetheless, after a long series of German interventions, the kings were to build up a defensive policy to uphold a diplomatic stability resting on a wide system of dynastic alliances.

The familiar relationship probably worked most effectively with Poland. Several pretenders, deposed and ousted rulers found refuge in Hungary, and vice

---

[17] „urgente regni sui necessitate…in expeditionem…": *Legenda sancti Ladislai Regis*. SRH. II. cap. 8. p. 522.

[18] "…adtendente pacem cum externarum provinciarum populis fideliter statutam corroboravit […] Cum omnibus circumquaquae positarum provinciarum vicinis de pace, cujus magna numquam antea fuerat amator": *Legendae S. Stephani regis*, SRH II. cap. 1., 4. pp. 378–80.; Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 125.

[19] „contra Bohemos in expeditionem profectus est, ubi reformata cum honore sup pace": *Legenda S. Ladislai Regis*. SRH. II. cap. 8. p. 522.

[20] *Legendae S. Stephani regis*, SRH II. cap. 17. p. 424.

[21] *Chronici Hungarici compositio,* cap. 153. p. 434.

[22] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 242.; Cosmas of Prague, *The Chronicle of the Czechs.* Transl. Lisa Wolverton. Washington, 2009. 231.

[23] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 124.

[24] Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 80.

versa, in Poland. The expelled claimants or rivals were "received amiably" either by the Árpáds, or the Piasts.[25] St. Stephen's banished nephews, sons of the blinded Vazul "sought refuge in Poland", and his descendants, as well as marrying with the Piasts, supplied or received military assistance to lead campaigns and assume the crown in their own countries.[26] St. Ladislaus is described as being "raised from childhood in Poland" as an *alum(p)nus* of the king, and "had almost become a Pole in his ways and life."[27] Nevertheless, the familiar assistance was not unscrupulously compensated for. The would-be king, St. Ladislaus, although received great assistance from King Bolesław II who "drove Salomon out of the country" in 1063 and "placed him on the throne", thus "called him his king…he installed in Hungary", refused to support the Polish king when he fled to him.[28] Ladislaus did not wish to sacrifice his papal relations on the altar of promoting the cause of the murderer of St. Stanisław.[29] The familiar support was not unconditional: Stephen II refused to help Yaroslav of Volhynia in 1118.[30]

The kings justified their motives as being defensive. In the 1050s the adversary of Emperor Henry III, Conrad, Duke of Bavaria was also received and helped with military force, which, under the shadow of imperial invasions served defensive concerns.[31] In 1092 St. Ladislaus laid an assault against Vasilko of Terebovl who had urged an attack of the Cumans into Hungary.[32] It was a recurrent accusation that the Russian principalities' instigated their auxiliaries to ravage Hungary.[33] The kings, however, did not indulge in revenge but as they sought to strengthen their positions in the east, where they found the defence unsatisfactory, came to conclude alliances with Russian princes. Three Kievan matrimonial bonds were contracted in the following years. On several occasions, the Árpáds were called in to intervene.[34] When in the 1090s St. Ladislaus was called in to give aid to his relative, Otto II, Duke of Moravia against the Prince of Bohemia, he did it in return for the "great number of strong knights" the Duke's father, Otto

---

[25] „amicabiliter recepti": Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum*. SRH. I. cap. 52. p. 177. English trans. *The Deeds of the Hungarians*. Eds. F. Schaer, L. Veszprémy. Budapest, 1999.

[26] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 121–22.; Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 66.; *Die Heiligen Könige*, 129. Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 44. p. 173.

[27] „ab infancia nutritus…quasi moribus et vita Polonus factus fuerat": [Gallus Anonymus] *Gesta principum Polonorum*. *The deeds of the princes of the Poles*. Trans. Paul W. Knoll, Frank Schaer. New York–Budapest, 2003. 96.

[28] „Salomonem effugavit…in sede Wladislaum…collocavit […] suum regem apellabat […] ": ibid. 96., 98.

[29] Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 182.

[30] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 61., 63.; 73. ; 106.; Kristó, Die *Arpaden-Dynastie*, 242.

[31] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 57–8.

[32] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 94–5.

[33] *Chronici Hungarici compositio,* cap. 145. p. 424.

[34] „rogansque Regis clementiam, ut in propria person sua ipsum adiuvaret": ibid.

I had provided for him in 1074 against the rival, Salamon.[35] It was a typical familiar tie (*consanguinitas*) in terms of which, the king intermediated, since Otto I married Ladislaus' sister. This system of "nutrition of relatives" worked well, e.g. when St. Ladislaus received his cousin, Duke Břetislav of Bohemia favourably and granted him a living and provisions.[36] The support of the Moravian dukes against the German-ally Bohemian princes was later resumed.[37] There were cases however, when the system did not work well and the Moravian dukes joined the German invaders.[38]

The insult of a blood-relative (*iniuria nepotis*) was treated as an offence and cause for intervention. In 1108 Coloman (1095–1116), "wishing to revenge the injuries done to him" by the Duke Svatopluk, i.e. his devastation, began to lay waste to Moravia.[39] In 1099 Sviatopolk and Yaroslav asked their relative, King Coloman to provide a force against their rivals.[40] In the early 1070s, as the Patzinaks broke into Hungary, allegedly incited by Byzantium,[41] St. Ladislaus led preventive counter-attacks into Byzantine territory and, as a base against further assaults, captured Belgrade.[42] It is probable that the Hungarians tried to exploit the Byzantine rivalries and extend their frontiers south of the Danube.[43] Expansion was in this way justified by defence interests, though the pillaging up to Niš and the seizure of the relic of St. Prokop as well as the huge booty the Hungarians gained cannot be argued for. Likewise, when they raided all the territories of their neighbours cannot be accounted for the safety of the country.[44] Similarly, St. Ladislaus' 1093 intervention to the Polish rivalry and a three-month siege and the starvation of the defenders of Cracow cannot at all be justified.[45] The interference and the support of the sedition of Romanus Diogenes in Byzantium against Emperor Constantine X Dukas in the late 1060s cannot be explained either.[46] To say

---

[35] „ad avunculum suum venit…in auxilium sibi venire rogavit…quia consanguinitatis vinculo illi iungebatur, memor sue actionis ducis patris eius, qui sibi in auxilium contra Salomonem venerat…contra Bohemos propter iniuriam nepotis sui": *Chronici Hungarici compositio,* cap. 140. p. 418.; cap. 117–19. pp. 385–6.

[36] Cosmas, *Chronicle*, 177., 238.

[37] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 101.

[38] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 100.; Cosmas, *Chronicle*, 208.

[39] Cosmas, *Chronicle*, 213–14.; Márta Font, *Koloman the Learned, king of Hungary*. Szeged, 2001. 24.

[40] *The Russian Primary chronicle: Laurentian text*. Eds. S. H. Cross, O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Mass., 1953. 196.

[41] Makk, *Aussenpoltik*, 64.; *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 104., p. 369.

[42] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 172–73.

[43] Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 65.

[44] E.g. a Czech campaign in the 1060s: *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 101. p. 365.

[45] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 86.

[46] Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 64.; Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 140.; Kerbl, *Byzantinische*, 15.

the least, in some cases the interest of defence and expansion intertwined. However, this policy was much more a defensive-offensive one, applying also preventive aggressive actions. St. Ladislaus provided a good example of that when in 1091/1092 led a campaign against the Cumans – who were incited by the Byzantines to break into Hungary – and wanted to combat them beyond the borders, in Byzantine territory, "rode in advance of them fearing a devastation of the country".[47] It is true that in the 11th and the 13th century Hungary had to fight against the "eastern aggression" to protect its existence and several times suffered large-scale Patzinak, Oghuz and Cuman invasions.[48] The threat was in several cases justifiable, and "the peril indescribably" catastrophic.[49] In 1099 the Cumans were driving them "for two days" "hither and yon as a falcon drives magpies", and "the slaughter was so huge" and "the Hungarians had rarely before suffered such a massacre" from the hand of the Cumans.[50] It was also a shock that lots of people from Szerém/Srem and Transylvania were carried off to Byzantium in the 1150s–60s.[51] However, foreign invasion or the prevention of an aggression was also to have Hungarian actions accounted for. When in 1202 King Emericus (1196–1204) led an invasion into Bulgaria, he was to find pretext in the former inroad of Bulgarian-subject Cumans and the capture of the Belgrade – although it was at that time Byzantine territory as Hungary surrendered them as the Árpád-princess, Empress Margaret's (consort of Isaac Angelus) dowry.[52] By that time, the Árpáds had already been waging war in the Balkans for years against the Bulgarian Tsar Kaloyan.

The preventive action or active defence based upon a frontier-guarding *indago*- or *gyepű*-system, a wide area of wastes and borderlands, consisting of gates and obstacles.[53] From the late 1020s King St. Stephen raided and plundered the marches of Ostmark and Bavaria, in return Emperor Conrad II's promotion of German settlement into the frontier region between the Fischa and Leutha.[54] Conrad went on a campaign against the Hungarians but "could not penetrate the fron-

[47] *Chronici Hungarici compositio,* cap. 137. p. 414.
[48] From the 1020s on, e.g. in 1068 at Kerlés/Chirales. Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 64. p. 183.; Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 63.; András Pálóczi Horváth, *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians*. Steppe peoples in medieval Hungary. Budapest, 1989. 31.
[49] „tanta pericula facta sunt, que dici non possunt": *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 145. p. 426.
[50] ibid.; *The Russian Primary chronicle*, 196.
[51] Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 81.
[52] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 362.
[53] Erik Fügedi, *Castle and Society in Medieval Hungary (1000–1437)*. Budapest, 1986. 37.
[54] Egon Boshof, „Dar Reich und Ungarn in der Ziet der Salier", In: *Bayern und Ungarn*. Ed. Ekkehard Völkl. Regensburg, 1988. 41–63. 44–45.

tier of the country well-protected by rivers and forests".[55] The defensive technique involved the "scorched earth" method, when the enemy were let in "until they were in rough country" and "distress".[56] Because of a treaty, the region between the rivers Leutha and Fischa was taken under Hungarian control.[57] Henry III reoccupied the zone in the 1040s, but it seems they kings of Hungary never ceased to threaten the region and laid almost regularly preventive campaigns.[58] It is also true that the Princes of Austria and Bohemia similarly devastated the frontier region from time to time.[59] In defence of the realm special border guard troops were settled in frontier zones, in some cases pushed forward as advanced outposts, serving as buffers against foreign invasion (e.g. the northern territories of Bosnia, the wardenship of Szörény/Severin). Frontier forces, mostly Patzinaks were also to lead preventive campaigns into enemy territory.[60] Abū Hāmid al-Garnātī writes of Muslims, possibly Khalyzians of Khwarazmian origin in 12th century Hungary, "with whom they launch raids to Byzantine territories."[61]

By the end of the 12th century Hungary became a leading political power of "international" prestige in the region. It was judged as a grand power in traditional historiography. Hungary was a decisive factor in the political map, an important actor in papal diplomacy on the frontier of *Latinitas*, playing a major role in conversion, the spread of Western Christianity and crusading. It was able to protect its interests, and had them well represented at the most important decisions touch-

---

[55] „Imperator…regnum fluviis et silvis intrare non valens". *Wiponis Opera*. *Gesta Chuonradi Imperatoris.* MGH Scriptores in Folio. XI. [Historiae aevi Salici]. Hrsg. G. H. Pertz. Hannover, 1854. 254–75. (cap. 26.) 268.; „quantum fluminibus et paludibus obstantibus poterat". [Hermann of Reichenau] Herimannus Augiensis, *Chronicon de sex aetatibus mundi*, MGH SS [Annales et chronica aevi Salici] Vol. 5. Ed. G. H. Pertz. Hannover, 1844. 67–133. 121. Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 50. p. 176.; The Greeks found themselves in an "impenetrable" and "steep thicket". [Kinnamos, Ioannes/ Cinnamus, Joannes], *Ioannes Cinnami Epitome Rerum ab Ioannes et Alexio Comnenis Gestarum*. Ed. A. Meineke. Bonn, 1836. (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae, v. 15) [hereinafter: Cinnamus] Lib. III. p. 105.; English transl. John Kinnamos, *The Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*. trans. by C.M. Brand. New York, 1976. [hereinafter Kinnamos] 87.

[56] The invaders were short of supplies and diminuted by fame: "sine militia et in nullo proficiens, quod inde exercitus fame periclitabatur": *Annales Altahenses maiores*, 18.; Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 57. p. 179.

[57] Wipo, *Gesta Chuonrardi*, 44. ; Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 129–30.; They even captured Vienna. *Annales Altahenses maiores*, 18., 20.; Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, 124.

[58] Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, 124.

[59] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 243.; Cosmas of Prague, *The Chronicle of the Czechs*, 213–14.

[60] They Patzinaks were "incessantly harassing the Germans all night long with their poisoned arrows, noosed prisoners by laying snares between the tents": *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*, cap. 90. p. 350.

[61] Abū Hāmid al-Garnātī, *Al-Mu'rib 'an ba'ḍ 'ayā'ib al-Magrib* [Eulogy on the countries of the West]. Budapest, 1985. 58. Chalisioi in Kinnamos, 86.

ing the fate of the region (cf. Hungary's envoys were present at the signing of the 1179 Venice treaty between Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III). The Árpáds maintained a large-scale dynastic policy, contracted marriages with determining powers, Byzantium, the Kievan Rus', the Capetiens, the Principality of Antiochia, the Sicilian Normans. It was a prime concern that they were not to acknowledge any suzerainty. In the interpretation of the Hungarian kings, the preservation of independence could also legitimize, if necessary, an intervention into its neighbours and the enforcement of vassalage. However, the territory where the kings had a permanent or long-term direct territorial rule was only Croatia proper. Nevertheless, in the political ideology of medieval Hungary it was held that if the kings had extended their rule over a territory, it was to belong now to the crown of Hungary once and for all. It was taken as if they had a legitimate right to possess it for ever now. Even though they lost control over some territory, the kings kept on using its royal titles, and assumed the dignities as *rex Serviae* or *Bulgariae*. It was helped by a special ideology: the territories and parts once belonging to the Kingdom of Hungary were taken as true members of the body of the Holy Crown of Hungary. The kings were always to make the members who had once accepted the Holy Crown but denounced it as *infideles regni* return under its obedience. In 1202, King Imre interfered in the dynastic rivalry in Serbia, then, on the pretext of supporting a claimant, led an invasion and assumed the title *rex Serviae*, and although he was not able to consolidate his rule, his successors kept on ruling as kings of Serbia.

The familiar diplomacy was rather flexible and pragmatic. The prime concern was to uphold the positions and the precious ties and alliances the kingdom had already seized. The rulers, when it seemed necessary, changed sides and chose to support new protégés. The pragmatism can be touched upon in 12th-century Russian campaigns. Although King Coloman was severely defeated in 1099 at the battle of Przemyśl, in 1123 his son, Stephen II embarked on a campaign supporting now the Árpáds' former enemy, Vasilko of Przemyśl against Vladimir II Monomakh of Kiev, to whom he had previously allied.[62] He was not to indulge in any kind of a personal vengeance, but was mainly concerned to keep the status quo, and back the party he found most beneficial for the interests of the kingdom. Stephen II also gave asylum to his former adversary, Duke Bořivoj II of Bohemia.[63] In 1018 St. Stephen assisted the Polish invasion against Kiev and turned against his former friend, Yaroslav I the Wise.[64] It might as well be seen as double-dealing, but it might perhaps be explained that Stephen wished to confirm his commitment to the 1018 treaty between Poland and the Empire when he joined an

[62] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 249–50.
[63] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 243.; Cosmas, *Chronicle*, 241.
[64] *Thietmar Merseburgensis*, Lib. VIII. 31–32. p. 531. *The Russian Primary chronicle*, 132.

aggression against Bolesław I's Kievan opponent, and help the German-Polish-backed Kievan claimant occupy the throne.[65] The king might have hoped to cement his friendship to Poland and sacrificed his Kievan alliance, he found less valuable for the moment.[66] Although at the end of the 12th century Hungary gave support to Emperor Isaac Angelus against the augmented Bulgarian power, as a new actor, the Latin Empire appeared on the scene, in the 1210s–20s King Andrew II (1205–35) came to support Ivan Asen II, contracting a marriage alliance and providing military help.

The *Realpolitik* was to prevent the formation of a great power in the Rus', any ill-proportioned augmentation of any of the principalities that might become a potential ally of Byzantium and lay a threat to Hungary. In a way, the Árpáds were interested in a certain level of fragmentization. Whenever the Árpáds were afraid a potential source of danger would be born, if any of the princes extended his territorial rule, they decided on an intervention. They were against the increase of power under Vladimir Monomakh, but came to support the Monomakhs, as Vladimir's successors lost the throne in Kiev, against their Chernigov relatives, also because Kiev was the greatest adversary of the Cumans.[67] Hungary was ready to supply military help whenever some power – in the 1140s Chernigov – sought to unite the principalities (Volhynia with Kiev). As Byzantium became a greatest threat and Manuel contracted alliances at the back of the Árpáds with the Galician princes, they, as realists, sought to find partners in their hinterland and in the 1140s–50s reconciliated their connections with Kiev. Between 1148 and 1152 King Géza II (1141–62) led six campaigns on behalf of the Monomakh-branch, and helped Izyaslav II assume and keep the throne as well as forged a matrimonial alliance. The Árpáds did not want to get caught up in a pair of Byzantine-Russian pincers. The safety of the northeastern border was of primary importance since Byzantium did consciously lay assaults against Hungary just at the time when the Hungarians were engaged on campaigns in the Rus'. There was even a greater threat, that of a three-front war as Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I proposed an alliance to Manuel and offered to assist him against Hungary.[68] The kings were very pragmatic and valued the balance of powers first. Although the Árpáds assisted the Monomakhs in their struggles against Vladimirko of Galicia, but, even as opposed to his Byzantine sympathies, disagreed to have him dispossessed and were to keep the independence of Halych-Volhynia and rejected it to be the united with Kiev. In return, the grateful Halychian prince helped the Árpáds against the Byzantine assaults in 1164.[69] Then, Volhynia was not annexed to

[65] Györffy, *Saint Stephen*, 142–3.
[66] Cevins, *Saint Étienne*, 353–54., 365., 379., 389.; Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 39.
[67] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 100.
[68] 1156: Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 123.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 79., 84.
[69] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 121., 124.

Kiev, but was to be ruled by a brother of the Grand Prince, and kept its integrity, also safeguarded by the Árpáds' matrimonial bond. The new Volhynian prince married Géza's niece, by which they wished to demonstrate it was now part of the dynastic block and for the concerns of the princess they were ready to intervene if the independence of Volhynia was to be threatened. In their Russian relations the Árpáds, until the late 12th century did not extend their rule or occupy territories, but were satisfied with political influence and did not go beyond dynastic assistance.

The kings also gave political asylum to foreign dynasty members or refugee princes but intervened if a foreign power granted asylum to a Hungarian throne-pretender, judging it as an aggressive act. St. Stephen harboured his brother-in-law, Bruno, bishop of Augsburg, who got into conflict with Emperor Henry II and intermediated to have the parties make peace.[70] This policy of familiar "intercession" was applied several times later on.[71] St. Ladislaus looked after the son of King Bolesław II of Poland "and for his father's sake treated him as he were his own son".[72] King Géza II (1141–61) sheltered his uncle, the Serbian *ban* Belos of the house of Uroš, who found refuge from Serbia.[73]

However, the kings usually made preventive steps to have the rival ousted. In 1127 the refugee Prince Álmos was received in Byzantium, the expulsion of whom was demanded and invasions were led by Stephen II. It was also a pretext for territorial expansion (Belgrade, Braničevo).[74] King Béla III devastated Austria because the Duke harboured his rival, Géza (1176).[75] Béla II (1131–41) was primarily interested to prevent his neighbours from supporting the alleged and disinherited son of Coloman.[76] Boris "obtained the aid of the Russians and Poles", who "intervened in Hungary on behalf of him".[77] The framework of familiar cooperation worked well and was mutual: the king received military help from Vladi-

[70] „fratrem suum fugisse ad Ungariorum regem veniae gratia acquirendae": *Thietmari Merseburgensis Chronicon*, Lib. VI. cap. 2–3., p. 278.; Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 125.

[71] „Bruno […] ad sororem suam Ungaricam reginam confugit […] intercessionem eius imploravit": Adalbold*, Vita Heinrici II. imperatoris*. MGH SS [Annales, chronica et historiae aevi Carolini et Saxonici] Vol. 4. Ed. G. H. Pertz. Hannover, 1841. 683–695. 691.

[72] „puerum…nutriebat…eumque loco filii parentis gratia diligebat": *Gesta principum Polonorum*, 100.

[73] „qui [Géza] a pueris cum illo enutritus fuerat et educatus": Cinnamus, *Historiarium* Lib. III. p. 104.

[74] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 245–47.; 253.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 78.

[75] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 135. A general overview: Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *From Coloman the Learned to Béla III (1095–1196). Hungarian Domestic Policies and their Impact upon Foreign Affairs*. New York, 1987.

[76] *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 149. p. 429.

[77] „ascito Rutenorum auxilio…pro Boricho venerant": *Chronici Hungarici compositio,* cap. 161. p. 448.

mirko, Prince of Zvenigorod-Halych, and, in return, in 1138 he gave help to Vladimirko against his Chernigov relatives, who laid an assault against Vladimirko's principality. It was also mostly mutual with Poland: King Coloman got asylum in Poland against his rival, Álmos. Then he made preventive measures and interfered in the Polish throne struggles to make Bolesław III not to back Álmos. In return, Bolesław supported Coloman against German invasions, since he was alike threatened by Emperor Henry V, who supported Bolesław's rival.[78]

A most critical period was the mid-12th century when the Árpáds had to face the expansive ambitions of the Comneni: large-scale invasions of nearly the whole imperial army, almost annually. Yet it is not the task of this study to give an overview of the whole history of Byzantine-Hungarian conflicts. Before the aggressions of Manuel Comnenus who did in fact threaten Hungarian independence, the kings of Hungary did lead preventive assaults into Byzantine territories.[79] By the mid-1160s the kingdom lost large territories in the south and was to agree to Prince Béla be taken as a hostage to Byzantium. Although Béla was brought up for a few years as an heir-presumptive, it is disputed whether Manuel considered for a united Byzantino-Hungarian empire.[80] The Árpáds had to fight against the Byzantine threat to save the kingdom from suzerainty. Although the Byzantine army laid smashing, two-pronged assaults, the Árpáds did manage to ward them off and prevent them from moving deeply into Hungarian territories. They lost several battles and thousands perished but although the areas south of the Sava, Srem, Croatia and Dalmatia were lost, the country was never under permanent foreign territorial rule. The kings allied with the Serbs, dispatched auxiliary forces against Byzantium, brought forth a marriage alliance with the Uroš, and pushed the defensive frontier forward.[81] Kinnamos also relates that Géza II's uncle, ban Belus "undertook to make Serbia a subject-ally" to the Árpáds.[82]

Byzantium traditionally had a liking to welcome, receive, nurture and harbour foreign pretenders. In the 1150s–60s Byzantium granted asylum to Boris, and assisted his military interventions,[83] then enthroned two anti-kings in Hungary, having them acknowledged Byzantine overlordship.[84] However, Hungary was able to

[78] Font, *Koloman*, 72–3.; Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 175., 184.
[79] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 124.
[80] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 330.; Kerbl, *Byzantinische*, 133–38.
[81] „...accepit Geiza in Dalmatiam irrupisse Romanos, copias auxilio Dalmatias submisit": Cinnamus, *Historiarium*, Lib. III. p. 104.; Kinnamos, 84.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 200.; Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 122.
[82] „illi beneficii iure obnoxiam facere est annixus […]": Cinnamus, *Historiarium*, Lib. III. p. 104.
[83] Cinnamus, *Historiarium* Lib. III. p. 117.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 79.; Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 266.
[84] Kerbl, *Byzantinische*, 76–88.; 114–130.

overcome these difficult periods and oust the anti-kings, neither of whose rules lasted more than a few months and the reigning king, Stephen III and his followers, also with Western help were able to regain the throne. The anti-kings recognized Byzantine suzerainty and took an oath of vassalage, but their rule did not mean in practice Byzantine conquest. Neither of the anti-kings brought in Byzantine administration or had castles garrisoned with Greeks. The Árpáds did even fight Byzantium with its own arms and sought to embrace the cause and gain the support of a rival Comnenus prince, and under the promise of territorial grants made him to assist Hungary with his troops against his cousin, the Emperor (1154).[85] Another defensive technique was "not to come close quarters", to march along the Danube, defer open-field combat and have the engagement prolonged until the Greeks were "gripped by anguish and fear". "They fled after a brief engagement…during the flight they dispersed and all of a sudden got lost". "When the Romans observed no one opposing them they thought of returning".[86] There was only one occasion that the Byzantine army were able to pass through the Hungarian defences, and crossed the Danube. However, they never moved further to the north then Bács/Bač, the Temesköz region and the southern territories of Transylvania.[87] The Árpáds did lead preventive campaigns and broke into Byzantine territories. In 1154 Géza II laid siege to Niš and Braničevo. However, it can be seen as a great result that at last Manuel accepted that he was not able to conquer Hungary. The wars were "laden with horror", the Greeks "suffered great losses", and at the battles "achieved nothing worth mentioning".[88] Byzantium was satisfied with the territories south of the Sava and the Danube, only Dalmatia and Bosnia were established as thema-districts. The Hungarians in a few years' time were able to reoccupy the territories and survived the "Greek peril". Byzantium had only a restricted, temporary political influence and had no direct rule in practice.[89]

In the political vacuum following the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, Hungary aspired to the role of a political arbitrator and a central diplomatic factor in the Central and Eastern European theatre, also aiming to fill the positions the fall of Byzantine Empire had left empty. Béla III (1172–96) made use of the waning of Byzantine power in 1183 when he led an invasion up to Niš and Sofia and recaptured most of the territories formerly lost to Manuel. This new power conception is symbolically signified by the fact that Béla adopted the double cross, the majestic insignium of the *basileus* and had in incorporated to his seal and coat-of-arms. However, the kings also sought to keep the balance of powers.

[85] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 122.; Moravcsik, *Byzantium*, 81.
[86] Cinnamus, *Historiarium*, Lib. III. p. 104–08.; Kinnamos, 85–96.
[87] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 121.
[88] Cinnamus, *Historiarium* L. III. p. 109.; Kinnamos, 87.
[89] Font, *Spannungsfeld*, 186.

When in 1185 Byzantium suffered a major Norman assault, Béla, though being still at war with Byzantium, came to make peace with Isaac II Angelus, cemented with a matrimonial alliance, and was to supply military aid. He also backed Byzantium in 1190 against German crusaders.[90] With his backing, Byzantium was able to remain on the political map. Hungary was also concerned that the German-ally Normans not seize positions in the Balkans. To uphold the balance, Hungary also gave support to Isaac against the augmented Bulgarian power.

The personal union of Hungary and Croatia is not to be seen here in depth, since it is out of the scope of this present study. Croatia does not closely belong to the field of foreign policy, being attached to the Kingdom in a personal union from 1091 on. To put it briefly, in 1091 St. Ladislaus intervened on behalf his sister, widow of King Zvonimir and occupied the kingdom, and bestowed it on his nephew. The union was also to be cemented with the foundation of the bishopric of Zagreb in 1093/94, a symbol of Ladislaus' authority. It is also emphasized even in Croatian narrative tradition that Ladislaus was called in by a league of nobles, who "urged to seize the kingdom and subjugate it to his lordship" because Croatia "remained without a king to guard and protect it".[91] In 1097 Coloman resumed the conquest, then was crowned as King of Croatia. In 1105 he conquered the coastal areas of Croatia and Dalmatia.[92] He assumed the title as King of Dalmatia at Zara/Zadar (1105/08). Hungarian sources treated Dalmatia as a *regnum*, though it was not a contiguous kingdom, but a number of cities.[93] The cities, as opposed to Venetian rule, welcomed and preferred Hungarian domination, and rather felt as being governed in a mutual understanding. [94]

Relations with Galicia/Halych(yna)-Volhynia (Halycz-Vladimir)

One of the areas where the Árpáds' rule meant for certain periods direct Hungarian rule was the *regnum Galiciae et Lodomeriae*, taken as a true member of the Holy Crown.[95] For a few years, it was made into a separate vassal state under the rule of an Árpád, governed as a subjected realm with a pro-Hungarian administration. Hungary had its castles garrisoned, levied taxes and built Catholic churches. The conquest was short-lived and failed as being totally refused by the

[90] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 124.
[91] „persuadens ei, ut ad capiendum Chroatiae regnum et suo dominatui subiugandum exiret": Thomae Archidiaconi Spalatensis, *Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum*. [History of the bishops of Salona and Split]. Eds. D. Karbic, M. Matijevic Sokol, J. R. Sweeney. Budapest, 2006. 92.
[92] Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 64. p. 183.
[93] *Chronici Hungarici compositio*, cap. 152. p. 433.
[94] Makk, *Aussenpolitik*, 95.
[95] Volhynia stands for modern Volodymyr-Volynsky.

locals. Four parties were warring for the throne: Cracow, Novgorod, Chernigov/Chernihiv and Hungary. Hungary applied various techniques ranging from organizing a league within the boyars to annexation. In 1205 Andrew II invaded on the pretext of safeguarding the rights of the infant prince, Danylo Romanovych, in the name of whom he established a protectorate. It is also a part of the truth that Andrew was called in by boyars to assist against Vsevolod IV of Kiev. However, Danylo and his patrons were exiled. The King came now to support a new pretender with arms and money: Roman II Igorevich, Prince of Zvenigorod. Hungary intervened to help him banish a new Rurikid pretender, Vladimir Igorevich. Thirdly, Andrew deposed the former protégé, Roman II and organized the principality into a Hungarian governorship (1208). There was a huge wave of discontent which had the Hungarians ousted in 1209. However, King Andrew had a last trump in his hand as a claimant, Prince Danylo was still kept in Hungary and receiving a Catholic education, was brought up as a new chance for a would-be-king. In 1211 a group of the Hungarian-league boyars asked Andrew's aid, who chose now to send Danylo to occupy the throne.[96] The rule was only to be upheld with Hungarian arms, and the boyars soon revolted against it, but were severely repressed and brutally put to the torture (1213). Then, lastly, coming to reconcile with Cracow, Andrew put forward a new claimant, his son, Coloman, who was to marry a Polish princess and with Polish consent crowned as king of Halych (1214–19). The king of Hungary also intended to form Galicia into a Catholic vassal state, as he gained a papal authorization and a crown. The Polish and Hungarian allies, almost in the style of modern-age colonization, divided their territorial conquests. However, there was much discontent arising against the Hungarian rule and Coloman was expelled by Mstislav of Novgorod (1219). Hungary did not give it up, and sought again to put the principality under its suzerainty, upheld by military force and subsequent interventions, which exhausted much of the country's energy. The Árpáds seem to have been driven by an overwhelming ambition to conquer Halych at all costs. In 1227 the King embarked again to enthrone his younger son, Andrew. Then, after his short-lived and much disliked rule, he attempted to put forward Hungarian rule with arms, but was defeated.[97] Nevertheless, it is to be mentioned that this last attempt did serve defence interests, since after the defeat of the Russian princes at the battle of the river Kalka (1223),[98] by the Mongols re-valued the importance of the region and the Árpáds might have also been aiming to build up a defensive buffer. All the Hungarian expansive efforts came to nothing. The rivalry between the Rurikid

[96] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 377.
[97] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 411.
[98] Thomae Spalatensis, *Historia Salonitana*, 252.

princes, Poland and Hungary at the eve of the Mongol Invasion contributed to the failure of resistance.

Conversion

The kings of Hungary were also led by religious fervour and assumed the role of *defensor Christianitatis*. A special political ideology was also conceptualized in the *Legenda Sancti Stephani regis*.[99] Stephen was also named by the Pope as *rex apostolicus* and received an apostolic cross since "upon his merits he is Christ's apostle since Christ converted many peoples by him".[100] All the kings of Hungary, as *apostolic* kings aspired to the role of a missionary, having a divine role assigned to convert the surrounding pagans.[101] A major direction of mission in the 13th century was the region *Cumania* east of the Carpathians.[102] As masses of the the Cumans asked to embrace Christianity, the Árpáds had Dominican friars settled and a missionary bishopric founded in 1226–29, centred in Milkó/Milcov(ia).[103] Although the kings of Hungary assumed the title *rex Cumaniae* in 1233, they had only a formal suzerainty over the region, since in 1241 the Mongols swept their influence away. Then, the Árpáds chose to establish a wardenship (*banatus*) in a smaller region between the Southern Carpathians, the Danube and the river Olt, centred in Szörényvár/Severin.[104] They had now only a formal political influence, but organized the district into a military frontier zone to ward off the Mongol invasions from the south-east.

A missionary bishopric was to pave the way for Hungarian influence in Bosnia. King Béla II (1131–41) occupied the core of the region around the river Rama and assumed the address *rex Ramae*. Although the territory was addressed as a princely duchy and donated to a younger son, it was not organized into an apanage but a vassal ban was appointed. Beyond that we do not know of any Hungarian influence in the midst of the Byzantine wars of the mid-12th century. However, the assumedly Patarene heresy, Bogumilism provided justification both for action and the spread of the Roman Catholic faith, the kings of Hungary, hand in hand with the Papacy intervened and led crusades from 1200 onwards. The backing of Innocent III provided an opportunity for the Árpáds to intervene in Serbia and Bulgaria and extending the conversion campaigns on to Orthodox

[99] *Die Heiligen Könige*, 29–60.
[100] „…ille vero merito Christi apostolus, per quem tantum sibi populum Christus convertit.": *Legendae S. Stephani regis*, SRH, II. cap. 9. p. 414.
[101] Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 48.
[102] Kristó, *Die Arpaden-Dynastie*, 404.
[103] Pálóczi, *Patzinaks*, 48.
[104] Fügedi, *Castle*, 132.

schismatici. From the 1190s on the Hungarians captured Serbian and Bulgarian territories, but were not able to extend their control beyond the Danube. They tried to enthrone their own claimants, and had them crowned as vassals, but got into conflict with Innocent, who wished to have them taken under the sole suzerainty of the Holy See instead and make them accept crowns St. Peter dispatched. In Bosnia, it was not until 1237, when a crusade was preached that Hungarian suzerainty got consolidated and a vassal was installed. The conversion was led by Dominican missionaries, also aided by the Papacy so as to establish a Catholic bishopric. The conversion of the Slav *schismatici* in the Balkans was to be furthered by the foundation of the bishopric of Szerém/Srem in 1229, under the authority of a Hungarian archbishopric.

Conclusion

Throughout the Middle Ages Hungary sought to run a leading role in the region, which also involved aggression. The Árpáds occupied Croatia, and reigned over its monarchy in a partial personal union, in certain periods ruled some parts of Dalmatia and Bosnia, annexed territories in Styria, Moravia, Silesia, Bulgaria and Halych-Volhynia. Hungary, as seen in foreign sources, "continually harassed its neighbours", yet it did not manifest itself in territorial gains or military administration. The reasons are to be understood in the conceptual framework of the *regnum Hungariae*, which, seen from inside, served defensive concerns, but from the outside, was nothing but strive for grandeur. The Holy Crown was to be treated as having several members. The occupied areas, as the *regnum* of Halych or Serbia were in perpetuity held as *membrum Sacrae Coronae*. In the political mythology of the Holy Crown it was seen whenever the kings laid an invasion against their neighbours it was because the princes subjected to the Holy Crown revolted against their lawful majesty. The kings restored the unfaithfuls to obedience. Using demonstrations of power, they were to protect the members of the crown, which came to be a guarantee of political stability. Yet the monarchical titles do not reflect that all territories were ruled by Hungary in fact. In most of the cases they did find justification for the hegemonic expeditions. The kings are mostly depicted as laying invasions "because of the deeds with which [their neighbours] had afflicted them".[105] It is also true that they had friendly terms with some of their counterparts (e.g. the Habsburgs in the late 13th century). Although it appears in the sources, they did not "force" neighbouring peoples "to pay tribute".[106] Beyond Croatia, and in certain years in Galicia and Northern Bulgaria from the people of which they "exacted obedience", they did not have direct terri-

[105] Cosmas, *Chronicle*, 213.
[106] Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 57. p. 178.

torial rule.[107] Their reasons could have been explained by the concerns of defence and the protection of Christendom, but in several cases these were only pretexts.

In medieval Hungarian political ideology, it was a prime concern to sustain the country's sovereignty and independence as well as to be a rightful member of Christian monarchies, being able to direct its own fate. The king considered himself as equal of other Christian sovereigns, who does not subordinate himself to any supreme power.[108] It was also underlined by the *regnum Marianum* concept, first conceptualized in the *Legenda Sancti Stephani regis*. It was proposed that St. Stephen asked the help of Virgin Mary to save the country from a German aggression, and offered it under her tutelage. She was to be the nation's "perpetual protector", which was now only subjected to the Virgin herself.[109]

[107] Simonis de Kéza, *Gesta*, cap. 73. p. 184.
[108] Zsoldos, *Legacy*, 49., 70.
[109] *Legendae S. Stephani regis*, SRH, II. cap. 17. p. 424.; *Legenda Maior*, SRH, I. cap. 10. p. 385.

László Pósán

Major Power or Not?
Lithuania in the Middle Ages

It is not easy to decide which state could be considered a "great power" in the middle ages because the criteria and viewpoints of later ages are not applicable to that age. For, everywhere – with the possible exeption of Italian city-states – political power and rule over a given territory in medieval times was based on personal relationships (on different forms of allegiance) rather than on some permanent system of institutions. Therefore, an oath of allegiance, matrimonial union, or the extinction of a princely family could alter overnight the existing arrangement of power. Undeniably, medieval political thinking commonly held the view that the extent of a prince's power was closely related to the size of the teritory he/she ruled. Thus, the question under what political constellation one exercised sovereign power, or what resources were available to this person appeared well-nigh immaterial from this point of view.

The present study makes an attempt at delineating the issue whether the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which had by the early 15th century expanded its sovereignity over very large territories could be considered a major power in contemporary Europe or not. Was it within its means to project its influence beyond its political boundaries, and be capable of shaping developments in Europe? How lasting and stable was that political power, that is, if it had influence over wider areas, was it incidental or was it a capability sustained over a longer time-frame?

Out of the Baltic peoples only the Lithuanians were able to found an independant state in the Middle Ages.[1] However, the Lithuanian statehood presented remarkable divergence compared with kingdoms that came into existence around the millenium or in the early centuries of the Middle Ages: statehood was not linked to the adoption of Christianity and forming church organization, but it took place amidst the gentilitial structures of a pagan world. The existence of the medieval Grand Duchy of Lithuania was proof of the possibility of building a territorial power-structure based on heathen fundaments which was capable of significant expansion and of becoming a momentous political factor in

[1] Bojtár Endre, *Litván kalauz* [Guide to Lithuania], Budapest, 1990. 16.

Eastern Europe. As a result of Lithuanian conquests in the Eastern Slav territories an empire extending over some 900,000 sq km area came into being by the end of the 14th century the upper stratum of which consisted of Lithuanians and Slavs in fealty to them while the bulk of the population was made up of Slavs. The actual Lithuanian territories on the ethnographical sense represented 70–80,000 sq. Km. area, that is they constituted only cca. 5–7% of the territory of the empire. (The territory of present-day Lithuania is 65,300 sq. Km.).[2] Whereas, the adoption of Western Christianity (which took place simultaneously with the Polish-Lithuanian Union of 1386)[3] was concommitant with the gradual decline and loss of Lithuanian souvereignty and led eventually to incorporation in Poland (1569).[4]

The first reports about Lithuanians and their land of residence date from 1009. It occurs in the written form of Lituae in the *Annales Quedlinburgenses*.[5] According to Chronica Latopis Nestora Yaroslav, Grand Duke of Kiev waged war against the residents of Litua in 1040 and forced them to pay taxes.[6] In the last third of the 12th century the Lithuanian tribes already formed two major territorial alliances which they called „low-landers" (*žemaitis*) and the „highlanders" (*aukštaitis*). This disctinction was probably derived from the lower, middle, and upper courses of River Neumas (Nyeman, Memel) and between the two areas, the valley of river Nevežis marked out the border.[7] The „highland" parts may have

---

[2] J. Ochmański, „Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft Litauens vom Ausgang des 14. Jahrhunderts bis 1655", *Studia Historiae Oeconomiae* Vol. 15 (1980) 131–159, 131; Marceli Kosman, „Programme of the Reformation int he Grand Duchy of Lithuania and How It Was Carried Through (ca. 1550-ca. 1650)", *Acta Poloniae Historica* XXXV. (1977) 21–50, itt: 22; V. Stanley Vardys, „Christianity in Lithuania", *Lituanus. Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences* 34 (1988/3) 2; Varga Ilona, „Az orosz orthodox egyház a kereszténység felvételétől az államegyház kialakulásáig" [The Russian Orthodox Church from the adoption of Christianity to the formation of the established Church], *Világtörténet* új folyam 1. (1988/1) 56–67, here: 60.

[3] Jörg K. Hoensch, *Geschichte Polens*, Stuttgart, 1998. 54, 72; Hartmut Boockmann, *Der Deutsche Orden. Zwölf Kapitel aus seiner Geschichte*, München, 1981. 171–172; Norber Angermann – Sabine Dumschat, „Die ukrainischen Länder unter litauischer und polnischer Herrschaft (bis 1569)," In: *Geschichte der Ukraine*, Hg. F. Golczewski. Göttingen, 1993. 37–57. itt: 39–40.

[4] On the process of the decline of independent Lithuania see e.g. Michail M. Krom, „Die Konstituierung der Szlachta als Stand und das Problem staatlicher Einheit im großfürstentum Litauen (15/16. Jahrhundert)", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 42 (1994/4) 481–492.

[5] Annales Quedlinburgenses, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. Tom. II. Ed. A. Bielowski. Warszawa, 1961. 769.

[6] Latopis Nestora, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica.* Tom. I. Ed. A. Bielowski. Warszawa, 1960. 702.

[7] H. Mortensen, *Litauen. Grundzüge eines Landeskunde.* Hamburg, 1926. 83; Ralph Tuchtenberg, *Geschichte der baltischen Ländern,* München, 2009. 12.

been the ancient residential areas whence smaller or larger groups migrated west and south-west as far as the estuary of river Neumas or the sea-coast, because Aukštaitia (Latin: Auxtote) was identified with Lithuania and Žemaitia (Latin: Samogitia) were recurrently mentioned separately. „*Lithuani et Samogiti*" can be read, for example, in a document dated around 1247, and Riga was attacked by „*Lithuani et Samogiti*" in 1286.[8] The unification of forces, the alliance of tribes, the foundation of broader power structures over gentilitial structures had begun in order to fend off external threat much earlier in the Lithuanian highlands bordering on the Polish Piast principalities and the succession states of the Kievan Rus than in the "lowlands". The medieval Lithuanian state came into being in Aukštaitia in the course of almost a century of internal strike. As early as 1219, the prince of Halych (Galicia)-Volhynia concluded peace with a Lithuanian tribal confederation headed by a prince named Živinbudas anonymously referred to by the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle (Livländische Reimchronik) and the annals of Halych (Galicia)[9]. The Lithuanian tribal confederation were to be reckoned with as a momentous political factor in the succession states of the former Rus and the Baltic region alike. "Their might goes far" („*ir macht ist breit*") reported the Livonian Rhymed Chronicle[10]. It was mostly the "lowland" Lithuanians that got within the scope of conquering Germans – owing to geographical proximity. In the Livonian Chronicle of Heinrich mention is made, for example, of a certain leader named Žvelgaitis, who attacked the land of the Estonians with a 2000-strong army and of a notable, named Daugerutas, who led a marauding campaign against Novgorod in 1213 (his daughter was, in turn, married by a Slav prince, Wszewolod of Gerzike) and a leader by the name of Stekšys whose troops were repelled by the Knights of the Order of the Sword Brothers to the further bank of the River Dvina (1213).[11] This, however, did not mean that the tidings of political changes in the Lithuanian "highlands" were not payed attention to. Živinbudas died around 1219/20 and Ringaudas became the most powerful prince who was no longer content with the alliance of individual tribes and princes and their political cooperation, but endeavoured to put an increasing expanse of land under his

[8] Regesta Lithuaniae ab origine usque ad Magni Ducatus cum regno Poloniae unionem. Tom. I: Tempora usque ad annum 1315 complectens. Ed. H. Paszkiewicz. Warszawa, 1930. Nr. 220, 659.

[9] Livländische Reimchronik. Hg. L. Meyer. Paderborn, 1876. Vers 2732 (= Reimchronik); Galician annuals are quoted by V.T. Pasuto, *Obrazovanyija litovszkava gaszudarsztva*, Moszkva, 1959. 338–340.

[10] Reimchronik V. 326–384.

[11] Heinrici Chronicon Lyvoniae. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarium ex Monumentis Germaniae. Ed. G. H. Pertz. Hannoverae, 1874. XVII, 3 (107), IX, 1 (21), XVII, 6 (108)

direct control.[12] The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle unequivocally calls him "great king" („*was ein konic* grôz").[13] He extended his authority over a large part of Aukštaitia and even to the Estern Slav Polock as well.[14] Subsequent to his death his male issue, Daugsprungas, succeeded him on the princely throne of Aukštaitia.[15] He married the younger sister of Vykintas, the most powerful prince of Žemaitia, in order to secure the northwestern borders by means of family ties. He gave one daughter in marriage to Alexander, prince of Novgorod the other daughter to Daniil prince of Halych (Galicia) thus wrapping up an alliance with the crucially important western and southern Russian principalities.[16] In the direction of the Eastern Slav territories, he launched a series of well-planned attacks while, between 1201 and 1226, Lithuanian incursions, marauding campaigns were equally directed against the Baltic regions and Russian territories, it was the Russian principalities that were primarily targeted by Lithuanian military activity from 1226 up until Daugsprungas' death in 1238. The fight against conquering Germans in Livonia essentially fell on the residents of Žemaitia, while the Ringaudas-dynasty, which had initiated the unification of Lithuanians wished to strengthen its position by feats of arms conducting expansionist military campaigns against Russian territories.[17] Daugsprungas was succeeded on the throne by his younger brother, Mindaugas, in 1238, but his nephews (Tautvila and Edvytas) posed as serious rivals who were also supported by their uncle on the mother's side, Vykintas, prince of Žemaitia. Tautvila also wanted to strengthen his power by conquering Russian lands and extended his control over the upper course of Rivers Dvina and Dnepr (Polock, Vitebsk, Drutsk).[18] Exploiting the huge Mongolian offensive mounted against the Russian princedoms in 1237,[19] Mindaugas expanded his rule towards both Red- and Black Russia and placed his son, Vaišvilkas at the head of the conquered Slav lands.[20] By the mid-1240's Mindaugas' authority over the bulk of the territory of of Žemaitia had been recognized.[21] In all likelihood the

[12] Zenon Ivinskis, „Mindaugas und seine Krone", *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 3 (1954/3) 366.
[13] Reimchronik V. 6383.
[14] Manfred Helmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter. Studien zur ostbaltischen Frühzeit und lettischen Stammesgeschichte, insbesondere Lettgallens.* Münster – Köln, 1954. 167.
[15] André Bossin, *La Lithuanie.* Paris, 1933. 19.
[16] Z. Ivinskis, *Mindaugas und seine Krone.* 367.
[17] Tomas Baranauskas, *Lietuvos valstybes ištakos.* [The Formation of the Lithuanian State] Vilnius, 2010. 248.
[18] M. Hellmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter*, 175.
[19] B. Szabó János, *A tatárjárás. A mongol hódítás és Magyarország.* [The Mongolian Conquest and Hungary] Budapest, 2007. 86–106.
[20] V. T. Pasuto, *Obrazovanyia litovszkava gaszudarsztva*, 341.
[21] Cf. Totoraites, *Die Litauer unter dem Könige Mindowe bis zum Jahre 1263.* Freiburg, 1905. 57.

fact that the Teutonic Order was at about this time engaged in the final phase of the conquest of Kurland[22] played an important role in this, and it had come to be directly bordered on Žemaitia, whose inhabitants felt threatened by it and expected help from the prince of Aukštaitia. His nephews, therefore, could not count on the support of the "lowlands" in spite of the help of their uncle on the mother's side, thus Mindaugas easily drove them out of Lithuania, but were allowed to retain their Russian gains. Tautvila sought alliance with the Livonian Germans and even converted to Christianity to facilitate this end (1248).[23] Mindaugas feared that the Livonian Germans (the bishop of Riga and the Teutonic Order), Vykintas, prince of Žemaitia, Tautvila (and his younger brother) and the Russian principalities threatened by Lithuanian expansion might form some kind of coalition against him, therefore, he decided to modify his political line he had been following up to that time. He declared his willingness to make peace with the Germans and to adopt Christianity thus breaking out of political and military isolation.[24] (At the same time, this move also meant that the Grand Duke of Lithuania relinquished the role of a being a defender of the tribes in Žemaitia and the Teutonic Order ceased to support Tautvila.) In 1251, Mindaugas and his sizeable armed retinue got baptized,[25] pope Innocent IV, in turn, made the Bishop of Riga consecrate a priest of the Teutonic Order as bishop of Lithuania.[26]

In the course of 1250/51, Mindaugas defeated his internal contenders and even his most formidable rival prince Vykintas, fell in combat. Because of the peace concluded with the Germans, the tribes of the "lowlands" turned against the Grand Duke of Lithuania and subsequent to Vykintas' death they sided with a new leader, Treiniota. Like Tautvila, Treiniota also belonged to the Lithuanian princely family: he was the son of Lengvenis, a notable in Žemaitia and the younger sister of Mindaugas.[27] Not unlike his brother, Mindaugas also settled his relations with the prince of Halych-Volhynia through matrimonial ties: one of his daughters married Daniil's son, Svarn.[28] The conversion of his son, Vaišvilkas to orthodoxy (1254) served the consolidation of Lithuanian rule over the conquered Slav territories. The bishop of Kulm enthroned Mindaugas as king of Lithuania

[22] Reimchronik V. 2517–2587.
[23] Reimchronik V. 2735–2793.
[24] N. Angermann – S. Dumschat, *Die ukrainischen Länder*, 38.
[25] Reimchronik V. 3543–3575; Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 241.
[26] Kurt Forstreuter, *Deutschland und Litauen im Mittelalter.* (Studien zum Deutschtum im Osten) Köln–Graz, 1962. 6.
[27] M. Hellmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter*, 180; Z. Ivinskis, *Mindaugas und seine Krone*, 385; For the genealogical tree of the descendents of the Ringaudas dynasty see: S. C. Rowell, *Lithuania Ascending. A Pagan Empire Within East-Central Europe, 1295–1345.* Cambridge, 1994.
[28] Mychajlo Hocij, „Die krone des Mindaugas", *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 3 (1954/3) 409.

with the approval of the Pope in 1253.[29] He and his country was granted the special protection of the Holy See[30] by Pope Innocent IV. In return, for the support of the Teutonic Order in consolidating his rule in Lithuania he donated Žemaitia to the Order of Knights, therewith shifting to the Knights the responsibility for the problems of mutinous locals.[31] In 1255 the Mongolians extended their rule over Halych-Volhynia and thus became neighbours to Lithuania, therefore Mindaugas' attention was directed to the Tartars in the second half of the 1250's (that is also why he gave up on the Lithuanian "lowlands") who did, in fact, go at Lithuania in 1258.[32] Victory over the Mongolians[33] made Mindaugas' rule over Lithuania even further cemented, but Treiniota, the leader in Žemaitia, rising up against him also boasted remarkable feats of arms enhancing his political authority. On July 13, 1260, he inflicted a crushing defeat at Durben on the Teutonic Order.[34] However, the king of Lithuania did not turn against the Livonian Germans even after that, because he thought that a war in Žemaitia would rather strengthen Treiniota than himself. Midaugas went on pushing towards the Russian territories and waged war against Brjansk. The Lithuanian notable displeased with his policies assassinated him on August 5, 1263.[35] Upon his death, savage internecine struggle got started for supremacy. In this struggle Treiniota defeated Tautvila (1263) then, in turn, he was overpowered by Vaišvilkas, Mindaugas' son of the orthodox faith (1265) who was also supported by his brother-in-law, Svarn, the prince of Halych-Volhynia, who recognized the Tartars' overlordship. In 1267 Vaišvilkas retired in a monastery and turned the princely throne of Lithuania over to his brother-in-law, thus creating a personal union of Lithuania and Halych-Volhynia (soon after this, some followers of his former adversaries assassinated Vaišvilkas.) Two years later, Svarn died, too, and therewith ended the Christian Lithuanian power, which had been a Roman Catholic kingdom at the time of Mindaugas, while under Vaišvilkas and Svarn it had been an orthodox duchy.[36] In 1270, Traidenis, a prince from Aukštaitia, got hold of the grand duke's throne. His position was cemented by means of a matrimonial alliance with a Roman Catholic

[29] Preußisches Urkundenbuch. Hg. R. Philippi, A. Seraphim. M. Hein, E. Maschke, H. Koeppen, K. Conrad, Bde. I.1 – VI.1. Königsberg–Marburg, 1882–1986. (henceforth: PUB) here: PUB I.2. Nr. 39.

[30] Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae. Tom. I. Ed. A. Theiner. Rom, 1860. 50.

[31] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 347.

[32] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 359; Font Márta, *Oroszország, Ukrajna, Rusz.* Budapest–Pécs, 1998. 121–122.

[33] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 377, 378.

[34] Reimchronik V. 5614–4517, 5630–5633, 5656–5657, 5709; Petri de Dusburg, „Cronica terre Prussie", *Scriptores rerum prussicarum.* Tom. I–IV. Hg. T. Hirsch, M. Toeppen, E. Strehlke. Leipzig, 1861–1874. (henceforth: SRP) here: SRP I. 97.

[35] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 405.

[36] Ralph Tuchtenberg, *Geschichte der baltischen Ländern.* München, 2009. 28.

princely dynasty: he married Ludmilla, the daughter of Boleslaw, the Mazovian prince.[37] He intended to establish his authority by means of conquest and led a campaign against Halych whose prince, Lev Daniilovich, turned to the Tartars for help. The troops of the Golden Horde attacked Lithuania in 1277 and 1279, but Traidenis – like Mindaugas before him – repelled both attacks and consolidated his position on the throne of the Grand Duchy.[38] Subsequent to his death (1282)[39] they embarked on more than a decade-long power struggle in which Pukoveros, son of Skolomand, a notable in Aukštaitia kept on getting a grip on larger and larger territories. In the Chronicle of Peter von Dusburg unequivocally called Pukoveros "king" of Lithuania („*Pucuwenus rex* Lethowie").[40] His son, Vytenis relying on the power structure he had built up managed to quickly obtain the dignity of Grand Duke.[41] He endavoured to harness the military might of Lithuanian notables and klans into campaigns abroad, the success of which would, in turn, strengthen his ducal power. He managed to exploit the serious political and military conflicts between the bishop of Riga and the Order of Knights, and he interfered in Livonian domestic affairs, too.[42] He lent the Bishop of Riga aid against the Knights.[43] While Tautvila or Mindaugas had to adopt Christianity in order to find German allies, Vytenis did not need to give up heathen believes which, however, confirmed his legitimation among Lithuanian society.

His brother, Gediminas, succeeded him on the throne. He successfully exploied the internal tensions of the Golden Horde[44] and extended Lithuanian supremacy over larger Eastern Slav territories than ever before. He conquered the region of Minsk in the 1320's then moved forward in the direction of Vitebsk and Smolensk. He took control of Kiev, placing his younger brother Feodor of the orthodox faith at the helm (1331). His other brother Voin was trusted with the governance of Polock. These military achievements rendered his authority and power inside Lithuania indispensable. His dynastic policy also aimed at consolidating the Lithuanian power conditions. One of his daughters was, in 1321, given in marriage to the Prince of Płock in Mazovia. He concluded an alliance with Vladislav (Łokietek), king of Poland, while his daughter, Aldona (named Anna

[37] M. Hellmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter*, 200; V. T. Pasuto, *Obrazovanyia litovszkava gaszudarsztva*, 277, 492.

[38] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 566; Gerd Schwalbe, *Geschichte Podlachiens in reußischer Zeit (XI–XIV. Jahrhundert)*. Hamburg, 1969. 167–169.

[39] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 483.

[40] Dusburg, SRP I. 161.

[41] V. T. Pasuto, *Obrazovanyie litovszkava gaszudarsztva*, 492.

[42] Regesta Lithuaniae Nr. 733 (1296), Nr. 760 (1300), Nr. 787 (1306), Nr. 795 (1307), Nr. 806 (1308), Nr. 816 (1311), Nr. 839 (1313)

[43] Dusburg, SRP I. 163; Canonici Sambiensis, SRP I. 283,

[44] On the Golden Horde's first decades in the 14th century see e.g.: István Vásáry, *Az Arany Horda* [The Golden Horde]. Budapest, 1986. 108–114.

when baptized) married Kazimir, heir to the Polish throne. The Polish-Lithuanian alliance was directed against the Teutonic Order, which both parties were at war with. In 1331, duke of Halych-Volhynia, Yurii Boleslaw II also married one of Gediminas' daughters, Eufemia. The Polish-Lithuanian alliance did, however, not prove to be long-lived and with the death of Queen Aldona/Anna (1339) it came to an end. Its main reason was that subsequent to the murder of the Grand Duke of Halych-Volhynia, the Lithuanian Grand Duke and the king of Poland became claimants to the throne of Halych-Volhynia. King Kazimir III made a peace agreement with the Teutonic Order, then the Lithuanians had to reckon with both Polish and German aggression. The struggles for Ruthenian territories resulted in the dissolution of the duchy: Halych got under Polish rule, while Volhynia fell into the hands of Lithuanians.[45] It was Gediminas' followers who governed Novgorod, Pskov (Pleskau) thus Lithuanian influence prevailed there. While Kernave and Trakai used to be the center of the power of the Grand Duke, Gediminas made Vilnius the most important ancient heathen place of cult his seat of government where the Lithuanians' high priest was also resident. So, in this way, unlike former dukes, a remarkable degree of legitimation was attached to his rule in Lithuanian society.[46] At the same time, the bulk of the population of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy was made up of orthodox eastern Slavs at the time of his reign, therefore Gediminas created an orthodox bishopric in Novohorodok (Nowogródok, Naugardukas) in the heart of Black Russia in 1317, in order to withdraw his subjects belonging to eastern Christianity from under the influence of Metropolitan of "Kiev and all Rus" who also had his seat in Vladimir from 1299 and moved to Moscow for good in 1328. Gediminas permitted Franciscan Monks to settle in Vilnius. These monks were his scribes and interpreters in conducting his diplomacy with the western world. The City of Riga, because of its commercial interests, and the conflict between the Bishop of Riga (who was also a Franciscan) and the Teutonic Order that had lasted for nearly two decades, took pains to shape good relations with the Lithuanian ruler. Riga concluded an alliance of political and military nature with Gediminas, who contemporaneosusly wrote the letters expressing his willingness to convert to the Catholic faith, which never came to pass.[47] The Lithuanian Grand Duke lost his life in battle against the

[45] Jörg K. Hoensch, *Geschichte Polens.* Stuttgart, 1998. 48–55; St. Zajączkowski, „Przymierze polsko-litewskie 1325 r." (= The Polish–Lithuanian Alliance of 1325), *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 40 (1926); G. Schwalbe, *Geschichte Podlachiens*, 189–195; Norman Housley, *The Later Crusades 1274–1580. From Lyons to Alcazar.* Oxford, 1992. 346.

[46] Tomas Venclova, *Vilnius, a city in Europe.* Budapest, 2009. 36–37.

[47] Liv-, Est- und Curländisches Urkundenbuch, Bde. I–XI. Hgg. F. G. Bunge, H. Hildebrand, P. Schwartz. Riga, 1852–1905. (a továbbiakban: LUB) itt: LUB II. Nr. 414, 415, 687, 688, 689, 690; Kurt Forstreuter, „Die Bekehrung Gedimins und der Deutsche Orden", *Altpreußische Forschungen* 5 (1928) 239–268; Codex diplomaticus Lithuaniae. Ed. E. Raczyński, Vratislaviae, 1845. Nr. 3.

Tartars in winter 1341. He had 14 children out of his three marriages: 7 boys and 7 girls. He had testamented well before his campaign against the Tartars how his sons should carve up the Grand Duchy among themselves and his eldest son Jaunatus, born of his first marriage, was appointed his successor on the throne of the Grand Duchy. Every one of his other sons was to get a part of the empire, but in theory all of them were subject to Jaunatus' overlordship. He, however, was not able to exercise his power over his brothers. The disintegration of Lithuania was a looming disaster. However, the crusader undertakings of the Teutonic Order and other western crusaders as well as because of the military threat posed by the Tartars and Moscow rendered it imperative to hold on to and expand the conquered eastern and southern territories (where the tax revenue came from) and to retain the political and military unity of the empire. The shiftless Jaunatus was dethroned by his two brothers Algirdas and Kestutis and ruled jointly (diarchy). The dignity of Grand Duke got vested in Algirdas'hands while Kestutis was allotted extra prerogatives and authority which exceeded those held by other brothers, but recognized his brother as his superior. In this way, one can actually not speak about diarchy, albeit there was a remarkable division of responsibilities between the two brothers.[48] Algirdas was engaged in the Eastern Slav territories and further conquests and had bonds to this world of orthodoxy through both of his marriages while he, personally, remained heathen. He gained a remarkable victory over the Tartars by the "Blue water", along one of the tributaries of the southern course of River Bug. The severe internal strife in the midst of the Golden Horde (between 1359–1380 more than 25 khans managed to get on the throne of the Horde) created favourable conditions for major Lithuanian conquests. Algirdas consolidated his rule over Kiev and got hold of Podolia, the broad expanse between the confluence of the Dniester and Bug rivers. He extended the borders of the Grand Duchy essentially as far as the Black Sea.[49] Moscow was also bent for exploiting the weakening of Tartar power and tried increasing her influence playing the role of the defender of the orthodox Eastern Slav lands.[50] Her expansionist drive targeted the same Russian territories as that of the Lithuanians, so in the second half of the 14th century Algirdas launched three offensives against Mos-

[48] Bojtár Endre, *Bevezetés a baltisztikába. A balti kultúra a régiségben.* [Introduction to Baltic Studies. Baltic Culture in Ancient Times] Budapest, 1997. 139; Stanisław Zajączkowski, „Die Geschichte Litauens bis 1386 in der polnischen Geschichtsschreibung der letzten 20 Jahre", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 4(1939/1–2) 139.

[49] Bertold Spuler, „Die Aussenpolitik der Goldenen Horde. Die Horde als Großmacht in Osteuropa und Vorderasien", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 5 (1940/3–4) 284.; V. S. Vardys, „Cristianity in Lithuania", 2; Vásáry István, *Az Arany Horda*, [The Golden Horde] 120.

[50] P. Nitsche, „Die Mongolenzeit und der Aufstieg Moskaus (1240–1538)," *Handbuch der Geschichte Rußlands. Bd.I.1: bis 1613. Von der Kiever Reichsbildung bis zum Moskauer Zartum.* Hg. M. Hellmann, Stuttgart, 1981. 534–715.

cow (1368, 1370, 1371).[51] Just like his father, he also wanted the orthodox Russian territories under his rule to have a religious center of their own so that they should be independent of the Moscow Patriarch. However, the establishment of a bishopric of the Eastern Church under Lithuanian supervision did not prove successful.[52] His younger brother Kestutis governed the western parts of the Grand Duchy (with Trakai as the seat of government) and his main task was the defensive fight against the Teutonic Order and Crusaders regularly coming from Western Europe.[53] During his 37 years of activity there were more than 140 military campaigns between the two sides.[54] At the time of Algirdas and Kestutis, the Lithuanian Grand Duchy succeeded in defending its western borders, while in the east and south it significantly enlarged its area of authority. By the last third of the 14th century, its Eastern border lay a mere 200 kms from Moscow. Thus, a Lithuanian-Slav empire of 900,000 sq.km. had come into existence, which was about 150–200,000 sq km in excess of the territory of the Holy Roman Empire then regarded as the great power in medieval Europe. Based on the geographical expanse of territories under its authority, the Lithuanian Grand Duchy could be considered a great power. However, territorial expanse in the second half of the 14th century in itself is not enough to pronounce that a country can be considered to have been a major power. It is not the scale of expanse, but rather the size of the taxpaying population that mattered. Germany, for example, had a population of cca. 5–6 million at the time of Heinrich III in the mid-11th century, which number had grown to 10–12 million by the end of the 13th century and to 14–15 million by the mid-14th century. (It is not by chance, that Germany was the greatest "exporter" of settlers in medieval colonization). As a result of late medieval visitations of the plague, the number of population fell back to cca. 10 million. Population started to grow again from the mid-15th century onwards and by the end of that century it had reached the 12 million level of 200 years before.[55] Whereas the Lithuanian Grand Duchy was a thinly populated state: its population density did not exceed

[51] Maike Sach, *Hochmeister und Grossfürst. Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Deutschen Orden in preussen und dem Moskauer Staat um die Wende zur Neuzeit.* Stuttgart, 2002 (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa 62), 67; Henryk Łowmiański, *Studia nad dziejami Słowiańszczyzny, Polski i Rusi w wiekach średnich*, [Studies in the medieveal history of Slavs, Poles and Russians] Poznań, 1986. 523.

[52] Bojtár Endre, *Bevezetés a baltisztikába*, [Introduction into Baltic Studies] 139.

[53] S. Zajączkowski, „Die Geschichte Litauens" 139; Ralph Tuchtenhagen, *Geschichte der baltischen Ländern*, 29; On the cursader undertakings of the western knights against lithuanians see: Werner Paravicini, *Die Preusenreisen des europäischen Adels I–II.* Sigmaringen, 1995; H. Boockmann, *Der Deutsche Orden*, 158; S. C. Rowell, „Unexpected Contacts: Lithuanians at Western Courts, c. 1316 – c. 1400", *The English Historical Review* 111 (1996) 559.

[54] A. Schmidt, *Geschichte des Baltikums*, 69.

[55] Pósán László, *Németország a középkorban*, [Germany in the Middle Ages] Debrecen, 2003. 162, 189–196, 252, 378.

4–5 people per sq.km., so its total population cannot have exceeded 4–4.5 million at the end of the Middle Ages.[56] At the end of the 15th century the Grand Duchy of Moscow surpassed Lithuania in geographical expanse (cca. 1,380,000 sqkm), but its population was smaller than that of the latter (cca. 3–3.5 million).[57] Germany had, thus, a much smaller territory, but had three times as many people as Lithuania or the Moscow Grand Duchy. By the end of the 14th century the territory of Poland had increased to 240,000–250,000 sq.km. while the size of her population roughly equaled that of the four times as large Lithuanian state.[58] On the basis of these considerations, it is understandable why Jogaila, the son of Algirdas, after two decades of fighting a war with his cousin Vytauas (son of Kestutis) for the throne of the Grand Duchy, did finally relinquish in 1401[59] the rule of Lithuania after having been recognized as overlord for the benefit of Vytautas himself giving preference to gaining the Polish royal crown. But the size of population and the related military and economic capabilities and potential also explain the fact why the state of the Teutonic Order hardly covering an area of 100,000 sq.km. and consisting of 900,000 inhabitants, was able not only to resist for more than a century the attacks of the Lithuanians, but also to launch repeated campaigns – albeit with the help western crusaders. (According to Werner Paravicini's calculations the Order of Knights started a total of 299 military actions against Lithuania between 1305–1409).[60]

The military might of the Lithuanian Grand Dukes rested for a long time on the military service of free Lithuanian yeomen, the Dukes' own armed retinue and the troops of the subdued Slav princes and their boyars' retinues (druzina). Similarly organized were the armed forces of the Golden Horde as well as the army of the state of Moscow. The Lithuanian military consisted largely of light cavalry not unlike the troops of the Tartars and Moscow. Therefore the Lithuanians, Tartars and Russians might gain important victories or sustain grave losses, for their military potential, its organization, and equipment did not differ much. The Teutonic Order along the western and southwestern borders of Lithuania, as well as Poland and Hungary disposed of a more developed military technology (especially in the field of building and defending fortified castles and also in siege technology), no wonder therefore that Lithuanian expansion was not directed against these parts.

---

[56] J. Ochmański, „Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft Litauens", 131;

[57] Font Márta – Krausz Tamás – Niederhauser Emil – Szvák Gyula, *Oroszország története*, [The History of Russia] Budapest, 2001. 102.

[58] J. K. Hoensch, *Geschichte Polens*, 55.

[59] Codex epistolaris Vitoldi magni ducis Lithuaniae 1376–1430. Ed. A. Prochaska, Cracoviae, 1882. Nr. 223, 224.

[60] W. Paravicini, *Die Preussenreisen* I. 20–41.

Medieval Lithuania extended her political authority over the region surrounded by the Teutonic Order, Poland, the Golden Horde, and Moscow. This geographical position also meant that it fell between great religious cultures, that is, between the Roman Catholic world, the orthodox Eastern Church and the Islamic world. The overwhelming majority of its population followed the orthodox faith, but Muslims, Jews, Armenians and Catholics also dwelt in the duchy with a good part of the ethnically Lithuanian population retaining their ancient polytheistic believes. Religious pluralism prevailed in Lithuania and the heathen Grand Dukes practiced religious tolerance.[61] Since the Lithuanian princes strengthened their power by means of conquering Slav territories as early as the 13th century, they inevitably got into contact with Eastern Christianity, thus orthodoxy exerted remarkable influence on the upper strata of Lithuanians.[62] Even Vaiśvilkas, son of Mindaugas assumed Eastern Christianity (1254) and Daumantas, head of the plot against Mindaugas, also adopted the orthodox faith, moreover got canonized in the Eastern Church after his death (1299) and is venerated as Saint Timothy.[63] Duke Traidenis had a Roman Catholic wife, and his daughter, Gaudamante also converted to the Catholic faith (1279) and was given the name Sophia, Duke Gediminas' second and third wives followed the orthodox religion while four of his sons, Narimantas, Jaunutis, Karijotas and Liubartas followed the Eastern Church and came to be called Gleb, Ivan, Michael and Dimitry in Christianity. Only three of his seven sons remained heathen, but the eldest of the three, Manvidas died soon after his father, Gediminas (1342). It was essentially Algirdas (who dethroned Jaunutis) and Kestutis who remained pagan. Both wives of Algirdas' were orthodox Russian princesses and the majority of their children were baptized[64]. The Lithuanian Dukes chose their religious affiliation based on political considerations. They usually entrusted the governance of a conquered Russian principality to a family member who intended to alleviate religious differences and tensions between the conquerors and the subdued (between polytheism and monotheism) by their adoption of the orthodox faith. Nevertheless, religious diversity weakened the political unity of the Grand Duchy. Neither Gediminas nor Algirdas managed to establish an independent orthodox hierarchy under Lithuanian supervision, therefore it was Moscow that became the religious center of the

[61] H. Boockmann, *Der Deutsche Orden*, 153.

[62] H. Jablonowski, *Westrussland zwischen Wilna und Moskau. Die politische Stellung und die politischen Tendenzen der russischen Bevölkerung des Großfürstentums Litauen im 15. Jahrhundert,* Leiden, 1955. (Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas 2) 23.

[63] Paulius Rabikauskas, „The most significant events in Church History in Lithuania from the 13th century to the 19th century," *A katolikus egyház a balti országokban.* [The Catholic Church in the Baltic countries] Ed.. A. Caprioli, L. Vaccaro (Ecclesia Sancta 5) Budapest, 2000. 122.

[64] http://fmg.ac/Projects/Medlands/LITHUANIA.htm

Eastern Slav territories. Since the Lithuanian Grand Dukes were either pagans or Roman Catholics (after 1385), while their subjects were mainly orthodox, this fuelled constant internal political tension. The Grand Dukes of Moscow, however, could rely on the cohesive force and influence of the Eastern Church against the Lithuanian state. How far the adoption of Christianity was determined by actual political needs is well illustrated by the case of Vytautas, the grand Duke of greater consequence. He was baptized five times in the last last decade of the 14th century joining once the Latin Church and again the Eastern Church or offered sacrifices to pagan deities.[65]

The Lithuanians left conditions unchanged in the conquered Eastern Slav territories: they did not touch the taxes formerly levied by the Tartars, leaving them unchanged.[66] The end of Tartar rule over the Russian lands did not mean a change for the better from the viewpoint of the Russian population, so these circumstances, apart from the religious issues, were not suited to enhance in any significant way the social support of Lithuanian power. Subsequent to Jogaila's and Vytautas' conversion to the Catholic faith, the bulk of the upper stratum of the grand Duchy also converted to western Christianity and as a consequence the laws negatively discriminated the followers of the Eastern Church while the Lithuanian population had to give up their heathen cults and practices. In keeping with the agreement concluded in Horodło (1413), the Catholic Lithuanian boyars and landowners were of the same status as the Polish nobels as regards their personal, political and property rights, that is, the same status as the so-called *szlachta*, who were exempt from all obligations and dues, except military service. They could have had a place on the Grand Duke's Council (rada) and they held the more important offices of the Duchy.[67] According to Jan Długosz, 15th century Polish chronicler, "many especially the Russians" were happy after the death of Vytautas (1430), because they hoped that the position of the followers of orthodoxy would change favourably.[68] It was mainly due to their support that Švitrigaila (younger brother of Jogaila) became Grand Duke and the landowners of the Eastern Church got strengthened, which gave rise to resentment among Catholic circles. The bishop of Krakow wrote in January, 1432 that Švitrigaila would only listen to his orthodox followers and placed them in all positions at the head of castle-administration, which[69] could never have occurred at the time of Vytautas. The Catholic camp installed Sigismund Kejstutovič on the throne of the Grand Duchy,

[65] Josef Pfitzner, *Großfürst Witold von Litauen als Staatsmann.* Prag–Brünn, 1930.; Henryk Łowmiański, *Witołd wielki książę litewski.* [Vytautas litván nagyfejedelem] Wilna, 1930.
[66] J. Pelenski, *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus.* New York, 1998. 135.
[67] Akta unji Polski z Litwą 1385–1791. wydal S. Kutrzeba, W. Semkowicz. Kraków, 1932. Nr. 51.
[68] Joannis Dlugossii Historiae Polonicae libri XII. Tomus IV: Libri XI–XII. Ed. A. Przezdziecki, Cracoviae, 1877. 418.
[69] Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti. Tomus II. Cracoviae, 1891. Nr. 204.

thus the Lithuanian state had two Grand Dukes, splitting the empire into two parts, one Catholic (Lithuanian) and the other orthodox (Slav) and there ensued many years of armed struggle between them.[70] The final disintegration of the Grand Duchy was only prevented by Grand Duke Sigismund. Recognition of Catholic and orthodox nobles as equals in several deeds of privilege.[71] So, the upper stratum of the Slavs deserted Švitrigaila, who suffered a final defeat.[72]

The internal unity and stability of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy were often put at risk by the power struggles inside the ruling dynasty. The Grand Dukes usually appointed one of their sons to be heir to the throne, but their other children and relatives were also given large parts of the empire, who, in turn, relying on those parts ruled by them, did not recognize the successor on the throne. This is what happened in the case of the sons of Gediminas (Jaunutas was dethroned by Algirdas and Kestutis), or when Kestutis (and his son Vytanutas) did not recognize his younger brother Jogaila's title of Grand Duke and two decades of internecine war broke out. As long as the policy of conquest proved successful in the orthodox territories, interest lying in maintaining the unity of military power always took priority over conflicts within the ruling dynasty. However, Vytautas was badly defeated by the Tartars by River Vorskla, which put an end to Lithuanian conquests and it became indispensable to keep up the Polish-Lithuanian union in order to make it possible to remain master of the vast territories that had been gained.[73] As long as the conquests drew together in one camp the different Lithuanian interest groups of the nobility, the cessation of conquests gave way to separatism in different parts of the empire.[74]

The Lithuanian Grand Duchy attained in the course of the 14th century the status of a major power in Eastern Europe ranking with the Golden Horde, from the second third of the 15th century onwards, however, it gradually lost weight and influence and its role was taken over by the Duchy of Moscow on the rise in the Eastern Slav areas. From the 1480's the princes and governors along the Eastern borders of the Lithuanian Grand Duchy began to take fealty to the Grand Duchy of Moscow and pledged to serve it.[75]

---

[70] Michail M. Krom, „Die Konstituierung der Szlachta als Stand und das Problem staatlicher Einheit im Großfürstentum Litauen (15/16. Jahrhundert)", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 42 (1994/4) 483; Oswald P. Backus, „The Problem of Unity int the Polish-Lihuanian State", *Slavic Review* 22 (1963/3) 413.

[71] Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti. Tomus III. Cracoviae, 1894. Nr. 17, 22.

[72] Henryk Jablonowski, *Westrußland zwischen Wilna und Moskau.* Leiden, 1955. 145–147.

[73] M. Sach, *Hochmesiter und Großfürst*, 70.; Vásáry István, *Az Arany Horda*, 144.

[74] M. M. Krom, „Die Konstituierung der Szlachta", 487–488.; Klaus Eberhard Murowski, *Zwischen Tannenberg und Thorn. Die Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens unter dem Hochmeister Konrad Erlichshausen 1441–1449.* Göttingen, 1953. 325–329.

[75] M. Sach, *Hochmeister und Großfürst*, 84.

SMALL NATIONS AND GREAT POWERS DURING THE EARLY MODERN ERA

Réka Bozzay

Eine „kleine" Großmacht im frühneuzeitlichen Europa – Die Niederlande zwischen 1579–1713

1648 ist ein neuer Staat auf der Karte von Europa entstanden: die Sieben Vereinigten Provinzen der Niederlande. Schon vor der Anerkennung der Unabhängigkeit des Landes spielte das Gebiet eine besonders wichtige politische und wirtschaftliche Rolle unter den europäischen Großmächten. Die Geburt des Landes ist mit der Idee verflochten, zwischen zwei Großmächten einen Pufferstaat zu kreieren, der für das Machtgleichgewicht auf dem Kontinent sorgen und die territoriale Expansionslust der Großmächte einschränken kann.

Niemand hat aber damit gerechnet, dass dieses Land im Laufe des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts trotz seines kleinen Territoriums eine Zeit lang eine Großmachtposition einnehmen würde. Im Folgenden versuche ich zu erklären, welche Bedingungen die Republik der Sieben Vereinigten Niederlande erfüllen musste, um eine führende Rolle in der europäischen Politik spielen zu können. Für die Analyse versuchte ich auf Grund sekundärer Literatur über die frühneuzeitliche historische Entwicklung der nördlichen Niederlande bezüglich ihrer Großmachtposition einen Überblick zu geben.

Sehen wir uns zuerst an, was die Charakteristika eines Kleinstaates und einer Großmacht sind. Es gibt unterschiedliche Definitionsmöglichkeiten dieser Begriffe. Die Theoretiker sind sich aber in dem Punkt einig, dass einer der wichtigsten Bestandteile die Dimension der Macht ist. Um diese Aussage näher zu beleuchten, möchte ich hier die drei fundamentalen Komponenten zur theoretischen Definition der Macht von Raymond Aron nennen:

1. Milieu: der von der politischen Einheit besetzte Raum;
2. Quellen: die Qualität und Quantität der zu erreichenden Materialien, einbegriffen die Techniken, mit denen sie zu Waffen umgestaltet werden können; die Anzahl der Leute und die Möglichkeit, sie zu Soldaten zu machen, bzw. die Quantität und Qualität der Mittel und des Personalbestandes;
3. kollektive Aktion: die Kollektive Handlungsfähigkeit, die die Organisation der Armee, die Disziplin der Soldaten, die zivile und militärische Befehlsführung im Frieden und im Krieg, deren Qualität und die Solidarität der Einwohner in der Krise umfasst.

Nach Aron erfüllen die Kleinstaaten die Bedingung des Begriffs Kleinstaatlichkeit wegen der begrenzten Mittel der aufgelisteten Relationen.[1]

Arons Definition beschränkt sich auf die militärische Handlungsfähigkeit. Wir dürfen aber nicht vergessen, dass eine Machtposition auch durch die wirtschaftliche Handlungsfähigkeit erreicht werden kann, wobei die militärischen Aktionen in erster Linie zur Verteidigung des freien Handels und nicht unbedingt zur territorialen Expansion dienen. Dies galt (größtenteils) auch für die Sieben Vereinigten Provinzen im 17. Jahrhundert. In Ergänzung und Umformulierung von Arons Machtdefinition um den wirtschaftlichen Faktor möchte ich die Position der Sieben Vereinigten Provinzen unter den Kleinstaaten und Großmächten vom Ende des 16. bis Anfang des 18. Jahrhunderts im Folgenden definieren.

Die Definition des Milieus kann ohne weiteres in der ursprünglichen Bedeutung, also als von der politischen Einheit besetzter Raum, gebraucht werden. Die Quellen müssen mit der Qualität und Quantität der finanziellen und geistigen Mittel ergänzt werden, die zum erfolgreichen Handel nötig sind. Hier darf man auch nicht die praktische Organisation des Handels vergessen. Der Begriff der kollektiven Aktion muss um die notwendigen außenpolitischen Maßnahmen erweitert werden.

Milieu

Zur Festlegung der Grenzen der politischen Einheit müssen wir zuerst mit einem historischen Rückblick beginnen. Die niederländischen Territorien wurden unter der Herrschaft der burgundischen Herzöge und der Habsburger vereinigt. Als erster wichtiger Schritt wäre hier die Ehe des burgundischen Herzogs Philipp des Kühnen mit Margaretha, Tochter des flandrischen Ludwig von Male, im Jahre 1369 zu erwähnen. Hiermit gerieten neben Flandern das Artois, Nevers, Rethel sowie die Städte Antwerpen und Mecheln unter burgundische Herrschaft.[2] Die aus dieser Ehe geborenen Kinder folgten der Heiratspolitik ihrer Eltern. Mit der burgundisch-wittelsbachschen Doppelhochzeit von Philipps Sohn Johann von Nevers (Johann ohne Furcht) mit Margaretha von Bayern und Philipps Tochter Margaretha mit Wilhelm von Oostervant legten die burgundischen Herzöge die Grundlage für die Erweiterung des burgundischen Anspruchs auf die von den Wittelsbachern regierten Grafschaften Holland, Seeland und Henegauen. Zur tatsächlichen Machtübernahme in diesen Grafschaften kam es erst 1433, als die Grä-

---

[1] István Hüvely, A kisállamiság politikaelméleti és történeti dimenziói [Die politisch-ideologischen und historischen Dimensionen der Kleinstaatlichkeit], In: *Kisállamok a globalizálódó nemzetközi rendszerben [Kleinstaaten im globalisierenden internationalen System]*, Red. István Hüvely, Budapest, 2003., 34.

[2] Liek Mulder, Anne Doedens, Yolande Kortlever, *Geschiedenis van Nederland. Van prehistorie tot heden*, Apeldoorn, 1989., 109.

fin Jacoba van Bayern, Frau des Neffen des Herzogs Johann ohne Furcht, von ihren Titeln Abstand nahm. So konnte Philipp der Gute, der Sohn von Johann ohne Furcht, die Macht in Holland, Seeland und Henegauen übernehmen. Drei Jahre zuvor, 1430, wurde Philipp der Gute auch in Brabant und Limburg als Erbherr anerkannt und noch früher, 1421, kaufte Philipp der Gute die Grafschaft Namur, wodurch 1441 auch das Herzogtum Luxemburg unter burgundische Herrschaft geriet.[3] Er konnte auch 1435 Pikardien erwerben.[4] Karl dem Kühnen, dem Sohn Philipp des Guten, gelang es, sich kurzzeitig Geldern (1473) einzuverleiben. Seine Tochter Maria von Burgund heiratete Maximilian von Habsburg. Mit dieser Ehe machten die Habsburger ihren Eintritt in die niederländische Geschichte. Maria verlor die tatsächliche Macht über das Herzogtum Burgund sowie Pikardien, Artois, Geldern und Lotharingien.[5] Ihr Enkelsohn, Kaiser Karl V., fügte seinem Reich 1521 das Bistum Doornik hinzu, erwarb 1528 die weltliche Herrschaft über das Stift Utrecht und gliederte 1543 das Herzogtum Geldern ein. Noch 1523 hatte Friesland ihm die Herrschaft übertragen, Groningen mit Drenthe unterwarf sich 1536.[6] „Die Absicht Karls V., aus der Landmasse ein Königreich zu formen, ist niemals konkretisiert worden, und die Territorien haben sich lediglich bereit gefunden, die Pragmatische Sanktion von 1549 anzunehmen, in der die einheitliche Erbfolge für alle Territorien geregelt und damit eine Trennung in Einzelherrschaften ausgeschlossen wurde."[7] Hiermit ist der burgundische Kreis entstanden, der bis zur Aufteilung des Gebietes aus konfessionellem Grund bestand.

Als territorialer Ausgangspunkt der späteren Republik können die in der Union von Utrecht vereinigten aufständischen Gebiete betrachtet werden, auch wenn am 23. Januar 1579 zum Verband noch Gent, Antwerpen, Breda und Lier zählten und einige „Territorien der späteren Republik erst mit einiger Verzögerung der Union beitraten. (…) Die Partner der Union waren es dann, die dem spanischen König als Landesherren 1581 abschworen. (…) Zwar war die Republik damit noch nicht proklamiert, aber die Entscheidung über Staats- und Regierungsform war voll in die Hände der Städte gelegt."[8] Die Utrechter Union war nichts anderes als ein Zusammenschluss souveräner Territorien, ein Interessenverband, dessen Aufgabe der Kampf gegen Spanien war. Nach dem militärisch bedingten Ausscheiden Brabants und Flanderns (1585/86) erreichten die Generalstände erst 1595 mit dem Beitritt von Stadt und Land Groningen die endgültige Zusammen-

---

3 Ebd., 109–111.
4 Maarten Prak, *Hollandia aranykora [Das goldene Zeitalter der Niederlande]*, Budapest, 2004., 13.
5 Mulder, Doedens, Kortlever, *Geschiedenis van Nederland*, 114–116.
6 Horst Lademacher, *Geschichte der Niederlande*, Darmstadt, 1983., 13.
7 H. Lademacher, *Geschichte der Niederlande*, 31.
8 Ebd., 75–76.

setzung der ’sieben vereinigten Provinzen’ (Holland, Seeland, Utrecht, Geldern, Friesland, Overijssel, Stadt und Land Groningen).[9]

In der Staatsformung der Niederlande – und dadurch auch in ihrer Machtposition – müssen zwei wesentliche Wendepunkte erwähnt werden. Die Spanier erkannten 1609 die Unabhängigkeit der Republik für die Dauer des 12-jährigen Waffenstillstandes an, der Ostindien-Handel blieb frei und die Bekenntnisfreiheit für Katholiken wurde nur für die begrenzten Gebiete Brabants und Flanderns vereinbart. Bei den Waffenstillstandsgesprächen im Haag waren England, Frankreich, Dänemark, die Pfalz, Hessen und Brandenburg zugegen. Mit der Anwesenheit wichtiger europäischer Mächte erhob sich die Republik aus der Rebellion und präsentierte sich als international anerkannter Partner.[10]

Zur tatsächlichen Unabhängigkeit kam es erst 1648, weil diese territoriale Einheit bis zum Westfälischen Frieden offiziell einen Teil des Deutschen Reiches ausmachte.[11] „Die einzelnen Artikel des Friedens benannten die durch die Republik eroberten Gebiete, regelten die Schließung der Schelde, bestimmten, dass Spanien die Schiffahrt im Monopolbereich der Ost- und Westindischen Kompanie verboten war.“[12] Hiermit ist der neue Staat offiziell geboren und wurde als politisch souveräne Einheit von den europäischen Mächten anerkannt.

Weiterhin dürfen wir nicht vergessen, dass das Gesamtgebiet der nördlichen Provinzen mit dem Polderbau vergrößert wurde. Im Laufe des 17. Jahrhunderts wurde das Gebiet der Provinz Holland um ein Drittel größer. Die Einpolderung war wegen der Ausdehnung der Landbaugebiete unvermeidlich. Als die extensive Agrarwirtschaft in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts abnahm, wurde auch mit den weiteren Einpolderungsarbeiten aufgehört.[13]

Im Vergleich zu den europäischen Großmächten der Zeit verfügte also die Republik über eine verhältnismäßig kleine Fläche. Wenn man nur den durch die politische Einheit besetzten Raum betrachtet, gehörte die Republik also eindeutig zu den Kleinstaaten.

Quellen

Um eine Machtposition unter den europäischen Großmächten einnehmen zu können, brauchte man eine leistungsfähige Wirtschaft und eine erfolgreiche Außenpolitik. Um die wirtschaftliche Expansion verstehen zu können, sehen wir uns einige statistische Daten an. Die Einwohnerzahl nahm ab dem 16. Jahrhundert

[9] Ebd., 78.
[10] Ebd., 134–135.
[11] M. E. H. N. Mout, Het Duitse Rijk 1519–1648, In: *Republiek tussen vorsten. Oranje, Opstand, Vrijheid, Geloof,* Red. Frouke Wieringa, Zutphen, 1984., 95.
[12] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte,* 143.
[13] M. Prak, *Hollandia aranykora,* 93.

überall in Europa zu. Vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert stieg diese Zahl in England und Wales von 3,75 Millionen auf 5,67, in Frankreich von 15 auf 21 Millionen und in den Niederlanden von 0,9 auf 2 Millionen. Die Anzahl der Einwohner der Niederlande blieb also immer geringer als die der zwei wichtigen Großmächte der Zeit. Doch war die Bevölkerungsdichte in den Niederlanden, vor allem in der Provinz Holland, die höchste in Europa mit einer Bevölkerungsdichte von 37 Personen/km^2.[14] Die ab der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts zunehmende Bevölkerungszahl ist größtenteils den protestantischen Flüchtlingen aus den südniederländischen Gebieten zu verdanken.[15] Sie siedelten sich vor allem in Holland an und trugen in großem Maße zum wirtschaftlichen Aufschwung der Provinz bei.

Der neugeborene Staat musste die politischen und finanziellen Verhältnisse unter den Provinzen regeln. Die für den 18. Januar 1651 einberufene große Versammlung (Grote Vergadering) bekräftigte die provinziale Selbstständigkeit und bestätigte praktisch auch die Hegemonie der Provinz Holland.[16] Eine der wichtigsten Verabredungen war die Erhebung der Steuer, weil ein wesentlicher Teil des Geldes die militärischen Kosten deckte. Der Staat hatte bis 1805 kein einheitliches Steuersystem, die einzelnen Provinzen konnten selbst Steuern erheben. Jede Provinz musste jedes Jahr ihren Beitrag zu den Verteidigungskosten genehmigen. Schon zu der Zeit von Karl V. wurde der Beitrag jeder Provinz im Verhältnis zu dem der anderen festgelegt. 58,3% aller Kosten trug die Provinz Holland alleine, währenddessen sich die anderen sechs Provinzen die übrig gebliebenen Kosten unter einander teilten.[17] So ist es kein Wunder, dass Holland, das die größte wirtschaftliche Last trug, die führende Rolle in allerlei politischen Beschlüssen – auch die Wirtschaft und die Außenpolitik betreffend – spielen wollte.

Auch in der Verteidigung galten die holländischen Interessen. In den Admiralitäten, die während des 80-jährigen Krieges zur Leitung der Flotte gebildet wurden, besaßen die Holländer drei Büros von den 5. Die Matrosen der niederländischen Flotte waren sehr gut ausgebildet, aber sie hatten auch Glück darin, dass sie bis 1648 keinem Gegner von Format begegneten. Die Flotte war ursprünglich nicht unterteilt in eine Kriegs- und Handelsmarine, auch Handelsschiffe hatten Kanonen an Bord. Erst nach dem Ersten Englisch–Niederländischen Handelskrieg wurden 64 Schlachtschiffe mit 40–60 Kanonen ausgerüstet und weitere 80–90 Schiffe als Konvoi-Flotte gebaut.

---

[14] *Nyugat-európai gazdaság- és társadalomtörténet. [Westeuropäische Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte],* Red. H. A. Diederiks et al., Budapest, 1995., 34–37. Hierzu hat beigetragen, dass die maritime und städtische Ökonomie der Provinz Holland ab den 1640 Jahren eine immer zunehmende Arbeitskraft benötigte. Siehe: Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*, Oxford, 1998., 622.

[15] M. Prak, *Hollandia,* 102.

[16] Ebd., 47.

[17] Ebd., 74–76. und J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic,* 712.

Die Landmacht von 35.000 Soldaten wurde im Laufe des 17. Jahrhunderts verdreifacht. Die höchste Anzahl erreichte sie während des neunjährigen Krieges gegen Frankreich.[18]

Wirtschaftlich gesehen lag eine der wichtigsten wirtschaftlichen Regionen im Mittelalter im östlichen Teil der Niederlande an der Ijssel entlang. Städte wie Kampen, Harderwijk, Zwolle, Zutphen, Deventer und Elburg gehörten zur Hanse. Dies hat zur Blüte des Handels und der städtischen Kultur beigetragen. Diese Städte verbanden zwei wichtige Handelsgebiete: die Hanse auf der einen und Holland-Flandern auf der anderen Seite.[19] Erst im 13. Jahrhundert kann von einer Stadtentwicklung in der Grafschaft Holland gesprochen werden. Drei Faktoren haben diese Entwicklung gefördert: die Verbesserung des interlokalen Verkehrs, die Sundfahrt und die zunehmende Bedeutung des holländisch-seeländischen Heringsfangs. Die Städte der Grafschaft erwarben einen wachsenden Anteil am internationalen Handel, vor allem am hansischen Transitverkehr zwischen Flandern und Hamburg, Pommern und Livland. Im Süden der Grafschaft entwickelte sich Dordrecht zum wichtigsten Rheinhafen und Stapelmarkt. Durch die starke Erweiterung des Seehandels mit den baltischen Ländern konnte die Tuchindustrie der Grafschaft enorm expandieren.[20]

Nach der Einwanderung der flämischen Flüchtlinge nach dem Ausbruch des 80-jährigen Krieges übernahm Holland von Flandern die führende Rolle in der Textilindustrie. Die Flüchtlinge brachten sowohl ihre Initiativkraft als auch ihr „know-how" ein.[21] Die Händler aus Brabant, vor allem aus Antwerpen, trugen auch zum Aufschwung der Warenbörse bei. Die holländischen und brabantischen Händler konnten zusammen neue Märkte erobern. Dazu gehörte das Mittelländische Meer und Ostindien.[22]

Im 15. Jahrhundert wurde aus Frankreich noch drei- bis viermal so viel Getreide in die Niederlande gebracht wie aus dem Baltikum. 1636, als man in Amsterdam versuchte, die Einfuhr aus Europa zu schätzen, stellte man fest, dass von 30 Millionen Umsatz 12,5 Millionen, also 40 Prozent des gesamten Umsatzes, aus dem baltischen Handel stammten. Zu dieser Zunahme trug die Entwicklung eines neuen Schifftyps, des sog. Flötenschiffes (fluit), bei. Der Rauminhalt eines solchen Schiffes hatte zugenommen, der gesamte Tonneninhalt belief sich auf 40–50.000, zweimal so viel wie der eines venezianischen Schiffes. Die holländi-

[18] Ebd., 62–69.
[19] *Koggen, kooplieden en kantoren. De Hanze, een praktische netwerk,* Red. Hanno Brand und Egge Knol, Hilversum, 2010., 119.
[20] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte,* 4–5.
[21] Ebd., 127.
[22] M. Prak, *Hollandia,* 32.

schen Schiffe brauchten aber nur 9–10 Personen als Mannschaft, während englische Schiffe derselben Größe 30 Leute benötigten.[23]

Ab den 1590er Jahren ist der Handel in den Mittelmeerraum wieder frei geworden, weil Spanien das Embargo gegen die niederländischen Rebellen aufhob. Die niederländischen Kaufleute nahmen Getreide und immer häufiger Textilien in die Region mit und transportierten von dort Gewürz, Seide und Luxusartikel in die baltischen Gebiete, wo sie einen reißenden Absatz fanden.[24]

Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts entstand in den Nordniederlanden der Bedarf, unmittelbare Handelskontakte mit Asien herzustellen. Die asiatischen Produkte wurden bis dahin durch portugiesische Kaufleute in die Niederlande transportierte. Nach unterschiedlichen erfolglosen Versuchen, einen Seeweg über Nordrussland zu finden, sind vier Schiffe nach Asien gefahren. Obwohl auch diese Unternehmung – zumindest wirtschaftlich – von wenig Erfolg begleitet wurde, bewies diese Reise, dass unmittelbare Handelskontakte mit Asien möglich sind. Nach der Einfuhr eines neuen spanischen Embargos wurden Handelskompanien gegründet, um den Handel mit Asien zu sichern.[25]

Aus diesen unterschiedlichen „Vorkompanien" ist 1602 auf Initiative des Ratspensionärs Johan van Oldenbarnevelt die Vereinigte Ostindische Kompanie entstanden, die sich dann im 17. Jahrhundert zu einer der wichtigsten Handelsgesellschaften der Welt entwickelte.[26] Die Kompanie erhielt zum einen das Schifffahrts- und Handelsmonopol für das Gebiet zwischen dem Kap der Guten Hoffnung und der Magellanstraße. Die VOC durfte im Namen der Generalstände im Haag Verträge mit den Fürsten Asiens schließen, Festungen anlegen, eine Armee rekrutieren und unterhalten sowie Gouverneure anstellen. Die Niederländer bauten ein Handels- und Verkehrsnetz auf mit – seit 1619 – Batavia auf Java als Zentrum und beherrschten die Sundastraße, wozu später mit der Eroberung des portugiesischen Forts Malakka die Kontrolle der Durchfahrt vom Indischen zum Stillen Ozean kam. Die Erweiterung des asiatischen Handels und der Ausbau des innerasiatischen Handels erfolgten in den 1620er Jahren. Als Zeichen für die wirtschaftliche Blüte der VOC mag auch die günstige Entwicklung der Aktienkurse an der Amsterdamer Börse gelten. Der noch Anfang der 1630er Jahre auf 200 (in

[23] Ebd., 95.
[24] Ebd., 97.
[25] Ebd., 98.
[26] *Kaufleute als Kolonialherren: Die Handelswelt der Niederländer vom Kap der Guten Hoffnung bis Nagasaki*, Hg. Eberhard Schmitt, Thomas Schleich, Thomas Beck, Balberg, 1988., 5.

Gulden) stehende Kurs stieg im Jahre 1643 auf 470 und beim Abschluss des Münsteraner Friedens gar auf 539.[27]

Das handelsgesellschaftliche Pendant für die Neue Welt, für beide Amerikas und Westafrika, wurde die 1621 gegründete Westindische Kompanie. Das eigentliche Motiv zur Bildung dieser Kompanie war ein militärisches, darüber hinaus ging es auch darum, den afrikanischen Gold- und Sklavenhandel sowie die Erzeugung von und den Handel mit brasilianischem Zucker an sich zu reißen. Wesentliches Ziel war die militärische und wirtschaftliche Schwächung der Spanier. Herausragendes Ereignis war 1628 die Aufbringung der spanischen Silberflotte durch die Niederländer unter Piet Heyn. Dieser Kompanie gelang es aber nie, wirtschaftlich, handels- und kolonialpolitisch den Rang der ostindischen Schwester zu erreichen.[28] Die Niederländer eroberten Gebiete in Nordamerika, im karibischen Gebiet und auch in Südamerika. Die auf brasilianischem Boden gegründete niederländische Kolonie war nur kurzlebig, hatte aber trotzdem eine wichtige Rolle in der niederländischen Kolonialgeschichte, weil ab 1635 hierher Sklaven – vor allem von der Goldenen Küste – angefahren wurden. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an nahmen die Niederländer am Sklavenhandel aktiv teil und sind einer der größten Sklavenhändler geworden.[29]

Beide Kompanien entwickelten sich nach dem Staat zum größten Arbeitgeber und bereicherten den für den niederländischen Handel so wichtigen Stapelmarkt mit tropischen Erzeugnissen. Von besonderer Bedeutung war auch das internationale Prestige, das die Republik durch solche Unternehmungen gewann, die nicht nur finanziell attraktiv waren, sondern schlicht auch als Unternehmungen zur Entdeckung neuer Schifffahrtrouten den Namen der niederländischen Republik in alle Welt trugen.[30]

Der Aufschwung des Handels inner- und außerhalb Europas vermehrte die Nachfrage nach Produkten der Textilindustrie und des Schiffbaus. Neue Industriezweige entstanden, die auf Rohstoffen basierten, die bisher in der Republik unbekannt waren: z. B. die Zuckerraffinerie, Tabakindustrie, Seidenweberei und die Diamantschleiferei.[31]

Zum Erfolg der niederländischen Kaufleute trugen zwei Institutionen wesentlich bei: die Wechselbank und die Börse. Die Amsterdamer Wechselbank entwickelte einen besonderen Grad der Vertraulichkeit und Präzision beim Feststellen des richtigen Wertes der Münzen aus aller Welt. Die wichtigste Funktion der Bör-

---

[27] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte*, 144–146. In der Periode 1621-1647 schienen die Niederländer im asiatischen Handel sogar die größte europäische Macht zu sein. Siehe Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 941.

[28] Ebd., 146–147.

[29] P. C. Emmer, *De Nederlandse slavenhandel 1500–1850*, Amsterdam, 2007., 39–41.

[30] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte*, 145.

[31] M. Prak, *Hollandia*, 99–100.

se war es, Leute zusammenzubringen: Hier wurden nicht nur Waren, sondern auch wichtige Informationen über innen- und außenpolitische Geschehnisse ausgetauscht.[32]

Die Blüte des Handels bedingte auch eine Blüte des gewerblichen Sektors. Ein Anwachsen der Betriebsgrößen sowie eine Diversifizierung und zugleich Spezialisierung in der Güterproduktion sind zu bemerken. Die einzelnen Gewerbezweige konzentrierten sich vor allem in den Städten im Westen des Landes, in Holland und Seeland. Hier bot der Handel die Kapitalbasis und sorgte für den Aufbau von Unternehmen. Es entwickelten sich die sogenannten ‚trafieken', eng an das Warenangebot des Handels gebundene Gewerbezweige, zum Teil nichts anderes als Veredelungsbetriebe. Gerade diese waren investitionsfreudige, kapitalintensive Bereiche, die einigermaßen konkurrenzlos arbeiten konnten.

Die Landwirtschaft erlebte einen ebensolchen Aufstieg wie die anderen Wirtschaftssektoren. Wichtige Voraussetzung der Anpassungs- und Leistungsfähigkeit war die traditionell ‚freie Struktur' der Landwirtschaft, die aus den besonderen Siedlungsschwierigkeiten zu erklärende Freiheit der Bauernschaft mit Eigentum oder Pachtbesitz bei nur gering entwickelter Grundherrschaft. Vor allem Holland und Seeland sind hier zu nennen. Neue Anbautechniken und -methoden wurden eingeführt. Das Kapital stellten die Amsterdamer Kaufleute zur Verfügung. Die Kapitalinvestition für Produktionsmittel wie Windmühlen zur Verarbeitung der Agrarerzeugnisse war beträchtlich.[33]

Wie kann die Blüte der Wirtschaft im 17. Jahrhundert erklärt werden? Auf Grund der neusten Forschungen machten die Niederlande den ersten Schritt in die kapitalistische Wirtschaft. Das Kapital wurde frei in Unternehmungen investiert, statt größtenteils in Grundherrschaft festgelegt zu sein. Dies bedeutet, dass der freie Markt viele Sachen bestimmte, wie z. B. die Anstellung und Entlassung der Arbeitskräfte. Regeln der Gilden, die noch im Mittelalter entstanden sind, lebten in der Republik noch lange fort, aber die Sektoren, wo sie nicht mehr gebraucht wurden, weiteten sich aus. In der Republik gab es keine absolute Monarchie und keinen Adel, der hohe Steuer erhob. Der Staat wurde durch Kaufleute-Regenten regiert, die den Handel in ihren (politischen) Entscheidungen eine wichtige Rolle spielen ließen. Die Kaufkraft der Einwohner des Landes war höher als in den Nachbarländern. Hieraus folgt, dass in Holland zwischen 1580 und 1690 ein stabiles wirtschaftliches Wachstum von ein oder anderthalb Prozent pro Jahr festgestellt werden konnte.[34]

---

[32] Arie Wilschut, *De tijd van regenten en vorsten (Kleine geschiedenis van Nederland, band 6.)*, 1600–1700, Zwolle, 2007., 94–96. Über die Entestehung der Börse siehe noch: Lodewijk Petram, *De bakermat van de beurs. Hoe in de zeventiende-eeuws Amsterdam de moderne anndelenhandel ontstond*, Amsterdam/Antwerpen, 2011.

[33] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte*, 128–129.

[34] A. Wilschut, *De tijd van regenten*, 97–98.

Kollektive Aktionen

Die niederländische Außenpolitik wurde im 17. Jahrhundert durch zwei Faktoren bestimmt. Die erste und wichtigste Zielsetzung war die Sicherstellung der Handelsbelange inner- und außerhalb Europas. Die zweite war die militärische Verteidigung des Gebietes zuerst gegen die Spanier und in der zweiten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts gegen die Engländer und Franzosen bzw. ihre eventuellen Alliierten.

Der Dreißigjährige Krieg hat die Position der österreichischen Habsburger dermaßen geschwächt, dass eine neue Machtkonstellation in Europa entstanden ist: England, Frankreich und die Republik gehörten zu den einflussreichsten Mächten des Kontinents. Der Entstehung dieses Machtgleichgewichts ging eine Reihe von Kriegen voraus. England und die Republik führten zwischen 1652 und 1674 dreimal Krieg gegen einander. Ab 1672 standen die Republik und Frankreich fast ohne Unterbrechung im Kampf. England bedrohte den Handel der Republik, Frankreich ihre territoriale Integrität. Die Republik, und vor allem Ratspensionär Johan de Witt, sah die wichtigste Aufgabe der niederländischen Außenpolitik darin, einen französisch–englischen Bund zu verhindern.

Die Regierung von Cromwell verhielt sich ambivalent zur Republik. Einerseits sah sie einen natürlichen Alliierten in der Republik, der bei der Stabilisierung der jungen englischen Republik helfen könne. Andererseits wurde in England gedacht, dass die Vereinigten Provinzen einem viele Handelsmöglichkeiten vor der Nase weggeschnappt hatten.[35] Deswegen nahm das englische Parlament die Navigationsakte an, die einfach darauf gerichtet war, die niederländische Handelsschifffahrt vom Warentransport nach England auszuschließen.[36] Die Navigationsakte wurde in der Republik als Kriegserklärung verstanden. Der bewaffnete Streit begann 1652.[37] Der Krieg endete 1654 mit dem Frieden von Westminster. Er schaffte die Navigationsakte nicht ab und beinhaltete eine Ausschlussakte (akte van seclusie), worin sich die Stände von Holland bereit erklärten, die Oranier aus der Statthalterschaft und der Position des Generalkapitäns auszuschließen. Mit dieser innenpolitischen Intervention probierte Cromwell die Restauration der englischen Monarchie zu vermeiden, da die Oranier mit dem englischen Königshaus verwandt waren.[38]

Die Republik mischte sich auch in den Nordischen Krieg ein. Der Handel mit dem Baltikum war zu der Zeit für alle europäischen Großmächte von besonderer Bedeutung. Das schwedische Holz war notwendig für den Schiffbau, das baltische Getreide ergänzte den eigenen Anbau in Süd- und Westeuropa. Diese Waren

---

[35] M. Prak, *Hollandia,* 48.
[36] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte,* 150.
[37] *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden,* siehe noch: Paul Arblaster, *A History of the Low Countries*, Houndmills, 2006., 156. Red. J. C. H. Blom, E. Lamberts, Baarn, 1993., 157.
[38] M. Prak, *Hollandia,* 50.

mussten durch die schmale Sundstraße zwischen Dänemark und Schweden transportiert werden. Die Republik hatte einen großen Anteil an der Anfuhr der Ostseeprodukte und war deswegen an einem Gleichgewicht zwischen Dänemark und Schweden interessiert. Sie unterstützte die schwächere Partei und zwang Schweden zu Friedensbedingungen, die ihren Belangen entsprachen.[39]

Die zweite Auseinandersetzung der Handelsrivalen, England und die Republik, konzentrierte sich vor allem auf die westindischen Gebiete. Die englische Company of Adventures und die niederländische Westindische Kompanie kämpften um den Zuckerhandel, und um die Monopolisierung des Sklavenhandels. Ohne Sklaven hätten sie die Zuckerplantagen im karibischen Gebiet nicht mit Arbeitern versehen können. 1664 eroberten die englischen Truppen die niederländischen Festungen an der westafrikanischen Küste – die die Niederländer größtenteils zurückeroberten – und besetzten auch Neuamsterdam in Amerika.[40] Im Frieden von Breda 1667 bekam die VOC die Alleinherrschaft in Ostindien, die niederländische Kolonie in Nordamerika wurde gegen Suriname in Südamerika umgetauscht, was damals ein guter Tausch zu sein schien.[41]

Die Friedensbestimmungen von Breda gestaltete der Ratspensionär De Witt für England ausgesprochen mild. Er sah in England einen künftigen Koalitionspartner gegen voraussehbare französische hegemoniale Ambitionen.[42]

Die niederländisch–französischen Beziehungen waren in den 30er Jahren des 17. Jahrhunderts freundschaftlich. Die Franzosen waren am Scheitern der Friedensverhandlungen mit den Spaniern interessiert, weshalb Kardinal Richelieu 1630 den niederländischen Ständen Subsidien von einer halben Million Gulden jährlich versprach. 1634 kam es zu einem Abkommen mit Frankreich, in dem sich die Republik gegen finanzielle Unterstützung verpflichtete, bis 1635 nicht mit Spanien zu verhandeln. Diese Zeitspanne diente zur Vorbereitung einer militärischen Zusammenarbeit zwischen Frankreich und der Republik. Weiterhin diente dieses Abkommen dazu, die Zukunft der spanischen Niederlande zu regeln: entweder durch die Bildung eines unabhängigen, von Frankreich und der Republik garantierten Staates oder durch die Eroberung und Aufteilung des südniederländischen Gebietes zwischen den beiden Mächten. Die militärische Zusammenarbeit wollte aber nicht gelingen und der Krieg ist für die Republik aus dem vertrauten Bereich der Aktionen gegen Spanien in seine echte internationale Phase getreten. In den 1640er Jahren veränderte sich die französische Außenpolitik und strebte nach besseren Kontakten mit Spanien durch die Besiegelung einer Ehe zwischen

---

[39] *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden,* Red. Blom, Lamberts, 158.

[40] M. Prak, *Hollandia,* 50–51.

[41] Mulder, Doedens, Kortlever, *Geschiedenis van Nederland,* 182. Siehe noch: P. J. van Winter, "De Acte van Navigatie en de Vrede van Breda", *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis der Nederlanden,* 4 (1949), 44, 53.

[42] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte,* 118.

dem französischen Dauphin und der spanischen Infantin. Die Franzosen sollten weiterhin das von ihnen besetzte Katalonien räumen und dafür die spanischen Niederlanden erhalten. Der Republik wurde der Tausch Maastrichts gegen Antwerpen angeboten. Dies stieß aber bei den niederländischen Ständen auf Widerstand. Es tauchten Stimmen auf, die den Oranier verdächtigten, mit dem Besitz von Antwerpen und der Unterstützung des französischen Königs auch nach der Herrschaft eines Souveräns greifen zu wollen. Dazu kamen noch die militärischen Erfolge der Franzosen, mit denen die französische Gefahr für die Republik konkrete Formen annahm. Während der Waffenstillstandsverhandlungen mit Spanien 1646 in Münster war klar geworden, dass Großmächte in der Nachbarschaft der Republik nicht erwünscht waren. Dieser Gedanke bestimmte dann die niederländische Außenpolitik in den nächsten Jahrzehnten, weshalb die Republik die Herstellung und Wahrung einer Barriere zwischen Frankreich und den Vereinigten Provinzen unterstützte.[43]

Nach dem Pyrenäenfrieden (1659) betrat ein expansionsfreudiges Frankreich die europäische politische Bühne. Die Republik suchte nach Koalitionspartnern. Eine Allianz mit Frankreich, um gegen die See- und Handelsmacht England zu streiten, hätte eine Bedrohung der staatlichen Unabhängigkeit bedeutet, der Kampf gegen Ludwig XIV. mit England als Koalitionspartner hätte dagegen eine gewisse Preisgabe des maritimen Wettbewerbs und eine Änderung der eigenen Innenpolitik bedeutet. Ein distanziertes Einvernehmen gegenüber Frankreich schien die einzige Möglichkeit, zunächst einmal die spanischen Niederlande vor den Ambitionen Frankreichs zu retten. Ein 1662 geschlossener französisch–niederländischer Allianz- und Freundschaftsvertrag klammerte das Schicksal der Südregion aus. Während des Zweiten Englisch–Niederländischen Krieges (1665–1667) fielen die Franzosen zur 'Wahrnehmung' des Devolutionsrechts in die spanischen Niederlande ein. Dies führte rasch zum englisch–niederländischen Frieden von Breda (1667) und ein Jahr später zur englisch–niederländisch–schwedischen Trippelallianz, die dem Schutz der spanischen Niederlande dienen sollte. Ein Jahr später musste Frankreich einen Großteil der eroberten südniederländischen Gebiete wieder herausrücken. Eine Konsequenz des französischen Einfalls war ein spanisch–niederländischer Leihvertrag gewesen, nach dem den Niederlanden gegen einen bestimmten Geldbetrag eine Zahl fester Plätze in den spanischen Niederlanden als Truppen- und Festungsorte übereignet wurde.

Frankreich probierte in dieser Situation, mit England Verhandlungen zu führen. Als Ergebnis dieser Verhandlungen galt der Vertrag von Dover (1670), in dem die Partner einen Angriff auf die Republik vereinbarten. Frankreich sollte die

[43] Ebd., 139–142.

Last des Landkrieges, England die des Seekrieges übernehmen. In einem zweiten Vertrag Ende des Jahres wurde die Eröffnung des Krieges für 1672 festgelegt.[44]

Die neue niederländische Außenpolitik beruhte auf der Ansicht, dass die Existenz der Republik nur durch die Sicherung der Existenz der spanischen Niederlande garantiert und die Erhaltung der Republik aber vor allem eine Garantie für die Wahrung des politischen Gleichgewichts in Europa sei – ein Schutz gegen hegemoniale Bestrebungen Frankreichs. Das Allianzsystem sollte nunmehr ein beständiges sein. Schon 1673 konnte der Oranier beide habsburgischen Häuser in der großen Haager Allianz binden und die Neutralität Englands im Frieden von Westminster 1674 garantieren. Diese Allianz- und Sicherheitspolitik als Instrument der Gleichgewichtspolitik musste durch militärische Maßnahmen, in concreto durch die Nutzung der südlichen Niederlande als Barriere, gestützt werden. Im Frieden von Nimwegen von 1679 gab Ludwig XIV. sechs Städte aus den von ihm eroberten südniederländischen Gebieten an Spanien zurück. Nach dem Krieg der vom Statthalter Wilhelm von Oranien zusammengebrachten zweiten Großen Haager Allianz gegen Frankreich (1689–1697) erstrebte der Oranier bei den Friedensverhandlungen von Rijswijk eine größere Zahl von festen Plätzen, die stark gegen die französische Nordgrenze verschoben lagen. Er konnte zwar diese Ideallinie nicht erreichen, schloss aber im folgenden Jahr einen Vertrag mit dem Gouverneurgeneral in den spanischen Niederlanden, Max Emanuel von Bayern, ab, nach dem Truppen der Republik in acht südniederländischen Festungen stationiert werden durften.[45]

Man hätte denken können, dass die Besteigung des englischen Throns durch Wilhelm ein höheres Maß an Sekurität, an Sicherstellung der englischen Allianz bedeutete, gewiss ist aber auch, dass nur mit dem Ratspensionär Heinsius an der Spitze die Allianz auf dem Kontinent getragen werden konnte. Heinsius hinderte den Oranier vor 1697 separat mit Ludwig XIV. Frieden abzuschließen. Ludwig XIV. nahm im November 1700 das gesamte spanische Erbe für seinen Enkel Philipp von Anjou an, besetzte die acht Barriereplätze und nahm die niederländischen Garnisonstruppen gefangen. Hierauf kam am 7. September 1701 die Dritte Große Allianz vom Haag zustande. Sie umfasste die Niederlande, England und den Kaiser. Die Partner waren verpflichtet, die spanischen Niederlande als Barriere für die Republik zurückzugewinnen. Die englischen und die niederländischen Interessen schienen unterschiedlich zu sein. England wollte eine möglichst weitgehende Schwächung Frankreichs, währenddessen die Republik befürchtete, dass an die Stelle französischer Handelskonkurrenz in Amerika und der Levante England treten würde. 1706 forderte die Republik sechzehn Plätze

[44] Borus György, *Az angol–holland forradalom háttere 1660–1690 [Der Hintergrund der englisch–niederländischen Revolution 1660–1690]*, Budapest, 2007., 41–43.
[45] H. Lademacher, *Die Geschichte*, 153.

als Barrierefestungen, darunter Nieuwpoort, Gent und Ostende, Hafenstädte, die für den englischen Handel so wichtig waren. Die Forderung lief schließlich auf die Anerkennung der gesamten spanischen Niederlande als Barriere hinaus. England fürchtete jetzt die Vorherrschaft der Niederlande in diesem Raum bei gleichzeitigem eigenem Ausschluss. Die niederländische Barriere wurde letztendlich 1709 anerkannt, erreichte aber nie wieder den ursprünglichen Umfang.

Der Machtverlust der Republik ist für die Phase 1709–1713 besonders deutlich, denn im Utrechter Frieden blieben die Handelsvorteile aus, England wusste Nieuwpoort und Ostende aus der Barriere herauszulösen und es fehlten auch die gegen Frankreich vorgeschobenen Grenzfestungen. Diese hatte England zuvor den Franzosen zugesagt. Die Republik fand sich plötzlich allein, infolge eigener Koalitionstreue stand sie isoliert, nachdem zuvor Gelegenheit gewesen wäre, separat mit Ludwig XIV. Frieden abzuschließen.

Im Frieden von Utrecht 1713 wurden der Republik sieben Barriereplätze (Namur, Doornik, Warneton, Ypern, Knokke, Veurne) und ein Besatzungsrecht in Dendermonde zugesagt. Weiterhin wurde die Stationierung und Unterhaltung eines permanenten österreichisch–niederländischen Truppenkorps von 35.000 Mann vereinbart. Dieses Abkommen hatte der Republik weitestgehend freien Warenzugang zugesichert.

Mochten die Niederlande zunächst auch noch in dem österreichischen Gebiet eine wirtschaftlich herrschende Stellung einnehmen, mit dem Utrechter Frieden endete auch die zentrale Rolle, die sie bis dahin im europäischen Mächteverband gespielt hatten. Das Land war offensichtlich zu klein, als dass es dauernd den Part einer starken Land- und Seemacht gleichermaßen hätte spielen können. Tatsächlich hat der hohe Steuerdruck die wirtschaftlich-gewerbliche Entwicklung des Landes gestört. Außenpolitisch folgte den großen koalitionspolitischen Ereignissen ein Abstieg.[46]

Konklusion

Wie sich in dieser Studie herausstellte, konnte die Republik der Sieben Vereinigten Niederlande nur für eine beschränkte Zeitspanne die Rolle einer europäischen Großmacht spielen. Was war der Grund hierfür? Im Vergleich zu den europäischen Großmächten der Zeit verfügte die Republik über eine verhältnismäßig kleine Fläche. Wenn man nur den durch die politische Einheit besetzten Raum betrachtet, gehörte die Republik eindeutig zu den Kleinstaaten. Im 17. Jahrhundert erlebte aber das Land wegen der zunehmenden Einwohnerzahl, der spezialisierten Flotte, der vorteilhaften Handelskontakte und der erfolgreichen Verteidigungspo-

[46] Ebd., 155–159.

litik mindestens einige Jahrzehnte lang eine wirtschaftliche und politische Blütezeit. Das kleine Gebiet konnte in der langen Strecke nicht genügend finanzielle Mittel aufbringen, um seine politischen Interessen in den Kriegen verteidigen zu können. Die Republik stand nach dem Frieden von Münster fast ununterbrochen im Krieg entweder mit England oder mit Frankreich oder mit beiden gleichzeitig. Diese Kriege erschöpften das Land auch wirtschaftlich, da die Unterhaltung der Armee viel Geld kostete. Der Frieden von Utrecht bekräftigte nur den Machtverlust der Republik. In den folgenden Jahrhunderten versuchte die Republik, sich aus den großen europäischen Konflikten herauszuhalten. Statt ein Mitspieler in der europäischen Politik sein zu wollen, beschränkte sie ihre Position ab dem ersten Viertel des 18. Jahrhunderts auf die des Zuschauers.

Petri Karonen

Finland in the Swedish realm during the 17th and 18th centuries

This article gives an overview of the role and status of Finland and Finns during the early modern period (c. 1600–1800). I am going to argue that Finland and the Finns had a special rank and status in the Swedish realm. There are three things to be studied here. Firstly: What was considered to constitute "Finland" and how was it defined during the 17th and 18th centuries? Secondly: What was the basis of the special status given to Finland? Thirdly: What kind of problems did exist in the relationship between "Sweden" and "Finland" and how did the Finns express themselves in different situations and arenas?[1]

In this paper, I am not going to assess questions relating to identity or ethnicity. There was not much what can be called "early nationalism" in the eastern part of the Kingdom of Sweden during the 17th and 18th centuries. Finland as a concept was used first and foremost as a form of "pressure" towards the central government in order to get the demands of the Finns met. However, this does not mean, that the Finns did not have a shared solidarity with each other.

---

[1] There is no room for a comprehensive review of the historiography concerning the Swedish-Finnish relationship during their shared history. Some major general works and collections of articles dealing with the history of Sweden (and Finland) during this period include: Michael Roberts (ed.), Sweden's Age of Greatness 1632–1718, New York, 1973; Michael Roberts, The Swedish Imperial Experience 1560–1718, Cambridge, 1979; Michael Roberts, The Age of Liberty. Sweden 1719–1772, Cambridge, 1986; David Kirby, Northern Europe in the Early Modern Period. The Baltic World 1492–1772, London, 1990; Arnold H. Barton, Scandinavia in the Revolutionary Era 1760–1815, Minneapolis, 1986; Michael F. Metcalf, The Riksdag. A History of the Swedish Parliament, New York, 1987; Harald Gustafsson, Political Interaction in the Old Regime. Central Power and Local Society in the Eighteenth-Century Nordic States, Lund, 1994; Eva Österberg and Sølvi Sogner (eds.), People Meet the Law. Control and conflict-handling in the courts. The Nordic countries in the post-Reformation and pre-industrial period, Otta, 2000; Carl Hallendorff and Adolf Schück, History of Sweden, London, 1929; Paul Douglas Lockhart, Sweden in the seventeenth century, Basingstoke, 2004; David Kirby, A Concise History of Finland, Cambridge, 2006; Petri Karonen, Jari Eilola, Marko Hakanen, Marko Lamberg, and Olli Matikainen (eds.), Hopes and Fears for the Future in Early Modern Sweden, 1500–1800, Studia Historica 79, Tampere, 2009.

During the period under consideration, the Swedish realm was a conglomerate state which had a variety of parts and areas. The realm looked like a mosaic especially in the 17th century, when Sweden conquered large areas in the east and in Central Europe. In some of these areas, the inhabitants had "better" rights than Finns (and Swedes), while some groups of people had nothing but duties to carry out.[2]

There were at least two crucial things which divided the "real", or "the hard core", Swedish realm from the later conquests. These two things are very important when analyzing the role of Finland during the 17th and 18th century. Firstly, the inhabitants of Sweden and Finland were represented in the Diet. One of the main tasks of the Diet was to deal with the Crown in financial matters relating to the military and other burdens. Secondly, it was possible to form new military units and maintain the existing troops only with manpower recruited from either Sweden or from Finland. These two areas were seen as loyal and safe in the 17th century, thus it was not considered as a big risk to arm these groups and train them to fight. The mercenaries were used on the battlefields in Central and Eastern Europe during the Thirty Years' War, but they were very expensive and not always reliable in a state of emergency. Sweden was not a very wealthy state, thus it badly needed all the resources it could gain from the land.[3]

The "war" was the key concept in this context. If we look at the history of Sweden and Finland during this time, it is easy to find landmarks which indicate the huge impact of war. Soon after the crisis of the 1590s a reform programme began, making the period of the Swedish great power possible. During this time much attention was paid on Finland. After the Peace of Westphalia (1648), Queen Christina of Sweden was forced to give away large donations to war veterans, the financers of the war and their heirs in Sweden and particularly in Finland. Moreover, the catastrophic wars of 1700–1721 (the Great Northern War), 1741–1743 (The War of the Hats) and Russo-Swedish War of 1808–1809

---

[2] For Sweden as a conglomerate state, see especially Harald Gustafsson, "The conglomerate state. A perspective on state formation in early modern Europe", Scandinavian Journal of History (1998); cf. also Torbjörn Eng, Det svenska väldet. Ett konglomerat av uttrycksformer och begrepp från Vasa till Bernadotte [Swedish forms of dominion: a conglomerate of expressions and concepts from Vasa to Bernadotte], Studia Historica Upsaliensia 201, Uppsala, 2001.

[3] Jan Lindegren, "The Swedish 'Military State', 1560–1720", Scandinavian Journal of History, 10:3 (1985); Sven A. Nilsson, De stora krigens tid. Om Sverige som militärstat och bondesamhälle [The era of the great wars: Sweden as a military state and its agrarian society], Uppsala, 1990; Leon Jespersen (ed.), A Revolution from Above? The Power State of 16th and 17th century Scandinavia, Odense, 2000; Jan Glete, War and the state in early modern Europe. Spain, the Dutch Republic and Sweden as fiscal-military states, 1500–1660, London, New York, 2002.

(Finnish *Suomen sota* – the Finnish War) sealed the destiny of the period of a shared common history between Sweden and Finland.[4]

What Was "Finland" and How Was it Defined During the 17th and 18th Centuries?

It is usually claimed that the early modern Swedish rulers did not know much about the situation and the special problems of Finland. Even the contemporaries spoke at great length about this in their propaganda, especially during the middle of the 18th century, when feelings in the political arena were running high. But if we take a closer look at the documents, this impression seems to be a bit far-fetched. The central administration and the members of the political elite (i.e. council of the realm and the four estates' in the Diet) certainly had knowledge of what happened in Finland; as a matter of fact, the central government was active in gathering information about the situation in Finland – as well as from other areas of the kingdom. Another thing is that although the government was not always able to *do* something about the problems, it was nevertheless neither ignorant nor uninformed.[5]

The information on the situation in every part of the realm was collected and distributed by the central administration to Stockholm. The central administration, i.e. collegiums (Swedish *kollegier*) also prepared various reports. In the Diet, which had increased importance after the fall of autocracy from 1718 on-

---

[4] On the problems of War-to-Peace transition during the Swedish Era, see for instance Petri Karonen & Antero Holmila, "War and Peace in the History of Finland: Social and Political Impacts in Longue Durée, 1590–1950" (forthcoming); Petri Karonen, "Coping with Peace after a Debacle: the Crisis of the Transition to Peace in Sweden after the Great Northern War (1700–1721)", Scandinavian Journal of History (2008); Petri Karonen, "The Council of the Realm and the Quest for Peace in Sweden, 1718–1721," In: Hopes and Fears; Petri Karonen, "The Peace Treaty of Hamina and its Aftermath in Sweden and in Finland", Sjuttonhundratal (2010).

[5] See for instance K. O. Alho, Läntinen tutkijakunta ja sen toiminta vuosina 1725–1727. Eräs Suomen jälleenrakennustyön vaihe isonvihan jälkeen [The Western Commission of Inquiry and its effectiveness from 1725 to 1727], Helsinki, 1940, 1; A. R. Cederberg, "Suomen asema Ruotsin valtakunnassa vapauden aikana. Muutamia yleisiä havaintoja" [Finland's position in the kingdom of Sweden during the Age of Freedom. Some general observations], In: Turun Historiallinen Arkisto IX, Turku, 1945; Einar W. Juva, Suomen tie Uudestakaupungista Haminaan 1721–1808. Historiallinen tutkielma [Finland's road from the Peace of Uusikaupunki to the Peace of Hamina, 1721–1808. A historical study], Helsinki, 1947, chapter VI; Toivo J. Paloposki, Suomen talouden kehittäminen 1750–1760 -lukujen valtiopäiväpolitiikassa [Developing the Finnish economy in the Swedish Diet during the 1750's and 1760's], Forssa, 1976, 134–137.

wards, the estates often heard experts as well as interested parties and stakeholders.[6]

Finland had come into focus already in the beginning of the 17th century, when the Swedish central power was strengthening. In that situation Finland was on the one hand seen as a periphery, which, however, had a clear potential to improve its performance. On the other hand, Finland and its resources were desperately needed, because the realm was involved in a number of simultaneous wars. One important solution was to concentrate the whole Finland under one man: a number of general-governors were sent to Finland from the 1620s to the 1660s. The general-governors practically had viceregal powers within their administrative areas. At the same time, Sweden developed a well-functioning provincial administration which both monitored the subjects more closely throughout the kingdom and provided information to the ruler in Stockholm.[7]

Even so, a definition of what "Finland" was during the 17th and 18th centuries is not easy to find in manuscripts or other documents. The definition varied widely during the period under consideration, but even in the 17th century Finland was most likely to have been seen as an area consisting of several administrative districts. More often than not, "Finland" consisted of districts of Finland Proper, Tavastia, Satakunta, Savonia and Karelia (without the province of Käkisalmi). In addition, the district of Ostrobothnia and the Åland islands were connected to Finland during the 17th century by the administrative, judicial and ecclesiastical systems. In the 18th century, Finland was understood as the eastern part of the realm even in official texts. At that time the formerly not uncommon concept of "Finland *and* Ostrobothia" disappeared completely. From then on, it was usual to divide the kingdom into two parts in *administrative* texts: the first part was named as "the realm" (Swedish *Rike*), i.e. Sweden, and the second one was the "Grand Duchy" (Swedish *Storfurstendömet*), i. e. Finland.[8]

---

[6] Voitto Ahonen, Jälleenrakennuksen politiikka ja talous. Kaupunkien toipuminen isostavihasta noin vuoteen 1740 [Reconstruction and economic policy. Recovery of the Finnish towns after the Great Wrath], Helsinki, 1988; Aulis J. Alanen, "Suomen provinssikonttori ja suomalaisuuskysymys 1700-luvun keskivaiheilla" [The Finnish provincial office and the question of Finnishness in the mid-18th century Sweden], In: Juhlajulkaisu K. R. Melanderin kunniaksi hänen täyttäessään 80 vuotta 18/11 1938, Historiallinen Arkisto 44, Helsinki, 1938.

[7] For instance Erkki Lehtinen, Hallituksen yhtenäistämispolitiikka Suomessa 1600-luvulla (1600–n. 1680) [The governmental unifying policy in Finland in the 17th century], Helsinki, 1961; Petri Karonen, Pohjoinen suurvalta. Ruotsi ja Suomi 1521–1809 [The Northern great power], Porvoo, 2008; Nils Erik Villstrand, Riksdelen. Stormakt och rikssprängning 1560–1812. Finlands svenska historia 2 [Finland as a part of the Swedish Kingdom. The great power and the disintegration of a Kingdom], Jyväskylä, 2009; Nils Erik Villstrand, Sveriges historia 1600–1721 [A history of Sweden], Värnamo, 2011.

[8] Carl von Bonsdorff, "Finlands förra ställning inom det svenska riket" [The position of Finland in the Swedish Realm], Historisk Tidskrift för Finland (1919); Matti Klinge,

To illustrate the spatial dimensions of Finland it is useful to present some examples of contemporary maps from the 17th and 18th centuries. The first map was produced in the 1660s by a famous Dutch cartographer, Johan Blaue, who drew this map with the help of Swedish information. The map shows the Grand Duchy of Finland with its districts and their coat of arms.

Map 1. Blaeu, Joan., Magnus Ducatus Finlandiae, [Amsterdam], [1662]. Source: The electronic map collections at the University of Jyväskylä, Department of History and Ethnology

---

Bernadotten ja Leninin välissä. Tutkielmia kansallisista aiheista [Between Bernadotte and Lenin. Studies in national issues], Helsinki-Porvoo, 1975; Matti Klinge, Kaksi Suomea [Two Finlands], Helsinki, 1982; Harald Gustafsson, Political Interaction in the Old Regime. Central Power and Local Society in the Eighteenth-Century Nordic States, Det nordiska forskningsprojektet Centralmakt och lokalsamhälle – beslutsprocess på 1700-talet, Publikation 6, Lund, 1994; Jonas Nordin, Ett fattigt men fritt folk. Nationell och politisk självbild i Sverige från sen stormaktstid till slutet av frihetstiden [A people of poverty and liberty: National and political self-image in Sweden from the late age of greatness to the end of the age of liberty], Eslöv, 2000; Petri Karonen, ”De finska borgarna och begreppet ’Finland’. Om borgarståndet och dess krav på ständertidens riksdagar” [The Finnish bourgeoisie and the concept of ”Finland”. The burghers on the Diet at the age of freedom], In: Maktens mosaik. Enhet, särart och självbild i det svenska riket, Eds. Max Engman & Nils Erik Villstrand, Helsingfors, Stockholm, 2008.

Ethnology.Samuel Gustaf Hermelin's laudable map dating from the end of the 18th century illustrates the situation at the point when the common history of Finland and Sweden was about to end. The different provinces are marked with different colours and it is possible to piece together the future Finland already in this picture. Moreover, the map shows the difficult defense position of Finland, because the eastern border was drawn to the Kymi-river after the disastrous War of the Hats in the 1740's.

Map 2. Samuel Gustaf Hermelin,
Charta öfwer Storfurstendömet Finland, Stockholm, 1799.
Source: The electronic map collections at the University of Jyväskylä,
Department of History and Ethnology

The special role of Finland can be noticed quite easily during the 17th century in the *Riksdag*, i.e. the Diet, where a strict distinction was made between the Crown resolutions directed at the subjects in the Finnish districts on the one hand and in districts in Sweden on the other hand. Contemporaries often referred to specific idiosyncrasies and manners of the people in the "particular half of the realm", but this should not be interpreted too literally, as it is quite clear that the other parts of the Swedish realm had their own kinds of peculiarities. But what is interesting in this context is that "Finland" was often seen as *one* area, although the differences between, for example, Finland Proper and Savonia were marked.[9]

The Swedish Realm was judicially a united and undivided entity. Finland had no constitutional status within the kingdom; that is why the often used term "Sweden-Finland" is not correct – it is a rather anachronistic and unhistorical concept. The legislation as well as the secular and religious authorities and the administration were usually the same on both sides of the Gulf of Bothnia. The subjects in Sweden and in Finland had the same rights as well as the same duties.

For the contemporary lawyers the concept "Kingdom" (Swedish *rike*) referred to the area where the Swedish law was in force and to the areas that were represented in the Diet. Such a definition differed in a significant way from both the practices of the administration and the views of many members of the Estates for whom the basic categorization of the empire was the division of the kingdom and the grand duchy. We know many examples from the 18th century in which Finland is not counted as belonging to the kingdom. In these cases the concept "the kingdom" meant exclusively the Swedish part (Swedish *Svealand*, *Götaland* and *Norrland*) of the realm, while "the Grand Duchy of Finland" was intended to include the so-called Swedish Finland and Ostrobothnia. Thus the geographical Finland was perceived in a flexible and impartial way.[10]

[9] See for instance, Karonen, Pohjoinen suurvalta; cf. Eng, Det svenska väldet; Jan Samuelson, Eliter, riket och riksdelningen. Sociala nätverk och geografiska mobilitet mellan Sverige och Finland 1720–1820 [Elites, kingdom and the dividing of the Realm. Social networks and geographic mobility between Sweden and Finland, 1720–1820], Skrifter utgivna av svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland 705, Helsingfors, 2008.

[10] For instance, Erkki Lehtinen, "Suomen asema Ruotsin suurvallassa" [Finland's position in the Swedish Realm at the 17th century], In: Historian päivät 1985, Historiallinen Arkisto 88, Helsinki, 1986; Sten Carlsson, "Finland och det svenska riket" [Finland and the Swedish Realm], In: Finland i det svenska riket, Ed. Sulo Huovinen, Stockholm, 1986.

The Changes in the Role of Finland Over Time

The importance of Finland in the Swedish realm varied over time during the period under consideration. In the second part of the 16th century, Finland's role as a guardian against Russia laid a heavy burden on the dwellers of the Finnish side of the realm, as most of the financial costs of warfare were collected from Finland during the 25 years long war against Russia, lasting from the 1570s to the mid-1590s. (Long Wrath, 1570–1595).

The Club War in Finland (1596–1597) and the end of the "crisis of the 1590s" in Sweden was a major turning point in the history of Sweden. The turbulent era began right after the death of King John III in 1592. This period of political confrontations and civil war lasted up until the beginning of the 17th century and caused serious damage, especially to the Finnish peasantry and the high-commanding noble officers in Finland, who had had a very strong position in Finland during the 25-years war against Russia.[11]

The usurper Duke Charles (b. 1550, d. 1611) – known later as King Charles IX (1604–1611) – used very harsh methods to "tame the Finnish noble-lords". In Finnish historical research, this period has traditionally been described as a period in which there was a loss of the special status of Finland and the Finns. On the other hand, due to the fact that the Club War was a real catastrophe for the peasants, there has been some tendency to see the role of the Finnish peasantry as repressed and crushed.

These perceptions are both partly true. But if we raise the whole question to the macro-level and if we are more interested in the situation of the Swedish realm as a *state*, it becomes quite easy to conclude that the aftermath of the cri-

[11] The Club War has not been adequately examined as part of the general crisis which affected the *whole* of Sweden in the 1590s and which had contemporary parallels elsewhere in Europe. On the debate, see esp. Eric Anthoni, Konflikten mellan hertig Carl och Finland. Konfliktens uppkomst och hertigens seger [The conflict between Duke Charles and Finland. Conflict's origins and the Duke's victory], Helsinki, 1935; Eric Anthoni, Konflikten mellan hertig Carl och Finland. Avvecklingen och försoningen [The conflict between Duke Charles and Finland. The closure and reconciliation], Helsingfors, 1937; Pentti Renvall, Kuninkaanmiehiä ja kapinoitsijoita Vaasakauden Suomessa [King's men and the mutineers in 16th century Finland], Turku, 1949; Pentti Renvall, "Ruotsin vallan aika" [The period of the Swedish rule], In: Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia 1, Helsinki, 1962; Heikki Ylikangas, Nuijasota [The Club War], 3rd edition, Keuruu, 1996; Kimmo Katajala (ed.), Northern Revolts. Medieval and Early Modern Peasant Unrest in the Nordic Countries, Helsinki, 2004; Mirkka Lappalainen, Susimessu. 1590-luvun sisällissota Ruotsissa ja Suomessa [Civil War in Sweden and in Finland at the 1590s], Helsinki, 2009; [the old text continues from here: "in general…"] in general see also Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith (eds.), The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century, 2nd edition, London, 1997.

sis of the 1590s was a victory for the king and for the state governed by a strong central administration. Whereas it may have been possible for the members of the nobility to act in ways which had no legal basis or which were not justified at all in wartime during the war between Sweden and Russia, in the new situation this was very carefully rooted out from the realm.

It was clear that from the beginning of the 17th century all of the peripheries or even very well-to-do-regions and their inhabitants had much more difficulties in continuing to act the way they used to. At the same time, the poor and not very urbanized kingdom was embroiled in many long and very expensive wars which demanded even more resources from all the regions from the geographically large country. This is why the subjects of the King of Sweden, even on the eastern side of the Gulf of Bothnia, were closely subjugated under the new and efficient administrative system of the Swedish Crown. The "new order" was led from one centre, i. e. Stockholm. This meant an end to the local diversity or semi-independent areas. As a matter of fact, this was a general phenomenon that stretched across the whole of the Kingdom of Sweden.

The central government in Stockholm paid serious attention to Finland in the Age of Greatness (from ca 1620 to 1720), especially during the first half of the 17th century. It was during this time that the central government sent Finland several general-governors with the task to fulfill the government plans. The government desperately needed the resources which could be collected from the eastern parts of the realm. The system of general-governors was subsequently introduced to other parts of the realm too.

The Great Northern War (1700–1721) in which Sweden was overrun by the Russians was, in particular, a significant turning point in the status of Finland. The horrors of the Great Wrath in Finland and the loss of large territories from the eastern borders of the realm – especially the areas of the Karelian Isthmus – on the one hand weakened the possibilities to defend the eastern parts of the kingdom, but on the other hand strengthened the Finns' demands from the crown. The dwellers of the Grand Duchy of Finland discovered that it was important to make collective pleas if they wanted to gain some results. Right after the peace treaty of Uusikaupunki (1721), the Finns succeeded in gaining many tax-free years for their ruined domiciles and, moreover, their demands did not stop there.[12]

The central government did not pay much attention to the defence of the eastern parts of the realm during the 1720s and 1730s. The main reason for this was the illusion that Sweden could retake the areas it had lost in the Great Northern War. After the losses of the War of the Hats in the 1740s, this attitude changed and the defence of Finland became a priority in the defence plans of

[12] Kustaa H. J. Vilkuna, Viha. Perikato, katkeruus ja kertomus isostavihasta [The Great Wrath]. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 229, Helsinki, 2005; Karonen, Coping; Karonen, The Council.

the kingdom. Two strong fortresses were built on the eastern border. The construction of Sveaborg (i.e. Castle of Sweden) and Svartholma fortifications eased the anxiety of the Finns who felt that they had been left alone with the enemy already two times during the first half of the 18th century.[13]

Critical voices rose every once in a while during the 18th century, but most of the Finns were loyal to the Swedish Crown and the king of Sweden. It is possible that "Finns" did not care much about the "Swedes", but the monarch was the rallying point which connected these two parts together. The most remarkable exception to this rule were those few members of the nobility who during the second part of the 18th century, and especially during the 1780s, were active in making plans for forming some kind of "Finnish separatist movement". But these actions were not realistic. Thus, on the threshold of Finnish autonomy there were not many individuals who wanted to change the ruler from the Swedish king to the czar of Russia. The strongest opponents to the Russian rule came, not surprisingly, from the peasantry. The burghers were also very suspicious towards the new rule, as they were not sure about the nature of the czarist government. They were especially afraid of losing their rights and privileges granted by the Swedish crown. The new situation was not so problematic for the clergy and the nobility, because they could lean on their special skills and status, even under Russian rule.[14]

"Swedes" and "Finns" in the Early Modern Period

For the representatives of three upper estates in Finland – i.e. the nobility, the clergy and the burghers – the status of the Finnish language was not a big problem, because all the members of these groups had a good knowledge of Swedish and they had also access to the tacit knowledge of the manners and general behaviour of the ruling classes. The language was not a a point of contention in

[13] Michael Roberts, The Age of Liberty. Sweden 1719–1772, Cambridge, 1986; Einar W. Juvelius, Suomen puolustuskysymys ison- ja pikkuvihan välisenä aikana [The question of defence of Finland between the Greater and Lesser Wrath, 1721–1741], Helsinki, 1919; Jean Häggman, Studier i frihetstidens försvarspolitik. Ett bidrag till Sveriges inre historia 1721–1727 [Studies on the defence policy in the Age of Liberty. A contribution to Sweden's internal history], Stockholm, 1922.

[14] Martin Hårdstedt, Finska kriget [Russo-Swedish War], Stockholm, 2006; Max Engman, Pitkät jäähyväiset. Suomi Ruotsin ja Venäjän välissä vuoden 1809 jälkeen [The Long Goodbye. Finland Between Sweden and Russia after 1809], Juva, 2009; Karonen, The Peace; Petri Karonen, "Introduction: Sweden, Russia and Finland 1808–1809", In: Monetary boundaries in Transition. A North European Economic History and the Finnish War 1808–1809, Eds. Cecilia von Heijne and Tuukka Talvio, The Museum of National Antiquities Stockholm, Studies 16, Huskvarna, 2010.

the 17th century at all; as a matter of fact, there are only a few remarks relating to the language before the 18th century in the sources. One of the most famous is the story about the hated and feared Finnish "iron-marshal" and a councillor of the realm Klaus Fleming who was one of the prime movers during the crisis of the 1590's and a loyal supporter of King Sigismund of Sweden and Poland. Klaus Fleming was called a "sootnose" (Finnish *nokinenä*)**,** because of his unsophisticated outward appearance. His Swedish language was also criticized for being very broken. Later, these kinds of remarks disappeared. The main reason for this was, of course, the improved language skills of the members of the three upper estates.[15]

The problem of not understanding Swedish was the worst among the peasantry, because most of them spoke only Finnish. During the time when men were needed to fight in a war, and the duty had to be done, this was a serious matter for the Crown and its officials at the local level. The peasants made numerous complaints about problems that resulted from the office-holders who lacked knowledge of Finnish. The Crown took these complaints seriously and tried to ease the friction. In many cases the peasants were satisfied with the results, which suggests that the language was not the main issue here. In these matters the Crown efficiently used the knowledge of the local priests to translate official declarations etc. The problems were, of course, much more difficult, if the priest did not have a sufficient knowledge of the language, as sometimes was the case when priests from Sweden were placed in completely Finnish speaking regions.[16] The problems associated with using the Swedish language for the peasants were thus based on practical reasons and not reasons concerning principles.

However, in the 17th century, and even more so in the 18th century, the three upper estates frequently complained about the appointments for official positions in Finland. As already mentioned, the language was not an issue for these groups. The repeated complaints concerning the problems of the people of "the Finnish Nation" (Swedish *den Finska Nationen*) should therefore be interpreted as arguments relating to the practises of the society of privileges (which the Swedish society in the 17th to 18th century certainly was) and – in many cases this was the main reason – as attempts to secure a person's own status and to gain benefits. Professor Sten Carlsson proved in 1962, that the "Finns" – that is mostly, "The Swedish speaking Finns" – had occupied, during the 18th century, almost every seat of the official posts in Finland. Nevertheless, they argued that

---

[15] For instance Karonen, Pohjoinen suurvalta; Villstrand, Sveriges historia.

[16] Erkki Lehtinen, "Vieras virkakieli ja suomalaiset talonpojat n. 1650–1735" [Foreign official language and the Finnish peasants, c. 1650–1735], Historiallinen Arkisto 55, Helsinki, 1955; Villstrand, Riksdelen.

the King's subjects from the eastern part of the realm were not treated justly in the appointments.[17]

Above all, the burghers from the Finnish towns were very active to separate "Finland" from "Sweden" in their petitions and complaints at the Diet in the 18th century. They argued repeatedly that the town-dwellers on the eastern side of the realm had much inferior possibilities to conduct business than their counterparts in Sweden. In particular they contrasted the situation between the capital Stockholm and Finland. This was a very effective argument, and the merchants of the Finnish towns got all they dared to ask from the Crown. Perhaps this seems a little surprising, as in Finnish historical research there has been the impression that the Finns did not succeed in their demands at all. But the main reason for these, sometimes very aggressively expressed, arguments was mainly the economic benefits. Thus, it was not the question of separation or a "divorce" from Sweden.[18]

Conclusion

The first basic finding of this article is that Finland and the Finns had a special status in the Swedish realm during the early modern period. Secondly, "Finland" was understood in different ways in different contexts. Thirdly, Finland was seen as a valuable resource and a "buffer" against possible attacks from the East. Fourthly, the status of the Finnish language was not a big problem for the representatives of three upper estates in Finland – i.e. the nobility, the clergy and the burghers. The situation was less good for the peasants and other inhabitants in the countryside.

The war, and especially the relationship with Russia, played a crucial role in the common history of Sweden and Finland and especially for the Finns already in the early modern period. The "war" was the key concept in this context, having a huge impact for the Swedish and Finnish society in the Early Modern period.

---

[17] Sten Carlsson, Bonde – präst – ämbetsman. Svensk ståndscirkulation från 1680 till våra dagar [A Farmer – a priest – an official. Swedish social circulation from 1680 to the present day], Stockholm, 1962; Karonen, De finska; cf. Samuelson, Eliter.

[18] Petri Karonen, Patruunat ja poliitikot. Yritysjohtajien taloudellinen ja yhteiskunnallinen toiminta Suomessa 1600–1920 [Masters and politicians: business managers as economic and political actors in Finland, 1600–1920], Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 217, Tampere, 2004; Petri Karonen, "The Swedish Diet as a Forum for Gathering Commercial and Political Information", In: Scandinavia in the Age of Revolutions. Nordic Political Cultures, 1740–1820, Eds. Pasi Ihalainen, Michael Brensgbo, Karin Sennefelt, Patrik Winton, Cornwall, 2011.

Table 1.
The main factors behind the special status of Finland, ca 1600–1800.

Factor	Explanation
WAR	General importance is decreasing relatively during the 18th century.
RUSSIA	Importance is relatively small during the 17th century, but increases greatly after that.
ECONOMIC FACTORS	
Taxes	Including tolls etc.
Products	Tar, timber, grain etc.
Resources	Manpower for the military; capable officials for the administration etc.; forests; "free" soil which can be donated (donations only possible in the 17th century)
OTHER FACTORS	
Different institutions and symbols	Academy of Turku, Court of Appeals (Turku, Vasa), the King of Sweden as a Grand Duke of Finland
Problems of controlling the area	Large administrative districts, the uncertainty and "leaking" of the east border – Finland as an "abnormal" area as seen by the high-ranking officials in the capital of Sweden
Finnish language	Not a primary question in the early modern period, but very important for the peasants

It is also important to notice that already in the beginning of the 17th century the Swedish realm was a highly centralized and controlled state. This meant that the government and the administration had a pretty good understanding of what happened in different regions. In terms of its territory and its administration, Sweden was a great power, but not in terms of its material resources. Thus, the central administration in Stockholm usually did know a lot about the realities and practices in Finland. Most exceptions were the harsh war-time periods, especially in the beginning of the 18th century.

Table 1 pulls together the arguments presented above. In this table it is possible to see some of the main factors which might be considered important in relation to the special status of Finland during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Finland's relative share of products and services in the Swedish realm was much higher than her population. On the other hand, taxes were the "weak point" of Finland from the point of view of the central government.[19] However, the most important keywords here are "war" and "Russia", and almost everything else was dependant on these two concepts: warfare needed vast resources and the role of Russia became greater during this period.

[19] Sven-Erik Åström, "Finlands tribut till Sverige" [Finland's tribute to Sweden], In: Symposium för historiker från Sverige och Finland, Helsingfors, 1980, 90–102; Sven-Erik Åström, "The role of Finland in the Swedish national and war economies during Sweden's period as a great power", Scandinavian Journal of History 11 (1986), 135–147.

Erzsébet Bodnár

The Russian Diplomacy and the Swedish/Finnish Question, 1801–1815*

Several works have analyzed the relationship between Russia and Sweden in depth, as well as have seen the diplomatic background and history of frequent Russian–Swedish wars. However, the reconstruction of the changes in Russian–Swedish relationships, with the help of the diplomatic sources of the period, has not been so far duly reconstructed. The events in the North constitute only a small particle of the Napoleonic Wars, nevertheless they provide important details to have a more thorough examination of the diplomatic history of the period, as well as to grasp the right perspectives of Russian foreign policy in the Swedish Question.

The present paper gives an overview of the changes in the Russian–Swedish relationship in 1801–1815, based on published diplomatic sources from the Russian Empire's Archives for Foreign Affairs (Moscow). It investigates the circumstances that led the two states towards cooperation during the Napoleonic Wars, and the principles of Russian foreign affairs. It explores the causes of the outbreak of the last Russian–Swedish war (1808–1809), and clarifies how the consequences affected the relation between the states and the international affairs.

The year 1801 brought forward essential changes in the history of the Russian State. Alexander I came into power by the Palace Revolution ('dvortsovyi perevorot') in March 1801. The new Sovereign and his diplomacy did their best in order to keep away from the European conflicts, and maintain good relationships with the European powers. Alexander I inherited a number of agreements[1] and obligations from his predecessor, Paul I (1796–1801).[2] The main problem was the con-

* This paper is part of a research project in the framework of the Historical Russistics Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA–ELTE Történeti Ruszisztikai Kutatócsport 2006TK 1194).

1 Vneshniaia politika Rosszii 19 i nachala 20 veka, [hereinafter VPR], Dokumenti Rossiiskago Ministerstva Inostrannikh g'el, Ser. I. t. 1. Moskva, 1960. Prim., 662., 703. The Russian–Swedish agreement on friendship, trade and naval shipping was concluded on 1 March 1801.

2 Istorii vneshniei politiki Rossii. Pervaia polovina 19. veka. Ot voin Rossii prot'iv Napoleona do Parizhskogo mira 1856 g., Moskva, 1995. 27.; Janet M. Hartley, *Alexander I*, London, 1994. 61.

flict with England, and the proximity of the English fleet to the Russian capital, St Petersburg as well. During 1800 Paul I revived the League of Armed Neutrality with the participation of Denmark, Sweden and Prussia. The merchant ships were to be guarded by armed forces from that time on. However, England did not accept the situation and the British fleet appeared off Copenhagen in March 1801, and with their cannons set the capital of Denmark on fire.[3] Alexander I was committed to the League of Neutrality because of his father's politics, and he promised his allies not to leave them alone, but at the same time emphasized that this policy needed to be modified and adjusted towards the interests of London.[4] On 6 April 1801 Alexander I ordered his ambassador, S. R. Vorontsov, to London to make the English Cabinet understand: „*The restoration of the friendly terms between Russia and England depends on the ceasure of the state of war against Denmark and Sweden"*.[5] On 9 April 1801 the Tsar informed the Russian ambassador in Stockholm, A. Ya. Budberg about the steps to make towards England.[6] The Russian Government invited Sweden and Denmark to St Petersburg to attend the English–Russian negotiations about entering into a sea convention, but the two powers did not take the opportunity.[7] The new English–Russian Sea Convention was signed on 5 June 1801.[8]

After having solved the conflict with England, the Sovereign informed his diplomats of the essentials of the new Russian foreign policy. He announced that he would stay away from European affairs, emphasizing that such a huge country as Russia did not need any further territorial growth. He did not wish to take part in European conflicts and was to provide peace for his nation.[9] In fact, he believed in the policy of non-alignment and peace, and was to intervene into European conflicts only if necessary. „*If I happened to take up arms […] I would do it only to protect my nation, or if the peace of Europe would be threatened by the danger of*

---

[3] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 5. Aleksandr I generalu ot kavalerii P. A. Palenu, 8 (20) aprelia 1801 g. 17.; Prim., 8., 698.

[4] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Moskva, 1960. Dok., 3. Aleksandr I poslu v Stokgolme A. Ya. Budbergu, 9. (21) aprelia 1801 g., 18–19.; H. Ragsdale, „Prosvishchonnii absolutizm i vneshniaia politika Rossii v 1762–1815 godakh", *Otechestvennaia istoriia* 3 (2001) 15.

[5] VPR, Ser. I. t 1. Aleksandr I S. R. Vorontsovu, 6 (18) aprelia 1801 g., 16.

[6] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 6. Aleksandr I poslu Stokgolme A. Ya. Budbergu, 9 (21) aprelia 1801 g., 22–23.

[7] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Prim. 19., 699.

[8] See the content of the convention in detail: VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 9. Anglo–russkaia morskaia konvenciia, 5 (17) iiunia 1801 g., 28–39.

[9] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 12. Aleksandr I poslanniku v Berline A. I. Kriudeneru, 5 (17) iiulia 1801 g., 49–50. The instructions containing the new principles and alternatives of Russian foreign policy were handed to A. I. Markov, Russian ambassador in Paris on 27 June 1801, and S. R. Vorontsov, Russian ambassador in London on 5 July 1801. See details in: VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Prim., 20., 699.

the pursuit of ambition"[10] – he wrote. Actually, with this foreign policy the Russian Cabinet wished to stabilize the presence of Russia on the Continent with a system of agreements, furthermore, to keep her position as a great power and have the European affairs influenced with her policy of isolation.[11] With his first steps in foreign policy, the Russian Sovereign attempted to restore his diplomatic relationship with England (it had duly occurred on 5 June 1801), as well as to strengthen his alliance with Sweden, in order to establish friendly terms with Austria and Prussia, and sign a peace with France. However, this latter was only to take place after long negotiations on 8 October 1801.

Central Europe became the main axle of Russian foreign policy.[12] Beside the German States the role of the Northern States, Denmark and Sweden was growing in Russian European Diplomacy. On the one hand, they neighboured Russia, which became more and more important considering the protection of the borders. On the other hand, this connection provided Russian Diplomacy with a much wider range of opportunities on the international battlefield. The most important task, which the Russian Government was aiming at, was to prevent French influence in the area. Alexander I considered it necessary to build a barrier from the German States that would be able to prevent French territorial expansion.[13] In this effort, Sweden proved to be a partner, since the Swedish Cabinet was afraid France attack their North-German territories.

Finally, on 18 March 1802, after long-lasting negotiations, Sweden also became part of the English–Russian Sea Convention, which Denmark had already signed on 11 October the previous year. The Swedish Cabinet was not totally satisfied with the results achieved by the Russians, they disapproved that the interests of the Neutral States had not been appropriately enforced. On 16 May 1802 Alexander I, in his letter to the Russian ambassador in the Hague, G. O. Stackelberg, gave voice to a different opinion. *„I am absolutely sure of the fact that neither Denmark, nor Sweden would have ever been given such concessions as they have obtained now, thanks to my mediation. Although, the accession of Sweden to the convention came into being, the case came to an end at last"*.[14] In his letter, Alexander highlighted that apart from Sweden and Russia being on friendly terms, he was afraid that Sweden, struggling with serious financial problems, would do anything to accept the French help to improve her economic situation. *„It is*

[10] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 12. Aleksandr I poslanniku v Berline A. I. Kriudeneru, 5 (17) iiulia 1801 g., 50.

[11] Istoriia vneshniei politiki Rossii, (1995), 33.; P. W. Schroeder, *Transformation of European Politics*, Oxford, 1994. 29–30.

[12] Istoria vneshniei politiki Rossii, (1995), 33.

[13] Ibid. 39–40.

[14] VPR, Ser. I. t. 1. Dok., 78. Aleksandr I poslanniku v Gage G. O. Stakelbergu, 16 (28) maia 1802 g., 213.

widely known that the Cabinet in Stockholm is making attempts to get closer to the French Cabinet. The King does not seem to like the French Government, but on the other hand, this Sovereign has hostile emotions towards England, which could remain, resulting in an approach to France, particularly if the First Consul shows that he is willing to help Sweden, which is in extreme financial situation".[15] On 16 May 1802 he formed a similar opinion in his secret dispatch sent to his ambassador in Madrid, I. M. Murav'ov-Apostol, which was also dispatched later, on 26 July, to his ambassador in Berlin, M. M. Alopeus. He kept on emphasizing the fact that the relationship with Sweden was friendly, whereas he was afraid of the rapprochement between France and Sweden. *„Beside being neighbours I am in a particularly close relationship with Gustav IV"*[16] – he wrote to Alopeus, hoping that the family relations connecting him to the Swedish Sovereign would protect the friendly cooperation, and would also keep Sweden beside Russia.

At the beginning of 1801, the aim of Russian foreign policy was to strengthen the friendship with Sweden, and they seem to have been successful. However, from the autumn of 1802 the Russian–Swedish connection appeared to have slackened, because of the Swedes' French policies. This is also shown by the fact that Alexander I did not only ask information from his ambassadors in European courts, but also from Constantinople, Ambassador A.Ya. Italinsky. He entrusted him *„to observe, preparing for any circumstances, the relationship between the Swedish Mission and the Turkish Ministries"*.[17] The Russian Government also relied on the possibility that the French Government would refresh its old „Eastern Barrier System", and would make Sweden and the Ottoman Empire stand by France and against Russia. The concern of the Russian Cabinet is manifest in the letter of A. R. Vorontsov, Foreign Minister, written on 6 October 1802, in which he asked a detailed report from D. M. Alopeus – on duty in Stockholm from August 1801 –, about the financial situation and the condition of the Swedish army and fleet. Beyond that, he ordered him *„to focus on the political relationship of Sweden with other states"*.[18]

However, from the end of 1803 onwards the European situation changed along with the Russian standpoint with regard to Sweden. It was again seen as a strong ally, which was related to the newly modified Russian foreign conception. The policy of isolation, announced at the beginning of 1801, failed, and it became

[15] Ibid. 214.

[16] VPR, Ser. I., t. 1. Dok., 98. Aleksandr I poslanniku v Berline M. M. Alopeusu, 26 iiulia (7 avgusta) 1802 g., 265.; Prim. 154., 712. IV. Gustav Adolf married the Princess of Baden, who was the sister of Alexander's wife.

[17] VPR, Ser. I., t. 1. Dok., 110. Aleksandr I poslanniku v Konstantinopolie A. Ya. Italinskomu, 30 avgusta (11 sentiabria) 1802 g., 286.

[18] VPR, Ser. I., t. 1. Dok., 120. Ministr inostrannih g'el A. R. Vorontsov poverennomu v g'elah v Stokgolme D. M. Alopeusu, 6 (18) oktiabria 1802 g., 311.

clear that Russia should take a harder line in European affairs against the expansive policy of France. The Treaty of Amiens (25 March 1802) between England and France proved to be short-lived. After 12 May 1803 warfare was resumed between the two states, and the Russian Diplomacy made keen efforts to enter into a military alliance with Prussia, and later, in December 1803, with Austria. After Russia's unsuccessful attempts to solve the conflicts between the two German States, and make a coalition with them against Napoleon – Russia concluded an agreement with Prussia in May 1804, and with Austria in November the same year –, the necessity of a Russian–Swedish alliance came to to forefront.

Napoleon being elected emperor, the dramatic incidents in 1804 (the execution of the Duke of Enghien), and the French policy towards the German States filled the Swedish Government with fear. All these are clear from the minutes of the discussions of A. A. Czartoryski, the Russian Foreign Minister, and Karl Stedingk, the Swedish ambassador in St Petersburg. The ambassador reported that *„the King of Sweden was afraid that Swedish Pomerania was in danger, since its location makes it a stronghold, and there is the port of Stralsund as well, a good catch, which will surely arouse the interest of the First Consul"*.[19] For this reason, he enquired *„whether his Sovereign could count on the help of Russia if the French start military operations in Pomerania"*.[20] The ambassador received a satisfying answer, since the Russian Government was ready to help Sweden at the smallest sign of danger. Furthermore, Alexander I offered his diplomatic services to obtain English financial support, which the Swedes accepted.[21] On 8 January 1805 Russia made a convention with Sweden in order to protect Northern Germany.[22] The document, consisting of ten Articles and five Secret Articles, was signed by A. A. Czartoryski and D. P. Tatishchev, Secret Counsellor from the Russian side, and Karl Stedingk, Swedish ambassador in St Petersburg, from Swedish side. In the preamble several reasons why the convention was made were listed. The alliance was explained as *„French troops marched into Germany, without paying attention to the neutrality of this Empire, […] sacked Hannover and the Hansa-cities. The French Government went too far. These incidents called the attention of the*

[19] VPR, Ser. I. t 2. Moskva, 1961. Dok., 89. Verbalnaia nota (tovarishcha ministra inostrannikh g'el A. A. Czartoryskogo) svedskomu poslu v St Peterburge Stedingu, 2 (14) maia 1804 g., 56.

[20] Ibid.

[21] VPR, Ser. I. t 2. Prim. 26., 660.The efforts of D. M. Alopeus, Russian ambassador in Stockholm largely contributed to the Russian–Swedish convention concluded on 3 December 1804 and 19 August 1805, in which England ensured Sweden of its financial support to strenghten the Swedish troops stationed in Stralsund.

[22] VPR, Ser. I. t 2. Dok., 89. Russko–svedskaia konvenciia o sovmestnikh gieistviiakh po oborone Severnoi Germanii, 2 (14) ianvaria 1805 g., 267–271. Previously, Russia concluded an alliance with Sweden in Gatchina on 18 October 1799.

Swedish and Russian Sovereign from the beginning. […] The Swedish King should consider the situation of the threatened Swedish Pomerania, which is on the border of Northern Germany invaded by the French army".[23]

The First Article of the convention included that *„in case of a further decline of the relations of France and Sweden, and if the Northern German territories of Sweden are under attack, the Russian Sovereign, in accordance with the Gatchina Agreement, will send troops of 40–50,000, and the Swedish King will have to arm a force of 20–25,000 troops"*.[24] Further Articles established the foundations of the cooperation of the Russian and Swedish Army and Navy. Secret Article No. 1 underlined that *„the alliance is open for those Powers that wish to take part in it"*.[25] Secret Article No. 4 made it clear that *„since the alliance also serves the interests of England, England will give financial help to Sweden in order that it is able to raise a force of 25,000"*.[26] Secret Article No. 5 claimed that *„supposing France attacked either of the parties of the convention, the other one would immediately offer help, and support it with necessary military force"*.[27]

Napoleon being crowned emperor (2 December 1804) accelerated the rapprochement between England and Russia as well. Alexander I sent N. N. Novosiltsev to London to negotiate with Prime Minister William Pitt about the organization of an anti-Napoleonic coalition. It is clear from Novosiltsev's notes of 13 December 1804, taken at his talks with Pitt that the Russians counted on Sweden. As Russia was unable to fight alone, the aim was to organize as great military power as possible, and put it into action against Napoleon. The idea was that *„Russia and England will bring Austria and Prussia into the coalition, to which the Ottoman Empire and Sweden are bound to join, possibly Denmark as well; the central aim of this coalition would be to put an end to the territorial expansion of France, and the barbarous actions of Napoleon"*.[28] In the spring of 1805, the alliance was being negotiated in London, and an agreement was signed on 30 March 1805.[29] The English–Russian alliance, which was to make the foundation of the Third Coalition, and which Sweden officially joined, is regarded, in many respects as a milestone in Russian foreign policy in the period. It became obvious that Russia was unable to stay away from European events, the policy of isolation

[23] Ibid. 267.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid. 269.
[26] Ibid. 270.
[27] Ibid. 271.
[28] VPR, Ser. I. t. 2. Dok., 79. Zapis besedi N. N. Novosiltseva s premier-ministrom Velikobritanii Pittom, 13 (15) giekabria 1804 g., 237.
[29] The complete text of the agreement: VPR, Ser. I. t. 2. Moskva, 1961. Dok., 117. Anglo–russkaia soiuznaia konvenciia o merakh k ustanovleniiu mira v Yevrope 30 marta (11 aprelia) 1805 g., 355–377.

would bring self-isolation, which was definitely not acceptable for such a great power with quite a significant military potential. Furthermore, it also became evident that simply with diplomatic methods the Russian Government is not able to stop the French expansion, interfering into Russian interests. Entering into the Third Coalition meant war for Russia. The Cabinet felt relieved when Sweden allied with Russia in their fight against Napoleon.

From 1804 to 1807, Russia was preoccupied with the struggle against Napoleon. After the defeats of the Third Coalition (1805), of which Sweden was a member, and later those of the Fourth Coalition (1806–1807), Russia was forced to accept the French alliance, along with its burdens, which meant joining the Continental System. After the Treaty of Tilsit (7–9 July 1807), Russia's political sphere in the international battlefield was narrowing, and the situation even worsened since the French alliance dissatisfied Russian nobles.[30] The Treaty of Tilsit put an end to the period of Russian influence in Central Europe, but at the same time gave opportunity to Alexander I to protect the interests of Russia in the North against Sweden, and in the South against the Ottoman Empire. Russia also declared in the Treaty of Tilsit that she would turn Denmark and Sweden against England. Denmark was inclined towards it, whereas Sweden did not join the Continental Blockade introduced against England, and Alexander I used this to prove his attack. This step of his was not really in connection with the economic problems, but rather he felt strategically threatened in the Baltic if the Swedes would have allied with England.[31] Apart from all these incidents, the Russian Government did not wish to enter into war with the Swedish, and did not want to obtain Finland, which, in fact, could have been a necessary step for the protection of Russia in the Baltic. Russia, because of the pressure from France, declared war on England in November 1807. Napoleon hoped that Russia would enter into war with Sweden as well. However, the Russian Cabinet took every pretext to postpone the beginning of the war until February 1808. It created a hopeless situation for Sweden, since keeping its alliance with England foreshadowed the conflict with Russia, but if it had joined the French–Russian alliance, England would have proved a threat.[32]

---

[30] V. M. Bezotosny, „Vnieshnepoliticheskii vybor Rossii na geopoliticheskom prostranstve Yevropi v epokhu 1812 goda", *Otechestvennaia istoriia* 2 (2008) 68.; See also: N. Troicky, *Aleksandr I protiv Napoleona*, Moskva, 2007. 166.; Dominic Lieven, *Russia against Napoleon: the True Story of the Campaigns of War and Peace*, London, 2009. 96.

[31] Hartley, *Alexander I*, 95.

[32] There were two reasons why Sweden insisted on its anti-French position: one was the hatred Gustav Adolphe IV felt against Napoleon, the other was its relation to England. The Swedish Sovereign did not wish to break up the economically important relationship with England, and finally his inflexible policy led to war. See in detail: Matti Klinge „Mezhdunarodniie aspekty finliandskoi voini", *Rossiskaia istoriia* 3 (2009) 82–83.

Napoleon was satisfied while Russia paid a full attention to the North, partly because it was, though formally, to protect the Continental System. What is more, he offered military help, but the French were far too engaged in the war with Spain from the summer of 1808. This is why Napoleon did not want to interfere in the affairs of the North, which was a great relief for Alexander I. The Russian Army soon defeated the Swedish in Finland: a force numbering about 24,000 won over 20,000 badly equipped and poorly trained Swedes and Finns. Only the Fortress of Sveabog, which was responsible for checking the naval route towards Helsinki, was able to hold out for a longer time, but it also capitulated in May. The way to Helsinki was open, Alexander I announced the incorporation of Finland into the Russian Empire.[33] In the spring of 1809 Gustav Adolphe IV was deprived of his power. The Finnish Diet was convoked in Porvoo, and on the same day, 29 March 1809, when the Finnish swore allegiance to Tsar Alexander I, the common Sovereign of Sweden and Finland resigned.[34] The union made Finland a Grand Duchy, what is more, a „peculiar state". „The Finnish nation lifted in the row of nationalities" became the subject of the Russian state, and at the same time received a right of political representation under their Sovereign: the estates could collectively represent the interest of the whole nation. For Alexander I, in the unfavourable international situation, it was important to conciliate Finland soon, and to stabilize the Government with the cooperation of the leading Finnish figures and the estates. In Porvoo, in his sovereign oath, the Tsar promised that the Evangelical religion, the constitution and the privileges of the estates, originating from the Swedish reign, would remain acknowlegded.[35] Finland, as a consequence of the Napoleonic Wars alliance policy, got out of the authority of Sweden, and with the Treaty of Fredrikshamn (5 September 1809) closing the Finnish war, became part of the Russian Empire.

The Fredrikshamn Peace was preceded by negotiations lasting for about a month. The representatives were, from the Russian side N. P. Rumiantsev, Foreign Minister and D. M. Alopeus, ambassador in Stockholm from 1803 to 1808, and from the Swedish side Baron Karl Stedingk, ambassador in St Petersburg from 1792 to the beginning of the Russian–Swedish war, as well as General André Frederich Skjöldebrand. The Swedish and Russian representatives met first on 2 August 1809, but official talks began only the following day. Alopeus made detailed memoranda and a protocol report on the sessions from 2 to 5 August 1809, as a consequence, the parties' points of view in the disputed issues are most clearly shown, and the changes in the content of the Articles of the Treaty could

[33] Hatley, *Alexander I*, 95.
[34] Fred Singleton, *A Short History of Finland*, Cambridge, 1998. 62., 178.
[35] *Finnország története.* [History of Finland] Ed. Anssi Halmesvirta, Debrecen, 2001. 144.

also be easily followed.[36] The negotiations were intensive and supervised by Alexander I himself. The Swedes at the very beginning agreed on passing Finland, as well as joining the Continental Blockade against England. From the side of Sweden an Article was to be amended in order that the import of a few staple goods would be allowed for their citizens. Two questions, however, were for relatively long discussed: the state of the Aland Islands and a clear demarcation of Russian–Swedish (Finnish–Swedish) inland borders. In the first issue Stedingk argued that „*those were never parts of Finland […] and if these islands are annexed to Russia, the population of Stockholm will not even for a single night sleep peacefully, being afraid of a sudden assault, which could be easily laid. Moreover, the occupation of these islands will make it possible to check naval traffic in the Bay of Botten, which could break the contact of the capital with the Northern harbours*".[37] Furthermore, Stedingk told Rumiantsev that he had not been given authority in Stockholm to negotiate about the passing of the Aland Islands. Alopeus noted that „*Rumiantsev was astonished at this, because from the preceding correspondence it should have been known in Stockholm that we will never renounce these isles, since we are aware how important this territory is regarding the protection of Finland*".[38] In issue of the borders the Russian delegates pointed that „*the Russian Sovereign finds it important to push the borders to the North, in order that his successors should not enter into new wars for the causes of a correct demarcation, […] and when they are discussing the borders, natural frontiers will have to be found, with which a new war could have been avoided*".[39] The delegates were not able to discuss the cases of the Aland Islands and the northern borders, because the Russian request was not known in Stockholm, thus, Alopeus was to send a courier for further instructions.

From 5 August 1809 onwards the talks were suspended until the return of the Swedish courier. The same day Rumiantsev sent a letter to Barclay de Tolly, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian army stationed in Finland, in which he reported on the results of the first conference with the Swedish in Fredrikshamn. The Russian Foreign Minister asked Barclay to be prepared in case the war should be continued, since the treaty was not signed.[40] The negotiations started again on 12 August 1809, which was joined by the Danish as well. The Russians did not renounce the Aland Islands, or give up their territorial aims in the question

[36] See in details: VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 79.; Dok., 80.; Dok., 95.; Dok., 100.; Dok., 105.
[37] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Moskva, 1967. Dok., 79. Protokolnaia zapis russko–svedskikh mirnihk peregovorov v Fridrikhsgame s 2 (14) po 5 (17) avgusta 1809 g., 140.
[38] Ibid. 141.
[39] Ibid. 142.
[40] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 80. Ministr inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancev glavnokomanduiushchemu armiiei v Finliangii M. B. Barklaiu-de-Tolli, Fridrikhsgam, 5 (17) avgusta 1809 g., 146.

of the northern frontier of Russia and Sweden.[41] In the meantime, the Russian Foreign Minister, Rumiantsev in his letter of 26 August, let the Tsar know that the peace would be signed soon. He also reported that he had explained his point of view to the Swedish delegate regarding the renewal of the alliance of the Northern States. *„For Stedingk I revealed that my idea is that at the conclusion of peace with the cooperation of Sweden and Denmark we should create the Northern Alliance, and the basis of this alliance, with the help of revising and renewing of the former conditions, […] taking charge of the state of the Baltic, provided by the three monarchies. […] My views were proved to be satisfactory for Stedingk. […] I reassured him with reference to the opinion that Russia has interest in retaining Sweden, apart from the fact that they are at war at the present time, and that Sweden is in a difficult situation as a consequence of its home affairs"*[42] – he wrote. Rumiantsev informed the Sovereign that the Swedish would sign the peace if the Russian agreed on a smaller modification of the frontiers. *„Sovereign, Baron Stedingk has repeated for me that he is ready to sign the treaty with the condition that I am willing to push the frontier as far as the river Torneo".*[43] Rumiantsev asked for the permission of Alexander I, which was given on 27 August 1809. The letter, which the Russian Sovereign sent in return, also proves that he followed the proceedings of the peace negotiations, and kept them under control. In connection with the peace he formed further instructions to Rumiantsev, among others he asked for the creation of an Article, in which Sweden would guarantee the territorial safety of Denmark, and that Russia must not be blamed for the consequences, coming from the choice of the Duke of Augustenbourg in the question of the accession of the Swedish throne.[44] Finally, after negotiating about some minute details, the treaty was signed on 5 September 1809.

---

[41] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 95. Protokolnaia zapis russko–svedskih mirnikh peregovorov v Fridrikhsgame s 12 (24) avgusta po 24 avgusta (5 sentiabria) 1809 g., 179–180. Stedingk wanted to draw the borders along the river Kemi instead of the Calix, which he considered geographically acceptable. However, Rumiantsev argued for the river Calix for the same reasons.

[42] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 97. Ministr inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancev Aleksandru I, Fridrikhsgam, 26 avgusta (7 sentiabria) 1809 g., 185.

[43] Ibid. 186.

[44] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Aleksandr I. ministru inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancevu, 27 avgusta (8 sentiabria) 1809 g., 187. It was after a turning point in Swedish history when after Gustav Adolphe IV, on 25 May 1809 Carl XIII ascended the throne. Since he did not have a male issue, the question of succession immediately arose. The choice fell on a relative of the Danish King, Kristian–August Holstein, Prince of Augustenbourg, who Commander-in-Chief of the army stationed in Norway. The Prince arrived in Sweden in January 1810, where Carl XIII adopted him. The Swedish efforts to separate Norway from Denmark and have it annexed with his help were not realized, since the Prince died in June 1810, soon after his arrival. After his death, Carl XIII adopted Bernadotte, Napoleon's Marshal, who became the Crown Prince after 1810. In: VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Prim., 143., 673.

The Peace Treaty set essential relations not only in the history of Russia and Sweden, but also that of the region of Northern Europe. The First Article of the Treaty declared that *„from this time there will be friendship and good relationship between the Russian Sovereign and the Swedish King"*[45], and they would make efforts to keep it up among their states and subjects. In the Second Article it was formulated that the Swedish Sovereign would conclude peace with the allies of the Russian Tsar. In the Third Article, which is considered to be the most important one, Sweden agreed to join the Continental System. The Swedish King promised to close the harbours of the country in front of the British navy and merchant ships. However, Sweden, with the approval of Russia, was allowed to import some significant goods (salt and colonial goods) in order to meet the needs of the Swedish population, with this permission the total blockade did not come into operation. Russia promised to make France and Denmark accept this situation. Article No. 4 contained that Sweden renounce Finland. It is eye provoking, otherwise that Finland by its geographical name was not mentioned in the agreement, instead the Provinces, incorporated in Russia, were listed. Article No. 5 proves to be a significant part of the peace treaty, which demarcated the frontier between the two states down the rivers Torneo and Muonio, and gave a detailed list of the status of the islands by the rivers. It described to the engineers where to draw the borderline exactly. Article No. 6. reassured the promise made by the Russian Sovereign during the war that the population of the incorporated Finland was allowed to keep their evangelic religion, and the Swedish laws would remain in operation. A number of articles regulated the technical details of the incorporation of Finland into the Russian Empire.[46] Alexander I made a complacent statement in his letter of 6 September 1809, written to his sister, Grand Duchess Catherine: *„This peace is perfect and absolutely like what I had wanted. I can not sufficiently thank the Almighty for this. The cession of all of Finland up to the Torneo with the Aland islands, the adherence to the continental system and closure of its ports to England, and finally, peace with the allies of Russia; all this is concluded without intermediaries*".[47]

The Treaty of Fredrikshamn did not solve the problems arising with the incorporation of Finland into the Russian Empire. After the peace the Russian Cabinet considered it important to stabilize their relationship with Sweden, and confirm their newly drawn borders with a new agreement.

---

[45] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 106. Mirnii dogovor mezhdu Rossiiei i Sveciiei, Fridrikhsgam, 5 (17) sentiabria 1809 g., 220.

[46] For a thorough analysis of the peace, see: V. V. Roginsky, „Istoricheskoie znacheniie fridrikhsgamskogo mira 1809 goda dlia Rossii", *Rossiiskaia istoriia* 3 (2009) 72–79.

[47] Aleksandr I – velikoi knagine Yechaterine Pavlovne, 6 (18) sentiabria 1809 g., In: Nikolai Mikhailovich, velikii knaz, *Perepiska imperatora Aleksandra I s sestroi velikoi knazhnoi Yechaterinoi Pavlovnoi*, SPb., 1910. 25.

This aim was served by the Russian–Swedish Convention of 8 January 1810, in the preparation and conclusion of which P. K. Suchtelen, a Dutch diplomat of Alexander I, played an important role. In fact, Suchtelen was acting as an ambassador in practice in Stockholm from December 1809 to September 1811, and afterwards from March 1812 to April 1813. On 28 October 1809 Alexander charged him with a special commission that in the Swedish capital he „*furnish a basis for a close friendship, which I wish to form between my Empire and the Swedish Kingdom*".[48] The Tsar, in his instructions dispatched to Suchtelen to reassure the Swedish Government, ordered that „*after transferring Finland they do not have to be afraid of the Empire, since Russia does not want to benefit from the weakening of Sweden. […] It is in my own interest to wish the best for this Kingdom".*[49] As far as the problems around the Swedish accession were concerned, Alexander explained that he had not intended to disturb the inner peace of the country. „*Every nation is only able to decide on their own what is more preferable for them, and no statesman has a right to interfere in the public affairs of another nation*"[50]– he expounded his attitude. Alexander I commissioned that Suchtelen be mainly responsible for the strengthening of the friendship between the two states. Furthermore, he was to reassure the Swedish Sovereign that the main purpose of the Tsar, that is Sweden would live in happiness, could only be provided by this peace. „*Promise him that I will making efforts in order that this recently signed peace between Us should never break up*"[51] – as he pointed out.

In the spring of 1810 the French Cabinet also gave a thought of an alliance with Sweden. It clearly appears in the memoranda Jean-Baptiste Champagny made for Napoleon on 16 March 1810. The French Foreign Minister laid down the aims of French foreign policy, and defined the essential elements of the attitude in regard to Russia. Champagny stressed that based on its economic and political interests, England is a „natural ally" of Russia, and their approach would in no time be inevitable. For this reason, France should turn back to its former, anti-Russian alliance policies, and revive the system of „Eastern Barrier", that is, there is no other way than an alliance with Turkey, Sweden and Poland. The French Cabinet was to make efforts to obtain a positive reply from the Ottoman Empire. They were to do their best not to bring an end to the Russian–Turkish war, starting in 1806, and but also act as a mediator in peace negotiations and prevent the Russians from enforcing their interests. „*It is important to strengthen the alliance with Sweden temporarily, because they could be relied on against Russia, but we must act carefully, not to induce the approach between Russian and France when*

[48] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 134. Instrukciia Aleksandra I inzhener-generalu P. K. Sukhtelenu, 28 oktiabria (9 noiabria) 1809 g., 279.
[49] Ibid. 281.
[50] Ibid. 282.
[51] Ibid.

French troops are occupied in the Iberian Peninsula"[52] – he stressed. The French Government, due to the France's ambassador in St Petersburg, Armand Caulaincourt, was aware of Russian foreign purposes in regard to the Swedish Question as well. On 10 June 1810 Caulaincourt reported to Champagny that the Russian Foreign Minister, N. P. Rumiantsev let him know on a number of occasions that Russia had not intended to interfere in Swedish home affairs, including that of the designation of the heir to the throne.[53] In the meantime, the diplomatic personnel in Paris were busy exploring the French position regarding the Swedish succession. A. I. Chernishev, the Russian representative in Paris learnt that Napoleon supported the designation of Marshal Bernadotte as Crown Prince and Heir to the throne. After negotiations with Bernadotte in Paris, on 13 July 1810 he reported to Rumiantsev that „*Bernadotte has a good relationship towards Russia, he believes the Swedish Sovereign must show a friendly behaviour to make sure that His northern frontiers are in safety*".[54] This news was reassuring for the Russian Government, which immediately tried to get in touch with Bernadotte, the new Heir to the Throne. The Russian Foreign Minister, in his letter of 21 October 1810 commissioned Suchtelen to assure Carl Johan (Bernadotte) that „*Russia would like to live in a perfect harmony and peace with Sweden, its King and the Crown Prince*".[55] The answer of Suchtelen arrived from Stockholm to St Petersburg on 12 November 1810. „*I believe that the happiness of Sweden cannot be separated from the conclusion of peace with Russia*"[56] – the ambassador interpreted the position of the Swedish Heir to the throne in this way. On 20 November 1810 the Swedish ambassador, Stedingk informed Charles XIII that Rumiantsev tried to assure him that Russia had not raised any demands towards the Swedish Kingdom since it had obtained Finland. Furthermore, supposing the Swedish Government had made much closer contacts with the Russian Cabinet than with the French, they would have avoided the war with England, which caused hardships in the Russian trade.[57]

On 12 December 1810 Alexander I, in a letter to Prince Carl Johan, Heir to the Throne expounded his expectations to strengthen the alliance with Sweden and

---

[52] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Zapiska ministra inostrannikh g'el Francii Champani Napoleonu I, 16 marta 1810 g., 392.

[53] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Francuzskii posol v St Peterburge Kolenkur ministru inostrannikh gel Francii Champani, 10 iiunia 1810 g., 456.

[54] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Polkovnik A. I. Chernisev ministru inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancevu, Paris, 13 (25) iiulia 1810. 481.

[55] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 255. Ministr inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancev inzhener-generalu P. K. Sukhtelenu, 21 oktiabria (2 noiabria) 1810 g., 569.

[56] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Dok., 264. Inzhener-general Sukhtelen ministru inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancevu, Stokgolm, 12 (24) noiabria 1810 g., 595.

[57] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Feldmarsal Steding Karlu XIII, St Peterburg 20 noiabria (2 giekabria) 1810 g., 604.

tighten their personal friendship. *„You can always rely on Me, and never surrender to the fear that is being tried to be planted in You in relation to Russia"*[58] – he encouraged him. In spite of all these, a year-long effective work of the Russian Diplomacy was needed for the realization of the Swedish alliance. Both the worsening of the French–Russian relationship and Napoleon's more and more anti-Russian policy affected the situation.

On 3 January 1811 Chernishev reported to Alexander I from Paris that Napoleon's statements regarding Russia had not been sincere, and that he was preparing for a war against the country. As a consequence, he advised the Sovereign to conclude an alliance with Sweden and Austria as soon as possible, occupy the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in a preventive war, and proclaim himself King of Poland.[59]

In the autumn of 1811, the work of the diplomatic representation in Stockholm was becoming busy. P. A. Nicolai, the Russian delegate in Stockholm managed to be received by Crown Prince Carl Johan. In his letter of 19 October 1811 sent to Rumiantsev, he reported on his negotiations with the Prince. He emphasized that the Heir to the Throne had made it unambiguous for him what his position in relation to Russia was. The two states were to establish closer relations in the future and form a union in the North.[60] The Swedish Government was not in an easy situation. It is understandable from the report of Suchtelen, written to Alexander I on 13 March 1812 that Carl Johan had resisted Napoleon's pressure several times, and also refused his offer to enter the war against Russia, on the French side.[61]

After Sweden had lost Swedish Pomerania and French troops marched into the territory in January 1812, the Swedish Cabinet, being in a difficult situation, was resolute to make a crucial decision. At the beginning of February 1812 Count Karl Löwenhielm, charged with an exceptional commission, was sent to St Petersburg in order to negotiate with the Russian Cabinet to establish a protective alliance, as well as to obtain Russian help in order to gain Norway.

Due to Chernishev the Russian Government was informed of the „Norwegian plan" of the Swedish still in December 1811. Löwenhielm arrived in the Russian capital on 16 February 1812, Alexander I received him on 24, and was willing to conclude an alliance. Engeström, the Swedish Foreign Minister, with the mediation of Suchtelen, forwarded the Swedish alliance-plans to St Petersburg on 17 March 1812. According to the project, Russia had to guarantee that Sweden would obtain Norway in a way that Denmark would be compensated for its terri-

[58] VPR, Ser. I. t. 5. Aleksandr I svedskomu nasledniku princu Karlu Juhanu (Bernadotu), 19 (31) giekabra 1810 g., 645.
[59] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. Moskva, 1962. A. I. Chernisev Aleksandru I, 3 (15) 1811 g., 9.
[60] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. Dok. 83. Poverennii v g'elah v Stokgolme P. A. Nicolai ministru inostrannikh g'el N. P. Rumiancevu , 19 (31) oktiabria 1811 g., 214.
[61] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. P. K. Sukhtelen Aleksandru I, 13 (30) marta 1812 g., 312.

torial losses, and the Government of Denmark would be offered to enter the Swedish–Russian alliance. The alliance envisaged military action in Northern Germany, and foreshadowed England joining the alliance as well. In addition, Sweden offered the Russian Cabinet to be a mediator during its peace talks with the Turkish Government, and advised to persuade the Ottoman Empire to be their ally. There were intensive negotiations in both capitals, first starting in Stockholm on 18 March. The participants did not agree on two points at the talks in St Petersburg. The Swedish insisted that obtaining Norway should not be an honour, but it should be given to Sweden for their military actions in Northern Germany. The Russian Government, on the other hand, thought that Denmark should be made to stand on their side well before they enter into war with them.

The Russian–Swedish defensive and offensive coalition was made on 24 March 1812. The agreement was made up of 20 Articles and 4 Secret Articles. In the preamble the participants of the coalition set the reasons and aims of their contract, namely *„to strengthen their friendship and cooperation in order to provide the protection of their territories and the independence of the North, which are equally threatened by the ambition and desire for territorial expansion of France, and to be able to reach these two goals they make this agreement of defensive and offensive alliance*".[62]

In the meantime, St Petersburg had arranged the situation of the Grand Duchy of Finland within the Russian Empire on 11 December 1811. Alexander I, in his decree, united the Grand Duchy of Finland with „old Finland", namely with the territories that were annexed to the Russian State in the Treaty of Nystadt in 1721 and the Treaty of Abo in 1743.[63]

In the period after the Treaty of Fredrikshamn, the alliance, signed in St Petersburg on 24 March 1812, became the most significant event of Russian–Swedish relations, which was to be completed with two further conventions, on 3 June 1812 in Vilno,[64] and on 18 August in Abo.[65] Russia agreed that Norway be annexed to Sweden, and Sweden renounced Finland forever.

The French–Russian alliance was not very popular in Russian circles. By the beginning of 1812 more and more debates arose between France and Russia regarding the Polish Question and the Continental System.[66] These strained rela-

[62] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. Dok., 130. Russko-svedskii soiuzni dogovor, St Peterburg, 24 marta (5 aprelia) 1812 g., 324.

[63] Roginsky, „Istoricheskoie znacheniie fridrikhsgamskogo mira", 77.

[64] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. Dok., 171. Dopolnit'elnaia konvenciia k russko-svedskomu soiuznomu dogovoru ot 24 marta (5) aprelia) 1812 g., 428–431.

[65] VPR, Ser. I. t. 6. Dok., 230.Vtoraia dopolnit'elnaia konvenciia (sekretnaia) k russko–svedskomu soiuznomu dogovoru ot 24 marta (5) aprelia) 1812 g., 545–556.

[66] S. M. Solov'ov, *Imperator Aleksandr I*, Moskva, 1995. 279–281.; Bezotosny, „Vnieshnepoliticheskii vybor Rossii", 69.

tions led to war. Napoleon, with an easy victory over Alexander, wanted to force him to return to the conditions of the Treaty of Tilsit, but his campaign in Russia ended in failure. At the end of 1812 the Russian Government had the opportunity either to finish the war, or, continue and take part in the liberation of Europe, the elimination of Napoleonic power. The Russian fight against Napoleon continued together with Sweden, entering into the Sixth Coalition between 1813 and 1814. The military expedition over the frontiers brought success for Russia, its influence in the European affairs strengthened, its status changed in the European political theatre. As the strongest state in Europe, and in the world as well, Russia took on a missionary role and was to restore peace. Catherine II had still fought for the interests of Russia, whereas Paul I and Alexander I already fought for the interests of Europe.[67] Sweden also achieved its aim with obtaining Norway in 1814.

In conclusion, the Swedish Question was a problem successfully managed by the Russian Diplomacy between 1801 and 1815. Diplomatic documents show that the activity of Russian foreign policy towards this region – which was important geopolitically and strategically – did not decrease during the Napoleonic Wars. Although, the last Russian–Swedish war (1808–1809) put an end to a peaceful cooperative period, it did not have a negative effect on Russian–Swedish relationships. Both states were trying to re-establish their neighbourly relations, Napoleon's policy of expansion and the growth of his European power helped the realization of a Russian–Swedish rapprochement. The Treaty of Fredrikshamn, concluding the Finnish War, which ceded the Grand Duchy of Finland to the Russian Empire, indicated a change, which finally, by 1815 led to an alteration of the North-European political system, and also had an influence on Russian European policy. After the peace treaty, in 1810 and 1812 further agreements stabilized Russian–Swedish relations and the position of the Grand Duchy of Finland within the Empire in 1811. New nation-states appeared in the region: the Grand Duchy of Finland gaining autonomy and the Kingdom of Norway in personal union with Sweden. The changes absolutely correspond with the interests of the Russian Empire in relation to North-European strategies and foreign policies.

[67] Ragsdale, „Prosvishchonnii absolutizm", 21.

Piia Einonen

Cultural Conflicts in a Border Town – The Question of Russian Serfdom in Vyborg in the Beginning of the 19th century[1]

Introduction

During the Finnish War (1808–1809) the Russians tried to pacify the Finns, above all, by assuring that Finnish peasants would never be repressed to serfdom. Count and General Friedrich Wilhelm von Buxhoevden declared in 1808 that slavery would never be extended to Finland, and affirmed this by referring to the county of Vyborg, where slavery did not exist even though the area had long belonged to Russia.[2] This shows how the serfdom was one of the greatest fears of Finnish subjects.

Despite the declaration serfdom was not an unknown phenomenon in Vyborg (Swedish Viborg, Finnish Viipuri). This Finnish border town had been a fortress against East since the Middle Ages. It had always been an important trade town and in the late eighteenth century also became an industrial centre and a traffic hub. The position as the capital of the county of Vyborg meant that government, health care, education and garrison were essential features of the town.[3] During centuries Vyborg had been the greatest town in the eastern Finland and the central point of Karelia.

Sweden lost Karelia, the region which is called "Old Finland", to the Russian Empire after the Greater Wrath and the Treaty of Uusikaupunki (Swedish *Nystad*) in 1721. The region was re-united with the rest of Finland in 1812 and from then on constituted a part of the Grand Duchy of Finland. During the 18th century, when Old Finland belonged to Russia, the old Swedish laws were

[1] This research has been funded by the Kone Foundation and by the project…" …Remove "and by the Kone Foundation" at the end of the note.

[2] Declaration 4.6.1808, Kustavi Grotenfelt, Suomenkielisiä historiallisia asiakirjoja Ruotsin vallan ajalta (vuosilta 1548–1809) [Historical documents during the Swedish reign in Finnish], Helsinki, 1912, 305–307. I am grateful for Merja Uotila for pointing this out and for her comments in general.

[3] Jaakko Paavolainen, "Väestöolot" [Demography], In: Viipurin kaupungin historia [Vyborg's history] IV: 2, 1840–1917, Eds. J. W. Ruuth & Erkki Kuujo, Helsinki, 1981, 262. The status as a border town is not addressed in this article as the focus is on the cultural aspects of serfdom.

maintained, but subsequent Swedish regulations were not applied in Karelia, which led to eventual Russianization of the legal system. At the beginning of 19th century, the administrators strove for unifying the government in Old Finland with the laws and orders of the Grand Duchy.[4]

Vyborg is an interesting and special research subject as a result of its multicultural nature and status as a border town between the Russian Empire and Finland. When Old Finland was re-united with the Grand Duchy of Finland the national diversity was still characteristic for Vyborg. There were Russian, German and Swedish speaking residents while the proportion of Finnish population was less than half of the total population.[5] In Vyborg the number of Russian inhabitants and soldiers was larger than in other areas, since it was situated near St. Petersburg. Consequently, the cultural impact of Russians was also conspicuous even though the Russian influence extended, to some degree, to other important towns of the Grand Duchy of Finland as well.

In this article I will study how serfdom was manifested in Vyborg and how serfs were treated at the beginning of the 19th century. The main emphasis is to be laid on the cultural conflict of the Russian inhabitants' attitudes towards serfs (Swedish *lifegne, träl*, Finnish *maaorja*) compared with the viewpoints of other residents of Vyborg. The research period starts from 1812, when the county of Vyborg was re-united with the Grand Duchy of Finland, and ends in 1839, when the court of appeal was founded in Vyborg. This period is in the focus of the study because it is characterized by cultural contrasts: administration and the legal system were integrated with the Grand Duchy and residents were living

[4] See for example O. A. Kallio, Viipurin läänin järjestämisestä muun Suomen yhteyteen [About organizing the county of Vyborg within the rest of Finland], Helsinki, 1901; Jukka Partanen, Isän tuvasta omaan tupaan. Väestö ja kotitaloudet Karjalankannaksen maaseudulla 1750–1870 [From father's cottage to own cottage. Population and households in the Karelian Isthmus], Helsinki, 2004, 50. About Old Finland see Antti Räihä, "Främmande men bekanta? Synen på ryskhet i Villmanstrand efter ofrederna på 1700-talet" [Foreign but familiar? Views of Russianism in Lappeenranta after Wraths of 18th century], Historisk Tidskrift för Finland 93 (2008) 400–401.

[5] J. W. Ruuth, Viborgs stads historia 2 [Vyborgs history], Helsingfors, 1906, 793–804. Vyborg has often been presented as an exception amongst Finnish towns due to its multicultural and multilingual nature, but in fact other 19th century towns were also nationally, religiously and linguistically versatile compared with the 20th century. See Piia Einonen, Citizens and outsiders: languages and nationalities in the city of Viipuri at the beginning of the 19th century, In: Nation split by the border. Changes in the ethnic identity, religion and language of the Karelians from 1809 to 2009, Eds. Tapio Hämynen & Aleksander Paskov, Joensuu, 2012, 50–52; K. O. Lindeqvist, Hämeenlinnan kaupungin historia III, vuosina 1809–75 [Hämeenlinna's history], Hämeenlinna, 1930, 74–78; Sigurd Nordenstreng, Haminan kaupungin historia [Hamina's history] II, Hamina, 1910, 413–414; Heikki Waris, "Helsinkiläisyhteiskunta", In: Helsingin kaupungin historia [Helsinki's history] III:2, Helsinki, 1950, 17–33; Räihä, Främmande, 403–40.

under pressure of both Russian and Western influences. From 1840s onwards, the mental and physical change gathered speed when Vyborg grew in size and the Fennomanian national movement strengthened. After this point, references to serfs are sparse.[6]

The source material consists of documents from the local level as well as from the central government. The court record books and appeals reveal frictions and, therefore, the cases involving disputes are the most valuable ones in analyzing cultural collisions and differences even if the conflicts are overrepresented and vice versa: "ordinary life" is hard to reach.[7] I have researched the minutes of the treasurer's court (Swedish kämnärsrätt, Finnish kämnerinoikeus) and the magistrate's court (Swedish magistrat, Finnish maistraatti) in five-year intervals.[8] The treasurer's court of Vyborg was the lower court where almost all disputes and crimes were processed in the beginning of the 19th century. The magistrate's court mainly concentrated on economic issues. The decisions of the magistrate's court and governor could be further petitioned in the Senate. The Economic department of the Senate received all kinds of appeals concerning trade, town administration and many other issues. I have also analyzed the appeals to the Senate[9] throughout the period and used the population registers (Swedish *mantalslängd*, Finnish *henkikirja*) as complementary source material. The population registers of Vyborg differed from the rest of the Grand

---

6 Ruuth, Viborgs, 794; Jouko Teperi, Vanhan Suomen suomalaisuusliike. 1, Kehityspiirteitä ja edustajia 1830-luvulta 1850-luvun alkuun [The Fennomanian movement of the Old Finland. Development and representatives.], Helsinki, 1965, 17; Ulla Ijäs, Piikoja ja puotipuksuja. Sukupuolittunut työnjako 1820- ja 1830-lukujen Viipurissa [Maids and shop assistants. Gendered division of labour in Vyborg in 1820's and 1830's, unpublished master's thesis, http://tutkielmat.uta.fi/pdf/gradu02405.pdf], University of Tampere, 2008, 3, 19. Especially Teperi characterizes the turn of the decade as a critical period. According to Ijäs in the population registers of 1830 and 1840 no serfs were mentioned. This did not mean that there were no serfs in Vyborg, but most likely they were registered in Russia. Evidently the amount of serfs anyway decreased.

7 There are also serfs involved in debt cases but these are not studied in detail in this article. See for example Treasurer's court 9.2.1830 §4, 16.3.1830 §10, 30.9.1830 §4, 28.9.1837 §4, the archives of Vyborg's court of appeal, the provincial archive of Mikkeli [hereafter PAM].

8 The years are 1815, 1820, 1825, 1830 and 1835. Instead of 1825, however, I have read the treasurer's court records for 1826 because it is the last volume in the archives of the town court. The later volumes can only be studied as fair copies (Sw. *renoverad*, F. *renovoitu*) which were sent to the court of appeal for inspection. The differences of versions are not relevant in this research.

9 I have researched all annual records of appeal (Sw. *supplikdiarium*, F. *anomusdiaari*) within this period and used them as an index to the extensive appeal acts. For a shorter period I have also explored the records of letters (Sw. *brevdiarium*, F. *kirjediaari*) comprising letters from the officials.

Duchy because the entire population was listed and records were compiled only from 1818 onwards.[10]

The serfs have been – purposefully or purposelessly – an overlooked topic in Vyborg's history. Only Ulla Ijäs has analyzed their role to some degree.[11] Hence the purpose of this paper has been to gain knowledge of serfs in general: what did they do in Vyborg, how were they treated and what can be found out about residents' attitudes towards serfdom. Besides Ulla Ijäs's recent study, the most relevant documentations and studies relating to Vyborg's history originate from the 19th century and the first half of 20th century (Gabriel Lagus[12] and J. W. Ruuth). Even though Ruuth's studies have later been updated, the basic approaches and results have been essentially the same. In addition to historical facts, there exists a great variety of beliefs, opinions and myths concerning Vyborg and its history.

In this research, I understand culture widely as interaction between actions on the one hand, and the world of ideas or values, norms and world views on the other hand.[13] These are formed within material, social and mental context. This definition emphasizes the cultural conflicts caused by the different backgrounds of the inhabitants in Vyborg. In Russia the population was numerically dominated by the peasant masses and hence the foundation and identity of the (popular) culture found its sharpest expression in the patriarchal family and the rural commune. Peasants and society's moral sore point, serfdom, were central issues for upper-class culture as well.[14] Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that serfdom was in the cultural focal point in Vyborg. The concept of multiculturalism

---

[10] For further details of Vyborg's population registers see Ijäs, Piikoja, 5–6, 20.

[11] Ijäs, Piikoja, especially 93–95.

[12] Gabriel Lagus, Kuvauksia Wiipurin historiasta: muistokirja 1 [Descriptions of Vyborg's history, remembrance book], Wiipuri, 1893; Gabriel Lagus, Kuvauksia Wiipurin historiasta: muistokirja 2, 1. Asukas- ja kieliolot Ruotsin ajalla, Wiipurilaisia sukuja [Population and linguistic circumstances during the Swedish period, Vyborg's families], Wiipuri, 1895.

[13] This definition of culture is close to Peter Burke's. See Peter Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe. Revised reprint, Aldershot 1994, xxiii; see also Piia Einonen, Poliittiset areenat ja toimintatavat.
Tukholman porvaristo vallan käyttäjänä ja vallankäytön kohteena n. 1592–1644 [Political Arenas and Modes of Action
The Burghers of Stockholm as Subjects and Objects in Exercise of Power, ca. 1592–1644], Helsinki, 2005, 9–12 about the concept of political culture.

[14] Mark D. Steinberg & Stephen P. Frank, "Introduction," In: Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia, Eds. Stephen P. Frank & Mark D. Steinberg, Ewing, 1994, 6; Boris N. Mironov, "Peasant Popular Culture and the origins of Soviet authoritarianism," In: Frank & Steinberg, Cultures, 55, 70. Nicholas Rzhevsky, "Russian cultural history: introduction," In: The Cambridge Companion to Modern Russian Culture. Ed. Nicholas Rzhevsky, Cambridge, 1998, 7.

on the other hand refers to the variety of ethnic, religious and linguistic groups living in Vyborg.

The beginning of the 19th century witnessed a wider criticism towards serfdom in Russia because of the ineffectiv and inhuman nature of the system, but, despite this critique, serfdom continued in Russia until 1861.[15]

Serfdom in Karelia

Economically, socially and culturally the most significant difference between Russian and Swedish (or "Finnish") society at the beginning of the 19th century was serfdom. In Russia the entire peasantry was bound to the state, church, crown or nobility, but in Sweden and Finland the peasants and workers both in town and in countryside had traditionally been free although their life was regulated by a number of laws and by the order of compulsory service (Swedish *tjänstetvång*, Finnish *palvelupakko*).[16] In comparison to serfs they were nevertheless paid and free to change place in between contracts.

Karelia had always been rural by nature and the urban population was scarce: only about four percent of the total population in the area lived in an urban environment in 1815, while in the middle of the century this figure rose to six percent.[17] Thus, the question of serfdom in Karelia has been mainly researched as related to the fiefdom system. The nature of fiefdom had been interpreted sometimes as serfdom, but the latest research suggests that peasants' status and burden in the Karelian donations diverged significantly from the

---

[15] Field, End, passim; Ijäs, Piikoja, 94; Kimerling, Wirtschafter, 208–212.

[16] About compulsory service and other laws see for example Waris, Helsinkiläisyhteiskunta, 95–96; Pertti Haapala, "Työväenluokan synty" [Birth of the working class], In: Talous, valta ja valtio. Tutkimuksia 1800-luvun Suomesta [Economy, power and state. Studies on 19th century Finland], Ed. Pertti Haapala, Tampere, 1992, 229–230; Toivo Nygård, "Patriarkaalisuus 1600- ja 1700-luvun lainsäädännössä" [Patriarchality in the Employment Legislation in the 17th and 18th Centuries], In: Arjen valta. Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan patriarkaalisesta järjestyksestä myöhäiskeskiajalta teollistumisen kynnykselle (v. 1450–1860) [The Power in Everyday Life. On the Patriarchal Order in the Finnish Society from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Industrialization], Eds. Piia Einonen & Petri Karonen, Helsinki, 2002, 158–168; see also Sheilagh Ogilvie, "The economic world of the Bohemian serf: economic concepts, preferences, and constraints on the estate of Friedland, 1583–1692", The Economic History Review 54 (2001) 431; Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, Russia's Age of Serfdom 1649–1861, Malden & Oxford & Victoria, 2008, 8–9, 81, 168.

[17] Yrjö Kaukiainen, "Kauppamiesten Karjala" [The Karelia of tradesmen], In: Karjala. Historia, kansa, kulttuuri [Karelia. History, people, culture], Eds. Pekka Nevalainen & Hannes Sihvo, Helsinki, 1998, 148; compare with Russia (Kimerling Wirtschafter, Russia's, 100).

situation of Russian serfs and their workload was considerably lighter. Even if the status of the fiefdom peasants was open to various interpretations the peasants regarded themselves as peasants of the Crown (Swedish *skattebonde*, Finnish *kruununtalonpoika*). Office holders, on the other hand, considered that only the taxes but no property rights were donated to fief-owners who themselves looked upon their donations as eternal and hereditary "vottšina".[18] Therefore, different groups construed the situation based on their own cultural background. Serfs were also transported to the deserted Karelian villages from other parts of Russia[19], which made the situation even more complicated.

In Vyborg serfs were servants and lodgers.[20] After the Treaty of Uusikaupunki in 1721 plenty of Russians moved to Vyborg accompanied by their serfs. In the middle of the 18th century there was an intensified period of russification in Vyborg during which the immigration of Russian serfs was also promoted. Also some of the original families of the town gradually became serf-owners and they treated their serfs similarly to the Russians: serfs were considered to be property who could be sold and deposited as pawns, and also punished severely. Sometimes serfs were also released and, in the late 18th century, liberated serfs could even gain a status of a burgher. In 1812 there were altogether 106 serfs in Vyborg while, at the same time, the total population was at the minimum circa 2,900 inhabitants.[21]

---

[18] Kallio, Viipurin, 5–10, 17–18, 149–169, 257–268; Jyrki Paaskoski, Vanhan Suomen lahjoitusmaat 1710–1826 [Noble Land-Holding and Serfdom in 'Old Finland'], Helsinki, 1997, 118, 135–139 (Bibliotheca Historica 24); Partanen, Isän, 37, 51–53, 86–87; compare with Hannes Sihvo ("Karjalainen kulttuuri ja kulttuuri Karjalassa," [Karelian culture and culture in Karelia] In: Nevalainen & Sihvo, Karjala, 450) who sees that the fiefdom system led Karelia nearly to serfdom. See also Teperi, Vanhan, 39–40.

[19] Kaukiainen, Kauppamiesten, 151–152.

[20] Compare with Russia, where there were similar groups of serfs as well (Daniel Field, The End of Serfdom. Nobility and Bureaucracy in Russia, 1855–1861, Cambridge & London, 1976, 44; Kimerling Wirtschafter, Russia's, 97; Dennison, Institutions, 60–61, 80–81, 156–169, 178–179, 230–231). Not all the serfs belonged to the households and especially outside city centre there were also serfs living as lodgers. Serf *(trälinnan)* Lisa Inos was even listed as an owner of a real estate and she had lodgers of her own (Population register 1818, The Digital Archives, http://digi.narc.fi/digi/, The National Archives). Compare with the situation in Helsinki, where serfs and emancipated serfs were mainly soldiers (Eirik Hornborg, "Sotaväki ja sotatapahtumat," [Military and events of war] In: Helsingin kaupungin historia III:1, Ajanjakso 1809–1875 [Helsinki's history], Helsinki, 1950, 222, 224–225).

[21] Ruuth, Viborgs, 802–803; J. W. Ruuth & Erkki Kuujo, Viipurin kaupungin historia III, vuodet 1710–1812 [Vyborg's history]; Helsinki, 1975, 25, 51, see also 64; compare the number of inhabitants with Ijäs (Piikoja, 20). She suggests that the amounts presented in the Vyborg's history are not consistent with the population registers. She also claims that there were serfs in the population registers only in 1820, but serfs were listed also 1818.

Owning serfs became an issue as Vyborg was re-attached to the Grand Duchy of Finland and Swedish laws were emphasized. In his re-union manifest, the emperor restricted the nobility's rights over serfs living in Finland and also proclaimed that all inhabitants of the province of Vyborg were to be governed according to the Finnish laws. Besides peasants there were plenty of maids, hands and self-employed serfs to whom the manifests did not apply. They remained serfs unless they applied for emancipation. In the beginning only a few serf families were emancipated but in 1822 and in 1825 dozens of families were liberated. In 1826 it was ordained that all the serfs who could prove legally to have been registered in the province of Vyborg at the time of the re-union were entitled to apply for emancipation, but other serfs did not have such right. Nor could the serfs moving from Russia to Finland be registered. Next year it was also prohibited to turn serfs over to Finnish citizens.[22]

Nevertheless the upper class Russian households, especially military families, kept on having serfs in Vyborg after the re-union.[23] In the beginning of the 19th century, for example, Colonel Axel von Müller had two serfs with their families in his household and even one of the "Russian" magistrates of Vyborg, Peter Kovaleff, had a serf. But, as previously suggested, owning serfs was adapted by non-Russian inhabitants: Civil Counselor (Swedish *statsråd*) Nils Jaenisch[24] had two serf families and Titular Counsilor (Swedish *titulärråd*) Petter Sutthoff also had serfs. They were both of German origin.[25] This shows the cultural impact of the Russian regime.

(Ijäs, Piikoja, 94; compare with Sigurd Nordenstreng, Haminan kaupungin historia [Hamina's history] III. Suom. Santeri Ivalo, Hamina, 1912, 644).

[22] Kallio, Viipurin, 18, 102, 266–267. An example of emancipation certificate, see magistrates court 27.3.1830 §4, 5.4.1830 §2, 13.9.1830 §6, PAM. The freedom was given to serf with his wife, four children and their future inheritors. It was also stated that the serf himself had wanted a status under compulsory service. The emancipation had happened four years earlier and after that the serf had worked as a hired man for three years and at the moment he had applied for a status as a burgher in Vyborg.

[23] Ijäs, Piikoja, 94.

[24] About Jaenisch family see Georg Haggrén, "Jaenisch (1700–1900)" (The National Biography of Finland, http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/english/).

[25] Treasurer's court 3./15.11.1815 §1, 11./23.11.1815 §1–§2, PAM; population register 1818; Ruuth, Viborgs, 794–795; Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin III, 53. Compare with the serfs acting as shop-assistants of non-Russian merchants in Hamina (Nordenstreng, Haminan II, 445, note 1). Double dates were used in documents because in Russia the Julian calendar was in use till 1918 whereas in the Great Duchy of Finland the Gregorian calendar was used. In the 19th century the difference between the two calendars was 12 days. In the population register 1818 there are no serfs mentioned in the Kovaleff's household.

Serfs in Vyborg: Status and Occupation

When the magistrate's court of Vyborg decided to grant rights for retail trade and burgher rights to bookkeeper Henric Niclas Heitman, mostly Russian merchants complained about the decision and criticized him for being a foreigner. In his answer Heitman cast doubts on his opponents' ability to understand trade or the language used in the documents. He pointed out – condescendingly – that ignorance was common amongst people who had spent their lives under burdensome serfdom.[26] Heitman's insulting reference to serfdom revealed his attitude towards Russians and it is most likely that many other inhabitants of Vyborg shared this view. It is also obvious that besides nationality and language one of the most distinctive cultural features of Russians was serfdom. This also suggests that owning and treating serfs was obtrusive for non-Russian residents and the conditions serfs lived in were dubious.

The Russian population shared a long-term tradition in which serfdom played an essential role economically, socially and culturally. The Russian identity was built on this collective experience, but in the 19th century Vyborg serfdom only separated the Russian nationality from others. The Russian nationality of Vyborg seemed to be a closed and, to some degree, even isolated group. Their social life was restricted by their inability to use other languages besides Russian.[27] Therefore they were eager to employ artisans of their own nationality, which also included employing skillful serfs. In 1822 an emancipated serf, Vasilei Schversnikoff, was given burgher rights as a tailor. The tailor guild criticized this, but the majority of Russian burghers had wished for his appointment for tailor master. Schversnikoff had served for 20 years in the manor of Monrepos near Vyborg and his master, Baron Ludwig Heinrich von Nicolay, had died 1820. Schversnikoff was emancipated when Baron Nicolay died, but

[26] Appeal acts Eb: 258, AD 277/179 1823, Economic department of the Senate [hereafter ED], National Archives [hereafter NA]. See Einonen, Citizens, 57–59, for more details of Heitman's case. See also Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin III, 131 about admission of foreigners as burghers. Emancipated serfs were often acting as bookkeepers. This was prohibited in 1817, but serfs could continue working if they were emancipated or given burgher rights, Nordenstreng, Haminan II, 413–414, 436; Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin III, 128; J. W. Ruuth & Erkki Kuujo, Viipurin kaupungin historia [Vyborg's history] IV: 1, 1812–1840, Helsinki, 1981, 61; Ijäs, Piikoja, 27.

[27] Dennison, Institutional, 1–5, 91; Einonen, Citizens, 54–55, 59–60, 62; see also Ijäs, Piikoja, 39. Compare with the situation in Hamina and Helsinki: Nordenstreng, Haminan II, 436–437; Waris, Helsinkiläisyhteiskunta, 28–29 and to Congress Poland's Warsaw, where the Russian population formed a closed colony. Their interaction with the local inhabitants was characterized by mutual contempt. Stephen D. Corrsin, "Warsaw. Poles and Jews in a Conquered City," In: The City in Late Imperial Russia, Ed. Michael Hamm, Bloomington, 1986, 131.

he was still occasionally called a serf in the court record books. The artisans working in Monrepos were highly appreciated and it is understandable that the members of the guild felt their position threatened.[28] Even if the tailor guild criticized explicitly Vasilei Schversnikoff's training as a tailor, probably also his status as a former serf was an issue.

There were other emancipated serfs working as professional craftsmen in Vyborg. However, as the complaints show, at least some of these burgher rights were disputed. All in all, gaining right to exercise handicraft or trade was still at that point a process which often included a number of contradictory interests.[29] It was also a process in which all aspects were considered: besides the applicant's professional skills and training his reputation and nationality were weighed as well as the need for artisans and tradesmen. When a former serf, Anisia Alexandroff, was given burgher rights as a painter master 1824, the decision was criticized by another master. Nonetheless, the burghers of Vyborg stood up for him, because Alexandroff had been living and practicing his profession in town for a long time and there was also plenty of work to do. Some of the most prominent merchants had even given him a recommendation praising his nature and skills.[30] So, if a former serf had integrated himself into the community and could act economically and professionally as a town-dweller with full rights, his status as an emancipated serf was not a problem.

In his statement, Anisia Alexandroff accused his opponent of striving for a monopoly while he also purposefully attacked his opponent's foreign origin, at the same time emphasizing his own Russian nationality. In comparison to his critic, he identified himself as a Russian by birth and as a loyal Russian subject. Alexandroff also accentuated working for the benefit of the fatherland.[31] This national pathos indicates that he had an identity of a citizen *(*Swedish *medborgare)* – as he became a citizen after his emancipation – and of a burgher. Possibly his long career as a respected craftsman had released him from the burden of serfdom. Alexandroff's arrogant behavior could be interpreted as a reflection of xenophobia and chauvinism, which were not uncommon amongst Russians[32].

Handicraft was regulated and controlled in the first decades of the 19th century but in Vyborg the Russian and Western practices collided from time to

---

[28] Appeal acts Eb: 249, AD 32/149 1823, ED, NA; Rainer Knapas, "Nicolay, Ludwig Heinrich von", The National Biography of Finland. For more details about this case see Einonen, Citizens, 59–61. About identification and titles compare with Räihä, Främmande, 402–403.

[29] See further in Einonen, Citizens, 55–61. About emancipated serfs as burghers in other towns see for example Lindeqvist, Hämeenlinnan, 76.

[30] Appeal acts Eb: 282, AD 351/56 1824, ED, NA.

[31] Appeal acts Eb: 282, AD 351/56 1824, ED, NA.

[32] Corrsin, Warsaw, 131; Katriona Kelly, "Popular culture," In: Cambridge, 126, 130.

time. Peter the Great had founded the Russian guild system in the 1720's, but in Russia the guilds were open for foreigners, soldiers and peasants making them open in comparison to their Swedish and other western counterparts. Craft, training or quality control were not privileged for the guilds and the town order of 1785 allowed everybody to earn their living by handicraft if they used no helping hands. As the Finnish Ruling Senate had confirmed this order 1804, it was considered valid also after 1812. By contrast, Vyborg's magistrate's court and guilds had been throughout the Russian period trying to preserve the Swedish guild system and applying the Swedish guild regulation of 1720.[33]

Due to the contradictory regulations and practices, interpretations of legitimate handicraft varied. Sometimes serfs tried to earn their livelihood by working as artisans, like Philipoff in 1822. Shoemaker masters had complained to the magistrate's court that Philipoff had been acting as a shoemaker together with his sons. He defended himself to have manufactured slippers for merchants to sell and claimed that burgomaster had given him permission for crafts in order to earn a livelihood for him, for the widow who owned him and for the whole family: his parents, two underage brothers, children and wife. If he could not work they all would be begging for their bread. Furthermore he had made slippers for municipal magistrate Ivanoffskoij's shop.[34] This shows clearly the problems typical for Vyborg. The administrators could follow the old customs they were acquainted with and ignore legal orders. On the other hand, the flexibility in interpreting orders created possibilities to act practically. Philipoff's case shows that magistrates apparently thought that it was better and cheaper to permit his illegal handicraft than to support the whole household through the poor relief.[35]

[33] Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin III, 153; Ijäs, Piikoja, 41.

[34] Ijäs, Piikoja, 42–43. Philipoff was fined for illegal handicraft. When carpenter master Björklund found in 1830 serf Ipatoff working in a building site he immediately confiscated his tools and sued him for illegal handicraft. Ipatoff defended himself that the government secretary Alfthan had hired him to finish some details in his new building. Alfthan confirmed that he had hired four "peasants" and criticized Björklund's slowness in his work. He said that it would have taken years if Björklund had been hired to do the job, magistrate's court 11.1.1830 §4, PAM.

[35] Ijäs, Piikoja, 43. There were similar cases for example in Hämeenlinna, see Lindeqvist, Hämeenlinnan, 119–120. Likewise, the serfs were for instance given permissions to sell pictures of saints. Some also applied for license to sell religious books in Russian but as the selling of books was privileged for bookbinders the magistrate's court refused this, magistrate's court 11.2.1837 §4, 12.6.1837 §2, PAM.

Marrying a serf

Serfs acted as maids and hands, but since they were the property of their masters their lives were strictly regulated as compared with their free counterparts. In general, the most essential feature of serfdom was the owner's power to restrict serf's right of moving and marrying.[36] When serfs wanted to get married it was a complicated issue and such cases were processed in the treasurer's court of Vyborg. In 1820, Johan Oppi, a soldier wanted to marry Colonel Axel von Müller's serf maid, Catharina Johansdotter, and Oppi sued the reluctant colonel at court. Oppi and the maid had had a child together, but the child had already died. The case concerning a serf could not be decided in the treasurer's court and the members of the court had written for guidance to the governor, who on his part turned to the governor-general of Finland, Fabian Steinheil for advice. Obviously, the treasurer's court and the governor were aiming to grant a marriage license, but, since von Müller and Colonel de Gervais did not approve of the marriage, the couple was not granted the license, but received a fine for illegal intercourse instead.[37]

It is noteworthy that von Müller and de Gervais did not need to give any justification for denying the marriage as Catharina Johansdotter was probably de Gervais's property and only working in the household of von Müller. The serf owners had also right to separate serf couples or families from each other if they wanted to.[38]

In 1815, a soldier, Henrik Koppinen had sued magistrate Peter Kovaleff in a similar case. Koppinen had had a child together with Kovaleff's serf maid, Maria Petrova. The child had died, similarly to the other four illegitimate children to whom Petrova had given birth earlier, but nevertheless Koppinen wanted to marry the maid. Kovaleff did not consent to their request of emancipation. Maria Petrova had been sold for the first time 26 years earlier, when she was only ten years old, to "an unknown nobleman". Five years earlier she had been sent to Kovaleff as a pawn. According to Russian practice, Kovaleff claimed that Koppinen needed to pay for her emancipation and then they could

---

[36] Field, End, 14, 45; Steven L. Hoch, Serfdom and Social Control in Russia. Petrovskoe, a Village in Tambov, Chicago and London, 1986, 103; Paaskoski, Vanhan, 168–169; Ijäs, Piikoja, 94–95; Dennison, Institutions, 42, 87–90, 223; see also Boris N. Mironov, "Consequences of the price revolution in eighteenth-century Russia", The Economic History Review 45 (1992) 473; T. K. Dennison & Sheilagh Ogilvie, "Serfdom and social capital in Bohemia and Russia", Economic History Review 60 (2007) 518, 521, 534–535.

[37] See for example treasurer's court 19.4.1820 §1, 20.4.1820 §1, PAM. In the fiefs, the donation holders tried to pressure their serfs to marry as early as possible as new workers were needed. About this and illegal sexual relationships in the Karelian isthmus see Partanen, Isän, 61–65, 75.

[38] Field, End, 44–45; Dennison & Ogilvie, Serfdom, 534–535; Ijäs, Piikoja, 95.

get married. Kovaleff also complained about all costs which were caused by maid's time in childbed and child's christening. It could be documented that Kovaleff did not own Petrova so Koppinen and his bride were guided to seek for emancipation from her real owners in St. Petersburg. They were also to be punished for their illegitimate sexual relationship.[39]

Kovaleff's demand for compensation was understandable in the context of Russian serfdom, in which a female serf who got married and moved away from a fief was obliged to compensate for her master for the lost property and labour.[40] Henrik Koppinen answered to Kovaleff that in the Great Duchy of Finland everybody was free according to the imperial orders, and hence no-one could claim for compensation for a maid's freedom.[41] The cultural difference is striking as the Russian merchant was acting according to his comprehension of serfdom and power relations whereas to a Finnish soldier freedom was a basic right belonging to everybody, also in Vyborg.

Serfs as Property

In January 1820, a young burgher, Ivan Alexejeff Golovanoff, was charged in the treasurer's court of Vyborg with sending his serf to St. Petersburg against her will. On Sunday 28 June 1818, Golovanoff had without a proper reason bound his maid, sent her away with a peasant and kept her belongings. Golovanoff had prepared this action carefully: he had obtained a certificate in Russian for the peasant to prove that he was legally transporting the serf. When customs officer Olof Söderström had stopped the peasant he found Maria Ivanova lightly dressed wearing only a headgear, a vest and a shabby skirt. She was in a bad shape and had burst into tears when Söderström had asked her something. When the peasant was asked for his destination he had presented some kind of a freight certificate in Russian which confirmed that he was transporting Ivanova to St. Petersburg to some unidentified person. There she was to be sent to the penitentiary because she had been disobedient slave *(*Swedish *slaf)* or escaped from her household – it was left for the owner to decide which argument to use. Söderström testified to have followed his instructions: he

[39] See for example treasurer's court 3./15.11.1815 §1, 11./23.11.1815 §1–§2, PAM.

[40] Paaskoski, Vanhan, 168–169; Tracy Dennison, The institutional framework of Russian serfdom. Cambridge, UK/New York, 2011., 57, 74; see also Field, End, 14; Hoch, Serfdom, 99–102, 104–106. About demanding compensation for emancipated serfs see also appeal acts Eb: 331, AD 432/141 1826, ED, NA. In the Grand Duchy of Finland the emancipated male serfs compensated for their masters but later the owners were paid by recruits or saleable recruit receipts, see Kallio, Viipurin, 267.

[41] Treasurer's court 3./15.11.1815 §1, PAM.

stopped the peasant and sent him with Maria Ivanova to the governor so that it could be legally determined whether she had acted illegally during her service. Golovanoff was imprisoned for some time by the treasurer's court, but he was later released by the town court to wait for his court hearing.[42]

The crime was characterized as violating peace of vow[43] and the case raised emotions especially amongst non-Russian residents. Customs officer Olof Söderström had evidently been upset by the incident. He considered transporting a maid to be against the law of "New Finland" because there was no slavery in Finland.[44] All in all, Söderström's attitude towards serfdom was strictly condemning. In his statement he referred to the Grand Duchy of Finland as well as Vyborg in comparison to Russian regions and emphasized the "Finnish" laws. This view was probably shared by many other non-Russian residents.

Golovanoff was a second-generation immigrant in Vyborg. In 1818, he was only 26 years old and lived in the largest suburb of Viipuri, namely St. Petersburg, with his 20 years old wife and their three children. His serf, Maria Ivanova, was 25 years and they also had a hired man, but, according to the population register, he was a free man.[45] Golovanoff was not the legal owner of Maria Ivanova even if she had been working in his household – and even if he acted as one, when he tied her up and sent her to St. Petersburg in the load of a peasant. In 1817, it was prohibited to have serfs working in the shops and the order was implemented in Vyborg at the beginning of 1818, when many serfs were emancipated or sent back to Russia.[46] Presumably this was also the reason why he tried to smuggle the maid

---

[42] Treasurer's court 20.1.1820 §2, PAM. About the further proceedings in the treasurer's court see 28.1.1820 §3, 5.2.1820 §1, 12.2.1820 §2, 17.4.1820 §4 and 15.5.1820 §4. The case was handled in the court of appeal in Turku 1.12.1819, but it was sent back to Vyborg for further investigation because the court of appeal considered it not to be satisfactorily investigated. After the first hearings the treasurer's court tried unsuccessfully for months to reach some of the litigants and sometimes even Golovanoff himself was absent. The court proceedings ended in May 1820 and it is unknown whether the case was further processed in the court of appeal. The case was not brought up in the town court, see the archives of the town court C I: 12 Cb, C IVa: 2 Ca, PAM. Compare with Ijäs, Piikoja, 95.

[43] There was no special paragraph criminalizing this kind of action, see the law of 1734, http://agricola.utu.fi/hist/kktk/lait/1734/.

[44] Russian butchers' right to use serfs in their shops, even if the statute of 1817 prohibited using serfs in bourgeois trade, was discussed in 1822. Burghers of Vyborg stated that they had nothing against the butcher, but serfdom was a problem because it did not exist in Finland, see appeal acts Eb: 230, AD 113/148 1822, ED, NA; decision deposit copy Da:13, 25.10.1822, ED, NA. Compare with the situation in Helsinki, Waris, Helsinkiläisyhteiskunta, 27.

[45] Population register 1818.

[46] Ruuth, Viborgs, 802; Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin IV:1, 61; Ijäs, Piikoja, 94. Golovanoff said that Ivanova had had a passport written by Miss Maria Prokorovna Pirskoi and that he promised to try to find it, but it was however not presented in the court session. Prokorovna Pirskoi was said to be the original owner of Maria Ivanova.

away. Serfs were property and they could be treated as such.[47] It is nevertheless impossible to know whether the serfs in Vyborg were owned by their masters or if they were legitimate migrant serfs working with passports.[48]

Using serfs as maids and workers in a household was profitable as they did not need to be paid and they could be treated as the owner wished. According to some of the most drastic cases, they did not need to be fed and could be easily moved to other areas where labour was needed. Owners were also entitled to get all kinds of services from their female serfs. Clearly in Vyborg the non-Russian pressure towards serf owners was restricting their behaviour, thus one serf owner was witnessed in a court room to have said that in St. Petersburg he could whip his serfs as often as he wanted.[49] Apparently these were extreme examples and mostly serfs lived and worked in the same way as servants in general did.

In the Margins of Society

Many serfs lived in the margins of the organized town society. Although there are only a few cases in which serfs committed crimes[50], obviously there were a plenty of serfs who were staying in Vyborg illegally without necessary documents. One burgher was charged for hiring a runaway serf maid[51] and in 1837 a widow, Domna Protopoff was accused of lodging a runaway male serf for 14 days in her shed. She shuffled off responsibility and answered that her son was the master in the household. According to burgher Vasili Protopopoff, the serf had only worked for him for a day, but was not lodged. Altogether, the problem was that the serf was in Vyborg illegally and had no passport, so he could not be identified and his background could not be verified either. Protopopoff explained to the treasurer's court that it had not occurred to him to ask for a passport. Nevertheless he was fined.[52] Everybody living in a town knew the impor-

[47] Ruuth & Kuujo, Viipurin III, 51; Field, End, 14.

[48] Dennison, Institutions, 173–176.

[49] Field, End, 14; Ijäs, Piikoja, 94–95; about wages of serfs see for example Ogilvie, Economic, 436–438; Dennison, Institutions, 173, 177.

[50] Treasurer's court 13.9.1820 §2, 19.9.1820 §1, 23.9.1820 §4, 25.9.1820 §4, PAM about a theft and town court and 19.7.1830 §2, PAM about using a falsified passport. In 1830, an emancipated serf complained about his wife who was misusing alcohol and fornicating especially with Russian soldiers lodged in Vyborg and therefore dishonouring herself as well as her family. They were granted a divorce and she was fined for adultery, treasurer's court 8.7.1830 §4, PAM.

[51] Treasurer's court 16.3.1826 §5, PAM.

[52] Treasurer's court 19.5.1837 §4, 26.5.1837 §2, 1.6.1837 §1, 6.6.1837 §3, 17.8.1837 §2. PAM. About controlling passports see Kallio, Viipurin, 226–227; about passports and illegal lodging in St. Petersburg see Max Engman, Dagligt liv i S:t Petersburg. Bland kejsarens finländska undersåtar [Daily life in St. Petersburg. Among the Finnish subjects of the Emperor], Helsingfors & Stockholm, 2003, 181–186; see also Dennison, Institutions, 158, 168, 176, 214.

tance of a passport, therefore, it was useless to appeal to this argument in the court room. Regardless, these cases suggest that Old Finland and especially Vyborg were attractive alternatives to serfs who for some reason had no passport. There was work to do and evidently the burghers and officials did not control the official documents with such eagerness as they presumably should have done.[53]

In 1826, the town prosecutor, (Swedish *stadsfiskal*, Finnish *kaupunginviskaali*) Krogerus was ordered by the magistrate's court to charge five Russian merchants with lodging serfs without passports. The governor had ordered in his recent circular that such deed should be punished by fines. The defendants claimed that their serfs had had passports but they had expired and it was impossible to get new ones. One problem was the distance between Vyborg and the serfs' home area. The treasurer's court decided not to get involved in this case and shoved it to the police force.[54] Without passports serfs were nonetheless outside the organized town society and their legal status was even worse compared to serfs with relevant documents. When three brothers, all of them emancipated serfs, applied for a job as town's worker they were rejected because they did not have extracts from the church register or certificate of emancipation and the magistrate's court did not know them.[55] Employment could have been a chance to secure a status in a town community but this was denied to them.

Even a status as a registered taxpayer in Vyborg was a desired position for an emancipated serf. If a serf could provide evidence of his emancipation and also prove that he was a legitimate child, a good Christian and a trustworthy worker, he could be registered.[56] This allowed a legal status in town including poor relief and could open new possibilities for social progress.[57]

Serfdom in Vyborg at the Beginning of the 19th century

In Finland, serfdom was seen as an unfamiliar system with dubious and frightening reputation. The annexation of the Old Finland into Russia 1721 meant that serfdom was exceeded to Finland in the form of fiefdom system and by migrating Russian households with serf servants. Keeping serfs was a way of manifesting power and emphasizing Russians' status as representatives of the

[53] Compare with Russian moving labour: Waris, Helsinkiläisyhteiskunta, 111; Nordenstreng, Haminan II, 445.

[54] Treasurer's court 8.12.1826 §2, PAM. It is not mentioned that the defendants were Russian, but their names were Russian and thus I have interpreted them to be Russian.

[55] Magistrates court 14.8.1830 §1, PAM.

[56] Magistrate's court 5.5.1830 §2, PAM; about legal conditions see Kallio, Viipurin, 266–267.

[57] See Gösta Lext, Mantalsskrivningen i Sverige före 1860 [Registration of population in Sweden before 1860], Göteborg, 1979, 185–195.

conquering empire. At the same time Russian customs and conventions infiltrated Vyborg through serfdom.

Although serfdom was primarily a Russian phenomenon, some families of German origin also had serfs in Vyborg. A special kind of serfdom appears to have existed in Vyborg as there were both emancipated serfs and those working within households. Obviously serfs were a labour resource which could be utilized as needed but they mainly seem to have been working permanently as maids and hands. On the one hand, the rights of serfs were restricted, for instance, when soldiers wanted to marry serf maids, but, on the other hand, emancipated serfs could integrate into the society as craftsmen or merchants if they had experience and proper training and their behavior was blameless. In Vyborg serfs had possibilities for social progress, but they could also hide themselves if needed.

Even though Vyborg had been under the Russian regime already for approximately a hundred years by the beginning of the 19th century, serfdom was seen among non-Russian residents as a peculiar and even abhorrent feature of Russian society and culture. It seems that, although the laws were basically the same, the re-union with the Grand Duchy re-enforced Vyborg's status as Finnish town, emphasized the return to western norms, and created a space for criticizing practices of serfdom and thus cultural collisions. The inhabitants of Vyborg had had to tolerate serfdom for decades but in the first half of the 19th century they were able to raise objections against it. Even a humble soldier emphasized the freedom of people and contested a Russian magistrate defending his cultural legacy.

SMALL NATIONS IN COLONIAL CONTEXTS

Csaba Lévai

In between and within Great Powers – The Comparison of Hungary and the British Colonies in North America in the 18th century[1]

In this paper I intend to compare the 18th –century historical development of Hungary within the Habsburg Empire on the one hand, and the mainland British colonies in North America within the British Empire on the other. In order to be able to compare the historical development of Hungary and the British colonies in mainland North America, first I must give a very brief summary of 18th –century Hungarian history, then I can point out some interesting similarities in the developments of the two territories.

Hungary in the 18th –century Habsburg Empire[2]

Due to the Turkish occupation of its capital Buda in 1541, the medieval Kingdom of Hungary collapsed under the pressure of the armed forces of the Turks, and the territory of the country became a theatre of war in the struggle between two great powers, the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empires. As a result the country became divided into three parts:

1. The Kingdom of Hungary, under the rule of the Habsburg dynasty in the northern and western parts of the country.
2. The Principality of Transylvania in the eastern parts, which was officially under the authority of the Turks but was, in reality, relatively independent under the rule of Hungarian princes.
3. The central and southern regions belonging to the Ottoman Empire.

The Habsburg kings of the Kingdom of Hungary tried to rule the country as absolute monarchs without the three Hungarian estates (Catholic clergy, nobility, in-

[1] This essay is a significantly modified and improved version of the study I published in 2008 under the title "Within Two Imperial Systems: Hungary and the British Colonies in North America Compared in the Writings of Gergely Berzeviczy (1763–1822)". In *Europe and its Empires* Eds. Mary N. Harris and Csaba Lévai (Edizioni Plus, Pisa University Press, Pisa, 2008.) 31–45.

[2] In my survey of 18th century Hungarian history I extensively used László Kontler's work: L. Kontler, *Millennium in Central Europe: A History of Hungary*, Budapest, 1999.

habitants of the so-called royal free cities) during the 16–17th centuries. These efforts proved to be unsuccessful because of the fact that, by the aid of the Ottoman Empire, the confederacy of the estates of the Kingdom of Hungary and the Hungarian princes of Transylvania could counterbalance the pressure of the Habsburgs. As a result, the Kingdom of Hungary could remain an autonomous part of the Habsburg Empire with its own legislative body, and governed by the nobility, which dominated the Diet, as well as the county assemblies.[3]

This situation changed radically at the end of the 17th century when the Ottoman Turks were forced to withdraw from the central regions of Hungary with the crucial aid of the Habsburg army. The Habsburgs also invaded Transylvania and they integrated it into their empire as a separated province from Hungary. Due to this fundamental change in the balance of power the Hungarian estates could no longer rely on the support of the Turks and the princes of Transylvania against the absolutist tendencies of the Habsburgs. Consequently, the Habsburgs started to govern the country as an occupied territory. They tried to ignore the traditional rights and privileges of the Hungarian estates and the former autonomous status of the country within the Habsburg Empire. This policy of Leopold I (1657–1705) offended several strata of Hungarian society. He affronted the nobility, since he did not summon the Diet after 1688, and "demanded the holders of estates in the recovered areas to produce legal documents of ownership; and even if they could do so, they were required to pay reparations for the damages of the war."[4] Due to the peace treaty with the Turks in 1699 there was no need for fortresses in the middle of the country any more. The Habsburg government disbanded the Hungarian regiments and garrisons, which provided the opportunity for upward social mobility for the peasantry. The war for liberation lasted for more than fifteen years (1683–1699) and resulted in the demolition of agriculture and the countryside. The Habsburg king preferred and supported the Catholic Church and Protestants were clearly discriminated against.[5]

The result of the growing discontent was the outbreak of the war of independence led by Ferenc Rákóczi (1676–1735) between 1703 and 1711 which was part of the great international conflict of the period, the War of Spanish Succession (1701–1714).[6] Rákóczi was aided by Louis XIV of France (1643–1715), and the defeat of France also sealed the fate of Rákóczi's struggle in 1711. Fortunately for the

---

[3] L. Kontler, *Millennium in Central Europe: A History of Hungary*, Budapest, 1999, 139–149, 159–180.

[4] L. Kontler, *Millennium*, cit., pp. 185.

[5] Kontler, *Millennium*, cit., pp. 181–185.

[6] The War of Spanish Succession ended with three separate peace treaties. France, Spain and Great Britain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Prussia and Savoy concluded the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. France signed the Peace of Rastatt with the Habsburgs and the Peace of Baden with the estates of the German Empire in 1714.

Hungarian cause, the Habsburg's war against Louis XIV came to an end only with the peace of Rastatt in March 1714, and the new ruler, Charles III (1711–1740, as Emperor Charles VI) wanted peace in the Hungarian hinterland. He was ready to reach a compromise with the privileged strata of Hungarian society. According to the peace treaty of Szatmár, Charles granted amnesty and the restoration of estates for those supporters of Rákóczi, who returned to the Emperor's allegiance. He promised to be observant of the rights and privileges of the nobility and the country, and to stand in with the Diet in governing Hungary. He also plighted to secure free worship. In 1712 Charles III summoned the Hungarian Diet, and in his coronation charter he promised to maintain the territorial integrity of Hungary and to govern it in conformity with its customs and statutes. As László Kontler noted, the laws enacted by the Diet

[…] codified the compromise of Szatmár: in other words, unlike in Austria and Bohemia, where the crown managed to shake off the control of the feudal estates in government and to some extent to curtail their privileges, including those related to taxation, in Hungary the balance between the crown and the corporate structures, that is, the political influence and social privileges mainly of the magnates, was preserved.[7]

In exchange for that the Hungarian estates accepted the rule of the Habsburgs in Hungary and recognized succession in the female line of the dynasty in 1723. In that year the hereditary provinces of the Habsburgs and Hungary were declared by the Hungarian Diet to be linked "indivisibly and inseparably", and to be obliged to defend each other in case of aggression by foreign powers.[8]

Due to the fact that it was advantageous for the Hungarian estates for political as well as economic reasons, the compromise worked quite well even after the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748). At the beginning of this war, Prussian, Saxon, and Bavarian troops invaded the Habsburg Empire, and the latter approached even Vienna. Under such circumstances Maria Theresa (1740–1780), the daughter and successor of Charles III, decided to summon the Hungarian Diet, and could convince the Hungarian estates to support the war efforts of the empire. To the astonishment of all Europe, the Hungarian estates did not take the opportunity to attain their independence from the Habsburgs. On the contrary, the Hungarian Diet ordered an insurrection of nobles, and offered four million florins of war subsidy and thirty thousand recruits to the young queen. As László Kontler aptly remarked

It was less a chivalric gesture to an attractive woman in plight (which was the romantic account of what happened) than an act of prudence: the estates had no

[7] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 196.
[8] Kontler, *Millennium*, cit., pp. 195–198.

suitable pretender, were warned anew of the Ottoman threat, and recognized that on the whole their situation was more favorable than that of their counterparts elsewhere in the Habsburg Empire or in most of Europe.[9]

These are the main reasons why the Hungarian estates proved to be faithful to the Monarchy during the Seven Years War (1756–1763) too. During that war the Habsburgs were not able to regain Silesia, which they had lost in the War of the Austrian Succession. The defeat of the Habsburg army and the loss of Silesia made the leaders of the Empire recognize the relative military and economic weakness of the monarchy. Consequently, they initiated a series of reforms from the 1740s onwards. The lessons of the wars also made the Viennese court realize that its "vast territory and natural resources destined Hungary for a central role among the bases of the Habsburg Monarchy's power".[10] As a result, the leaders of the Empire made serious attempts to utilize the sources of Hungarian economy more effectively.

The first step was taken in Hungary in 1754 with the introduction of new tariff regulations. Inspired by the principles of mercantilism, the government erected an internal customs barrier between Hungary and the other parts of the Empire. The government substantially subsidized the development of manufactures and trade in Austria and the Czech lands. The Viennese court intended to modernize agriculture in all parts of the monarchy, but it was the intention to make Hungary the main suppliers of foodstuffs and industrial raw materials for the industrial regions of Austria and the Czech lands. Low duties were levied on the manufactured products of the Western provinces delivered into Hungary, and much higher ones on goods that were imported from outside the monarchy. High tariffs were imposed on all kinds of Hungarian goods that were to be exported outside the empire, and also on Hungarian industrial products exported to the Western provinces of the empire. This means that the Habsburg government wanted to establish a division of labor between Hungary and Austria and the Czech lands. The Viennese government tried to develop the established branches of the economy in both halves of the empire: agriculture, the production of food and raw materials in Hungary, and manufactures and industrial output in the western lands.[11]

Maria Theresa tried to raise more revenue from Hungary in other ways, too. The queen grew increasingly impatient with the insistence of the Hungarian es-

[9] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 201–202.

[10] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 203.

[11] On the reign of Maria Theresa see K. A. Roider, *Maria Theresa,* Englewood Cliffs 1973. On the economic policy of Maria Theresa see P. G. M. Dickson, *Government and Finance under Maria Theresa 1740–1780,* Oxford 1987. On the reforms of Enlightened Absolutism in Hungary see É. H. Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs 1765–1800: An Experiment in Enlightened Absolutism,* Budapest 1997.

tates on their privileges, especially those concerning taxation. She demanded the Diet, summoned in 1764, to increase the war subsidy. The queen called the attention of the estates to the ineffectiveness of noble insurrection and wanted to convert it to cash payment by the nobility. Maria Theresa also made it clear that she wanted to regulate by law the peasant dues and services and lord-serf relations. But due to the resistance of the estates she decided to dispense with the Diet, and for nearly three decades Hungary was governed by decrees between 1765 and 1790. It is also true that the queen also made efforts to appease the nobility, and during her reign, the growing disaffection between the bulk of the nobility and the monarch did not transform into an open resistance movement.[12]

But with the accession of her son and successor Joseph II (1780–1790) in 1780, the style of Habsburg policy changed markedly. The new monarch did not care about the old compromise at all. Inspired by the ideas of enlightened absolutism, he tried to create

> […] a unitary state not made up of heterogeneous parts, but established on the clear principles of reason and ruled by one ruler and a centralized bureaucracy and army… Joseph recognized that the privileges of the nobility and the Catholic Church, regional rights and institutions were major obstacles in attaining these objectives.[13]

Joseph also tried to centralize the government of Hungary. In May 1784 he made German the language of all official communication and education in Hungary. He argued that Latin was a dead language, and that Hungarian was not civilized enough for the requirements of a modernized government, not to mention the fact that it was spoken by less than 50 per cent of the population of the country. Officials had to learn German within three years. Joseph also ordered a national census and land survey, which were regarded by the nobility as a first step towards abolishing its privileges concerning taxation.[14]

The administrative system of Hungary was traditionally based on the county system, in which the government of the counties was in the hands of the nobility. In March 1785 Joseph abolished the old county system and introduced ten dis-

---

[12] The queen created a fund for Hungarian nobles to study in Vienna in 1749, and established the Royal Hungarian Bodyguard in 1760. She re-acquired the Saxon towns of Szepes from Poland in 1772, reintegrated some military frontier regions into the Hungarian administrative system, and annexed the port of Fiume (now Rijeka in Croatia) on the Adriatic to Hungary.

[13] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 212. On the reign of Joseph II see T. C. W. Blanning, *Joseph II*, Cambridge 1994.

[14] On the census and land survey see P. G. M. Dickson, *Joseph II's Hungarian Land Survey*, in "English Historical Review", 1991, pp. 611–634.

tricts, headed by royal commissars appointed directly by the monarch. In August 1785 the ruler "abolished by decree the name serf and conceded the right of free migration, of the free choice of profession and of the free disposition over property to the peasantry".[15] Through the patent of February 1789 the monarch levied a uniform tax on all landed property, which nobles were also expected to pay. They would have to pay 12.25 per cent of their income from land.[16]

The measures of Joseph II violated the traditional positions of the privileged groups of contemporary Hungarian society. The counties led by the nobility protested vehemently against the census and the land survey. Due to the resistance of the counties it proved to be impossible to put the language decree into practice, "and the military had to be dispatched on several occasions to carry out the census amidst the turbulence."[17] The estates wanted the Diet to be summoned, and dissatisfied nobles devised plans for an insurrection and for inviting an English or Prussian prince to the throne of Hungary. By 1789 Hungary was on the brink of armed revolt.[18]

The Comparison of the position of Hungary and the British Colonies in North America

If one compares the position of Hungary within the Habsburg Empire to the position of the mainland colonies in North America within the British Empire in the 1770s and 1780s, many interesting similarities can be found. I do not doubt that there were fundamental differences as well between the two territories regarding their social structure, economic development, and political institutions. Nonetheless, in this essay I intend to stress the similarities between Hungary and the British colonies in North America.

The Constitutional Position of the Two Territories

Before the reforms of Maria Theresa and especially those of Joseph II, Hungary enjoyed some kind of autonomy and self-government within the empire. The current ruler of the empire was the king or queen of Hungary at the same time, and Hungary had her own legislative body, the Hungarian Diet. The mainland colonies in North America also enjoyed widespread self-government within the Brit-

[15] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 217.
[16] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 217.
[17] Kontler, *Millennium*, cit., pp. 215.
[18] On the 18th-century history of the Habsburg Empire in general see J. Berenger, *A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1700–1918*, Harlow 1997; C. W. Ingrao, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618–1815*, Cambridge 1994.

ish Empire. The king of Britain was the ruler of the colonies, but the colonies also had their own legislative bodies. The governments in Vienna and London were required to approve the decisions of the local legislative bodies, but it was also in the interest of the imperial governments to assure their cooperation. This means that before the reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II in Hungary, and before the end of the Seven Years War in North America, the local and imperial elites could reach a well-working compromise. The North American colonies as well as Hungary profited from participation in imperial structures. Both of them needed military assistance for example, against the Turks and the French. This is not to suggest that the situation on both sides of the Atlantic was exactly the same. The two systems of representation were very different. In the Hungarian Diet only the traditional estates (nobility, Catholic clergy, inhabitants of the so-called royal free towns) were represented, and they constituted a small minority of the total population. It is true that colonial assemblies were also controlled by the local elites, and suffrage was quite restricted. Ownership of freehold land was an important qualification for the franchise, but religious considerations were also deemed important. Jews in seven and Roman Catholics in five colonies had been excluded. Nevertheless, suffrage was still less restricted than in the mother country. According to Colin Bonwick "the probable range of voting was between 50 and 80 per cent of all free white adult males."[19] On the whole it means that far more people had a say in politics in North America than in Hungary. The social structure of Hungarian society was naturally very different, as well. In Hungary serfdom was still in existence and serfs constituted by far the largest stratum of society. The bourgeoisie was much smaller and weaker, and society was still dominated by the privileged estates of the nobility and the Catholic clergy.[20]

The Reasons for the Split between the Peripheries and the Cores of the Empires

Both empires were deeply involved in the international conflicts of the 18th century. It is very interesting that the attitude of the two elites concerning these wars was quite similar again. They supported the war efforts of the empires, but always in view of their own special interests. The consequences of these wars were also similar in Hungary and North America. The British government initiated a new policy towards the colonies at the end of the Seven Years' War, in order to reor-

[19] C. Bonwick, *The American Revolution,* Charlottesville, 1991. pp. 46–47.

[20] J. P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Polities of the British Empire and the United States 1607–1788,* New York, 1990, pp. 7–76; I. K. Steele, *The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689–1784,* in P. J. Marshall (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century,* Oxford 1998, vol. 2. pp. 105–127.

ganize the structure of the enlarged empire. The Viennese court experimented with the same, in order to mobilize the resources of the empire to be able to take revenge against Prussia. Both states became severely indebted, and in order to raise revenue, imperial governments tried to invent more efficient governmental structures. In doing so, the Viennese and the British governments kept in view the ideal of a more centralized and unified empire, serving basically the interests of the imperial centers. They subordinated the local interests of their peripheries to the welfare of the empire as a whole.[21]

The Means of Imperial Intervention

Mercantilist economic policy

The economic policies of both empires were inspired mainly by mercantilism. In mercantilist theory, the value of an empire came to be defined by its utility as both a supplier of raw materials and a market for finished products. To promote its economic interests, the British government introduced several measures for regulating its colonial economy during the 17th century and in the first half of the 18th century.[22] But the British administrations in the first half of the 18th century also developed an approach to colonial affairs known as "salutary neglect". The result of this policy was that the executive power was occasionally lax and always selective in the enforcement of legislation. This meant that the colonists "enjoyed the benefits of British protection and the advantages of trade within the imperial system, while they avoided many of the restrictions aimed at them".[23] As it is well known, Americans complained a lot about the regulation of their economy by the British government even before the Seven Years' War. Some elements of these regulations were discriminatory to be sure, but others definitely supported the development of colonial economy. According to most modern economic historians, on the whole, the British regulations introduced before 1763 rather improved the economic position of the colonies than worsened it.[24]

---

[21] C. Bonwick, *The American Revolution*, Charlottesville, 1991, pp. 69–77; P. Lucas, *American Odyssey, 1607–1789*, Englewood Cliffs 1984, pp. 212–218.

[22] For example the Navigation Acts of 1651, 1660, 1663, 1673, the Wool Act of 1699, the Trade Act of 1705, the Hat Act of 1732, the Molasses Act of 1733, or the Iron Act of 1750. On British mercantilist policy see J. Hughes, *American Economic History*, Boston 1990, pp. 65–81.

[23] Lucas, *American Odyssey* cit., p. 133. On mercantilism and "salutary neglect" see *ibid.*, pp. 57–72, 127–142. There is still a debate among economic historians about the impact of British rule on the colonial economy. On these debates see Hughes, *American Economic History* cit., pp. 65–81.

[24] Hughes, *American Economic History* cit., pp. 65–81.

The Hungarian economy was in a similar position within the Habsburg Empire in the first half of the 18th century. The expulsion of the Turks did provide Hungary with a chance to revive its economy. The growing demand for foodstuffs in the more populous and industrialized Western Habsburg provinces stimulated Hungarian agricultural production. This development was suited to the plans of the Viennese court. Consequently, the Habsburg government, just like the British government in North America, tried to promote the sectors of Hungarian economy that seemed to be the most useful from the point of view of the imperial center. The Viennese court promoted the introduction of better methods of cultivation and animal husbandry in Hungary. It helped to popularize such new plants as corn, tobacco, the potato, hemp, and the mulberry tree in Hungary, just like the British government subsidized the cultivation of indigo in South Carolina and Georgia. Since most cultivated lands were in the hands of the nobility and the Catholic clergy, these developments proved to be profitable for the privileged estates of Hungarian society. Under these circumstances they were ready to reach a compromise with the Habsburgs, and to accept the integration of the country into the empire. It is very important to note that, the new tariff regulations of 1754 did not "demolish" Hungarian economy, despite the arguments of some contemporary authors. Such enlightened Hungarian writers as Gergely Berzeviczy (1763–1822) complained about it after 1790. These regulations were clearly discriminatory, but the inequality regarding the industrial development of Hungary and the Western Habsburg provinces did not emerge as a result of the new regulations, and did not increase as a result of them. Hungary exported agricultural products outside the Habsburg Empire in large quantities before 1754: cattle to Venice and Northern Italy, wine to Poland and Western Europe, and grain to several countries. It means that Hungarian economy was in dependence of foreign regions even before the introduction of the new tariff regulations. László Kontler argued:

> What now happened was that some of her main partners were changed. For the Hungarian purchaser it was probably inconvenient that better and cheaper products from Silesia and Germany were now replaced with somewhat inferior and more expensive articles from the neighboring Habsburg lands. But for Hungarian craftsmen and the few industrialists, the competition of these products was less dangerous, and consequently more conducive to progress, which… did take place in the number of capitalist factories and the sophistication of their products as well.[25]

Attention is to be called to the fact that the impact of imperial economic regulations was also similar in Hungary and colonial North America. Although imperial centers wanted to restrict and regulate the economic activities of their peripheries,

[25] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 204–205.

the economies of Hungary and British North America did not "collapse" as a result of them, despite the serious complaints of contemporaries at both places. On the contrary, according to modern economic historians, the economies of both peripheries could also profit from them.But under the pressure of urgent need for the reorganization of the structure of their empires, both imperial governments ended the compromises of former years. The Viennese court introduced the new tariff regulations of 1754, and made preparations for the reform of the tax system. The London government also invented new methods to raise revenue in the colonies, and to tighten the control of them after 1763.[26] And in contrast to the former decades, decision-makers in Vienna and London made it clear that they were determined to enforce new regulations.

The Reaction of the Hungarian Estates and the North American Colonists to the New Intervention of Imperial Centers

Fluctuations in the balance of power

On both sides of the Atlantic a peculiar fluctuation was observable in the relationship between the imperial peripheries and centers during the 18th century. The oscillation of the pendulum depended upon the actual balance of power between the two sides. The Passing of the Declaratory Act in 1766 after the repeal of the Stamp Act, the Townshend Acts a year later in the British Empire and the accession of Joseph II to the throne in 1780 in the Habsburg Empire, were clear signs that both imperial governments were determined to continue their administrative reforms.[27]

The role of the local legislations

In the North American mainland, the colonial assemblies were bastions of local self-government and centers of resistance against the encroachments of the British government. In Hungary, local government and administration were managed by the county assemblies, in which only the nobility was represented. These assemblies were not only bastions against the encroachments of the Habsburgs, but also the main defenders of the traditional privileges of the nobility. No wonder that one of the principal aims of Joseph II was to eliminate the counties from the administrative system of the country. Instead of having more than sixty counties, he organized ten districts, which were headed by loyal royal commissars. The two-

[26] For example: the Proclamation of 1763, the American Revenue or Sugar Act of 1764, the Stamp Act of 1765.

[27] On the Declaratory Act, the Stamp Act and the Townshend Duties see: C. Bonwick: *The American Revolution*, pp. 71–75.

fold aim of this measure was to rationalize and modernize the administration of the empire, and to crush the resistance of the Hungarian nobility. The British government also tried to crush the resistance of the colonial assemblies, and loyal colonial governors had the same conflict with the assemblies as the royal commissars with the counties in Hungary.[28]

Loyalists in British North America and Hungary

Nevertheless, not all Hungarians were hostile towards the measures of Joseph II. He had a little group of devoted followers, the Hungarian Josephists. They realized the backwardness of their homeland, and as faithful disciples of the Enlightenment, they had confidence in an enlightened monarch. As royal commissars and other civil servants appointed by Joseph, Hungarian Josephists played a crucial role in Hungarian state administration during his reign. They were shocked by the resistance of their compatriots to the "benevolent" reforms of Joseph. But they were also Hungarians who worried about some of their ruler's measures, especially the language decree and the subordination of Hungarian interests to the ideal of a centralized monarchy. The American loyalists, especially the royal governors of American origin – Thomas Hutchinson (1711–1780) the last civilian governor of Massachusetts, is the best example – were in a very similar position in revolutionary North America. They also tried to reconcile their loyalty to the mother country and their homeland. On the other hand, loyalists constituted a much larger proportion of colonial society than the tiny fraction of Hungarian Josephists. According to some estimates, loyalists constituted some 20-30 per cent of the total population of the thirteen North American colonies, and the representatives of all social strata could be found among them. The proportion of Hungarian Josephists in the total population was much lower and they were almost exclusively noblemen and intellectuals.[29]

---

[28] On the colonial assemblies see for example J. P. Greene, *Peripheries* cit., pp. 19–76; Lucas, *American Odyssey* cit., pp. 169–176. On the role of the counties in Hungary see Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 215–217.

[29] It should be also added that regions differed greatly in regard to the proportion of loyalists in them. The proportion hardly exceeded 10 per cent in New England, while in the South as a whole it was around 25-30 per cent. Regarding the middle colonies we know for example that 27 per cent of adult males voted against independence in Queen's county (New York) in September 1776. On loyalists see Bonwick, *The American Revolution* cit., 96–101. o. On Hungarian Josephists see Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 212–213. On the role of colonial governors see Greene, *Peripheries* cit., pp. 21–22, 34–42, 46–47. On the life and career of Thomas Hutchinson see B. Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, Cambridge, Mass. 1974.

The role of the local elites

Hungarian nobles were eager to maintain their traditional privileges and also their leading role against their social inferiors on the one hand, and they were the defenders of the country's independence against the absolutist tendencies of the Habsburg emperors on the other. In some ways, colonial elites were in the same position. They dominated the colonial assemblies and they were the leaders of the resistance against the new measures of the British. On the other hand, they were also eager to maintain their privileged position and opposed the radicalization of the revolution.[30]

Similarities in the arguments of the opposition

It is very interesting that the arguments used by the local assemblies in Hungary and North America were similar too. They argued that they simply defended their "ancient rights and liberties" against the tyrannical intrusions and innovations of their respective rulers. They emphasized that they wanted nothing more but to return to the "good old days" of the former compromise.[31]

Changing identities in British North America and Hungary

Resistance to the encroachments of the imperial centers proved to be a major catalyst in the birth of modern nationalism and national consciousness in both places. The resistance to the language decree of Joseph gave a major impetus to the movement for the modernization of the Hungarian language. These were the days of the birth of modern Hungarian literature and science. Every "true Hungarian" gentleman and lady wore stylized national costumes to demonstrate their national identity and resistance against Joseph. The breach with Great Britain also forced the American colonists to try to redefine their identity. First, they emphasized that they were the true heirs to English liberties, but after independence, they had

[30] Bonwick, *The American Revolution* cit., pp. 38–42, 45–48, 61–65, 112–114, 126–129, 197–198. On Hungarian nobility see Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 198–200.

[31] On the ideology of the American Revolution see B. Bailyn, *The Ideological origins of the American Revolution*, Cambridge, Mass. 1967; G. S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic 1776–1787*, Chapel Hill 1969; J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*, Princeton, 1975. On the influence of Enlightenment in Hungary see G. Barany, *Hoping Against Hope: The Enlightened Age in Hungary*, in "American Historical Review", 1971, 76, 1, pp. 319–357. P. F. Sugar, *The Influence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution in Eighteenth-Century Hungary*, in "Journal of Central European Affairs", 1958, 17, pp. 331–355.

to take a step forward and they started to stress their peculiar American characteristics.[32]

Conclusion

The resistance to the measures of Joseph II brought Hungary to the brink of an open revolt. Nevertheless, in contrast to the mainland colonies in North America, this dissatisfaction with the policy of the imperial center never led to an open rebellion, despite the above-mentioned similarities. Under the pressure of international (unsuccessful war against the Ottoman Empire, rebellion in the Austrian Netherlands, and the outbreak of the French Revolution) and domestic events, the disillusioned and mortally ill Joseph revoked all his decrees except for the Patent of Toleration and those relating to parishes and the peasantry four weeks before his death, at the end of January 1790. His successor and younger brother, Leopold, shared the fundamental principles but not the rigidity of his brother, and was a more tactical politician. Leopold II (1790–1792) summoned the Hungarian Diet, which ended with a compromise again. The Hungarian estates acknowledged the rule of the Habsburg dynasty in Hungary again, while a law passed by the Diet and adopted by the king, described the country as a "free and independent kingdom", to be governed by its laws only. The ruler was obliged to summon the Diet every three years and the exclusive right to vote taxes and recruitment was also given to it.[33]

[32] J. P. Greene, *Empire and Identity from the Glorious Revolution to the American Revolution,* in Marshall (ed.), *Oxford History of the British Empire* cit., pp. 208–230. Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 215–216.

[33] Kontler, *Millennium* cit., pp. 217–220.

Gábor Pusztai

Ein kleines Land mit Großmachtallüren – Holland und seine Kolonialpolitik

Für mich als Literaturhistoriker, der sich vor allem mit der niederländischen (kolonialen) Literatur beschäftigt, war es eine schöne Aufgabe und zugleich eine große Herausforderung, mich auf das Gebiet der Historiker zu wagen. Die Frage, was die Niederlande nun war, eine Großmacht oder ein kleines Land im Nordwesten Europas, ist eine ambivalente. Im weiteren versuche ich diese Frage zu beantworten und zu zeigen, wie sich im Laufe der Jahrhunderte die Stellung der Niederlande änderte und was für eine Rolle dabei die Kolonialpolitik gespielt hat.

*

Eine kleine Großmacht

Die Niederlande waren seit ihrer Unabhängigkeit im Jahre 1648 nicht nur ein Land des wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Aufschwungs im Goldenen Jahrhundert, sondern auch eine der bedeutendsten Seemächte Europas. Sie haben mit Erfolg gegen eines der mächtigsten Länder des damaligen Europas, gegen Spanien, gekämpft und die Unabhängigkeit erworben. Die Niederlande wurden nach der Schweiz die zweite Republik Europas.

Die Niederländer konnten 1652 im Ersten Englisch–Niederländischen Krieg, der wegen dem *Act of Navigation* (1651) ausgebrochen war, die englische Flotte schlagen,[1] im Nordischen Krieg (1655–1660) um den Sund konnte die niederländische Flotte die Schweden zurückdrängen und im Zweiten Englisch–Niederländischen Krieg (1665–1667) haben die Holländer ihren Feind auf eigenem Boden geschlagen. Auf der Themse fuhr die niederländische Flotte bis Chatham, durchbrach die englische Blockade und vernichtete die englische Flotte.[2] 1672, im sogenannten „Katastrophenjahr", als die vereinte englisch–französische Flotte und die Bistümer Köln und Münster zu gleicher Zeit die

[1] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis* Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 218.

[2] Ronald Prud'homme van Rijne, *Rechterhand van Nederland* Amsterdam, 1998, 193.

junge Republik angriffen, konnte Holland diesen feindlichen Angriff abwehren.[3] Diese militärischen Erfolge gegen die Großmächte Europas zeigen die ökonomische und militärische Stärke der jungen Republik und machen deutlich, dass die Niederlande im 17. Jahrhundert selbst zu den Großmächten gehörten.

Neben dem Erkämpfen der Unabhängigkeit, dem Abwehren der Anfälle der Feinde und der kulturellen Blütezeit[4] hatte das Land auch genug Mittel und Kraft, die Expansion in Übersee zu beginnen. Die Expansion begann bereits Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts und war ein reines Handelsunternehmen.[5] Für die Niederländer war neben dem lukrativen Ostseehandel der Vertrieb der asiatischen Gewürze in Nordeuropa eine der wichtigsten Handelsaktivitäten. Die Gewürze (vor allem Pfeffer, Gewürznelken und Zimt) kamen in portugiesischen Schiffen aus Asien in Lissabon an und wurden unter anderen an niederländische Händler verkauft.[6] Die Niederländer haben dann die Märkte von Nordeuropa mit der exotischen und sehr teuren Ware versorgt. Es war eine sehr rentable Aktivität, die die holländischen Kaufleute auch am Anfang des Krieges gegen Spanien (1568–1648) ausüben konnten. Dass die Niederländer doch selbst den Seeweg nach Asien suchten, war verschiedenen Faktoren zu danken. Der erste Faktor war das veränderte Machtverhältnis in Portugal. Der spanische König Philip II. annektierte Portugal und wurde ab 1580 auch portugiesischer König. Das hatte erst keinen direkten Einfluss auf den Handel mit Holland, aber Philip II. hat 1585 die spanischen und portugiesischen Häfen geschlossen und die ausländischen Schiffe beschlagnahmt.[7] Der zweite Faktor war, dass die Portugiesen ab 1580 die Gewürze in Lissabon nicht mehr frei an die ausländischen Händler verkauften, sondern sogenannte „Pfefferverträge“ schlossen. Damit wollten die Portugiesen vor allem süddeutsche Handelshäuser, wie zum Beispiel die Fugger und Welser, oder spanische und italienische Händler bevorzugen und die Niederländer zurückdrängen.[8] Ein dritter Faktor war der Preis des Pfeffers, der ab 1592 drastisch stieg. Das war den Engländer zu danken, die alles getan haben, um portugiesische und spanische Schiffe zu erobern und zu versenken, bevor diese die portugiesischen Häfen erreichten. Demzufolge erreichte nur ein Teil der mit Pfeffer beladenen portugiesischen Schiffe aus Asien Lissabon. Es kam also immer weniger Pfeffer auf den europäischen Markt, obwohl die Nachfrage

---

[3] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis* Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 224.

[4] Denken wir nur an die berühmten niederländischen Maler der Zeit wie Rembrandt, Frans Hals oder Vermeer. Siehe weiter: J. J. M. Timmers, *De glorie van Nederland*, Tirion, Baarn, 1989, 180–264.

[5] J. J.P. De Jong, *De waaier van het Fortuin*, SDU, Den Haag, 1999, 7.

[6] J. van Goor, J. van, *De Nederlandse koloniën*, SDU, Den Haag 1994, 16.

[7] Femme S. Gaastra, *Geschiedenis van de VOC*, Walburgpwers, Zutphen, 2009, 11.

[8] Idem.

immer größer wurde. Venedig hatte natürlich auch einen Anteil an dem europäischen Gewürzmarkt, aber konnte die steigende Nachfrage auch nicht befriedigen.[9] Ein vierter Faktor war die Besetzung von Antwerpen 1585. Gerade in dem Jahr, als Philip II. die niederländischen Schiffe in den portugiesischen und spanischen Häfen beschlagnahmte, besetzten die Spanier mit Antwerpen die wichtigste Hafenstadt der Niederlande.[10] Die Bewohner der Stadt, unter anderen Händler, Künstler, Wissenschaftler und reiche Bürger, flohen in den Norden. Sie nahmen ihr Hab und Gut, aber auch ihr Wissen, die Kunst und Handelsbeziehungen mit. Die niederländische Flotte schloss die Schelde ab und versperrte damit den Zugang zum Hafen.[11] Antwerpen als wichtigster Pfeffermarkt in Nordeuropa ging verloren und es sah so aus, dass seine Rolle von Hamburg übernommen würde.[12] Die Flüchtlinge aus Antwerpen stimulierten durch ihr mitgenommenes Kapital, Wissen und die Beziehungen die nordniederländische Ökonomie. Auch ihnen war es zu danken, dass Amsterdam, das als Pfeffermarkt bis dahin nur eine sehr bescheidene Rolle gespielt hatte,[13] letztendlich die Rolle von Antwerpen übernahm.[14] Der fünfte Faktor war, dass die Niederländer zu dieser Zeit schon genügend Kenntnisse hatten, um die Reise nach Asien zu wagen. Sie hatten jahrhundertelange Erfahrung auf der Ostsee, Nordsee und dem Mittelmeer. Außerdem waren in der Zeit in Holland Beschreibungen über Asien erschienen. Lucas Janszoon Waghenaer schrieb 1592 das Werk *Tresoor der Zeevaert*, in dem das bereits früher herausgegebene Werk von Dirck Gerritszoon *China* aufgenommen war. 1596 erschien von Jan Huigen van Linschoten *Itinerario*, eine wichtige Beschreibung des Seeweges von Europa nach Asien. Van Linschoten machte 1584 in portugiesischem Dienst eine Reise von Lissabon nach Asien und kam erst 1592 nach Europa zurück. Er hat während seiner Reise insgeheim Karten gezeichnet und Notizen gemacht und übte damit eine Art Betriebsspionage gegen die Portugiesen aus.

Diese fünf Faktoren haben dazu geführt, dass die Niederländer den Schritt wagten, aus eigenen Kräften den Seeweg zu den Gewürzinseln zu finden. Die Zeit war reif für ein eigenes Unternehmen: Die bisherigen Handelsquellen in Portugal gab es nicht mehr, es gab genug Kapital, Wissen und Erfahrung im eigenen Land und es lohnte sich, die Reise zu riskieren, denn die Pfefferpreise waren unglaublich hoch. Nach einigen fehlgeschlagenen Versuchen Richtung

[9] Idem. 13.
[10] J. C. Blom, E. Lamberts (red.), *Geschiedenis van de Lage Landen*, HB Baarn, 2006, 115.
[11] Gert Mak, *Amszterdam, egy város életrajza*, Corvina, Budapest, 2001, 73.
[12] Femme S. Gaastra, *Geschiedenis van de VOC*, Walburgpwers, Zutphen, 2009, 11.
[13] Idem.
[14] Gert Mak, *Amszterdam, egy város életrajza*, Corvina, Budapest, 2001, 73.

Norden[15] sind 1595 vier Schiffe mit 249 Mann an Bord unter Kommando von Cornelis de Houtman Richtung Süden in See gestochen. Es war ein Sprung ins Dunkel. Keiner wusste, ob die Schiffe jemals zurückkehren würden. Deshalb versuchte man die (finanziellen) Risiken zu minimalisieren. Neun Kaufleute aus Amsterdam haben eine „Compagnie", eine Handelsgesellschaft, gegründet und das Geld (300.000 Gulden) für die Expedition zusammengebracht. Das war die „Compagnie van Verre." De Houtman ist nach zwei Jahren 1597 nach Amsterdam zurückgekehrt mit drei Schiffen und nur 89 Überlebenden an Bord, aber mit Pfeffer im Laderaum. Was aber das wichtigste war, der Seeweg war gefunden. Der Gewürzhandel war kein Monopol mehr der Portugiesen, er stand jetzt auch den Niederländern offen. Sie eroberten wichtige Handelshäfen und Küsten, gründeten Faktoreien unter anderem auf Java und Sumatra, in Südafrika, Indien, Ceylon, China, Malakka, den Philippinen und Japan. Die 1602 gegründete Niederländische Ostindien-Kompanie (Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie) war weltweit das größte und kapitalstärkste Unternehmen seiner Zeit.[16] Die Holländer schalteten ihre portugiesische und englische Konkurrenz aus und beherrschten nicht nur den Handel zwischen Java und Europa, sondern spielten auch im asiatischen Handel eine bedeutende Rolle. 1619 wurde von Jan Pieterszon Coen Batavia das heutige Jakarta gegründet.[17] Aus einem unwichtigen Küstenort wurde das wichtigste Handelszentrum Südostasiens. Auch in Afrika (Kapkolonie) und Amerika (Suriname, Antillen) besaß Holland Handelsgebiete, aber die wichtigsten und größten Gebiete besaßen die Niederlande unter dem Namen Niederländisch-Indien, dem heutigen Indonesien, im Südosten Asiens. Dank der ökonomischen Erfolge konnten die Niederlande in Asien ein Imperium aufbauen und damit im 17. Jahrhundert die Stabilität und den Wohlstand im Mutterland sichern. Was Oberfläche und Bevölkerungszahl anging, waren die Niederlande ein kleines Land, aber nach der ökonomischen und militärischen (vor allem maritimen) Kraft zu urteilen, war das Land eine Großmacht. Eine „kleine Großmacht" also. Das „Goldene Jahrhundert" nahm im 18. Jahrhundert ein Ende, die Ökonomie kränkelte und die Bedeutung von Holland in der europäischen Politik nahm rasch ab.

---

[15] Die Expeditionen von Willem Barendsz auf Initiative des Geografen und Theologen Petrus Plancius, um den Seeweg über den Norden (eine nordöstliche Passage) nach Asien zu finden, waren misslungen. Barentsz starb auf der letzten Fahrt 1595. Siehe dazu mehr in Karel Bostoen (red.), *Verhalen over verre landen*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2001, 19–27.

[16] Els M. Jacobs, *Varen om peper en thee*, Zutphen, 1991, 95.

[17] Theo D'Haen, *Inleiding*, Theo D'Haen (red.), *Europa Buitnegaats, Koloniale en postkoloniale literaturen in Europeische talen*, Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2002, 43.

Ein kleines europäisches Land

Im 18. Jahrhundert war die Position der Niederlande geschwächt. Am Ende des Jahrhunderts sorgten Konflikte zwischen *Patrioten* (Sympathisanten der französischen Revolution) und sogenannten *Prinsgezinden* (Anhängern der Oranier) für blutige Auseinandersetzungen.[18] Die französische Besatzung 1795 und das Ausrufen der *Bataafse Republiek*, das Königreich Holland 1806 und schließlich die Einverleibung der Niederlande in Frankreich 1810 führten Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts das endgültige Ende der Großmachtstellung von Holland herbei.[19] Die Briten haben schon Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts angefangen, die niederländischen Kolonien zu besetzen. Nach der französischen Invasion in den Niederlanden sahen die Briten, die seit 1793 gegen Frankreich Krieg führten, ihre Position in Übersee gefährdet und wollten verhindern, dass strategische Gebiete, wie z.B. Kapstadt und die Kapkolonie in die Hände der Franzosen fielen. Das hätte weitgehende Folgen für die britischen Kolonien in Asien, wie z.B. für Indien, gehabt. Auf diese Weise haben die Niederlande alle ihre Gebiete in Übersee verloren. Während der „französischen Zeit" kam die Niederländische Ostindien-Kompanie (VOC) endgültig in Probleme.[20]

Während die Niederländische Ostindien-Kompanie im 17. Jahrhundert Gewinne in astronomischer Höhe machte, verfiel sie im 18. Jahrhundert. Dabei spielten Konflikte mit England (vor allem der letzte Englisch–Niederländische Krieg 1780–1784), Organisationsprobleme, Korruption und die immer stärker werdende Konkurrenz eine wichtige Rolle und besiegelten Ende des Jahrhunderts den Untergang der Handelsgesellschaft.[21]

Die Niederländische Ostindien-Kompanie ging 1799 bankrott. Der niederländische Staat übernahm den Rest der Gesellschaft samt aller Schulden (die mehr als 140 Millionen Gulden betrugen) und Besitztümer.[22] Erst die französische Besetzung und Plünderung des Landes,[23] der Bankrott der größten Handelsgesellschaft des Landes sowie der Verlust der Gebiete in Übersee machten aus Holland ein unbedeutendes, kleines europäisches Land an der Nordsee.

---

[18] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis* Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 254–260.
[19] Idem. 282.
[20] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 142.
[21] Femme S. Gaastra, *De geschiedenis van de VOC*, Zutphen, 1991, 170.
[22] E. M. Beekman, *Paradijzen van weleer*, Prometheus, Amsterdam, 1998, 22.
[23] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 282.

Nach dem Fall von Napoleon bekamen die Niederlande 1814 die wichtigsten Kolonien von England zurück.[24] Ceylon, die Kapkolonie (Südafrika) und weitere Gebiete in Afrika behielten die Briten aber. Dass die Holländer die wichtigsten Kolonien (vor allem Niederländisch-Indien) zurückbekamen, ist damit zu erklären, dass England und die anderen Siegermächte das neue Europa beim Wiener Kongress so einrichten wollten, dass Frankreich keine Chance mehr hatte, seine Nachbarn zu bedrohen. Deshalb wollte man nördlich von Frankreich einen stabilen Staat schaffen.[25] Das wurde das Königreich der Niederlande (1815–1830), das aus dem heutigen Holland, Belgien und Luxemburg bestand. Es konnte nach den damaligen Auffassungen nur stark sein, wenn es auch Kolonien besaß.[26] Die Niederlande mussten also nach der Befreiung von der französischen Besatzung eine Großmachtfunktion nördlich von Frankreich erfüllen, aber das dauerte nur kurz. Der erste König des neuen Königreichs wurde Wilhelm I. aus dem Hause Oranien-Nassau. Die Provinzen im Süden des Landes (Flandern und Wallonien) akzeptierten die Politik des Königs nicht.[27] 1830 brach ein Aufstand aus, dessen Ziel es war, den südlichen Landesteil aus dem Königreich auszugliedern und einen neuen Staat unter den Namen Belgien zu gründen.[28] Die Niederlande, die im 17. Jahrhundert noch eine europäische Großmacht waren, in militärischen Konflikten England, Schweden und Frankreich schlagen konnten, waren jetzt nicht mehr fähig, einen Aufstand in Flandern zu bezwingen. Die letzte Chance, aus den Niederlanden wieder eine Großmacht zu machen, war 1830 verflogen. Holland wurde endgültig ein kleines Land am westlichen Rande Europas mit einer kleinen Wirtschaft, einer unbedeutenden Armee und geringem politischen Gewicht. Trotzdem gab es ein Gebiet, auf dem die Niederlande mit den europäischen Großmächten gleichzogen: ihr Kolonialreich.

[24] J.C.H. Blom, E. Lamberts (red.), *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden*, Baarn, 2006, 248.
[25] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 100.
[26] Idem.
[27] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 285.
[28] Der König Willhelm I. akzeptierte das neue Land Belgien bis 1838 nicht, weil er es immer noch als Teil seines Königreichs betrachtete. Nur unter dem Druck von England und Frankreich war er bereit, acht Jahre nach dem Aufstand den Vertrag mit Belgien zu unterzeichnen. Siehe dazu: E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 100.

Bescheidenheit in Europa aber Großmachtallüren in Asien

Nach der Aufhebung des Königreichs der Niederlande 1830 brachte das 19. Jahrhundert für Holland nichts Aufregendes. Das Land zog sich zurück, nahm an den großen europäischen politischen Prozessen nicht teil und verfolgte eine passive Neutralitätspolitik.[29] Als 1848 in den meisten europäischen Ländern eine bürgerliche Revolution ausbrach (z.B. in Italien, Frankreich, Deutschland, Polen, Ungarn usw.), blieb es in Holland bei einer Verfassungsreform. Auch der Deutsch–Österreichische Krieg (1866) und der Deutsch–Französische Krieg (1870–71) hatten für Holland keine weitgehenden Folgen, Holland blieb neutral und passiv.[30] Die Niederlande vermieden alle Konflikte auf dem alten Kontinent und zogen sich in ihr Schneckenhaus zurück. Das Land war wehrlos und schwach.[31]

Im Gegensatz zu der passiven Neutralitätspolitik in Europa verfolgten die Niederlande nach anfänglichem Zögern im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in ihren Kolonien eine sehr aktive und aggressive Expansionspolitik, sowohl auf wirtschaftlichem als auch auf militärischem Gebiet.

Von den ausgedehnten Handelsgebieten der Niederländischen Ostindien-Kompanie blieb nach dem Wiener Kongress nicht viel übrig. Nur Niederländisch-Indien wurde 1816 wieder holländischer Besitz, Ceylon und Südafrika (Kapkolonie) haben die Briten behalten.[32] Der Regierungsstil des englischen Gouverneurs Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles (besser bekannt als Gründer von Singapur) orientierte sich an den Werten der Aufklärung und war auch später für seinen niederländischen Nachfolger Van der Capellen ein Vorbild. Van der Capellen führte eine doppelte Verwaltung ein, in die neben dem holländischen Kolonialbeamten auch die örtliche Eingeborenenaristokratie einbezogen war. Niederländische Beamte waren verpflichtet, die einheimische Sprache zu erlernen, der Gouverneur stimulierte die Erforschung der einheimischen Sprachen und Kultur, förderte den Unterricht der Einheimischen, gründete den botanischen Garten in Buitenzorg (heute Bogor) und versuchte zu verhindern, dass europäische Großunternehmer Plantagen auf Java gründeten, weil er davon über-

---

[29] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 354.

[30] Abgesehen von einer fehlgeschlagenen und katastrophal langsamen Mobilisierung, weshalb der zuständige Minister entlassen wurde, und ungefähr 23.000 niederländischen Toten im Folge einer Pockenepidemie, die wegen des Krieges ausgebrochen war, hatte der Krieg auf Holland keinen Einfluss. Siehe dazu: http://www.innl.nl/page/3656/nl und Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 354.

[31] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 142.

[32] J. J. M. Timmers, *De glorie van Nederland*, Tirion, Baarn, 1989, 298.

zeugt war, dass dies nur zur Ausbeutung der Bevölkerung führen würde. Diese Maßnahmen waren ganz im Sinne der Aufklärung, aber kosteten sehr viel Geld. Das Defizit der Kolonie betrug 20 Millionen Gulden. Die Kolonie kostete den niederländischen Staat eine Menge Geld, statt Geld zu verdienen. Parallel dazu wurden Aufstände und bewaffnete Konflikte in dem Gebiet immer häufiger. Der niederländische Staat, der sich in Europa neutral und passiv aufstellte, wollte im 19. Jahrhundert seine Macht auf dem Archipel ausbreiten. Diese aggressive Expansionspolitik der Niederländer stieß aber oft auf den Widerstand der örtlichen Sultane. Auf Sumatra gab es den Padri-Krieg (1819–1825), den außergewöhnlich blutigen und langen Atjeh-Krieg (1873–1914) und den Batak-Krieg (1872–1895), auf Java den Java-Krieg (1825–1830), auf Borneo den Chinesischen Aufstand (1823), auf Celebes den Bone-Krieg (1825) und auf Ambon den Ambon–Krieg (1817), der dem Kolonisator sehr ernsthafte Probleme und noch höhere Ausgaben einbrachte. Allein der Atjeh-Krieg kostete den niederländischen Staat zwischen 7 und 20 Millionen Gulden pro Jahr.[33] Im Gegensatz zur holländischen Haltung in Europa, verfolgten die Niederlande im 19. Jahrhundert in ihren Kolonien also eine sehr aggressive Politik, die viel Geld kostete. Am Ende des Java-Krieges hatte sich das Defizit der Kolonie verdoppelt und betrug 40 Millionen Gulden. Die Regierung in Den Haag hatte genug von der Führung der Kolonie, die nur Verluste machte. Ein neuer Gouverneur General wurde ernannt: Johannes van den Bosch. Van den Bosch leitete die Kolonie mit harter Hand und führte ein System ein, mit dem das Mutterland Gewinn aus der Kolonie ziehen konnte. Es wurde unter dem Namen „Kultursystem“ [cultuurstelsel] bekannt.[34] Man ging davon aus, dass alles Land in der Kolonie dem Staat gehörte. Wenn jemand das Land oder einen Teil davon benutzte, musste er dafür zahlen. Auch der kleine Bauer, der auf einem kleinen Acker Reis anbaute, musste eine Art Steuer dafür zahlen. Die Regierung wollte diese Steuer aber nicht in Bargeld, sondern in Naturalien einnehmen. Die Bauern wurden verpflichtet, auf einem Fünftel ihres Landes Kulturpflanzen anzubauen, die für den europäischen Markt wichtig waren. Daher kommt der Name „Kultursystem“. Diese Pflanzen waren vor allem Kaffee, Tee, Zuckerrohr, Tabak usw. Die Ernte wurde für einen sehr niedrigen, von dem Gouvernement festgelegten Preis von den Bauern aufgekauft. Die Erzeugnisse wurden später auf dem europäischen Markt teuer, also mit viel Gewinn, verkauft. Das System wurde 1830 eingeführt und schon ein Jahr später konnte man einen Gewinn verbuchen. 1831 machte man schon 200.000 Gulden Profit. Im Vergleich zu den Verlusten der Jahre davor, war das ein sehr gutes Ergebnis. Die Gewinne wurden immer höher: 1834 6 Millionen Gulden, 1857 45 Millionen Gulden. Zwischen 1831 und 1877 zog die Kolonie

[33] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 331.
[34] E. M. Beekman, *Paradijzen van weleer*, Prometheus, Amsterdam, 1998, 23.

Niederländisch-Indien eine positive Bilanz mit 823 Millionen Gulden Gewinn.[35] Das ist eine sehr hohe Summe, wenn man bedenkt, dass ein Arbeiter in dieser Zeit in Holland im Durchschnitt ungefähr 1 Gulden pro Tag verdiente.[36] Dank dieser Einnahmen konnten die Niederlande ihre anderen Kolonien mit einer negativen Bilanz finanzieren, sie konnten die Sklaverei abschaffen (1863), zahlten ihre Staatsschulden zurück und konnten im 19. Jahrhundert ihr gesamtes Eisenbahnnetz finanzieren.[37] Außerdem bildete die Kolonie einen riesigen Absatzmarkt für holländische Textilwaren.[38] Für die einheimische Bevölkerung von Java hatte das Kultursystem jedoch verheerende Folgen. Da die Bauern nicht auf ihrem ganzen Land Reis anbauen konnten, wurden ihre Vorräte an diesem Hauptnahrungsmittel immer knapper. Ein einziges Jahr mit Missernten reichte, damit eine Hungersnot ausbrach. Das Kultursystem hatte in Holland wirtschaftlichen Aufschwung und Wohlstand zu Folge, auf Java bedeutete es aber Hunger und Entbehrungen.[39]

Die liberale Regierung der Niederlande hob das Kultursystem 1870 auf.[40] Zur gleichen Zeit wurde die Kolonie für europäische Landbauunternehmer geöffnet. In dieser Zeit entstanden die großen Plantagen auf Java, wo vor allem Tee, Zuckerrohr und Kaffee angebaut wurde. Europäische Unternehmer konnten von der Regierung für 75 Jahre Landgüter pachten.[41] Auch in anderer Hinsicht kamen Änderungen in den kolonialen Alltag. 1869 wurde der Suezkanal eröffnet, womit die Reise zwischen der Kolonie und dem Mutterland wesentlich kürzer wurde.[42] Regelmäßige Dampfschifffahrtlinien entstanden, Gasbeleuchtung, Telegraf, Telefon, Elektrizität, Eisenbahnlinien und später das Automobil machten das Leben in den Tropen wesentlich erträglicher. Diese Entwicklung

---

[35] H.W. van den Doel, *Het rijk van Insulinde. Opkomst en ondergang van een Nederlandse kolonie*, Amsterdam, 1996, 91.

[36] Der Wochenlohn eines Maurers lag 1860 in Utrecht bei 9 Gulden, der eines Zimmermannes bei 7,5 Gulden. Fabrikarbeiter verdienten deutlich weniger. Siehe dazu: P.D. 't Hart, *Leven in Utrecht 1850–1914: groei naar een moderne stad*, Hilversum, Het Utrechts Archief/Verloren, 2005, 208. Siehe auch: J.J.M. Timmers, *De glorie van Nederland* Tirion, Baarn, 1989, 307.; Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 315.

[37] H.W. van den Doel, *Het rijk van Insulinde. Opkomst en ondergang van een Nederlandse kolonie*, Amsterdam, 1996, 91.

[38] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 143.

[39] Erik Sweers, *Het cultuurstelsel 1830–1870*, http://www.theobakker.net/pdf/cultuurstelsel_geschiedenis.nl.pdf

[40] Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis*, Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991, 355.

[41] A. F. Manning, P.W. Klein, *Nederland rond 1900* The Readers Digest NV, Amsterdam, 1993, 282.

[42] E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986, 330.

hat dazu beigetragen, dass mehr Europäer, vor allem mehr Frauen, nach Niederländisch-Indien reisten. Das Leben in der Kolonie wurde europäischer.

Nach dem Ende des Kultursystems 1870 wurde die Staatskasse etwas ärmer. Die Staatseinnahmen kamen in den 50er Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts zu 31% aus den Kolonien, nach 1870 betrug der Anteil nur noch 13%.[43] Trotz dieser finanziellen Einbußen wurde das Kultursystem nicht wieder eingeführt, sondern die freie Arbeit gefördert. Man ging in der niederländischen Kolonie von einem feudalen System zu einem kapitalistisch-liberalen System über. Riesige Plantagen entstanden auf Java und auf Sumatra, die in den Händen von internationalen Gesellschaften waren. Neben traditionellen Produkten wie Tabak, Kaffee, Tee und Zuckerrohr kam der Kautschuk als wichtige Kulturpflanze hinzu. Man produzierte für den Weltmarkt und verdiente sehr gut damit.

Neben finanziellem Gewinn und Reformen brachte die Jahrhundertwende auch politische Turbulenzen. Der Zweite Burenkrieg (1899–1902) verursachte in den Niederlanden große Aufregung unter der Bevölkerung. Die Holländer fühlten sich sowohl kulturell, volkstümlich als auch sprachlich mit den Buren verwandt und unterstützten sie – moralisch jedenfalls – in ihrem Kampf gegen die machtgierigen Briten. Das grobe britische Auftreten in Südafrika gegen die Buren und auch gegen niederländische Staatsbürger empörte die Holländer in Europa.[44] Proteste und Demonstrationen waren die Folgen, aber die niederländische Regierung wagte es nicht, deutliche Schritte gegen London zu unternehmen, denn sie hatte Angst, die Briten könnten etwas gegen Niederländisch-Indien unternehmen.[45] Auch in so einer schwierigen Situation im Inland haben die Niederlande also die europäische Passivität gewählt, um ihre Kolonie, also den aktiven Teil ihrer Politik, zu schützen.

Im Fall Curacao wurde auch deutlich, wo der Primat der niederländischen Außenpolitik lag, nämlich in den Kolonien und nicht in Europa. Die wichtigste und größte Kolonie der Niederlande war zwar Niederländisch-Indien, aber das Land hatte auch im karibischen Gebiet Besitzungen: Curacao und Suriname. Nachdem die Bedeutung der USA in dieser Region in der Folge des Spanisch-Amerikanischen Krieges (1898) zugenommen hatte, versuchten die Amerikaner andere Kolonialmächte aus der Karibik zu vertreiben. 1902 hatte Washington von Dänemark die Jungferninseln gekauft und zeigte Interesse an dem niederländischen Besitz Curacao. Die holländische Regierung hat den Amerikanern deutlich gemacht, dass die Insel nicht zu verkaufen sei.[46] Als 1908 Venezuela

[43] H. W. van den Doel, *Het rijk van Insulinde. Opkomst en ondergang van een Nederlandse kolonie*, Amsterdam, 1996, 92.
[44] A. F. Manning, P.W. Klein, *Nederland rond 1900*, The Readers Digest NV, Amsterdam, 1993, 274.
[45] Idem. 275.
[46] Idem. 280.

versuchte, gegen die niederländischen Handelsinteressen auf Curacao aufzutreten, haben die Niederländer hart zurückgeschlagen. Mit politischen und militärischen Mitteln haben sie den Diktator Cipriano Castro aus Venezuela verjagt.[47] Wieder hat sich gezeigt, dass die passive, neutrale Isolationspolitik der Niederlande nur für Europa galt. Wenn es aber um Besitzungen in Übersee ging, war das kleine neutrale Holland schnell, entschlossen und aggressiv.

Parallel zum finanziellen Gewinn aus Niederländisch-Indien war die politische Führung in Den Haag geneigt, das Leben der Einheimischen zu verbessern. 1901 war mit der Thronrede der Königin Wilhelmina das Startsignal gegeben. Einheimische sollten auch von den finanziellen Früchten der Kolonie profitieren. Vor allem auf dem Gebiet des Unterrichtswesens und des Gesundheitswesens kamen viele Verbesserungen. Das nannte man „ethische Politik".[48] Konservative Politiker warnten, diese Entwicklung könne das Ende des Kolonialreichs bedeuten. International gesehen gab es reichlich Anzeichen in diese Richtung. Um die Jahrhundertwende können wir von einem Erwachen Asiens sprechen. Der Japanisch-Russische Krieg (1905), die Entwicklungen in Britisch-Indien (1885 wurde der Indian National Congress gegründet, der nach 1905 öffentlich die Unabhängigkeit anstrebte.) und die Entlassung der Philippinen in die Unabhängigkeit von den USA (1907) sind alles Zeichen der veränderten Zeiten.

Das Unabhängigkeitsstreben und der Freiheitsdrang der Einheimischen in Niederländisch-Indien führten zu zahlreichen Konflikten zwischen Kolonisator und Kolonisierten. Die Gruppen radikalisierten sich, Konflikte konnten nicht mehr friedlich geregelt werden. Finanzielle Schwierigkeiten während des ersten Weltkriegs und in der Weltwirtschaftskrise in den Dreißiger Jahren trugen zu den Spannungen bei.

Als die Japaner im März 1942 Niederländisch-Indien besetzten, machten sie nicht nur diesen Konflikten zwischen Einheimischen und Kolonisator plötzlich ein Ende, sondern auch dem niederländischen Kolonialreich. 1945 wurde die Unabhängigkeit Indonesiens ausgerufen, worauf ein blutiger Kolonialkrieg folgte, der vier Jahre dauerte. Die Niederlande, die im Mai 1940 innerhalb von fünf Tagen ohne wesentlichen Widerstand von der Wehrmacht besetzt wurden, schickten 1945 eine 100.000 Mann starke Armee nach Indonesien und kämpften bis 1949 für ihr Kolonialreich – vergeblich.

*

[47] Idem. 281.

[48] Gerard Termorshuizen, *'Indië is ook in het litterarische eene melkkoe', Indische–Nederlandse letterkunde van de negentiende eeuw*, Theo D'Haen (red.), *Europa Buitnegaats, Koloniale en postkoloniale literaturen in Europeische talen*, Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2002, 113.

Die Position der Niederlande war im 19. und in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts in der Welt sehr ambivalent. Die Niederlande waren ein "kolonialer Riese und zugleich ein politischer Zwerg."[49] Holland war zwar nach europäischen Maßstäben ein kleines Land, trotzdem hatte es, dank seiner Kolonien, vor allem Niederländisch-Indien, Großmachtallüren. In Europa war es klein, aber in Asien haben die Holländer doch Großmachtpolitik betrieben.

[49] H. L. Wesseling, *Europas koloniale eeuw*, Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2003, 199.

Weitere Bibliographie
E. M. Beekman, *Paradijzen van weleer.* Prometheus, Amsterdam, 1998.
J.C.H. Blom, E. Lamberts (red.), *Geschiedenis van de Nederlanden.* HB uitgevers, Baarn, 2006, 4e druk.
Karel Bostoen (red.), *Verhalen over verre landen.* Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2001.
H. W. van den Doel, *Het rijk van Insulinde, Opkomst en ondergang van een Nederlandse kolonie.* Prometheus, Amsterdam, 1996.
Femme S. Gaastra, *De geschiedenis van de VOC.* Walburg Pers, Zutphen, 1991.
J. van Goor, *De Nederlandse koloniën.* SDU, Den Haag 1994, 16.
P.D. 't Hart, *Leven in Utrecht 1850–1914: groei naar een moderne stad*. Hilversum, Het Utrechts Archief/Verloren, 2005.
Theo D'Haen (red.), *Europa Buitnegaats, Koloniale en postkoloniale literaturen in Europeische talen.* Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2002.
Els M. Jacobs, *Varen om peper en thee.* Rijksmuseum 'Nederlandse Scheepvaart Museum', Walburg Pers, Zutphen, 1991.
Klaas Jansma, Meinert Schroor (red.), *Onze vaderlandse geschiedenis.* Rebo Productions, Lisse, 1991.
J.J.P. De Jong, *De waaier van het Fortuin.* SDU, Den Haag, 1999.
E. H. Kossmann, *De Lage Landen 1780/1980.* deel I., Agon, Amsterdam, 1986.
Gert Mak, *Amszterdam, egy város életrajza*. Corvina, Budapest, 2001.
A. F. Manning, P.W. Klein, *Nederland rond 1900.* The Readers Digest NV, Amsterdam, 1993.
Ronald Prud'homme van Rijne, *Rechterhand van Nederland*. Arbeiderspers, Amsterdam 1998, 3e druk.
Erik Sweers, *Het cultuurstelsel 1830–1870.* http://www.theobakker.net/pdf/cultuurstelsel_geschiedenis.nl.pdf
Gerard Termorshuizen, *'Indië is ook in het litterarische eene melkkoe', Indische-Nederlandse letterkunde van de negentiende eeuw*. Theo D'Haen (red.), *Europa Buitnegaats, Koloniale en postkoloniale literaturen in Europeische talen.* Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2002.
J.J.M. Timmers, *De glorie van Nederland.* Tirion, Baarn, 1989.
H. L. Wesseling, *Europas koloniale eeuw.* Bert Bakker, Amsterdam, 2003.

Gábor Szabó-Zsoldos

The Anglo-Boer Political Relations and South African Confederation, 1877–1881 – Related to the British Colonial Policy in the Transvaal

From many aspects the 1870s was one of the most important periods in the history of Southern Africa. Key events such as the mineral revolution, the discovery of the diamond fields in Griqualand West, the subjugation of the Zulu kingdom and other independent African chiefdoms, the Transvaal Rebellion (1880–1881) and the strengthening of the Afrikaner nationalism indisputably shaped the face of the subcontinent.

My hypothesis is that the British colonial policy in Southern Africa during the second half of the 19th century can be characterized by different tendencies and changes. One of these tendencies was the British intention for the unification of the divided subcontinent (colonies and states) to organize a loyal, self-governing, white (particularly British)-dominated British South African colony like Canada, New-Zeeland or Australia. This study discusses this unification, with reference to the British official political tools and methods used in the Transvaal for the integration of the republic, as well as the role of this territory in various British confederation schemes. Between 1877 and 1881 the South African Republic was under British rule, which (term) situation provided a unique chance for the Colonial Office to promote the confederation there. This was the main reason why I chose this period.

Concerning the historiography of the South African Confederation, I have to highlight two historians. The first is Clement Francis Goodfellow and his book called Great Britain & South African Confederation (1870–1881).[1] Goodfellow examined the impact of the British statesmen's personalities on the South African colonial policy. Unlike him, Norman Etheringhton neglected the „Imperial Factor" and emphasized the importance of the local intentions (especially the interests of Natal) and the labour supply.[2]

---

[1] Clement Francis Goodfellow, *Great Britain & South African Confederation (1870–1881*), Cape Town, 1966.

[2] Norman A. Etherington, "Labour Supply and the Genesis of South African Confederation in the 1870's", *The Journal of African History* 20 (1979) 235–253.

The main sources of my research were the official correspondence between the statesmen of the Colonial Office, for instance Lord Carnarvon, and the men on the spot, the Governors and High Commissioners, like Sir Bartle Frere or Theophilus Shepstone. Furthermore, I examined the Hansard's Parliamentary Debates and other official documents, for instance the South Africa Bill or the Constitution of the South African Republic.

Southern Africa and the South African Republic in the 1870s

In this period the subcontinent was economically, culturally and, above all, politically divided into the British colonies (Cape Colony, Natal, Griqualand West), the Boer republics (Orange Free State, Transvaal), and African chiefdoms.

According to the theme of this presentation now I only focus on Transvaal's political system. „The right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British Government"[3] was guaranteed for the Transvaalers by the Sand River Convention of 1852. This document determined the Anglo-Boer relations for more than the next two decades. Although the constitution of the South African Republic the Grondwet, which came into force in 1858, just like in the case of the Orange Free State, was based on the constitution of the United States, some differences can be found between the two constitutions. For example according to the former document, in Transvaal it was only the members of the Dutch Reformed Church (Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk) who possessed the franchise and could bear office.[4] In a comparison with Cape Colony's political system, where the franchise did not depend on religion or race, more serious dissimilarities appear. The Africans, the colored were completely disfranchised, as the resolution of the Volksraad stated: „ […] they [all the colored people] may never be given or granted rights of burghership."[5]

As the Grondwet stated: The President of the Executive Council is the first or highest official" in the republic and „[…] all public officials are subject to him."[6] The place (institution) of the legislation was the unicameral Volksraad, which was elected only by white burghers. Besides the President, the Commandant-General, who was the leader of the army, was also an influential official, and member of the Executive Council.

---

[3] Sand River Convention, in George von Welfling Eybers, *Select Constitutional Documents Illustrating South African History 1795–1910*, London, 1918. 358.
[4] Constitution of the South African Republic, in ibid., 368–369.
[5] Resolution of the Volksraad, 21 Nov. 1853, in ibid., 362.
[6] Constitution of the South African Republic, in ibid., 376.

Basically, with respect to the relationship with Great-Britain and the British colonial policy, Transvaal had two disputed questions. The first issue was a territorial debate in the Keate Award area (in the Western border of the Transvaal) and the plan for a railway between Pretoria and the Delagoa-Bay, which would provide an outlet for Transvaal to the sea and it would certainly open up the republic for other powers (for example Germany). To prevent the building of this railway was a vital question for the Colonial Office.[7]

The British Colonial Policy and the Transvaal in the Light of the Confederation Schemes, 1850–1881

The history of South African Confederation can be easily traced back to the 1850s when the third Earl Grey was Secretary of State for the Colonies. The idea of the South African unity and the federal transformation of the subcontinent, a major pattern of the British colonial policy in this region in the 1870s, were born during his term of office, between 1846 and 1852. In order to understand the Transvaal's role in these plans, it is necessary to have a short, schematic review of the various British South African confederation schemes, 1850–1881.

In a chronological order the first was the third Earl Grey who planned the unification of the subcontinent on official level. He visioned a great South African colony, the extension of the British control to the hinterland and the introduction of the free trade as well. From his point a view the confederation would defend the Africans from the encroachments committed by white settlers, it would also provide better conditions for the civilization of the tribes and spreading the Christianity among them. From his point of view Britain had a great responsibility by the possessing of the colonies and had great and dignified duty: "I conceive that, by the acquisition of its Colonial dominions, the Nation has incurred a responsibility of the highest kind, which it is not at liberty to throw off. The authority of the British Crown is at this moment the most powerful instrument, under Providence, of maintaining peace and order in many extensive regions of the earth, and thereby assists in diffusing amongst millions of the human race, the blessings of Christianity and civilization."[8] Lord Grey was convinced about the "civilizing influence of commerce", which with the work of the missionaries, within the borders of a confederation would civilize the native tribes.[9] Although Earl Grey's

[7] Cornelis Willem de Kiewiet, *The Imperial Factor in South Africa*, Cambridge, 1937. 106.
[8] Earl Grey, *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration* I., London, 1853. 13.
[9] Earl Grey to Sir H. G. Smith, 12 Nov. 1850. In Correspondence with the Governor of the Cape of Good Hope relative to assumption of sovereignty over the territory between the Vaal and Orange Rivers [1360], 94.

scheme, which was based on his humanitarian and philanthropic attitude, was rejected probably by the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, he permanently exposed his views about the South African politics during the next decades.[10] Lord Grey published three pamphlets which concerned with the South African Confederation and the problems of the unification of the subcontinent which indicate the importance what that question meant for him.[11]

The next proposer of the confederation was Sir George Grey, the Governor of the Cape and High Commissioner (1854–1861). This was the first, but not the last time that the confederation policy was elaborated in South Africa, which caused conflicts in some periods between the Governorship and the Colonial Office. In Sir George Grey's case there were huge differences between his plans about the confederation plans and the South African policy of the Colonial Office (the Secretary of State for the Colonies was Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton).[12]

The concept of the South African Confederation was in some parts similar to Earl Grey's scheme when the Duke of Buckingham and Earl Granville were the heads of the Colonial Office. Both of them were convinced that the protection of the Africans was the Imperial Government's duty, but in order to reduce the Imperial responsibilities, the white settlers had to defend themselves. It meant that Earl Granville started to withdraw the Imperial troops from South Africa.

For Lord Kimberley, the leader of the Colonial Office during Gladstone's first Premiership from 1870 to 1874, the consolidation of the Diamond Fields crisis was the main South African issue. He was hoping that the ownership dispute about the Diamond Fields would be easily solved within the Confederation. The cornerstone of Kimberley's scheme was Cape Colony and the colonial initiation, the desire for the unity, which he found the most important preliminary necessity for forming the Confederation but the unwillingness of Cape political leaders determined the fall of the liberal plan.

The British confederation schemes of the period before 1874 can be divided into two groups:

To the first belong the Earl Grey's plan and those which viewed the Confederation from a humanitarian and philanthropic aspect. Others emphasized the financial advantages of the united South African colony, namely the reduction of the Imperial expenditures and responsibilities.

---

[10] John Ward, The Tird Earl Grey and Federalism, 1846–1852. The Australian Journal of Politics and History 3. (1957) 28.

[11] Earl Grey, "Past and Future Policy in South Africa", *The Nineteenth Century* 5 (1879) 583–596..; South Africa, *The Nineteenth Century* 8 (1880) 933–954.; The Prospect in South Africa, *The Nineteenth Century* 21 (1887) 428–451.

[12] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 21.

Lord Carnarvon's Confederation Policy, 1874–1878

Disraeli's second government brought about various changes in the British colonial policy, particularly in South Africa. Lord Carnarvon, the Secretary of State for the Colonies had great experience in the process of the colonial unification. During his first Secretaryship of State, in 1867 the British North America Act was introduced which brought federal unity for the British colonies in North America. The Canadian model was in many parts an example for Carnarvon in the case of South Africa.[13]

Carnarvon's confederation scheme can be summarized by its three main elements:

The first, which was his primary motive, was to secure the hinterland of Simon's Bay and its military and naval station which had a high strategic importance in Imperial level. Simon's Bay, from his point of view, even in the case of the Confederation, had to be retained under Imperial control. In favor of the better protection of this second Gibraltar (that is the second point) Carnarvon knew well that the colonists' loyalty was indispensable. To attain this purpose it seemed necessary to give them self-government. The third main point of his plan and strategy concerned with the native relations. Carnarvon hoped that the shadow of the anti-white black alliance and the independent tribes would convince the white communities about the necessity of the intercolonial common policy affecting Africans, which could be the first step on the road to the South African Confederation. Nevertheless, he and other leaders of the Colonial Office found essential to maintain some control over the South African native policy.

In addition, there were other patterns which highlight Carnarvon's policy from others. Unlike his predecessors, who had only concentrated on the remedy of the actual conflicts, Lord Carnarvon had a colonial and imperial perspective and believed that the Confederation would determine the future of the British interests in the subcontinent for a long time. The South African Confederation, being the way to guarantee the security of Cape's naval station, was a cardinal part of his imperial perception.

In contrast with Lord Cardwell or Lord Granville Lord Carnarvon did not care about the financial burden of the British colonial policy in South Africa and unlike Kimberley, he did not wait for the South African initiation to propose the confederation.

Although his successors, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (1878–1880) through Sir Bartle Frere, the Governor of Cape, and for a short time the liberal Lord Kimber-

[13] Carnarvon to Barkly 15 Nov. 1875, in F*urther correspondence relating to the colonies and states of South Africa* [C. 1399], 28–29.

ley attempted to maintain the confederation policy (after the British defeat in Isandhlwana just the sham policy), Carnarvon's scheme failed during the summer of 1880 because of the resistance of the colonies.

The Annexation of the Transvaal

It is necessary to emphasize the fact that between 1877 and 1881 the Transvaal was under a direct British rule. The roots of the British annexation can be found in the South African Republic in 1876.

The failures of the war with the Pedis in North Transvaal as well as the empty Treasury induced the Volksraad to ask Her Majesty's Government to undertake the governing of their country.[14] It seemed a unique and historical chance for the Colonial Office to neutralize the Sand River Convention of 1852 and carry out a bloodless annexation. In his letter to Sir Henry Barkly, the Governor of Cape and High Commissioner, Carnarvon exposed his opinion: „It would then, in any case, be necessary for Her Majesty's Government to insist upon this war being brought to a speedy close, and to take sufficient guarantees against any similar danger to British interests in future. There can be no doubt that the safety and prosperity of the Republic would be best assured by its union with the British Colonies, when no occasion for local wars would continue to exist. […] But the course which events have taken leave me no longer in the same position, and it is obvious that my inclination in favour of continuing to co-operate with the Transvaal as a separate State may have to be modified."[15]

Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who entered to the Transvaal on 4th January 1877, was sent to the South African Republic as a Special Commissioner.[16] His mission was to convince the Volksraad about the necessity of the annexation, but when President Burgers and the political leaders showed unwillingness, Shepstone proclaimed Transvaal a British colony on 12 April 1877.

[14] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 114.

[15] Carnarvon to Barkly 22 Sept. 1876, in *Correspondence respecting the war between the Transvaal Republic and neighbouring native tribes, and generally with reference to native affairs in South Africa* [C. 1399], 103.

[16] D. M. Schreuder, *The Scramble for Southern Africa*, New York, 2009. 13.

Political Tools and Methods

Lord Carnarvon, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Lord Kimberley, the Secretaries of State for the Colonies between 1877 and 1881, operated with numerous political tools and methods in order to involve the Transvaal to the South African Confederation.

The Colonial Office sought to organize a conference, presided by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, where the delegates of the South African states and colonies would make a decision in favor of the confederation and would negotiate about the details of the unity. Although year by year the conference appeared in the sources as a potential solution for the conflicts, the Colonial Office could not convene all the delegates.[17]

Moreover, especially in period between 1874 and 1875, Lord Carnarvon attempted to bind Transvaal and President Burgers closer to Britain by promises. The Secretary of State tried to exploit the Transvaaler's land shortage and the desire to expand in the Keate Award Area and in the Zulu territory, exactly in the Utrecht region.

Furthermore President Burgers' long-cherished dream about the railway between Pretoria and Delagoa Bay, which would provide a sea outpost for Transvaal, a link to the world and a chance to break out from the British encirclement, was also an important but less effective element of Carnarvon's stratagem. In a case of Transvaal's willingness to take part in the Confederation, he promised British capital to Burgers and contractors to build the desired railway as well as a possibility to expand the borders of the South African Republic within the Confederation.

During the negotiations in London 1875 Burgers seemed to be openminded about Carnarvon's plans. As Lord Carnarvon notced in his diary Burgers according to the Confederation: "approved of every word and that he would give me every support and assistance in his power".[18] Although the promising signs, the attempt to make the Transvaalers enthusiastic supporters of the federal unity in this way was unsuccessful. The efforts to bind the Boers closer by the British constructed railway also failed – the Boers tried to find investors on the continent, for instance in Belgium, Netherlands, Portugal and Germany.[19]

---

[17] Barkly, Letter addressed to the Presidents of the Republics and to Lieutenant-Governors of South African Colonies 25 Jun. 1875, in *Correspondence respecting the proposed conference of delegates on affairs of South Africa* [C. 1399], 13.; Carnarvon to Bulwer 14 Oct. 1877., in *Further correspondence respecting the proposed confederation of the colonies and states of South Africa* [C. 1980], 29.

[18] Peter Gordon (Ed.), *The Political Diaries of the Fourth Earl of Carnarvon, 1857–1890. Colonial Secretary and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland*, London, 2011. 250.

[19] De Kiewiet, The Imperial, 97–98.

Lord Carnarvon and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach relied largely on the British colonial officials, the Governors and High Commissioners, the men on the spot. It is worth to highlight two officials from that factor: Anthony James Froude and Sir Theophilus Shepstone.

Froude, historian and the editor of *Fraser's Magazine*, was Carnarvon's eye and ear in South Africa in the period between 1874 and 1875 without any official power, before the Secretary of State launched his new policy. In Clement Francis Goodfellow's opinion he was the primary source of information about the subcontinent for Carnarvon, who based the confederation scheme upon Froude's experience.[20] Froude was an enthusiastic advocate of colonial federation and was definitely against any policy which purpose was to get rid of the colonies. He criticized hevily the colonial policy of Gladstone and Lord Kimberley: "Gladstone and Co. deliberately intend to shake off the Colonies. They are privately using their command of the situation to make the separation inevitable."[21]

In March 1874 Froude informed Carnarvon about his plan: travelling to Australia to scrutinize whether the colonies could be drawn closer to Britain. Lord Carnarvon offered South Africa instead of Australia. For Carnarvon Froude as a well-known supporter of the idea of the colonial federation, seemed to be the most suitable and reliable person for gathering secretly informations about the chances of the unification of the South African colonies and states. Carnarvon noticed in his diary the objects of Froude's secret mission: "I explained what I wished him to give his attention to in South Africa, specifying three subjects in particular:

1. generally Federation
2. relations of Free States and Nations and ourselves
3. Natal in reference to recent insurrection. Agreed on this head that if necessary I should write to him and appoint him a Commissioner to enquire on the spot. […] He expressed himself as fully and entirely satisfied in this respect."[22] Furthermore the Secretary of State provided for Froude, with the approval of Lord Derby and Disraeli, £1000 for his secret service, which illustrates well that Lord Carnarvon did not care about the financial side of his colonial policy.[23]

Froude sailed to South Africa in August 1874 and visited each colonies and states including the Transvaal where he had promising impressions: "If we can make up

[20] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 54–72.
[21] Froude quoted in Herbert Paul, *The Life of Froude*, New York, 1905. 252–253.
[22] P. Gordon, The Political, 226–227.
[23] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 58.

our minds to allow the colonists to manage the natives their own way, we may safely confederate the whole country. The Dutch will be in the majority, and the Dutch method of management will more or less prevail. They will be left wholly to themselves for selfdefence, and prudence will prevent them from trying really harsh or aggressive measures. In other respects the Dutch are politically conservative, and will give us little trouble."[24] He became convinced that President Burgers and his people would accept the Confederation if they were compensated for their lost share from the Diamond Fields.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone was one of the key figures who played a crucial role in the integration of Transvaal to the South African unity. By 1877 Shepstone was know as an experienced and reliable colonial officer especially in the native policy. He was Secretary for Native Affairs (Shepstone was invited to the coronation of Cetshwayo in 1873) and tried to conciliate the territorial conflict between the Zulus and the Transvaal in favor of the former.[25] His knowledge was noted in Carnarvon's speech about the South Africa Bill in the House of Lords 23. April 1877: „They sent additional troops to the frontier, and they sent also as a Special Commissioner, and armed with the authority which they could give, Sir Theophilus Shepstone. But no authority which Her Majesty's Government could delegate to him is as great as that which his capacity, his knowledge of the Natives, and his great experience have given him. I have known him now for several years, and I am satisfied that there is no other man in South Africa more competent to deal with the difficulties of such a case as that which now exists in the Transvaal."[26]

On 12th April 1877 Shepstone declared Transvaal as a British colony. In the proclamation he referred to „*the inherent weakness*" and the faults of the Government of Transvaal in the conflicts with the neighbouring native tribes. The Special Commissioner justified the annexation with the vulnerability of the South African Republic in case of the threatening African attack.[27] Shepstone guaranteed a wide autonomy for the Transvaal, which resulted in further conflicts with the Colonial Office, between his conception and Carnarvon's confederation scheme, which operated with a central government: „And I further proclaim and make known that the Transvaal will remain a separate Government, with its own laws and legislature, and that it is the wish of Her Most Gracious Majesty that it shall enjoy the fullest legislative privileges compatible with the circumstances of the country and the intelligence of its people."[28]

---

[24] Froude quoted in H. Paul, The Life, 260.
[25] N. A. Etherington, Labour Supply, 241–242.
[26] Hansard, CCXXXIII, col. 1649. Carnarvon in Lords, 23 Apr. 1877.
[27] Annexation of the S. A. Republic to the British Empire, in G. W. Eybers, Select Constitutional, 450–451.
[28] Ibid., 452.

The annexation meant an excellent possibility for him to realize his scheme about the labour supply, influenced by Natal Expansionism.[29] It also seemed a chance for the development of the South African interior, and in this way the Transvaal could be, in the dimension of labour supply, one of the most important bases of this process owing to his progressive native policy.[30] As a Lieutenant-Governor Shepstone ruled the country like a king, but it came from the actual political situation and not from his personality. He became involved in the Transvaal-Zulu conflict and stood on the Boer's side in this case. Thus Shepstone was often absent from Pretoria, where he left the provisional administration to his secretary Melmoth Osborn and Joseph Henderson, his adviser. The Zulu conflict absorbed his energies and he couldn't concentrate on the confederation, which was unacceptable for the Transvaalers without the elected Volksraad.[31]

Moreover, the personal rule, his incompetence in the financial problems and his own concept about the Transvaal made him unpopular both in Pretoria and London, which resulted in his recall.

The annexation of the Transvaal and the discussion of the South Africa Bill in the Imperial Parliament happened almost at the same time. It received the Royal Assent on 10th August 1877 and was published as the South Africa Act. The permissive Bill, whose first draft was elaborated by Lord Carnarvon's staff in the winter of 1876, was to ensure the framework of the proposed Union's political structure: „A Bill intituled an Act for the Union under one Government of such of the South African Colonies and States as may thereto, and for the Government of such Union; and for purposes connected therewith. […] And whereas it is expedient to declare and define the general principles on which the constitution of the legislative authority and of the Executive Government in the Union may be established".[32]

The main principles and the political concept were based on the British North America Act. Although in some parts these two documents were word by word the same, a few differences can still be found, for instance unlike in Canada the Governor-General of South Africa would possess a power to disallow provincial Acts.[33]

Related to the Transvaal, the first draft stated: „In the event of the admission into the Union of the Orange Free State or the South African Republic, otherwise called the Transvaal Republic, all persons at the time resident in and enjoying the rights of citizenship within the said State and Republic respectively, and not being already British subjects, shall be and they are hereby declared to be henceforth

[29] N. A. Etherington, Labour Supply, 252.
[30] D. M. Schreuder, The Scramble, 73.
[31] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 147.
[32] *South Africa Bill* [H. L.], 12 Jun. 1877., 1.
[33] *South Africa Bill* [H. L.], 1 Aug. 1877., Clause 38.

ipso facto naturalized subjects of the Queen."[34] Nevertheless the naturalization was canceled by the amendments in the House of Commons on 31 July 1877 and the Transvaal was not mentioned in the South Africa Act.[35]

From late 1876 Carnarvon hoped that Natal would annex the South African Republic and the 58th clause of the South Africa Act rendered a possibility for the British colony (as well as Cape Colony) to incorporate the republic.[36]

In case of the Transvaal there were some problematic points of the Act. First of all, as Herbert, the Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies and Carnarvon's cousin and adviser stated, Shepstone's guarantee for the South African Republic stood as an obstacle on the way to the federal unity and to the acceptance the unification by the Transvaalers and to the incorporation of the republic by Natal. The Special Commissioner's proclamation had promised „that the Transvaal will remain a separate Government, with its own laws and legislature"[37], but the South Africa Act distributed the legislative power between the bicameral Union Parliament (Legislative Council, House of Assembly) and the provincial councils, just like in the case of the central executive power and the provincial governments. Furthermore, the restoration of the elected Volksraad was an essential political purpose and condition for any political cooperation.

A few symbolic elements can be found in the British confederation schemes which were mostly to convince the Transvaalers about the advantages of the unity. For instance, Owen Lanyon, Shepstone's successor tried to pacify the Transvaal People's Committee and neutralize their demands with plans about the new flag of the colony, which might combine the Union Jack and the Vierkleur.

Probably the language was a more significant question than the national colours. Shepstone's proclamation gave the Dutch language the parity with English: „That arrangements will be made by which the Dutch language will practically be as much the official language as the English; all laws, proclamations, and Government notices will be published in the Dutch language; in the Legislative Assembly members may, as they do now, use either language;".[38] As opposed to the proclamation, the South Africa Bill did not contain any clause about the use of language.

---

[34] *South Africa Bill* [H. L.], 12 Jun. 1877., Clause 4.

[35] Hansard, CCXXXVI, col. 649–650. Carnarvon in Lords, 9 Aug. 1877.; Carnarvon to Frere 16 Aug. 1877., in *Further correspondence respecting the proposed confederation of the colonies and states of South Africa* [C. 1980], 23.

[36] *South Africa Bill* [H. L.], 1 Aug. 1877., Clause 58.

[37] Annexation of the S. A. Republic to the British Empire, in G. W. Eybers, Select Constitutional, 450–451.

[38] Annexation of the S. A. Republic to the British Empire, in G. W. Eybers, Select Constitutional, 452–453.

Carnarvon knew well that he had to make some kind of concessions for the South African Republic. For example in the South Africa Bill the President can be found among the chief executive officers of the provinces, such as the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator.[39] Considering the Transvaaler's republicanism, according to the plans, the chief executive officer would be called President, which was excepted to be more acceptable for the Boers than the Governor or the Lieutenant-Governor.

Concepts about the Transvaal after Lord Carnarvon's resignation

The leaders of the British colonial policy who succeeded Carnarvon had to concentrate on preventing the escalation of a crisis in Transvaal. This was the primary motive and purpose of the Colonial Office in this colony after the devastating British defeat in Isandhlwana on 22 Jan. 1879. (Zulu war), which meant the fail of Sir Bartle Frere, the High Commissioner for South Africa and Governor of the Cape Colony, and his grand design about the transformation of the whole subcontinent.

By the spring of 1879 it seemed that the temple of Janus would not be closed in South Africa. Reports informed Frere that the Boer leaders and their followers assembled in an armed camp where Zulu envoys visited them. It induced Frere to transmit the People's Committee demands to London. In that document, which was signed by Marthinus Wessel Pretorius, M. J. Viljoen the chairmen of the Committee and W. Edward Bok, secretary, the authors demanded the freedom of their country from the Queen. For this purpose unwillingly but they were ready to fight: "What else can we do? Must we draw the sword? […] Must it then, your Majesty, come to war? It cannot be your will, just as it is not our wish."[40] For the conflicts and the problems they, just as Frere blamed Shepstone: "Now, how Sir Theophilus Shepstone able to get Her Majesty's Government to approve of the annexation? By the untruthful reports that the very great majority of the people was for annexation."[41] It is interesting that in the end of the memorandum the Boer leaders emphasized that Transvaal is open for the discussion on the South African unity: "Your Majesty cannot desire to rule over unwilling subjects. Unwilling subjects but faithful neighbours, we will be. […] Three years ago it was

[39] *South Africa Bill* [H. L.], 1 Aug. 1877., Clause 10.
[40] Sir Bartle Frere to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, 17 Apr. 1879, enclosing Memorandum of the People's Committee to Quenn Victoria, 16 Apr. 1879, in *Further correspondence respecting the affairs of South Africa* [C. 2367], 99.
[41] Ibid., 98.

the South African Republic that intimated its readiness to attend a conference for the purpose of discussing common interests in South Africa, which was invited by Lord Carnarvon, in order to discuss confederation. Two years ago Volksraad resolved as stated above, and in the name of the people of the South African Republic we solemnly repeat the assurance in everything that can conduce tot the unity and welfare of the several States in South Africa we will co-operate now and ever."[42]

According to the point of view of Sir Garnet Wolseley, the High Commissioner for South-East Africa and Governor of Natal and Transvaal, if the Boers were reluctant to compromise, the Colonial Office would have to choose between two ways:

1., the maintenance of the colony would require more troops there

Or

2., the abandonment Transvaal. The idea of the abandonment and withdrawal of the imperial troops was not alien from Hicks-Beach and some officers of the Colonial Office, for instance Edward Fairfield.[43]

After the Liberals had won the general elections in 1880, Gladstone and Lord Kimberley, the next Secretary of State for the Colonies attempted to continue the confederation policy. Although the Legislative Assembly of the Transvaal passed the resolution in favour of the Federal Union on 7 June 1880, this represented only the view of the English minority in Transvaal.[44] Furthermore, during the winter of 1880 five thousand Boers proclaimed the re-establishment the South African Republic in Heidelberg, which led to the Transvaal Rebellion. The Transvaaler's victory in the battlefields resulted in the Pretoria Convention and the restoration of the almost entire independence of the republic. By the Pretoria Convention Britain retained the control over Transvaal in just three questions: "(a) the right from time to time to appoint a British Resident in and for the said State, with such duties and functions as are herein-after defined; (b) the right to move troops through the said State in time of war, or in case of the apprehension of immediate war between the Suzerain Power and any Foreign State or Native tribe in South Africa; and (c) the control of the external relations of the said State, including the conclusion of treaties and the conduct of diplomatic intercourse with Foreign Powers, such intercourse to be carried on through Her Majesty's diplomatic and consular offices abroad."[45]

---

[42] Ibid., 99–100.

[43] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 178., 188.

[44] Ibid., 193.

[45] Article 2., *Convention for the Settlement of the Transvaal Territory* (Pretoria Convention), 1881. [C. 2998], 3.

Conclusions

Despite the fact that the Transvaal Rebellion and the Pretoria Convention meant the end of the British rule in the Transvaal for two decades, the refusal of the Cape's Legislature towards the federal unity and resistance against Carnarvon's scheme resulted in the failure of the Confederation policy. Kruger and Joubert argued in the letter that they sent to Leonard Courtney, a pro-Boer member in the House of Commons, reflecting to the debate in the Cape's Parliament: „Yesterday, the Imperial policy of the last six years received its deathblow".[46]

The military conflict with the Transvaalers drew the attention of both the British public opinion and the Treasury to the South African burden on the Imperial budget. The South African military expenditures increased from £143,561 in 1870-1 to £1,532,392 in 1878-9.[47] The high costs as well as the British defeats induced the press to criticize the annexation and the former South African colonial policy: „The annexation, even if it were justifiable as regarded the Boers, was the grossest of blunders. If the measure were expedient, it might have adopted within a short time on the application of the very community which has since denounced it as usurpation."[48] Another critic suggested the abandonment of the British liablities in South Africa: „If by any means, therefore, we can retain our hold on our naval station at the Cape, and leave all the rest of South Africa to take care of itself with some reasonable prospect of success, we shall be at once ridding ourselves of a most troublesome burden, and retaining in South Africa the footing for the sake of which we seized Cape Town at the beginning of the present century. In other words, what has to be done is to set the whole of South Africa free of the British flag, only retaining for ourselves, by treaty, the few square miles necessary for the existence of our naval port at Simon's Bay."[49]

In light of the Transvaal the fall had various causes:

First of all, the Colonial Office did not give appropriate answers for the political challenges in the Transvaal in almost any case. Although Boer delegations had negotiated with the Secretaries of States two times between 1877 and 1881, the British did not take the demands of the Transvaalers and threatening clouds above this new colony seriously enough. Moreover the Boer political leaders were underestimated by the British officials. For instance Paul Kruger, the former Vice-President and his political adviser, the former State-Attorney Dr Edward Jorissen

[46] Frere to Kimberley, 6 Jul. 1880, enclosing Kruger and Joubert to Courtney, 26 June, 1880 (as published in the Zuid-Afrikaan and the Cape Argus, 3 July 1880), in *Further correspondence respecting the affairs of South Africa* [C. 2655], 97.

[47] C. F. Goodfellow, Great Britain, 179.

[48] "The Transvaal", *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 52 (1881) 126.

[49] F. Reginald Statham, "How to get out of the South African Difficulty", *Fortnightly Review* 29 (1881) 297–298.

paid a visit on 30th October 1877 in Highclere, Carnarvon's residence. The Boer delegates visited the Secretary of State in a hope for a plebiscite on a wider freedom, a self-government for Transvaal. Lord Carnarvon, who noticed the meeting in his diary, was satisfied with the loyalty of those Boer politicians: "Both he (Kruger) and Jorissen promised to do all they could to influence their countrymen for good and to serve the Queen faithfully on their return."[50] Carnarvon's impressions about Kruger from his journal illustrate well the attitude of the British officals and statemen to the political leaders of Transvaal: "Old Kruger is a curious and really an interesting specimen. He illustrates, I take it, perfectly the Dutch "Dopper Boer"[51] − obstinate, narrow, rough, unlettered, prejudiced: but shrewd, not untruthful, homely and except as regards natives by no means unkindly. He looked at Margaret as she sat by me at luncheon with evident admiration and watched her as she moved about. But his chief admiration was for the stables and the horses: and when I had a breaking-in bit put into the mouth of one of the horses and a dumb jockey placed on the animals back he was extremely interested."[52] Carnarvon knew it well from the day when he received the news about Shepstone's proclamation (7th May 1877) that the annexation of the Transvaal would be one of the most important key events of his second Secretaryship of State and could have a crucial impact on the judgement of his whole political career: "It is a step which I think has no precedent for many a long year but I think it is right and it will anyhow mark my tenure of office."[53] He was right. Two years later Lord Derby blamed Carnarvon and his policy for the South African problems: "I always doubted the wisdom of the policy of annexation, & assented to it reluctantly. It was a mistake, & one for which Carnarvon as colonial secretary is primarily responsible".[54]

The other important factor in the fall of the British control was the incompetence of the men on the spot. The appointed colonial officers in the Transvaal were unable to make the Confederation and the British suzerainty acceptable for the Transvaalers. During the era of Shepstone the building of the Volksraad was rather an English club, filled with English Transvaalers, than the place of the legislation, and the former influential political leaders were not members of the new Executive and Legislative bodies.

Kruger and Joubert also blamed this factor, exactly Sir Bartle Frere for the conflicts: „Of all British officials who have honoured the Transvaal with a visit, there is certainly not one who has created a deeper impression of distrust than this writer; and there is no English statesman who has increased the aversion of our

[50] P. Gordon, The Political, 293.
[51] Carnarvon reffered here to the Dopper Church, strictly Calvinist religious community.
[52] P. Gordon, The Political, 293.
[53] Ibid., 291.
[54] P. Gordon, The Political, 313.

countrymen against British rule to such a degree, as Sir Bartle Frere has done."[55] Moreover, they found the British colonial policy absolutistic: „This system is the establishment and the extension of a British-Napoleonic Empire, ostensibly subject to the Home Parliament, but really governed by two or three persons in Downing Street, and governed as arbitrarily, as for instance, Cayenne under Napoleon III."[56]

The difference between the South African federal schemes which were elaborated by the Colonial Office and the plans and strategies of the men on the spot was also an obstacle stood on the way to the successful unification of the British colonies and the Boer Republics. One of the most problematic point was the self-government what Shepstone promised for the Transvaalers by his proclamation of April 1877. One part of the British officals and public opinion found the roots of the Transvaal Rebellion and the conflicts of South Africa in Shepstone's policy. For instance Frere, who wrote to his wife in 1879 about this problem: "It was clear to me that it was not the annexation so much as the neglect to fulfil the promises and the expectations held out by Shepstone when he took over the government, that has stirred up the great mass of the Boers and given a handle to agitators."[57] The third Earl Grey, who proposed the confederation of South Africa first also blamed Shepstone in his pamphlet, The Prospect in South Africa: "[…] promises were made to the Boers that powers of selfgovernment should be conferred upon them, without taking thought, apperantly, of the fact that self-government, according to the understanding of the Boers, meant that they were to be allowed to manage the affairs of the territory as they thought best for themselves […] The ill-judged promise to give the Boers greater power in the government was not performed as soon as they had been led to expect, and in consequence they began to demand the restoration of their independence."[58]

For the short period, between 1877 and 1881, the leaders of the Colonial Office, especially Lord Carnarvon tried to break certain tendencies, such as the decrease in the expenditures, which were indisputable for the former Secretaries of State. This attempt necessarily required innovation in the field of the political tools, methods and more initiative from the Colonial Office as well as from the men on the spot. By 1880 the change of the tendency broke under the external (resistance of the colonies, clash of the colonial interests) and internal (increasing South African expenditures) pressure. Under Gladstone's second Premiership the restoration of former tendencies occurred.

---

[55] Frere to Kimberley, 6 Jul. 1880, 99.
[56] *Ibid*., 98.
[57] Frere to Lady Frere, 20 Apr. 1879, quoted in John Martineau, *The Life and Correspondence of Sir Bartle Frere* II., London, 1895. 311.
[58] Earl Grey, The Prospect in South Africa, *The Nineteenth Century* 21 (1887) 9.

Timo Särkkä

Two Small Nations in between Two Great Imperial Powers – The Boers and the Finns in the Late-Victorian Liberty Discourses

Introduction

This article seeks to analyse and discuss the imperial connection of the British Empire to the two Boer Republics of the late nineteenth century, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, in comparison with the attempted Russification of the Grand Duchy of Finland by the Russian Empire. The temporal context is the "era of imperialism" which culminated in the collapse of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian and German empires during the First World War. This era in world politics was strongly influenced by the struggle for civil liberties, which reached its fulfilment in the case of Finns in 1917, when Finland achieved its full independence, and in the case of Boers in 1909, when a national constitution embodying the principle of responsible government was granted to the Union of South Africa.

The comparison of the case of Boers with that of Finns is mostly made in the context of the Victorian periodical press. Victorian Britain was the first "journalizing" society in the world, thus the mass media can be interpreted as the ideological environment of the modern world.[1] In the course of the nineteenth century books began slowly to lose their previous status as the primary source of information and conversation. As their status waned, the new and more democratic means of reaching the masses, newspapers, pamphlets, periodicals and other various printed ephemera began to displace books. For contemporaries, these new channels of information, newspapers and periodicals (weeklies, reviews and magazines) offered a channel through which to challenge some older interpretations of political thinking and political concepts as well as to start a debate, to criticise the opinions of others and to seek support for one's own views.[2] The

[1] Joanne Shattock, & Michael Wolff, "Introduction," In: Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and soundings, Eds. Joanne Shattock & Michael Wolff, Leicester and Toronto, 1982, xiv.

[2] Brian Maidment, "Readers Fair and Foul: John Ruskin and the Periodical Press," In: Victorian Periodical Press, 29–31, 34–40.

type of sources used in this article, can be categorised as presentative,[3] since they introduced new ideas and engendered new points of view.

The foundations of the popular press were laid in fertile ground. A growing middle class was eager to acquire the education it lacked and to question traditional thought and values.[4] In many imperial bodies, censorship of books, pamphlets, newspapers and periodicals made expressions of public opinion increasingly difficult in the course of the nineteenth century. In the Russian Empire, the supervision of "anti-Empire" expressions in publications was defined by law, but in reality this was a very broad field to be supervised and numerous guidelines also made interpretation hard for the staff of the Board of Censors. The situation in Finland shifted throughout the century and became intolerable only in the 1890s when several newspapers were permanently suppressed.[5] In the British Empire, the situation worsened in the early twentieth century when censorship laws were first implemented in the British India in 1907,[6] but in Britain authors could see their texts in print without distortion or manipulation by censors.

The lists of contributors of the Victorian periodicals reveal many prominent intellectuals who analysed civil rights of the Boers and the Finns. Among the most important Finnish contributors were Docent Julio Reuter (1862–1937) and Professor Edward Westermarck (1862–1939), the future Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics. Out of the British intellectuals, one of the most important contributors to the civil rights question was David G. Ritchie (1853–1903), Professor of Logic, Rhetoric and Metaphysics at St Andrews. There were also whole papers devoted to the cause of the Finnish people, like *Finland*, a British liberal journal published by Finnish activists and British Liberals together between 1899 and 1900.

The subject matter under the present investigation is closely related to the term "imperialism". Used either to proclaim or to denounce imperial rule, it is known to communicate notoriously poorly both temporally and spatially. The modern concepts of "empire", "imperial power" and "imperialism" were derived from the Latin term *imperium* but their usage has varied at different times in history and in different places.[7] According to *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*,

---

[3] Martin Wallace, The New Age under Orage. Chapters in English Cultural History, Manchester, 1967, 2.

[4] Walter E. Houghton, "Periodical literature and the articulate classes," In: Victorian Periodical Press, 4–7.

[5] For further information see Tuomo Polvinen, Imperial Borderland. Bobrikov and the Attempted Russification of Finland, 1898–1904, Translated from Finnish by Steven Huxley, London, 1995, 192–195.

[6] Gerald, N. Barrier, Banned – Controversial Literature and Political Control in British India, 1907–1947, University of Missouri Press, 1974, 4–8.

[7] Richard Koebner, Empire, Cambridge, 1961, 18–19.

"traditional" and "modern" connotations can be separated in relation to imperialism. The traditional connotations were synonymous with despotism. The modern connotations emerged in the 1880s and referred to imperial rule. From the modern point of view, an imperialist was, therefore, simply a person who respected imperial rule.[8] Furthermore, specific national connotations can be separated in relation to imperialism and they should be interpreted in their national political contexts.

As R. G. Collingwood, the late Oxford philosopher, has argued, in history, of all the academic fields, no timeless questions exist. Human thought communicates poorly temporally and spatially and thus it should always be analysed in its context. Therefore, it is the task of the historian to reconstruct the questions of the time rather than try to seek any ready-made answers.[9] That is to emphasise the importance of analysing past concerns in their own right. The subject matters being studied should be treated and discussed only in their historical context and not subjected to or involved with current political debate.[10] However, past debates and concerns over civil rights and imperialism have their value today because even if the empires they refer had collapsed, imperialism did not pass away with them. The durability of theories of imperialism demonstrates how each generation has recycled and found them illuminating for their own time. Past concerns can indeed be socially important and relevant today.

The Dispute over Civil Rights in the Boer States

For the British Liberals of the late 1890s, imperialism referred particularly to South Africa, where the two Boer Republics, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State waged a bitter three-year war (1899–1902) against the British. A century after this war, historians have re-evaluated some of the old interpretations of the war, its impact and participants. The intention of the authors of these studies has been to go beyond standard conceptualisations of the war by placing it in a wider context of globalisation – an orientation which is illustrated, for example, by the compilation entitled *Writing a Wider War*. They feel that previous conceptualisations did not sufficiently take account of new research perspectives on, for example, race, gender and identity. In addition, the name "South African

[8] Rudolf Walther, "Imperialismus," In: Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-socialen Sprache in Deutschland, Band 3, Stuttgart, 1982, 175–181.

[9] R. G. Collingwood, An Autobiography, Oxford, 1987 (1939) 30–32, 62–63, 67–68.

[10] Javier Fernández Sebastián, "Intellectual History, Liberty and Republicanism: An Interview with Quentin Skinner", Contributions to the history of concepts 3:1 (2007) 105, 118–119.

War" rather than "the Boer War" or "the Anglo-Boer War" is considered more fitting to reflect the complex nature of the conflict.[11]

South Africa in the late nineteenth century consisted of British colonies and protectorates in an uneasy alliance with the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. In the war of 1881 (in Boer eyes, the War of Independence) the Transvaal had defeated British troops at the battle of Majuba Hill. At the London Convention which followed, the President of the Republic, Paul Krüger, won a series of diplomatic victories over the British. Despite these victories, the Transvaal was surrounded by expanding British territory in the course of the 1880s. This diminished the authority of Krüger, whose presidency was already undermined by corruption charges. The dispute that was to alter the President's situation altogether was over the political rights of the "uitlanders" (outlanders), immigrants of mostly British origin, who constituted a majority of the white population in the major cities of the Transvaal. Johannesburg, a large cosmopolitan city at the time, was inhabited by some ten thousand white and a hundred thousand black miners working in the gold mines of the Witwatersrand (the Rand). The uitlander franchise question had originated in the early 1890s but beneath it lay the Rand capitalists' discomfort over the government's mining policy which was believed to weaken mining-houses.[12]

South Africa was in the eyes of the world a peripheral country up until the mid-nineteenth century when diamond findings in the country west of Bloemfontein (later known as the Kimberley diamond fields) altered South Africa's significance radically. By the 1870's these diamond fields had already been transformed from being simply an area of small claims into an area run by joint stock companies. In 1871, ignoring the rival claims of the region's indigenous Tswana people and the Boer republics, the British Government declared the diamond fields a British crown colony, Griqualand West, which was eventually incorporated into Cape Colony in 1880. The annexation of Griqualand West opened a new aggressive phase of imperial expansion in South Africa. Tens of

[11] For terminological discussion see David Omissi & Andrew Thompson, "Preface," In: The Impact of the South African War, Eds. David Omissi & Andrew S. Thompson, Basingstoke, 2002, viii; Donal Lowry, "Introduction: not just a 'teatime war'," In: The South African War reappraised, Ed. Donal Lowry, Studies in Imperialism, Manchester and New York 2000, 4. For new research orientations see David Omissi & Andrew S. Thompson, "Introduction: Investigating the Impact of the War," In: The Impact of the South African War, 2–3; John M. Mackenzie, "General Editor's Introduction," In: The South African War Reappraised, vii–viii; Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh & Mary-Lynn Suttie, "Introduction," In: Writing a Wider War: rethinking gender, race, and identity in the South African War, 1899-1902, Eds. Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh & Mary-Lynn Suttie, Ohio University Press, 2002, ix.

[12] Leonard Thompson, A History of South Africa, revised ed., New Haven and London, 1995, 115–117.

thousands of whites and blacks rushed to the area where the diamond city Kimberley was born in 1872. In the struggle for holdings that followed, a few young immigrants from Europe managed to overcome their competitors. The most successful of them all proved to be Cecil John Rhodes and Charles Dunnel Rudd, who owned the mining business venture founded in 1888, De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd., which was one of the largest British companies of the time.[13]

By the late 1880s, Rhodes's and Rudd's visions were already directed towards the north, the highlands of central South Africa. Between 1889 and 1895 they managed to subjugate all the remaining independent African polities south of the Limpopo River to the rule of the British South Africa Company (BSAC).[14]

The country was renamed Rhodesia in 1895 in honour of Rhodes. By the late nineties, however, it was already evident that mines in the newly-occupied territories of Rhodesia were not rich enough to compete with the gold mines of the Witwatersrand in the Transvaal.

For Rhodes, the dispute over uitlander civil rights offered an opportunity to undermine the Boer political power in South Africa. Furthermore, it seemed to serve his purpose to secure a British dominated white South Africa. From late 1894 onwards, Rhodes began actively to seek an opportunity to stir up an uitlander rebellion in the Witwatersrand aimed at overthrowing Krüger's government. Following these developments, in December 1895, a column of irregular mounted infantry lead by Dr. Leander Starr Jameson, a close friend and admirer of Rhodes, launched a raid into the Transvaal hoping it would serve as a starting point for an uitlander uprising.[15]

Without support and any true knowledge of the situation in the country, the poorly-informed Jameson forces were soon forced to surrender to the Boer forces. The miserable Jameson Raid was to have far-reaching effects on Anglo-Boer relations. Firstly, after the Jameson Raid, the hostility between uitlanders and the Boer authorities intensified, and allegations of police misbehavior against uitlanders were frequent. Secondly, it united the people behind Krüger and his government. The third great effect of the Raid was that the Orange Free State, the sister republic of the Transvaal that had gained its full independence in 1854, determined to enter into a closer union with the Transvaal. A military pact between the two republics was concluded in 1897. Lastly, the moral support expressed by Kaiser Wilhelm II led Boers to believe that in future Germany would back their cause. By September 1899, an armed conflict between Boers

[13] Leonard Thompson, A History of South Africa, 116–117.

[14] For further details see, for example, Ronald Robinson, & John Gallagher, Africa and the Victorians: the official mind of imperialism, Basingstoke, 1981 (1961) ch. VII.

[15] See, for example, J. G. Lockhardt, & C. M. Woodhouse, Rhodes, London, 1963, 296–297.

and the Empire seemed inevitable. After weeks of hesitation, the Boers finally issued an ultimatum on 9 October. Three days later the Boer columns moved into Natal, where the first battles took place.[16]

In the global context the great effect of the South African War was that it ultimately severed many intellectuals from the British imperial mission, civilizing efforts of which had been thus far widely accepted. South African authors, like Olive Schreiner who together with her husband S. C. Cronwright Schreiner wrote a series of essays and political tracts in the 1890s attempting to shape perceptions of South Africa and British-South African relations, gave a face to the sympathy for the Boers which existed at the time throughout Europe and the United States.[17]

In rivalling imperial bodies, such as in France, Germany and Russia, the South African War and the widespread pro-Boerism offered an opportunity to express anti-British and anti-imperialist feelings but also to stress the defects of British colonial policy compared with that of the French, the Germans or the Russians.[18] Many voluntary groups, fighting in the Boer ranks, including American, Russian, German, French, Hungarian and Scandinavian, expressed the whole pro-Boer atmosphere in practical terms. In a post-apartheid world it is sometimes difficult to remember how persistent a phenomenon pro-Boerism in fact was. Up to the 1960's Boers were still being seen as a progressive rather than a pariah people in many parts of the world.[19]

Pro-Boer sentiments were stronger in the Russian Empire than anywhere else in Europe. On the one hand, Russian pro-Boerism was closely connected with nationalism. In this context, the British South African policy was understood in terms of a liberal capitalism which did not show any respect for the Boer rural culture. On the other hand, in a way quite opposite to nationalist political thinking, pro-Boer sentiment was for the Russian social-democrats and liberals a way of expressing their anti-Tsarist attitudes. The social-democrats and the liberals consequently searched actively for points of correlation between the Boers and the minorities in the Russian Empire.[20]

---

[16] Thomas Pakenham, The Boer War, Abacus reprinted ed., 1998 (1979) 102–103, 107.

[17] Paula M. Krebs, "Olive Schreiner's Radicalization of South Africa," Victorian Studies 40: 3 (Spring 1997) 427–428; Olive Schreiner, Ratsumies Peter Halket Mashonamaasta [Trooper Peter Halket of Mashonaland], Translated by Aino Malmberg, Otava, Helsinki, 1911.

[18] Preben Kaarsholm, "Pro-Boers," In: Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity, vol. I: History and Politics, Ed. Raphael Samuel, London, 1989, 110–121.

[19] Donal Lowry, "'The World's no Bigger than a Kraal': the South African War and International Opinion in the First Age of 'Globalization'," In: The Impact of the South African War, 271–284.

[20] Apollon Davidson, & Irina Filatova, The Russians and the Anglo-Boer War 1899–1902, Cape Town, 1998, 190–194.

Philosophical Arguments in Justification and Condemnation of the War

The vastly expanded uitlander population in Johannesburg had placed civil rights at the heart of the Anglo-Boer conflict in the early 1890's, but diverse and even contradictory connotations of liberty have existed in political theory for almost four centuries. In the 1640's England, the King and the parliamentarians fought a series of battles over military and political hegemony, but also over political vocabulary. In this battle, the classical form of liberty was defined as being free to act at one's own will. This understanding was further defined by Thomas Hobbes in *De Cive* (1642) and *Leviathan* (1651), in which his view of state sovereignty reached its mature form. According to Hobbes's definition, civil liberty was the degree of freedom of will which was left outside the domain of the law.[21]

Supporters of the English republic, in their turn, supported a parallel, neo-Roman theory of civil liberty, which was put forward by James Harrington in *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656). The focus of neo-Roman civil rights was not so much on individual rights as on the liberty of the Commonwealth, the whole body of the people. These liberties were undermined if they were threatened by force by another state. This argument clearly arises from the Declaration of American Independence. Being colonised and thus enslaved by the English, the thirteen North American colonies considered their liberties to be threatened.[22]

After losing the thirteen American colonies, Britain reoriented the mercantilist system towards its Empire in Asia and Africa, stretching from the Indian subcontinent to the southern shores of Africa by early nineteenth century. Under the mercantilist system, the expansionist dynamic came from trading companies with only a little encouragement from the British government. The critics of the mercantilist system now asked whether the lessons of North America were similarly valid elsewhere in the Empire and what the purpose of possessing colonies was in general. The national economic advantages could be obtained by colonial trade which did not require the actual possession of colonies. In fact, the whole origin of the history of a critical attitude to empire lay in this liberal criticism of the mercantile system. In the mid-nineteenth century, the critics of colonialism were only a minority faction among Liberals but they managed to lay the foundations for late nineteenth century liberal anti-imperialism.

---

[21] Quentin Skinner, Liberty before Liberalism, Cambridge, 1998, 4-7; Quentin Skinner, "Democratisation and Political Rhetoric", A lecture delivered in the Department of History, University of Jyväskylä, 28 May, 2004.

[22] Henry Sidgwick, The Elements of Politics, London and New York, 1891, v. See also Quentin Skinner, Liberty before Liberalism, 98–99.

Another important contribution to the liberal political theory came from British idealism, which was a deeply responsive philosophy in dealing with many of the concerns of the Late-Victorian and Edwardian eras.[23] Idealists had to fight many battles over the prejudices against German philosophy in Britain. Idealism was typically regarded as incoherent and absurd or even dangerous as it was associated with continental upheavals and crises. These prejudices concerning idealism reached their climax in 1914 when the British idealists had to defend their position against accusations of harbouring blind state obedience or even a Prussian type of militarism in their thought.[24] Idealists did not offer a single response to the South African crisis nor did they agree on whether the Russian Empire possessed any rights that could have justified its repressive actions in Finland. They did, however, make important contributions in translating idealist theory into practical policies. Ritchie, among some other idealist thinkers, most notably R. B. Haldane, Henry Jones and J. S. Mackenzie, endorsed the war on the grounds that the Boer Republics were morally corrupt.[25]

The Boer Republics based their claim for national self-determination on the natural rights theory, which had already been challenged by Edmund Burke, Jeremy Bentham and Karl Marx.[26] Ritchie's challenge, however, was practical rather than theoretical. Ritchie, like many contemporary British idealist thinkers, oriented his philosophical idealism towards contemporary political issues. In doing so he gained a reputation for progressive political sympathies and joined many of radical societies and movements of the time, including the British signatories of the international petition to the cause of the Finnish people.[27] However, Ritchie did not have one single programme but he was interested in developing a political and social philosophy from idealist foundations. His uniqueness in idealist thinking rises from his analysis of the application of evolutionary theories to political thought.[28]

In *Darwinism and Politics* (1889), *Principles of State Interference* (1891) and in *Darwin and Hegel* (1893) Ritchie argued against the individualist dogma of laissez-faire expressed by Herbert Spencer and J. S. Mill. He challenged the antithesis between the individual and the state and pointed out the need for in-

[23] David Boucher & Andrew Vincent, British Idealism and Political Theory, Edinburgh, 2000, 3.

[24] Sandra Den Otter, British Idealism and Social Explanation. A Study in Late Victorian Thought, London, 1996, 13–14, 31–32, 47, 175.

[25] David Boucher & Andrew Vincent, British Idealism and Political Theory, 168.

[26] David Boucher & Andrew Vincent, British Idealism and Political Theory, 128, 135, 138, 140, 144, 150, 152–153.

[27] Finland 3 (September, 1899).

[28] S. M. Den Otter, "Ritchie, David George (1853–1903)," In: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online edition, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35763, accessed 24 Sept 2011].

creased state intervention.[29] Furthermore, he described the state and, indeed, the Empire as moral entities. As the state had its end in realising the best life for the individual, the Empire, in accordance with the previous statement, had its end in realising the best life for the colonies.

In Ritchie's evolutionary ethics rights, such as the right to self-determination, were not natural but derived from social utility and varied according to evolutionary standards. His evolutionary ethics justified a wide range of social institutions. Slavery, for example, would have been a perfectly justified social institution if only it had served a social purpose.[30] Ritchie's rights theory concerned itself with human capacities in a global context. Therefore, the races of mankind did not possess any natural rights but rights that varied according to the civilised standards of the time.[31] Ritchie supported the war because he felt that the Boer Republics were corrupted by their morals. Without the British, the oligarchic Boer Republics would have exploited the natives endlessly. Ritchie asked, to support his theory, if Cromwell would have put the rights of the Anglo-Saxon race before the political freedom of mankind.[32]

An idea of mature nations assisting younger nations to reach full citizenship was appealing for Ritchie, who defended South African war policy on the principle that the war was like a classical struggle for "true constitutional democracy". The cause of the British Empire seemed to him as just and the South African War as inevitable as had been the struggle between the North and the South in America. In Ritchie's mind, the war was fought for democracy, civilization and progress.[33] He pointed out that self-determination based on the natural rights theory was meaningless if society itself was not capable of self-determination. This argument justified the actions taken by the Jameson Raid which Ritchie compared to the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the American Declaration of Independence of 1776.[34]

---

[29] David G. Ritchie, The Principles of State Interference. Four Essays on the Political Philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer, J. S. Mill, and T. H. Green, London, 1891, v, 64, 169; David, G. Ritchie, Darwin and Hegel. With other Philosophical Studies, London, 1893, vii; David, G. Ritchie, Darwinism and Politics. With Two Additional Essays on Human Evolution, London, 1895.

[30] David G. Ritchie, Natural Rights. A Criticism of Some Political and Ethical Conceptions, 5th impr., London, 1952 (1894), ix, 101–104; David G. Ritchie, Studies in Political and Social Ethics, London, 1902, iv.

[31] David G. Ritchie, Natural Rights, 232–235, 247, 258–262, 279; David G. Ritchie, The Principles of State Interference, 94, note 1.

[32] D. G. Ritchie, "Another View of the South African War", Ethical World III: 2 (January 13, 1900) 19–20.

[33] Sandra Den Otter, British Idealism and Social Explanation, 50.

[34] D. G. Ritchie, "To the Editors of the Ethical World", Ethical World III: 7 (February 17, 1900) 110.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the dispute over the political rights of the uitlanders was widely compared by liberal intellectuals in the London press to minority rights questions then acute in various other imperial powers, including the Russian Empire. The simultaneously occurred attempted Russification of Finland offered the liberal intellectuals an opportunity, not only to express their sympathy for the Finns, but also to point out the liberal principles' inconsistency with imperialism.

The Boer States and the Grand Duchy of Finland: a Historical Comparison

"Over forty years ago, at the brink of the twentieth century, two small nations were unjustifiably attacked by their much bigger and powerful neighbours. The one was of our own people [the Finns], whose national privileges were compromised by the so called Manifesto of February 15th, and the other was the Boer people who lived at the far side of the world."[35]

In June 1902, the desperate Boer guerrilla war was over and this paved the way for the Boer political campaign. One of the best-sellers during the Boer national campaign was the war memoirs of the Boer General Christiaan De Wet (1854–1922) *De strijd tusschen Boer en Brit* (1902) which was immediately translated from the Dutch original into English (with the title *Three Years War*) and Finnish. In Finland, De Wet's war memoirs were for long regarded as a handbook suited to the Finnish national struggle with the Russian Empire (or later with the Soviet Union). In 1942, at the time of the Continuation War, Finland's political similarities to those of the Boer Republics were recalled in the manner quoted above.

Finland, an autonomous Grand Duchy within the Russian Empire since 1809, had her own political institutions (the Imperial Senate of Finland), her own (Lutheran) church, army, her own legislation (Swedish) and gold-based currency (since 1863). The country also had a liberal middle class who felt greater affinity with the Western countries, especially Sweden, than with Russia and its authoritarian tradition.[36] By the turn of the century, the Russian Empire was increasingly being transformed into a multinational state. Together with its chief national group, the Great Russians, there were Ukrainians, Belorussians,

[35] Antero Manninen, "Suomalaiselle lukijalle" [For a Finnish reader], In: Christiaan de Wet, Buurien ja englantilaisten sota [Three Years War], translated by Vihtori Peltonen, Porvoo, 1942, 5, author's translation.

[36] Osmo Jussila, "Finland as a Grand Duchy, 1809–1917," In: From the Grand Duchy to a Modern State. A political History of Finland since 1809, Eds. Osmo Jussila, Seppo Hentilä and Jukka Nevakivi, London, 1999.

Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Finns and other Finnic Peoples, Germans, Jews, and Romanians among other nationalities. The attitude towards national minorities shifted throughout the centuries. Before the reform era of Peter the Great religion had played a central role. The aim was to convert the non-Christian subjects to the Orthodox religion. With the 'secularisation' of the monarchy in the nineteenth century these religious interests were superseded by political and economic ones.[37]

The origins of the Finnish notions of empire, imperial power and imperialism lay in attempts to conceptualise the Russian imperial power. The attempted Russification of Finland by the Russian Empire and the imperial power of the Soviet Union were understood in terms of imperial language. One should note, however, that Finns were never mere victims of imperialism but active participants in the creation of imperial vocabulary. Finns did not hesitate to describe their country as forming a part of the Russian Empire, analogous to that which we speak of the British Empire. Imperial ventures and wars were highly popular topics in the early twentieth century Finnish literature. Some Finns even participated in empire-building in Southern Africa. That is to argue that national history writing itself tends to contain elements of power as subjects, terminology and the styles of narration are chosen by the authors. There is no unit of power and, therefore, "power" cannot be quantified. At best we can speak of some having "less power" or "more power". Studying power is consequently a problematic task for those who try to understand national history writing.

One of the early Russian intellectuals who took interest in the case of Finland was Peter Kropotkin (Pjotr Krapotkin), an emigrant anarchist who escaped political oppression from Russia through Finland to Britain in 1876. Krapotkin's article "Finland: A Rising Nationality", published in 1885 by *the Nineteenth Century*, a liberal-minded London journal founded by James Thomas Knowles in 1877, was the first straightforward political statement for the national constitution of Finns published by the London press. It was not, however, until Finns' national privileges were compromised by the Manifesto of February 15th in 1899, a new Army Bill aiming to raise the military force in the Grand Duchy of Finland from 5,000 to 35,000, that the fate of Finland was increasingly seen as an indication of a triumph of the autocratic principles of the East over the constitutional methods of the West.

By the end of 1899 the Grand Duchy of Finland had entered a period of political conflict with the Russian Empire. In Finland as well as in Britain, some liberals recognised the similarity between the political situation of the Grand Duchy and that of the Boer Republics' so far as questions of national self-

[37] Refer, for example, to Tuomo Polvinen, Imperial Borderland. Bobrikov and the Attempted Russification of Finland, 1898–1904, London, 1995, 17ff.

determination and an imperial connection were concerned. Finland was seen as an example of a nation that had cultivated its inner national interests instead of setting out to colonise: "[…] it is the small states alone who, unable to attempt to compete in the race for territorial aggrandizement, are enabled to develop their own countries unburdened by the crushing expense of an army out of proportion to their resources".[38]

In Augustine Birrell's article "Finland and Russia", published in July 1900 by the *Contemporary Review*, the political rights and privileges in the "Constitution of Finland", granted to the Finns by Tsar Alexander I and reconfirmed by Tsar Alexander II, were seen as an example of a proper handling of imperial minorities.[39] Founded in 1866, the *Contemporary Review* attracted from the very beginning many prominent writers including Arnold, Gladstone, Huxley and Spencer. However, despite the *Contemporary Review's* liberal and tolerant tone, a more activist approach was not adopted until Percy William Bunting took over editorship in 1882. As a supporter of social reform and liberalism, the articles he included on foreign issues began to follow the same sors of argument which had already been pursued in relation to social matters.[40]

In Birrell's provocative article, Russia and its authoritarian tradition, represented by Governor-General of Finland, had no respect for constitutionalism. "Autocracy he [Governor-General Bobrikoff] knows. It is power unlimited. How is it possible, he asks, that what is unlimited in mighty Russia can be restricted in tiny Finland? A Constitution is but a Ukase, and what a Ukase did, another Ukase can undo." Imperious and imperial ideas, whether the Anglo-Saxon idea or the Pan-Slavonic idea, seemed like to dominate the world at the time when the civil rights question were acute in places like Finland, Ireland, Canada (with the French Canadians) and South Africa. "Why be Finns?—become Russians! Why to be Dutch in South Africa?—become English!… How absurd to be a Finn! What is the Finnish idea?"[41]

It should be stressed, however, that not even the British liberals wished any other political solution to the South African situation than one compatible with imperial interests. An anti-war policy did not inevitably imply pro-Boer activity let alone anti-British feelings. In the heat of the war, any criticism was easily taken as a pro-Boer or anti-British statement. James Bryce, the author of *Impression of South Africa* (1897), for example, was seen as an opponent of the war but was by no means pro-Boer let alone anti-British.[42] The British liberals acknowl-

---

[38] Finland 7 (January, 1900).

[39] Augustine Birrell, "Finland and Russia", Contemporary Review 78 (July, 1900) 16–27.

[40] Walter E. Houghton, "The Contemporary Review, 1866–1900," In: The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824–1900, vol. I, Ed. Walter E. Houghton, Toronto, 1966, 212.

[41] Augustine Birrell, "Finland and Russia", 18–17.

[42] James Bryce, Impressions of South Africa, 3rd revised ed., London 1900 (1897).

edged that Russia had an important civilising mission in Central Asia and the Far East.

Richard Cobden's (1804–1865) pamphlet *Russia* (1836) was arguing against writers and speakers who supported Britain's intervention in the affairs of Russia and Turkey, as Cobden believed, on the false pretence that Britain's commerce, colonies and national existence required her to do so. The Turks, 'a race of Tartars of Asia' as Cobden saw them, were described, in terms of economics and culture, as a backward people. In the same sor of 'fierce tribes' with 'the rude habits of savages' belonged the peoples of the Caucasus against whom the Russians were compelled to guard their Southern borders. Things were quite the opposite in the case of the Turks and, if the Russians were to seize Constantinople they would be doing as great a favour for civilisation and humanity as they had done by their conquests in the Gulf of Finland. However, as this prospect did not satisfy the trade interests of Britain, she blocked Russia from the markets and concentrated on a colonial trade that was not based on economic rationality or the principles of free trade.[43]

Paradoxically, the British people accused the Russians of being an aggrandising people: 'If during the last century Russia has plundered Sweden, Poland, Turkey, and Persia […] Great Britain has, in the same period, robbed – no, that would be an unpolite phrase – "has enlarged the bounds of his Majesty's dominions" at the expense of France, Holland, and Spain'. They had not even questioned their own expansion based on unsound morality: '[…] but surely we, who are staggering under the embarrassing weight of our colonies, with one foot upon the rock of Gibraltar and the other at the Cape of Good Hope – with Canada, Australia, and the Peninsula of India, forming, Cerberus-like, the heads of our monstrous empire – […] surely *we* are not exactly the nation to preach homilies to other people […]'. England had simultaneously acted aggressively against other powers and seized upon colonies while accusing the Russians of conquering Ukraine, Finland and the Crimea. These accusations were carried out even though Russia was surrounded by 'barbarous nations' one of which (*i.e.* Turkey) had institutions that were by their nature warlike and aggressive.[44]

According to Cobden's argument Russia was morally justified in having subjugated 'less civilised states'. Russia had rooted out the 'predatory habits' of the 'barbarous and indolent' inhabitants of its Southern borders and kept Swedish laws and the peasantry's privileges alive in Finland by incorporating it into Russia. Annexation of Turkey by Russia would have been a morally righteous and humane act that would have led to a civilising intercourse with commercial

[43] Richard Cobden, "Russia," In The Political Writings, vol. I., London, 1963, 127–134, 137, 141–142, 149–150.

[44] Richard Cobden, "Russia," In The Political Writings, vol. I., 153, 156–157, 159.

nations. Otherwise 'these worse than savages' would have spread war, destruction and pestilence amongst the European states.[45]

Despite this legitimacy of Russia's civilising mission in the East, they saw Finland as "a nursery of western ideas and western culture" within the vast Russian Empire as expressed by R. Nisbet Bain in his article titled "Finland and the Tsar" published in May 1899 in the radical liberal *Fortnightly Review*.[46]

Professor John Westlake by his turn compared in his *National Review* article "The Case of Finland", published in March 1900, the turn-of-the-century political situation of Finland to England in the 1640's where the King and the parliamentarians were fighting over military and political hegemony but also over political vocabulary.[47] In the case of Finland the Tsar had broken his promise to the Finnish people and thus violated their liberties.

After the Manifesto of 15 February Finnish activists founded the so called Literary committee, the purpose of which was to promote the cause of the Finnish people in foreign press. In London, its representatives included Julio Reuter and Edward Westermarck.[48] Westermarck's article "Finland and the Tsar" was published by the *Contemporary Review* in May 1899 and Reuter's article "Russia in Finland" was published by the *Nineteenth Century* in May 1899. They illustrate strikingly the Literary Committee's efforts. Both articles were published in liberal journals and they were both aimed at liberal-minded intellectuals. The tone and the purpose of the articles were also similar: to explain the nature of Finnish autonomy to the British audience and the fundamental unease the Manifesto had caused to that autonomy.[49]

The Literary Committee's work reached its fulfilment in June 1899 when *Finland*, an English journal devoted to the cause of the Finnish people was founded. Although *Finland* was short-lived, its last number was published in May 1900, it managed to achieve its purpose from both British and Finnish liberal points of view: for the British liberal intellectuals it offered an opportunity to express their sympathy for the Finns and to point out the inconsistency of lib-

---

[45] Richard Cobden, "Russia," In The Political Writings, vol. I., 160–161, 164, 208.

[46] R. Nisbet Bain, "Finland and the Tsar", Fortnightly Review CCCLXXXIX (May 1, 1899) 735.

[47] J. Westlake, "The Case of Finland", National Review 205 (March, 1900) 111–121.

[48] Eino I. Parmainen, Taistelujen kirja. Kuvauksia itsenäisyystaistelumme vaiheista sortovuosina, osa I: Routakauden puhkeaminen ja sen ensimmäiset vuodet [Book of battles. Descriptions of our battle for independence during the years of oppression, part I: The beginning of the years of oppression], Helsinki, 1936, 367–368.

[49] Edward Westermarck, "Finland and the Tsar", Contemporary Review LXXV (May, 1899) 652–659; J. N. Reuter, "Russia in Finland", Nineteenth Century XLV: 267 (May, 1899) 699–715.

eral principles with imperialism and for the Finnish activists it was a way to promote Finnish civil rights.

The British liberals who were devoted to the cause of the Finns were anti-imperialists by definition but not pro-Boer. Therefore, Finland's pro-Boer movement was a very complicated issue for the British supporters of Finland's national interests. The Finnish pro-Boer activists considered the South African War a British attempt to steal Boer land as a payback from the First Boer War in 1881. The Boer Republics were believed to be in no way guilty for the outbreak of the war. The blame was placed on the "foreign gold seekers and criminals" who swarmed to Johannesburg. The war was also analysed in the wider context of British imperialism; the independent Boer states were in the way of the Chartered Company and Rhodes. After the Jameson Raid had failed, the British Government started to support imperialists in order to steal the Boer land and gold. Unlike the British, the Boers were believed to be a peace-loving people who were forced to defend their national sovereignty with arms.[50]

However, the pro-Boer attitudes were not shared by everybody in Finland. Free Church journalist Frederick Lönnbeck's (1854–1914) pamphlet *Pro Brittania* (in Swedish, 1900) was warmly welcomed by the journal *Finland* since it tried to convince Finns that the Boers were not to be idealised.[51] Lönnbeck argued that Boer social life was entirely based on slavery, a fact which consequently revealed the brutal and fanatic nature of the Boer people. Finns were not properly equipped to make valid judgements about the political situation in the Transvaal. According to Lönnbeck, "Dutch race superiority in South Africa" did not serve "the general interest of peace" and consequently did not legitimate the Boer national existence. The British Empire, however, had shown its civilising capacity and was therefore capable of furthering European culture and Christendom in South Africa. By expressing their pro-Boer attitudes, the Finnish people showed a lack of respect for the British civilising mission – something incomprehensible to Lönnbeck. Finns, who had taken their side with the anti-British party, did not earn the British devotion to the cause of the Finnish people.[52]

[50] Antero Manninen, "Suomalaiselle lukijalle," In: Christiaan de Wet, Buurien, ja englantilaisten sota 6–8.
[51] Finland 10 (April, 1900).
[52] F. Wald. Lönnbeck, Pro Brittannia, Ekenäs, 1900, 3–8, 11–15.

Conclusion

This British devotion to the cause of the Finnish people and the Finnish pro-Boer attitudes exemplify how problematic political and ideological categories such as “imperialist” or “anti-imperialist” can be. For the British liberals, *Finland* offered a channel, not only for supporting Finnish national interests but also for criticising despotic forms of government in Russia and the British Empire. In terms of the traditional understanding of imperialism, liberals opposed British imperialism since the traditional pejorative connotations of the concept were closely connected to despotism. Yet, in its context *Finland* and its liberal supporters were neither pro-Boer nor anti-British. Finland’s autonomous status was understood as a suitable example of the proper handling of imperial and national minorities; a question that was quickly becoming a highly acute political question not only in South Africa but internationally.

RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION OF SMALL STATES AND GREAT POWERS DURING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Satu Matikainen

The League of Nations and Minority Protection in East Central Europe – Finnish and British Policies in the League Council, 1927–1930

Introduction

In this paper, I am going to analyse and compare policies of two states, Finland and Britain, relating to the League of Nations minority protection system. When boundaries were changed and new states were created in the peace settlement following World War One, a number of minority treaties were concluded and subsequently placed under the guarantee of the League. It was precisely the small states between Germany and the Soviet Union that had to assume obligations on minority protection after World War One. This paper discusses the role of Finland, a small state, in sharp contrast with Britain, a great power. I am starting from the premise that due to different positions of the two states, Britain had a more central, influential and visible role than Finland in the League of Nations Council.

Sally Marks has argued that small nations were attracted to the League of Nations because of the promises that had been made concerning collective security and the principle of equality of nations. However, they soon found out that equality between member states was only a theoretic principle. The great powers settled the most important political matters behind the scenes of the League or in separate closed meetings.[1] Therefore, it is interesting to ask if matters relating to protection of ethnic minorities were deemed as a realm of the great powers or if a small state could wield influence in them. In any case, Council members simply had to familiarise themselves with all issues which came on the Council's agenda.

Britain had no obligations towards minority protection under international law. As one of the most powerful League members, it had strong interest in the smooth functioning of the system and securing peaceful conditions in East Central Europe. Britain also had long traditions in being relatively sympathetic – at least on a rhetorical level – towards human rights and minority rights in Eastern Europe. Britain had no problem in protecting minorities in other countries, but

[1] Sally Marks, "The Small States at Geneva", World Affairs 157: 4 (1995) 191–192.

the situation in her own empire was quite different: all outside attempts to extend minority protection to the British realm were completely rejected.

As for Finland, it is important to note that Finland itself believed she "had no obligations" under minority treaties.[2] The real situation was not that straightforward: Finland was bound by something akin to a minority treaty, namely the treaty on the position of the Åland Islands, 1921, concluded under the League of Nations. Sweden had intended to annex the islands, but the League awarded them to Finland. In the treaty, Finland offered certain guarantees to the population of the islands for the preservation of their language, culture, and local traditions. The treaty was always mentioned when the League of Nations catalogued minority treaties, but it nevertheless differed from "normal" minority obligations. Originally, when Finland had joined the League, it had been asked to show commitment as to the rights of minorities. The demand came primarily from Jewish organisations in Europe. Finland opposed this, arguing that minorities were treated equally within its borders. However, Finland was required to furnish the Council with information on the position of minorities, which apparently passed without problem through the League machinery.[3]

Within the League of Nations, the League Council acted as an executive body, meeting approximately five times a year. The Council had both permanent and non-permanent members which were elected by the Assembly. Britain was one of the permanent members of the Council, the others being France, Italy, Japan, as well as Germany, who had joined the League only in 1926. Two semi-permanent members were Poland and Spain. In addition, there were seven non-permanent members, elected for three years. In practice, one seat was for a Latin American state, one for an Asian country, one for the Little Entente countries, one for neutral European states – to which category Finland was counted – and one for the British Empire. Finland was a non-permanent member of the Council from September 1927 to September 1930.

In Finland, the president formally has the right to make the foreign policy decisions. However, President Lauri Kristian Relander (1925–1931) mainly left foreign policy decisions to foreign secretary Hjalmar Procopé,[4] whose role seems to have been large in the League of Nations matters. There was also the cabinet foreign affairs committee consisting of the prime minister, the foreign secretary and three other ministers. Ministry for Foreign Affairs bore the main responsibility of practical work. In addition, there was the foreign affairs com-

---

[2] See, for example, foreign secretary Procopé's speech in the League of Nations Official Journal [hereafter LNOJ] 4/1929, 526.

[3] P. de Azcárate, League of Nations and National Minorities: An Experiment, Washington, 1945, 174.

[4] Magnus Lemberg, Hjalmar J. Procopé: en politisk biografi [Hjalmar J. Procopé: a political biography], Helsingfors, 1989, 139–149.

mittee of the Finnish Parliament, which was primarily a discussion forum. However, in the League of Nations policy, the committee also had preparatory powers.[5] In Britain, on the other hand, the so-called Royal prerogative traditionally reserved the foreign affairs to the monarch, and by extension to the cabinet.[6] The executive branch of the government dominated the conduct of British foreign policy also during the interwar era. The British parliament did not have, for instance, a foreign affairs committee.

Hjalmar Procopé usually represented Finland in the Council, while Rudolf Holsti[7], Rafael Erich and Väinö Voionmaa participated occasionally.[8] For Britain, the delegates to the Council varied more, with the foreign secretary in less regular attendance. For instance, the change of government in early summer 1929 had an effect on representation and, further, to the British role in the following Council session. Out of the British delegates, foreign secretary Austen Chamberlain had the most central role in the matters discussed in this article.

Minority issues were handled in the Council from two perspectives. Firstly, minority issues were discussed in the Council sessions on a general level, as questions of procedure and principle. On the grounds that there were significant debates on procedural amendments during the late 1920s, this paper focuses on this aspect.

In order to understand the arguments made in favour and against procedural changes, it is necessary to familiarize ourselves with the basic operation of the League of Nations' minority protection. There were rules on how the petitions, i.e. claims to the League that a state had violated its treaty obligations, were to be examined. The examination of these petitions also constituted the second aspect of the Council work on minority issues. The petitions were handled in separate committees consisting of three Council members as well as in regular Council sessions in those cases in which the committees of three had not managed to reach a compromise solution.

Anyone could send a petition to the League of Nations, claiming that a breach of a minority treaty had occurred. The minorities section of the League

---

[5] Juhani Paasivirta, Suomen diplomaattiedustus ja ulkopolitiikan hoito itsenäistymisestä talvisotaan [Finnish foreign policy from the independence to the Winter War], Porvoo 1968, 113–114, 117–118, 126. During the period under discussion in this paper, minority issues appear in the committee minutes only very briefly. See The Library of Parliament Ulkoasiainvaliokunnan pöytäkirjat [Minutes of the parliamentary foreign affairs committee] UAV, years 1927-1929.

[6] Charles Carstairs & Richard Ware, "Introduction", In: Parliament and International Relations, Eds. C Carstairs & R. Ware, Milton Keynes, 1991, 3–4.

[7] The Finnish permanent representative to the League of Nations.

[8] Table of Council Sessions, http://www.indiana.edu/~league/tccouncils.htm, accessed 7 Feb. 2012.

Secretariat examined the petition in order to deem it either receivable or not receivable, according to certain criteria. Whenever a petition was receivable, observations of the state in question were next invited. Then all the documents that had been generated thus far were communicated to the League Council, in which a committee of three, consisting of three Council members, was set up to examine the petition. The matter was dropped at this stage if infractions were unfounded or the reply of the accused state was deemed satisfactory. Whenever breaches of the treaty were found, the state was induced to enter into informal negotiations with the minority to correct its behaviour and make compromises.[9]

If a compromise could not be reached, the matter was brought officially on the Council agenda by one of the Council members. One of the members acted as the rapporteur (during the late 1920s always the Japanese delegate) who summarised the question in a report which was then circulated to the Council. The state could at this point offer compensation or it could reverse its policy, thus settling the matter. If a settlement could not be reached even at this stage, the matter was referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice.[10]

The Beginning of the Discussion on Minority Protection in Late 1928 and Early 1929

In 1929 there was a major discussion in the League of Nations as to whether any changes to the existing minority protection procedure should be made. These proposals related mainly to the transparency of the procedure, publicity and the rights of those who petitioned the League. The whole discussion originated from the Council session of December 1928, when petitions of Germans in Polish Silesia were, in a normal way, on the Council agenda. The Canadian delegate Raoul Dandurand proposed, quite unexpectedly, that the League minority procedure should be opened up and discussed in the following Council session. This led to an exchange of words between August Zaleski, the Polish foreign secretary, and Gustav Stresemann, the German foreign secretary.[11]

Austen Chamberlain, the British foreign secretary, was not happy about the course the matters were taking, apparently fearing that the whole question would go too far and destabilise the political situation in Eastern Europe. He remarked to Eric Drummond, the secretary general of the League: “Now we are

[9] See, for example, Oscar Janowsky, Nationalities and National Minorities, New York, 1945, 115–122.

[10] Janowsky, Nationalities, 115–122.

[11] LNOJ, 1/1929, 68-71; Carole Fink, Defending the Rights of Others: The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878-1938, Cambridge, 2004, 308.

in for a hell of a row!"[12] This was just the beginning. During the following months, there was frenzied action around minority protection. It transpired that Canada, Germany and Poland were all planning to submit suggestions at the March Council. The first stages of the discussion in both Britain and Finland centred on contents of these proposals, information-gathering and subsequent reactions.

From the British point of view, there were, at first, the Canadian suggestions, which related purely to procedural questions. The matter was somewhat delicate as Canada was a British dominion, thus part of the British Empire. It has to be noted that Britain was not in any way party to the Canadian proposal and for Britain the initiative had come as a complete surprise. Alexander Cadogan, the leading expert on the League of Nations at the British Foreign Office, painstakingly prepared a memorandum commenting on Dandurand's views in which he generally shot the Canadian proposals down and did not even take them very seriously.[13]

The Polish diplomatic representatives kept trying to get support for their ideas in many European capitals. In early February 1929, the Polish government introduced their proposal of the general minority convention to the British Foreign Office. The Foreign Office, not surprisingly, found the idea unrealistic and ill-advised: the Poles aimed at generalising the minority obligations, a policy that Britain always opposed. The universal minority convention, apart from being generally impractical, also had potentially dangerous relevance to the British Empire, especially to "certain parts" of dominions.[14]

Soon after, Chamberlain and the Foreign Office heard from Drummond in Geneva that the Polish government did not want to put the proposal of universal minority convention on the Council agenda after all. The sudden volte-face was due to the pressure the French government had used on Poland – France did not want universal minority protection either and, due to the close relations between the countries, France had been able to influence Poland.[15] This also supports the argument emphasising the great power prerogative in minority questions.

Chamberlain conceded he was not entirely happy with the existing minority procedure. He advocated the upcoming Council discussion on the principles and procedure of minority protection, provided it did not go into details of individ-

[12] The National Archives [hereafter TNA], Foreign Office [hereafter FO] 371/14123/1249, Drummond to Cadogan, 6 Feb. 1929.

[13] TNA FO 371/14123/1294, minute by Cadogan, 14 Feb. 1929.

[14] TNA FO 371/14123/1096, Polish memorandum, 6 Feb. 1929; minutes by Broadmead and A. Leeper, 8 Feb. 1929; minute by Chamberlain, 9 Feb. 1929; Chamberlain to Sir William Erskine (Warsaw), 14 Feb. 1929.

[15] TNA FO 371/14123/1249, Drummond's record of telephone conversation with Sokal (Polish representative at Geneva), 8 Feb. 1929; TNA FO 371/14123/1096, Chamberlain to Erskine (Warsaw), 14 Feb. 1929.

ual minorities or petitions. Chamberlain also considered that in view of public opinion in Britain he did not want to appear to be suppressing the debate. In any case, Stresemann could not abandon his proposal now, once he had so publicly broadcasted it, and Britain and France should save their energies to more important questions in their relations with Germany, such as reparations and military occupation which were currently under reconsideration.[16] Richard S. Grayson, in his study on Chamberlain's foreign policy, has emphasised precisely this aspect: Chamberlain was happy to let Stresemann make pro-minority gestures directed mainly to German public, while the real issues at the time were reparations and occupation.[17]

While Britain was examining the situation from a number of perspectives, Finland was very uncertain what line to adopt. The Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs primarily attempted to gather information on the attitudes of other governments, in order to form their own opinion. At first, they tried to find out what the Canadian, German and Polish propositions would actually entail.[18] In London Eino Wälikangas, the Finnish chargé d'affaires, found out from the Foreign Office, the Canadian representatives and the *Daily Telegraph* that Dandurand's proposal was about the minority petitions procedure.[19]

The Finnish Embassy in Paris, for example, had heard unspecified rumours on the contents of the proposals and on the attitudes other governments were going to adopt and therefore asked information from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.[20] In order to seek more information on the attitudes towards the Polish proposal, Procopé sent a circular telegraph to five Finnish embassies:

> Poland is probably going to put forward in the March Council a proposition to the effect of extending the minority regulations to all minorities. Please enquire carefully about the opinion of the government you are accredited to. Our attitude towards these kinds of plans has thus far been negative.[21]

Therefore, the Finnish attitude towards the general minority convention was negative just like Britain's. In general, discussion in the MFA focused on the Polish proposal. The Finnish minister in Berlin, Väinö Wuolijoki, then reported

---

[16] TNA FO 371/14123/1544, Chamberlain to Tyrrell (Paris), 20 Feb. 1929.

[17] Richard S. Grayson, Austen Chamberlain and the Commitment to Europe: British Foreign Policy 1924–29, London 1997, 133–134.

[18] See, for example, UM [Archives of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs] 15: IB 1a, telegraphs from MFA to London and Berlin embassies, 31 Jan. 1929.

[19] UM 15: IB 1a, Wälikangas to MFA, 7 Feb. 1929.

[20] UM 15: IB 1a, Paris embassy to MFA, 9 Feb. 1929.

[21] UM 15: IB 1a, Procopé to Rome, Berlin, Paris, London and Stockholm embassies, 11 Feb. 1929. [Translated from Finnish by the author.]

that Poland had cancelled its proposition, largely due to the opposition from France.[22] Subsequently, the Polish minister in Helsinki, Franciszek Charwat,[23] sought Finnish support for the postponement of the whole minority question in the Council. To that effect, he had a meeting with the highest official in the Finnish Foreign Ministry, Aarno Yrjö-Koskinen. Charwat also enquired after the Finnish attitude towards the statements made by the so-called minority states, i.e. Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania. In the statements, it was argued that certain features of the current minority procedure were against minority treaties but, on the other hand, no changes to the system could be made without the consent of the minority states. Yrjö-Koskinen promised he would get back to Charwat once the Finnish cabinet discussed the matter, which was perhaps a tactic designed to delay the Finnish reply intentionally.[24]

There was a meeting of the foreign affairs committee of the Finnish Parliament (*Eduskunta*) on 26 February. In the meeting, Procopé gave a statement on the history and current situation of minority issues under the League. In the conversation that followed, a number of committee members expressed their wish to see the minority protection system enlarged. In general, the mood of parliamentarians was, according to Procopé, "minority-friendly". However, the chair of the committee, Georg Schauman, disagreed and adopted a similar view as Prime Minister Oskari Mantere had in an earlier cabinet foreign affairs committee meeting: the minority question could not be solved in a formulaic manner. This appeared to be the official Finnish line of policy at the time. It essentially meant supporting the existing system. The committee, in any case, did not make a formal proposal on the matter.[25]

Yrjö-Koskinen then asked Procopé's advice on what to do with Charwat. He assumed that Charwat's questions did not require any reply or statement on Finnish policy. In any case, the Finnish Foreign Ministry had been instructed to assume a "watchful attitude".[26] Procopé replied:

> If you are compelled to reply to Charwat, act evasive for example by pretending you did not reach me and saying that we firstly have to familiarise ourselves with Dandurand's proposal which I so far know only from newspaper accounts. For your information: I think it is impossible to give the

[22] UM 15: IB 1a, Berlin embassy to MFA, 14 Feb. 1929.
[23] A list of Polish diplomats, http://www.finland.pl/public/default.aspx?nodeid=40927&contentlan=1&culture=fi-FI, accessed 20 Feb. 2012.
[24] UM 15: IB 1a, minute by Yrjö-Koskinen, 27 Feb. 1929. Enclosure: statement of Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania, 20 Feb. 1929.
[25] UAV minutes, 26 Feb. 1929; UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, 4 March 1929.
[26] UM 15: IB 1a, Yrjö-Koskinen to Procopé, 27 Feb. 1929.

> promises Poland is asking. Our attitude depends on the situation in Geneva. So far I do no see any reason to change our opinion which is, as instructed, favourable to Dandurand's proposal as far as I understand.[27]

This letter is very informative. Firstly, Procopé instructs the officials to lie if necessary. Secondly, the Finnish position at the time is revealed in this communication: Finland essentially supported the Canadian proposal.

In general, there had been a widespread confusion across Europe, especially in the press, as to what the Council would actually deliberate at the March session. Alexander Cadogan at the British Foreign Office summarised the situation:

> In particular, it seems to be expected in some quarters that the Council is going to reconsider the whole question of its rights and duties as regards minorities, and revise its whole regime, if not produce a new one. Any such idea is to be discouraged. We do not, of course, yet know exactly what case, if any, Herr Stresemann is going to present. At present, the only concrete proposal on the agenda relate to League procedure: no question has been raised regarding the basis of League action, League responsibility, or the fundamental principles of the protection of minorities.[28]

Therefore, two items relating to the protection of minorities were on the agenda for the March Council session: the procedural amendments proposed by Dandurand and "the Guarantee by the League of Nations of the provisions concerning the protection of minorities" proposed by Stresemann. The British goal was to preserve the existing system which was believed to be the most functional procedural alternative. The Minorities Section of the League secretariat and Drummond called for Chamberlain to take initiative at the session. Chamberlain was asked to deliver a somewhat patronising introductory statement on the principles of the League minority protection to "lower the temperature" and to clarify the "true" situation. The Foreign Office was unenthusiastic. Cadogan believed it was best to wait how the discussion developed and react only then.[29] Interestingly, Finland was in fact doing the same thing.

---

[27] UM 15: IB 1a, Procopé to MFA, 1 March 1929. [Translated from Finnish by the author.]
[28] TNA FO 371/14123/1888, minute by Cadogan, 28 Feb. 1929.
[29] TNA FO 371/14123/1888, minute by Cadogan, 28 Feb. 1929; Drummond to Cadogan, 26 Feb. 1929.

The March Council Session

When Procopé arrived at Geneva, it soon became apparent to him that Poland's wishes for the postponement of the minority question were not realistic. Procopé advised that the Foreign Ministry should act cautiously on Finnish soil and not commit to Charwat's ideas.[30] Procopé had meetings with League officials and delegates of other states, for example, Chamberlain and Eric Drummond, who all explained their views on various proposals which had been made.[31]

The Polish representatives again sought Finnish assistance. The Polish permanent delegate to the League, Franciszek Sokal, wanted Finnish support in squashing the whole discussion along the same lines Charwat had already approached Yrjö-Koskinen in Helsinki. Sokal asked Procopé to put forward a proposition for a committee that would swiftly reject the Canadian and German suggestions as futile. Procopé, however, told Sokal he believed that setting up a more substantial committee – which was the general mood at the time – was a good idea. Later Zaleski warned Procopé not to support the British, French and Italian version of the future special committee. Procopé replied that, to Finland, this was a matter of principle relating to the interests of the League and to fair treatment. Procopé tried to assure Zaleski that the Finnish policy was not directed against Poland.[32] Therefore, in practice he refused to cooperate with Poland in the matter. Perhaps the Finnish policy was genuinely idealistic in calling for fair treatment and high principles, but it is also possible that Finland was using these arguments to justify its passivity.

However, Finland was now on a collision course with Poland. The relations between the two countries were not very smooth at this point. In early 1929, Poland had tried to press Finland to sign the so-called Litvinov Protocol which had been suggested to Poland by the Soviet Union. The Poles wanted other neighbours of the Soviet Union to join as well. The protocol was meant to renounce war among its signatories according to the principles of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Finland refused to enter the agreement. The Soviet Union, however, then signed the pact with Poland, Estonia, Romania and Latvia.[33]

In the view of the endless machinations during the two previous months, the Council session of March 1929 was somewhat anti-climatic. Dandurand and Stresemann both spoke at length. Dandurand presented his well-known suggestions. Stresemann spoke, for instance, about publicity, communication with petitioners,

[30] UM 15: IB 1a, Procopé to MFA, 4 March 1929.
[31] UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, 4 March 1929.
[32] UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, 4 March 1929.
[33] Lemberg, Procopé, 147–149.

and the permanent nature of protection given to minorities. Finally, he proposed the establishment of a committee of enquiry to report to the Council in June.[34]

Chamberlain was forced to comment on the subject of permanent minority protection, as Stresemann had referred to Chamberlain's often cited remark from 1925, in which he had said that minorities were gradually prepared "to be merged in the national community." Chamberlain now explained that he had not meant the abolishment of cultural characteristics of minorities, but had suggested that the treaties would bring about conditions in which minorities could be loyal citizens. In his speech, he defended the committees of three, and supported the formation of the study committee. He also called for two improvements for the minority procedure: greater publicity and speedier administration of petitions.[35]

Procopé had considered beforehand that it was necessary for him to speak out on the grounds that the matter was important. He also wanted to emphasise the view of law and justice prevalent in Scandinavia. Thirdly, he did not want Germany to appear as the only champion of minorities.[36] In his speech, Procopé argued that protection of minorities was one of the most important aspects of the League work and that it was based on the maintenance of justice in relations between peoples. Procopé worded his speech carefully, claiming to understand different viewpoints. Definite decisions on the large number of suggestions could not be made hastily and therefore Procopé expressed his support for establishment of a special committee.[37]

The end result of the Council session was thus only a resolution which contained the outlines for the work of the special committee. The Council instructed the minority rapporteur, Mineitciro Adatci of Japan, together with Austen Chamberlain from Britain and Jose Maria Quinones de Leon of Spain, to prepare a report on the basis of German and Canadian proposals and general discussion at the Council. The report was to be discussed at the June session.[38]

During private negotiations, the great powers had asked Procopé to serve in the committee. Procopé did not outright refuse, but complained that it was difficult for him to be away from Finland at the time the committee would meet. However, the idea of including Procopé was soon rebuffed by the minority states on which, especially Poland, Procopé's speech had made a bad impression and had branded him as a friend of revisionist minorities. Procopé however believed he had then managed to pacify the Polish representatives by supporting

[34] TNA FO 371/14131/2193, Second meeting of the 54th session of the Council, 6 March 1929.
[35] TNA FO 371/14131/2216, Third meeting of the 54th session of the Council, 6 March 1929.
[36] UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, 4 March 1929.
[37] LNOJ 4/1929, 526–527.
[38] LNOJ 4/1929, 541.

a Pole to a membership in the League Financial Committee.[39] Meanwhile, some misleading articles had appeared in Finnish and Estonian newspapers claiming, for instance, that Procopé had mainly supported the German view in the Council. Polish reactions were likely to follow and, in fact, the Polish minister in Finland, Franciszek Charwat, had been "in a bad mood". Therefore, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs asked Procopé to send a text of his speech quickly to the Ministry.[40] Procopé believed the Poles would in any case calm down eventually.[41] Apparently this was the case and the relations between Poland and Finland seemed to improve during the following months.

The preparation of the London Report

The work of the special committee that had been set up by the Council commenced straight after the Council session. The British Foreign Office, together with the League secretariat, shared the main burden of the work. Along the lines laid down mainly by British foreign secretary Chamberlain and Secretary General of the League Drummond, the League secretariat and the Foreign Office began to draft an extensive memorandum on the minority question for the use of the committee.[42]

The Council had stipulated that those states which were bound by the provisions for the protection of minorities could send observations to the committee – so could other members of the League. This was by no means compulsory. However, Mineitciro Adatci, the chair of the committee, had wished Finland would submit observations for the committee.[43] At this point, Finland was interested in the mood amongst the League secretariat and in the statements which other governments were going to submit to the committee[44], while the others were also keen to know if Finland would prepare a statement of its own. Hungarians hoped Finland would contribute something. Hungary, usually adopting the opposite stand to those of the minority states, had naturally been happy with Procopé's attitude in the previous Council.[45]

The Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs was also eagerly following what happened in the capitals of the great powers and – in vain – tried to find out about the results of the committee work. In May Procopé telegraphed to Harri

[39] UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, 4 March 1929.
[40] UM 15: IB 1a, Yrjö-Koskinen to Procopé, 7 March 1929 and 8 March 1929.
[41] UM 15: IB 1a, Procopé to MFA, 9 March 1929.
[42] TNA FO 371/14124/2689, Cadogan to Drummond, 20 March 1929.
[43] UM 15: IB 1a, memo by Procopé, March 1929 [no date].
[44] UM 15: IB 1b, Holsti to Procopé, 11 April 1929.
[45] UM 15: IB 1b, minute by Procopé, 28 March 1929.

Holma, the Finnish ambassador in Paris: "In the minority question you must remain fully passive."[46]

In mid-April, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs invited a working group which discussed the minority question in cooperation with the MFA and prepared a statement on the matter. The members of the group, chaired by Procopé, were Members of Parliament Georg Schauman (the chair of the parliamentary foreign affairs committee), J.H. Vennola, Väinö Voionmaa (former foreign secretary), Eino Aaltio and Yrjö Pulkkinen.[47] Apparently the group had trouble agreeing on the statement, a fact that was lamented by Schauman. Vennola, for instance, supported the German proposal for a more extensive study committee to be set up later, contrary to the "official" Finnish opinion.[48] In any case, the statement was to a large extent prepared and edited by the MFA. The reasons for the preparation of the document and its peculiar timing are unclear. Finland apparently did not want to submit a proper statement for the consideration of the committee, but wanted in some way express its opinion on the minority procedure. The Finnish policy in this situation seems very cautious and noncommittal.

In the statement, Finland argued that minority obligations should not be extended. Nevertheless, the improvement of procedure did not constitute extension of obligations and was thus desirable. Procopé suggested amendments to the working practices of committees of three, for example by adding a preparatory stage during which assistants to Council delegates would first examine relevant materials. Increased publicity was also called for.[49] The statement was sent to Adatci as late as on 16 May, which meant it did not arrive for the London meeting and neither was it meant to.[50]

In London, special committee of three met on the 29 April. The committee considered observations made by states and interest groups. The resulting report, i.e. the London report, included a lengthy historical section, a description of the current procedure, and recommendations of the committee.[51] To conclude, the London Report rejected proposals made by Canada and Germany, and thus upheld the existing minority protection system. However, the report suggested some minor procedural amendments. Petitioners were to be informed of the rejection of their petitions, committees of three were to report the results of their work to the Council, and annual statistics of the minority petitions were to be published. The issue of greater publicity was deemed secondary to the

[46] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé to Holma, 8 May 1929.
[47] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé to Schauman et al, 16 April 1929.
[48] UM 15: IB 1b, notes of meetings, 23 and 26 April 1929.
[49] UM 15: IB 1b, draft statement, 22 April 1929.
[50] UM 15: IB 4, Finnish statement, 16 May 1929.
[51] For the full text of the London report, see LNOJ 1929, Special supplement 73, 43–64.

smooth functioning of the informal committee of three negotiations.[52] The end result mirrored the views of the great powers Britain, France and Italy along with Japan: the system should be preserved in essence but minor modifications could be made.

The June Council session

As mentioned above, the London Report was to be discussed at the Council session in Madrid which was held in early to mid-June 1929. Both Britain and Finland had some problems in preparing for the session. There was a general election in Britain on 30 May, and the Conservatives suffered a defeat. Consequently, Ramsay MacDonald formed a minority Labour government. Given that Arthur Henderson replaced Austen Chamberlain as foreign secretary on June 5, neither was able to attend the Madrid meeting. The British delegate was thus Sir George Dixon Grahame, the Ambassador to Spain. He was coached by the outgoing Chamberlain. Chamberlain instructed Grahame to support the London report.[53] Hjalmar Procopé, attending for Finland, received the London Report only when he was already on his way to Spain. Therefore, the Finnish cabinet and foreign affairs committee of parliament could not be consulted beforehand and Procopé did not get any instructions.[54] Both delegates brought their difficult situation up in the meeting of the Council in committee on 7 June.[55]

In Madrid, the "Council in committee" discussed the proposal of the study committee, to prepare the matter to the Council session proper. Romania, in unison with Poland, wanted the London Report to be accepted as a whole, therefore closing doors for further discussions in the future, while Germany could not accept the report as a whole.[56] Stresemann presented three alternatives on how to proceed: postponement, referral to the Permanent Court of Justice, or adoption of practical conclusions of the London Report with all parties reserving their opinions on the question of principle. Others generally favoured at least a partial solution by way of acceptance of the practical conclusions.[57] France and Britain tried to calm Stresemann down by promising a separate

[52] LNOJ 1929, Special supplement 73, 43–64.
[53] TNA FO 371/14132/5478, Chamberlain to Grahame, 4 June 1929.
[54] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé´s notes from Madrid, 15 June 1929.
[55] LNOJ 1929, Special supplement 73, 6–11.
[56] TNA FO 371/14125/5611, Grahame to Henderson, 8 June 1929.
[57] TNA FO 371/14125/5717, Grahame to Henderson, 11 June 1929.

meeting on the war reparations question and other outstanding issues deriving from the Versailles settlement. Their tactics succeeded.[58]

Procopé at first thought the London report was unsatisfactory and was bound to be so in the view of the Finnish government and public opinion. He believed that the report in fact tried to protect minority states against their treaty obligations. When the Council in committee suggested some improvements, mainly related to publicity, Procopé pointed out to the MFA that those were in fact similar to what Finland had suggested in its statement in May. In the Council in committee session, he raised the suggestion relating to preparatory work that would be undertaken by "assistants" prior to Council sessions[59]. In his opinion, the report should not be adopted in its entirety, although the procedural changes could be authorized. He also pointed out that the change of government in Britain meant that the new Labour government was not keen to cling on the report that had been compiled under their predecessors.[60] Procopé gave an impression of active participation in the discussion both in the sessions where he raised a number of points and in private negotiations. He also demonstrated in his memorandum how delegates of the great powers, such as Stresemann, seemed to trust him and valued his opinion.

Thus the core of the matter was if the London report should be approved as such and in principle or if only the practical suggestions of the report were to be adopted. The latter line of action was chosen. Adatci drafted a number of different versions on the practical suggestions during the committee stage, and finally a text that more or less satisfied the others was submitted to the public session of the Council.[61]

At the Foreign Office, Ivone Kirkpatrick, a clerk in the Western Department, had a very low opinion of the competence of most Council members:

> An agreed solution will be difficult to find. Nobody except the Committee of Three appears to have gone into the question thoroughly and the views of the members of the Council are distorted by ignorance as well as prejudice. The Germans, for example, seem to have little idea of the complexity of the problem. As for the egregious Senator Dandurand, he is completely enveloped in ignorance. His un-called for intervention is most embarrassing.[62]

---

[58] Carole Fink, "Stresemann's Minority Policies, 1924-29" Journal of Contemporary History, 14: 3 (1979) 415–416; Fink, Defending, 313–315.
[59] LNOJ 1929, Special supplement 73, 16–17.
[60] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé to MFA, 12 June 1929; Procopé's notes from Madrid, 15 June 1929.
[61] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé´s notes from Madrid, 15 June 1929.
[62] TNA FO 371/14125/5717, minute by Kirkpatrick, 12 June 1929.

Others may have been ignorant, but the British representative Grahame himself, as a representative, was passive and voiced hardly any opinions during the sessions. There is no review of the role of Grahame in the Foreign Office minutes. However, an interesting remark is included in a despatch from Berlin in which Ambassador Rumbold describes German views on the Madrid meeting. According to some German observers, "the absence of a British representative capable of taking important decisions either in or outside the Council would necessarily deprive the Madrid Meeting of much of its importance".[63]

At the Council session on 13 June, the Japanese delegate Mineitciro Adatci, who had consistently defended the London Report during the previous meetings, submitted the resolution on the recommendations of the report. Dandurand now expressed his satisfaction, and Stresemann had a conciliatory tone as well. The resolution was then unanimously adopted in a "much better" atmosphere than during the preceding negotiations.[64] Grahame participated in the discussion by supporting the London Report as a distinct improvement, and by pointing out that public opinion would condemn the Council if a solution was not found.[65]

The Foreign Office was relieved, although there were fears that the question would be reopened at the following Council session in the autumn.[66] However, the minority question was not reopened in the League bodies in autumn 1929. In Finland, Hjalmar Procopé appeared relieved as well. He concluded that the Madrid session and its end results had proved quite satisfactory from the Finnish point of view, linking the matter again to relations with Poland:

> "It is hard to evaluate how the matter worked out, but I feel that we have relatively well steered away from troubles. At least with the Poles the relations are much improved from winter."[67]

The Council and individual minority cases

Apart from the discussion on general principles and procedure of minority protection, the League Council also handled those individual minority petitions which reached the committee of three or Council stages. Minorities in Silesia formed an exception: according to the agreement between Germany and Poland in 1922 Silesian petitions were sent directly to the Council. Therefore, Silesian minority affairs came up practically in every Council session during the time

[63] TNA FO 371/14125/6022, Rumbold to Henderson, 17 June 1929.
[64] TNA FO 371/14125/5795, Grahame to Henderson, 13 June 1929.
[65] LNOJ 1929, Special supplement 73, 40.
[66] TNA FO 371/14125/5795, minute by Kirkpatrick, 14 June 1929.
[67] UM 15: IB 1b, Procopé to Yrjö-Koskinen, 12 June 1929.

period under examination.[68] Silesian minority petitions often received only a cursory reading in the Council, and actual negotiations were carried out behind the scenes. Sometimes, however, more detailed discussions on Silesia occurred. In general, both Britain and especially Finland were relatively passive in these occasions, while the Japanese delegate, who acted as minority rapporteur, and Polish and German delegates spoke out.[69] It has to be noted that, as mentioned above, it was a debate on the Silesian petitions that originally sparked the whole question on procedure at the Council session in December 1928.

As for other minority matters – apart from Silesia – only one case reached the Council in the period under scrutiny. The matter was discussed in the 58th Council session in January 1930. It was the case of ethnic Russians who had had their property confiscated during the Lithuanian agrarian reform. Interestingly, Hjalmar Procopé had been the chair of the committee of three which had handled the matter and had subsequently referred it to the Council. However, the matter was not resolved even at this point, but was instead referred back to the committee, since Lithuania had made concessions that enabled the negotiations to proceed.[70]

At a lower procedural level, both Finland and Britain did their share in the committees of three. In fact, Finland seemed to be quite heavily utilised in this respect, relatively more so than Britain. Committee work often took a lot of time and matters were not resolved in one sitting. The League secretariat administered the handling of the large bulk of correspondence relating to these issues. The secretariat forwarded petitions and government responses to Council members. Subsequently, examination by the committees did not involve that much politically motivated wrangling between committee members. The role of the rapporteur, during this period the Japanese representative, was also significant in completing the report in those cases in which a matter was referred to the Council. Finland and Britain were in some committees of three together. For example, in March 1929, a committee consisting of Finland (president), Britain and Italy examined a petition relating to Russian minority in Lithuania. Finland also chaired another committee at the same time, with Britain and Chile as other members. This committee addressed a petition relating to the rights of Bulgarian minority in the Romanian-governed Dobrudja.[71]

Concerning the proceedings of the committees of three and the influence of committee members and the League Secretariat, Alexander Cadogan from the British Foreign Office observed in 1929:

---

[68] Azcárate, League, 147, 150–152.
[69] See, for example, LNOJ 10/1928, 1674–1679.
[70] LNOJ 2/1930, 102.
[71] TNA FO 371/14123/1367, Aguirre de Garcér to Cadogan, 12 Feb. 1929.

> It is, of course, true that I have only attended the small proportion of the minorities committees, of which the British Delegate is a member, and I am bound to confess that on most occasions his two colleagues are not extremely helpful and do not appear to take a very lively interest in the proceedings, and it may be that on certain other committees, which do not happen to contain an efficient or conscientious member, the decisions may be influenced unduly by the Secretariat.[72]

Cadogan thus lamented other members' ignorance, but it is not known which members he was particularly referring to. And, unfortunately, there is no information available on the Finnish views on the committees of three.

Conclusions

The question of altering the minority protection system of the League of Nations came up in late 1928 and soon began to focus on improving the existing procedure. The initiatives came from Canada, Germany and Poland, while neither Britain nor Finland was very happy to open the matter. The first stages of the discussion centred on the contents and merits of different proposals. Finland and Britain essentially only reacted to others' initiatives at this point. Britain was, however, much better informed on developments that Finland was. Finland seemed to have major problems in its information-gathering before the March Council session. This seems to illustrate that the great powers were at least to some extent willing to handle the matter behind the scenes. At the session, Finland sided with Britain in sending the examination of the matter to a special committee.

Finland was also interested in the opinions of, for instance, Scandinavian countries, trying to enquire if there was a common Nordic policy. This was related to one potential direction of Finnish foreign policy, the Scandinavian co-operation. In general, the Finnish attitude in the Council and outside of it was cautious and non-committal, in harmony with the currently preferred policy of non-alignment and League of Nations co-operation. However, it did not keep Finland out of trouble, since Poland was eager to seek signs of a pro-minority attitude in the statements of Finnish delegates, which led to minor misunderstandings between the states in spring 1929.

As a member of the committee that was entrusted the drafting of the London report, Britain was put in the centre of action in spring 1929. Finland, on the other hand, was again desperately trying to gather information on the work of

[72] TNA FO 371/14123/1294, minute by Cadogan, 14 Feb. 1929.

the committee and the attitudes of other governments that were offering their observations to the use of the committee. The Finnish foreign secretary Procopé then invited a group of members of parliament to prepare a Finnish statement on the matter, but the document was sent to the League – purposely and in line with Finland's cautious policy – only after the London report was finished.

In the Madrid Council session in June 1929, the Council decided on minor improvements in the minority procedure. This was the end result of procedural debates of 1929. Hjalmar Procopé, the Finnish foreign secretary was relatively active at this meeting, while Britain was to some extent sidelined. The reason for the British role was the very recent change of government, which meant that the new foreign secretary Arthur Henderson was unable to attend. The active role of Procopé is harder to explain, but it could perhaps relate to technical and legal nature of many details under discussion, in which Procopé was rather knowledgeable.

The discussion on general minority issues died out after the Madrid Council, not counting the fact that non-governmental organisations kept the matter in the fore in public during the following years. Behind all suggestions for amendments hovered the threat – or possibility – of establishing a permanent minority commission under the auspices of the League or even widening minority protection obligations. These were suggestions that both Britain and Finland opposed.

In committees of three which examined individual minority petitions, Finland and Britain both did their share, and, in fact, Finland had relatively heavy responsibilities. This shows that Finland had a reputation as a conscientious Council member. Confirming the hypothesis of this paper, Finland usually wanted to follow the lead of the great powers, while Britain was a more active policy maker. Finland and Britain often followed similar lines in their policies, largely because Finland desired to back the ideas suggested by the most important Council members. Sometimes it is hard to find out in the official documents what the Finnish policy actually was. In those cases when Finland was clearly more active than usual, primarily at the Madrid Council, the personal role of foreign secretary Procopé appears to have been important. All things considered, both Finland and Britain generally managed to sail the middle course amongst the contradicting and more extreme opinions and demands of other Council members.

Anssi Halmesvirta

An Unfortunate Kinship – Finnish-Hungarian Relations during World War II

Introduction

The aim of this article is twofold. Firstly, it endeavours to show how diplomacy and semi-official cultural and propaganda organisations of two nations, Finland and Hungary, viewed each other and their interests in the campaign – a common cause with Nazi Germany – against the Soviet Union from 1941 to 1945[1]. Secondly, the article aims at analysing how the realities of the war and the prospect of defeat changed all that. The method of study is that of the history of ideas and of kinship ideology as applied to eavesdropping on the dialogue of the representatives of the two nations[2].

The kinship movement is examined here as a variation of pan-movements and its ideology as representing macro-nationalism in its attempts to establish ideational links between two nations, Hungary and Finland, which stand relatively far away from each other in Europe.[3] This peculiar rapprochement of Hungarian and Finnish kinship enthusiasts and sympathizers was a mutual play of dualism of Identity (or "We") and Alterity (or "the Other") for they, as it were, mentally travelled into the spaces of another in order to overcome difference and encounter familiarity. In comparison to the earlier, primarily cultural identification of the late 19th century[4], the interwar and wartime contacts and cooperation enhanced the basic, common identity of them and lifted it onto the level political identification. In what follows also this process of valorization, i.e. making the "We" valid, giving it surplus-value and devaluing the "Others" (Russians, Romanians, Jews), is disentangled, showing that the former acts of exclusion were being transformed into actions of inclusion as the common ex-

---

1 The military relations have partly been covered by Antal Pergel, Harag és elfogultság nelkül. Magyar–finn katonai és politikai kapcsolatok 1939–1944. Budapest: Püski, 2009.

2 See Anssi Halmesvirta, Ideology and Argument. Studies in British, Finnish and Hungarian Thought. Helsinki: Gummerus, 2006, 8–9.

3 Cf. Louis Snyder, Macro-Nationalisms. A History of Pan-Movements, Greenwood Press: Westport, 1984.

4 Anssi Halmesvirta, "Identity in Difference. Antti Jalava's Hungary of 1875 Revisited", In: Studi Finno–Ugrici 1999–2001, Dipartimento di Studi dell'Europa Orientale, U.N.O., Napoli, 2003, 107–134.

periences triggered sentiments which invited the advocates kinship to a game of "give and take".[5]

Interwar Contacts

Hungary and Finland had recognised each other's independence in 1920 and their diplomatic relations had been officially established in 1922. However, it was only in 1924 when chargé d´affaires and kinship promoter Mihály Jungerth was moved from Tallinn to Helsinki, that the relations reached a more active and regular status, years before the countries opened their respective Embassies, in Helsinki in 1928 and in Budapest in 1934. The purpose of Jungerth's move was to boost the development of the so-called kinship relations which had been established in the early 1920s. High-level representatives of educational authorities in Hungary, Finland and Estonia had met in Helsinki in 1921 to launch an operation of recovery from the traumatic Civil Wars and peace-making processes. The leading Hungarian organiser, Aladár Bán of the Turanian Society[6], described the common sentiment of "resurrection" on the spot: "The Sampo [supposedly the mythical source of power in culture for the Finno-Ugric nations] has been freed from the realm of darkness"[7]. Mourning was now over and the youth from the three kinship countries were to be given opportunities to learn from each others' cultures through exchange relations. Now that Finland and Estonia were independent states, Hungarians realised that in the North – not only in the East or South – there were receptive relatives who understood the policy of revision (of the Trianon Peace Treaty of 1920) and consolidation efforts of the "bigger brother". Former PM Pál Teleki had noted it with satisfaction during an expedition to Finland and Lapland in 1924.[8]

---

[5] Anssi Halmesvirta, "Identity versus Alterity Some Analytical Considerations", The National Awakening of Endangered Uralic Peoples, Ed. Holger Fischer, Hamburg University Press: Hamburg, 2004, 29–31.

[6] The Turanian Society (Turán Társaság) was established in 1910 to promote cultural, artistic and scientific relations of Hungary with kinship people in Asia and Europe. Its paper Turán was started in 1913 and in the 1920s it advocated a wider concept of reunion of turanism, now including the Finno–Ugric kinship peoples. In this crusade, the Finns soon assumed (some) importance because the interest of Hungarians and Finns appeared more intimate than ever before. See László Szendrei, A turanizmus. Attraktor: Máriabesnyő – Gödöllö, 2010.

[7] Quoted in Niilo Pesonen, Voi voitettuja. Helsinki: Tammi, 1992, 11.

[8] Anssi Halmesvirta, "Teleki Pál finnországi tanulmányútja 1924", Történelmi Szemle 2 (2010) 189–208.

In the spirit of reunion of the Finno-Ugric or Turanian nations, kinship enthusiasts organised five cultural congresses in the 1920s and 1930s, the last one held in Tallinn in 1936. Ministries of Education and Foreign Affairs were called upon to support such scientific and cultural exchanges, and the Ambassadors, particularly Eemil Setälä and Sándor Kiss – the former an advocate of a separate institute for Finno-Ugric studies, the latter a member of the Turanian Society – helped Minister Kuno von Klebelsberg to execute the plan to strike an official agreement of cultural scientific exchange between Hungary and Finland in 1937. One seemingly insignificant gesture towards the politicisation of such a cultural-political rapprochement is that the book titled *Justice for Hungary* (1928) was distributed among select Finns from the Embassy. Among others, General C.G. Mannerheim and Risto Ryti read it and were convinced that Hungary had been mistreated in the 1920 Treaty of Trianon and that her claims to justice by revision were well-justified; however, they also saw that the League of Nations was not really warming up to them. The security policies of Hungary and Finland at the turn of the 1930s and 1940s did not succeed in preventing them from entanglement in the looming conflict between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The history of power politics had offered them something other than a peaceful deepening of bilateral relations as neutral states amid Slavic and German expansion.[9]

Early Enthusiasm

When trying to put the foreign politics of the two nations into the same context of Europe during wartime, one has to bear in mind that Finland had waged its Winter War against the Soviet Union in 1939–1940 without substantial help from abroad. It may also be mentioned in passing that the 341 Hungarian volunteers trained in Finland for winter-time warfare did not quite reach the Karelian front in time before the war ended in mid-March. Instead, Finland received many gestures of sympathy and international recognition for its resilient defence. In the opinion of many contemporary Hungarian observers, who had predicted that the war would be over within a few weeks, the Finns had fought heroically – by halting the Soviet invasion they had done nothing less than saved Western civilization from the Red Menace and had reached the rank of being

[9] István Papp had hoped that the Western powers would realize that Slavic imperialism could be dammed in the North only by the Finns who should gain Karelia to ensure defensible border against it. See his Finnország, Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság, 1938, 32–33. This was in keeping with the ideology of 'Greater Finland' promoted by the Academic Karelia Society in Finland but not in line with the neutrality policy of the Government.

among best nations in the world.[10] The Finns were the moral victors of the war, as they had defended not only their own honour, but also the honour of such small nations – Hungary, of course, included – that "were fit to survive and fulfill their missions".[11]

This sudden and intimate association between the Finns and their newfound relatives was to characterise the rhetoric of the informal relations between the two nations throughout World War II, and it was usually phrased in particularly affirmative and amplified language during the "Eastern campaign" against the Soviet Union in 1941–1945. Occasionally, particularly in 1941–1942 when the Red Army appeared to be on the verge of defeat, the diplomatic corps also adopted this unifying mode of speech and joined the kinship chorus rejoicing in the triumphal messages from the front. Finns and Hungarians, thought to be connected linguistically and culturally, embarked on a road of expansion with their own specific goals – their leaders stood ready to seize the rare opportunity of the historical moment. It had been complained that normally such small nations did not have a say in great power politics but now they believed that Nazi Germany would allow them to have their fair share.

Finnish and Hungarian motives to join Hitler's Barbarossa differed. To simplify somewhat, one can say that the Finnish army initially aimed at regaining the territories in Karelia it had lost in the Winter War, and it had made plans of coordination with the *Wehrmacht* as early as in winter 1941. When Hitler launched the attack in late June, he called on Finns to fight as *im Bund* with the Germans, a notion the Finns firmly rejected as they emphasized their separateness from the Axis, albeit not very convincingly. For her part, Hungary had already become an ally of Germany when it had joined Hitler's onslaught against Yugoslavia. PM Teleki, well-informed of Finnish affairs, tried to keep Hungary out of the war but failed and eventually committed suicide. Hitler offered Hungary, one after another, the territories she had had to cede in Trianon. For the services Germany did for Hungary, the Hungarians had to pay dearly in the end. Mária Ormos puts all the blame on incompetent and unwise PMs, but it is unclear what else they could have done. Certainly, the alternative to become yet another German-enslaved country did not entice them.[12]

---

[10] For the Hungarian volunteers and public reactions, see Antal Ruprecht, Magyar önkéntések a téli háborúban, Budapest: Hadtörténeti Intézet és Múzeum, 2003; Halmesvirta, "Teleki", 118–132.

[11] Quoted in Tamás Mathé, Suomi, Budapest: Corvineum kiadás, 1940, 55.

[12] See Mária Ormos, Magyarország a két világháború korában 1914–1945, Debrecen: Csokonai Kiadó, 1998, ch. 6; Sándor Szakály, Volt-e alternativa? Magyarország a második világháborúban, Budapest: Ister, 2000, especially 136.

What matters here is that suddenly the Finns and the Hungarians found themselves fighting, so to say, on the same side and having the same rough ride. To Aarne Wuorimaa, the Finnish Ambassador in Budapest, the reasons why Hungary had joined the attack – without any territorial claims that the Finns had – appeared to be ideological and honourable as such. He had attended an evening party organized by the Turán Társaság on 15 March 1941, and had realized that the Hungarian hosts described the foreign policy of both countries as "conclusive", implying that both Finns and Hungarians yearned for "justice"; they thought that it was high time they claimed it, even by force.[13] In view of the geopolitical idea of "natural borders", it was only right that Hungary took back all it had lost in 1920 in the same way as the Finns reclaimed Karelia, the Finnish "Erdely", as Hungarians occasionally identified it.[14] It was also in March that the Hungarian Foreign Ministry found out that the Finns knew of the Barbarossa plan, and the information strengthened the confidence also of those active in the respective kinship societies. For instance, Sándor Kulai, working as a press attaché in the Hungarian Embassy in Helsinki, explained that an attack against Yugoslavia had been justified because Yugoslavia was an artificial, not "historical state", and was thus doomed to disintegration.[15] War-time optimism was running high: now Finns and Hungarians had been given the chance to show their strength. It made kinship activists think big: ambitious visions of rooting out Bolshevism and of the final division of Russian lands between the Germans and the Finno-Ugric nations seemed realizable. Moreover, it was envisaged that both Finns and Hungarians were now fighting their final "war of freedom" and that the ideas of common origin and kinship were about to reach the level of kinship-love. The Finns and Hungarians were no longer only brothers-in-blood but brothers- or -friends in-arms (*bajtárs, fegyverbarát*).[16] Here the valorization of common identity reached a culmination point as the political identification superseded the cultural one, leaving it to the kinship "workers" proper.

When the news of victories in the East reached home, joy burst out. Finns congratulated Hungarians on taking part in occupying Kiev and on establishing a regime of order in Ukraine.[17] For his part, Hungarian Ambassador in Helsinki, Mr István Szabó, reported back that hungarophile Finns believed that the Soviet

---

[13] Unkarin kansallispäivän ohjelmistoa, 15.III.1941, Suomen heimotyöseuran julkaisuja [Publications of the Finnish Kinship Society] 1 (1941) 6.

[14] Vilma Mányoky, "Karjala a Finn Erdely", Turán III (1940), 99–100.

[15] Sándor Kulai, "Etelä-Unkarin vähemmistöjen kohtalo Jugoslavian vallan aikana", Itsenäinen Suomi 5 (1941), 57–61.

[16] Väinö Musikka, "Heimotyön merkitys", Heimotyö IV (1940–1941), 82–85.

[17] A. Sovijärvi, 'Silmäys Unkarin armeijan saavutuksiin Itärintaman taisteluissa' (manuscript of a lecture, 1941), C9, 1, 2, IV, Unkarin ystäväin kerho, KA [The Club of Friends of Hungary; National Archives of Finland].

Union would soon collapse and open for them the opportunity to defend their kinship people (Ingrians, Karelians, etc.) there and expand the Finnish *Lebensraum,* in keeping with the extreme right-wing ideology of Greater Finland. Inas-much as Hungary had for ages been a buffer against the East in the south, Finland was becoming a defensive wall in the North.[18] The Finnish Ambassador in Budapest was not so polite: he dared to remind the Hungarian Foreign Secretary of the fact that in Ruthenia and Transylvania there lived majority nationalities who had equal rights to cultivate their nationality with the Hungarians and that the dream of St. Stephen's realm was rather old-fashioned in modern times. The Secretary was upset and explained to Wuorimaa that Hungarian expansion was not "imperialism" but rather an act of reinstating "historical justice". This was also his excuse for the ban on the selling of foodstuff and alcohol by the Jews in Ruthenia.[19]

In early July of 1941 President Ryti sent a cordial note to Horthy in which he stated that Hungary and Finland fought "for truth and European civilisation".[20] Wuorimaa and PM László Bárdossy discussed the situation in September 1941 and reached the conclusion – or rather the prediction – that "Russia" (they did not use the term "Soviet Union") the "beast of Bolshevism", shall soon be slain.[21] It was cited in German sources that German military experts considered Bolshevism already dead and that only some "cleansing" was remained to be done, as the Red Army was running out of soldiers and Leningrad and Moscow were about to be occupied and destroyed.[22] Ambassador Szabó noted that the same "consciousness of victory" which filled German minds, had penetrated the minds of the Finns, too, not least the mind of Witting, the Foreign Secretary.[23] It was evident that the connecting ideology between Finns and Hungarians was the hatred of Bolshevism, on which the Hungarians had given a lesson to fascists and Germans earlier in 1919. In late August 1941 one Finnish clergyman witnessed in Budapest how the crusade in the East had elevated the Hungarians spiritually; their festivities on St. Stephen's Day were more "pious" than usual – the mission dating from the Middle Ages to protect the West from the Eastern menace was carried on by the modern Hungarians.[24]

---

[18] Szabó to Budapest, 19 July 1941, report no. 50, MOL (Magyar Országos Levéltár) [The National Archives of Hungary] K 63, 12/1.

[19] Aarne Wuorimaa, Muistojeni Unkari, Helsinki: Otava, 1948, 17.

[20] Szabó to Budapest, 6 July 1941, report no. 46, MOL K 63-4938/941-12/7.

[21] Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 20 September 1941, report no. 42, 72/389, 5C 27, UMA [The Archives of Finnish Foreign Ministry].

[22] 'Politicus', "Bolshevismin luhistumishetki", Itsenäinen Suomi 10 (1941), 35–37.

[23] Szabó to Budapest, 7 December 1941, report no. 106, MOL K 63-7532/941, 12/2.

[24] Uusi Suomi, 21 August 1941. Cf. Bertalan Korompay's comment in Suomalainen Suomi 8–9 (1941) 22–24.

High Hopes

When it turned out in late autumn that the Red Army could hold its ground, all hopes were invested in the following summer, of 1942, when the "final blow" was to be delivered. One Finnish foreign policy expert emphasized to his Hungarian colleague that the lesson learned from the fate of Napoleon's great army was of no significance in these calculations, so predetermined the outcome was.[25] On the more unofficial front, all sorts of triumphal festivities were being organized to celebrate military success. The atmosphere was at its peak during a festive dinner in the Old Student Union House in Helsinki on 15 of October 1941, the day of kinship – president and other personalities of the political and cultural elite as well as Hungarian honorary guests from the embassy and university were in attendance. A sublime flush of victory caught the speakers and they congratulated each other with numerous toasts. The Finnish-Hungarian feeling of brotherhood reached a higher level of consciousness – Finns did not feel that the Hungarians were foreign – on the contrary, they were now of the same family of "race" and mentally closer to the Finns than even the Finnish-Swedish in Finland.

Among others, V.A. Koskenniemi, the celebrated poet and leading germanophile intellectual in Finland, whose aggressively patriotic poems were being translated into Hungarian, demanded during the dinner that Finns should conquer all Karelia as it "was the blood and flesh" of Finland. It would inaugurate a renaissance to all Finno-Ugric peoples. He was proud of the Finns who had stopped the expansion of "barbarism" there, and rejoiced that the Karelians, who had been enslaved by "inferior races", had been freed. Bringing the Hungarians into the picture and in keeping with this Christian, messianistic nationalism, Koskenniemi continued by saying that the common crusade in the East bound Finns and Hungarians together not only with stripes of kinship but with common Christian values in "defence" against the arch-enemy of all Finno-Ugrians.[26] To one Hungarian listener this was "staggering" (*megrázó*), hitting straight to the heart. Another guest, Mr Bertalan Korompay from the Embassy, reminded the Finns in his speech of how the Hungarians had been on the "verge of death" after the Trianon, but revision had saved them. He promised that the Hungarians would follow the principles of St. Stephen and let the nationalities falling under their aegis live. Now that the Finns appeared on the banks of White Sea and the Hungarians drove the Russians far to the East, all other nationalities in Russia had a bright future ahead. He concluded by attributing this to Hungarian "determination" and "divine providence". As customary in such

[25] Itsenäinen Suomi 11–12 (1941), 1–2.
[26] Szabó to Budapest, 27 November 1941, MOL K 63-7731/941, 12/7.

messianic rhetoric, he neglected to mention the political constellations that had brought the momentary success about.[27] More toasting followed and the next evening the party continued at the Hungarian Embassy.

In Hungary the kinship-day was organised by the Turanian Society on the 15 November. Its President, Jenő Cholnoky, refrained from talking politics in his opening speech but was in a triumphal mood regardless. He was delighted that Germany and Japan – Singapore had just surrendered – had "helped" also the Finno-Ugric and Turanian nations to gain victories. In this way, he pointed out they earned their place in the chain of civilisation.[28] His speech was followed by an uplifting cultural programme: the audience sang the Finnish national anthem, *Maamme*; Bakay Lajos recited the poem by Larin-Kyösti titled *The Magyars;* and Elemér Virányi from the Hungarian-Finnish Society recited the song for Finno-Ugric nations to which Béla Vikár, the translator of the *Kalevala*, had written the lyrics. More singing and speaking followed, which seemed to prove that Hungarians loved the Finns more than the Finns loved the Hungarians.[29] One sign of this was also that a few streets in Kolozsvár (Cluj) had been renamed in Finnish: now there were the streets of Kalevala, Helsinki and Karjala, for instance. Virányi also read a telegram arriving from the Finnish-Hungarian Society, Helsinki. Its high-flown message was that at the moment Hungary and Finland were in an exceptional, world-historical situation, for they could together leave their mark by taking part in "decisive events". Prospects were really promising as Bolshevism was about to be erased from the earth. The warmest feeling was that the Finns and Hungarians were now "real allies" and that the long-standing kinship relations had gained also power political dimension.[30] Eagerly the members of the *Társaság* and the Finnish guests waited for the fall of Moscow so that the reconstruction work in Russia could be started. The occasion ended with the remark that Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was second on the best-sellers' list in Hungary.

One concrete result of the rapprochement of the various Finnish and Hungarian kinship societies was that they signed an agreement of cooperation in late November of 1941. Hungary was represented on the highest diplomatic level, as Szabó initiated the entire enterprise and gave it his blessing. On the Finnish side, Väinö Heiskanen from the Ministry of Education signed the agreement. The cooperation plans included e.g. publication of a leaflet containing up-to-

[27] Speeches are quoted from: Néprokonsági nap visszhangja a finn sajtóban. Szabó to Budapest 30 November 1941, MOL K 89-1942, Copy: 1387/1942; Cf. Heimokansa 2 (joulu-tammikuu) (1941–1942), 11.

[28] Jenő Cholnoky, "A turáni társaság és világháború", Turán (1942) 3–5.

[29] The records of the Turán Társaság, quoted in Heimokansa 2 (joulu-tammikuu 1941–1942), 11–12; Turán (1942), 43–46.

[30] Artturi Kannisto, "Újévi üdvözlet Finnországról", Turán (1942), 21.

date information from both countries. The Hungarian partner was soon able to compile the first academic Hungarian-Finnish dictionary and publish a comprehensive guide to Hungary for the Finns, *Unkarin kirja,* edited by Väinö Musikka and Sándor Kulai. Viljo Tervonen, lecturer of Finnish at the Eötvös Collegium, was allotted 6000 Fmk to collect sources for a history of Hungarian-Finnish kinship relations, and a committee was called to draft plans to write a history of Finland for Hungarian readers. Ambassador Szabó intervened in these operations and demanded that the contents of the publications not take a particular stance in hot political questions, as it was, in his opinion, very difficult to find "an objective" point of view. Nevertheless, he listed what the editors should include in the leaflet regarding Hungary: revision, sport, patriotic associations (Turán Társaság, Turul etc.) and defence of the family. Upon closer inspection of the final list, we can find timely political subjects as well, for example, the relations of Hungarians with the Croats and Serbs and many other themes related to the conditions of Hungarians in neighboring countries.[31]

During the years 1941–1942, the Hungarian Embassy in Helsinki was very active in controlling and sorting out what information or propaganda material from Finland was to be disseminated in Hungary and vice versa to promote the common cause. One representative example of this work may serve to this suffice here: Rudolf Molnár, working in the Embassy as a cultural attaché, was told to collect materials for a book titled *Suomalaisten taisteluhenki* and to edit the special Hungary -issue of the journal *Suomen Sotilas*. The latter was published in 1941 and, to put it short, was diametrically opposed to Romanian propaganda in Finland. For instance, Horthy and Mannerheim were shown as the main national heroes – however, this notwithstanding, the Hungarian Embassy could not prevent the publication of another special issue of *Suomen Sotilas* in which Marshal Antonescu accused Hungarians of not participating in the war with full strength. To this, Kulai retorted that the Romanians – a lesser ally in the war than the Finns in his mind – could not be taken into account when the so- called "New Europe" was born out of the war.[32] It remained quite unclear to Kulai what this "Europe" would look like, as its formation depended on where the Germans would draw its boundaries.

The Finnish Embassy in Budapest tried its best to match Hungarian production: a history of the Winter War and a history of the Finnish Civil War of 1918 were translated into Hungarian. They sold quite well in bookshops in Budapest and Debrecen.

---

[31] Jegyzőkönyv finn–magyar vegyesbizottság üléséről, 29 March 1942, K 89-1942-36-3-1407 (439); Szabó to Budapest, 8 September 1941, report no. 659, MOL K 89, 619/1941.

[32] 'S.K' [Sándor Kulai], "Unkarin aluelisäykset viimeisten neljän vuoden aikana", Suomen sotilas 17 (1941), 553; "Unkarin ja Suomen aseveljeys", Suomen Sotilas 17 (1941), 496–498.

The peak year of kinship relations was 1942. As the new cultural attaché of the Hungarian Embassy, Sándor Mikola had it, the Hungarians were no longer "alone" in the world in the way they had been throughout the 1920s and 1930s, and he surmised that a new Empire of the Finno-Ugric and Turanian nations might just emerge from the defeated Russia. Ambassador Szabó was happy that this kind of propaganda had been received by the Finns with enthusiasm, and added that President Ryti regularly took part in the propaganda displays arranged by the Embassy. All doubts about possible retreat from the front had, for the time being, been put aside, although it was suspected that the Romanians might change sides. In any case, the Hungarians would remain "faithful and reliable" until the very end, he assured.[33]

For the Finns' part, they became worried because the Hungarians were not able to export sugar, beans, peas and morphine to Finland – the Germans consumed them all.[34] They were obviously concerned about the increasing German pressure on Hungary, and Ambassador Wuorimaa was losing confidence in the Hungarian Foreign Office, as he continued talks with the Romanians, who protested Hungarian "imperialism" in Transylvania. He had evidently abandoned the cause of kinship policy. When he had travelled to Szeged to pick up the honorary doctorate granted to Mannerheim, he had given interviews in which he was no longer as sure about the victory in the Eastern front as his Hungarian hosts. Although he had been satisfied with the fact that the theatre of war was still deep in Russia, he was concerned about the United States' joining the war. He could only hope that both Finns and Hungarians could stand the war till the end and possibly gain new, more satisfactory borders in the ensuing peace treaty.[35] Wuorimaa also noted Hungarian jealousy provoked during Hitler's visit to Mannerheim's birthday party, due to Hitler's insinuation that the Finns had better fighting morale and were better mobilized for the war than the Hungarians. The Hungarian Embassy realized that this insult could not be compensated for by any Mannerheim-parties in Hungary or by Géza Képes's translation of the book *Mannerheim Syvärillä* [36]. In view of this, the Foreign Ministry sent notes to Helsinki instructing that in propaganda materials the Embassy should be prepared to refute all negative comments about Hungary. Simultaneously, the Head of the Ministry's Press Department stated that writings about Finland in

[33] Szabó to Budapest, 30 November 1942, Néprokonsági nap visszhangja a finn sajtóban, K 89-1942, Copy: 1387 (1942); Szabó to Budapest, 30th of September 1942, report no. 95, MOL K 637154/942, 12/7.

[34] Szabó to Budapest, 7 May and 8 July 1942, reports no. 96 (9335) and 8 (3087), MOL K 63, 12/7.

[35] Aarne Wuorimaa, "A közös vér parancsa", Északi rokonaink, 5 (1942, január), 1.

[36] Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 20 June 1942, report no. 38, 54/382; Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 11 June 1942, report no. 36, 51/381, 5C 27, UMA.

Hungary had been "cleaned" so that they were always "positive" in tone and the information contained therein was cross-checked in advance.[37] Papers were censored in order to maintain the morale of the civil population, and Szabó also personally replied to the letters from Finns and thanked them if they had written nice things about Hungary. To one Mr Jukonen from Keuruu (Central Finland) he sent issues of *Új Magyarság* implying that they contained the "latest information" about Hungary. Often he also expressed his disappointment when the Finnish newspapers did not write extensively about the kinship-days and he criticized the Finnish-Swedish *Hufvudstadsbladet* in particular for failing to mention them at all. However, he was delighted that some leading Finnish politicians and cultural personalities were sincerely interested in Hungary and in kinship work. One of them was Edvin Linkomies, the Vice-Speaker of the Finnish Parliament and PM in 1943–1994. He visited Hungary in January 1943 and had talks with Horthy. Szabó had also realized that the Finns liked Hungarian movies and plays which were regularly shown in Helsinki. The Embassy acquired them from Hungary and took the trouble to distribute them to cinemas in the countryside. This complemented nicely the domestic production of entertaining romantic and comedy movies.[38]

The Finnish Embassy in Budapest kept a close watch on Hungarian civil morale and in the summer of 1942 it reported that the counter-attacks of the Red Army had caused uncertainty among the inhabitants of Budapest, some of whom did not see the point of continuing the wasteful war. Most, however, remained confident: the economic situation seemed quite good, unemployment was low, the export of agricultural products was booming, oil had been found, Hungary had gained a lot of territory, and there was enough food and its prices were tolerable. In fact, Hungary appeared in 1942 to be more ready to fight in the ongoing total war than in 1941. Irrespective of how dependent Hungary was becoming on Germany, the Finns saw how the earlier "depressed" Hungary was to be replaced by a "happy" Hungary in the future.[39]

As the information and propaganda flow between Hungary and Finland reached record levels in 1942, so the identification of the Finns in Hungary with Hungarians reached its culmination point. The German (pseudo-) science of race had permeated Hungarian physical anthropology and far-reaching racial surveys were conducted, for instance, at the Catholic Pázmány Péter University in Budapest. Its researchers had measured 3,000 persons anthropometrically and 28 % of them had been found to represent the so-called "eastern Baltic race", a

---

[37] Paikert Géza to Weöres Gyula, 15 January 1942, 34.116/1942, MOL K 89, 1942–1944.

[38] Szabó's note from the meeting of the board of the Finnish–Hungarian Society. Quoted in Dezső Gaskó, Finn–magyar kapcsolatok I, Budapest: Pécsi Egyetem Kiadó, 1943, 96.

[39] T.H. Heikkilä, "Nouseva maa", Suomalainen Suomi (1942), 139–140; Lauri Kettunen, "Nouseva maa". Suomalainen Suomi (1942). 141–144.

newly-invented racial type to denote common characteristics of the Baltic Finno-Ugric peoples which erased all the formerly detected differences between the "We" and the "Other". It was this very type to which both Hungarians and Finns were now found to belong, an identification which may have embarrassed many a Hungarian who were more commonly associated with more Southern racial types. Hungarians and Finns were both described as 160-168 cm tall, "sturdy, sinewy and broad-skulled" – a sign of intelligence.[40] The Levente - youth group[41] that visited Finland in October–November of 1942 had purposely been selected among this type by measuring their "character, intelligence, skills and suitability to the military service". The inevitable conclusion of such measurements was that both Hungarians and Finns were not much inferior to the Aryan race, which the Germans – as *Herrenvolk* – represented. General Alajos Beldy, who led the group in Finland, explained to his hosts that Hungarians and Finns had a common "heritage of blood" which called upon them to carry out their guarding mission with the "Aryans". This "heritage" carried the military virtues which were manifested in Mannerheim and Horthy. Beldy proposed to the Finnish scout leaders that the Levente youngsters and Finnish scouts take part in the international youth camps organized by the Hitler Jugend to show to the Germans their abilities and prepare for "hegemony in the future". To Wuorimaa, Beldy at one meeting confirmed that in Hungary as well the haunting Jewish question was soon coming to the "final solution".[42] With Beldy many a kinship enthusiast promoted the idea of racial purity in Hungary, and it was supported by some of their Finnish colleagues as the up-to-date national ideal[43].

Of all the visionaries in the kinship movement in Hungary, the most megalomaniacal was Virányi whose book *Finnugor népek élettere* (1942) depicted a great empire for the Finno-Ugric race in East Europe and Russia where their former "*Totenraum*" was to be transformed after the collapse of the Soviet Union into a formidable *Lebensraum.* In the North, what Peter the Great had built the Finns tore down; and in the South, Hungarians re-conquered what they had lost 25 years earlier. From the union of "North" and "South" there would emerge a Finno-Ugric Volga-Ural state with over 20 million people, which was destined to become a part of the "New Europe" under construction by the Ger-

[40] Heimokansa 6 (lokakuu, 1942) 31.

[41] Levente (est. 1921) was a paramilitary organization in the interwar and wartime period and its purpose was physical and health training of the youth. By the Act of Defense (1939) boys from 12 to 21of age had to join it.

[42] Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 12 November 1942, report no. 73, 100/388; Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 12 November, report no. 72, 99/387, 5C 27, UMA.

[43] Iván Nagy, "Unkariin takaisin liitetyt alueet ", Heimotyö V (1941–1942) 197–202; Lajos Teleghi Rot's comment in Itsenäinen Suomi 10 (1941), 29.

mans.[44] Virányi's dream was one extreme version of the much-awaited "resurrection" (*feltámadás*) of the Hungarians, now intertwined with the "resurrection" of all Finno-Ugric peoples, a process of reunion on its way as the Finns annexed Karelia to Finland and the Estonians were "freed" from Soviet rule by the Germans.

Apart from the delusions of grandeur, the kinship societies of the three countries took to intensifying their cooperation, from exchange of scientists, scholars and artists, to visits of civil, party and professional delegations, and kinship exhibitions to correspondence of thousands of school children. One timely scientific joint project was undertaken to study the racial characteristics of 430 Mari war prisoners and conduct linguistic interviews with them. It was also decided that of all the Russian war prisoners, all those who looked Finno-Ugric should be shifted and anthropologically determined to racially belong to that type.[45] Ambitious projects of this kind were soon dropped, as the situation on the front deteriorated, and a tone of wary suspicion leaved its mark on the kinship publications which avoided telling the public what was really going on. The kinship propagandists promptly turned their attention to the home front.

Disillusion

The war was becoming increasingly unpopular in Hungary. In Finland the public mood remained more hopeful: as one Embassy attaché correctly reported, there was no "hysteria" and the Finns had good morale and kept their front. Some Finns with whom he had discussed the situation did not think that an Allied victory would be very "unpleasant", the problem being that Finns could not quite yet turn their backs on the Germans.[46] Meanwhile, in early 1943, the Hungarian representatives in Helsinki were preoccupied with counter-propaganda against the Romanians who had established a Finnish-Romanian Society through which they reported that the Hungarians were bad soldiers, a useless link in the Axis and that they discriminated against Transylvanian Romanians. As a counter-measure the Hungarians took to establishing Finnish-Hungarian societies in the countryside, and one of them was set up in Jyväskylä where the high school students became a major target. The Finnish kinship organizations

[44] Elemér Virányi, Finnugor népek élettere, Budapest: Stádium sajtóvállalat, 1942, 74, 83, 194–195, 198–199.

[45] See Tenho Pimiä, Tähtäin idässä. Suomalaisten sukukansojen tutkimus toisessa maailmansodassa, Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 124, Jyväskylä University, 2009, 213–214; M.J. Mustakallio, "Heimotyö ja sota", Heimokansa 6–7 (1942); Timo Salminen, Aatteen tiede. Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura 1883–2008, Helsinki: SKS, 2009, 151–152.

[46] Kuhl to Budapest, 5 December 1942, report no. 124, K 63-9335/942-12/7, MOL.

also reacted and soon informed the Hungarian Embassy that the Romanians could no longer do harm, as the Finnish-Romanian societies had been infiltrated by hungarophiles and disbanded. It was emphasized that the Finns knew that the Romanian stories about the Hungarians were "nonsense" (*badarság*) and, in any case, only very few Finns could understand French.[47]

In early 1943 the Finnish government secretly sought ways to get out of the war. When it was learned that they had to surrender, in May 1943 Edwin Linkomies – at that point the PM – declared that the Finns would not acquiesce, but rather decide for themselves when peace should be made. Finland continued its separate war. For Hungary, inextricably bound to the Axis, it was impossible. After the catastrophe of the 2nd Hungarian Army at Don River, Hungarian troops were called home. When Wuorimaa met PM Miklós Kállay in late March, Kállay surmised that the Germans could not beat the Soviets and admitted that Hungary should not have taken part in the crusade in the East. The only thing Finland could do, he concluded, was go on fighting.[48] Wuorimaa noticed that Hungarians still believed that they could defend their homeland – they just had to try to save what they could on the Carpathian front.[49]

Linkomies had visited Hungary in mid-January as a guest of the Hungarian-Finnish Society. In his talk to Hungarian dignitaries he did not mention Germany at all but stressed that it was a "European duty" of Hungarians and Finns to fight for "survival" and "parliamentarism" in face of Bolshevism, to which Kállay responded by saying that Hungarians and Finns were of the same "race" and thus their fates were bound together. Strangely to Wuorimaa's ears, Kállay made of "Swedish capitalism" yet another enemy of the Finns, along with "Slavic imperialism and proletarian penetration". For his part, Minister Jenő Szinyei Merse argued against Linkomies, stressing that now Hungarians waged a war of defence to which Linkomies politely retorted that Finns had also rejoiced when Hungarian revision had succeeded. Minister Paikert told Linkomies that he admired Finland because it was not contaminated by "Byzantism" or Balkan corruption but instead played "fair game" – Hungarians should be proud to have such relatives.[50] Linkomies's discussion with Horthy was more serious: they agreed that Germany would lose the war although it would take a long time. According to Wuorimaa, the atmosphere in the meeting was not very

[47] Gombo to Budapest, 1 February 1943, report no. 13 and 27 February 1943, report no. 27; Finnországi összefoglaló jelentés az 1942 évről, K 63 [?]; Szabó to Budapest, 10 August 1943, MOL K 89-1943-44-3-640 81943).

[48] Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 26 March 1943, report no. 25, 129/9, 5C 27, UMA; Cf. Wuorimaa, Muistojeni Unkari, 151.

[49] Heikkilä to Helsinki, 25 June 1943, report no. 40, 50/201, 5C 27, UMA.

[50] Északi rokonaink, 8 (április, 1943), 3–4, 7; Géza Paikert, "A finn példa", Északi rokonaink, 8. (április, 1943), 9–12.

encouraging; it was evident that both Hungary and Finland were in a forced situation. Moreover, if the Soviets were to win the war, civilisation, humanism and Christian values would be destroyed. They admitted that it was "a hard necessity" to continue to fight[51]. The import of Linkomies's visit was meagre, mere sympathy and polite gestures, and it reflects the situation of the two small countries in a war that was a matter of great powers and soon to be lost. All that remained was to try to accommodate the inevitable.

In spite of growing pessimism, kinship work (done by thousands of activists in both countries) was continued but festive occasions became rare and focus was laid on exchanging actual information and on disseminating it to wider society, the working class included. The plan to write histories of both countries was completed. From the Finnish side, Jalmari Jaakkola's *Finnország története* (1943) was heavily criticized in Hungary, as its ideological implications pointed towards distinct "Otherness", namely Scandinavianism, not towards the eastern origins of the Finno-Ugric peoples, the mystified pan-ideology, dear to Turanists and Finno-Ugrists. It also failed to represent Finnish history as a story of suffering, a tale familiar to Hungarians. A lot more congenial to Hungarian readers was Lauri Kettunen's *Finn évszázadok* (1943), which did not shy away from presenting past heroism and imagined greatness of the Finns between the West and East. It exaggerated the policy of Greater Finland as if it had been the official policy of the Finnish Government. Unfortunately, numerous factual errors in the book were not corrected before its publication (500 copies).

Both Embassies realised in 1943 that demand for popular cultural programs was on the increase. People were tired of war and needed to be entertained. For example, *Bánk Bán* was shown in Helsinki and a few Finnish plays were staged in Budapest. Hella Wuolijoki's *Niskavuoren naiset* and *Niskavuoren leipä* misfired for they were not really comedies. In one unfortunate performance in which Horthy and his wife were present, the play was in Swedish language, much to the annoyance of Wuorimaa and other Finns.[52] Another channel used in kinship cultural propaganda was radio broadcasts; from Finland Hungarians could hear not only daily news but *Kalevala* citations, Sibelius's masterpieces and folk music. The serenity of these programmes vanished, as in the autumn of 1943 the seriousness of the war situation was sounded also in kinship messages. Some militarists demanded better discipline in the army, and in contrast clergymen urged people to turn from violence and rioting to "holy, spiritual reflections" so that the "mental reconstruction" could begin even in wartime. They were afraid of ensuing spiritual emptiness and depression, and of the Red sol-

[51] Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 12 February 1943, report no.11, 12/196; Wuorimaa to Helsinki, 21January 1943, report no. 5, 6/195, 5C 27, UMA; Cf. Heimokansa 9 (maalis-huhtikuu 1943), 64.

[52] Viljo Tervonen, "Budapestin kirje", Heimokansa 2 (maaliskuu 1944).

diers, although some others still demanded "the right to live" in the "New Europe" that was to be born out of the war, irrespective of the shape it would take or under whose rule it would fall[53]. Censorship prevented the publication of defeatist or desperate writings, and the kinship work turned inwards, to taking care of the "lost souls", the barely surviving youth of the nation.

Many a politician and advocate of kinship ideology realized in spring 1944 that the historically unique moment for Hungarians and Finns was definitely lost. István Csekey, who had in 1941 predicted the downfall of Slavic imperialism, now saw that Finno-Ugric nations had to face suffering and hardships again. The "defensive wall" of the West was endangered also in Finland – the situation was becoming critical. Horthy hoped in late summer that the Germans who had occupied Hungary on the 16 March would leave Hungary in the same way as they had, according to his mistaken information, left Finland. He believed that Hungary might then avoid occupation by the Red Army. What came to kinship efforts, Finnish language courses were more popular than ever; in Budapest, Professor Miklós Zsirai taught 120 students and Lecturer Viljo Tervonen more than 300. Historian János Hankiss concluded that this was "real kinship love", apolitical and practical. There were some diehards, like Iván Nagy, the President of the Hungarian-Finnish Society, who believed that the Soviets would still lose and Finno-Ugric nations had a bright future ahead.[54] In Finland, Lecturer Jenő Fazekas and the Embassy's clerk Kulai continued their travelling lecture series and radio broadcasts. Included were such themes as "Viborg, the last bastion against the East" and "Thousand Years of Hungarian Realm"[55]. The leading Finnish kinship paper hoped that Western Allied Forces would stop the Red Army from conquering all of Europe. If that would not help, the only rescue plan was to be carried out by the "heavenly forces".[56] In autumn all means of such propaganda were exhausted and silenced, the Hungarian Ambassador appointed in June, Mr Marosy, left Finland in September and the Finnish representatives in Hungary left on 14 October.

---

[53] F.A. Heporauta, "Suomen heimotyön suuntaviivoja", Heimokansa 6–8 (1943), 2–3; "Suomalaisen heimotyön kotoinen rintama", Heimotyö VII (1943–1944) 3–4; Suomen Sotilas 2 (1943), 27 and 6 (1944), 5.

[54] István Csekey, "Finnország és Európa", Északi rokonaink 9 (február, 1944) 5–10; Hankiss's statement in Északi rokonaink 9 (február, 1944) 3; Iván Nagy, "Szuomi, a hősök földje", Északi rokonaink, 9 (február, 1944), 22–25.

[55] Hungarian articles for the Finlandia News. The Archives of the State Intelligence, file no. Hgz/M45/17/1, KA.

[56] Anon., "Saksa, Eurooppa ja me", Suomen heimo 4–5 (1944), 39–40.

Epilogue

In his postscript to the war, Count István Bethlen – a highly-respected ex-PM and anglophile foreign policy observer – condemned the Hungarian leaders of causing the unfortunate disaster to their country, although for him, the main villain was Hitler. On the other hand, in his opinion, the Finns had in the end been saved from Soviet occupation by Hitler's guns. Finns had been more cautious than Hungarians in avoiding an alliance with the Germans, although their position had been more precarious before the war than that of the Hungarians. Finns also had had a real *casus belli* whereas the Hungarians had not had. They should have defended themselves independently, tried to do the same as the Finns had bravely done.[57] Likewise, to Sándor Márai, who had written articles about the Winter War to the *Pesti Hirlap,* the Finns had been wiser: they had "cleared their matters" and got out of the war in high time, while the Hungarians had become both "accomplice" and "victim" with the Germans[58]. The Hungarians had evidently brought the misfortune onto themselves by their own decisions.

These indictments may also be interpreted as pointing to those who had aligned themselves with the powers that had led the Finns and Hungarians to the war. Kinship policies and the work of the pressure groups in kinship societies in both countries had contributed to the war-mongering, but as they were not in important decision-making positions, they can be regarded as rearguard actors playing auxiliary, though noisy, roles. Neither could their political ideologies – Turanism or Finno-Ugrianism as versions of macro-nationalism – compete with the great ideologies of the time. Although some of them were experts in this or that national discipline or foreign policy, they were not great political theorists or philosophers. At times they leaned towards authoritarianism or detested democratic politics of parties and cabinets. In Hungary, some kinship people were members of the Foreign Policy Society, giving opinions and advice, but in Finland they had exerted far less influence on foreign politics because it was firmly in the hands of the Government. Nevertheless, the kinship ideologists managed to identify the Hungarians with the Finns and vice versa taking it to the extremes of biological, "racial" familiarity and relatedness. Doing this, they were eager to toy with the prevalent theories of race, making out of them a basis of intimate power-political identification in a joint crusading venture in the East with the Nazi Germany. The valorization of common identity came close to perfection.

---

[57] István Bethlen, "A magyar politika", Bethlen István válogatott politikai írások és beszédek. Ed. Romsics Ignác, Budapest: Osiris, 2000, 390, 394, 398, 405, 426 and 430. Cf. Szakály, Volt-e alternatíva?, 136.

[58] Sándor Márai, A teljes napló 1945, Szombathely: Helikon, 2006, 112.

During the war, the kinship policy had many sympathizers in high politics, but the diplomats and military experts, who coordinated the exchange of secret information between Hungary and Finland, rarely utilized the channels of kinship networks. It had had more propaganda influence on the wider audience, particularly in 1941–1942 when it seemed that the illusions they had cherished for so long were about to come true, and it did not take very long for the Hungarian propaganda in Finland to be rekindled: it was János Kádár's comrade Ferenc Münnich (posted in Moscow) who monitored the establishment of a new Finnish-Hungarian society in 1950 in Helsinki. Its kinship ideology was permeated with a message that was quite antagonist to the anticommunist one prevalent in the war years and before. Again, the Hungarian-Finnish identification became politically useful.

Róbert Barta

British Ideas on the Post WWII Europe and Hungary

Introduction

This paper has twofold aims; first to give an analyse of semi- or non-official (Winston Churchill's views) British foreign policy ideas and intentions towards post WWII Europe and Hungary; and then to focus on a concrete case study through the activity and reports of Alvary Frederick Gascoigne (a British diplomat in Hungary after the Second World War /1945–1946/).

Histories abound about Winston Churchill's political career after the Second World War[1] and post- British foreign policy, and the list of such bibliographical items is continuously expanding.[2] I prefer to seek an answer to what standpoint Churchill represented as regards post-1945 Europe, and how he attempted to con-

---

[1] Important works about Churchill's post-1945 activity (the list is by no means complete): James W. Muller, *Churchill as Peacemaker*, Washington D. C. 1997. John W. Young, *W. S. Churchill's Last Campaign – Britain and the Cold War 1951–55*, Oxford, 1996. Martin Gilbert, *Never Despair – W. S. Churchill 1945–1965*, Vol. VIII. London, 1988. John W. Young, *Policy of Churchill's Peacetime Administration*, Leichester, 1988. Henry Pelling, *Winston Churchill*, London, 1974. Anthony Seldon, *Churchill's Indian Summer; The Conservative Government, 1951–55*, London, 1981. John Charmley, *Churchill's Grand Alliance: The Anglo-American Special Relationship 1940–57*, 1996. John Ramsden, *The Age of Churchill and Eden 1940–1957*, London, 1995. Anthony Montague Browne, *Long Sunset – Memoirs of Winston Churchill's Last Private Secretar*y, London, 1995. Lord Moran, *Churchill. Taken from the Diaries of Lord Moran*, Boston, 1966. Paul Addison, *Churchill on the Home Front 1900–1955*, London, 1992. Roy Jenkins, *Churchill*, London, 2001.

[2] For post-1945 British foreign policy see: Elizabeth Barker, *Britain in a Divided Europe 1945–1970*, London, 1971. Joseph Frankel, *British Foreign Policy 1945–1973*, London, 1975. Brian White, *Britain, Detente and Changing East-West Relations*, London, 1992. Martin Smith–Steve Smith–Brian White Eds. *British, Foreign Policy: Tradition, Change and Transformation*, London, 1988. John W. Young, *Britain and European Unity, 1945–1992*, London, 1993. Frank Roberts, *Dealing with Dictators: The Destruction and Revival of Europe 1930–1970*, London, 1991. Anne Deighton, *The Impossible Peace. Britain, the Division of Germany and the Origins of the Cold War*, Oxford, 1990. Kenneth O. Morgan, *The People's Peace – British History 1945–1990*, Oxford, 1992. Eds. M. E. Pelly, H. J. Jasamee, K. A. Hamilton, R. Bullen, G. Benett, *Documents on British Policy Overseas* London, HMSO, Ser. I–II–III. 1986, 1991, 1997. Ed. Gaynor Johnson, *The Foreign Office and British Diplomacy in Twentieth Century,* London, 2005.

vert it into the official stream of British foreign policy. Therefore, I will provide an overview of British foreign policy only when it radically differed from Churchill's position, which happened on several occasions. With this, following an analysis of his address evaluating the immediate post-war situation, as well as the Fulton speech, I will discuss Churchill's vision of United States of Europe.

Aside from using published and unpublished archival sources, it is necessary to analyze in detail some fundamental documents related to Churchill's post-1945 activities ("iron curtain telegram," Fulton Address, Zurich Address, documents related to the United States of Europe), because Hungarian studies of history, so far, have not dealt with them in a substantive manner.

The Europe that Churchill knew has ceased to exist. The author's aim is to present this controversial man's views about Europe, which themselves were controversial in their day. Nevertheless, without his predictions, concepts and visions of united Europe, today's European Union would not exist.

In case of Gascoigne's diplomatic reports[3] I clarify how the British tried to influence the fate of a small nation living in the shadow of a Soviet Union. From 1936 until 1938 Gascoigne was Chargé d' Affaires in Budapest, from 1945 until 1946 British Political Representative in Hungary with the rank of Minister. So, he became a witness of the last decade of pre war Hungary and an observer of the first steps of sovietization of Hungarians. Between 20, March 1945 and 16, May 1946 as Political Representative in Hungary with the rank of Minister, Gascoigne has sent 86 telegrams from Hungary to the British Foreign Office (28 of them were sent to Anthony Eden, the Foreign Secretary of the Conservative government and 9 of them immediately to the Premier, Winston Churchill). According to his diplomatic duties he has informed the following Labour government led by C. C. Attlee quite honestly, but based on his reports it became obvious that he was much more familiar with the conservative values of W. S. Churchill's government.

Churchill and the Post WWII Europe

Churchill's ambivalent attitude regarding communism and the Soviet Union evolved during the years of the Second World War. Prior to 1939, he represented an uncompromising anticommunism (a characteristic feature until his death, that even his sharpest critics admit), which somewhat softened during the war years

[3] For Gascoigne's reports see: Eva Haraszti-Taylor, *'Dear Joe'. Sir Alvary Frederick Gascoigne, G. B. E. (1893–1970): A Brtish Diplomat in Hungary after the Second World War. A Collection of Documents from the British Foreign Office,* Nottingham, 2005. For Gascoigne's activity in Hungary see: Róbert Barta, *Brit követjelentések és a magyar belpolitika: 1945–1946* [British Diplomatic Reports and the Hungarian Home Policy: 1945–1946] In: *Tiltott történelmünk 1945–1947* [Our Forbidden History 1945–1947], Ed. János Horváth. Budapest, 2006. 77–87.

for practical reasons due to a necessary cooperation with the Soviet Union. However, he remained suspicious of Soviet foreign policy, throughout the war. In October 1939 in a radio speech, he compared Soviet foreign policy to a mystery which is "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."[4] Although this statement was obviously inspired by the shock felt over the Molotov-Ribbentropp Pact and the rapid fall of Poland, still it provided the bottomline upon which British foreign policy laid judgements about the Soviet Union's power politics. Churchill sensed acutely the dangers implied in the Yalta order, which the words of his telegram of May 14, 1945 to Lord Halifax commenting on the Soviet declaration of war against Japan aptly illustrate. He was convinced that the cost of the Soviet declaration of war against Japan could be very high: the upper hand for the Soviets in Central Europe and in the Balkans.[5]

He took a similar position regarding Hungary, when, in a private conversation two weeks later, he emphasized that:'…The position of the Magyars has been maintained over many centuries and many misfortunes, and must ever be regarded as a precious European entity. Its submergence in the Russian flood could not fail to be either the source of future conflicts or the scene of national obliteration horrifying to every generous heart...'[6]

He contrasted the threat of communism and communist activity in Europe with the traditional values of the Christian world, but he never denied that communists are very practical and purposeful people. Canadian Prime Minister MacKenzie King noted in his diary that Churchill compared communists to Jesuits denying Jesus's principles, who would be willing to do anything to reach their aim and were to no extent naïve daydreamers. Since they were extremely pragmatic in their aims, that was the only way to manage them.[7] The fact that the Soviet Union's spread in Europe was relentless seriously worried Churchill. Such a fear indeed motivated the "iron curtain" telegram, which he sent to President Truman on May 12, 1945. Although the expression "iron curtain" originated much earlier,[8] the

---

[4] Op. cit. Ed. Robert Rhodes James, *Winston Churchill. His Complete Speeches 1897–1963*, VI. 1935–1942, New York, 1974, 6161. Quoted in: Viktor Mauer, "Harold MacMillan and the Deadline Crisis over Berlin 1958–59," *Twentieth Century British History*, Vol. 9. No. 1. 1998, 54–85.

[5] Churchill Papers, 20/219. Quoted in: Gilbert, op. cit. 14.

[6] Churchill Papers, M/529,/5. PM. personal minute. Quoted in: Gilbert, op. cit. 24–27.

[7] W. Pickersgill and D. F. Forster, *The macKenzie King Record*, vol. 3. 1945–46, Toronto, 1970. 83–87. Quoted in: Gilbert, op. cit. 160–162.

[8] Historical studies claim that the phrase "iron curtain" was first used by Russian emigrant philosopher Vasilij Rozanov in his 1918 book *Apocalypse of Our Time*, which discussed Russian development ("With a rumble and a roar, an iron curtain is descending on Russian History.") Two years later, in a book about her travels in Soviet-Russia (Through Bolshevik Russia), Ethel Snowden also mentions it ("... a country ... being behind an iron curtain.") The expression also appears in a speech by Goebbels, Nazi minister of propaganda, delivered on February

telegram is more than a mere analysis of the situation. He found it very urgent to make a lasting agreement with the Russians, before everybody got too comfortably settled in the occupied zones. Churchill's "iron curtain" telegram was motivated by a double fear. At all costs, he wanted to prevent an American withdrawal of troops from the continent when the war ended- this had been his primary aim in Yalta too − and, because he did not trust the Russians, he wanted to come to terms with them from a position of power.

The new first secretary to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, George F. Kennan's long telegram, cabled in spring 1946, already regarded the expansive Russian foreign policy as a crossbreed between Marxist hegemony and an old czarist politics of conquest. Thus, when Chruchill delivered his speech at Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, on March 5, 1946, he underscored an already chrystallizing American policy of containment. The speech did not contain surprising new elements, but its tone was unusually frank. It featured all of the major points of Churchill's future foreign policy. Soviet occupation did not ensure democratic development in Eastern and Central Europe, with special regard to Poland and those German regions under Soviet control. Dictatorships and police states were forming everywhere with the help of the Soviets and local communists, which fundamentally threatened peace in Europe and divided the continent.

In this situation, the most important task the English-speaking democracies needed to do was to cooperate closely in matters of economic, political and military, as well as pursue common action under UN auspices. The West needed to negotiate from the position of power: it must rearm and not allow any of the Western occupied German areas to fall into Soviet hands. Nevertheless, Moscow and surrounding satellite states must not be rejected from a coming reorganization of Europe; they must be negotiated with. Churchill was optimistic for the future because, when English-speaking peoples join efforts it must be for world peace and such an alliance would inevitably be invincible. Of course, in this unity he relegated a triple role to Great Britain: to be the focal point of the Western Euro-

---

25, 1945 ("... ein eisenes Vorhang."), as well as in a radio speech by Graf Schwerin von Krosigk, German minister of foreign affairs, delivered on May 2, 1945 ("... In the East the iron curtain behind which, unseen by the eyes of the world, the work of destruction goes on, is moving steadily forward.") Krosigk's speech was published in details in *The Times*, 3 May, 1945.
The term was also used by Allen W. Dulles in a position paper he presented to the Council on Foreign Relations in September 1945. The Office of Strategic Services (OSS), for which Dulles had worked, had just been disbanded. Dulles came to New York to give the Council his assessment of the immediate post-war European situation. In relation to this, he stated that with regard to the Soviet Union's activities in Eastern Europe it was "as if an iron curtain has fallen." This position paper was not published at the time, and remained in the Council's archive. Later on, it was eventually published in the Fall 2005 edition of the Council's journal *Foreign Affairs,* as part of its commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of the conclusion of World War Two.

pean democracies, the British Commonwealth, and the special American-British relationship. Hence, the western world, together with the British Empire, was face a charming future, as long as Churchill's recommendations were considered and followed.

Churchill's Fulton Address was not received with unanimous enthusiasm. Truman's administration distanced itself from the principles advertised in Fulton, although they had received Kennan's "long telegram" a week earlier and it reoriented American foreign policy in the exact direction that Churchill proposed. The British Labour government, naturally, did not take a speech by a conservative politician in opposition to be part of its official foreign political considerations, and foreign policy documents testify that the British could not do much against the sovietization of Central and Eastern Europe-at least, not in the field of economics. A final note of the summative document assessing the situation in Eastern Europe between 1945−46 stated that British commercial and economic interests in the region were negligible, but that existing ones needed to be protected.[9] Thus, the leading economic and political personalities in the least "sovietized" countries needed to be approached and dealt with, primarily through cooperation within international organizations. It would be an oversimplification to claim that British foreign policy "wrote off" the region: for instance, they continued to follow Hungarian domestic affairs attentively, but they did not have, nor could have, any influence over the proceedings.[10]

Summing up we can argue that Churchill's Fulton Address cannot be considered as the opening of the cold war. Neither the phrase "iron curtain" nor his evaluation of the contemporary European scene were original. The Fulton speech was in keeping with Churchill's style, but he was in opposition and his statements did not reflect the views of Mr. Attlee's Labour government. As for the United States, its foreign policy was already moving toward containment prior to the Fulton speech. In the language of sport: undoubtedly, the Soviet Union hit the high ball offered by Churchill, and using all mechanisms of the machinery of propaganda, they named the former wartime ally a warmonger. By this time, Soviet foreign policy was also inclined toward an unavoidable confrontation with the West. The same thing happened here was what happened several times during Churchill's career: he analysed the situation with brilliant sensitivity, he predicted future and, without him being involved, the events proved him right.

Because Churchill had in all his life been convinced that big events only waited for him to direct them and that he held extraordinary skills in strategic

---

[9] Eds. M. E. Pelly, H. J. Jasamee and K. A. Hamilton, Ass. by G. Benett, *FCO Documents on British Policy Overseas*, Series I. Vol. VI. HMSO, London, 1991. East-Europe 1945–46. 363–378. (An analysis of Soviet economic policies in the region.)

[10] Loc. cit. 157–158, 199–201, 305–312.

thinking, he referred to many of his earlier predictions in and about his relation to the Soviet Union. In his telegram to Stalin on April 29, 1945, he called attention that the grave differences between the western and the "eastern" world would sooner or later tear Europe apart, unless leaders of the antifascist alliance prevented it. Occasionally, however, he turned a critical eye on his own role, although he never denied that making big decisions in an informal way greatly appealed to him. Turning to his doctor in a confidential moment, he recalled the famous "percentage agreement" he made with Stalin in October 1944:

"Read that. We made an arrangement with Stalin in the war about spheres of influence, expressed in percentages. Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece and so on. Here they are in print ... It seems rather cynical, I said to Stalin, to barter away the lives of millions of people in this fashion. Perhaps we ought to burn this paper. `Oh, no' said Stalin, `you keep it.' … You see the people at the top can do these things, which others can't do."[11]

All of the major elements of his foreign policy vision featured in the Fulton Address, as we have argued above, unfolded the way he said they would, with the possible exception of the United States of Europe. Churchill first used the expression "United States of Europe" in Brussels on November 16, 1945, in a speech given in a joint session of the Belgian Senate and House of Representatives, although he acknowledged that it originated from Graf Coudenhove-Kalergi, the founder of pre-war pan-European movement.[12] This part of his speech contained generalities only and served for rhetorical purposes:'United States of Europe... would unify this continent in a manner never known since the fall of the Roman Empire, and within which all its peoples may dwell together in prosperity, in justice and in peace.'[13]

In front of the Dutch National Assembly in the Hague he practically repeated the Brussels speech; however, he also mentioned the integration of East Europe

[11] *Moran Diary*, August 16, 1953. Moran, op. cit. 481–482.

[12] Graf Kalergi met Churchill four times between 1946–1950. The preface to his book published in 1950 (An idea Conquest the World) was written by Churchill. Further important works by Kalergi: *Pan Europe*, Vienna, 1923. *Totalitarian State Against Man* (1938), *Europe Must Unite* (1940). Although Churchill acknowledges Kalergi's achievements, but did not agree with the pan-European movement being so sharply anti-Russian: "...I think it would be a pity for me to join an organization which had such a markedly anti-Russian bent, but I was not aware that this was Count C. K.'s conception." Letter to Duncan Sandys, June 29, 1946. Op. cit. Churchill papers, 2/23. Quoted in Gilbert, op. cit. 243. More about Kalergi's activity in detail: Emma Kövics, *Az európai egység kérdése és Németország 1889–1933* [The Question of European Unity and Germany 1889–1933], Budapest, 1992.

[13] Speech of 16, November 1945, Brussels. In. Churchill Papers 5/2.

and the Soviet Union, and he envisioned these under United Nations' control.[14] After such antecedents came his famous Zurich address, where he expatiated on his full concept of the United States of Europe. In his lecture delivered at the University of Zurich, on September 19, 1946, he attempted to connect a European image of the future with the democratic and federalist system of Switzerland, which was an obvious gesture towards his audience. The Zurich address touched upon a timely issue: nuclear weapons. He found it encouraging that this new weapon formed a protective shield over the Western world (because the USA enjoyed a nuclear monopoly then), but pointed out in no uncertain terms that this situation was bound to change and, if used for aggression, the atomic bomb would lead to a world catastrophe. Everybody took the hint that the speech did not mention explicitely: an effective security system must be developed before the Soviet Union came into possession of a similar piece of arms. Churchill was, nevertheless, wary of excluding the Soviet Union and other Eastern European peoples from United Europe. When, as a first step, he proposed the foundation of a Council of Europe, he mentioned that in the creation of united Europe, France and Germany must act as leaders, but Great Britain, peoples of the British Commonwealth, possibly the USA and hopefully the Soviet Union must also participate.

Media responses to Churchill's Zurich address were very mixed, most of them highlighted the surprise element of the speech: Franco−German reconciliation. French pouting is quite understandable after considering a report sent by Churchill's in-confidence son-in-law, Duncan Sandys about his visit to De Gaulle. The initiative came from Churchill, who, in a letter dated November 26, 1946, asked De Gaulle's opinion about Franco−German reconciliation as proposed in the Zurich address. Sandys delivered the letter in person and he reported in writing to his father-in-law about the French politician's answers during their conversation: "He said (De Gaulle) that the reference in Mr. Churchill's Zurich speech to a France-German partnership had been badly received in France. Germany, as a state, no longer existed. All Frenchmen were violently opposed to recreating any kind of unified, centralized Reich, and were gravely suspicious of the policy of the American and British Governments. Unless steps were taken to prevent a resuscitation of German power, there was the danger that a United Europe would become nothing else than an enlarged Germany."[15]

More realistic responses emphasized Churchill's consideration of the interests of the Soviet Union. Russians refused it unanimously, the French took it grudgingly, and British reactions were also contradictory. Even Churchill acknowl-

[14] "... I see no reason why, under the guardianship of the World organization, there should not ultimately arise the United States of Europe, both those of the East and those of the West..." Speech of 9 May 1996, The Hague. In. Churchill Papers 5/5.

[15] Churchill Papers 2/20.

edged that his Zurich address contributed largely to the Labour Government's not supporting the British delegation travelling to a session of the Congress of Europe held in the Hague between May 7−10, 1948, because it was led by him.[16] The idea of the United States of Europe in his Zurich address was partly naïve – because it really did not address the continent's division. An article in the liberal Manchester Guardian reflected the most realistic British opinion: "Europe is at present divided into two parts by the quarrel between the Soviet world and the Western world. If this division persists the best we can hope for is a closer union of the nations in the western half, which Russia would certainly consider a hostile "block". True unity can to be achieved only by agreement with the Soviet group, which will not be favourably impressed by any speech of Mr. Churchill's."[17]

Gascoigne in Hungary

The representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Alvary Frederic Gascoigne,[18] arrived in Debrecen on 23 February 1945, (he had spent only 50 days in the city) and described the Hungarian home policy events[19] and characteristic of leading Hungarian politicians of the time. In a report to his intimate friend and colleague (Orme Sargent)[20] Gascoigne gave a long analyses on his staying in Debrecen, Russian intentions, and foreseen future events: '…The Leftists in the National Assembly, i.e. the Communists, the Social Democrats and the National Peasants, may wish to take over power and rid themselves of the 'coalition' government,

[16] Churchill as chairman of the British United Europe Committee led the delegation, and only two Labour Party politicians supported travelling (Gordon Lang, Hugh Delargy). Gordon Lang of the Labour Party, who participated in Churchill's United Europe movement, got totally isolated within Labour because of his article published in London *Cavalcade* on 10, May 1947 in which he ensured the Conservative politician of his support.

[17] *Manchester Guardian*, 20, September 1946. "East and West."

[18] Gascoigne was educated at Eton and after his war service entered the Foreign Office in 1919. He was a Third Secretary in 1921, a Second Secretary in 1925, a First Secretary in 1933 and a Counsellor in 1941. From 1936 until 1938, he was Chargé d'Affaires in Budapest, from 1939 until 1944 Consul-General for the Tangier Zone (North-Africa). From 1945 until 1946, he was a British Political Representative in Hungary with the rank of Minister, and from 1946 until 1951 British Representative in Japan with the rank of Ambassador. Two years before his retirement he was appointed His Majesty's Ambassador to Moscow (1951–1953). More on his life see: Haraszti-Taylor, op. cit. xiv-xv.

[19] For the Hungarian history of the time, see: Jörg K. Hoensch, *A History of Modern Hungary 1867–1986*, London, 1989. 161–187. László Kontler, *Millenium in Central Europe. A History of Hungary*, Budapest, 1999. 387–407. Ignác Romsics, *Hungary in the Twentieth Century*, Budapest, 1999. 217–264.

[20] In 1945 Sir Orme Sargent was Deputy Secretary of the Foreign Office responsible for Eastern-and Central Europe. From 1946, he became Deputy of the Foreign Secretary.

but it seems to me possible that, before doing so, they will wait until the present regime is well and properly floundering in the mud of land reform, so that they shall not bear the weight of responsibility for its results. Of course, behind the scenes, there are the Russians. Everyone else is a marionette, pulled this way and that by the Russian strings; but it may be that the Russians would not welcome a government in Hungary in which was composed entirely of radically 'leftist' elements. The latter might get out of hand and be inconvenient to Moscow in more ways than one.'[21] Gascoigne found the Hungarian Prime Minister of the time[22] as a pessimistic politician without experience and stamina. General Dálnoki Miklós Béla gave him to understand that he was having problems with the Cabinet because of the cruel offensive policy of the leftist, pro-soviet cabinet members. The Premier admitted that the economic situation in Hungary would be serious in the near future which was due to the failure of the harvest and the confusing policy of the Russians based on forced urgency of sudden land reform.[23] Although there was a fear in the Foreign Office according to Gascoigne's preference for the prewar Hugarian regime, he made obvious that his main tasks were to inform the Foreign Office on Hungarian home policy issues and keep contact with Hungarian political leaders and decision makers of various political parties. After the British Labour Party's electoral victory in the summer of 1945 Gascoigne sent 29 telegramms to the newly appointed Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin. In these he gave detailed information on his meetings with various Hungarian party leaders and tried to estimate the outcome of the forthcoming Hungarian election. He emhasized many times that there were no significant differences between the Hungarian social democratic party leaders and the communist ones. He believed that Árpád Szakasics[24] the head of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party was a real communist.[25] This short but basically true statement of him was based on the fact that Szakasics appeared as mediator to set up a meeting between Gascoigne and

[21] Gascoigne to Sargent, 10 April 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 71.

[22] Dálnoki Miklós Béla (1890–1948) army officer, Hungarian military attaché in Berlin (1933–36), general and leader of the Governor's military office (from 1941). In December 1944, he was appointed as a Premier of Hungarian Provisional Government. He was resigned after the general election of November 1945.

[23] Gascoigne to Bevin, 21 August, 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. xvii

[24] Árpád Szakasits (1888–1965) journalist, social democratic politician, leader of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party from 1939. As a pro-communist he became the president of Hungary after the communist takeover (1948–1949).

[25] In this case Gascoigne referred to the speech of Árpád Szakasics on a Social Democratic Party Congress (18, August 1945) which was-by his opinion- so similar to another speech on that ocassion given by the communist leader, Mátyás Rákosi. Gascoigne to Bevin, 21 August 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 172–173.

the communist leader Mátyás Rákosi.[26] Probably because of his attitude he remained a „foreign observer" keeping equal distance from political parties of the time. His reports based on very sharp and sensitive analyses, Gascoigne was really open minded and always ready to meet anyone from the Hungarian political life included the communist party leader Mátyás Rákosi: '…M. Szakasits…ask me whether I would receive M. Rakosi (Mattias), the Communist leader. I said that if M. Rakosi wish to see me, I should of course be delighted to welcome him here, as I would the leaders of any of the Hungarian political parties. I thought it well, however to stress that the initiative must be theirs and that my attitude towards the five existing political parties was merely that of an 'interested observer'.[27] In a former telegramm the British diplomat described Rákosi as very talented person, a strong man of the Russians and the future leader of Hungary.[28] The background of this meeting went back to the first parliamentary speech of Ernest Bevin (20 August, 1945) in which the new British Foreign Secretary described Hungary- together with Bulgaria and Roumania- as non-democratic country. Gascoigne thought that Rákosi tried to assure the British not to worry about the fate of Hungarian democracy because the only problem he said, was the weakness and incompetency of Hungarian government of the time. By the opinion of the communist leader there were no political terror in Hungary, the inroduction of exeptional governmental measures was necessity in order to stop the black market and secure the food supply of the cities. Rákosi expressed that the Hungarian political secret police was a body of amateurs, they missed the target and were unable to realize the existence of hundreds of „reactionary, anti-democratic" groups needed to be arrest. He informed Gascoigne on the forthcoming free election and estimated equal results between the three dominant parties (smallholders, social democrats, communists). Rákosi made clear that introduction of Soviet-type system in Hungary was out of question and the coalition governmental system would exist at least for five years (until the end of the country's resurrection).[29]

The issue of forthcoming election became a key element of the Hungarian home policy from the summer of 1945, so it is no wonder that Gascoigne made permanent reports on that ocassion. The leaders of Hungarian Smallholders Party

[26] Mátyás Rákosi (1892–1971) civil servant, communist politician, leader of the Hungarian Communist Party (1945–1956). He became a dictator and emblematic figure of Hungarian communist regime from 1948 until 1956.

[27] Gascoigne to Bevin, 4 August, 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 152.

[28] '…It seems possible therefore that M. Rákosi will play a prominent role in future Hungarian politics and that the power and influence of the Kremlin may possibly make itself felt through the medium of this individual…'Gascoigne to Eden, 28 May 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 4.

[29] The importance of the meeting was indicated by the fact that Gascoigne has sent a long telegramm (three pages) on that to London and it was circulated-with attached minute of Orme Sargent- to other British embassies (Beograd, Bucharest, Sofia, Caserta, Moscow, Prague, Washington). Gascoigne to Bevin, 22, August 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 178–181.

(especially Zoltán Tildy and Ferenc Nagy)[30] called the British mission many times to achieve more active steps of London against the Soviets. They emhasized their sure electoral victory but Gascoigne was more cautious about that. He thought that only the Hungarian communists had enough money and Soviet support to manage successful electoral campaign.[31] By the reports of Gascoigne it is crucial to stress that there was an idea well before the elections between the Hungarian political parties to establish a coalition government (and it was obviously against the values of all types of classical democratic procedures).[32] After these starred preliminaries the correct management of the elections was pleasant surprise for the British, especially when they noticed that the Soviet Red Army was ordered to stay in their barracks during the election day. The first analyses on the election's outcome was given by Béla Zsedényi[33] to the British. He stated that although most of the Hungarians voted against the communists, the economic situation was so serious in the country that the smallholders dominated coalition government would give many concessions to the communists. He believed that this election was much more a kind of plebscite against communism than a real election. Zsedényi stated that the leadership of smallholders were under permanent pressure coming from the leftists and the Russians and this would steer the smallholders to a position of never-ending concessions. This would case not just a total collapse of the smallholders but a sudden communist takeover. Gascoigne agreed with this opinion and emhasized that the smallholders accepted the idea of the coalition govenment just because they wanted to shift the responsibility of making serious economic decisions on to other parties.[34]

According to his duty, Gascoigne has sent two telegramms on the electoral results[35] and the structure of the new government. He emphasized that Hungarian

---

[30] Zoltán Tildy (1889–1961) pastor of the Hungarian Reformed Church, smallholders politician, Premier and President of Hungary (1945–1948). Ferenc Nagy (1903–1979) farmer, smallholders politician, Premier of Hungary (1946–1947). In June 1947 he was deposed by the communists and forced to go to U.S. exile.

[31] Gascoigne to W. G. Hayter, 5, November 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 216.

[32] '…It was further suggested that the coalition government which it had been decided by the party leaders would in any case be formed as a result of of the General election, should be made up before the election were held. After some ten days of crises…it was decided that a new coalition government should be formed after the elections, and not before them…' Gascoigne to Bevin, 5, November 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 220–222.

[33] Béla Zsedényi (1894–1955) lawyer, jurist, moderate right-wing politician, between December 1944 and December 1945 President of the Provisional National Assembly.

[34] Gascoigne to Bevin, 10, November 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 225–229.

[35] The election were held on 4, November 1945 and the smallholdres could gain all the seats of the sixteen electoral districts collecting 57% of the total votes. The social democrats scored 17, 4%, the communists 17% and the rest of the votes went to smaller parties. See also: L. Kontler, *Millenium,* 396.

political parties were not fully satisfied with the results and the communists would probably start very dynamic parliamentary and governmental acivity to balance their electoral failure. Further on, there were signs that that the communists were tried to gain the key positions of executive power. Gascoigne also had firm views about the Russians, whom he found difficult. He found Voroshilov ('the peasant Marshall', as he called him) a pleasant person, but shrewd and businesslike. Quoting Gascoigne: 'The Russians as a whole are always pleasant and polite when we meet them, but they have not yet, at any rate, seen fit to give us that measure of assistance which we have a right to to expect from them.'[36]

In his last telegramm before his leaving for Japan Gascoigne informed the Foreign Office on the forthcoming visit of the Mayor of Budapest to London and the arriving and welcoming of Count Mihály Károlyi[37] in Budapest. He noticed that although Károlyi was received as a great statesman but after estimating the situation the Count realized his hopeless position in a Soviet and communist controlled Hungarian home policy. He was so depressed and disillusioned when he expressed his opinion that there was not much chance to strenghten a western-type democracy and political culture in Hungary.[38] Gascoigne thought that the Russians were not versed in the art of co-operation and were filled with suspicion and distrust of the British.[39] In that respect Gascoigne was right, and his despatches about Hungarian personalities and politics also reflect the above views. Even if Gascoigne was sent to Hungary because not much could be done for Britain in his situation, and though he was criticized by A. C. Macartney,[40] a Profes-

[36] Gascoigne to Sargent, 10, April 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 69.

[37] Count Mihály Károlyi (1875–1955) liberal Hungarian aristocrat and landowner, between October 1918 and March 1919 he was a Premier and President of Hungary. From July 1919 until May 1946 he lived in England and then in France (between 1949 and 1955).

[38] '… Count Károlyi told me that he was suffering from great sorrow, disillusion and disgust; sorrow because of the ruince of a once beautiful capital, disillusion because of the weakness which was obviously being displayed by those in power towards the Communists, disgust because of the wholesale inmorality and graft which permeated all strata of the population, both official and otherwise…Count Károlyi said that he would not be staying in Hungary for very long. He did not desire to have anything to do with the internal politics of the country…' Gascoigne to Bevin, 16, May 1946. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 236–238.

[39] In his Westminster speech of 20 August, 1945, the newly appointed British Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin listed those Eastern-and Central European countries (included Hungary) in the Russian zone of occupation in which there was no chance for democracy. The speech resulted significant outcry in Hungarian home policy and among the Russians staying on Hungarian soil.

[40] As a historian and chief adviser of the Foreign Office (from 1937) Carlile Aylmer Macartney became an expert of the Hungarian question (due to his first book: *Hungary and Her Successors. The Treaty of Trianon and its Consequences 1919–1937.* London, New York, Toronto, 1937.) In this he could accept a limited revision of Hungarian borders based on ethnic aspects. His second book (*October Fifteenth. A History of Modern Hungary 1929–*

sor, historian and leading Hungarian expert at the Foreign Office Research Department, Gascoigne was very dilligent, seemingly enjoyed his popularity, mixed easily with every shade of the political and social life in Hungary.

As his Majesty's Ambassador to Moscow (the last position of his diplomatic career) he improved his inability to understand the high politics. In a telegramm dated 9, January, 1952 Gascoigne sent a long analyses on Soviet foreign policy in Asia making a consequence that the Soviet presence in Korea is like a springboard to sovietize Japan. In Moscow he disliked that strange atmosphere, suffered from the lack of real public life and finally this old-fashioned diplomat with traditional values was deposed and retired in 1953.

Conclusions

Churchill's activity strenghtened a Western European movement for unity and helped secure the Marshall Plan. His United Europe Movement organized in Great Britain imagined unity with London in the center, which Churchill may have been the only one to support. Nonetheless, he could not deny that the British Empire was still at the center of his political consciousness. The policies he followed especially during his second premiership (1951–1955) followed classic 19th-century traditions of British diplomacy (pragmatism, a sense of compromise, national interests emphasized). He radically opposed a policy of appeasement if rooted in weakness, but he was also convinced that the West must negotiate with Moscow from a position of power.

He was an anticommunist to the bone, but he would not convert the cold war into an election campaign. Although he always denied doing it, in fact he wished to act as mediator between world powers. He accepted the division of Europe (and Germany) as a temporary condition, but he would render a Finland-type solution (independence, with friendship with the Soviet Union) for Eastern European Soviet satellite states. Because he believed in Western democratic values, he considered that the kind of government the Soviet Union had was part of their domestic affairs. Yet he condemned dictatorship and tyranny. His aim was to stem the spread of communism – even if on his own, so for him the policy of easement was more a form of containment than its opposite. He wanted to maintain a strong Western alliance system even when cold war tensions would release.

1945. Vols. 1–2. Edinburgh, 1956.) is an objective and well balanced survey of the Horthy-regime, in this sense a fundamental historical work of that period of Hungarian history. He openly clarified his critical standpoint on Gascoigne: '…he loses no opportunity…of creating the simultaneous impression that we do not want to have any influence in Hungary, and could not have if we would.' Minute by A. Macartney to Mr Addis, Southern Department, Foreign Office, 29, August, 1945. Haraszti-Taylor, op. cit. xviii.

He may have been the first leader in the West to realize that rigid anticommunist propaganda and an unreasonably strong opposition against the Soviet Union would only solidify it as a police state. Since the Americans never formally accepted Europe's division, Churchill could not get Stalin to repeat the percentage distributions of political influence as he had in October 1944.

As a British diplomat in Hungary Gascoigne could represent a very weak and limited British influence in the region (because of the general weakness of the post WWII British Empire). The British were unable to renew their old super power presence in Europe (included Central and Eastern Europe) and could not avoid the upper hand of Moscow in those countries which were occupied by the Red Army. Quoting J. M. Addis (Southern Department, Foreign Office) minute (15, August, 1945) to Gascoigne's report: 'I fear that the revised arrangements for British and American participation in the Controll Comission will make no difference to Hungary's plight. No change seeems possible until the Russian troops withdraw. And even after that, Hungary will remained tied to the Soviet Union economically. British influence in Hungary has no chance against Soviet influence; and those elements in Hungary who look to the West for support for their conception of democracy, will look in vain. It seems clear that for many years to come Hungary will be a satellite of the Soviet, in which the Communist influence will predominate.'[41] Gascoigne tried to give an objective picture on Hungary (he had 86 diplomatic reports sent to the Foreign Office) although he was keen on the non-communist parties and the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church as well (József Grősz[42] the Archbishop of Kalocsa was his political intimate).[43] But this old fashioned British gentleman could not represent the interests of a weak and disillusioned British Empire in a country where the Soviet Red Army had an upper hand. When Gascoigne clarified his personal standpoints in his reports he has followed the special Churchillian argumentation; generally we support the pro-Western political parties in Hungary but practically we are not more than curious but desinterested observers. In spite of this limited British involvement, Gascoigne's subtle analyses give us a chance to clarify more delicate focus on the diplomatic history of that period.

[41] Minute of J. M. Addis to Gascoinge's report to Churchill, 23, July 1945. Haraszty-Taylor, op. cit. 138.

[42] József Grősz (1887–1961) priest of the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church and Archbishop of Kalocsa (1943–1951). In 1951 he was arrested by the communists and released in the days of the revolution of 1956.

[43] Gascoigne was a mediator between the Archbishop and the Holy See. Grősz informed the Vatican on the land reform, home policy issues and activities of the Russians in Hungary. Gascoigne to Churchill, 23, July, 1945 with Minutes. Haraszti-Taylor, op. cit. 138.

Simo Mikkonen

Soviet Cultural Operations and Small Nations – Cultural Imperialism or Mutual Benefit?

Background

Soviet presence was felt all around the world for much of the 20th century. In the field of international politics, this was especially difficult for many smaller countries bordering the Soviet Union in the West, ranging from Finland to Romania. Before the Second World War the attitude of most European governments towards the Soviet Union was hostile, and cooperation was mostly non-existent, limited to sporadic diplomatic connections. On the grass-roots level, however, the situation was more ambiguous already in the 1920s and 1930s: for some, the first socialist state provided a vision of a glorious future, while for many others the vision was scary, filled with pain and wrongdoing. Few were left indifferent. But even among Western supporters of the Soviet system there were little connections with the Soviet Union itself. Before WWII, the Soviets had suppressed most foreign cultural connections. All the more drastic, then, was the change that took place after WWII and in particular after Stalin's death in 1953, when the Soviet presence in the international arena became manifold. Soviet artists rushed to foreign concert halls and musical competitions, and Soviet works of art filled exhibition halls and museums. A country that had kept its borders closed, fiercely blocking foreign influences, suddenly started to interact with the surrounding world, even with capitalist countries. Consequently, Soviet cultural presence grew considerably in the Soviet orbit, but also in neighboring countries such as Finland.

This paper is based on two interlinked projects conducted at the University of Jyväskylä. The first is my personal project examining the Soviet project of cultural diplomacy in the post-Stalinist period, based primarily on archival research conducted in Moscow and Tallinn and aiming at creating the framework for a detailed study about Soviet cultural influence. The other project concentrates on Finnish cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Finland's cultural connections with socialist countries were unmatched in any other capitalist country, but as such, have never been studied in depth. Both projects aim at producing new knowledge about the objectives, impact and extent of cultural exchanges and cultural influencing in the post-WWII Europe until the collapse of the communist camp. This paper will focus mostly

on describing the framework for Soviet cultural diplomacy, and makes connections to Finland briefly only in the very end. Without a proper study about the objectives and conduct of Soviet foreign cultural operations, it is very hard to understand the consequences and dynamics of Finnish-Soviet cultural relations.

While there are existing studies of the Cold War era cultural operations conducted by the the United States, Soviet foreign cultural operations have never been subjected to extensive scrutiny. Soviet foreign affairs have typically been examined in terms of international relations, mainly political or military. Culture and arts have mostly been omitted from such studies. And yet, from 1953 onwards, cultural exchanges played an enormous role in Soviet international strategy. The Soviet leaders gave pride of place to sending out Soviet cultural artifacts and artists to disseminate information about the Soviet Union and its achievements. In the immediate postwar years, these actions were mostly conducted in the Soviet-occupied zones ranging from Germany to Bulgaria, but after 1953 the Soviet Union already sought bilateral agreements on cultural exchange even with Western countries. As a result, the Soviet presence in the West, and also in the third world, expanded significantly. Members of the Soviet cultural elite were believed to be perfect cultural ambassadors, people who could convey Soviet messages of peaceful coexistence and the good will of the Soviet Union better than Soviet politicians ever could. Therefore, it was Soviet artists who spearheaded the exchanges, although these quickly expanded from leading artists and few privileged apparatchiks to include broader segments of Soviet society in the form of tourism and a wide variety of friendship activities.

Eventually, cultural exchanges developed into a very lively exchange between the Soviet Union and the West. Soon socialist countries in East-Central Europe were allowed to build connections to the West, too, with similar aims: presenting the Soviet system and socialism around the world. Indeed, the major expansion and actual creation of Soviet cultural diplomacy was based on the assumed appeal of the Soviet system. The Soviet leaders believed that anti-Soviet attitudes in the West stemmed from Western propaganda and misunderstandings and were convinced that through the exchanges and dissemination of correct information, the Soviet system would find increasing support and those hostile to the Soviet Union would be marginalized. The price the Soviets paid was naturally a flow of Western influences into the Soviet Union and to East-Central Europe in particular. Through exchange programs, scientists, scholars and artists, and in some cases even ordinary people were able to establish foreign ties on an unprecedented scale. This resulted in Soviet and East-Central European people being exposed to Western influences in ways unimaginable during the Stalin era. For the Soviet leaders, however, the international presence of the USSR and the embellishment of its public image were the top priorities. In the fierce ideological competition with the USA, the Soviets felt they could win

over foreign populations by proving their superiority in the cultural arena. However, what was for the Soviet leaders a battle for hearts and minds was for many individuals primarily a chance to go abroad and pursue their personal ends. Thus, while on the governmental level there was certainly a political dimension to the cultural exchanges between East and West, for individuals the significance was often rather different.

The aim here, then, is to explain the logic of Soviet cultural diplomacy, not primarily as a political phenomenon, but as a cultural and social occurrence that greatly influenced transnational relations. I have personally conducted several sub-projects dealing with Soviet foreign cultural operations and examined various manifestations of Soviet cultural diplomacy in order to construct the framework in which the East-West exchanges took place. Rather than interpreting them merely as inter-state affairs, I have attempted to get closer to the ground. Many Soviet and East-Central European artists took part in these exchanges, and their contact with the West gave them access to international trends. On the other hand, in some cases Soviet and East-Central European art made important contributions to the international scene, especially in film, literature, music and dance.

The study of Soviet cultural diplomacy also helps us understand the beginnings of the downfall of communist rule. As the Soviet Union started to open up to the outside world, the ideological corrosion and alienation of the people from Soviet and Communist ideals slowly began. Soviet leaders believed that by openly challenging the West, and by learning from it, they could modernize the country and catch up with the USA. Cultural exchanges, however, resulted in growing exposure to Western ideals and consumerism, something the Soviet system could not, or was not ready to, face. Process went along the same tracks in East Central European countries, although separately in each country. The process in the Soviet Union has been explained by Alexei Yurchak in his book *Everything Was Forever Until It Was No More*. Like Yurchak, many scholars have referred to the role of Western cultural influence in this process, but few have examined how Soviet policies contributed to it. While in the West the influence of Soviet art, media and music or their exposure to Western influences have been subjected to examination, my purpose is to deconstruct the framework in which these processes were made possible. During the Stalin era, such influences were inconceivable. And while the Brezhnev era aimed at suppressing some of them, these attempts were half-hearted compared to those of the 1930s. Foreign connections were never completely extinguished after 1953, quietly continuing for over thirty years until Gorbachev's *perestroika*.

Deconstructing Soviet Cultural Diplomacy

During the late Stalin years the Soviet Union used programs of cultural exchange to influence Soviet-occupied countries trying to help them in adapting to the Soviet system as well as removing general anti-Soviet feelings. Leading Soviet artists, cooperation in the field of radio, exchange of exhibitions and printed materials were used by the Soviet Union in an attempt to appeal to people's feelings.[1] During the Stalin era, however, especially western influences were repelled and kept outside Soviet borders. Thus, exchange was partial, and Soviet authorities closely controlled what was allowed to enter the Soviet Union. Yet, experiences from this work were exploited in the international scene after Stalin's death in 1953. Suddenly, Soviets were making bilateral agreements even with capitalist countries, aiming at large scale cultural exchange with them. Despite this drastic change, however, research on Soviet foreign policy, and Soviet operations in the Cold War, bypass almost completely the role played by cultural exchanges and cultural influencing.[2]

Few books examine cultural Cold War taking the Soviet side into account. Among them is David Caute's The Dancer Defects (2003).[3] Since Caute, few scholars have tackled the issue.[4] Other publications on cultural Cold War practically represent the Western point of view exclusively. In Cold War studies, culture has been a rising theme and it is already generally acknowledged that for the US, American mass culture was one of its greatest assets.[5] But culture still is overshadowed by traditional diplomacy, high-level politics and military operations in the Cold War studies. Cultural influencing has not found its way to the

---

1 Problems regarding early cultural exchanges are discussed for example in Gyorgy Peteri (ed), Nylon Curtain: Transnational and Transsystemic Tendencies in the Cultural Life of State-Socialist Russia and East-Central Europe, Trondheim, 2006.

2 Aleksander Fursenko & Timothy Naftali, Khrushchev's Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary, New York, W.W.Norton, 2006; Vladislav M. Zubok, A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2007; Jonathan Haslam, Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2011. Though aforementioned are very good publications on Soviet foreign policy during the Cold War, they pay practically no attention whatsoever on culture.

3 David Caute, The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.

4 Kristin Roth-Ey, Moscow Prime Time: How the Soviet Union built the Media Empire That Lost the Cultural Cold War, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2011; Anne Gorsuch, All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

5 Walter L. Hixson, Parting the Curtain. Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945–1961, London, Macmillan Press, 1996.

mainstream even in cases in which its connections with high-level political making are obvious.[6]

One reason for non-existing literature about Soviet cultural diplomacy is conceptual. The concept is American, created in the late 1940s to describe an area of foreign politics that quickly developed into an important field in US foreign operations. Cultural diplomacy consists of actions that are aimed at appealing and influencing the people in target countries. For the US, this meant questioning the authority of Communist Parties through a number of cultural operations: student exchange, tourism, international radio broadcasting, and by generally introducing consumerist culture and modern lifestyle. American tradition aims at distinguishing cultural diplomacy from propaganda and transnational relations, as there has existed an extensive civic society outside the government that has been active in foreign operations. In the Soviet case, there was no such thing as a civic society, at least, not in the first post-WWII decades. While friendship societies were for the West part of civic society, for the Soviet Union they constituted an integral part of the administration and were strictly controlled by the government. The Communist Party subjected their actions to close scrutiny and their objectives were directly tied to Soviet foreign policy. The traditional definition of cultural diplomacy thus works poorly in the Soviet case, although this has also been attempted.[7]

Soviet foreign cultural operations need to be examined either separately, or as part of larger foreign political objectives. As the field was exceptionally extensive in the Soviet case, here I will concentrate on the Khrushchev era, when Soviet cultural diplomacy and many of its operations were still formulating and

---

[6] General books on Cold War typically bypass culture either completely, or with few sentences. John Lewis Gaddis, The Cold War: A New History, New York, Penguin Press, 2005 e.g. does mention peaceful coexistence as a concept, but does not look how it manifested itself. Among few works that do discuss the topic, primarily from the American point of view, see: Peter Coleman, The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Post-War Europe, New York, Free Press, 1989; Reinhold Wagnleitner, Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: The Cultural Mission of the United States in Austria after the Second World War, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1994; Hixson, Parting the Curtain; Frances Stonor Saunders, Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War, London, Granta Books, 1999; Caute, Dancer Defects; Yale Richmond, Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain, University Park, Penn State Press, 2003; Victor Rosenberg, Soviet-American Relations, 1953–1960: Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange During the Eisenhower Presidency, Jefferson, McFarland & Co, 2005; Jessica Gienow-Hecht, "Culture and the Cold War in Europe", In: The Cambridge History of the Cold War, vol. I, Eds. Melvyn Leffler & Odd Arne Westad, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010, 398–419.

[7] Nigel Gould-Davies, "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy", Diplomatic History 27 (2003) 193–214.

were rather fresh. Later, many of these forms stabilized as part of the normal Soviet conduct, and changed very little from the way they were formulated in the 1950s and 1960s.

It is illustrative that, when the United States suggested a program of cultural exchanges to the Soviet Union in 1949, it was immediately countered. There was no willingness for bilateral agreements on exchanges in the Stalinist Soviet Union. Cultural exchange with the capitalist countries became topical after the Geneva Convention (1955).[8] Temporarily slowed by the events in Hungary in 1956, many agreements with capitalist governments were signed in 1957-1958, among them with the United States. They were important as they made large scale exchange of people and cultural artifacts possible. Indeed, after signing of agreements, what started as exchanges of top artists and troupes, expanded with student and professional exchange, and even tourism. Agreements were general by nature, so that western governments could not control their side of agreements very strictly.[9] This made it possible for the Soviets to contact directly e.g. art business for producing Soviet art and artists to western concert arenas without western governments' interference.

Perhaps the single most important early manifestation of the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States were national exhibitions in the summer of 1959: the Soviet exhibition in New York and the American exhibition in Moscow. The US exhibition has received a lot of attention in research.[10] Its Soviet counterpart, however, has remained outside research so far,[11] although the Communist Party followed very closely both exhibitions.[12] Generally, the

[8] Unites States Department of State, "Cultural Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union. Efforts to Establish Cultural-Scientific Exchange Blocked by the U.S.S.R.", Stanford University: Hoover library collections, 1949. Apparently, the memo was drafted to point out that the Soviet Union had prevented agreement from being reached. Yet, ideas of the United States about free change of ideas and people were impossible for Stalin.

[9] Zhukov's memorandum about bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and Western Europe and the United States, 28.11.1961, Russian State Archives of Recent History [hereafter RGANI] f. 5, op. 30, d. 370, ll. 74–76.

[10] Marilyn S. Kushner, "Exhibiting Art at the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959: Domestic Politics and Cultural Diplomacy", Journal of Cold War Studies 4 (2002) 6–26; Hixson, Parting the Curtain, 169–180; Richmond, Raising Curtain, 14–20; Rosenberg, East-West, 131–132.

[11] Susan Reid's innovative article deserves to be mentioned as an important exception: "Who Will Beat Whom? Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959", Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History 9 (2008) 855–904. Here Reid examines reactions of individual Soviet citizens to American exhibition.

[12] Zhukov's memoranda to Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party about American exhibition in Moscow, 9.1–27.7.1959, RGANI f. 5, op. 30, d. 291. Party leadership was closely following how the exhibition proceeded, the reactions of citizens and the way in which exhibition appealed to people.

lack of attention for the Soviet side in these agreements causes significant distortion as the Soviet Union and Khrushchev were essentially initiators in these agreements, and the agreements therefore had close links to Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence.[13]

The basic reasoning for the Soviets to engage in cultural agreements that eventually increased the Western influence in the Soviet-controlled area can be found in the postwar situation. Foreign policy had become increasingly dependent on popular opinion, and, for the Soviet Union, appealing to people was therefore an important chance to have a direct impact on foreign policy of Western governments. Thus, Soviet leaders aimed at using what they considered as a crucial weakness of democratic systems. This was practically spelled out by the central figure of US foreign policy under the presidency of Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, when he said about Geneva Convention that it was not desired by the United States, but that people's expectations forced the US to negotiations.[14] Soviet foreign policy after Stalin's death aimed at lessening fears towards the Soviet Union, and supporting peace movements in the West. Therefore, the Soviet engaged in measures directed especially at the middle classes in the West.[15] Although Soviet authorities hardly believed in turning Western populations into Communists in large scale, it was equally important to decrease anti-Soviet attitudes and raise positive attitudes about the Soviet Union.[16] Against this background, the Soviet Union skillfully combined international propaganda, exchange of arts and culture, public diplomacy and other measures into part of its foreign policy. While some of the measures existed before Stalin's death, the scale had been considerably smaller, and actions poorly controlled before mid-1950s.

The change can be easily seen in the field of classical music, which was considered to be of higher standard in the Soviet Union than anywhere else in the world. Yet, before the mid-1950s, the Soviet Union was very selective, only participating in international competitions sending out the best and most-trusted musicians to win these competitions. Apart from such competitions, there had been only very occasional appearances of Soviet artists in the western concert arenas prior to 1955.[17] After that, the change was drastic. Instead of individual

---

[13] Relationship between peaceful coexistence with the agreement on cultural exchanges with the US has been examined by Rósa Magnusdóttir,"Be careful in America, Premier Khrushchev!" Soviet perceptions of peaceful coexistence with the United States, Cahiers du Monde Russe 47 (2006) 109–130.

[14] National Security Committee's (NRC) Memorandum 256, 28.7.1955. Foreign relations of the United States, 1955–57, 5:534, Washington: State Department, Bureau of Public Affairs.

[15] Zubok, Zhivago's Children, 102, 104.

[16] Zubok, Zhivago's Children, 104.

[17] Report about cultural affairs with the United States, 19.4.1972, RGANI f. 5, op. 64, d. 126, ll. 20–24.

competitors, whole opera houses and orchestras started making American and European-wide tours that lasted months. The political dimension of such tours was obvious and it was a logical continuum in increasing Soviet presence in the international arena in general. For instance, simultaneously, the primary Soviet foreign radio broadcasting operation Radio Moscow expanded its volume by 15% per year.[18]

Perhaps even more illustrative was the administrational change that took place. In 1957 Soviet Foreign Ministry that had been shaped by the long rule of Viatcheslav Molotov lost important parts of its power to a new State Committee of Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries (GKKS). This new committee assumed planning and coordination responsibilities over a number of forms of cultural influencing, bilateral agreements with foreign countries included, as well foreign radio programming, publicity campaigns, foreign ties of cultural institutions, exchange of people and so forth. This organ in essence created the Soviet cultural diplomacy. For ten years it exercised power over a number of Soviet ministries, until in 1967 it was terminated and its power returned to ministries. Like another State Committee, KGB, GKKS was more significant than its formal status would seem to be.[19]

One of the core aims of this committee was to replace "Western falsification" with facts about the Soviet Union. Generally, it is important to underline that GKKS was created to control the Soviet public image more effectively and control cultural influencing around the world. Its actions were less aggressive, often putting lessening of Western influence in target countries in the first place and increasing of Soviet influence only to the secondary position. In the West, this typically meant encouraging non-dependence on the United States. Furthermore, the emphasis was less on the superiority of the Soviet system, while inter-cultural solidarity was brought to the fore. This was especially important for many smaller countries, although in practice Soviets often placed their culture in the first place. Even so, reciprocity was underlined in bilateral agreements and gradually became a core element in cultural exchanges.[20]

---

[18] United States Information Agency, "Advance Release: for Monday papers, 1.2.1960", Stanford University: Hoover library collections, 1960. Soviet foreign broadcasts reached 975 hours per week when Voice of America broadcasted 609 hours per week. About Soviet foreign broadcasts more in detail, see Simo Mikkonen, "To control the world's information flows – Soviet Cold War broadcasting", In: Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War, Eds. Andreas Fickers & Alexander Badenoch & Christian Heinrich-Frank, Baden-Baden, Nomos, forthcoming in 2012.

[19] Zhukov's memorandum to Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, 16.7.1959, RGANI f. 5, op. 30, d. 304, ll. 78–84.

[20] Frederick Barghoorn, The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960, 11.

The power of GKKS is also manifested in the fact that the chairman of the Committee, Yuri Zhukov, personally took care of negotiations with foreign governments. Thus, even if the first Soviet-American agreement on cultural exchanges is often called as Lacy-Zarubin act since Ambassador Georgi Zarubin signed the agreement, it was Zhukov who took care of the negotiations.[21] Zhukov was the former deputy editor-in-chief of Pravda, as well as its foreign correspondent, for example to Paris.[22] He was, thus, no alien to foreign or public diplomacy. What is perhaps even more important is that he openly admired US foreign public and cultural diplomacy and the way they were coordinated. He urged that this was something Soviet organs should learn.[23]

Forms of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy

One of early forms of Soviet cultural diplomacy that survived from the Stalin era were radio broadcasting and the distribution of a magazine presenting life in the Soviet Union in a number of foreign languages. Broadcasts consisted typically of programs that were translated into various languages and then broadcast to their target countries. The magazine was similarly general, mostly with translated contents. With the general activation of Soviet cultural diplomacy in the mid-1950s, these materials were updated and better adapted to local circumstances and with more local materials. With many countries, the distribution of a Soviet magazine required reciprocal publishing of a magazine in the Soviet Union, like the magazine called *Amerika* in the US case. While the Communist Party allowed such publications, they also gave strict orders about how to prevent distribution of these magazines and to downplay their influence in the Soviet Union.[24] This is illustrative of different forces in the Soviet administration: hardliners especially within KGB were constantly worried about foreign influences, while GKKS was filled with people whose primary focus was to further Soviet presence in the world and to work for the Soviet image. Thus, when after the Geneve convention Molotov, who was still the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, was against extending foreign contacts, his removal in 1956 made it

[21] Zhukov's memorandum to Pospelov about the meeting with George Allen, 2.1.1958, RGANI f. 5, op. 33, d. 72, l. 1.

[22] Zhukov was displaced as the chair of the Committee in 1962 after which he served in less important post, like as the vice head of the Soviet Peace Committee until 1982.

[23] Zhukov's memorandum to Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party about the US propaganda service, 20.1.1958, RGANI f. 5, op. 30, d. 270, ll. 6–25.

[24] About restructuring VOKS, Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, 5.9.1957, RGANI f. 89, per. 55, d. 21, ll. 3–5. The same document can be found in: RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 28, ll. 1–3.

possible to use embassies and assets of the Foreign Ministry for widening foreign cultural projects.[25] Especially after events in Hungary, the peaceful nature of Soviet foreign policy was being underlined.[26]

Bilateral cultural agreements with a number of foreign countries were typically similar by content, with little variation. They outlined principles for reciprocal exchange of delegations and materials. Often this meant exchange of exhibitions, media contents, musical recordings, but also increased movement of people in the form of delegations, artists, and often also tourists. For Soviet authorities, the foremost field of exchanges was music and dance, which can be seen in the strong presence of concert artists and troupes in the first wave of exchanges. Also, recordings were heavily distributed in the West following agreements. Along with classics, works by leading Soviet composers such as Shostakovich, Kabalevsky, Prokofiev and Khachaturian were prominently featured.[27] Along with music, media was considered highly important. By the summer 1961, radio and television programs were exchanged already with 55 countries altogether. Exchange was naturally most intense with the socialist countries that had their own cooperation organ in OIRT, but documentaries and recordings of major events, as well as some art films were exchanged with Western countries, too.[28]

The Soviet aim in these exchanges was to equal Russian and Soviet high culture with the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union in people's minds. Association between communism and scientific development as well as good and equal life in general were to be strengthened as a result. Positive and cultural connotations, thus, were used for foreign political purposes. Even if détente was the stated purpose, the aim of proving their superiority remained as guiding principle.[29] Exchange programs did not constitute of occasional representatives, but of a selected elite of their fields. Cultural exchange seems to stand out as a mixture of measures aimed at mutual understanding that emphasized peaceful coexistence, and cultural influencing more clearly representing the cultural Cold War. In any case, after the Khrushchev era, cultural diplomacy became part of the normal arsenal of Soviet foreign policy.

Another activity that had in some form existed in the Stalin era, but then became softer and was substantially expanded was that of friendship societies.

---

[25] Zubok, Zhivago's Children, 108, 113.

[26] Zubok, Zhivago's Children, 176.

[27] Memorandum by Zhukov and Chesnokov about agreement on cultural exchanges with the US, 6.5.1958, RGANI f. 5, op. 33, d. 72, ll. 71–85.

[28] Radio and television committee's report about the resolution of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party on 29.1.1960 and development after the resolution, spring 1961, State Archives of the Russian Federation [hereafter GARF] f. 6903, op. 1, d. 675.

[29] Memorandum by Zhukov and Chesnokov about agreement on cultural exchanges with the US, 6.5.1958, RGANI f. 5, op. 33, d. 72, ll. 71–85.

While during the Stalin era they were primarily communist-controlled organizations, doing mostly Soviet-bidding, since the mid-1950s they started to become more clearly cultural organizations, although they still had their ties to Soviet foreign policy. While friendship societies had been controlled by VOKS, in 1957 it was terminated and replaced by SSOD, the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies, which expanded the field and aimed at more active cooperation with the foreign friendship organizations. With SSOD, reciprocity increased notably. SSOD was, for example, very active in sending and receiving all kinds of delegations between the Soviet Union and foreign countries. Under SSOD, there were professional sections which nurtured ties to their foreign counterparts, aiming at furthering knowledge about the Soviet Union through direct ties at the grass-root level.[30] Yet, while biggest friendship societies, like the Finnish-Soviet society, were independent, many others, like the US-Soviet friendship society were funded by the Soviet Union and were only seemingly independent.[31] The division of labor between GKKS and SSOD was in practice clear. SSOD was a visible organization that was in touch with foreign friendship societies on a daily basis. GKKS, in turn, was powerful a State Committee that planned and coordinated actions in the higher levels of administration.

The friendship societies' publicly-expressed purpose was to have friendly ties and to nurture mutual understanding with target countries. Simultaneously, societies were supposed to make the Soviet Union and its people better known and correct false perceptions. The rejection of the ideas conveyed by the Western media was among central purposes.[32] Societies were supposed to arouse sympathy for the Soviet Union and present the Soviet Union as the pillar of the international community. The aim was to find partners from abroad who would spread the Soviet message better than the Soviet Union itself could. Back home, friendship societies were expected to familiarize Soviet people with the life, culture and language in the target countries, manifesting the duality of the Khrushchev era politics. SSOD seemed to offer for moderate people in the Soviet administration a chance to expand foreign contacts, while for the hardliners SSOD provided another channel to spread propaganda abroad.[33]

---

[30] About restructuring VOKS, Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, 5.9.1957, RGANI f. 89, per. 55, d. 21, ll. 1–3.

[31] Zhukov to Central Committee, December 1958; Report of Kazakov and Romanov, 24.2.1959, RGANI f. 5, op. 33, d. 76, ll. 48–53.

[32] Report by section's active regarding meetings with foreign delegations related to cultural relations, summer 1958, GARF f. 9576, op. 16, d. 24. ll. 164–166.

[33] About restructuring VOKS, Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, 5.9.1957, RGANI f. 89, per. 55, d. 21, l. 1–4. Suslov received the draft about establishment of SSOD on 15 August, and secretariat made its decision on 5 September 1957.

The softening Soviet approach to foreign propaganda, and foreign cultural ties in general, did not mean that Soviet authorities abandoned their aims of influencing foreign populations or the ideological competition with the United States. In practice, it was tactics rather than strategy that went through significant changes. Origins of these changes are hard to come by. One source for the change can be found from the Soviet intelligentsia members whom Khrushchev had sent around the world to report to Khrushchev about their experiences. One such trip was made by Boris Polevoy, the author of *Story about a True Man*, who wrote a lengthy letter to Khrushchev in May 1958 advising him in several issues related to Soviet cultural diplomacy. His letter is made significant by the fact that several of his ideas were put into action in the following years, suggesting that Khrushchev decided to follow his advice. Polevoy was convinced about the success of peaceful coexistence.[34] He considered that Soviet propaganda paid too little attention to average people and their issues. There should be more about medical and social security issues, about education and science. There should be less about communism as such, since this alienated many people and made it hard for the message to go through. Furthermore, Polevoy considered that, as outright anti-Soviet attitude had been diminishing in Western media, Soviet media ought to do the same in order to be more plausible.[35]

Although Polevoy's suggestions started to be carried through, the problems were plenty. Editors who were used to rigid bureaucracy could not easily produce new kind of media items. Suggestions for new, more popular programs were titled: "How [the Soviet Communist Party] accelerates progress towards Communism", or "What does the 7-year plan give to Soviet citizens" or "What is the core content of the restructuring of Soviet elementary education?"[36] On the other hand, radio started a major restructuring which resulted in improved news coverage, reporting from the spot, and generally was remodeled towards the Western model.[37] New brochures to be distributed abroad in exhibitions, with Soviet magazines, through friendship societies and in connection with festivals were to be produced. Leading Soviet writers and editors were employed ranging from Mikhail Solokhov, Leonid Leonov and Konstantin Fedin to Nikolay Tikhonov. They were assigned to go around the Soviet Union collecting ex-

[34] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, ll. 8–12.

[35] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, ll. 12–14.

[36] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, ll. 5–6.

[37] Memorandum to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party regarding developing of radio broadcasts to domestic and foreign audiences, 12.12.1959, RGANI f. 11, op. 1, d. 457, ll. 27–41.

periences about the 7-year plan, peaceful coexistence and the role communism played in the improving of people's lives. These pieces of experience were to be the base for new brochures about the Soviet Union.[38]

In order to maximize the impact of cultural exchanges, Soviet presence in Western media was also to be increased. Western journalists and writers were to be tempted to quote Soviet leaders' speeches. For this end, speeches of Soviet leaders were to be translated to English and French and distributed through different channels, ranging from embassies to friendship societies and Radio Moscow.[39] More information about tourist trips to the Soviet Union was also to be spread.[40] Polevoy's suggestion about arranging grants for foreign writers and editors to visit the Soviet Union if their work was believed to support political ends was also taken to heart.[41] The Soviet objective, thus, seems to have been to find as powerful local actors to further the Soviet foreign political agenda, instead of merely producing and executing their own contents.

Many of the methods related with Soviet cultural influencing would be seen in the West as normal transnational relations, however, as the Communist Party controlled Soviet Union foreign ties, they were always political by nature. Thus, while foreign radio broadcasting was on both sides seen as political activity, concert tours were in the West part of the market-based activity, whereas for the Soviet Union they were part of the cultural front of foreign policy. Indeed, the mobility of artists was central for the Soviet Union; reports by the Soviet Ministry of Culture to the Central Committee of the Party point this out clearly. In the first half of 1960, the Soviet Ministry of Culture invited 663 artists from 31 countries to perform in the Soviet Union. During the same period, 2,905 Soviet artists performed in 53 countries. The destinations of more than half of these trips were capitalist countries.[42] Naturally, these figures do not include trips made through friendship societies, or other organizations. The Ministry of Culture also sent typically the same artists to foreign tours over and over again. As bilateral agreements were accomplished there were typically one or more tours by leading dance companies, like Moiseyev's National Dance Company, Beriozka group, Georgian or Ukrainian National Dance Companies, Bolshoi Ballet, and naturally Red Army Song and Dance group. All of the aforementioned

[38] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, l. 2.
[39] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, ll. 2–3.
[40] About the letter of Polevoy to Khrushchev, 12.5-26.12.1958, RGANI f. 89, per. 46, d. 13, l. 3.
[41] Memoranda to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party about foreign cultural relations, summer 1959, RGANI f. 5, op. 36, d. 92, ll. 20–22.
[42] Report by the Ministry of Culture about foreign business traveling, August 1960, RGANI f. 5, op. 36, d. 125, ll. 134–136.

presented core elements for Soviet propaganda: friendship between different nations and national traditions in the Soviet Union.[43]

Reasons for choosing only top artists were clearly political. The Soviet authorities wanted to prove the superiority of the Soviet system. In 1959, the Central Committee of the Party listed all international prizes won by Soviet musicians since 1936. There were 149 artists who had won 41 first, 22 second and 19 third prizes. Also, there had been six international festivals in which 162 Soviet musicians had won 75 golden, 67 silver and 20 bronze medals. For the Party, this was a clear sign of the highest level of Soviet musical culture.[44] And yet, the Party was not all satisfied with the training of top talents, but wanted more.[45] Furthermore, another important core principle for cultural exchanges was being neglected: pieces they played consisted too much of Western classics while there should have been more Russian and Soviet compositions. For the Party, these artists were messengers of Soviet culture, therefore, music that was essentially Soviet ought to have featured more prominently.[46]

Tourism was also present when there was talk of cultural exchange. Foreign tourism with capitalist countries started in the mid-1950s, both to and from the Soviet Union. While at first ordinary citizens were rarities among tourists, their share increased later on.[47] In practice, Soviet foreign tourism consisted of group trips with strict programs, which typically had a group leader, a "nanny", hired by KGB to look after the group. Such trips were used for establishing foreign ties of all kinds, as well as exploited for introducing Soviet culture. This could either be distribution of Soviet publications or, like in one case, the continuous concert activity by professional musicians in what was officially a tourist trip.[48] While friendship societies did not have the biggest tourist quotas, they are quite representative of early foreign tourist trips. They were supposed to further Party

[43] Number of outgoing artists from the Soviet Union was constantly four times greater than that of incoming foreign artists in the latter half of the 1950s.

[44] Decision of the Ideological Commission "regarding definiciencies in training of Soviet musicians to international competitions," 1.10.1959, RGANI f. 11, op. 1, d. 49, l. 19. See also an earlier related memorandum, 17.6.1959, RGANI f. 5, op. 30, d. 102, ll. 67–69.

[45] Report by the Ministry of Culture about the results of the international Tchaikovsky violin competition, 22.4.1958, RGANI f. 5, op. 36, d. 71, ll. 17–27.

[46] Memorandum by Cultural section of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party about deficiencies in training Soviet musicians to international competitions, 17.6.1956, RGANI f. 5, op. 36, d. 102, l. 69.

[47] Memorandum about foreign tourism to the Soviet Union, spring 1954, RGANI f.5, op. 30, d. 70, ll. 110–112.

[48] Report by the Italian section of SSOD about trip to Italy, May 1960, GARF f. 9576, op. 16, d. 12, ll. 21–24. Vera Dulova and Alexander Baturin, who worked at Bolshoi of Moscow, participated in the Italian roundtrip and gave concerts practically in every town they visited.

objectives through fresh ties between target countries and the Soviet Union. Those selected to such trips had to be loyal, have correct political views and in addition listen before the trip instructions on how to behave abroad. There was constant cooperation with Inturist, the Soviet tourist organization, for fulfilling political objectives of trips. Soviet tourists were also encouraged to meet people with similar professions, but also their countrymen, representatives of same nationalities and to publicize their old home countries for them.[49]

Conclusion

While the early stages of Soviet cultural diplomacy did not last long and relaxations of the early Khrushchev era soon turned sour, many forms of cultural exchange and bilateral agreement themselves were kept alive. Thus, foreign influences kept flowing to the Soviet Union, which likely was very important not only for the corrosion of the Soviet system, but also for individuals living in the Soviet Union. There is certainly a dire need to produce more research especially about the impact of cultural exchanges on individuals on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

In the late 1950s, the significance of direct propaganda was downplayed by the Soviet Union and there was more strain on indirect operations. The Soviet administration showed appetite for an American style cultural diplomacy. Even if some of these tendencies were real, aiming at détente, they were occupied by direct propaganda and aspirations of hardliners during the Brezhnev era. Yet, this period of ten years is very important as then foreign connections increased drastically, in practice bringing the Soviet Union to the international arena in large scale, but also enabling the flow of Western influences to the Soviet orbit.

What this framework of cultural exchanges made possible was to open new worlds for individuals. While they counted as political action for the Communist Party, individuals who participated in them, either as artists, tourists, or perhaps receiving foreign visitors did not typically consider their work as political. Instead of seeing themselves as representatives of the Soviet Union, it might have been much more important for them to establish professional contacts, or to find consumer goods unavailable in the Soviet Union. Or in the case of a Finnish tourist to Leningrad or Tallinn, instead of testifying superiority of the Soviet system in cultural events, this tourist might rather have suffered from severe hangover caused by cheap alcohol.

[49] About tourist trips of SSOD to foreign countries, Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, 20.5.1961, RGANI f. 89, per. 55 d. 8, ll. 1–2, 5–6.

For a small country such as Finland, cultural exchanges made it possible to receive top artists of international level in scale unimaginable without the Cold War. Finland, lying on the northern edge of Europe, was far away from Central European or British top arenas. But Finnish neutrality and connections both to the East and the West made Finland a special case, inducing top artists from both capitalist and Communist worlds. Especially during the immediate postwar years, the Soviets attempted more actively to change people's perceptions about the Soviet Union, but as this work in Finland hardly reached larger segments of population, softer methods were taken into use towards the 1950s. This is especially well manifested in the changing face of the Finnish-Soviet friendship society, which dropped politics almost completely from its agenda. Views about the Soviet Union also started to change and the society became a genuine mass organization, with others besides Communists joining in from the late 1950s onwards in growing numbers. This was made possible by the cultural work conducted by the society, as well as large scale tourism, in which the society was involved.

In conclusion, it can be said that the Soviet Union used cultural exchanges to its political aims, and attempted at furthering its agenda especially forcefully in smaller countries that were neighboring the Soviet Union. Towards Finland, exchange was surely dominated by the Soviet culture, but tourism from the Soviet Union to Finland grew continuously, and in other fields, too, exchange was, if not equal, then at least it worked both ways. Finland did not fall victim to Soviet cultural pressure, but in most cases, benefited from cultural exchange. For many, the Soviet Union provided the first touch to internationalism already at elementary school, either in the form of visiting delegations from abroad, or as visits to friendship schools abroad. Thus, while the Soviet Union managed to lure people to act in ways that benefited the Soviet Union, to participate in friendship societies and programs, to visit the Soviet Union and so forth, most participated out of their own motivation and did not feel they represented or served the Soviet Union. Although several Western citizens have been accused of working for the Soviet Union, actually quite few did so. More often they had their own reasons to act in ways they did, even while the Soviet Union perceived this was for their benefit. Working for the Soviet Union was thus much rarer than conspiracy theories would suggest. In the Finnish case, more often individuals and Finnish societies and organizations benefited from cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union and therefore engaged in cooperation with the Soviet Union. Their motivation was very seldom their belief in the superiority of the Soviet system, or its adaption to Finland.

László Pallai

Alternativen gegen den deutschen wirtschaftlichen Einbruch im Ostmitteleuropa während der Weltwirtschaftskrise

Seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts spielte Ost- und Mitteleuropa in der deutschen Außenwirtschaftspolitik und Machtpolitik eine wichtige Rolle.[1] Hier handelt es sich um eine Region, die von den Politikern, Ökonomisten, Schriftstellern und Künstlern in Anbetracht des Inhalts und der geographischen Grenzen mit vielen Bezeichnungen und Namen apostrophiert worden war. In dem letzten Jahrhundert konnte man sich mit solchen Benennungen, wie Ostmitteleuropa, Mitteleuropa, Zwischeneuropa, Donauraum usw. begegnen. Diese Termini haben ihre eigene Geschichte. Unter diesen Begriffen ist das „Mitteleuropa" eine abwechlungsreiche Bahn verlaufen. Mitteleuropa war im Laufe des ersten Weltkrieges das offizielle Kriegsziel, im NS-Zeitalter war es wegen seiner rassischen Nebenbedeutung kompromittiert; dieser Begriff wurde in den 1980er Jahren wieder geboren frei von dem negativen Inhalt. Der Spielraum der deutschen Außenpolitik war in den 1920er Jahren durchaus eng. Die Weltwirtschaftskrise aber eröffnete neue Möglichkeiten. Die Wirtschaftskrise tauchte in der mittel- und osteuropäischen Region früh auf, in Form der Agrarkrise. Derzeit war Deutschland der grösste Agrarimporteur Europas. Diese Tatsache garantierte bedeutende politische Aktivität und Möglichkeit für die deutsche Politik und Aspirationen in der Region. Der vorliegende Aufsatz versucht diejenigen Anstrengungen zusammenzufassen, die das Ziel hatte, um das deutsche wirtschaftliche Invasion in Ostmitteleuropa und ihre schweren politischen Konsequenzen zu verhindern.

---

[1] Die ausführlichste Zusammenfassung über Deutschlands Mitteleuropa-Pläne seit dem Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts siehe bei: Henry Cord Meyer: *Mitteleuropa in German Thought and Actoin 1815–1945.* Den Haag, 1955. Die sorgfältige Zusammenfassung der deutschen Mitteleuropa-Pläne der Zwischenkriegszeit von: Jürgen Elvert: *Mitteleuropa! Deutsche Pläne zur europäischen Neuordnung (1918–1945).* Stuttgart, 1999. Aus der jüngsten Fachliteratur die folgenden sind wichtig zu erwähnen: Friedrich Lenz: *Deutsche Mitteleuropapläne 1815–1945. Eine Studie zum modernen Imperialismus und zur Formation der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden-Amöneburg*. 2008., Hermann Graml: *Berhard von Bülow und die Deutsche Außenpolitik. Hybris und Augenmaß im Außwärtigen Amt.* München, 2012.

Die Weltwirtschaftskrise bedeutete einen Wendepunkt sowohl in den politischen, wirtschaflitchen und gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse der Zwischenkriegszeit, als auch in den Integrationsbestrebungen, die nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg eine neue Blütezeit hatten.[2] Solche ökonomische und politische Umlagerungen erfolgten sich, die das Spielraum der Integrationsgedanken im Vergleich zu den Zwanzigerjahren im beträchtlichen Maße vermehrten.[3]

Angesichts der Integrationspläne ist es keine Überraschung, dass um die Wende der 1930er Jahren solche Vorstellungen in einer grossen Zahl entstanden. Viele formulierten das Gedanke der Annäherung als Alternative, eine Technik der Krisenbehandlung. Zur Verwirklichung der Einheitsbestrebungen trat eine Chance in einem Zeitpunkt auf, als die existierende wirtschaftlich-politische Einrichtung durchaus schwank wurde, und man formulierte die Möglichkeit und Notwendigkeit der Schöpfung einer neuen Struktur. Diese Beobachtung ist besonders gültig für die Jahren der Krise. Darauf weist das Gedanke des Artikels verfasst 1933 von dem früheren Ministerpräsidenten und Äußenminister Frankreichs – Pierre-Étienne Flandin – hin, nämlich: „Es wäre eine grosse Irrtum zu glauben, dass die heutige Lage Mitteleuropas für eine lange Zeit aufrechterhalten werden kann".[4]

Ein neues Element war die Dominanz der Vorstellungen wirtschaftlichen Inhalts. Das kann mit dem Wesen der Krise erklärt werden. Ein anderer neuer Aspekt ist das, dass die Integrationsgedanken auch der Politik und der politischen Öffentlichkeit annäherten. Diese Gedanken erschienen früher nur in Form als Eigeninitiativen. Viele Politiker der ehemaligen Siegermächte identifizierten sich mit dem Gedanken der Integration. (Aristide Briand, André Tardieu, Eduard Beneš, Juliu Maniu usw.) Diese Umstände sicherten der Politiker der Einheitsbestrebungen ein grösseres Handlungsspielraum. Zahlreiche Politiker, ökonomische Experten formulierten wieder die Notwendigkeit der wirtschaftlichen Annäherung der Nachfolgerstaaten, zur Situation abpassend, die durch die Krise entstanden worden war. In der instabile gewordenen Situation entstanden mehrere Vorstellungen und Pläne, die sich nach der Verhinderung des deutschen

---

[2] Zu den Ursachen und Wirkungen der Weltwirtschaftskrise siehe: Kindleberger, Charles P.: *Die Weltwirtschaftskrise 1929–1939.* München, 1984., Cipolla, Carlo M. (Hrsg.): *Europäische Wirtschaftsgeschichte. 5. kötet. Die europäische Volkswirtschaften im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert.* Stuttgart–New York, 1980., Graml, Hermann: *Europa zwischen den Kriegen.* München, 1969., Hillgruber, Andreas: *Die Zerstörung Europas. Beiträge zur Weltkriegsepoche 1914 bis 1945.* Frankfurt am Main–Berlin, 1989. Kaser, M. C. – Radice, E. A. (Ed.): *The Ecomomic History of Eastern Europe 1919–1975. Volume II. Interwar policy, the War and Reconstruction.* Oxford, 1986.

[3] Über die Vorgänge in dem Wirtschaftsleben der 1920er Jahre: Aldrocft, Derek H.: *Die zwanziger Jahre. Von Versailles zur Wall Street 1919–1929.* München, 1978.

[4] Berend, Iván T.: *Válságos évtizedek.* (Krisenhafte Jahrzehnte) Budapest, 1987. 408.

wirtschaftlichen Eindringens in die Region bestrebten. Die Folgen der deutschen wirtschaftlichen Revision war klar.

Während der Krise die Einheitsbestrebungen erschienen in recht unterschiedlichen Formen. Ihr gemeinsames Merkmal ist die Suche nach der Lösung der Wirtschaftskrise. Die Integrationsvorstellungen, die die Krise behandelten, tauchten in den folgenden Ebenen auf.

l: die Suche nach dem Ausgang in dem Rahmen des Weltwirtschaftssystems.
2: Lösungen auf der europäischen Ebene.
3: Regionale Einheitsbestrebungen.
4: Bilaterale Übereinkunfte.
5: Grossmächtige Regelung.

Die neuen Bedingungen der Integrationsbestrebungen wird durch die Tatsache charakterisiert, dass durch Aristide Briand erstmals die Idee der europäischen Einheit erstmals von einer Grossmacht offiziel unterstützt wurde.[5] Am 5. September 1929 brachte er in Den Haag, an der 10. Tagung des Völkerbundes die Idee der *Vereinigten Staaten Europas* vor. Als die französische Regierung teilte ihr Memorandum den europäischen Mächte am 17. Mai 1930 mit, wurde diese Initiative ein offizielles politisches Programm; die Antwort sollte bis zum 15. Juli zurückgekommen werden. Die Veröffentlichung der Paneuropa-Idee von Briand war nicht ohne Voraussetzung, denn er war eine bekannte Figur der Paneuropa-Bewegung in seinem Heimatland. Er war auch der erste unter den Politikern, die das Program der Verwirklichung der europäischen Einheit in einer offiziellen Form verfasste. Am Anfang des Planes dominierten die wirtschaftlichen Überlegungen, das heißt, er hatte die Ansicht um die europäischen Länder in einer Zollunion zu vereinen. Die Verkündigung des Plans von Briand waren nicht nur durch die Wirtschaftsproblemen der Krise begründet, sondern diejenige Anerkennung europäischer Politiker und wirtschaftlichen Fachleute, dass die ökonomischen Prozesse in der Richtung der Entstehung der immer grösseren wirtschaftlichen Systeme irreversibel fortschritten. Der politische Inhalt des Briand-Plans wurde aber immer eindeutlicher. Die Bestätigung des europäischen Status quo unter dem französischen Einfluß wurde von mehreren Regierungen abgelehnt. In dem Moment der Erschütterung der Versöhnungspolitik versuchte die französische Regierung, dass gleich vor der allgemeinen Debatte über die revisionischen Einforderungen, Deutschland in ein europäisches System zu integrieren. Der Plan war zugleich eine Krisenstrategie auch, die als

[5] Über den Plan Briands siehe Barraclaugh, Geoffry: Die Einheit Europas als Gedanke und Tat. Göttingen, 1964., Brugmans, Henri: L'Idée Européenne 1920–1970. Bruges, 1970., Nelböck, Friedrich: Kleine Beiträge zum Kampf um Völkerbund, Paneuropa, Mitteleuropa. Brünn–Prag–Leizig–Wien, 1930., Pegg, Carl H. (Ed.): Evolution of the European Idea 1914–1932. Chapell Hill–London, 1983.

Alternative gegen die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Angriffe Deutschlands nach Österreich und Südost-Europa diente.

Es gaben viele, die das Gedanke der Integration unterstützten, aber sie sahen es stufenweise, nach der Realisierung des regionalen Zusammenschlusses zu verwirklichen. Sie übten an den Entwurf von Briand eine scharfe Kritik. Sie betrachteten die Schaffung von Paneuropa als eine wirtschaftliche Notwendigkeit, aber es wäre möglich nur in dem Verlauf der Vereinigung der kleineren Einheiten, wie z. B. das neue Mitteleuropa. Die Aktion Briands in dem Völkerbund, mit der er den politischen Bund der europäischen Staaten in den Vordergrund stellte, schädigte mehr, als es der wirtschaftlichen Näherung der europäischen Länder beitrug. Die Zollunion als Endziel kann niemals außer Acht genommen werden, aber wir müssen damit klar sein, dass ihre Verwirklichung ohne Stationen nicht möglich sein kann. Es wäre also unrichtig, die Kooperation der historisch, geographisch und wirtschaftlich zusammenhängenden Gebiete in der Schwebe halten oder verschieben bis zur Entstehung eines gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftsbundes oder zu dem zollpolitischen Waffenstillstand. Die Konzeption der europäischen Einheit in einer offiziellen Form erwies sich also kurzlebig. In bescheidener Maße beförderten sie die Entstehung jenes politischen Umstandes, in dem die mittel- und südosteuropäischen Einheitspläne mit grosser Intensität sich entfalten konnten. Später wurden die regionale und bilaterale Vorstellungen dominant, als ein Weg aus der Krise. Das Zurückdringen der Idee Paneuropas wurde nicht nur durch die neue außenpolitische Richtlinie der Grossmächte geprägt, sondern durch den Personenwechsel. Der Tod Gustav Stresemanns in 1929 und die Sturz Briands in 1932 bedeutete die Politik der Grossmächte auch.

Die Krise tauchte in den Nachfolgestaaten vor allem als Absatzproblem auf. Die Lösung der Überproduktion bedeutete die grösste Herausforderung. Die internationalen Konferenzen und Integrationspläne hatten die Ansicht um diese Frage zu ordnen. Die verschiedenen Vorschläge untersuchten die Verlagerungsmöglichkeiten, die Verminderung der Zölle und die Verfahren der Produktionsregelungen. Die folgende Tabelle zeigt die Veränderung der Menge des Exportweizens in der Krisenzeit. Der Weizen und andere Getreidesorten gehörten zu den wichtigsten Exportartikeln der Region.

Die Menge des Exportweizens, in Millionen q[6]						
Land	1928–29	1929–30	1930–31	1931–32	1932–33	1933–34
Sechs Agrarländer in dem Donauraum	*9*	*15*	*14*	*23*	*3*	*15*
USA	98	111	106	130	107	62
Kanada	140	84	109	91	128	96
Der übrige Waizen-überschuss der Welt	391	306	378	377	358	297
Waizenimport Europas	179	140	168	167	120	102

In der Tabelle kann man klar und eindeutig sehen, dass die Menge des Exportwiezens der Staaten des Donauraumes grosse Schwingung zeigt, und sein Volumen war im Vergleich mit der europäischen Weizenausfuhr unbedeutend. Es war der Grund jener Vorstellung, dass die Weizenkrise im Donauraum auch in europäischen Rahmen gelöst werden kann, wenn die traditionellen Importeure gegen die transatlantischen Gebiete die Agrarstaaten Mittel- und Osteuropas bevorzugen. Das Preferenzsystem erschien als die beste Möglichkeit der praktischen Verwirklichung dieser Vorstellung.

Nach der Sturz des Briand-Plans wurde die wirtschaftliche Konsolidation der Region eine ständige Frage der internationalen Konferenzen und Tagungen. In der Genfer Konferenz für Zollwesen im Jahre 1930 schlugen die Franzosen die Begrenzung der Meistbegünstigkeit und die Einführung des Preferenzsystem für die Agrarstaaten vor.[7] Die Vereinigten Staaten, England und andere westliche Mächte versteiften sich noch für die vollständige Freiheit des Handels. Das bevorstehende Fiasko der Konferenz wurde dadurch offensichtlich, dass unter den Gesandten der sechsundzwanzig Staaten nur acht über Stimmberechtigung verfügte. Seitens der Franzosen war Loucher der Anreger, der auch der geistige Vater der Weltwirtschaftskonferenz von 1927 gewesen war.

Die Lösung der Marktprobleme suchend tauchte die Idee des Preferenzsystems auf, mit dem sich auch die Gemeinschaft der ungarischen Ökonomen abgab. Mehrere Möglichkeiten standen zu ihrer Anwendung offen. Die Figuren

---

[6] Elekes, Dezső: *A dunavölgyi kérdőjel. A dunakörnyéki Közép-Európa gazdasági problémája.* (Das Fragezeichen in dem Donauraum. Das Wirtschaftsproblem Mitteleuropas) Budapest, 1934. 90.

[7] Über die Konferenz berichtet: Zelovich, László: *Az 1930. évi genfi vámfegyverszüneti konferencia.* (Die Genfer Konferenz über den Zollwaffenstillstand von 1930) In: Magyar Szemle (Ungarische Rundschau), November 1930. 225–233., Ders: *A legnagyobb kedvezmény kérdése és az 1930. évi genfi vámkonferencia.* (Die Frage der Meistbegünstigkeit und die Genfer Zollkonferenz von 1930) In: Közgazdasági szemle (Ökonomische Rundschau), 74. Band, 1930. 295–305.

des Wirtschaftslebens arbeiteten mehrere Vorstellungen zur wirtschaftlichen Kooperation der Donaustaaten heraus und befürworteten die sg. „protektionnele Präferenz". In diesem System verringern sich die Zölle inwärts nicht, sondern vergrößern sich auswärts. Großbritannien verwendete diese Lösung nach 1932, als sie steigerte die Agrarzölle auswärts deswegen, um Vergünstigungen ihren Dominien zu bieten. Wegen der schon hohen Zölle bedeutete diese Lösung keine Linderung. Eine andere Lösung war die „zollunionartige Präferenz", die annuliert die Zollmauer inwärts vollständig, und vertritt eine einheitliche Handelspolitik auswärts. Die Meinungen über die Beziehung zwischen Präferenz und Freihandel waren durchaus unterschiedlich. Einige hatten die Absicht, dass die Präferenz das Mittel des Protekzionismus ist, und so ist der liberalen Auffassung der Handelsfreiheit gegenseitig. Andere waren aber der Meinung, dass die Präferenz nicht die Leugnung der Handelsfreiheit wäre, sondern es ist ihre Fortentwicklung. Richard Riedl, der einstige Botschafter Österreichs in Berlin und viele anderen äußerten sich, dass in der Mitte der Zollkämpfe und kommerziellen Beschränkungen die alte Interpretation der Handelsfreiheit ihre Aktualität verloren hatte.

Zwei Gedankensysteme tauchten im Zusammenhang mit der Lösung des Marktproblems auf. Das eine ist der Versuch der Schaffung der Agrarblöcke, und das andere ist die Vereinbarung der Industrie- und Agrarstaaten miteinander. Die Krisenjahren schöpften die praktischen Rahmen der wirtschaftlichen Zusammenarbeit der mitteleuropäischen Agrarländer. Die Agrarkonferenzen der Nachfolgestaaten zwischen 1930 und 1932 galten als eine neue Erscheinung in dem Prozess der Integrationsbestrebungen.[8]

Während der 1920er konnte man die mehrseitigen Verhandlungen der Staaten der Region nicht veranstalten. Im Rahmen der Mitteleuropäische Wirtschaftstagung (weiter *MWT*) war eine Konferenz für Schifffahrtswesen in Budapest im Mai 1929 die erste inoffizielle Veranstaltung, wo alle Nachfolgestaaten vertraten sich selbst.[9]

Die Veranstaltung der mitteleuropäischen Agrarkonferenzen inspirierten die grösste Hoffnung der Zusammenarbeit und des deutschen wirtschaftlichen Eindringens. Die westlichen Mächte konnten aber keine Impulse geben, die irgendeine Ergebnisse gehabt hätten, obwohl in der Organisation der Agrarkonferen-

---

[8] Über diese Konferenzen zusammenfassend siehe: Elekes: *A dunavölgyi kérdőjel,* a. a. O.., Riedl, Richard: *Statistische Grundlagen innereuropäischer Handelspolitik.* Berlin–Grunewald, 1933., Ders.: *Két világgazdasági konferencia között.* (Zwischen zwei weltwirtschaftlichen Konferenzen) In: Külügyi Szemle (Außenpolitische Rundschau) 1933/2. 104–116.

[9] Der Bericht über die Konferenz: Hantos, Elemér: *Mitteleuropäische Wasserstraßenpolitik.* Wien, 1929.

zen sowohl der Völkerbund als auch der Römische Internationale Landwirtschaftliche Anstalt teilgenommen hatte.

Viele Politiker und Agrarfachleute grüssten den Gedanken der Agrarkonferenzen. Sie gingen daraus, dass die bisherigen isolierten Versuche zur Lösung des Absatzproblems der Landwirtschaft – wie z. B. das Boletta-System in Ungarn und in anderen mitteleuropäischen Ländern – nur geringe Ergebnisse hatten.

Die erste Konferenz fand im August 1930 mit der Teilnahme von Ungarn, Jugoslawien und Rumänien in Bukarest statt.[10] Sie schlugen die Gestaltung eines preferenzialen Zollsystems gegen das überseeischen Getreide. Sie unterstützten die Schöpfung kartellartiger Vereinbarungen, wie Elemér Hantos, im Gebiet der Landwirtschaft auch. Sie meinten die Aufhebung der konkurrenzbeschränkenden Verbote und tiermedizinische Regulierungen notwendig. Die Verteidigung gegen die Preisschwankung wurde mit der Entstehung eines internationalen Lagerungssystems möglich gesehen.

Die nächste Konferenz wurde in Sinaia um die Wende von Juli und August mit der Teilnahme von Jugoslawien und Rumänien veranstaltet. Der Gedanke der hier vorgeschlagene Zollunion löste die Bangigkeit seitens der anderen Agrarstaaten aus, weil sie darin eine mögliche Form einer späteren wirtschaftlichen Kleinentente entdeckt hätten. Die bedeutsamste Agrarkonferenz fand im August 1930 in Warschau statt, wo – außer Österreich – sowohl die fünf Donauländer, als auch Bulgarien, Estland und Lettland sich selbst repräsentierten. Die hier ausgearbeiteten Vorschläge waren die folgenden: die Aufhebung der Exportprämien, die Errichtung eines internationalen Exportanstaltes, Abschluss multilaterale Handelsverträge, die Schaffung des Gleichgewichtes in dem Außenhandel, die Regelmäßigkeit der Agrarländer zur Verwirklichung der gemeinsamen Interessenvertretung. Die nächste Veranstaltung erfolgte in Belgrad, im September 1930. Unter den Teilnehmern befand sich Polen auch. Man formulierte hier die Gedanken einer gemeinsamen Exportstrategie und die Aufrichtung eines internationalen Büros. In der Konferenz von Sofia im Dezember 1931 erschienen die Gesandten und Fachleute Polens und Estlands neben die der Donauländer. Der wichtigste Betreff der Tagung war die finanzielle Frage infolge der zwischenzeitlichen Kreditkrise. Die Agrarländer betrachteten die Schuldenverwaltung, die durch die Errichtung einer international landwirtschafltichen Kreditbank durchführbar sein kann.

In der Krisenzeit verschärfte sich die mitteleuropäische Aktivität Italiens auch.[11] Mit seinen Empfehlungen hätte es die Absicht seinen Einfluß in dem Donauraum zu erhöhen. Es mangelten sich aber an die notwendigen wirtschaft-

[10] Elekes: *A dunavölgyi kérdőjel,* a. a. O. 130.

[11] Frey, András: *Olaszország külpolitikája az Abesszin viszályig.* (Außenpolitik Italiens bis zur Abessinenkrise) In: Magyar Szemle (Ungarische Rundschau), Oktober 1935. 188–196.

lichen Mittel. Ignazio Brocchi entwickelte den Entwurf, der später nach ihm genannt worden ist, der potentiellen Preferenzen in sich verbarg. Mit der Amplifikation des Planes auf Österreich wollte man die Näherung dessen an Deutschland verhindern. Das System wurde 1932 vollständig, aber es erwies sich für die Behandlung des Marktproblems unzulänglich. Die steigernde italienische Erkundigung wurde dadurch bezeugt, dass unter der Mitwirkung des Internationalen Landwirtschaftlichen Anstalts in Rom eine überstaatliche Getreidetagung veranstaltet wurde, wohin 46 Länder ihre Delegaten geschickt hatte. Seit 1927 konnte man erstmals eine solche Wirtschaftskonferenz unter einem Dach bringen, wo auch die transatlantischen Agrarexporteure dabei waren. Wesentliche Entscheidungen aber nicht gefällt sind, weil die überseeischen Gebiete protestierten gegen das Preferenzsystem für die europäischen Staaten, das auch vom Frankreich nicht eindeutig unterstützt worden war. Die Delegaten stimmten nur in der Frage der Errichtung einer landwirtschafltichen Hypothekenbank unter der Ägide des Völkerbundes miteinander überein. Das Problem der Lagerung des agrarwirtschaftlichen Überschusses tauchte in anderen Tagungen auf. In London sammelten sich die agrarausführenden Staaten im Mai 1931 zusammen. Interessanterweise fand man unter diesen Ländern die Sowjetunion auch. Während der Krisenperiode wurde die Verhältnis der Sowjetunion mit den übrigen Agrarländern wegen der Dumping-Klage sehr angespannt.[12] Die Teilnehmer hatten die Meinung, dass die Krise mit der Einschränkung der Produktion, der Steigerung des Verbrauchs und der Festsetzung des Exportkontingents behandelt werden kann. Nach einem Monate später trafen sich die Teilnehmer eines landwirtschaftlichen Kongresses in Prag. Die hier entworfenen Vorschläge klangen mit den bisherigen Empflehlungen zusammen. Sie brachten einen Antrag zu der Milderung der Importzölle, der Einrichtung eines preferenzialen Zollsystems und der Organisation eines zentralen Beschaffungsanstaltes ein.

Die Konferenzen konnten aber keine wesentlichen Veränderungen erzielen. Der Verwirklichung der aufgetauchten Empfehlungen mangelten sich an die Unterstützung der Großmächte, denn sie wollten in der traditionellen Prinzipien des internationalen Handels zugunsten des preferenzialen Systems nicht lassen. Ein wichtiger Aspekt war das auch, dass die Vorschläge, die von den Großmächten später verfasst worden sind, stützen sich auf die Empfehlungen der früheren Tagungen in einem beträchtlichen Maße. Es wurde auch ersichtlich, dass die wirtschaftliche Zukunft des Donauraumes nicht durch Agrarkonferen-

[12] Zur Konflikt der mitteleuropäischen Agrarstaaten mit der Sowjetunion siehe: Kövér, György: *A Szovjetunió és Közép-Kelet-Európa. Gazdasági érintkezés a két világháború között.* (Die Sowjetunion und Ostmitteleuropa. Wirtschaftliche Kontakte in der Zwischenkriegszeit) In: Történelmi Szemle (Historische Rundschau), 1986/3–4. 481–489., Kiss, Dezső: *Az orosz dumping.* (Das russische Dumping) In: (Außenpolitische Rundschau) 1931/3. 306–319.

zen und anderen Tagungen bestimmt werden kann, sondern das Folgen des Wettbewerbs der Großmächte miteinander.

Dieser großmächtige Wetteifer um die wirtschaftliche Organisation des Donauraumes entfaltete sich fürwahr, als Deutschland trat hervor.[13] Stresemann führte eine Politik innerhalb der Rahmen des Friedenssystems von Versailles um den möglichts grösste Handlungsspielraum für Deutschland zu schaffen. Heinrich Brüning versuchte dieses politische System zu verändern und die Bewegungsmöglichkeiten zu benützen, die einst von Stresemnann geschaffen worden waren. Die neue Richtlinie der deutsche Außenpolitik wurde durch die Personenwechsel bezeugt. Kanzel Brüning, Außenminister Julius Curtius und Bernhard Bülow, Staatssekretär der äußeren Angelegenheiten vetraten diejenigen deutschen außenpolitischen Ideen, die die von der Rückgewinnung der alten ost-mitteleuropäischen wirtschaftlichen Positionen die Möglichkeit der Revision erhofften. Bülow fasste im August 1930 diese Möglichkeit folgendermaßen zusammen: „Besser als in den übrigen Teilen Europas, die Sachen in Südost-Europa sind bildsam und beweglich. Die deutsche Außenpolitik muss lostreten, weil die künftige Chancen Deutschlands befinden sich dort."[14] Diese Veränderung der deutschen Außenpolitik war in den Debatten innerhalb der MWT greifbar.[15] Früher zeigte Deutschland eine viel kleinere Aktivität trotz seiner wirtschaftlichen Möglichkeiten. Jetzt veränderte es sich auch. Nach dem Besuch des deutschen Außenministers zu Wien im Februar 1931 kündigten die beiden Regierungen an, dass sie eine solche Vereinbarung abgeschlossen hatten, die die Zollunion zwischen den beiden Ländern ermöglichte.[16] Der Plan der deutsch–

[13] Über die deutsche „Mitteleuropa"-Pläne und die deutsche Politik im Mitteleuropa siehe: Brechtefeld, Jörg: *Mitteleuropa and German Politics. 1848 to the Present.* New York, 1996., Droz, Jacques: *Évolution historique de l'Idée "Mitteleuropa".* Paris, 1960. Elvert, Jürgen: *Mitteleuropa! Deutsche Pläne zur europäischen Neuordnung.* Stuttgart, 1999., Groß, Hermann: *Die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung Südosteuropas für das Deutsche Reich.* Stuttgart–Berlin, 1938., Meyer, Henry Cord: *Mitteleuropa in Germain Thought and Action 1815–1945.* The Hague. 1955., Schöllgen, Richard: *Die Macht in der Mitte. Sationen deutscher Außenpolitik von Friedrich dem Großen bis zum Gegenwart.* München, 1992.

[14] Romsics, Ignác: *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében.* (Unser Ort und Schicksal im Donauraum) Budapest, 1996. 195.

[15] Über diesen Vorgang vgl. Szevera, Walter: *Die Mitteleuropadebatte in der 30-er und 80-er Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts in Österreich: ökonomische, politische, kulturelle Aspekte einer konservativen Diskussion.* Dipl. Arbeit. Wien, 1991. 26.

[16] Über das Projekt der deutsch–österreichischen Zollunion siehe: Gratz, Gusztáv: *A német–osztrák vámunió kérdéséhez. Magyarország Középeurópai Intézete Közlemények* 2. (Zur Frage der deutsch–österreichischen Zollunion. Mitteilungen des Ungarischen Mitteleuropa-Instituts) Budapest, 1931.; Ders.: *A német–osztrák vámunió terve.* (Der Plan der deutsch–österreichischen Zollunion) In: Külügyi Szemle (Außenpolitische Rundschau), 1931/3. 277–288., Ormos, Mária: *Franciaország és a keleti biztonság 1931–1936.* (Frankreich und die östliche Sicherheit 1931–1936) Budapest, 1969. 60–79.

österreichischen Zollunion löste eine grosse Befürchtung europaweit aus. Trotz des Kommuniques beider Regierungen, die den wirtschaftlichen Charakterzug des Planes betonte, die europäische Öffentlichkeit sah das Vorbild des Anschlusses in der deutsch–österreichischen wirtschaftlichen Einigung. Der Entschluß von Den Haag erklärte die geplante Zollunion sowohl mit dem Friedensvertrag von Saint-Germain, als auch mit dem Genfer Protokoll von 1922 entgegengesetzt. Wegen der französischen Intervention ist der Plan der deutsch–österreichischen Zollunion durchgefallen, aber auch die Franzosen konnten sich dafür nicht erfreuen. Sie waren auch unfähig, das Absatzproblem zu lösen, sogar die Kreditkrise im ganzen Mittel- und Südost-Europa vertiefte die Wirtschaftskrise weiter.

Die französische Außenpolitik stand vor einer grossen Herausforderung, weil die verneinende Antwort auf das deutsche Projekt Paris darauf bemüßigte, um eine neue Konzeption zu entwerfen. Die Wiedererscheinung der Frage der Gutmachung ermäßigte aber die außenpolitische Aktivität Deutschlands für eine kurze Zeit. Die Deutschen hatten die Absicht zu abwarten. Auf der Tagung der deutschen Kommission der MWT sagta man am 19. Mai 1932: „Die deutsche Politik muss ein Langzeitprogramm herausarbeiten. Für die offizielle Politik bedeutet es vor allem zu warten. Wir haben nur eine Chance, wenn Frankreich kann die Länder nicht finanzieren, und sie müssen sich Deutschland wenden, um ihre Produktionsüberschüsse zu lagern."[17]

Vor den Franzosen traten die Tschechen mit einer Integrationsvorstellung auf. Der Gedanke der deutsch–österreichischen Zollunion befürchtete die Tschechoslowakei auch. In dieser Situation kam Eduard Beneš mit dem Plan eines Zollverbündnisses zwischen der Tschechoslowakei, Ungarn und Österreich.[18] Der Plan war von vornherein zum Misslingen verurteilt. Einerseits entfaltete Beneš seine Vorstellungen nicht eindeutig, und die westlichen Mächte dachten auch nicht so, dass die Lagerung des landwirtschaftlichen Überschusses in einer solchen Konstruktion möglich gewesen wäre. Es mangelte sich aber an die politische Gewogenheit auch. Das tschechslowakisch–ungarische Verhältnis war traditionell belastet, und diese Beziehung wurde nach dem Zollkrieg von 1930 noch schlimmer. Die österreichische und ungarische Regierungen betrachteten den Entwurf von Beneš als eine wirtschaftliche Halblösung und hatten Angst auch vor den eventuellen politischen Folgen. Unter den entworfenen Plänen schien den Plan von Brocchi sich zu verwirklichen, als die ungarische Regierung bestätigte den Pakt mit den Italienern am 20. Februar 1932.

---

[17] Ránki, György: *Gazdaság és külpolitika. A nagyhatalmak harca a délkelet-európai gazdasági hegemóniáért (1919–1939).* (Wirtschaft und Außenpolitik. Der Kampf der Großmächte um die südosteuropäische Wirtschaftshegemonie 1919–1939) Budapest, 1981. 172.

[18] Der Bericht von Beneš über die Pläne: Beneš, Edward: *Das Problem Mitteleuropas und die Lösung des österreichischen Frage*. Prag, 1934.

Die Krise spornte auch England zur Aktivität. England war der bedeutendeste Kapitalexporteur der Region, trotzdem war es an der Lösung der wirtschaftlichen Schwierigkeiten der Nachfolgestaaten nicht besonders regsam. Am 17. Januar 1932 warf die englische Regierung offiziell den Gedanken den Zollbund der sechs Donauländer auf. Der sechste Staat wäre Bulgarien gewesen. Die englische Außenpolitik bestrebte sich mit der Schaffung der wirtschaftlichen Einheit nicht nur die deustchen Ambitionen zu kompensieren, sondern England hatte traditionell auch eine Affinität für die Kooperation der mitteleuropäischen Länder. Die Engländer hatten sich aber wegen der französischen, italienischen und tschechischen Gegenrede zurückzuziehen.

1932 eine neue Regierung gelang zur Herrschaft in Frankreich, und das bedeutete eine Wende in der Außenpolitik auch. André Tardieu wollte energische Schritte für die Verhinderung der östlichen Ambitionen Deutschlands machen. Er kündigte am 2. März 1932 in dem Abgeordnetenhaus seinen Plan an, der drei Tage später an den betroffenen Regierungen offiziell weitergesendet worden war.[19] Tardieu empfahl im Interesse der Aufhebung des Marktproblems die Errichtung des preferenzialen Zollsystems der fünf Donauländer. Die Idee selbst war nicht neu, aber die Tatsache, dass sie seitens Frankreichs verfasst worden war, bedeutete eine grössere Öffentlichkeit. Die italienische und deutsche Außenpolitik erkannte die Bedeutung dieses neuen Plans auch, und sie hatten eine Angst vor dem Misslingen ihrer mitteleuropäischen Ambitionen. Nach einem zeitgenössischen Aufsatzes der französische Plan „ist nicht nur eine Antwort auf die Wirtschaftskrise, aber seine echte Absicht ist die Verhinderung eines neuen deutschen Dranges nach Osten."[20] Die Außenpolitik beider Länder wurde noch aktiver in den Nachfolgestaaten. Solange Deutschland versuchte den Tardieu-Plan mit seiner früheren Empfehlung für die Preferenz zu blockieren, dann Italien beschleunigte die Verwirklichung des Brocchi-Planes. Das Schicksal des Planes entschied sich in London. Die englische Regierung rief eine Tagung zur Behandlung der Einzelheiten zusammen. Der Vorschlag fiel schnell wegen der italienischen und deutschen Einwände durch. Das abgedrosselte Verhalten der Engländer trug auch dem Durchfall des Plans bei.

Nach dem Fiasko des Tardieu-Planes waren die Franzosen nicht mehr in der Lage um das Schicksal der Region in den weiteren wesentlich zu gestalten. Die

---

[19] Über den Plan siehe: Diószegi, László: Gazdasági egységesítési tervek a Duna-medencében az 1929–1933-as világgazdasági válság időszakában. (Die Pläne zur wirtschaftlichen Vereinigung im Donauram im Zeitalter der Weltwirtschaftskrise von 1929–1933) In: Bán, András – Diószegi, László – Márer, Pál – Pritz, Pál – Romsics, Ignác: *Integrációs tervek Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19–20. században.* (Integrationspläne im Ostmitteleuropa im 20. Jahrhundert) Budapest, 1997. 85–99.

[20] Romsics, Gergely: *A Foreign Affairs és Magyarország 1922–1939*. (Die *Foreign Affairs* und Ungarn, 1922–1939) In: Századok (Jahrhunderte), 1998/5. 936.

Aktivität Frankreichs dadurch bestimmt, dass zwischen 1930 und 1932 die Wirkung der Krise daheim noch nicht greifbar war, und die wirtschaftliche, beziehungsweise finanzielle Lage Frankreichs schien stabil zu sein. Die Krise entfaltete sich seit 1932 schrittweise, die die außenpolitischen Möglichkeiten Frankreichs bedeutsam beschränkte. Italien und Deutschland blieben nur in dem Wettbewerb für Mittel- und Osteuropa.

Bevor dieser Wetteifer in seine letzte Phase getreten wäre, die Grossmächte hatten einen unkräftigen Versuch um den deutsche Versuch zu verhüten. Im Sommer von 1932 fanden zahlreiche Tagungen statt, die die Marktprobleme der Agrarstaaten einrichten wollten. Inzwischen erschienen neue Tendenzen in den internationalen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. Die Tagung von Ottawa in Juli und August 1932 ordnete nicht nur das Beziehungssystem von Grossbritannien und seine Dominien, sondern formulierte neue Prinzipien in dem internationalen Handeln auch. England war gezwungen zu bekennen, dass das Prinzip der Meistbegünstigung nicht mehr aufrechtzuerhalten. Die Einrichtung der preferenzialen Systeme ist wieder ein Tagesordnungspunkt geworden. Die Konferenz von Warschau im August 1932 bereitete nicht nur die Tagung in Stresa vor, sondern sie schlug die Gesamtbehandlung des Marktproblems und der Verschuldung. Die polnische Initiative hatte den Vorsatz, dass die verschuldeten Agrarstaaten bis zu der Maß ihrer Schulden Kontingente in der Agrarausfuhr erhielten.

Noch in der Tagung von Lausanne im Jahre 1932 tauchte der Gedanke auf, dass man um der ökonomischen Reorganisation der mitteleuropäischen Region willen eine internationale Tagung zusammenrufen musste, mit der Teilnahme aller betroffenen Staaten. Die Konferenz wurde im September 1932 in Stresa (Italien) veranstaltet. Die Anwesenheit der fünfzehn Staaten und die Tagesordnung der Fragen erweckten in den Agrarstaaten grosse Hoffnungen. Die Unzahl der Zusagen und die Verwirklichung klangen aber wieder nicht zusammen. Unter den Vorschlägen tauchte die Einrichtung eines einheitlichen Währungsfonds und die Schaffung der Subvention für die Agrarstaaten empor.

Die Wankung der ost-mitteleuropäische Stabilität bezeugte die Krise der Kleinentente auch. Die organisatorischen und konzeptionalischen Defekte der Kleinentente kamen immer mehr hervor. Mit dem Organisationspakt von 1933 konnte man sie umformen, doch mangelten sich an die außenwirtschaftlichen Bedingungen zur Verwirklichung der ökonimischen Kleinentente.

Im Juni und Juli 1933 wurde in London wieder eine Weltwirtschaftskonferenz veranstaltet.[21] Sie hatte das Vorhaben um die Eintracht der Produktion und des Verbrauchs zu regulieren. Diese Regulation schien mit den folgenden Me-

[21] Den Bericht über die Konferenz siehe: Eckhardt, Tibor: *A londoni világgazdasági konferencia mérlege.* (Die Bilanz der Weltwirtschaftskonferenz in London) In: Külügyi Szemle (Außenpolitische Rundschau), 1933/4. 321–330.

thoden zu verwirklichen: die Reduktion der Ackerfläche, die Vermeidung der weiteren Überproduktion, die Bestimmung der Exportquoten. Sie betrachteten die Anwendung einer verbrauchsteigernden Propaganda für notwendig, weil sich der Getreidekonsum in den westlichen Ländern mit 20–25 Prozent unter 20 Jahren verringerte. Die überseeischen Gebiete auch zogen sich daneben eine Selbstbegrenzung in der Maß der europäischen Getreideausfuhr unter.

Das Hinziehen der Lösung des Marktproblems bedeutete eine immer grössere Schwierigkeit in dem Finanzwesen auch. Der freie Devisenverkehr ist aufgehoben worden. Um das Problem zu überbrücken schlug dr. Wilhelm Reisch, der Präsident der österreichischen Notenbank in 1931 in einer Prager Tagung den Gedanke des Systems des Zahlungsausgleichs vor. Damit wurde der multilaterale Handelsverkehr in immer grösserer Maße bilateral. 1932 schloss Deutschland einen Clearingvertrag mit den Donauländern. 1938 erfolgte sich das 80–85 Prozent des internationale Außenhandels aufgrund dieser Clearingverträge.

In der Lage, als Frankreich und England schon, und Deutschland noch nicht konnte in das Leben der Länder des Donauraumes eingreifen, Italien versuchte ein neues Bündnissystem zu gestalten. Mussolini sah die Rolle der Donauländer in der italienischen Außenpolitik folgendermaßen: „Die pangermanische Lösung der Donaufrage wäre für uns so unannehmbar, wie eine panslawische Lösung. Das Donaubecken ist unser Hinterland. Wenn wir darauf absagen, wir werden eine gewichtslose Halbinsel am Rande Europas. Damit kann man mein Interesse in der Richtung Österreichs und Ungarns erklären."[22] Die Pläne und die Möglichkeiten Italien klangen aber wieder nicht mit einander zusammen. Es konnte das Marktproblem nicht lösen, weil seine Begabtheiten in dem Außenhandel dies nicht ermöglichten. Hitlers Machtantritt bedeutete eine sofortige Wende in der Donaupolitik Deutschlands nicht. Das Denken über die ostmitteleuropäische Region modifizierte sich in 1934 weder in seinem Inhalt, noch in seinem persönlichen Bedingungen. Deutschland hatte kein Interesse an der raschen Lösung der wirtschaftlichen Schwierigkeiten der Agrarstaaten. Es öffnete seine Märkte nur schrittweise. Mit dem Neuen Plan in September 1934 begann die Verwirklichung der Expansion Deutschlands donauwärts.[23] Staatssekretär Poose fasste das Wesen dieser Politik zusammen: „Als der planmäßige Ausbau des inneren deutschen Wirtschaftsraumes war die wichtigste Aufgabe der nationalsozialistische Staatsregierung, jetzt ist die Zeit angekommen, dass

[22] Réti, György: *Gömbös és a római hármas egyezmény, 1934.* (Gömbös und der Dreimächtepakt in Rom, 1934) In: Történelmi Szemle (Historische Rundschau), 1994/1–2. 135.

[23] Über diesen Vorgang vgl.: Broszat, Martin: Deutschland – Ungarn – Rumänien. In: Manfred Funke (Hrsg.): *Hitler, Deutschland und die Mächte. Materialen zur Außenpolitik des Dritten Reiches*. Düsseldorf, 1978. 524–564.,

wir die Einfügung der deutschen Wirtschaft in der organisch entstehenden 'Grossraumwirtschaft' als unsere wichtigste Obliegenheit zu betrachten."[24]

Die Nachfolgestaaten konnten weder auf einander noch auf die Grossmächte gegen das deutsche Eindringen stützen. Ein ungarischer ökonomischer Expert, József Cseténvi schrieb über diese Situation wie es folgt: „Italien kann irgend etwas machen, Frankreich und England können mit den Mitteln der Diplomatie bemühen: in dem Donauraum marschiert Deutschland nach seinem Ziel, solange die Zersplitterung der Donauregion dauert, und die einzelnen Länder um Deutschlands Gunst wetteifern, wann, in welcher Maße und mit welchen Preise können sie in das deutsche Markt eingeführt werden."[25]

Der Plan von Milan Hodža in 1936 war der letzte Versuch dafür, dass die Staaten der Region gegen das deutsche Eindringen ökonomisch zu auftreten. Es mangelte sich sowohl an wirtschaftlichen Bedingungen als auch die Unterstützung der Grossmächte. Die Kleinstaatigkeit trat in die Phase des Niederganges. Nach 1934 gab es keine Alternative für die wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit der Donauländer ohne Deutschland.

In dieser aussichtslosen Lage schrieb ein ökonomischer Fachmann die folgenden: „Es ist möglich, dass diese Verwirklichung des Donaugedanken noch lange auf sich warten lässt, und man braucht noch mehr Not und Leid, um die Machtfaktoren sich dem Donaugedanken anzunehmen; die Tatsache wird nicht verändert, dass nur das einheitliche Donaubecken ist der Ramen, in dem die geschichtliche Berufung der ungarischen Nation, ihre staatsorganisatorische Kraft und kulturelle Entwicklung zur Geltung gebracht werden kann. Diese Entfaltung an der Donau ist nicht nur eine ungarische Angelegenheit in dem engen Sinne, sondern ein europäisches Problem, ihre Verwirklichung ist der Beruf des Ungarntums."[26]

Diese Lösung aber scheiterte sich. Parallel mit der Erfolglosigkeit der Integrationsbestrebungen wurden die westlichen Mächte aus der Region verdrängt, und man konnte das Eindringen Deutschlands nicht mehr aufhalten.

---

[24] Berend, Iván – Ránki, György: *Közép-Kelet-Európa gazdasági fejlődése a 19–20. században*. (Die Wirtschaftsentwicklung Mittel- und Osteuropas im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert) Budapest, 1976. 381.

[25] Cseténvi, József: *Új Trianon felé?* (Auf dem Wege eines neuen Trianons?) Budapest, o. J. 70.

[26] Hantos, Elemér: *A dunai tengely.* (Die Donauachse) In: Duna Népe (Das Volk der Donau), Juni 1937. 3–4.

The organizers

Department of History, University of Debrecen
4032 Debrecen, Egyetem tér 1. P.O. Box 48.
Hungary
http://tortenelem.unideb.hu/

Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
P.O. Box 35 (H) FI-40014 Jyväskylä
Finland
https://www.jyu.fi/hum/laitokset/hie/

The authors

RÓBERT BARTA,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
ATTILA BÁRÁNY,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
ERZSÉBET BODNÁR,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
RÉKA BOZZAY,	Department of Dutch Studies, University of Debrecen
GÁBOR BRADÁCS,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
PIIA EINONEN,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
ANSSI HALMESVIRTA,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
PETRI KARONEN,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
CSABA LÉVAI,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
SATU MATIKAINEN,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
SIMO MIKKONEN,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
LÁSZLÓ PALLAI,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
LÁSZLÓ PÓSÁN,	Department of History, University of Debrecen
GÁBOR PUSZTAI,	Department of Dutch Studies, History University of Debrecen
TIMO SÄRKKÄ,	Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä
GÁBOR SZABÓ-ZSOLDOS,	Department of History, University of Debrecen

SPECULUM HISTORIAE DEBRECENIENSE
(SOROZATSZERKESZTŐ: PAPP KLÁRA)
sorozat eddig megjelent kötetei

1. MATTHIAS AND HIS LEGACY: CULTURAL AND POLITICAL ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.
   Eds. *Attila Bárány, Attila Györkös.* Debrecen, 2009.
2. SZŐLŐTERMELÉS ÉS BORKERESKEDELEM.
   Szerk. *Orosz István, Papp Klára.* Debrecen, 2009.
3. *Ifj. Barta János*: „HA ZEMPLIN VÁRMEGYÉT AZ ÚTAS VISGÁLJA...” GAZDÁLKODÁS ÉS TÁRSADALOM ZEMPLÉN MEGYÉBEN. Debrecen, 2009.
4. ARISZTOKRATA ÉLETPÁLYÁK ÉS ÉLETVISZONYOK.
   Szerk. *Papp Klára, Püski Levente*. Debrecen, 2009.
5. *Orosz István*: A JOBBÁGYVILÁG MEGSZŰNÉSE MAGYARORSZÁGON. Debrecen, 2010.
6. *Csorba Dávid*: A ZÁSZLÓS BÁRÁNY NYOMÁBAN. A MAGYAR KÁLVINIZMUS 17. SZÁZADI VILÁGA. Debrecen, 2011.
7. DEBRECEN VÁROS 650 ÉVES. VÁROSTÖRTÉNETI TANULMÁNYOK. Szerk. *Bárány Attila, Papp Klára, Szálkai Tamás.* Debrecen, 2011.
8. *Szendrei Ákos*: JUSTH GYULA POLITIKAI PÁLYÁJA. A FÜGGETLENSÉGI POLITIZÁLÁS LEHETŐSÉGEI A 19–20. SZÁZAD FORDULÓJÁN. Debrecen, 2012.
9. „... ÉLTÜNK MI SOKÁIG ‘KÉT HAZÁBAN’...” TANULMÁNYOK A 90 ÉVES KISS ANDRÁS TISZTELETÉRE. Szerk. *Dáné Veronka, Oborni Teréz, Sipos Gábor,* Debrecen, 2012.
10. „NINCS EGY IGAZ BARÁTOM SE!” TANULMÁNYOK SZÉCHENYI ISTVÁN POLITIKAI KAPCSOLATAINAK TÖRTÉNETÉHEZ. Szerk. *Velkey Ferenc*. Debrecen, 2012.
11. *Jeney-Tóth Annamária:* „... URUNK UDVARNÉPE …” UDVAR ÉS TÁRSADALMA BÁTHORY GÁBOR ÉS BETHLEN GÁBOR FEJEDELEMSÉGE IDEJÉN A KOLOZSVÁRI SZÁMADÁSKÖNYVEK TÜKRÉBEN. Debrecen, 2012.
12. A MAGYAR ARISZTOKRÁCIA TÁRSADALMI SOKSZÍNŰSÉGE, VÁLTOZÓ ÉRTÉKEK ÉS ÉLETVISZONYOK. Szerk. *Papp Klára*, *Püski Levente.* Debrecen, 2013.
13. FRANCIA–MAGYAR KAPCSOLATOK A KÖZÉPKORBAN. Szerk. *Györkös Attila, Kiss Gergely.* Debrecen, 2013.