
West Bohemian Historical Review

X | 2020 | 1

Editors-in-Chief

Lukáš Novotný (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)

Gabriele Clemens (Faculty of Social Sciences, University Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany)

Co-editor

Roman Kodet (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen)

Editorial Board

Stanislav Balík (Faculty of Law, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)

Radek Fukala (Faculty of Philosophy, J. E. Purkyně University, Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic)

Michael Gehler (Faculty of Educational and Social Sciences, University of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, Germany)

Frank Golczewski (Faculty of Social Sciences, University Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany)

László Gulyás (Institute of Economy and Rural Development, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary)

Arno Herzig (Faculty of Social Sciences, University Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany)

Hermann Joseph Hiery (Faculty of Cultural Studies, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany)

Václav Horčíčka (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Ivan Jakubec (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Drahomír Jančík (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Zdeněk Jirásek (Faculty of Philosophy and Sciences, Silesian University, Opava, Czech Republic)

Hans-Christof Kraus (Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Passau, Passau, Germany)

Richard Lein (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria)

Hermann Mückler (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria)

Martin Nejedlý (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Aneta Pawłowska (Faculty of Philosophy and History, University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland)

Monica Rüthers (Faculty of Social Sciences, University Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany)

Irén Simándi (Institutional Departments of International Relations and History, Kodolányi János University, Székesfehérvár, Hungary)

Aleš Skřivan, Jr. (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen / Faculty of Economics, University of Economics, Prague, Czech Republic)

Aleš Skřivan, Sr. (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen / Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Arnold Suppan (former Vicepresident of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria)

Miroslav Šedivý (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)

Andrej Tóth (Faculty of Economics, University of Economics, Prague / Faculty of Philosophy, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czech Republic)

Jaroslav Valkoun (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen / Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Pavel Vařeka (Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)

László T. Vizi (Kodolányi János University of Applied Sciences, Székesfehérvár, Hungary)

Marija Wakounig (Faculty of Historical and Cultural Studies, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria)

Jan Županič (Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic)

Contents

Studies

- Aleš Skřivan Sr. – Aleš Skřivan Jr.*, Trade Gateway to the Habsburg Monarchy. On Trieste's Status, Development and Importance to the mid-19th Century..... 1
- Irmína Gadowska – Magdalena Milerowska*, Jewish Capital as the Factor Shaping the City's Architecture. Selected Examples of Industrial Urban Development of Piotrków Trybunalski in the Second Half of the 19th Century (up to 1914)..... 25
- Arnold Suppan*, Saint-Germain and Trianon, 1919–1920.
The Imperialist Peace Order in Central Europe..... 39
- Zuzana Donátková*, Futurism and the Birth of Fascism 69

Discussion

- Сама́ра Курба́налиевна Осмо́нова*, Традиционное воспитание детей кыргызской семье в системе труда (в конце XIX – начало XX вв. На примере юго-запада Ферганской долины) 101
- Agnieszka Gralińska-Toborek*, An Independent Artistic Movement in the Last Decade of Communistic System in Poland..... 123

Review

- Filip PAULUS, Šárka STEINOVÁ et al., Krajina a urbanismus na rukopisných plánech z 18. století – Landscape and Urbanism in Manuscript Plans from the 18th Century. Translokační plány židovských obydlí v zemích Koruny české v letech 1727–1728 – Translocation plans of Jewish Settlements in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown from the Period of 1727–1728
(*Michal Wanner*)..... 139



Trade Gateway to the Habsburg Monarchy. On Trieste's Status, Development and Importance to the mid-19th Century¹

*Aleš Skřivan Sr. – Aleš Skřivan Jr. **

This study presents and evaluates Trieste's relationship to the House of Habsburg, or the Habsburg Monarchy, from its beginnings in the 14th century to the mid-19th century. The authors evaluate the port's longstanding rivalry with the Republic of Venice, notes the Habsburgs' initial only marginal interest, and their change in approach from the 17th century. The first peak in Trieste's development occurred in the 18th century, when the city's population grew, extensive construction work was undertaken, privileged societies were founded for trading overseas, and there were even attempts made at acquiring colonies. The wars with revolutionary and Napoleonic France had highly negative consequences, with the port occupied three times. The subsequent section provides an overview of developments from 1815 until the mid-19th century. Here an evaluation is made of trade in Trieste, its structure and trading connections. Attention is paid to the beginnings of steam navigation, in particular regarding the establishment of Austrian Lloyd's second section. In the final section, the study framework is focused on the transformative events following the mid-19th century, with the essential inclusion of the defeats in the wars in 1859 and 1866, the February Patent of 1861 which brought a restoration of constitutional life and a new status for Trieste, the importance of the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 including the involvement of Austrians in designing and funding its construction, with the eruption of the economic crisis in 1873 the final milestone. [Habsburgs; Trieste; Trade; Austrian Lloyd; Suez Canal]

When Trieste representatives Antonio de Dominico, Adelmo de Petazzi and Nicolò de Picha arrived in Graz in 1382 in order to ask Duke Leo-

¹ This study has been produced under the Student Grant System *Selected problems in the history of sailing from the Habsburg Monarchy overseas* (SGS–2018–24) at the Department of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia in Plzeň.

* Department of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia in Plzeň, Sedláčkova 38, Plzeň, 306 14; e-mail: skrivan2@khv.zcu.cz; alesskrivan@hotmail.com.

pold III² for assistance in defending their city, they could not have realised that the port's link to the Habsburgs, or to the Habsburg Empire, would continue for over half a millennium. This symbiosis would not end until the defeat of the Habsburg Monarchy in the First World War and signature of the armistice at Villa Giusti outside Padua on 3 November 1918.³ On 30 September 1382, the Trieste emissaries received a document in which the Duke took over the defence of the city, which held on to a lot of autonomy, although its podestà, elected by the city council, was replaced by a governor named by the Duke. The obligation to pay a tribute of 100 jugs of wine for the feast day of the city's patron, Saint Justus (San Giusto, 2 November) was only of symbolic importance.⁴ The main reason for this step being taken was to secure support for Trieste in its many years' conflict with the Republic of Venice and to stand up to pressure from the Patriarch of Aquileia. Another undoubted reason was the fact that the Austrian duke was already in control of the port's hinterland.

The foundation for Trieste's economic position was trade, the production and sale of salt, and also fishing. Also important was Trieste traders' involvement in the sale of cereals and the transportation of pilgrims travelling to Rome. Trieste traders had representatives in Ancona, Ferrara, Pesaro and Ravenna, and they also traded in the south of the peninsula in the Kingdom of Naples, in Bari, Brindisi, Otranto and Trani.⁵ All these activities were a thorn in the side for Venetians, who considered maritime trade their domain, and who similarly aimed to control the lucrative salt trade throughout the Adriatic Sea region. These facts led to constant tension, disputes and wars between Trieste and the Republic of St Mark, and one can only concur with the view that, "*in 1382–1719, Trieste had a volatile, sometimes tragic fate and [...] was literally crushed between the hegemonic endeavours of the German Emperor on the one hand and the Republic of Venice on the other*".⁶ The Venetians acquired some territory following a conflict

² Leopold III, "the Just" (1351–1386), progenitor of the House of Habsburg's Leopoldian line, was Duke of Austria, Styria and Carniola, and Count of Tyrol, and from 1379 also Duke of Carinthia. After his death in 1386, the city of Trieste remained permanently under the domain of the Habsburg's Leopoldian line.

³ The armistice came into effect on 4 November 1918. In 1809–1813, Trieste was exceptionally ruled by the French.

⁴ G. GATSCHKE-RIEDL, *Triest. K. u. K. Senhnsuchtort und Alt-Österreichs Hafen zur Welt*, Bernsdorf 2016, p. 9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁶ G. SCHATZDORFER, *Triest. Portrait einer Stadt. Geschichten zur Geschichte*, Wien, Graz, Klagenfurt 2008, p. 18.

with Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg (Muggia, Montfalcone), in 1461 they launched a naval blockade of Trieste, which had to sign a very disadvantageous peace treaty with them on 17 November 1463, the Venetians controlled Castelnuovo and other castles, and Habsburg Emperor Frederick III was unable to give assistance to the city. Pope Pius II – Enea Silvio Piccolomini, also linked to Czech history, protected Trieste from the worst, being Bishop of Trieste from 1447, and Pope between 1458 and 1464, and mediating between the two feuding sides.⁷ Developments in Trieste were not favourable. Repeated conflict between supporters of the Habsburgs and Venice led to what was essentially a civil war, with the city repeatedly afflicted by epidemics of plague and other diseases, with fighting and looting taking place, and even politically motivated vendettas not uncommon. Compared to Bologna, Florence, Mantua and other Italian cities where a Renaissance culture was flourishing, Trieste was in steep decline. The port was not particularly helped by the fact that Emperor Frederick III issued a charter on 3 August 1468 in Graz in which he declared himself and his heirs the masters and owners of the city. This was the outcome of a previous request in which the city, *“of its own accord and in full knowledge”* definitively yielded to the Emperor, with the Imperial army occupying Trieste in 1469.⁸ Although the increase in the Habsburgs’ influence contributed towards a certain stabilisation, on the other hand it brought restrictions to the marked autonomy, or almost independence, which the port had previously enjoyed. Although the conflict with the Republic of St Mark had not ended, the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–1516) led to the Venetians once again besieging, occupying and plundering the city in 1508. Although in 1509 they officially renounced their claims to Trieste, more wars followed in 1563, 1578 and the so-called War of Gradisca in 1615–1617. In the 16th century, Trieste had a population of just 3000 people, and they were undoubtedly lucky that the so-called Long Turkish War (1593–1606) and the Thirty Years’ War did not particularly impact the city.

Under Charles V, Trieste belonged to the Spanish Empire for a short period, but in 1552 the city again came under the Austrian Habsburgs. There are a number of circumstances which justify the claim that, *“in the first two centuries of the modern era, in which maritime navigation, discoveries and*

⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸ *Triest. Der Hafen Mitteleuropas*. Hg. von P. WEINHÄUPL für die Gustav Klimt/Wien 1900 – Privatstiftung, Wien 2018, p. 20.

*overseas trade became [...] a decisive political and economic factor of European powers' [policies], Vienna ignored the Empire's only port and gateway to the world. This is also a classic example of the House of Habsburg's lack of political instinct [...] Trieste had to wait a long time for the Habsburgs to discover it".*⁹ Although it is true that Vienna's interest in the port's development as the "only gateway to the world" was a marginal one for a long time, one must posit the question of why historians are somewhat one-sided in their assessment of Habsburg policy in this regard. For compelling reasons, the Austrian Habsburgs' states had significantly different priorities in the 16th and 17th century compared to West European states, which at the time were highly focused on overseas expansion. In contrast to these states, the Habsburg Empire was subject to repeated pressure from the Ottoman Empire, such that the war of 1683–1699 really did represent a struggle for its very existence. The situation did not change until the so-called Prince Eugene War in 1716–1718, which ended with the Treaty of Passarowitz on 21 July 1718, which moved the Habsburg's perimeter defences far to the south-east. Furthermore, repeated confrontations with France's aggressive Louis XIV also exhausted the Habsburg's forces. Another undoubted handicap was the fact that the Austrian Habsburgs' empire was a conglomeration of lands whose cohesion was somewhat questionable due to the forces wanting to break away, especially in Hungary.

In terms of the growth in the port's importance, *"the 17th and even more so the 18th century saw the beginnings of Austrian economic policy which involved declaring a free zone in the Adriatic, endeavours at colonial expansion and the establishment of a free port and trade emporium in Trieste".*¹⁰ The first faint signs came following the mid-17th century. In 1660, Emperor Leopold I landed at nearby Duino, who under the influence of mercantile ideas, began considering ways to develop Trieste. Imperial officials discussed setting up a Handelskompagnie in the city with Dutch traders, prompted by hopes of trading with the Levant¹¹ and construction work began at the port. In 1662, Leopold I issued the city with privileges for the port in terms of customs and taxes, also this essentially went no further than plans and ideas.

⁹ SCHATZDORFER, p. 22

¹⁰ A. ESCHER, *Triest und seine Aufgaben im Rahmen der österreichischen Volkswirtschaft*, Wien 1917, p. 1.

¹¹ The eastern part of the Mediterranean is traditionally referred to as the Levant.

More pronounced changes came with the more dynamic development following the accession of Charles VI to the Imperial throne in 1711. Often noted in this regard is the aide-memoire of Trieste patrician, Giovanni Casimiro Donadoni on the need to build a port. In 1717, influenced by an endeavour to weaken the Republic of Venice, Charles VI declared freedom of navigation on the Adriatic. Following the decline in the threat from Turkey and the end of difficulties linked to implementing the so-called Pragmatic Sanction, several bans were issued regarding the import and export of goods, directed mainly against Venice. Vienna was also beginning to make efforts to ensure goods exports from southern Germany were rerouted from Venice to Trieste. As such, several German companies set up branches in Trieste in addition to ones they already had in Venice, through which an ever-greater proportion of trade between southern German states and the Levant was going. On 27 July 1718, the *Orientalische Handelskompagnie* was set up in the city, which was particularly focused on developing trade with the Levant and strengthening the Habsburg influence in the Mediterranean. Although it was equipped with quite extensive privileges, it did not achieve significant success and closed in 1742.¹² *Seemansche Levantecompanie* met the same fate, having been set up using Austrian and Dutch capital and initially raising a lot of expectations. Austria's East India Company was founded in 1722, but it was founded in Ostend in the Austrian Netherlands. Despite its successes, it was sacrificed to ensure the so-called Pragmatic Sanction was recognised by the maritime powers, Great Britain in particular, and it was abolished in 1731. Proposals that its operations should be restored in Trieste failed mainly as a result of fears of London's response. A landmark moment for Trieste was 18 March 1719, when an Imperial Patent exempted it from the Habsburg Monarchy's customs territory alongside Fiume (Rijeka) and it was declared a free port.¹³ This step was part of Vienna's more vigorous policy in Italy, with the Habsburgs gaining Spain's Duchy of Milan, Kingdom of Naples and Duchy of Parma following the end of the War of the Austrian Succession, although it only controlled the latter two territories for a fairly brief period.

¹² GATSCHER-RIEDL, p. 16. Some authors date the company's establishment to 1719 and date its closure to 1750. U. HAUSBRANDT, *Welthafen Triest – Anspruch und Wirklichkeit. Die Entwicklung des Seehandelsplatzes im außenwirtschaftlichen System der Habsburger Monarchie 1814–1914*. Diss., Wien 1991, p. 22.

¹³ H. F. MAYER – D. WINKLER, *In allen Häfen war Österreich. Die österreichisch-ungarische Handelsmarine*, Wien 1987, p. 23.

Trieste's declaration as a free port resulted in distinct advantages, but these were not for the local burghers or nobles, but rather for foreigners who were attracted by various privileges including freedom in the port for all ships, people and goods, customs-free trade, tax exemption, debt forgiveness, exemption from military service, the pardoning of old offences, and exemption from various obligations which in contrast local burghers continued to be subject to. Freedom of religion was assured within the city. However, Trieste did not have modern port facilities, the local trading class was weak, and there was also no strong financial institution, needed to develop trade. In 1754 and 1755, Vienna even had to approve loans to the city in order to ensure the port's competitiveness.¹⁴ According to some data, it took just 48 days to build a road across the Semmering mountain pass in 1728¹⁵ and regular weekly connections between Vienna and Trieste were established. Emperor Charles VI also used this route in 1728, but he discovered that the port's development was slow. Despite Venice's loss of power, having gradually become a satellite of the Habsburg Monarchy to the outside world, the Republic of St Mark was a strong trading rival to Trieste. Under Charles VI, the mediaeval walls were demolished, facilitating the city's further development, and land was purchased in the north of the city on which store houses and granaries were built, while construction of the roads linking the port to the hinterland continued, and a quarantine hospital was built. One can nevertheless agree with the sentiment that, "*Charles VI's work, although it did not bring the success he had hoped for, cannot be described as a complete failure [...] His intuition was correct and the fruits were borne later*".¹⁶

Although Maria Theresa, who acceded to the throne in the Hereditary Lands in 1740, never visited the port on the Adriatic, in contrast to both her father and son, under her rule the city's landscape changed significantly, it began to develop positively and in a number of regards the conditions were created for the results seen in the first half of the 19th century. In the second half of the 18th century, Vienna began to support the development of the port's infrastructure more extensively. Significant construction work was done – the San Carlo pier and an arsenal were built, and the new so-called Theresian Quarter was established

¹⁴ GATSCHER-RIEDL, p. 14.

¹⁵ MAYER – WINKLER, p. 23.

¹⁶ This statement was made by Flauco Arneri, author of the work *Trieste. Breve storia della città* (Trieste 1998), cited by SCHATZDORFER, p. 24.

in the north. Churches for various denominations, water supply systems, schools and other buildings were also constructed.

The growth of trade, including transit trade, led to the establishment of the custom house and numerous warehouses, and the chamber of commerce (Collegio dei Mercanti) was set up. On 20 June 1755, the Commodity (trading) Exchange was opened, which over time became the most important institution for Trieste traders, a place where the trading of many different commodities was undertaken. Some of the most important included “*metal goods, pharmaceutical goods, fine fabrics, smoking materials of all types, leather, silk and silk goods, scarves, canvas, silver, threads, hemp, linen, fruit, liquorice, lemon juice, oil, soap, salted meat, fish, cheeses, jewellery, wax, tobacco, wooden goods and glass*”.¹⁷ In 1758, the Commercial Court received new Court Rules. Gradually, Trieste took over some of the transit trade between the states of Germany and the Levant. In 1783, it took on 23% of exports and 27% of imports from southern Germany. The development of manufactories in the Hereditary Lands of the Habsburg Monarchy led to increased production of goods for export, and these were also transported to the Levant via Trieste. The state began to pay export premiums for fabrics, cereals and wine. By the mid-1760s, the value of the transit trade through Trieste was around half of the value of imports and exports (Table 1). Over almost 20 years, between 1760 and 1783, cotton imports grew tenfold and the city grew wealthy from the trade of coffee, olive oil and Mediterranean products. By 1783, a full 36% of exports from the Habsburg Monarchy went via Trieste.

Several measures were taken in regard to maritime navigation. A harbourmaster and port commission were established in Trieste. In 1754, the Theoretical Practical Mathematical and Nautical School was opened, educating mainly naval officers. Two years later, a decree was issued authorising only graduates of this school to be employed in government offices at the coast.¹⁸ The core rules for maritime navigation were determined in the Imperial Navigational Edict of 1774. In the 1780s and 90s, the first maritime navigation insurance companies were set up¹⁹ and so Trieste ship-owners were no longer dependent on foreign insurance

¹⁷ HAUSBRANDT, p. 29.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁹ These were Camera vecchia d'Assicurazione (1766), Banco d'assicurazione e di cambi marittimi (1786), Camera d'Assicurazione (1787), Società Greca d'Assicurazione (1789), Nuovo Banco d'Assicurazione e cambi marittimi (1790) and Unione d'Assicurazione (1794). Ibid., p. 15.

companies. By the beginning of the 19th century, there were 26 companies operating in the city which provided transport insurance, and there were hundreds of trading houses at the port.²⁰ Closely linked to the reforms of the late Theresian and early Josephine period is the name of Count Karl von Zinzendorf, who was the Governor of Trieste between 1776 and 1782. The records in his renowned diary from this period contain important information on the port and the changes which it underwent.²¹

There were attempts currently to establish more permanent contacts with overseas territories, or even to acquire colonies. Important activities in this regard were undertaken by William Bolts, the son of British parents who was born in Amsterdam in 1738, and who submitted a proposal to Vienna for establishing a new privileged company for trading with East Asia.²² Likely due to previous failures of similar businesses, he did not initially receive clear support for the highest officials – while Maria Theresa and Chancellor Kounic supported his project, Archduke Joseph, the future Emperor, was initially very reserved. Although he was an advocate for supporting the development of maritime trade and Trieste port in general having visited the city many times, in this particular case his position was influenced by the fact that he did not attach much importance to trade with India.²³ In the end, however, Bolts was successful and on 5 June 1775 he received privileges to set up a company for trading with India and China,²⁴ on which basis he set up the *Imperial Asian Company in Trieste*.²⁵ A basic condition for being awarded privileges was that the company's ships should sail from Trieste, to which they should also return

²⁰ ESCHER, p. 2.

²¹ Count Carl von Zinzendorf (1739–1813) kept a diary from the age of eight years old, and it contains 76 volumes written in French, and was never published. The information about Trieste is of interest regarding the presented study, although much more significant are his entries about theatrical performances, in particular the first performances of Mozart operas.

²² For more on Bolts' activities, see F. von POLLACK-PARNAU, Eine österreich-indische Handelskompanie, 1775–1885. Beitrag zur österreichischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte unter Maria Theresia und Josef II, in: *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Beiheft 12, Stuttgart 1927; M. WANNER, William Bolts a Císařská asijská společnost v Terstu, in: *Dějiny a současnost*, 23/5, 2001, pp. 11–16.

²³ HAUSBRANDT, p. 23.

²⁴ Octroi de Sa Majesté l'Imperatrice Reine Apostolique, accordé au Sieur Guillaume Bolts. Recueil de pièces authentiques relatives aux affaires de la si-devant Société Imperiale asiatique de Trieste, gereés a Anvers. Antwerpen 1787, pp. 45–49.

²⁵ Société Imperiale asiatique de Trieste.

following their journey to Asia and unload their cargo. Bolts breached this condition, however, with his first ships not sailing from Trieste, but rather from Livorno in Italy, Ostend and Lorient in France. *Kaunitz* was the first of the company's ships to sail from Trieste to India in 1780, and according to some information it aroused much attention due to its size and cargo.²⁶ In 1781, Bolts even asked for an exception from his privileges so that his ships did not have to sail from Trieste. In any event, three of his ships sailed from Livorno that same year. In 1777, the Imperial Company set up a factory in Delagoa Bay on the Mozambique coast, although this closed following intervention from the Portuguese in 1781. On 12 June 1778, the captain of the ship *Giuseppe e Teresa*²⁷ declared a claim to some of the Nikobar islands,²⁸ although in doing so they disregarded the fact that the Danes had already declared their claims to the islands, and in April 1783 the Danes sent a frigate there equipped with 40 guns, putting an end to the endeavour. Eventually, the company had settlements on India's Malabar Coast, and they considered setting up a colony, something allegedly even favoured by the ruler of Mysore, Navab Hyder Ali.²⁹ Bolts certainly didn't win the sympathy of Trieste traders, as he prevented them from being involved in the company's activities, and in Trieste merely got into debt (as he did with the banks of the Austrian Netherlands). Following his reception for an audience with Emperor Joseph II in Brussels on 28 July 1781, the entrepreneur undertook a "rescue" operation – he ceded his charter to the newly established *Imperial Company for Asian Trade in Trieste and Antwerp*,³⁰ which began operating in August 1781 through the sale of shares. Initially, they undertook many activities – they sent a ship to India, in China they were involved in the tea trade, they undertook sailings to Africa and were even involved in whale hunting. Difficulties soon manifested themselves, however, which were to some extent a legacy of the previous company, whose debts they had had to take on. The new company had a chronic lack of funds which its management could not bring itself to admit. It ordered the construction of the ship *Kaiserlicher Adler* with a displacement of over 1,000 tons from the shipyard in Fiume,

²⁶ HAUSBRANDT, p. 24.

²⁷ Some authors erroneously refer to two ships, the *Giuseppe* and the *Teresa*. See ESCHER, p. 4. This ship sailed in 1776–1781.

²⁸ This archipelago lies in the Indian Ocean, around 150 km north of the then Aceh Sultanate in northern Sumatra.

²⁹ ESCHER, p. 4.

³⁰ *Société Impériale pour le commerce Asiatique de Trieste et d'Anvers*.

which was launched in March 1784. This only brought it closer to disaster, however, and in January 1795 the company stopped sailing, shortly thereafter going bankrupt. Bolts came out of the whole affair relatively well because he was able to invest the funds he had acquired from his awarded privileges in new activities.

The period from the 1780s to the war with revolutionary Napoleonic France brought prosperity to Trieste, with ships sailing there from China, India and America carrying colonial goods which were redistributed inland. The volume of imports doubled within the short timeframe of 1782 to 1789, while the volume of exports increased fourfold (Table 2). Traders here had support from Vienna in their business. Trieste became a busy trade centre, with representatives of trading houses from across Europe setting up at the port, and local companies developing trade relations with partners from Vienna, various centres in the Ottoman Empire, from Hamburg, London, Marseille, Livorno and Venice. One curiosity of the time, undoubtedly a result of the economic boom at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, was the *“today long forgotten project to construct a canal. Emperor Francis (ruled 1792–1835) was an advocate, using his own assets to support this gigantic enterprise. Vienna and Trieste were to be linked by a waterway. Following the launch of construction in 1795, the Vienna – Wiener Neustadt section was put into operation. No further construction took place, however”*.³¹ It is extraordinary that the entire project was not definitively and officially ended until 1879.

General developments had an essentially negative impact on the city's situation, in particular as a result of the almost continuous and quarter-century long battle between European coalitions against revolutionary and Napoleonic France, something the Habsburg Monarchy was also naturally involved in. Trieste was seriously damaged by these wars, with the city occupied three times by the French army. The port suffered mainly from an economic perspective, but also from a demographic perspective. On the other hand, the traders here were also able to take advantage of the situation, since the naval war between Britain and France in the Mediterranean disturbed the old trading route from the Levant to Gibraltar and from there to the ports of Western and Northern Europe. As such, many goods were transported via Trieste, and traders here were also able to profit from the increase in the price of cotton and colonial products.

The port was first occupied in 1797, and the two-month occupation ended with signature of the Treaty of Campo Formio (today Campor-

³¹ MAYER, WINKLER, p. 25.

mido) on 18 October 1797. Since this treaty resulted in the dissolution of the Republic of Venice, with Venice itself³² alongside Istria and Dalmatia going to Austria, this solution was beneficial to Trieste, as it created the premise for eliminating the pressure from its old rival. On the other hand, it could hardly be said to be beneficial for Trieste that it was forced to pay a contribution of 3 million lira.³³ Furthermore, the second French occupation in 1805–1806 lasted just a few months, but it had more significant negative consequences for the port. Following the defeat of the Russian and Austrian forces at Austerlitz on 2 December 1805, Austria lost its recently acquired Istria and Dalmatia and the French demanded 6 million francs from Trieste. Just a year later, the Continental System declared by France on 21 November 1806, a blockade which meant an embargo on all imports to the continent from Great Britain, began to damage the port. The third and longest French occupation between 1809 and 1813 was a total disaster for Trieste. The city and the surrounding region were administered directly by France as the so-called Illyrian Provinces. During this period, Britain imposed a complete blockade on the Adriatic Sea, with the city cut off from its hinterland and its traditional trade links also cut off. Its status as free port was lost, and the French customs system came into force. Trade at the port was completely paralysed; comparing data on imports into Trieste between 1804 and 1811, we find that the import of goods fell by 94%, and exports fell by 81% (see Table 3). A similar fall is seen in the number of boats sailing to Trieste (Table 4). French attempts at boosting trade and sailings failed completely. During the French occupation, the old State Council comprising city patricians was replaced by an assembly of the bourgeois, with Italian becoming the official language. Thousands of citizens left the city under the desperate conditions, with the population falling from 33,000 to 20,600 just between 1808 and 1812. It is of note that once the French had left the city in 1813, the population rose to 36,000 in just two years. This marked the beginning of Trieste's economic rise which, naturally with some fluctuations, was to continue for a whole century until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.³⁴

During the Napoleonic Wars, for a certain time Trieste lost its role as mediator between the Mediterranean and Central Europe, and after the

³² The Austrian troops entered Venice on 18 January 1798.

³³ F. SCUBITZ, *Triest und seine Bedeutung für den deutschen Handel*, Leipzig 1881, p. 26.

³⁴ To the development of the Population in Trieste cf. A. SUPPAN, *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas zwischen Adria und Karawanken*, Berlin 1998/2002, p. 296.

wars Trieste traders attempted to accelerate the restoration of the port's position. On the other hand, Vienna's efforts were focused on greater links between provinces and the monarchy, with the Austrian Littoral established as a province which was part of the Kingdom of Illyria. The Littoral included the Princely Counties of Görz and Gradisca and the Margravate of Istria, with Trieste as its administrative centre. In 1849, the Littoral was declared a separate crown land, and Trieste acquired the status of "reichsunmittelbare Stadt", so that it could become a separate crown land on the basis of a constitution of 26 February 1861, and it remained so until the end of the monarchy.

In the years following the Napoleonic Wars, the port's economic situation improved only slowly, in line with overall developments in Austria. The consequences of the 1811 state bankruptcy were still to express themselves, and in 1816–1817 there was extensive crop failure, while a lack of capital had a negative impact for a relatively long period of time, and the state expressed a lack of interest in economic matters for some period. Fears of competition from cheaper and higher quality British goods were influenced by the state's restrictive customs policy. A patent of 27 August 1803 had led to a large increase in customs by up to 500%, with about 240 commodities completely excluded from imports.³⁵ It wasn't until 1840, when Baron Kübeck became the leader of the Court Chamber (Hofkammer)³⁶ that there was any attempt at introducing a new system which would eliminate the unfortunate situation regarding customs. However, fears of possible consequences condemned the attempt to failure. The monarchy's foreign trade did not undergo continuous growth, stagnating in the initial years following the Napoleonic Wars. The question remains as to what extent this affected Trieste, which did not benefit from its links to the lands of the monarchy alone. The establishment of the German Customs Union in 1834 did not bring Austria any benefits; rather the opposite. In fact, this union treated the Habsburg Monarchy as any other foreign state. In terms of imports via Trieste, colonial products, coffee and sugar, were of great importance. It is difficult to ascertain exact data in this regard, because, for example, a large amount of coffee was smuggled since customs duty on its import was 100% higher in

³⁵ HAUSBRANDT, p. 39.

³⁶ Court Chamber (Hofkammer) – the authority which administered the sovereign's income to cover the outgoings of the court and state. It operated as a central advisory body for economic and financial matters.

Austria than it was within the Customs Union.³⁷ Trieste gradually built up an important position in the import of colonial goods, tropical fruits, vegetables and materials, of which the most important was the import of cotton, followed by leather and dyes. Beginning in the 1830s, the most important exports were silk, glass, cereal and construction materials.

In terms of the import and export of goods from Trieste, the largest fall was undoubtedly during the third French occupation. All general crises affected Trieste, with a significant fall in trade sometimes occurring, but it is of note that these were short in duration. Another shake-up occurred at the end of the 1810s, when imports into the port fell in 1818 and 1819 by 35%, and exports by 20% (Table 5). This situation occurred again in 1824, with another fall of around 20%. *“The economic crisis in the second half of the 1830s began in 1836 in Great Britain mainly as a result of extensive speculation in shares, especially of railway companies. It moved to the United States the following year, and by the turn of 1837/1838 it was severely affecting many countries in continental Europe, including the Habsburg Monarchy. In Trieste, the first signs were seen at the end of 1837, and it erupted in full force in spring 1838. By July, payments stopped to 30 trading companies.”*³⁸ It is extraordinary that the 1830s crisis did not have a negative overall impact on the import and export of goods in Trieste; in fact there was a significant increase in both figures in 1838 and 1839, with imports growing by 18% and exports by 21%, and this trend essentially continued until the 1848 revolution (Table 5).

Compared to other major European ports, Trieste's development was hampered by several fundamental facts. In particular, the main centres of industrial enterprise in the Habsburg Monarchy – Bohemia, Moravia, Lombardy-Venetia and Lower Austria – were too far away and railway connections inland were not built until the launch of the Südbahn in 1857. For many years, the Czech lands had stronger links to Saxony and Silesia, with a railway link between Bohemia and Hamburg in operation from the beginning of the 1850s. Transport on the Elbe to Hamburg had long been burdened by high customs duties, but these were eliminated through signature of the so-called Elbe-Schiffahrts-Acte by representatives of the concerned states on 23 June 1821, securing freedom of navigation and trade on the river. The lack of capital in Trieste has already been noted.

³⁷ L. TEGOBOFSKI, *Übersicht des österreichischen Handels im eilfjährigen Zeitraume 1831–1841*, Wien 1844.

³⁸ A. SKŘIVAN st. – A. SKŘIVAN ml., Paroplavební společnost rakouského Lloydů. Vznik, počáteční aktivity a problémy, in: *Historický obzor*, Vol. 29, No. 9/10, 2018, pp. 194–201 (p. 198).

In 1816, Austria's National-Bank was established, but the strong influence of the Viennese Rothschild, Arnstein, Eskeles and Sina banking houses, which enjoyed great profit from mediating trade at the port, prevented a branch from being set up in Trieste.

Trade between the Habsburg Monarchy and foreign states was secured by agreements from the 18th century, with trade agreements a component or consequence of peace treaties with the Ottoman Empire signed in Passarowitz (21/7/1718), Belgrade (18/9/1739) and Sistova (4/8/1791). Austria had long been able to profit from its exceptional position in terms of trade with the Ottoman Empire, but at the end of the 1820s, its influence fell in Turkey, mainly as a result of the Treaty of Adrianople signed following the Russo-Turkish War (1829) and in relation to British trade policy. Britain had concluded a free trade treaty with the Turks in 1838, which France joined, as did Austria following some hesitation in 1839. In line with this development, Austria's traditional influence in the Levant fell, to the detriment of Trieste which had traditionally held an exceptional position in trade with the Levant, where products of the Austrian distilling and sugar industries were sent, with Trieste traders also supplying the market there with wood, glass, textiles, ironmongery goods and other commodities. Increased competition, from Marseille and Genoa in particular, forced Trieste entrepreneurs to become more efficient and increase their competitiveness.³⁹ Unsuccessful discussions had been held for many years with Russia, where Trieste traders had marked interest in the export of cereals, on a new trade agreement, and eventually in March 1822 St Petersburg implemented a strict protective customs tariff, and Austrian ships in Russian ports had their fees increased by 50%. The eventual trade agreement with Russia, concluded in December 1845, did not bring any changes of benefit to Austria. Relations with Greece were more positive, a trade agreement being signed in 1835 shortly after Greece attained independence. In Italy, the Habsburg Monarchy had good trading relations with the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, but once the southern Italian state concluded a trade agreement with Great Britain, and then with France and Spain, Austrian traders lost their previous position and advantages. Regarding West European states, trade with France did not develop particularly well following 1815. Discussions were held with Great Britain from 1817, but London never ceded any advantages in trade with its colonies, something Austria

³⁹ ESCHER, pp. 54–55.

was striving to achieve. In 1829, a trade agreement was concluded with the United States, but it was mostly Americans who took advantage of it, with Austrian goods not really finding a foothold across the ocean. In the first half of the 19th century, Trieste was of course primarily dependent on the monarchy's foreign trade and "*Austrian economic policy at that time supported Trieste's development through all means*,"⁴⁰ although this did not always correspond to the trading interests of the state and port, for whom the Habsburg Empire's foreign trade structure was a disadvantage. Of great importance to Trieste were both mediating transit trade from the South German states and Switzerland and involvement in securing trade between the Levant and the states of western and northern Europe. By 1845, goods to a value of 9 million gulden transited through Trieste from neighbouring countries, while Austrian manufacturers exported goods worth 5.7 million gulden via the port.⁴¹ Trieste's greatest rivals in the Mediterranean were Livorno and Genoa in Italy, and the French port of Marseille. A certain overuse of the free port by foreigners was criticised by some from the beginning, and the situation was complicated by the complex customs arrangements of the Habsburg Monarchy. In the period following the Napoleonic Wars in 1819, a number of Habsburg Monarchy lands (Dalmatia, Lombardy-Venetia, Tyrol, Vorarlberg as well as the Free Ports) were outside Austrian customs territory, which they were gradually incorporated into over the course of the 19th century, with the Free Ports of Trieste and Fiume joining it in 1891.

In the first half of the 19th century, the vast majority of Austrian maritime trade was secured by sailing ships, which within a short period significantly reduced the time taken to sail to certain destinations – a sailing from Trieste to Istanbul, for example, fell from an average of 41.01 to 27.95 days between 1832 and 1838, i.e. by 31.8%⁴² (Table 6). Although the era of steam ships began in the century's second decade, more significant development did not occur until the setting up of Austrian Lloyd's steam-navigation department in Trieste in 1836. Its development, however, underwent dramatic twists and turns with considerations made of Lloyd's nationalisation and even its dissolution.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 6.

⁴¹ HAUSBRANDT, p. 105.

⁴² See the chapter *Segelschiffahrt zwischen Triest und Konstantinopel vom Jahre 1832 bis 1838*. S. BECHER, *Statistische Übersicht des Handels der Österreichischen Monarchie mit dem Auslande während der Jahre 1829 bis 1838*, Stuttgart, Tübingen 1838, pp. 247–249.

The beginnings of Austrian Lloyd's steam navigation⁴³ are linked to the activities of companies for insuring ships and their cargo in Trieste, the first of which, *Compagnia di Assicurazioni*, was set up in 1766. The founders of these institutions were mostly bankers, traders and ship-owners. In 1831, most Trieste insurance companies were merged into the company *Stabilimento centrale delle compagnie di sicurtà*, whose objective was to set up an organisation providing ship-owners and traders with information on seafaring, trade and the situations in Europe and overseas. In order to establish an information centre, *Stabilimento centrale* set up a special commission – *Commissione Organizzatore del Lloyd Austriaco*. Its most important members were Carl Ludwig Bruck⁴⁴ (representing *Acienda Assicuratrice*), who played a large part in setting up *Austrian Lloyd*, and the banker Pasquale Revoltella (*Assicurazioni Generali*).⁴⁵ The Commission proposed

⁴³ In 2018, the authors of this text published an extensive study on the circumstances of the establishment, initial activities and problems of *Austrian Lloyd* (see note 38), so in this study we present only basic information on its establishment.

⁴⁴ Karl Ludwig von Bruck (1798–1860), eighth child of a bookbinder from the Rhineland, fought at Waterloo as a youth and took part in the Greek War of Independence. A trader in Trieste, he was member of parliament for Trieste during the revolution of 1848 in Frankfurt's National Assembly, and Minister for Commerce in Felix Schwarzenberg's cabinet between 1848 and 1851. He was briefly Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire (1853–1855) and became Finance Minister in 1855. He played a large role in securing economic development, construction of the railways and organisation of financial matters. Due to suspicions he had personally enriched himself in performing his duties, he was dismissed and committed suicide on 23 April 1860. These suspicions proved entirely unfounded and unsustainable. For more on von Bruck, see R. CHARMATZ, *Minister Freiherr von Bruck. Der Vorkämpfer Mitteleuropas. Sein Lebensgang und seine Denkschriften*, Leipzig 1916. More recently, see E. MACHO, *Karl Ludwig Freiherr von Bruck. Ein Wirtschaftsfachmann ohne Beamtenmentalität. Beiträge zur Neueren Geschichte Österreichs*. Hg. von B. M. BUCHMANN, Frankfurt am Main 2013. On von Bruck's tragedy, *ibid.*, pp. 165–192.

⁴⁵ Pasquale von Revoltella (1795–1869), son of a butcher who arrived in Trieste from Venice in 1796. In 1816, he began working for the financial house, Collioud et Co., gaining access to the most influential financial circles in the city, involved amongst other matters in setting up *Gabinetto da Sicurtà*, which was the company behind the establishment of *Assicurazione Generali*. Revoltella was involved in the setting up of *Austrian Lloyd*, was involved in the activities of the Rothschilds' founded *Österreichische Credit-Anstalt für Handel und Gewerbe*, set up the shipyard *Stabilimento Tecnico Triestino* in Muggia in 1857, acquired the engineering works and boiler shop *Struthof* in San Andrea and the shipyard in San Rocco. He did a lot of work in relation to the construction of the Suez Canal, allegedly providing 25 million gulden to fund the project, investing the cash in 500 000 shares of the Suez Canal Company, of which he was Vice-President. He died on 9 September 1869, just two months before the canal was opened. For more on Revoltella, see GATSCHER-RIEDEL, pp. 126–131.

setting up *Austrian Lloyd* on 20 April 1833, with 22 insurance companies involved, essentially all of those then active in Trieste.⁴⁶ On 24 August 1833, the company's Commission asked the governor of the Austrian Littoral, Prince Porcia, to approve its charter, which happened on 11 November 1833,⁴⁷ with the Emperor affirming the decision on 21 June 1834.

The establishment of *Austrian Lloyd's* second section, the *Steam Navigation Company*, on 2 August 1836 was undoubtedly a significant event in the development of steam navigation within the Habsburg Monarchy, but it was not linked with its beginnings. In 1817, Briton John Allen had founded the *English Company*, which secured a link between Trieste and Venice. Allen sold his company in 1819 to British shipbuilder William Morgan. Of greater significance, however, was the establishment of the listed company, *First Danube Steam Navigation Company*, founded by Britons John Andrews and Joseph Pritchard. Its shareholders included Chancellor Metternich and leading Austrian banking houses.

In January 1835, the *Lloyd* General Assembly asked the government to approve an expansion of their activities to incorporate a second section, which would focus on operating maritime steam navigation.⁴⁸ In a letter to Chancellor Metternich on 16 August 1835, then-official at the *State Chancellery*, Carl Ritter von Menz, called on Austria to set up two shipping lines to the Levant as soon as possible, because “*discussion in both chambers in France [...] has openly revealed the intention of the French government to capture [the transport of] a large section of European post which currently goes through Austrian hands*”.⁴⁹ Menz also came up with a plan so that Austrian

⁴⁶ Some of the most important included Banco Adriatico di Assicurazioni, Azienda Assicuratrice, Banco Ilirico d'Assicurazioni, Assicurazioni Generali Austro-Italiche, Banco di Maritime Assicurazioni, Compagnie degli Amici Assicuratori a Società Orientale d'Assicurazioni. H. G. WURMBÖCK, *Die Entwicklung der österreichischen Schifffahrt und die Geschichte des Österreichischen Lloyd*. Diplomarbeit, Wien 1974, p. 29. For more on the role of insurance companies, see U. COVA, *Die entscheidende Rolle der Assekuranzgesellschaften und der Kaufmannschaft in Triest bei der Gründung des Österreichischen Lloyds (Lloyd Austriaco)*. Sonderabdruck aus dem Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 123 Jahrgang, 1986, So. 6, pp. 162–174.

⁴⁷ R. E. COONS, *Steamships, Statesmen, and Bureaucrats. Austrian Policy towards the Steam Navigation Policy of the Austrian Lloyd 1836–1848*, Wiesbaden 1975, p. 10.

⁴⁸ MACHO, p. 24.

⁴⁹ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien (hereinafter OESTa), Abteilung Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (hereinafter HHStA), Ministerium des Äußern 1784–1924, Administrative Registratur (hereinafter Adm. Reg.), Fach (hereinafter F) 38, Karton (hereinafter Kt.) 7/2 (Lloyd 1833–1860). Menz an Metternich, Mailand, den 16. August 1835.

ships could be involved in transporting British post to India. His plan, however, was determined to be unrealistic and did not get support. At the end of November 1838, Britain's Foreign Secretary, Viscount Palmerston, informed the Ambassador in Vienna, Sir Frederick Lamb, that the Foreign Office had begun negotiations with the French.⁵⁰

In 1834, *Lloyds* management appointed Metternich its "honorary protector" in an endeavour to gain the statesman's favour. On 30 July 1835 *Lloyds* directors instructed their representative in Vienna to provide the Emperor with an aide-memoire in which they asked for approval of the steam navigation company's charter and stressed its importance for the monarchy.⁵¹ At a special meeting of the General Assembly on 5 October 1835, Bruck provided information on the project, and on 12 October 1835 the establishment of the *Austrian Lloyd Steam Navigation Company* was approved. A personal letter from Emperor Ferdinand I's *Court Chamber* expressed consent. 2 August 1836 is the date of the establishment of the *Austrian Lloyd Steam Navigation Company*, confirmed at the General Assembly, with Francesco Taddeo von Reyer⁵² elected President of the new company, at that time seemingly the most important trader in Trieste. Lloyd's entry was impressive, and by the end of 1838 it owned 10 ships. Sir Thomas Sorell, British Consul in Trieste, declared that "*Lloyd steamships are well built and have good crews*,"⁵³ while British Ambassador in Vienna, Sir Frederick Lamb expressed the opinion that the company's vessels were "*equal to the best British and American ships*."⁵⁴

⁵⁰ The National Archives London-Kew (hereinafter TNA), Foreign Office (hereinafter FO), 7 (Austria)/270. Political and Other Departments: General Correspondence before 1906. Austro-Hungarian Empire (formerly Holy Roman Empire). To Sir Frederic Lamb. Date: 1838. Palmerston to Lamb, London, 30 November 1838.

⁵¹ OESStA, HHStA, Adm. Reg. F 38/7. Untertänigste Bitte der Direktion des Österreichischen Lloyds um genehmigung der modifiziertem Statuten und um Unterstützung der Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft. Wien den 30. Juli 1835. Also CHARMATZ, p. 12.

⁵² For more on Reyer, see COVA, pp. 171–172; W.-D. BURGSTALLER, *Das österreichische Handelsministerium unter Karl Ludwig Freiherrn von Bruck und der Kampf um die politische und Wirtschaftliche Vormachtstellung im deutschen Raum*, Diss., Graz 1969, p. 3.

⁵³ TNA, FO, 7 (Austria)/270. Political and Other Departments: General Correspondence before 1906. Austro-Hungarian Empire (formerly Holy Roman Empire). Consul Sir Thomas Sorell. Foreign Various and Consular Domestic. Date 1843. Sorell to Bidwell, Trieste, 10 February 1838.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, FO 7/272, From Frederic Lamb, 04 July 1838–31 October 1838. Lamb to Palmerston, Lienna, 25 October 1838.

The mid-19th century brought a series of events which determined the future development of the Habsburg Monarchy in a fundamental way, and this naturally also impacted Trieste's development and position. The 1848/1849 revolutions did not particularly impact the port, in contrast to other parts of the monarchy. On the other hand, defeat in the wars of 1859 and 1866 brought fundamental change. For Trieste, Italy gaining its old rival, Venice, was of key importance. Italy began to support Venice's development, and to a certain extent the situation as it used to be was restored, although the Italian ports of Livorno and Genoa were greater rivals. The February Patent, declared on 26 February 1861, established a constitutional system, and on this basis, Trieste became a separate crown land. The Austro-Hungarian Compromise and the December Constitution of 1867 had a marked impact. The Hungarian government began heavily supporting the development of rival Fiume (Rijeka). The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 was of undoubted great significance for Trieste's position, providing the port with new opportunities. Of importance was the reduced time needed to sail to Asian ports – the route to Mumbai was shortened by 7,400 km, the sailing 38 days shorter, i.e. a 61% reduction in its previous length.⁵⁵ Experts at the time realised the benefits sailing brought to Trieste. Renowned geographer, traveller and diplomat, Karl von Scherzer, for example, judged that: *"In regard to Austria-Hungary, Trieste and Fiume could acquire the same trading significance as Liverpool has for England, and Hamburg and Bremen have for northern Germany. Yes, they could become transshipment points for diverse Indian and Asian products which have previously entered the markets of south and southwest Europe circuitously via London and Amsterdam."*⁵⁶ However, it appears that *"although the Suez Canal, a construction of epoch-making significance, was designed by Austrian engineer Alois Negrelli von Moldelbe, and the project was greatly promoted and funded by Trieste banker and entrepreneur Pasquale Revoltella, the proper authorities in Austria-Hungary did not immediately realise what opportunities would be opened for Trieste in regard to its position in world trade"*.⁵⁷ The port was not sufficiently

⁵⁵ M. SMOLENSKY, *Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Österreichischen Lloyd, der Austro-Americana und der Freien Schifffahrt im Aussenhandel Österreichs*, Zürich 1916, p. 5.

⁵⁶ *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre Österreichischer Lloyd, 1836–1911*. Hg. von Publizistischen Bureau des Österreichischen Lloyd, Triest 1911, p. 60.

⁵⁷ A. SKŘIVAN st., *Doprava z Rakousko-Uherska do zámoří*, in: *Zdvořilý nezámek. Ekonomické a politické zájmy Rakousko-Uherska na Dálném východě 1900–1914*, Praha 2014, pp. 41–58 (p. 43).

ready from a purely technical perspective, and the “*facilities of the Trieste port [with regard to the needs of modern sea navigation] were still rather underdeveloped*”.⁵⁸ Furthermore, “*Austrian and Hungarian shipping had never been great users of canals, unlike conveyors from Great Britain, and later Germany*”.⁵⁹

The last major event of this transition period was the economic crisis which began in 1873.⁶⁰ This was mainly the result of an overheated economy in the “*seven fat years*” of 1867–1873. To illustrate the “*founding pace*” – in the final year prior to the crisis, 1872, 1,005 stock companies were founded in the Habsburg Monarchy, of which just 516 survived to 1874.⁶¹ The crisis began in Austria-Hungary when the Vienna Stock Exchange crashed on 9 May 1873, and recovery did not take place until the end of the 1870s. This economic disruption naturally had a marked impact on Trieste, and its share of implementing the monarchy’s foreign trade fell. Over subsequent decades, the port underwent a period of renewal and although shipping transportation was affected by fluctuations and Austrian Lloyd was only lifted out of difficulties with the help of the state,⁶² prior to the First World War in terms of the volume and value of goods transported and passenger numbers, Austrian Lloyd was the largest steam navigation company in the Mediterranean and Trieste was the second most important port in the region.

⁵⁸ SMOLENSKY, p. 6.

⁵⁹ SKŘIVAN st., p. 43.

⁶⁰ For more on the causes, course and consequences of the crisis, see H. RUMPLER, *Österreichische Geschichte 1804–1914. Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa. Bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall in der Habsburgermonarchie*, Wien 1997, pp. 463–486.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 463.

⁶² For more on this issue, see C. CONTRIBUENTI, *Uebelstände und deren Heilung. Kritisch-ökonomische und finanzielle Studie über die Oesterr.-Ungar. Lloyd-Gesellschaft*, Wien 1890. Separatabdruck der „L’Austria“.

Appendices

Table 1. Monarchy's Maritime Trade via Trieste 1761–1765 (in gulden)

Year	Exports	Imports	Balance	Transit	Total
1761	3 964 914	1 820 851	2 144 063	917 000	6 702 765
1762	3 002 746	2 242 872	759 874	965 619	6 211 237
1763	3 411 739	2 544 347	857 392	709 385	6 675 471
1764	4 069 993	2 662 459	1 407 534	1 100 056	7 832 508
1765	3 280 326	2 984 206	296 110	1 340 917	7 605 449
average	3 545 944	2 452 947	1 092 997	1 006 596	7 005 486

Source: W. KALTENSTADLER, Der österreichische Seehandel über Triest im 18. Jahrhundert, in: *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Bd. 56 (Teil 2), 1969, p. 31.

Table 2. Imports and Exports from Trieste (in gulden)

Year	Imports	Exports
1782	9 310 689	4 042 186
1789	20 627 525	16 226 030

Source: B. JÜLG, Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der österreichischen Seeschifffahrt, in: *Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik*, Bd. 104/2, 1904, p. 101.

Table 3. Imports and Exports by sea from Trieste over Time, 1802–1813 (in gulden)

Year	Imports	Exports
1802	28 623 110	21 302 720
1803	26 727 350	29 310 470
1804	30 714 348	24 342 930
1805	24 972 400	21 437 210
1806	18 520 370	12 430 410
1807	16 932 520	14 800 400
1808	14 500 300	10 900 500

1809	6 270 742	7 430 137
1810	2 503 745	3 070 092
1811	1 749 921	4 640 400
1812	2 380 300	3 192 430
1813	1 932 388	447 844

Source: *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie*, Jg. 1829. Given in Hausbrandt, p. 30.

Table 4. Maritime Transport in Trieste between 1802 and 1813
(number of ships, total tonnage in tons)

Year	under the Austrian flag		under a Foreign flag		Total	
	number	tonnage	number	tonnage	number	tonnage
1802	440	68 011	238	46 396	678	114 407
1803	496	88 815	263	56 480	759	145 295
1804	421	75 433	160	30 680	581	106 113
1805	275	51 380	172	31 783	447	83 163
1806	440	80 782	281	51 466	721	132 248
1807	350	60 838	105	19 989	445	80 827
1808	59	10 509	63	11 899	122	22 408
1809	45	8 689	31	5 974	76	14 653
1810	6	1 200	28	3 674	34	4 874
1811	3	491	12	1 993	15	2 484
1812	2	390	29	5 798	31	6 188
1813	15	3 108	30	5 664	45	8 772

Source: *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie*, Jg. 1829. Given in Hausbrandt, p. 31.

Table 5. Maritime Imports/Exports to Trieste over Time
(data in million gulden)

Year	Imports	Exports	Year	Imports	Exports
1802	28 623 100	23 302 720	1826	31 732 051	29 243 825
1803	26 727 350	29 210 470	1827	32 574 247	31 245 378
1804	30 714 348	24 342 930	1828	33 882 117	35 561 823
1805	24 972 400	21 437 210	1829	36 273 145	31 646 227
1806	18 520 370	12 430 410	1830	35 710 666	35 159 205

1807	16 932 520	14 800 400	1831	38 870 370	35 455 390
1808	14 500 300	10 900 500	1832	50 714 722	34 380 070
1809	6 720 742	7 430 137	1833	46 007 256	36 910 374
1810	2 503 745	3 070 092	1834	45 054 518	38 165 616
1811	1 479 921	4 640 400	1835	51 259 764	40 438 028
1812	2 380 300	3 192 430	1836	63 157 840	45 363 911
1813	1 932 388	447 844	1837	48 514 518	38 482 214
1814	42 771 387	21 365 398	1838	50 775 518	35 405 638
1815	34 555 323	32 847 756	1839	59 842 985	42 832 915
1816	45 048 413	31 083 168	1840	56 290 919	39 758 063
1817	32 470 839	27 295 271	1841	46 823 721	36 681 815
1818	33 321 815	26 547 089	1842	53 080 578	39 522 468
1819	21 545 605	21 063 525	1843	58 446 888	40 557 315
1820	22 123 428	18 012 819	1844	56 512 100	44 470 100
1821	29 530 872	20 474 289	1845	59 763 000	50 962 000
1824	24 438 274	26 119 628	1846	67 136 100	56 522 200
1825	32 104 137	29 695 522	1847	66 004 500	55 897 600
			1848	63 734 500	50 045 300

Source: *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie*, Jg. 1840an. Given Hausbrandt, p. 111.

Table 6. Sailings from Trieste to Istanbul

Year	Austrian Ships			Foreign Ships		
	No. Ships	No. Days Sailing		No. Ships	No. Days Sailing	
		All Ships	Per Ship		All Ships	Per Ship
1832	72	2 916	41.01	18	617	34.27
1833	35	1 322	37.77	7	210	30.00
1834	43	1 567	36.46	4	115	28.85
1835	49	1 350	34.61	5	180	36.00
1836	95	3 312	31.86	38	1 347	35.44
1837	120	3 609	30.08	35	1 170	33.42
1838	108	3 019	27.95	26	820	31.54
	511	17 095	33.45	133	4 559	33.52

Source: S. BECHER, *Statistische Übersicht des Handels der Österreichischen Monarchie mit dem Auslande während der Jahre 1829 bis 1838*, Stuttgart, Tübingen 1838, p. 247.

Jewish Capital as the Factor Shaping the City's Architecture. Selected Examples of Industrial Urban Development of Piotrków Trybunalski in the Second Half of the 19th Century (up to 1914)

*Irmina Gadowska – Magdalena Milerowska**

Currently, Piotrków Trybunalski is one of many medium-sized towns on the map of Poland, yet at the end of the 19th century was the fifth largest in the Polish Kingdom, second only to Warsaw, Łódź, Lublin, and Częstochowa. The city was the seat of governorate authorities, the tax chamber, as well as the Warsaw-Vienna railway station. Until the outbreak of World War II, Poles, Germans, Russians, and Jews living next to each other gave the city its multicultural character. This paper attempts to characterize the economic activity of Jews and their role in trade and the process of industrialization of Piotrków. Selected examples of industrial buildings erected on the initiative of this mentioned group were also analysed.

[Piotrków Trybunalski; Jewish Architecture; 19th Century Architecture; History of Poland]

Introduction

Piotrków Trybunalski is situated in central Poland – in the middle of Lodz Uplands, on the Strawa River, the left-bank tributary of Łęka River. It is known that as early as in the 11th century there was a trade route passing through in the vicinity of the present-day city, however, the earliest of the known records of Piotrków as a town date back to as late as 1313.¹ Municipal charter granted to Piotrków was confirmed by the king

* Institute of Art History, University of Łódź, Narutowicza 65, 90–131 Łódź; e-mail: irmina.gadowska@uni.lodz.pl, magdalena.milerowska@uni.lodz.pl.

¹ *In civitate nostra Petricouiensis* – was written in a document that granted privileges to Sulejów monastery on 16 October 1313. It is assumed that Piotrków was granted municipal charter before 1292, for it was then that the charter was granted to Sulejów,

Władysław Jagiełło in 1404.² In the following centuries, the town played an important role in the history of Poland. From the Middle Ages to the early modern period Piotrków was the seat of kings and dukes, the location of general meetings of the Polish Sejm as well as the residence of the Crown Tribunal for many years.³ Following the Third Partition of Poland,⁴ Piotrków was, under the terms of the Congress of Vienna, incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland which was in personal union with the Russian Empire. In the second half of the 19th century, the popular periodical *Tygodnik Ilustrowany* (*The Illustrated Weekly*) said: "It is said that that anyone who has at least some knowledge about national events should know something about Piotrków Trybunalski."⁵

The exclusion of the city from the government plans of creating the textile industrial district, which concerned Kalisz and Masovian Voivode-ships, was a significant factor determining the demographic structure and the direction of the city development in the first half of the 19th century. Highly qualified craftsmen brought from Germany avoided Piotrków

the city of a lower rank. T. NOWAKOWSKI, *Piotrków w dziejach polskiego parlamentaryzmu*, Piotrków Trybunalski 2005, p. 3.

- 2 The original document is in the Research Library of the Polish Academy of Arts and Science (PAU) and the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN) in Kraków, ref.16. It was released by the king Władysław Jagiełło, on 8th June 1404 and it locates Piotrków on German law. After 600 years, the document was displayed in the Piotrków Trybunalski Castle on 6th–8th June. M. GAŚLOR, *Najstarsze dokumenty miasta Piotrkowa. Katalog wystawy z okazji 600-lecia nadania miastu prawa magdeburskiego 1404–2004*, Piotrków Trybunalski 2004, p. 4.
- 3 Piotrków, as the seat of the Tribunal, was at the end of the 18th century one of the most economically resilient cities in the central part of Poland. It performed the function from 1578. During the sessions of the Crown Tribunal it became the place of general reunions of Polish nobility. It had a positive impact on the further development of the city. B. BARANOWSKI, *Ziemia piotrkowska do końca XVIII w.*, in: B. BARANOWSKI (ed.), *Województwo piotrkowskie. Monografia regionalna. Zarys dziejów, obraz współczesny, perspektywy rozwoju*, Łódź, Piotrków Trybunalski 1979, pp. 93–94.
- 4 In the time between 1772 and 1795 three partitions of Poland took place, which resulted in the division of the Commonwealth lands among Austria, Prussia and Russia. Thereby Poland, an independent country, disappeared from the map of Europe for 123 years. At first Piotrków Trybunalski belonged to the Prussian Partition (from 1793 on), afterwards it became a part of the Duchy of Warsaw (from 1807 on), to finally become incorporated into the Russian Partition as the city of the Kingdom of Poland (from 1815 on). About the situation of Poland after partitions, cf. A. CHWAŁBA, *Historia Polski 1795–1918*, Kraków 2005; N. DAVIES, *Boże Igrzysko. Historia Polski*, Kraków 2010.
- 5 L. RZECZNIOWSKI, *Odrzwia kamienne i futro od okna*, in: *Tygodnik Ilustrowany*, 239, 1864, p. 152.

to settle down in Kalisz, Zgierz, Łódź, Tomaszów and in other centres along the trackway Warsaw – Kalisz. The economy of the city was shaped first and foremost by Polish and Jews. The latter ones were engaged in commerce and craft. In 1848 there was a Warsaw-Vienna railway connection established in Piotrków, which contributed to the migration of population and initiated a long-term process of development and industrialization of Piotrków. In 1867, after the administrative reform of the Kingdom of Poland, the town became the main centre of one of the ten governorates with the seat of the governorate authorities, the governor's office, the revenue board, the circuit court as well as magistrates' court of many other institutions. The change of status was another, apart from the establishment of the railway connection, contributor to the development of Piotrków in the second half of the 19th century. According to the census, in the years 1871–1882 the population rose from 14,680 to 20,086, out of which Jews constituted 57,5% in 1882.⁶ Towards the end of the century the city was the fifth biggest urban center in the Polish Kingdom, after Warsaw, Łódź, Lublin and Częstochowa. In the last decades of the century Piotrków underwent a remarkable transformation. The formerly dominant wooden housing was replaced by the one built of brick, squares were established, streets were paved, paraffin lighting, later replaced by gas lighting appeared. In the *Geographical Dictionary of the Kingdom of Poland* the following description can be found: "In P. [Piotrków] there are 9 squares, six of which are paved, 45 streets, most of which are also paved, mainly with asphaltic pavements [...] two public gardens and many private ones, in which there are around 1100 fruit trees [...] Wooden buildings are situated solely in the suburbs; they are exceptionally rare in the town. [...] Among the large buildings, catholic churches, in the number of seven, come first, there is a protestant church, an orthodox church. [...] A synagogue built in 1689, [...] Whoever entered the town through Sieradzka Gate, found himself in a narrow street with crookedly arranged buildings, which led to a rectangular, packed with buildings and not very big market square, in the middle of which the tribunal town hall reared up. The market square was surrounded by single-storey as well as multi-storey tenement houses."⁷

The outbreak of World War I stopped hindered the growth of Piotrków. When the war finished and Poland gained independence in 1918, the town lost its significance. Its role as an economic (and political) centre

⁶ L. RZECZNIOWSKI., Spis jednodniowy, in: *Tydzień*, 26, 1882, p. 3.

⁷ F. SULIMIERSKI – B. CHLEBOWSKI – W. WALEWSI, *Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, Vol. VIII, Warszawa 1902, pp. 186, 197.

in the developing Second Polish Republic was negligible despite a few still active manufacturing plants, cultural institutions and religious communities.

Jews in Piotrków Trybunalski

The beginnings of Jewish settlement in Piotrków are most likely to relate to Middle Ages, however, there are no original documents left confirming the assumptions. It is all the same known that in the 16th century Jews used to live in so called Podzamcze.⁸ The localization behind the city walls was quite typical for a couple of reasons. The first and the most important one resulted from local restrictions, the other responded to the needs of Jewish settlers. As a rule, Jews made their homes in the vicinity of bigger trade centres, or not far from city gates. They were willing to dwell in river valleys, which were available and cheap due to the threat of flooding and at the same time complied with all requirements concerning religious rituals. The precarious situation of Jewish community in Piotrków stabilized as late as in the 17th century, when King Jan III Sobieski granted them the privilege of taking up residence just behind the city walls,⁹ which was confirmed by general edict in Jarosław in 1679.¹⁰ Since that time Piotrków's Jews had their community, which made it easier for them to focus on the economic development of the area they inhabited. In the economy of Piotrków Trybunalski situated in central Poland, trade, which concentrated mostly in Jewish part of the city, played a significant role. Orthodox Jews from Piotrków were engaged in small-scale trading (cattle, leather, fur, cloth, iron) and home craft. They dealt with furriery and mead brewing. Besides, they granted loans, traded in grain and woods.¹¹ Factors, who taking advantage of grand nobility reunions mediated with property transactions, sales, hypothecations and leases of property, and even matrimonial cases, constituted a particularly numerous

⁸ In many publications concerning the history of Piotrków Trybunalski the same area of the city, where Orthodox Jews lived was named *Podzamcze*, (bailey) *Wielka Wieś* (great village) or *jurydyka* starościńska. It should be assumed that *Podzamcze* means the area adjacent to the castle.

⁹ The privilege was granted in Jarosław on 16 March 1679. M. FEINKIND, *Dzieje Żydów w Piotrkowie i okolicy od czasów najdawniejszych do chwili obecnej*, Piotrków Trybunalski 1930, p. 12.

¹⁰ K. PECELT, *Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne w XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII w.*, in: BARANOWSKI (ed.), *Dzieje Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego*, Łódź 1989, p. 82.

¹¹ FEINKIND, p. 26.

group.¹² Despite the attempts to combat illegal crafts, in the 17th and 18th centuries a big role was played by the so called *partacze* (craftsmen not belonging to the guild) from the Jewish district. Magnates and gentry were their clientele.¹³ There are very few records left on the activity of *partacze* functioning independently of guilds. They are known to have gathered in their hands a significant share of production of precision goods of different kinds. In the 18th century there was a big banking and usury center in the Jewish quarter. Even Piotrków's kahal authorities were involved in the loan granting practice, which attracted traders from the remotest towns.¹⁴

From the mid-17th century to the end of the 18th century the regulations concerning Jewish settlement in Piotrków underwent continual changes. Following the downfall of the Commonwealth Prussian government removed in 1797 and 1802 all restrictions that Jewish people living within the administrative boundaries of Piotrków had been subject to.¹⁵ Unfortunately, when in 1809 the Austrians were stationed in the city, Jewish people had to leave it again.¹⁶ In 1811 the regulation which allowed Jews to settle solely on the outskirts of Piotrków, in the village Wielka Wieś,¹⁷ and four years later the ban on purchasing houses and apartments from Christians, purchasing land, starting new inns or distilleries was imposed.¹⁸ The sanctions were supposed to stop the migration of Jewish people towards city centers. It was as late as in 1840 when, so called Miasto Żydowskie (Jewish City) and Wielka Wieś (Great Village) were officially attached do Piotrków.¹⁹ 22 years later the border between them was abolished. In the mid-19th century Oskar Flatt wrote:

¹² R. ROSIN, Okres od schyłku XVI w. do rozbiorów Polski, in: Z. STANKIEWICZ (ed.), *Województwo piotrkowskie. Monografia regionalna. Zarys dziejów, obraz współczesny, perspektywy rozwoju*, Łódź, Piotrków Trybunalski 1979, p. 94.

¹³ K. URZĘDOWSKI, Piotrków w okresie staropolskim w świetle akt cechowych, in: R. KOTWICZ – R. SZWED (eds.), *Archiwum i badania nad dziejami regionu fasc. 1*, Piotrków Trybunalski 1995, p. 51.

¹⁴ B. BARANOWSKI, Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne w drugiej połowie XVII i XVIII w., in: BARANOWSKI (ed.), pp. 91–92.

¹⁵ J. BARANOWSKI – H. JAWOROWSKI, Historia i rozwój przestrzenny synagogi w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim, in: *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*, 57, 1966, p. 123; FEINKIND, p. 22.

¹⁶ O. FLATT, *Opis Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego pod względem historycznym i statystycznym*, Warszawa 1850, Piotrków Trybunalski 2014, p. 45.

¹⁷ Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (AGAD), Komisja Rządowa Spraw Wewnętrznych (KRSW) 1795–1868, Akta Miasta Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego (AMPT), Ref. 1439, p. 51.

¹⁸ BARANOWSKI – JAWOROWSKI, p. 123.

¹⁹ M. KOTER, Układ przestrzenny, in: BARANOWSKI (ed.), p. 216.

“The history of Piotrków reflects a constant struggle between Christians and Jewish people: despite numerous decisions, resolutions and royal charters Jews forced their way into the city. The stricter edicts were issued against them, the more widely they spread in the city. They ultimately scored a triumph: nowadays they constitute half the population and they rule over all trade. Only the government’s strong will prevented Jewry, so far crammed into their quarter, from flooding the Christian city like the second flood.”²⁰

The remaining accounts present an inconsistent image of, so called, Jewish Piotrków. Some historians, like M. Baliński and T. Lipiński perceived the Jewish quarter as a place of poverty and misery.²¹ Others emphasized the commercial character of the area inhabited by Jews.²² The beginning of the 19th century was very difficult for Piotrków, not only on account of political situation. The dynamics of the development evidently ground to a halt, the city was exhausted after wars, fires and epidemics. A small manufactory of Abram Zalman Rosenblau that started the production of chicory in 1815, was one of the first (and the very few) investments.²³ Other Jewish companies established subsequently in the 19th century contributed to the development of not only the city, but also the industry on the territory of the Russian Partition.²⁴ According to the Geographical Dictionary of the Kingdom of Poland there were 732 manufacturing and trading plants (mainly small and medium-sized) operating in Piotrków before 1882.²⁵ In 1901 out of 680 plants paying for patents 456 belonged

²⁰ FLATT, p. 45.

²¹ M. BALIŃSKI – T. LIPIŃSKI, *Starożytna Polska pod względem historycznym, jeograficznym, i statystycznym*, Vol. 1, Warszawa 1885, pp. 259–260.

²² FEINKIND, *passim*.

²³ National Archives in Piotrków, the files of Piotrków, *Dowody do Rachunku Kassy Ekonomiczney Miasta Piotrkowa 1815–1816*, ref. 6, p. 27 et seq; K. GŁOWACKI, *Urbanistyka Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego*, Vol. 1, Piotrków, Kielce 1984, p. 66.

²⁴ Among others one can mention C. Goldach’s soap store, M. Braun’s rectification plant and distillery, Joel Kagan’s machine factory and foundry, Rappaport and Eichner’s wood products factory, Inselstein’s iron foundry, Jakub Goldach’s factory of polishes and lacquers, Natan Goldlust’s first factory of weaving, Matylda Landau’s steam sawmill, Israel Goldach’s mineral water bottling plant, two brickworks, honey manufactory, distillery, two factories of tallow candles. The list based on: The National Archives in Łódź, Rząd Gubernialny w Piotrkowie, *Wydział budowlany*, Ref. 3485, 7231, 7375, 9330, 9626, 10154.

²⁵ The authors of the study name among them: mill and steam sawmill, agricultural tools, 12 brickworks, 2 distilleries, 4 breweries, 2 mead breweries, a factory of vinegar, a factory of tiles, 5 oil mills, 2 factories of tallow candles, lathe workshop, 2 dyeworks, 3 tanneries, 4 soap stores, boiler manufacturing plants, 2 stocking factories, 6 wind-

to the Jews. The Jews also dominated commerce in Piotrków. At the end of the century out of 600 people engaged in commerce, there were 82% of Jews, 14% of Catholics, 4% of people of other faiths.²⁶

Industrial Architecture

Taking into consideration centuries-old history of Piotrków, one should point to geographical features, political events, epidemics, fires and religiously diverse structure of society as the major factors determining the visual character of the city. The influence of Jewish people on the transformation of the building stock of Piotrków constitutes an interesting, however not thoroughly explored aspect of the studies on the development of the city. As exceptionally mobile citizens with a wide variety of jobs, Jews had a profound impact on the profile of the local economy and due to their capital assets on construction traffic. The phenomenon is particularly evident after 1862, when restrictions concerning the real estate property purchase that Jewish people had been subject to were removed. In the first half of the 19th century, Jewish urban development of Piotrków concentrated in the vicinity of the castle and in the neighbouring village Wielka Wieś on the account of the restrictions. The structure of the Jewish quarter was marked by overpopulation and apparent chaos demonstrated in the irregular city plan as well as in the external appearance of the buildings (diversity of forms, non-homogeneity of building materials). Low-rise wooden buildings predominated, only the buildings of profound ritual significance, like the synagogue were made of brick. In the second half of the century, following the great fire of Piotrków in 1865, an attempt to regulate the plan of the quarter was made. A dozen or so urban blocks were built up with single-level and one-storey houses surrounded by wooden outbuildings. Despite endeavours, the ghetto sprawled out of control and the housing standard was extremely low. Brick houses in the city centre inhabited by wealthy Jews were built in neoclassical style, historicism style and at the turn of the 20th century in the Art Nouveau style as well. As opposed to sacral buildings (a synagogue) or secular ones associated with the functioning of Jewish community (schools, ritual

mills, a slaughterhouse, 4 bookbinderies, joinery workshops and cooper's workshops et al. Cf. F. SULIMIEŃSKI – B. CHŁEBOWSKI – W. WAŁEWSKI, *Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, Vol. VIII, Warszawa 1902, p. 187.

²⁶ B. HAŁACZKIEWICZ, Działalność gospodarcza ludności żydowskiej w Piotrkowie w latach 1914–1939, in: A. PIASTA (ed.), *Badania nad dziejami regionu piotrkowskiego*, Fasc. 3, Piotrków Trybunalski 2002, p. 28.

baths), or even housing construction (private houses) characterized by the use of specific decorative elements (e.g. orientalising detail, characteristic imagery), factory buildings were not distinguished by anything exceptional falling into the pattern of industrial architecture. Among the most important industrial buildings erected in Piotrków since the second half of the 19th century up to 1914²⁷ there were: the steam mill of Pniower brothers, 'Anna' Glassworks, Piotrków's Manufacture, 'Raymond & Joel' iron foundry, Markus Braun's brewery.

In 1860 Izrael and Jakub Pniower started the mill equipped with a 57-horsepower steam engine.²⁸ Situated in the vicinity of the railway station, it soon developed to be one of the most modern plants of the Kingdom of Poland.²⁹ The fact that approximately 164,000 puds³⁰ of flour and groats were produced there testifies to the panache of the investment. Such a significant production – having satisfied the local needs – enabled dispatching of surplus products all over the governorate territory.³¹ There were around 30 workers employed in the plant. The original appearance of the factory is not known. It was probably smaller in size. Its current appearance is the result of reconstruction that took place in 1912, after the firm was overtaken by the *Peasant Agricultural and Trade Cooperative* (*Włościańska Spółdzielnia Rolniczo-Handlowa*). Four-storey building was erected on the plan of the elongated rectangle. The fourteen axial front elevation is divided by regularly spaced windows. The austere façade is devoid of decorative detail. Adjacent to the building from the north side, there was a lower outhouse (two storeys high) with a doorway leading into the interior. From the east side the mill touched a four-storey tenement house facing the street.

²⁷ All preserved to date.

²⁸ J. KRYŃSKI, *Fabryczne opowieści. Młyn*, in: *Tygodnik Piotrkowski*, 44, 1981, p. 5.

²⁹ In the seventies of the 19th century the mill in Piotrków belonged to the group of the 16 biggest commercial mills in the Kingdom of Poland. J. BATRYŚ, *Produkcja artykułów spożywczych*, in: M. DEMBIŃSKA (ed.), *Historia kultury materialnej Polski w zarysie*, Vol. VI, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk 1979, pp. 238 et seq.

³⁰ Pud is a former Russian weighing unit. 1 poodle = 16.38 kg.

³¹ GŁOWACKI, p. 94. In 1913 the mill caught serious fire. In the twenties the ownership of the mill passed to the company Horn, Oppenheim and Ska. In 1937 the ownership was transferred to the Peasant Agricultural and Trade Cooperative (*Włościańska Spółdzielnia Rolniczo-Handlowa*). In 1952 the state-owned gristmill (*Państwowe Zakłady Zbożowe*) took ownership of the mill. The National Archives in Piotrków Trybunalski, *Akta Miasta Piotrkowa, Akta Magistratu Miasta Piotrkowa dotyczące się konsensów na Procedera 1839–1869*, Ref. 40, p. 1063.

The 'Anna' Glassworks co-owned by Józef Schuldberg, Maurycy Tuwim and Abram Weitzman was the first bigger factory established in Piotrków in 1889. In August 1888, a short item that appeared in the Piotrków periodical *Tydzień* (*The Week*) said about the purchase of a built-up area, once belonging to the factory of potato syrup, made by the investors – co-owners of glass factories near Chełmno and Łuków mentioned before. The new factory was intended to produce crockery of high quality, ornate lampshades, etc.³² In 1905 it employed 85 workers.³³ The plan from 1889³⁴ presenting one of the production halls, shows a rectangularly elongated, single-storey, brick and plastered house with a gable roof and skylights located on the entrance axis. The horizontal layout of the elevation is highlighted by the row of windows and doors. The entrances were accentuated by flat avant-corps (apparent avant-corps) with curb roofs, the windows were arranged in groups of two, separated from each other by a profiled frame. Both windows and door copings have the form of a segmental arch. There are small, oval windows over the main entrance.

The first weaving factory named Piotrków Manufactory was the next important investment in the city. The beginnings of the complex situated on the eastern outskirts of the city date back to the 80s of the 19th century. In Sulejowska Street (the one going out of the city, south-easterly, towards Kielce) there were several dozen Jewish looms operating back then, which ushered in the development of the 'Bugaj' weaving district. The short item in the periodical *Tydzień* says: "Their founders are local Israeli, who overtook us in that respect as usual, setting a good example of promptness and energy."³⁵

Convenient location on the city outskirts, on the ground situated in the vicinity of a water reservoir, influenced the decision to locate the weaving

³² Fabryka wyrobów szklanych, in: *Tydzień*, 36, 1888, p. 1.

³³ In 1907 the factory was taken over by E. Haebler. After the redevelopment and modernization, it operated as an ironworks "Hortensja". J. PIETRZAK, *Z dziejów przemysłu w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim* (od połowy XIX do lat trzydziestych XX), in: R. ROSIN (ed.), *750 lat Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego*, Piotrków Trybunalski 1969, p. 199; T. NOWAKOWSKI, *Piotrków Trybunalski i okolice*, Warszawa 1972, p. 51; L. JEZIORAŃSKI, *Księga adresowa przemysłu fabrycznego w Królestwie Polskim*, Vol III, Warszawa 1906, dep III, item 1272; M. ZDROJEWSKI, 1889–1969. 80 lat Hortensji, in: *Gazeta Ziemi Piotrkowskiej*, 49, 1969; pp. 4–5; J. KRYŃSKI, *Fabryczne opowieści. Pierwsza była Anna...*, in: *Tygodnik Piotrkowski*, 28, 1981, p. 7; W. PUŚ – S. PYTLAS, *Szklana Hortensja. Dzieje huty w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim*, Łódź 1982, p. 12.

³⁴ B. BARANOWSKI – K. BARANOWSKI – A. LECH (eds.), *Katalog zabytków budownictwa przemysłowego w Polsce*, Vol. IV, Fasc. 4, Wrocław 1971, p. 73.

³⁵ Warsztaty tkackie, in: *Tydzień*, 13, 1889, p. 2.

plant in 'Bugaj' district. On 8th June 1893 'Frumkin & Co Piotrków Manufactory' co-partnership was established in the notary's office of Karol Filipiński. Naftali Frumkin, Mendel Schlosberg and Lejb Wyszniwski were the shareholders in the factory. The company bought the ground situated on the eastern outskirts of the city together with the adjacent pond. On 28th July 1894, the foundation stone for the factory was laid. Gurland, the engineer, managed the construction works, there were mostly local workers employed, only carpenters and joiners were brought from Grodno. The erection of the factory was preceded by the construction of a brickworks to provide construction material. In February 1895, a report on the progress of works appeared in *Tydzień*: "*With the advent of spring the first large-scale steam dyeworks will be opened in our city; in May the weaving mill will start operating and at the same time the construction works on a spinning mill and a finishing plant.*"³⁶

The weaving mill building was constructed on a rectangular plan with dimensions 60 m × 42 m. It could accommodate 400 weaving stations, which were provided with additional light by two metres high windows. The factory floor was heated and ventilated and so was the neighbouring dyeworks. The weaving mill worked due to the modern, 300-horsepower, two-cylinder "Camponnd" machine, mounted in a separate room. It was also equipped in steam boilers from the factory of Fitzner and Gamper in Sosnowiec. The lightning was provided by a dynamoelectric machine. Water supply installation was located inside the building, which prevented pipes from freezing.³⁷ In 1896 the construction works of two residential houses for workers commenced.³⁸ These were two-storey, brick family houses, similar to the workers' houses called "famuły" for the workers from Karol Scheibler's factory on Księży Młyn (*Pastor's Mill*) or the houses for the workers from Israel Poznański's factory in Ogrodowa street in Łódź.³⁹ Two years later the next two residential buildings were constructed. In 1898 "Frumkin & Co Piotrków Manufactory" converted into "Stock Association of Piotrków Manufactory" ("Akcyjne Towarzystwo Piotrkowskiej Manufaktury") with M. Schlosberg, A. Frumkin and J. Friedstein as the managing board. One million rouble loan raised from St. Petersburg Trade Bank was meant to help develop production and facilitate competition

³⁶ Fabryki na Bugaju, in: *Tydzień*, 5, 1895, p. 2.

³⁷ Fabryka na Bugaju, in: *Tydzień*, 6, 1896, pp. 1–2.

³⁸ Z fabryki na Bugaju, in: *Tydzień*, 33, 1896, p. 2.

³⁹ M. KOTER, *Układ przestrzenny*, in: BARANOWSKI (ed.), p. 222.

with manufacturing plants from Łódź.⁴⁰ In 1900 a spinning mill and a finishing plant appeared next to the weaving mill and the dyeworks. The development of the mill was accompanied by an increase in employment. In 1896 there were 150 workers employed in the factory, in 1903 the number increased to as many as 442.⁴¹ Worse economic circumstances and risky financial operations conducted by the shareholders led to stagnation and finally to production halt. In 1911 the manufacture in Piotrków was taken over by Poznański, Silberstein and Co. Company from Łódź.⁴² At that time the construction of a grand, four-storey wool spinning mill started. Erected at 45 Sulejowska Street, four-storey spinning mill was constructed on a rectangular plan. The monumental building was partly cellared. Horizontal character of the front elevation was additionally stressed with a building plinth, and cornices (both intermediate and crowning) separated the four rows of windows. On the fourth axis from the left, the tower in the form of avant-corps, with corner cut-offs and a decorative surmounting with a crenellation was found. The windows on the three floors of the factory hall were embraced by a common frame. Ornate pilasters between the ground-floor windows interconnected with archivolts with accentuated tropic, created arcades. In the upper part of the tower an ornamental rosette and an array of small windows placed in the cornice constituted an additional decoration. The corners of the seven-axial side elevations stuck slightly out of the building. The whole structure was covered by a slightly sloped hip roof with two ventilation towers to ventilate the production hall. Social rooms were built on in the northern part of the building. On each storey of the spinning mill there were two production halls well-lit by the rows of window.⁴³ The whole complex was surrounded by a plastered, brick wall with the rhythm provided by pilasters separated by panels and surmounted with triangular coping. The building of the spinning mill formally represents characteristics of the nineteenth-century historicism. Unplastered, brick elevation, regularly arranged windows, rhythmical division of walls, impressive towers with water tanks or staircases fall into industrial architecture.

⁴⁰ Fabryka na Bugaju, in: *Tydzień*, 47, 1898, p. 2.

⁴¹ NOWAKOWSKI, p. 51.

⁴² B. WACHOWSKA, Z dziejów ruchu robotniczego w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim w latach 1918–1939, in: ROSIN (ed.), p. 97.

⁴³ E. GWÓŹDŹ, *Karta Ewidencyjna Zabytków Architektury i Budownictwa*, in: Provincial Office of Monuments Preservation, Delegacy in Piotrków Trybunalski, Piotrków Trybunalski 1998, pp. 1–6.

In 1899 the construction of the “Raymond and Joel” machine factory was finished.⁴⁴ Karol Raymond and Adolf Joel were traders from Konin. The factory was in the south of the city, in a district named Tomiczyna after the bishop Piotr Tomicki.⁴⁵ The complex designed by Czesław Zambrzycki, the engineer from Piotrków, consisted of a few single-storey, brick buildings housing the factory of machines, a forge, a joinery, a lathe workshop, assembly plant, a room for a steam engine, a count room, a ferrous foundry and a boiler manufacturing plant with some rooms for i.e. an electric motor and drying room. Not far from the ferrous foundry a chimney was erected, next to which rooms for workers, a warehouse-store with ready-to-sell products, stores with raw materials, a stable and a coach house were located.⁴⁶ The ceremonial opening of the factory was attended by workers and their families, owners, administration and guests – managers and engineers from industrial plants in Piotrków, Łódź, Sosnowiec, and others. Due to the majority of employed there, the factory was consecrated by a priest. The inaugural speeches emphasized the importance of industrialization for the city and the surrounding area ensuring the livelihood for the local population.⁴⁷ Around 1900 the factory employed 100 workers and belonged to four biggest factories in Piotrków.

One of the best-known Jewish entrepreneurs in Piotrków was Markus Braun – a philanthropist and funder of a Jewish hospital.⁴⁸ He was an owner of squares, brickworks and in the years 1875–1890 he ran a brewery in his grange on Obrytka (at present the area around Batory Street). In 1881 a nearby distillery was converted into a big steam powered plant. From 1891 the building object functioned as Manufacturing Plant, Steam Brickworks and Rectification of Fiscal Spirit and Steam Distillery. At the same time Braun started the development of the plant.⁴⁹ The project of

⁴⁴ Fabryka maszyn i kotłów, produkowanych w oparciu o własną odlewnię żeliwa. Patrz: J. PIETRZAK, Z dziejów przemysłu w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim (od połowy XIX do lat trzydziestych XX), in: ROSIN (ed.), p. 199.

⁴⁵ He was a founder of many buildings in the area. D. KLEMANOWICZ, Fabryka maszyn, kotłów i odlewnia żelaza „Raymond i Joel” jako przykład aktywności kapitału żydowskiego w przemyśle Piotrkowa Trybunalskiego na przełomie XIX i XX wieku, in: PIASTA (ed.), p. 42.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

⁴⁷ Poświęcenie fabryki, in: *Tydzień*, 9, 1900, pp. 2–3.

⁴⁸ Markus and Salomea Braun Jewish hospital was situated in the north-eastern part of the city (now in Wojska Polskiego street).

⁴⁹ GŁOWACKI, p. 122.

one of the buildings designed by Czesław Zambrzycki presents a neoclassical, three-storey, twelve-axial façade surmounted with a triangular pediment. Characteristic for functional architecture elevation is marked by discreet, reduced decoration composed of pilaster-strips and window lintels accentuated with both semi-circular and segmental arches. The horizontal composition is emphasized with horizontally arranged cornices separating the storeys. In 1917 Markus Braun's plant became a joint stock proprietorship with the shareholders: Juliusz Pinkus, Marian Splifogel and Filip Konn.⁵⁰

Summary

Jewish people played an important role in the process of industrialization of Piotrków in the second half of the 19th century. Although it is difficult to talk about the dominance of the group, its significance for the development of trade should be emphasized. Supported by their capital intensification of craft and trade, resulted in the development of financial institutions offering credits for the modernization of craft workshops, the start-up of transport companies and manufacturing plants. Until the end of the 19th century, the most developed industry branch in Piotrków was food industry, which translated into a great number of mills, distilleries, breweries, windmills, oil mills, sparkling water manufactories, home manufactories of spirit and vinegar. Sawmills and factories of machines also operated in the city. At the turn of the 20th century, big textile, glass, wood and brick companies appeared. Industrial construction concentrated close to slip roads, in the vicinity of water reservoirs and railway stations. In 1899 the weekly paper *Tydzień* said: "As we know, the districts of Piotrków, apart from the railroad, develop and populate with increasing speed [...] without any plans or building regulations that are applicable in the city centre. However, they indisputably do not differ from the latter one and form with it a coherent whole."⁵¹

At the time of the outbreak of the World War One Piotrków was a medium-sized city with moderately developed industry, but the manufacturers had the strong competition with nearby Tomaszów Mazowiecki and Lodz on their hands.⁵² Among the bigger industrial plants with Jewish

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ *Tydzień*, 3, 1899, p. 3.

⁵² A. PIASTA, *Piotrków Trybunalski w czasie pierwszej wojny światowej*, Piotrków Trybunalski 2007, p. 55.

capital were: Piotrków Manufactory, Rectification of Spirit, the brewery of Bartenbachs, the mill of Horn and Openheim, the factory of threads of Woliński and Bartenbach or the trading companies of Kranc, Kurc, Rotberg and Adler. On the grounds of the census carried out in 1916 on recommendation of the Municipal Office, it is known that among the 94 firms operating in the city, 64 were in Jewish hands. The political situation in 1914 had a negative impact on the economic development of Piotrków, leading to the stagnation and the closing down of 10 out of 14 industrial plants that were in Jewish hands.⁵³

⁵³ B. HAŁACZKIEWICZ, Działalność gospodarcza ludności żydowskiej w Piotrkowie w latach 1914–1939, in: PIASTA (ed.), pp. 25–26.

Saint-Germain and Trianon, 1919–1920. The Imperialist Peace Order in Central Europe

*Arnold Suppan**

The peace treaties of Saint-Germain and Trianon sealed the disintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy into seven successor states under international law. Due to the ethnically mixed settlement structures of Austria-Hungary, the application of the right of self-determination led to multiple demarcation conflicts between the new nation-states. When the Allied Powers started the Paris Peace Conference in January 1919, the negotiations were influenced by the unsettled atmosphere in East-Central Europe, which was suffering from an acute shortage of food and coal. Applying different political, strategic and economic principles, the peace treaties with Austria and Hungary were more vindictive than the one with Germany.

[Disintegration; Habsburg Monarchy; Demarcation Conflicts; Paris Peace Conference]

The peace treaties of Saint-Germain and Trianon sealed the disintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy into seven successor states under international law: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and Italy. The transition years from the dissolved Habsburg Monarchy to the majority republican successor states were usually difficult, sometimes chaotic. However, there were experienced politicians in most of the new states, who had already learned their trade in the parliaments of the defunct empire. At the beginning, the legal, administrative, economic, and social orders of Austria-Hungary had been adopted, but the political constitutions had now been reversed, as well as the politically guiding ideas. The repercussions of the “total war” experience, the impoverishment processes, the lack of food and coal, the “Spanish Flu”, as well as radical nationalism, including anti-Semitism, were felt intensely in the following years. The legal measures of the new governments also set in motion hundreds of thousands people between

* Austrian Academy of Sciences; e-mail: Arnold.Suppan@oeaw.ac.at.

the successor states of the Habsburg Monarchy, especially previous Austrian and Hungarian civil servants. These devastating situations triggered millions of people's fears about the present and pessimism about the future.

At the end of October 1918, on the home front, national independence was claimed by everyone: Poland, Czechoslovakia, German-Austria, the State of the Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs, Hungary, and the West Ukrainian Republic. In Vienna, the Social Democrat Karl Renner became State Chancellor of the German-Austrian government; in Budapest, the "Aster Revolution" triumphed with the appointment of Count Mihály Károlyi as Prime Minister; in Prague, the National Committee called together a National Assembly made up of Czech and Slovak deputies. In mid-November 1918, the German-Austrian, Czecho-Slovak and Hungarian parliaments proclaimed republics. Already on 29 October 1918, the National Council of Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs in Zagreb had declared all South Slavic provinces of former Austria-Hungary an independent state, meaning Slovenia, Croatia-Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Vojvodina. The armistice of Padova, signed on 3 November 1918, determined the withdrawal of the Austro-Hungarian troops from all occupied territories in Northern Italy, the Balkans, and Eastern Europe, the complete demobilization of the Imperial Army and its reduction in peacetime to a maximum of 20 divisions, as well as the right of the Entente armies to "*move freely inside Austria-Hungary and occupy strategic points*". Some 360,000 Austro-Hungarian soldiers found themselves taken as prisoners of war.

In point ten of his Fourteen Points to the Congress US President Woodrow Wilson had addressed: "*The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to safeguard and assure, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.*" Wilson also called for the removal of all economic barriers, the reduction of national armaments, and the alignment of borders after "*historically established lines of allegiance and nationality*". For all nationalities of Austria-Hungary nation-building meant the connection between ethnicity, territory, and sovereignty. The political representatives of all nationalities wanted on "their" territory to establish their own, independent nation-state. The nation-state was supposed to guarantee not only political, economic, social, and cultural independence but also physical security. Due to the ethnically mixed settlement structures in the Habsburg Monarchy, however, this application of the national right of self-determination led to multiple demarcation conflicts between the nations, particularly between the German-Austrians and Czechs or Slovenes, the Hungarians and Slovaks or Romanians or Serbs,

the Czechs and Poles, the Poles and Ukrainians, and the Italians and Slovenes or Croats.

The Paris Peace Conference

On 18 January 1919, the Peace Conference under the leadership of the French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau convened at the Quai d'Orsay in Paris. Achieving peace was undoubtedly complicated by the fact that a total of five Allied and 24 Associated States were represented. The directing force was the Supreme Council in varying form, first as the Council of Ten (the heads of government and foreign ministers of France, Great Britain, the United States, and Italy, as well as two representatives from Japan), later divided into the Council of Four (with Clemenceau, Wilson, the British Prime Minister David Lloyd George, and Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando) and the Council of Five or Council of Foreign Ministers. The Council of Ten determined the agenda of the Peace Conference and appointed 58 expert commissions and committees, which included the Commissions on Polish, Czechoslovak Affairs, Romanian and Yugoslav Affairs, and the Central Committee on Territorial Questions. However, the defeated Central Powers were not given a right of audience in the negotiations. The most important clauses were agreed among the major Allies and quickly imposed upon the vanquished parties as the preliminaries for peace.

On 25 December 1918, the Austrian State Secretary for Foreign Affairs Otto Bauer had sent a comprehensive “Memorandum on the International, Political, and Economic Position of German-Austria” to all the powers and governments of the Entente states and the United States, which expressed the standpoints of German-Austria on its international legal recognition, the inclusion of German-Bohemia, the Sudetenland, South Bohemia, and South Moravia, the normalization of relations between German-Austria and Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Italy, the question of the Danube Federation, the *Anschluss* question, the critical economic situation, and national border disputes. For German-Austria, Bauer demanded a national territory of 107,555.69 sq km with more than ten million inhabitants, agreed with plebiscites under neutral control, and provided the *Anschluss* or a “Danube Federation” as possible alternatives.¹ Although some Austrian industrialists, bankers, employers,

¹ Memorandum State Secretary Bauer to all the powers represented in Vienna and to all Entente states and the USA, Vienna, 25 December 1918. In: K. KOCH –

and workers feared German competition and some Catholics feared Prussian Protestantism, the German-Austrian National Assembly had already unanimously voted for this union on 12 November 1918. Between 27 February and 2 March 1919, German-Austrian *Anschluss* negotiations took place in Berlin. The most difficult point on both sides was the question of currency and the relationship between the Austro-Hungarian Bank and the *Reichsbank*. Finally, it was stated that German-Austria, as an independent member state, should enter the German *Reich*, adopt the German customs system and enter into a monetary union with the *Reich*; Vienna would have become the second capital of the *Reich*. However, when Clemenceau was asked on 27 March 1919 in the Council of Four what the Allies should say to the Austrians who wanted the *Anschluss*, he clarified the French position: “We ask only that you remain independent. Do with this independence what you will; but you should not join a German bloc and take part in a revenge plan.” Therefore, on 2 May 1919, Clemenceau, Wilson, and Lloyd George approved Article 80 of the Treaty with Germany: “Germany recognizes and shall strictly respect the independence of Austria within the frontiers that shall be fixed by the Treaty made between that State and the Principal Allied and Associated Powers; she recognizes that this independence is inalienable, except with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations.”²

The draft contract of the peace treaty handed out to the German delegation on 7 May 1919 contained, on the one hand, a series of tough conditions, but left, on the other hand, the German Reich in its potential position as great power. The German Reich was required to relinquish all of its colonies, Alsace-Lorraine, the Saarland, Eupen-Malmedy, North Schleswig, Danzig/*Gdańsk*, West Prussia, Posen/*Poznań*, Memel/*Klaipėda*, and Upper Silesia. Article 231 enshrined the responsibility of Germany and its allies – Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire – as the “originators” of the war and of the Allied losses and damage, which was regarded as essential justification for the demand for reparations. Conscription and the general staff were abolished, with the Germans restricted to an army of 100,000 men (Austria to 30,000 and Hungary to 35,000 men). Germany was forbidden to have an air force, to possess

W. RAUSCHER – A. SUPPAN (eds.), *Außenpolitische Dokumente der Republik Österreich 1918–1938* (hereinafter ADÖ), Vol. 1: *Selbstbestimmung der Republik*, Wien 1993, Doc. No. 104.

² N. ALMOND – R. H. LUTZ (eds.), *The Treaty of Saint-Germain: A Documentary History of its Territorial and Political Clauses. With a Survey of the Documents of the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference*, Stanford, London, Oxford 1935, p. 363.

tanks, armored cars, or submarines, and the German Navy as well as the merchant marine were drastically reduced. The German delegation's answer from 29 May 1919, especially criticized the "war guilt article," as well as the cession of Upper Silesia, the Saar area, Danzig, and the Memel.³ Wilson objected: "*The treaty is undoubtedly very severe indeed,*" but it is not "*on the whole unjust [given] the very great offense against civilization which the Germans committed.*" However, after fierce discussions among the Allies the mainly German-speaking Danzig and its environs was supposed to be made a free city; and plebiscites would decide the questions of Upper Silesia, Allenstein/*Olsztyn*, Marienwerder/*Kwidzyna*, Eupen-Malmedy, and northern Schleswig. Advised that the *Reichswehr* was too weak to face an Allied advance, the German government capitulated. The final ceremony took place in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, on 28 June 1919. In the end, Germany lost 70,579 square kilometers of territory (= 13 percent) with 6,476,000 people (= 10 percent), among them 3,482,000 Germans.

Before the Austrian delegation left for Paris, in mid-May 1919, the Council of Four had settled the questions of the Bohemian Lands, Lower Styria, Southern Carinthia, and South Tyrol. A few days after the proclamation of the Czecho-Slovak State, the Provincial Government of German-Bohemia sent a note to Washington via Sweden, protested against the "*imperialist encroachments of the Czech state*" and asked President Wilson to take over the protection of this German minority in Bohemia. The German-Austrian government then proposed a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the population in the German-inhabited regions of Bohemia and Moravia. However, Edvard Beneš, the new Foreign Minister of the Czechoslovak Republic, encouraged the Prague government to "militarily" occupy, *via facti*, the "historical" borders of the Bohemian Lands that had allegedly already been documented by the French government. Under French Marshal Ferdinand Foch's Allied High Command, the Prague government was able to complete the occupation of German-Bohemian and German-Moravian cities, markets, and villages by the end of 1918. The German property owners and educated *bourgeoisie* remained essentially calm, fearing both revolutionary riots and, in the case of resistance, a negative reaction from the Allies. When State Secretary Bauer sent a protest note to the governments of the Entente, French Foreign Minister

³ Observations of the German Delegation on the Condition of Peace, 29 May 1919. In: *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereinafter *FRUS*). *The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, Vol. VI, Washington 1946, pp. 795–797.

Stéphane Pichon rejected the proposed referendum and granting the Czechoslovak state the borders of the historic provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia until the decision of the peace conference. On 25 December, Bauer warned the Entente against the possible consequences of a violent integration of the German-Bohemians in the Czechoslovak state: *“The peace of Europe would be permanently endangered by the German irredenta within the Czechoslovak state.”*⁴

The Czechoslovak President Tomáš G. Masaryk tried to persuade US Envoy Colonel Edward M. House that the Germans’ right to self-determination in Czechoslovakia could be achieved in a better way if the German minority was made up of three million and not one million citizens, but the US negotiators did not want to commit themselves. When the Czechoslovak Finance Minister Alois Rašín separated the Czechoslovak currency from the Austrian by affixing stamp marks to the Austro-Hungarian crowns, effected on 25 February 1919, and started a strongly deflationary policy, there was a wave of German protests against the over-stamping of the banknotes; but in the final analysis the Sudeten Germans also benefited because the Czechoslovak crown became a stable national currency. However, the monetary measure merged with the inaugural session of the newly elected Parliament of the German-Austrian Republic on 4 March 1919. As the Czechoslovak government had banned the holding of elections to that parliament in the Bohemian and Moravian border areas, the German Social Democratic Party organized a general strike. This time, the Czechoslovak government did not hesitate to use armed force: Fifty-four demonstrators were killed and eighty-four heavily wounded.⁵

Beneš and the Czechoslovak Prime Minister Karel Kramář presented Czechoslovakia’s case to the Council of Ten on 5 February 1919. At first, Beneš claimed Bohemia, Moravia, Austrian Silesia, Slovakia, and Lusatia “for ethnographic reasons”. He spoke of *“old historical causes that armed the Czech people against the Germanic masses”* and that *“the Czechs had always felt that they had a special mission to resist the Teutonic flood”*. While he reduced the number of Germans in Bohemia from 2,467,724 to 1.5 million, he enlarged (based on Wilson’s question) the number of Czechs from

⁴ Memorandum State Secretary Bauer, Vienna, 25 December 1918. In: *ADÖ*, Vol. 1, Doc. No. 104.

⁵ Notes circulaires State Secretary Bauer to all missions of neutral States, Vienna, 7, 8 and 13 March 1919. In: *ADÖ*, Vol. 1, Doc. Nos. 182, 184, 186.

4,241,918 to 4.5 million. The “best argument” for Beneš to claim all of Bohemia was the fact that the “*Czech-German parts of Bohemia contained nearly the whole of the industries in the country*”. When Lloyd George enquired what the reasons might be which had led to the concentration of industries at the edges of the country, Beneš replied that the presence of waterpower, coal, and minerals explained it. Describing the ethnic composition of the population engaged in these industries, Beneš made the false assertion “*that the majority was Czech,*” only “*the employers are chiefly German*”. When Lloyd George asked whether the area in question had been represented in the Austrian Reichsrat by German deputies, Beneš had to agree. Now, Lloyd George “*enquired whether the inhabitants of these districts, if offered the choice, would vote for exclusion from the Czecho-Slovak State or for inclusion. Beneš replied that they would vote for exclusion, chiefly through the influence of the Social Democratic Party, which thought that the Germans would henceforth have a Social Democratic regime*”.⁶ When the Council of Four discussed the report of the Commission on Czechoslovak Affairs the Sudeten German matter was quickly and almost casually settled. The French head of the commission insisted: “*The inhabitants of these regions were accustomed to live in close connection with the rest of Bohemia, and did not desire separation. [...] The result of the policy suggested by Mr. Lansing might be that the whole of Bohemia would elect to join Germany in order not to be separated from the German-Bohemians.*” Beset by the fact that the new borders of Czechoslovakia strongly contravened the principle of self-determination, the Council accepted Clemenceau’s suggestion to opt for the simple solution of following the pre-war border between Germany and Bohemia and include more than three million Germans in the new Czechoslovakia. Astonishingly, Colonel House who was the agent for the ailing American president raised no objections and agreed “*that we would accept the old line of the historical borders and would not delineate a new one*”.⁷

In local-council elections on 15 June 1919, the German parties won 33.08% of all votes in Bohemia, 21.41% in Moravia, and 66.80% in Silesia. The Allied Powers could have viewed the results of these municipal elections as a democratic vote, not including the Germans of the Bohemian countries in the Czechoslovak state. Both the vociferously proclaimed

⁶ D. LLOYD GEORGE, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, Vol. 2, New Haven 1939, p. 608.

⁷ FRUS. *The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, Vol. III, Washington 1943, pp. 877–883; D. HÁJKOVÁ – P. HORÁK (eds.), *Edvard Beneš, Němci a Německo*, Vol. 1, Praha 2014, pp. 345–349.

democratic principles and the equally loudly proclaimed right to self-determination gave rise to this. However, a reopening of the question of the affiliation of the Germans of the Bohemian countries was no longer up for discussion after the preliminary decisions made by the Allies in April 1919 in Paris. The Czech position had prevailed without compromise.

After military conflicts between Poland and Czechoslovakia over the former Austrian Duchy of Teschen in January 1919, the Allied Powers had to intervene in the conflict between the two new allies. According to the 1910 Austrian census, a total of 54% Poles, 27% Czechs, and 18% Germans lived in Teschen Silesia. Teschen/*Cieszyn/Těšín* and Bielitz/*Bielsko* were majority German towns, but the industrial and mining parts of the country were dominated by Polish and Czech workers. An important Czech argument was the fact that the only important railway linking Moravia and Northern Slovakia was the train line Oderberg/*Bohumín*–Teschen–Jablunkau/*Jablunkov*–Zsolna/*Sillein/Žilina*. When the Conference of Ambassadors tried to organize a plebiscite in July 1920, Beneš asked for an arbitration by the Conference of Ambassadors and pushed through the partition of the region and its main city without a plebiscite. As a result, Poland received only the eastern part of the disputed area, while Czechoslovakia received the more valuable western part with the mining and smelting facilities. At the same time, the Conference of Ambassadors assigned to Poland 25 Carpathian villages in the former Hungarian counties of Árva/*Orava* and Szepes/*Zips/Spiš*.

In the atmosphere of social revolutionary tensions in Croatia-Slavonia and in view of the threat to Carniola, Istria and Dalmatia by advancing Italian troops, a majority of the Zagreb National Council formed a 28-member delegation, which travelled to Belgrade on 27 November. The National Council agreed to transfer governmental power to King Petar and the Prince Regent Aleksandar throughout the territory of the Slovenian, Croatian, and Serbian state and wished to establish a joint parliamentary government and a common parliament. The prince regent accepted this address and on 1 December 1918 announced the union of Serbia and Montenegro with the countries of the independent State of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (*Kraljevina SHS*).

Although the United States recognized the new kingdom on 7 February 1919, Britain, France, and Italy preferred to negotiate with the Yugoslav delegation in Paris under the title “Delegation of the Kingdom of Serbia”. Although on 6 January 1919, Prince Regent Aleksandar once again

emphasized that the Yugoslav peace delegation should demand “*only the ethnographic borders of our people*,” on 18 February 1919 the Yugoslav delegation, under the leadership of Prime Minister Nikola Pašić, presented a whole series of wider territorial demands before the Council of Ten that affected the majority German-Austrian cities Villach, Klagenfurt, and Marburg/*Maribor*, the majority Magyar cities Pécs, Zombor/*Sombor*, Szabadka/Maria-Theresiopel/*Subotica*, *Szeged*, and *Arad*, the majority German city Temesvár/Temeschwar/*Timișoara*, some Bulgarian cities, the Albanian city of Skutari/*Shkodër*, and the majority Italian cities of Fiume/*Rijeka*, Pola/*Pula*, Trieste/*Trieste*/Trst, and Görz/*Gorizia*/*Gorica*. Yugoslav delegates and experts pointed to the Italianization in the Littoral, the Germanization in Carinthia and Lower Styria, and the Magyarization in southern Hungary, and tried to represent the ports of Trieste and Fiume as indispensable for the Slovenian and Croatian economy.⁸ The admission of the Yugoslav delegation to the Council of Ten on 18 February was less friendly than that of the Polish, Czechoslovak, and Romanian delegations since Italy had acted from the outset as a great competitor.

Because the Vienna Parliament in accordance with the provincial assemblies in Graz and Klagenfurt also demanded the inclusion of the Drava Valley in Lower Styria and of the Karawanken border in Carinthia, no fewer than eleven Styrian and thirteen Carinthian judicial districts with a total of 470,000 inhabitants (among them 229,000 Slovenes and 218,000 Germans) were disputed regarding future state affiliation. On 1 November 1918, the commander of the *k.k. Landsturm* District Command in Marburg, the Slovene Major Rudolf Maister, had already seized military power in Marburg and its surroundings, and built a “Styrian Border Command”. When it came to the South Slavic occupation of southeastern Carinthia at the beginning of December 1918, the Provisional Carinthian State Assembly unanimously decided not to oppose Entente troops but to “*oppose the entry of Yugoslav troops*”. Indeed, after Christmas Day 1918, the Carinthians undertook a counter-offensive and reconquered about half of lower Carinthia. This defensive struggle by those who were the directly affected was ultimately decisive for the future border demarcation since knowledge of these events also reached the US Study Commission of

⁸ Mémoire présenté à la Conférence de la Paix concernant les Revendications du Royaume des Serbes, Croates et Slovènes; Annex: La frontière Nord avec l’Autriche allemande, Paris, 3 March 1919. In: B. KRIZMAN – B. HRABAK (eds.), *Zapisnici sa sednica Delegacije Kraljevine SHS na Mirovnoj Konferenciji u Parizu 1919–1920*, Belgrade 1960, pp. 52–54.

Professor Archibald C. Coolidge (Harvard University) in Vienna. During armistice talks in Graz, two US officers, Lieutenant Colonel Sherman Miles and Lieutenant LeRoy King, joined the negotiations and proposed mediation. On 27 January 1919, Miles set off from Graz to Maribor with his mission, where they were received by General Maister. While the Slovene general explained the Slovenian demands concerning Carinthia in Maribor's town hall, a large German-Austrian demonstration with thousands of participants took place outside. The crowd surrounded and attacked a South Slav officer, whereupon the Yugoslav troops positioned by Maister opened fire without orders, killing thirteen people and wounding sixty. Between 28 January and 6 February 1919, the Miles Mission toured several small towns, markets, and villages in ethnically mixed Lower Carinthia, and spoke to secular and spiritual dignitaries, peasants and workers, market goers and schoolchildren. As early as 7 February, the mission submitted a first report to Coolidge, stating in their majority report, *"that the entire [Klagenfurt] basin is a geographical and economic entity and should be assigned to Austria because the majority of the population, even those of Slovene nationality, would like it"*. While Miles stated, *"[...] there are many Slovenes who do not wish to join Yugoslavia [...] – we strongly recommend that the final frontier between Austria and Yugoslavia in the province of Carinthia be drawn along the watershed of the Karawanken mountains,"* Professor Robert Kerner advised: *"Thus the Drau-Mur Line would appear to answer the demands for a good boundary."* Coolidge, however, accepted the majority report with just a few changes and sent Miles to Paris to give a personal report to the US delegation. Although the Yugoslav peace delegation protested against publication, and French Foreign Minister Pichon spoke of the *"actions of a certain Mr. Coolidge,"* the Council of Ten assigned the Carinthian and Styrian frontier questions to the Commission on Romanian and Yugoslav Affairs to study.⁹

This Commission, chaired by the later French Foreign Minister André Tardieu, discussed the demarcation of Yugoslavia and Austria in March and April 1919. Very quickly, it became apparent that the French and British delegates wanted to join Maribor and the surrounding area to Yugoslavia, while the Italian delegate spoke in favor of German-Austria.

⁹ A. C. COOLIDGE, *Life and Letters*, H. J. COOLIDGE – R. H. LORD (eds.), Boston, New York 1932, pp. 198–201; Ch. M. GIGLER, *Die Berichte der Coolidge-Mission im Jahre 1919. Die mitteleuropäischen Interessen der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, Klagenfurt 2001, pp. 68–125.

The Americans Charles Seymour and Clive Day, however, pleaded unequivocally for the preservation of the Klagenfurt Basin in Austria, both for economic reasons and as a result of the military resistance of the German- and Slovene-speaking Lower Carinthians, which “*can be interpreted like a referendum*”. In the end, the Commission recommended that the Council of Five “*assign to Yugoslavia the Marburg Basin*” but hold a plebiscite in the Klagenfurt Basin. On 12 May, Ambassador Tardieu explained the principle of the plebiscite to the Council of Ten; then, Clemenceau, Wilson, and Lloyd George agreed. Now the Yugoslav peace delegation tried to divide the Klagenfurt Basin without a plebiscite, along a so-called “Green Line”. However, neither the occupation of southeastern Carinthia by Yugoslav troops nor an intervention by the Serbian envoy Vesnić at the Council of Four on 4 June 1919 could change this decision, not even a direct intervention by the Ljubljana Bishop Jeglič and the Slovene Governor Brejc with Wilson.¹⁰

When the Peace Conference started, the Italian delegation did not pay much attention to the creation of the new principles in foreign relations and gave the impression it was interested only in gaining all the territories the secret Treaty of London (26 April 1915) had foreseen, with the addition of the Hungarian port Fiume/*Rijeka*. In November 1918, Italian troops had entered Trieste, Pola/*Pula*, Fiume, Zara/*Zadar*, and Sebenico/*Šibenik*, as well as Trento, *Bozen/Bolzano*, and even Innsbruck. Because the Entente had promised Italy for entering the war against Austria-Hungary the future border at the Brenner Pass, the Rome government demanded not only the Italian part of South Tyrol but also the district of Ampezzo populated by Ladinians and the whole of the German parts of South Tyrol, although 220,000 Germans, 19,000 Ladinians and some 6,000 Italians lived north of the Salurner Klause. However, the Italian delegates submitted a memorandum to the Council of Ten on 7 February 1919 in which the incorporation of Tyrol was required up to the Brenner, in addition,

¹⁰ Report of the Commission on Romanian and Yugoslav Affairs, Paris, 6 April 1919; Discussion by the Council of Ten, Paris, 12 May 1919; Memorandum of the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the Peace Conference, Paris, 31 May 1919; Annotations on the discussions of the Council of Four on the Klagenfurt Area. All in: ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 363–364, 380–384, 508–510; D. HUNTER MILLER, *My Diary at the Peace Conference of Paris. With Documents*, Vol. XVI, New York 1924, pp. 264–270; M. ÁDÁM – Gy. LITVÁN – M. ORMOS (eds.), *Documents diplomatiques français sur l'histoire du bassin des Carpates 1918–1932*, Vols. I–II: octobre 1918–juin 1920, Budapest 1993, 1995; Vol. I, Doc. Nos. 227, 239, 323, 326.

the Sesto Valley, the Kanal Valley, and the region of Tarvis/*Tarvisio*. The memorandum spoke of the liberation of his oppressed brothers in Trentino, Alto Adige, and Venezia Giulia, a “*geographical and political unity*” of Trentino and Alto Adige, in which an alleged 420,000 Italians and only 180,000 Germans lived, and introduced the need for the strategic Brenner border. The US “Inquiry” had originally been against the Brenner border, but in October 1918, Colonel House could imagine the Brenner border in connection with autonomy for South Tyrol and the liberation of young German men from military service. On 21 January 1919, the “Inquiry” proposed a division of German South Tyrol, whereby the Etsch Valley with Bozen and *Meran/Merano* should be given to Italy, while the Eisack and Puster Valleys with *Brixen/Bressanone* and *Bruneck/Brunico* should remain in Austria. Wilson, “*who for some reason had a preference for the solution of the Adriatic problem in favor of Yugoslavia,*” was obviously prepared to accept the Italian position in the Alpine border from the end of January 1919.

On 26 February 1919, the Tyrolean Government sent a petition to President Wilson that stated: It has been proven that the territory from Kufstein to the *Salurner Klause* “*is solely, and in a compact mass, inhabited by Germans; [...] The Germans as well as the Ladinians of Tyrol have repeatedly declared their earnest wish to remain united, and to decide their future for themselves. [...] The people of Tyrol [...] trust in the achievement of the President’s ideal political aims, as put down in the 14 points of his message*”. The Tyrolean Government enclosed a Memorandum “*concerning the indivisibility of this country,*” pointing to Point IX of Wilson’s 14 points that speaks of an adjustment of the Italian frontier “*along clearly recognizable national lines*”. The Memorandum also underlined the clear separation of the German and Italian speaking districts and the contrast between the social and economic conditions of the Germans and the Italians.¹¹

In the Council of Ten, Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando talked dramatically about Austria being Italy’s main enemy during the war; his deputies at Paris kept hold of the London Treaty and argued using strategic reasons and that the Poles, Czechs, Romanians, and Yugoslavs were also breaking the principle of nationality. Other notes by the Austrian Government and the Tyrolean Diet to the Council of Ten followed, offering a military neutrality of German Tyrol; but even the threat of a Tyrolean *irredenta* and

¹¹ Memorandum Tyrolean Government, Innsbruck, February 1919; Memorandum Tyrolean Government to President Wilson, Innsbruck, 26 February 1919. Both in: *ADÖ*, Vol. 1, Doc. Nos. 170 and 170 A.

an *Anschluss* of North Tyrol to Germany did not help. After negotiations on 14, 19 and 24 April 1919, the Council of Four decided in favor of Italy. Wilson himself would later admit that he conceded the territory based on “insufficient study” and that he had come to regret this “ignorant” decision.¹² On 3 May 1919, the Tyrolean State Assembly even dared “to proclaim the closed German and Ladinic territories up to the Salurner Klause as an independent, democratic and neutral Free State of Tyrol,” if only the unity of these areas could be respected; but this desperate step was also never agreed to by the peace conference.

In February 1919, Prime Minister Orlando persuaded his main Allies that the Adriatic settlement remain in the exclusive competence of the Council of Ten. Of course, Orlando and the Italian delegation strongly opposed the expansive demands of the Yugoslav delegation, which included not only the whole of Dalmatia and Istria but also Trieste and Gorizia. When President Wilson made the compromise proposal in mid-April 1919, which largely took account of the ethnic circumstances, of joining the eastern part of the territory of Gorizia and Istria as well as Fiume and all of Dalmatia to Yugoslavia, it came to “stormy” clashes between Wilson and Orlando; but when the Italian delegation stubbornly refused a compromise solution, Wilson appealed directly to the Italian people, and the Italian delegates left the Peace Conference on 24 April 1919, in order to reinforce their authority at home. With this political mistake, the role of Italy became less influential. On 7 June 1919, Wilson made public a new memorandum on the Italian-Yugoslav border. The memorandum mentioned the creation of a Free State of Fiume, according to the model of Danzig, which would include the city (with an Italian majority) and the entire eastern part of the peninsula of Istria (with a Croat majority). However, when Wilson returned to the United States, on 28 June 1919, the strongest protector of the Yugoslav demands had left the stage.

The invasion by Gabriele D’Annunzio and his legionnaires in Fiume on 12 September 1919 worsened the Yugoslav negotiating position. After armed incidents in Spalato, Zara, Fiume, and Trieste, the new Italian government under Giovanni Giolitti with Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza demanded the border in Istria on Mount Nevoso/*Snežnik*, Fiume

¹² Note Staatsamt für Äußeres to foreign missions (without Italy), Vienna, 9 April 1919; Tyrolean Government to President Wilson, Innsbruck, April 1919. Both in: *ADÖ, Vol. 2: Im Schatten von Saint Germain*, Wien 1994, Doc. No. 209; see Wilson’s Note concerning the basis for decisions regarding frontiers especially the Italian frontiers, Washington D.C., 24 February 1919. In: ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 346–350.

as an independent state with a territorial connection to Italy as well as the Quarnero Islands of Cherso/*Cres* and Lussino/*Lošinj*, and in return, was ready to leave all of Dalmatia – with the exception of Zara and some islands – to Yugoslavia. Soon after the failure in the Carinthian plebiscite, Prime Minister Milenko Vesnić and Foreign Minister Ante Trumbić went to Italy, to negotiate the Istrian community of Castua/*Kastav* remaining in Yugoslavia and signed the Treaty of Rapallo on 12 November 1920. Italy kept the whole Littoral with Trieste, Gorizia, Istria, and the Quarnero Islands of Cherso, Lussino, and Unie, but only the city of Zara and the islands of Lagosta/*Lastovo* and Pelagosa/*Palagruža* in Dalmatia; Fiume/*Rijeka* was to become a buffer state between the two countries, but in 1924, was divided between Italy and Yugoslavia: Italy kept the city of Fiume, while Sušak was given to Yugoslavia. However, 350,000 Slovenes and 150,000 Croats in Italy became new minorities without minority rights. Nonetheless, in Italy the myth of “mutilated victory” (*Vittoria mutilata*) was born. Of course, the main reason was Italy’s passing over from the division of the former German colonies and some decision-making by the “Big Three” in the former Ottoman Empire.

The Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye

On 14 May 1919, the German-Austrian delegation under the leadership of State Chancellor Karl Renner arrived at Saint-Germain-en-Laye, a suburb of Paris. On 29 May, Renner was told “*The Allied and Associated Powers have decided to recognize the new Republic under the name ‘Republic of Austria’*”. The first draft of the peace treaty, handed over by Clemenceau on 2 June, did not include all clauses. Renner was given the opportunity to present the views of the German-Austrians and, thus, also of the Sudeten Germans, South Tyroleans, Carinthians, and Styrians. Renner denied that the new Republic – as the other nation-states – could be considered the successor of the late Monarchy, and stressed that the new Republic “*has freed herself from all those imperialist aspirations, which have become so fatal to the existence of the ancient Monarchy*”. And: “*The German-Austrian Republic [...] has never declared war, never carried on war, and in relations with the Western Powers never had the position of a warring Power from an international point of view.*” Nevertheless, getting the first draft, the Austrian delegation “*felt very sad, bitter and depressed when we realized that Austria had received harsher terms than Germany*”. The German districts in the Bohemian lands were allotted to Czechoslovakia, South Tyrol to Italy, and Lower Styria with Maribor to Yugoslavia. Reparations and other financial clauses were copied from

the conditions imposed on Germany but added to these conditions was the confiscation of all property held by Austrians in the territories of the former Monarchy. And little Austria was to be burdened with the majority of the debts of the former Austrian Empire. State Secretary Bauer commented with bitterness: *“The confiscation of bank branches, factories, trading companies, and estates located in foreign language area means the downfall of Vienna.”*¹³

The Austrian delegation was only allowed to make written objections. Therefore, the note of Section Head Richard Schüller “Austria cannot live” was the first to be transmitted to the Supreme Council, protesting with great energy against the confiscation of property belonging to Austrian citizens in the territories of former Austria-Hungary. Indeed, the article was replaced by the interdiction of such confiscation. However, Article 88 of the treaty expressly stated that the independence of Austria is “inalienable” and forbade the joining of the two German states (also the joining with Hungary or with any other state) unless the consent of the Council of the League of Nations was given. On 20 July 1919, the “Final Text of Peace Conditions” comprising 381 articles was delivered to Renner. Referring to the “wall of prejudices and incorrect judgements” that were directed against the German-Austrian people abroad, Bauer resigned a State Secretary, on 27 July: *“I cannot hope to find confidence among the French rulers, who, as Marx taunted, still consider the disunity of the German people a right of the French nation.”*¹⁴

The definite text of the peace conditions started with the Covenant of the League of Nations and the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. Part II fixed the frontiers of the new Austria along the watershed between the Inn and Etsch Rivers as well between the Drau and Tagliamento Rivers. The inhabitants of the Klagenfurt Basin were supposed to indicate in a plebiscite to which State they wished the territory

¹³ ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 38–64; State Secretary Bauer to Austrian representatives in Berne, The Hague, and Berlin, Vienna, 3 June 1919: in: *ADÖ*, Vol. 2, Doc. No. 260; Minute of the National Assembly, Vienna, 7 June 1919. In: *ADÖ*, Vol. 2, Doc. No. 268; Comment of the Austrian Delegation (Renner) on the 2 June Draft of the Conditions of Peace with Austria, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 10 June 1919. In: ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 204–209.

¹⁴ Austrian Delegation to Staatsamt für Äußeres, Saint-Germain, 20 July 1919; Draft Eichhoff, Saint-Germain, July 1919; Minute of the National Assembly, Vienna, 26 July 1919; Bauer to Seitz, Vienna, 25 July 1919. All in: *ADÖ*, Vol. 2, Doc. Nos. 316, 318, 327, 324; ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 178–203.

would belong. A part of Western Hungary with Ödenburg/*Sopron* would become a part of Austria. The borders with Czechoslovakia remained the old administrative borders between Lower and Upper Austria and Moravia and Bohemia; but even some Lower Austrian communities near Feldsberg/*Valtice* and *Gmünd*/*Cmnt* were given to Czechoslovakia. As one of the two heirs to the Habsburg Monarchy, Austria had to accept a “war guilt” clause (Art. 177) and was made liable for reparations. According to Art. 197, “*all the property and all sources of revenue in Austria were first and foremost to pay the costs of redress and all other burdens arising from the present treaty*”. This right to general lien (*Generalpfandrecht*) was not abolished before January 1930. Article 207 conceded to all successor states according to the territorial principle all the state property within their borders: administrative, court, and school buildings, barracks and fortresses, railroads, archives, libraries, etc. It also included “*all crown property as well as the private property of the former Austro-Hungarian ruling family*”. However, the liquidation of state debts and assets proved difficult, as well as things like the rolling stock of the railroads and the central archives in the former imperial capitals of Vienna and Budapest.¹⁵

An explanation for the harsh conditions of the Saint-Germain Treaty was given by Clemenceau in his cover letter, delivered to Renner on 2 September 1919: “[...] *The Austrian people share in a large number with their neighbor, the Hungarian people, responsibility for the ill, which Europe has suffered in the course of the last five years. [...] It is now evident that this ultimatum [on Serbia, A. S.] was but a hypocritical pretext to begin a war, which the old autocratic government in Vienna, in close accord with the rulers of Germany, had prepared long ago, and for which it judged the moment had arrived. The presence of Austrian cannons at the sieges of Liège and Namur is a proof more, if one were needed, of the close association of the government of Vienna with the government of Berlin in the complot against public law and the liberty of Europe. [...]*

If the Austrian people had during the years, which preceded the war, made efforts to repress the spirit of militarism and of domination; [...] if it had raised an effective protest against the war; [...] but the war was acclaimed from the moment of its declaration at Vienna, the Austrian people have been from beginning to end its ardent partisan; [...] proof sufficient that conformably to the sacred rules of justice, Austria should be held to assume its entire share of responsibility for the crime, which has unchained upon the world such a calamity.

¹⁵ Observations of the Austrian Delegation, 9 August 1919. In: ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 310–323.

But there is more: the Allied and Associated Powers feel obliged to point out that the polity of the old Habsburgs had become in its essence a polity destined to maintain the supremacy of the German and Magyar peoples over the majority of the inhabitants of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. [...] It is this system of domination and oppression, setting the races against one another, and to which the Austrian people has given its constant support, that has been one of the most profound causes of the war. It has produced on the borders of Austria-Hungary those irredentist movements, which have fostered in Europe fermenting agitation. [...].”¹⁶

Clemenceau’s mantle note, oozing with more than dubious double morality, suppresses the fact that Austria-Hungary did not declare war on France, Great Britain, Japan, Italy or the United States, but that all five Allies had declared war on the Habsburg Monarchy. Of course, all the deputies of the Austrian National Assembly considered this cover letter to be an intense humiliation, and, of course, the Austrian politicians and the Austrian public did not forget this humiliation – at least until March 1938. Nevertheless, on 6 September 1919, the Social Democratic and Christian Social deputies voted under protest – particularly against the deprivation of the German-Austrian nation’s right of self-determination and the separation of the Sudeten Germans and the Germans of South Tyrol – for the Treaty and instructed Renner to sign the Peace Treaty.¹⁷ Renner returned to Paris and signed the Treaty at the Castle of Saint-Germain-en-Laye on 10 September 1919.

According to Article 49 of the Treaty the inhabitants of the Klagenfurt area should be called upon to indicate by a vote the State to which they wish the territory would belong. The Klagenfurt area was divided into two plebiscite zones, the first (A or I) to the south and the second (B or II) to the north of a transversal line beginning east of Villach – through Wörthersee – south of Klagenfurt – north of *Völkermarkt/Velikovec*. While the Governor of the Province of Carinthia, Arthur Lemisch, protested to the Interallied Commission against the “tyranny” of the Yugoslav authorities in the southern plebiscite zone, the Slovenian government recognized an unfavorable situation, because “*our own military has behaved to the Slovene people, as if they were in enemy territory*”. In fact, Slovene politicians, the military and civil servants were placed on the defensive by the anti-royal and anti-Orthodox German-Carinthian propaganda, which

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 225–230.

¹⁷ Minute of the National Assembly, Vienna, 6 September 1919. In: *ADÖ*, Vol. 2, Doc. No. 355.

also challenged the general compulsory military service in Yugoslavia. However, anti-Semitic and sexist interventions did not help when Slovene propaganda leaflets warned not only against the “Viennese Jewish economy” but also the civil-law anchoring of the marriage in Vienna. In a foreign policy debate on 20–22 April 1920 in the Constituent National Assembly the Carinthian Social Democratic deputy Florian Gröger tried to weigh the expected voting behavior: *“It is true that in Zone A the majority of the population belongs to the Slovene nation. But all these Slovenes are able to speak German and they all gravitate to Klagenfurt, to Carinthia, to German-Austria. It is the economic and political circumstances that are more relevant to voting in the contested area than the national one. [...] The workers [...] have for decades been members of the trade unions, political and consumer cooperative organizations of Austrian Social Democracy.”*¹⁸

When, on 6 August 1920, the demarcation line was reopened, the population of Zone I hurried to Klagenfurt and stormed, above all, the manufacturing shops and hardware stores. The opening of the demarcation line between the two voting zones had been forced by the Interallied Commission formed in March 1920, which demanded now the release of passenger traffic and trade, the facilitation of return for expellees and refugees, and the abolition of sequestration. On 10 October 1920, nearly 96% of the over 39,000 eligible male and female Lower Carinthian voters participated in the plebiscite Zone I, which was carried out smoothly and in the correct form, monitored by British, French, and Italian officers. Although there was a narrow majority for Yugoslavia in two districts, the overall result was clear with 22,025 votes for Austria (= 59.04%) compared to 15,279 votes for Yugoslavia (= 40.96%). About 11,000 Germans and Slovenes each voted for Austria, and just over 15,000 Slovenes for Yugoslavia. Therefore, a plebiscite in Zone II (with Klagenfurt) was dropped. As this result was perceived as national catastrophe in Slovenian politics and public debate, there were brief military and diplomatic attempts to prevent the plebiscite from being cleared. However, the Paris Conference of Ambassadors recognized the result and the Plebiscite Commission subordinated Zone I once again to the sovereignty of the Republic of Austria. Chancellor Renner praised the policy of Professor Coolidge:

¹⁸ ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 521–523; Anketa, Ukrepi za izvedbo plebiscite na Koroškem, *Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja*, Ljubljana, Fasz. 30/7 and Fasz. 144; Konstituierende Nationalversammlung der Republik Österreich, *Stenographisches Protokoll zur 73. bis 75. Sitzung*, Vienna, 20–22 April 1920. In: *ADÖ, Vol. 3: Österreich im System der Nachfolgestaaten*, Wien 1996, Doc. No. 444.

“[...] It is no doubt in consequence of the impartial reports to that Mission [the Coolidge Mission], based for the greater part on local information, that the Interallied Powers granted the population of Southern Carinthia the advantage of deciding its own future. Thanks to the impartiality, zeal and broad-minded counsels of this eminent man, [...] there triumphed a principle, which according to the intention of the United States, should have served as a basis for the reconstruction of all our frontiers.”¹⁹

The Treaty of Trianon

When the Hungarian Prime Minister Count Mihály Károlyi came to Belgrade to sign a separate armistice with the Entente, on 13 November 1918, the French Commander-in-Chief of the Oriental Army, General Louis Franchet d'Esperey, did not welcome him in a friendly manner: “In your country, you have oppressed those who are not Magyar. Now you have the Czechs [?], Slovaks, Romanians, and Yugoslavs as enemies.” Already at the beginning of November 1918, Serbian troops had advanced over the Sava and Danube and had occupied Újvidék/Neusatz/Novi Sad, Szabadka/Maria Theresiopel/Subotica, and Temesvár/Temeschwar /Timișoara, later even Pécs/Fünfkirchen with its coalmines, and the Belgrade Convention accepted these occupations. In Transylvania, Romanian troops followed the retreating German Mackensen Army, and the Entente fixed a demarcation line on 23 December 1918. In the North, under the influence of the Czech representatives in Paris, the preparatory commission of the Peace Conference declared a new demarcation line following the Danube and Ipoly Rivers directly to the mouth of the Ung into the Tisza River. Therefore, at the beginning of January 1919, the Czechoslovak Army occupied several cities and towns in Slovakia, including Pozsony/Pressburg/Bratislava and Kassa/Kaschau/Košice and tried to establish its authority.²⁰

The mood in Paris was anything but Hungary-friendly. Many politicians, diplomats, and journalists saw Hungary as a land of aristocratic landowners who were still oppressing their peasants. This negative sentiment was also transmitted to the Commission on Romanian and Yugoslav Affairs, particularly to the French and Italian experts, while the British and American were looking more for the ethnic frontiers. Therefore, the US

¹⁹ S. WAMBAUGH, *Plebiscites since the World War. With a Collection of Official Documents*, Vol. 2, Washington 1933, pp. 126–130; ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 524–533; COOLIDGE, pp. 215–216.

²⁰ ÁDAM – LITVÁN – ORMOS, *Documents diplomatiques français*, Vol. I, Doc. No. 33 and Map 1.

delegate Seymour demanded the number of the future Magyar minorities in Czechoslovakia should be kept as low as possible. Nevertheless, on 20 March 1919, Lieutenant Colonel Ferdinand Vix actually handed a note from the Supreme Council to President Károlyi that the Hungarian troops were to pull back within ten days to an area west of the neutral zone in the Tisza area, i.e. west of the exclusively Magyar cities Debrecen, Békéscsaba, Orosháza, Hódmezővásárhely and Szeged. This was to prevent further military clashes between Hungarian and Romanian units, which could advance to the line Szatmárnémeti/*Satu Mare*–Nagykároly/*Carei*–Nagyvárad/*Oradea*–Arad. Károlyi lost his nerves: “*Make it a French colony, or a Romanian colony, or a Czechoslovak colony.*”²¹ On the next day, Károlyi left his power to a government of Social Democrats and Communists, which proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of a Revolutionary Governing Council led by Béla Kun.

While the Communist-led Hungarian government decreed public ownership of industry, agriculture, trade, and finances, and the Red Guards put pressure (and even terrorized) not only on aristocrats, the bourgeoisie and well-to-do peasants, but also the lower strata of the peasantry, Romanian and Czech units continued to advance towards core Hungary. Therefore, the Revolutionary Governing Council mobilized the workers of Budapest and provincial towns and began counterattacks in Slovakia in May 1919. Despite the military successes of the Hungarian Red Army, led by former *k.u.k.* Army and *Honvéd* officers, the Council of Four accepted the demarcation proposals submitted by the Commission. At the beginning of June, the Hungarian Red Army even occupied large part of eastern Slovakia with Kassa/*Košice* and Eperjes/*Prešov* and proclaimed a Slovak Soviet Republic. Nevertheless, on 13 June 1919, the Allies presented Hungary’s new borders. Although Kun withdrew Hungarian troops from Slovakia, Romanian troops remained on the Tisza Line and began attacks towards Budapest. On 1 August 1919, Kun fled with his government on a special train to Vienna, from where they travelled to Moscow.²²

Only in November 1919 did France and Great Britain order the governments in Bucharest, Prague, and Belgrade to withdraw their troops immediately from Hungarian territory, which of course meant the new lines of

²¹ Ibid., Map 1.

²² P. MANTOUX (ed.), *Les Délibérations du Conseil des Quatre (24 mars–28 juin 1919)*. Notes de l’Officier Interprète, Paris 1955, pp. 338–339, 354; H. NICOLSON, *Peacemaking, 1919*, London 1933, p. 298; M. HRONSKÝ, *The Struggle for Slovakia and the Treaty of Trianon, 1918–1920*, Bratislava 2001, p. 200.

demarcation. The Peace Conference sent the experienced British diplomat Sir George Clerk, who succeeded in forcing the withdrawal of Romanian troops from Budapest and, on 24 November, forming a new Hungarian coalition government with Christian, Liberal, and Socialist ministers. Already on 16 November, the former *k.u.k.* Vice Admiral Miklós Horthy de Nagybánya – since May Minister of War of a counter-government in Szeged – had ridden at the head of his troops in Budapest and had taken over the real rule. After elections at the end of January 1920, the new parliament declared Hungary a kingdom on 28 February, and on 1 March, Horthy was elected Regent by the National Assembly.

Under the guidance of Count Albert Apponyi and Count Pál Teleki the Hungarian delegation to the Peace Conference prepared material with 346 memoranda and 100 maps and statistical material, translated into French and English. However, the Hungarian memoranda could not explain why the Hungarian language clearly dominated the school system and why there were only a handful of minority representatives among the 413 members of the Hungarian Parliament. A few days after the Hungarian delegation had arrived in Paris on 6 January 1920, Count Apponyi received the draft from the Allied Powers: Hungary should not only lose all of Upper Hungary, the entirety of Transylvania as well as the greater part of southern Hungary, but also areas with predominantly Magyar population such as the Csallóköz/*Velký Žitný ostrov*, the region around Komárom/*Komárno*, the south of the Kassa–Rimaszombat/*Rimavská Sobota* line, the regions of Szatmárnémeti/*Satu Mare*, Nagyvárad/*Oradea*, and Arad, and the Szabadka/*Subotica* area in the northeast of the Bácska/*Bačka*. In reply, the Hungarian notes marshaled numerous counterarguments to these frontier proposals: linguistic and ethnic, historical, cultural and religious, economic and hydrographic. Apponyi, who delivered his speech in French, English, and Italian, stressed that Hungary was more harshly punished than the other defeated nations. It lost two thirds of its territory and population; three and a half million Magyars would now be living outside the Hungarian borders. Therefore, Apponyi proposed that the disputed areas should be allocated in accordance with the wishes of their peoples – under the principle of national self-determination advocated by President Wilson. France, however, reproached Hungary for having supported Prussian policy since 1867 and later German imperialism.²³

²³ A. APPONYI, *The Memoirs of Count Apponyi*, London 1935, pp. 253–256, 270; ÁDAM – LITVÁN – ORMOS, *Documents diplomatiques français*, Vol. II, Doc. Nos. 132, 154, 156.

Hungarian diplomacy met with interim-success when there were question in the British Parliament during the meeting of the heads of governments and foreign ministers of the Allies at the end of February/beginning of March 1920 in London about some provisions of the peace treaty with Hungary. Because of economic questions, Foreign Secretary Lord Curzon and Prime Minister Lloyd George suddenly brought border issues back onto the agenda. A British delegate suggested leaving the Csallóköz and an area around Kassa with Hungary, and the Italian Prime Minister Francesco Nitti even called for the repatriation of Pozsony to Hungary. However, the Political Director at the Quai d'Orsay, Philippe Berthelot, strongly warned against the reopening of demarcation discussions, as they set a dangerous precedent for the peace treaties with Germany and Austria that had already been concluded. Thus, the Allied heads of government and foreign ministers decided against any change, even against an amendment to the draft treaty for Hungary.²⁴

Surprisingly, the new Secretary General at the Quai d'Orsay, Maurice Paléologue, had begun secret negotiations with Hungary in April 1920 to strengthen the influence of France in the Danube region within the framework of a Central European Confederation. Budapest offered the French arms company Schneider in Creusot, which had already taken over majority shareholding of Škoda in Plzeň in autumn 1919, the control of the arms factories on Csepel Island, the Hungarian State Railways for 90 years and an option for the Hungarian General Bank. With the help of French capital, a Danube port was to be developed in Budapest and the construction of a Danube-Tisza canal started. In return, Pozsony, the Csallóköz and an area around Kassa should stay with Hungary, as well as Carpathian Ruthenia. Now, Hungarian Foreign Minister Teleki also believed that the Bácska should be called south to the Franz Joseph Canal and the whole Banat; but now Britain and Italy pointed out that they had no interest in revising the peace provisions.²⁵

On 6 May 1920, the Conference of Ambassadors sent the final peace terms to the Hungarian delegation and set a deadline of 21 May. The new president of the Peace Conference, the French Prime Minister Alexandre Millerand, tried to explain the Hungarian government the territorial clauses of the treaty: "[...] *The nationality situation in Central Europe is such*

²⁴ I. ROMSICS, *The Dismantling of Historic Hungary. The Peace Treaty of Trianon 1920*, Boulder, Col. 2002, pp. 169–170.

²⁵ ÁDAM – LITVÁN – ORMOS, *Documents diplomatiques français*, Vol. II, Doc. No. 173.

that it is not possible to make political frontiers fully agree with ethnic frontiers. As a result of this, the powers, although not without regret, had to decide to leave certain areas with ethnic Hungarian or Magyar population under the sovereignty of other states. [...] The powers had decided not to accept the demand for a plebiscite only after achieving certainty that such an appeal to public opinion, although it could be done with a complete guarantee of sincerity, would not bring results significantly different from those achieved by careful study of ethnic situation in Central Europe and national wishes. That is: The demand of the nations was expressed in the two months of October and November 1918, when the Dual Monarchy disintegrated and the long oppressed nations united with their Italian, Romanian, Yugoslav, and Czechoslovak brothers."²⁶

It is true that the preliminary decisions for future demarcations had already been made in November and December 1918, albeit by military occupation, which was covered by the Allied Powers. Presumably, plebiscites in both the south of Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia as well as in Máramaros/Maramureş, in Körösvidék/Crişana, in the Banat, and in the Bácska would likely have been in favor of Hungary. However, the Hungarian delegation had to admit the complete lack of success of its activities and resigned on 19 May 1920 its mandate. Government and Parliament were now in a dilemma to reject the conditions, but to sign the peace treaty. In the end, the Minister of Public Works and Social Welfare together with an envoy were sent as plenipotentiaries to Paris. The signing ceremony occurred on 4 June 1920 in the Grand Trianon Palais at Versailles. The Treaty was perceived by Hungarian society as a "blatant injustice," and on the day, the treaty was signed, hundreds of thousands protested on the streets in Budapest with the slogan: "Nem! Nem! Soha!" [No! No! Never!] Revision became the alpha and omega of all parties in the Hungarian political spectrum for a quarter of century or more.²⁷

Surprisingly, the precise marking of the new borders laid down in the peace treaty generally proceeded without major obstacles and relatively quickly. Only in the Baranya triangle and in Western Hungary were there difficulties. The Allies had determined the third week of August 1921 to be the date for the withdrawal of the Yugoslav troops from the Pécs coal region. It was only under pressure from the major powers that the

²⁶ F. DEÁK – D. UJVÁRY (eds.), *Papers and Documents Relating to the Foreign Relations of Hungary, I: 1919–1920: Excerpts from the Political Diary of the Hungarian Peace Delegation*, Budapest 1939, p. 918.

²⁷ ÁDAM – LITVÁN – ORMOS, *Documents diplomatiques français*, Vol. II, Doc. Nos. 170, 206, 252; *Pester Lloyd*, 2–5 June 1920.

Belgrade government gave way, and the Hungarian Army was able to take possession of the majority of the Baranya. In Western Hungary, when the regular Hungarian Army had vacated the area to be relinquished to Austria, Hungarian irregulars offered military resistance with the tacit approval of the Hungarian government, forcing the Austrian gendarmes to retreat.

The State Declaration by the German-Austrian National Assembly on 22 November 1918 had also insisted on the annexation of the closed German settlements in the Hungarian counties of Pozsony/Pressburg, Moson/Wieselburg, Sopron/Ödenburg, and Vas/Eisenburg, because they allegedly belonged geographically, economically and nationally to German-Austria and were indispensable for the food supply of the city of Vienna. According to the Hungarian census of 1910, a total of 332,148 inhabitants (= 27.6%) had German as their mother tongue in these counties and in the two municipal cities Pozsony/Pressburg/*Bratislava* and *Sopron*/Ödenburg. Amazingly, State Secretary Bauer did not include this demand for Western Hungary in his memorandum of 25 December 1918; in return, the Károlyi government had promised autonomy for the predominantly German territories of Western Hungary.²⁸

In May 1919, the Council of Ten discussed for the first time the borders of Austria and Hungary, and on 12 May, the Supreme Council decided for the time being to leave the border of 1867 between Hungary and Austria unchanged. However, when the Austrian delegation demanded a plebiscite in Western Hungary, in its notes to the Peace Conference in June 1919, a border dispute began between Vienna and Budapest. On 16 June, the Austrian Government presented its memorandum on territorial questions, claiming an area of 5,000 sq km with about 300,000 inhabitants in western Hungary. The Austrian delegation presented national, economic, strategic, and historical arguments; Renner also stressed an ideological standpoint against the “Bolshevik Government” in Budapest.²⁹

Following discussions in the Supreme Council on 1 and 2 July 1919, the US and British delegation expressed their willingness to accept Austria’s intervention in Western Hungary. Coolidge reiterated his argu-

²⁸ ADÖ, Vol. 1, Doc. Nos. 26, 27, 104; *Volkszählung in den Ländern der Ungarischen Heil. Krone im Jahre 1910, VI: Zusammenfassung der Endergebnisse*, Budapest 1924, Tables 4, 25, 29.

²⁹ Lansing’s note about a conversation in the Council of Ten, 12 May 1919. In: J. D. BERLIN (ed.), *Akten und Dokumente des State Department der USA zur Burgenland-Anschlussfrage 1919–1920*, Eisenstadt 1977, Doc. Nos. 22 and 25; Austrian Replies to Allied Terms, 10, 16 and 18 June 1919. In: VARES, *Western Hungary*, pp. 126–128.

ments in the Commission to Negotiate Peace (the German population, the economic context, and the military aspects) and highlighted the approximately 332,000 Germans out 350,000–400,000 inhabitants of the region who wanted to join Austria. On 7 July in the Council of the Heads of Delegations, the US, British, French, and Japanese delegates (but not the Italian!) agreed to designate to Austria a Hungarian territory that included a German-speaking population of 250,000. Hungary retained the railroad from Pozsony to Zagreb via Hegyeshalom, Csorna and Nagykanizsa. Therefore, the second part of the peace terms, which was presented to the Austrian delegation on 20 July, read: *“The frontier between Austria and Hungary has been modified so as to follow more closely the ethnic frontier rather than the frontier of 1867. This results in including in Austria two thousand two hundred square miles of former Hungarian territory and three hundred and fifty thousand persons of whom an overwhelming majority are of German speech. The new frontiers will extend from a point south of Pressburg to a point on Yugo-Slav frontier fourteen miles northeast of Radkersburg.”*³⁰

On 16 September 1919, the Inter-Allied Military Mission in Budapest informed the Hungarian Foreign Minister Count József Somssich that the western Hungarian territory had *“has now been assigned to the German-Austrian Republic,”* and that Hungarian officials had to cease operations. However, the Hungarian Foreign Minister denied the Saint-Germain border determination and continued to assert the validity of Hungary’s state sovereignty in Western Hungary in completion of the peace treaty with Hungary. The British Special Envoy Clerk recommended to the Supreme Council that the withdrawal of Hungarian troops from Western Hungary be combined with the withdrawal of Romanian troops from eastern Hungary, but the Supreme Council made no pressure on the Hungarian government. Opinions among the Allies about remaining tough with Hungary regarding the western Hungary issue changed, and the British military attaché in Vienna even warned about attaching western Hungary to Austria because, in the case of an *Anschluss* with Austria, this area could one day fall to Germany. Only the Italian Prime Minister Nitti offered Renner his support in the implementation of the Treaty of Saint-Germain.³¹

³⁰ Reports Coolidge to the Commission to Negotiate Peace, Vienna, 13, 15 and 21 May 1919. In: Berlin, Doc. Nos. 27, 29–31; Discussions in the Council of Heads of Delegations, Paris, 7, 9, 10 and 11 July 1919. In: ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 416–419; Supreme Council to the Austrian delegation, 20 July 1919. In: BERLIN, Doc. Nos. 41, 43, 45.

³¹ Bandtholz to Somssich, Budapest, 16 September 1919; Somssich to the Inter-Allied Military Mission in Budapest, 30 September and 1 October 1919. In: DEÁK – UJVÁRY,

Even after signing the Treaty of Trianon, the Hungarian government tried to negotiate a new border with Austria. However, on 22 December 1920, at the urging of the new Austrian government under the leadership of the Christian Social Professor Michael Mayr, the Conference of Ambassadors decided to hand over western Hungary to the Allied Military Commission in *Sopron*/Ödenburg. Further discussions by Hungarian and Austrian government officials did not bring any substantive progress. Although the Hungarian side accepted the figures with the German majority in western Hungary, the mayor of Sopron and the president of the Ödenburg chamber of commerce and trade, both bilingual Germans, protested against the annexation to Austria for economic reasons. The Roman Catholic bishops of *Győr*/Raab and *Szombathely*/Steinamanger as well as the majority of their Magyar, German, and Croatian parish priests also took a pro-Hungarian standpoint. In the meantime, Hungarian legitimists had worked for the return of King Károly/Karl IV, believing that his would ensure the reestablishment of the constitutional and legal order. When the last Habsburg ruler appeared in Hungary, during Easter week of 1921, Horthy and his supporters in the officer corps rejected Karl's claims. While the neighboring countries Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia mobilized, the Allied Powers informed the Hungarian government that a Habsburg restoration was unacceptable. Nonetheless, in October 1921, Karl made a second attempt, was arrested and interned on the island of Madeira, where he died six months later.³²

At the end of June 1921, the Conference of Ambassadors pledged the Austrian and Hungarian parties to comply with the limits set forth in the peace treaties, and made it clear that, with the exception of minor local corrections, a change in them would be left to the consent of the victors. On 26 July 1921, Austria and Hungary actually exchanged the ratified versions of the Treaty of Trianon, and the surrender of the parts of the western Hungarian counties granted in the treaties of Saint-Germain (Art. 27) and Trianon (Art. 71) Austria was scheduled for 29 August 1921. Nevertheless, Hungary continued to insist on the ownership of

Vol. 1, Doc. No. 17; Telegram Clerk to the Supreme Council, Budapest, 9 November 1919, and Notes of a Meeting of the Heads of the Delegations of the Five Great Powers, Paris, 30 December 1919. Both in: *FRUS, The Paris Peace Conference 1919, Vol. IX*, Washington 1946.

³² M. ÁDÁM – Gy. LITVÁN – M. ORMOS (eds.), *Documents diplomatiques français sur l'histoire du bassin des Carpates 1918–1932, Vol. III: juillet 1920–décembre 1921*, Budapest 1999, Doc. Nos. 122, 217–223, 231, 235, 263, 403–442, 454, 461, 473, 495, 498, 508.

Sopron as the economic and traffic center of western Hungary. When the regular Hungarian Army left the area to be relinquished and the regular Austrian Gendarmerie invaded western Hungary, Hungarian irregular armed units offered military resistance with the tacit approval of the Hungarian government. However, although the Austrian government protested, the diplomatic representatives of France, Britain and Italy did not give Hungary an ultimatum. Now, the Italian Foreign Minister Pietro Tomasi Marchese della Torretta, on the basis of a confidential letter from the Hungarian foreign minister, proposed to mediate a plebiscite in the contested area to which Austria agree with resignation. On 13 October, Torretta, the Hungarian Prime Minister Count István Bethlen, and the Austrian Federal Chancellor Johannes Schober signed the Venice Protocol according to which Hungary undertook to immediately repatriate its irregular armed units and to transfer the territory to Austria with the exception of the city of Sopron and its environs. The Allied General Commission in Sopron would monitor these measures and hold a referendum in the city of Sopron and its environs eight days after complete pacification. Although the Hungarian military did not leave the plebiscite zone until 12 December, two days before the start of the voting, and the Hungarian authorities still exercised all administrative power, the plebiscite was carried out against the protests of the Austrian government. In the city of Sopron 72.8% of the participants voted for Hungary, in the neighboring eight villages 54.6% voted in favor of Austria. According to the Venice Protocol, the two results had to be added together, giving a total of 65.1% for Hungary. Since the Council of Ambassadors had overruled the Austrian protests, on 31 December 1921, the Vienna government told the Entente representatives that its objections to the plebiscite would not be upheld. Thus, on New Year's Day 1922, the Entente Commission officially handed over Sopron and its environs to Hungary.³³

A Reassessment after 100 Years

1) The Allied Powers treated the new Republic of Austria and the new Kingdom of Hungary as the sole heirs to the Habsburg Monarchy and having been guilty of causing World War I (together with Germany). Neither

³³ ÁDAM – LITVÁN – ORMOS, *Documents d'archives français*, Vol. III, Doc. Nos. 280–281, 284–310, 333, 335, 337, 344, 350, 361, 372, 379, 384–386, 391, 397–398, 448, 463, 526, 528, 539–541, 545; ADÖ, Vol. 4: *Zwischen Staatsbankrott und Genfer Sanierung*, Wien 1998, Doc. Nos. 549, 553–554, 571, 573–576, 584–585, 597, 602, 606, 610, 612, 616, 618, 620, 625–626, 636; ALMOND – LUTZ, pp. 436–437.

Austria nor Hungary could abandon their independence without the consent of the Council of the League of Nations; in other words, Austria could neither unite with Germany nor reunite with Hungary.

2) From the former Habsburg Monarchy with 676,614 sq km and 51,390,649 inhabitants (1910), only 83,709 sq km with 6,647,241 inhabitants remained in the new Austria and 92,833 sq km with 7,606,971 inhabitants in the new Hungary. The newly formed Czechoslovakia took over 140,183 sq km with 13,546,307 inhabitants, the new Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes 143,297 sq km with 7,696,843 inhabitants, the new Poland 80,089 sq km with 8,196,458 inhabitants, and the enlarged Romania 113,123 sq km with 6,053,516 inhabitants. The Kingdom of Italy annexed 23,351 sq km with 1,590,422 inhabitants, while 52,891 people remained in the Free State of Fiume of 28 sq km. On the one hand, of 10 million German-Austrians only 6.1 million belonged to the new republic (plus a quarter million of Hungarian Germans), and of the ten million Magyars only 6.8 million remained in Trianon-Hungary. On the other hand, approximately a third of the population of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Romania consisted of national minorities, particularly Germans, Magyars, Ukrainians, and Jews. In freeing the old nationalities, the peace treaties created millions of new national minorities.

3) Austria had to pay two thirds of the Austrian war loans and more than one third of the war debts. To guarantee the reparations, the Reparations Commissions got the right to sequester all Austrian respectively Hungarian properties and all their sources of income (until January 1930). Hungary was obliged to pay 200 million gold crowns as reparations over the next twenty years. Over and beyond that, the “nostrification clause” allowed the victors to acquire capital shares of Central Power nationals in enterprises within their borders, either as reparations or with just compensation. The peace treaties did not respect the economic consequences of the dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. The common railway network was interrupted, new customs and currencies hindered the trade. The new nation-states introduced protectionist measures to gain autarky. So, after 1918, something like a permanent state of customs wars developed among the successor states.

4) Since the French and partly the British governments wanted to create “an eastern barrier” (*cordon sanitaire*) in East-Central Europe as a counterweight to Germany and Soviet Russia, the Allies tacitly tolerated the inclusion of borderlands with clearly visible German and Magyar majorities into Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia.

Clemenceau told the Council of Four: “Our firmest guarantee against German aggression is that behind Germany, in an excellent strategic position, stand Czechoslovakia and Poland.” A. J. P. Taylor’s commentary makes the point: “This was a surprising exaggeration of Czech and Polish strength.” However, even Clemenceau had some doubts: “Yes, this treaty will bring us burdens, troubles, miseries, difficulties, and that will continue for long years. I cannot say for how many years, perhaps I should say for how many centuries, the crisis which has begun will continue.”³⁴

5) The Paris Peace Treaties were made against the losers and not with them. However, many problems were left unsolved: the problem of Germany’s eastern borders (including the Danzig question); the *Anschluss* question; the problem of borderland minorities in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Italy; the question of Hungary’s new borders; the South Tyrolean question; the problem of the Italian-Yugoslav border; the Ukrainian question; and the problem of the Romanian–Bulgarian border. After the peace treaties, Europe remained divided along many fault lines: between victors and losers, defenders of the treaties and revisionists, militarism and pacifism, capitalism and communism, right and left.

On the substance of the peace treaties of Saint-Germain, Trianon, and Neuilly, the British historian Zara Steiner passed a noticeably clear judgment: “The treaties with Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria were far harsher and more vindictive than the one with Germany. The Austrian and Hungarian settlements were punitive in the extreme. [...] Austria became a shadow of its former self, with nearly a third of its population in Vienna and the rest scattered in its uneconomic Alpine hinterland. It was left in a perilous economic condition and only rescued from bankruptcy in 1922 by League-organized loans. Hungary, now ethnically homogenous, was economically viable but so stripped of territories and people as to guarantee its revisionist status.”³⁵

³⁴ A. J. P. TAYLOR *The Origins of the Second World War*, Harmondsworth 1964, pp. 63–64; G. CLEMENCEAU, *Grandeur and Misery of Victory*, New York 1930.

³⁵ Z. STEINER, *The Lights That Failed. European International History 1919–1933*, Oxford 2005, pp. 99, 608.



Futurism and the Birth of Fascism

Zuzana Donátková*

This study analyses selected aspects of the Italian Futurist movement's political agenda, its involvement in interventionist campaigns for Italy to join the First World War, and its subsequent role in the forming of the Fascist movement. The *Intervento*, the nine-month period when the nation was deciding whether to join the war, became an important milestone in Italian history, bringing together diverse political forces in Italy previously hostile to each other, shaping the traits which would determine its future. The turbulent days of the *Intervento* also marked the beginning of co-operation between the founder of Futurism, F. T. Marinetti, and Benito Mussolini, which culminated in the founding of the Fasci di Combattimento.

[Futurism; Fascism; Marinetti; Mussolini; Intervento]

Introduction

The proclamation in the Founding Manifesto of Futurism: *"We will glorify war – the world's only hygiene – militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of freedom-bringers, beautiful ideas worth dying for, and scorn for a woman"*¹ remains today probably the most cited idea in regard to Futurism. For the leader of the Futurist movement, F. T. Marinetti, war was the cure to all of Italy's maladies, would force Italy to look to the future rather than its illustrious history, and would lift up Marinetti's homeland and secure it a great future in which Italians would once again be a proud and respected nation and cultural elite. Lifting up the Italian nation and fulfilling the legacy of its ancient history was also the objective of Mussolini's Fascist movement, to which Marinetti turned his hopes and dreams in his country, with Futurism as the official national art and Futurists as its cultural elite.

* Department of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia, Sedláčkova 38, 306 14 Plzeň, Czech Republic; e-mail: donatkov@khv.zcu.cz.

¹ Fondazione manifesto del Futurismo, 1909, Museo d'Arte Moderna e Contemporanea di Trento e Rovereto (hereinafter MART), Archivio del '900, Fondo Gino Severini, SEV. VII., Sev. VII. 1.

From 1910 at the latest, Marinetti took on an aggressively nationalistic attitude. He was also convinced that artists, as the cultural elite, must get involved in politics in the interest of the future of his country, Futurists in particular, whom he declared to be “*anarchists operating in the field of art*”.² As the irredentist anti-Austrian unrest generated by Futurist evenings demonstrated, however, art wasn’t the only field in which they operated. Many of them aimed to “capture” Italian passatist towns and were motivated by the need to modernize society. Marinetti believed that the fate of his nation depended on Futurist propaganda and the inevitability of war, which if Rome, Venice and other cities were to continue to live from Classical Tradition and Florence was to continue to be no more than a picture gallery, would lead to disaster.³ His desire to modernize Italian cities was not based merely on blind acceptance of modern things alone. Marinetti, despite the Triple Alliance, believed that war with Austria-Hungary was drawing near and that his country must get ready for it. Following the Futurist evening in Milan’s Teatro Lirico in February 1910, Marinetti continued to spread the ideas of Futurism across Europe, while at the same time promoting his strident anti-Austrianism. Still, in February, he visited Paris where he glorified the new Futurist Italy and presented his desire to evoke an intellectual *riavvicinamento* between the two countries, i.e. a cultural rapprochement between Italy and France, in order to prepare for a possible conflict with the Central Powers.⁴ In the same year, he called for the same rapprochement in London, claiming that a war against Austria-Hungary, and with it the treaty-bound Germany, would finally eliminate Pan-Germanism.⁵ His anti-Austrian demonstrations led to a number of heated moments for Italian diplomacy in Britain, which were refuted by stating they stood on good moral principles, although according to diplomats Marinetti was just one of many irredentists who did not have a decisive influence on political events.⁶ Nevertheless, Marinetti did come to see his expectations come to fruition on 28 July 1914, one month after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo, when Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. By 4 August, alliance obligations plunged all the European powers into conflict and the continent

² E. IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti: The Artist and His Politics*, New Jersey 2015, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁴ E. IALONGO, Futurism from Foundation to World War: the Art and Politics of an Avant-garde Movement, in: *Journal of Italian Modern Studies*, 21, 2, 2016, p. 314.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 46.

found itself at war. Only Italy declared neutrality, doing so on 31 July. Advocates of war on the side of the Triple Alliance were in a minority, and most Italians did not want to get involved in a war against Great Britain. Also playing a part in the decision was the fact that during the July crisis, Vienna had not consulted its approach with Italy, and furthermore the Italian government had previously signed an agreement with France that in the event of a conflict in which Germany was the aggressor, it would not support Germany and was not bound to join the war alongside its Triple Alliance partners. Furthermore, Italy was not ready militarily for a conflict of such a size, with many of its forces still dislocated in Libya and the country also weakened due to June's massive Red Week workers' protests and the cataclysmic July death of Chief of Staff, Alberto Pollio. His successor was General Luigi Cadorna, whom Giolitti said he would not choose simply for the reason of knowing him. Fearful of an attack by Austria, Cadorna proposed immediate mobilization. San Giuliano and Salandra feared, however, that this would provoke the very reaction which Cadorna feared, and so the Italian army was not mobilized.⁷

There was an interesting phenomenon prevalent within Italian society, however, which was a legacy of the nationalization of the military in the 19th century. The co-existence of two military cultures during the Risorgimento period had left an ambivalent image of the heroic warrior fighting for his homeland, often referred to in nationalistic rhetoric. Garibaldi and his volunteers had left a legacy that Italians found difficult to reconcile with a legitimate army secured by the state.⁸ Before Italy joined the First World War and subsequent to it, many voluntary regiments were set up in addition to the regular army. The most important point, however, was that the Nationalists now again awakened Garibaldi's legacy: *"the attractive image of young heroes, the myth of a courageous minority focused on the national revolution against the old and perverse ruling class, the high moral value of the prescribed weapons test: these elements were part of the ideology of intervention,"*⁹ which invigorated the turbulent days of the pre-war months. During the autumn of 1914, Garibaldi's grandson Peppino set up the Garibaldi Legion of volunteers, which he commanded, and which 4,000 volunteers joined, including his four brothers. In December, the Garibaldi Legion

⁷ Ch. SETON-WATSON, *Italy from Liberalism to Fascism 1870–1925*, London 1967, p. 418.

⁸ C. PAPA, *L'Italia giovane. Dall'Unità al fascismo*, Roma 2013, pp. 131–132.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

was deployed with the French Foreign Legion in Argonne.¹⁰ Their heroism was celebrated through nationalist interventionist agitation and by the whole of Italian society. Marinetti wanted in as early as August to create a legion of volunteers who would fight for France while Italy remained neutral,¹¹ which was directed by Foreign Minister San Giuliano during the summer months. In October, Italy received more tragic news, this time San Giuliano's death. Salandra took over his agenda for a short period until he put his friend Sidney Sonnino in the position of Foreign Minister in November. The ten-month period of neutrality, termed the *Intervento* by Italian historians, is one of the pivotal moments in Italian history. The turbulent atmosphere over the issue of intervention plunged Italy to the verge of civil war, while also determining its future, not just in the repercussions of joining the conflict, but also in shaping the characters which were to govern Italy's fate.

As soon as the war broke out and Italy's neutrality was declared, a wave of strikes began in Italy, either for or against intervention. The socialists threatened revolution were the government to join the conflict, and Catholics were also opposed to Italian involvement. Nationalists were clear in wanting war on one side or the other, and not for ideals or sentiment, but rather for the size of the country. They later placed their support on the side of the Allied powers, and Corradini declared that Italy must fight the Allies' war, but to fight it for itself: *"This war must not be the last Italian war for unification, but the first war of Italy as a great power."*¹² Futurists threatened revolution if Italy did not join the war against the Central Powers on France's side. They wanted to lead the fight not just with weapons, but also as a clash of cultures and civilizations:¹³ *"We are grateful to the French Revolution for our first patriotic and military awakening, our current civil and intellectual freedom. We owe the French army for the unification of our country. We are grateful to France for our culture and our art of the last two centuries. This sympathy is even firmer in these days,"*¹⁴ wrote Papini in *Lacerba*, a journal which gradually transformed itself over 1914 from a cultural newspaper into a political weekly, becoming a tool of Futurist propaganda, with of Milan's Futurists only Marinetti continuing to write articles for it.

¹⁰ SETON-WATSON, p. 421.

¹¹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 52.

¹² SETON-WATSON, p. 421.

¹³ C. TISDALL – A. BOZZOLLA, *Futurism*, London 1977, p. 174.

¹⁴ G. PAPINI, *Il dovere dell'Italia*, in: *Lacerba*, II/16, August 15, 1914, p. 243.

During this period, Milan was brimming with interventionist activity, with violent clashes between pro-war and anti-war members of the public whipped up by the socialists breaking out on 1 August. Marinetti co-operated with the pro-French demonstrations led by the republicans and pro-war socialists. In the event of intervention in the war on the side of the Central Powers, he threatened the government with revolution, and that it would be he who would start it in Milan, his people now clearly demonstrating their readiness for conflict with Austria-Hungary.¹⁵ During September, the French halted the German advance at the Marne, igniting further Futurist demonstrations in Milan putting pressure on Italy to join the war. To this end, the Futurists created the tactic of “political action in theatres”. On 15 September 1914, Puccini’s *La Fanciulla del West* opera had its premiere at Teatro del Verne. According to the records of the Milan prefecture, after the first act Marinetti, Boccioni, and Carrà rose from the audience, Marinetti unfurled an Italian flag from the upper gallery with the inscription: “*Long Live Italy and France*”, while Carrà at the same time illustratively destroyed a piece of cloth in the Austrian colours bearing the message “*Down with Austria*” from the opposite gallery.¹⁶ They were subsequently removed from the theatre, only for them to symbolically burn the Austrian flag at the Galleria Vittorio Emanuele the next day during another demonstration of interventionist unrest. Marinetti was arrested with several other Futurists, and they spent a number of days in prison.¹⁷

After his release, Marinetti continued in his interventionist activities, publishing the manifesto *In this Futurist Year*, which was aimed at students and introduced the ideas and activities of the movement, explaining why it supported intervention and glorified war and encouraged students to take on these core Futurist ideas for themselves. He reminded them that in the period of *Intervento*, the Futurist battle wasn’t just political manifestations, but this Futurist year was also the pinnacle of their cultural struggle: “*War discredits all its enemies: diplomats, professors, philosophers, archaeologists, critics, cultural obsession, Greek, Latin, history, senility, museums, libraries, foreign industry. War will develop gymnastics, sport, farming schools, trade and industrial practice. War will rejuvenate Italy, enrich it with men of action, force it no longer to live from the past, from its ruins and nonviolent climate, but rather from its own*

¹⁵ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 52.

¹⁶ R. HUMPHREYS, *Futurism*, London 1999, pp. 64–65.

¹⁷ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 52.

nationalist forces."¹⁸ He also drew attention to art, which was also meant to conform to the interests of the homeland and war, and urged Futurist artists to promote this in their work. He hoped that such art would bring new pliant war dynamic and artistic originality. He also sent letters to Severini, who was still residing in Paris, urging him to accept the new Futurist aesthetic doctrine: *"This war in a way encircles the entire world. It will remain at war, [...] meaning in an aggressive, dynamic, futurist state for at least 10 years. It is therefore essential that Futurism does not take part in the wonder of this fire just directly, [...] but that it also becomes the plastic expression of this Futurist hour. I am speaking about a wider expression which is not limited to the narrow circle of experts; about expression so strong and synthetic which would impact the imagination and sight of all or almost all intelligent readers. I do not see this as the prostitution of the plastic dynamic, but I believe that this greatest war, intensively experienced by Futurist painters, may arouse real trembling in their sensibility. [...] You will likely have fewer abstract paintings and drawings, a little more realistic and in some regards they may be post-Impressionist Avant-Garde. Perhaps, and I hope this should be so, this will give birth to a new military plastic dynamic. Boccioni and Carrà are with me in my opinion and they believe in the greatest possible artistic innovation which can be achieved. As such, I ask you to focus on war and its reverberations in Paris in your paintings, endeavour to live a painter's war, study it in all its wonderful mechanical forms (military trains, fortifications, injuries, emergency surgery, hospitals, parades, etc.)."*¹⁹ Thus Marinetti, if not for the last time in his life, declared military Futurism.

In subsequent months, Severini endeavoured to bring his work as near as he could to what Marinetti had proposed. During 1915, he painted pictures with a military theme which were fundamentally more realistic than the interventionist works of his Italian friends. These include the pictures *War*, *Armoured Train*, and *Red Cross Train*. In contrast, Carrà began to distance himself from Marinetti's ideas. Nevertheless, his *Interventionist Demonstration* of August 1914 is often described as the most Futurist work ever. It is a collage which approximates Cubist practice. Nevertheless, it brings together the typical Futurist aesthetics of the pre-war years with an approach characteristic for Futurism of the era, i.e. a *"fragmentation of the traditional perceptual space, inserting snippets*

¹⁸ F. T. MARINETTI, In quest'anno futurista, 1915, in: *La guerra, sola igiene del mondo*, Milano 1915, p. 149.

¹⁹ Marinetti's Letter to Severini, November 20, 1914, MART, Archivio del '900, Fondo Gino Severini, SEV. I. 3., SEV. I. 3.4.13.

from newspapers and discovered advertising materials, inducing an impression of kinesthesia through visual dynamics created by the collage construction as a vortex and also a pattern of intersecting fields laid out in mutually unsettling diagonals, and finally also confronted with the different sound level of the language with its graphical symbols,"²⁰ all as a model disseminated as cultural propaganda. In Demonstration, Carrà brought together the need for freedom and spontaneous expression with his innate desire for order. This was what Marinetti was trying to square in his politics; to unleash the revolutionary energy of the individual and focus it on collective nationalistic purposes.²¹ A month later, Carrà created his Futurist Synthesis of War manifesto, which was a patriotic metaphor glorifying eight poets, nations fighting on the frontiers of war and Italy, and their positive characteristics as against Austria-Hungary's and Germany's pedantry and passatism. In it, Carrà highlights, for example, the practical spirit, sense of duty, honour, and respect as characteristics typical for the British and the Italian genius, as against the bigotry, passatism, and penchant for spying amongst the German nations.²² A year later, the similar manifesto, Synthesis of World War was produced, which copied the structure of the previous manifesto, with Carrà's graphical compositions also used, accompanied by Marinetti's texts. The Futurists also attempted to propose a new national flag in which red, the colour of spilt blood, would dominate over the green and white. They even declared the watermelon the national fruit, as in its ripe state red predominates over the green and white edges.²³

Probably the most original Futurist interventionist contribution was Balla's experiments in fashion. Besides his abstract paintings in the national colours he produced during this period, Balla also created his own style of dress and taking the idea that one should look the way one thinks reflecting the opinions one holds he designed interventionist clothing. He described his principles in the manifesto *Anti-neutral Dress*, accompanied by clothing designs for individual Futurists. They were all to be in Italian colours. Marinetti's art management met with reluctance not just from Carrà, with the Florence group beginning to turn away from the Milan group, and Lacerba ended co-operation with Marinetti's group. Papini and Soffici also criticized his cumbersome management and blinkered

²⁰ H. FOSTER – R. KRAUSOVÁ – Y.-A. BOIS et al., *Umění po roce 1900*, Praha 2013, p. 95.

²¹ IALONGO, *Futurism from Foundation*, p. 318.

²² TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, pp. 187–188.

²³ G. LISTA, *Futurism*, Michigan 2001, p. 101.

nationalist policies,²⁴ and criticized the Milan Futurists' laxity: "*Since the start of the war, when we transformed Lacerba into a political propaganda weekly in sharp Futurist intent, meaning irredentist and pro-war, to our surprise we no longer find out [Milanese] friends at our side. The Futurist demonstrations in support of intervention which we called for and expected to be numerous and impulsive, were modest and unimportant, culminating in just a small Milan demonstration, and in Balla's inappropriate and empty manifesto of anti-neutral clothing.*"²⁵ In early 1915, Papini himself took over Lacerba's management, and *marinettism* continued to find itself the target of criticism in the journal. In February 1915, Papini, Soffici and Palazzeschi broke away from Marinetti's Futurism and left the movement. Marinetti wrote to Severini that Lacerba had become totally passatist, and "*Papini, Soffici, and Palazzeschi [...] have betrayed us*".²⁶ Lacerba continued to agitate for intervention until May, when it closed down, with its tone becoming ever more aggressive. Its final issue openly called for the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of a republic. "*War with Germany or civil war. War with Germany or revolution. War with Germany or a Republic,*" and criticized the King's silence.²⁷ With the Florence artists' departure, the Futurist movement, which prior to the war had always acted as an organized group, began to fall apart.

Over the course of winter, it began to become clear that the war would not be over by Christmas, as many European statesmen had predicted. To move the conflict into a new phase and open new fronts, greater pressure was placed on the Italian government by the Great Powers, as well as by its own population. Also, at Christmas, the news came to Italy that brothers Bruno and Costante Garibaldi had fallen in battle. Their bodies were brought home, and an alleged 300,000 people attended their funeral in Rome.²⁸ According to some contemporaries, this represented the largest ever public gathering in Italian streets.

Marinetti continued to rouse the population to demonstrate for Italy to join the war, now also doing so outside Milan. He set out on a propaganda tour with the Nationalist Corradini in December. He toured Italian universities, where he proved a hit amongst students, mainly due

²⁴ IALONGO, *Futurism from Foundation*, p. 319.

²⁵ G. PAPINI – A. SOFFICI, "Lacerba" Il Futurismo e Lacerba, in: *Lacerba*, II/24, December 1, 1914, p. 325.

²⁶ Marinetti's Letter to Severini, March 26, 1915, MART, Archivio del '900, Fondo Gino Severini, SEV. I. 3., SEV.I.3.4.15.

²⁷ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 175.

²⁸ J. RIDLEY, *Mussolini*, Praha 2002, p. 75.

to the interruption of the lectures of pro-German lecturers, and they were recruited for nationalist objectives. He was also well-received by the politicized working class when he demonstrated support for pro-French intervention alongside the syndicalists and pro-war socialists.²⁹ Futurists also focused their attention on Rome, and they were arrested here during a demonstration in front of the parliament building on 19 February 1915.³⁰ Two months later, Marinetti was again arrested in Rome, this time on 12 April alongside Balla, Settimelli, and a number of other Futurists, and with Mussolini during an interventionist demonstration at Piazza di Trevi. This was the first large activity that Mussolini took part in. Later, Marinetti would describe this event as crucial for his future political direction.³¹ On 26 April, the Italian government signed the Treaty of London, which bound Italy to join the war on the side of the Allies, for which it would receive *terre irredente*, Istria, and other areas of the Dalmatian coast and a number of overseas possessions. Salandra then endeavoured to raise the influence of the interventionist groups, supporting some in secret, such as D'Annunzio, whom he informed of the wording of the treaty in order to demonstrate that all public opinion was for the war and the government thus felt under its pressure.³² Subsequently, on 4 May, Italy left the Triple Alliance agreement.³³

In spring, the interventionist campaign generally became broader. In 1919, Marinetti recalled that during this period, one could behold, “*on the tumultuous squares of Milan and Rome, an odd couple out together again, the destructive actions of liberals and patriotism, with their new faces: Mussolini, Corridoni, Corradini, Garibaldi and Marinetti, all allied in the demand for ‘War or Revolution’*”.³⁴ However, following his April arrest and stay in prison where, unlike Mussolini, he spent a number of days, Marinetti withdrew from his political engagement for a while and was not particularly involved in the events of “radiant” May. The largest pro-war demonstration was held on 5 May on the unveiling of the monument to Garibaldi’s Expedition of the Thousand in Quarto, near Genoa for the 55th anniversary of the expedition setting sail. Taking part in the event were veterans of the

²⁹ HUMPHREYS, p. 65.

³⁰ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 54.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

³² P. MILZA, *Mussolini*, Praha 2013, p. 194.

³³ SETON-WATSON, pp. 431–432.

³⁴ F. T. MARINETTI, *Old Ideas That Go Hand in Glove but Need to Be Separated*, 1919, in: F. T. MARINETTI, – G. BERGHAUS, *Critical Writings*, New York 2006, p. 332.

Thousand, Garibaldi's son Ricciotti and Peppino's grandson, who had returned from the French front.³⁵ D'Annunzio made a speech calling for war. Once Salandra was made familiar with its content, he publicly distanced himself from the ceremony and recommended the King do the same. D'Annunzio's calls for restoring Italy's greatness were well-received by the crowd of 20,000, and the original memorial event subsequently grew into turbulent unrest.³⁶

Tensions within society and in the parliament built up, with clashes between pacifists and interventionists continuing to occur in Italian cities, often accompanied by violence and rivers of blood, until on 23 May Foreign Minister Sonnino submitted an ultimatum to the Austro-Hungarian government, and mobilization was declared in Italy. Italy joined the conflict the next day, marked by the jubilant cheering of crowds, although played out in an atmosphere of civil war.³⁷ When Salandra and Sonnino led their country to war, they claimed the war was an opportunity to join history; "*Now or never, Italy must master its past and make Risorgimento real rather than experience permanent rivoluzione mancata.*"³⁸ The social atmosphere invoked by intellectuals during the Intervento period and prior to it had significantly contributed to the lead-up to the war, just as their failure in defiance of Fascism did a generation later.³⁹ The war changed everything, for Europe, for Italy, and for the Futurists. In this "Futurist" hour of joining the battle, Futurism's principal idea became real: war was no longer a projection of the future, and thus the movement partially lost its justification.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, in the end the war transformed Futurism more radically. It also affected Marinetti himself, showing him that Italians could be recruited as a patriotic unit of revolutionary individuals, and at its end strengthened his desire to create the Futurist Political Party.

* * *

The First World War represented a new brutalization of public life, in which violence became routine, and the nationalist ambitions without

³⁵ RIDLEY, pp. 76–77.

³⁶ SETON-WATSON, p. 442.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 449.

³⁸ R. J. B. BOSWORTH, *Italy and the Wider World 1860–1960*, New York 1996, p. 29.

³⁹ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 177.

⁴⁰ W. L. ADAMSON, *How Avant-Gardes End—and Begin: Italian Futurism in Historical Perspective*, in: *New Literary History*, 41, 4, 2010, p. 861.

which Fascism could not triumph intensified. The war itself was nevertheless not the cause of the rise of Fascism; Fascism was more the result of the post-war politics, and most of the concepts which Fascism gave birth to had existed before 1914.⁴¹ These included faith in a new revolutionary culture led by the elite to replace the old elites of liberalism and conservatism or the left-wing, shared by Nationalists, Futurists and some syndicalists, and a common theoretical background to these currents. Much of what became Fascism after 1919 can be found in the Founding Manifesto of Futurism ten years earlier.⁴² The Futurist tactic of “conquering” passatist cities, accompanied by frequently violent clashes can also be seen as a precedent for the future Fascist conquering of socialist centers. Also important in the genesis of Fascism was the influence of syndicalist Sorelianism and its faith in the principle of the regenerative impact of violence. In any case, Mussolini’s view of Sorel’s teachings was not permanent, and he was only partially influenced by them. Nevertheless, Sorelianism placed down roots in several political and intellectual factions in Italy, meaning that directly and indirectly it was involved in the rise of Fascism.⁴³

Socialist Mussolini was not an orthodox Marxist, being highly influenced by Sorel’s theoretical criticism of revolutionary syndicalists and Pareto’s theory of elite. He spoke of himself as an “*authoritarian and aristocratic socialist*”,⁴⁴ and like Marinetti held an elitist, anti-parliamentary and initially also anti-Church position, believed in cleansing through violence and like syndicalists believed that only a special revolutionary vanguard could shape a new revolutionary society. Mussolini’s ideas were both cause and consequence of the form of Italian Fascist history, whose ideology was as a result not firm and intransigent, and over the whole of the Fascist epoch it was entirely dependent on Mussolini’s will and ideological inclinations.⁴⁵ The foundations were laid during the Inter-vento period, the events of which were crucial for Mussolini’s intellectual rebirth, for the shaping and nascence of Fascism.

Following the outbreak of the First World War and the declaration of Italian neutrality, Mussolini, as the editor-in-chief of *Avanti!*, continued

⁴¹ S. PAYNE, *A History of Fascism*, New York 1995, p. 79.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁴³ J. J. ROTH, The Roots of Italian Fascism: Sorel and Sorelismo, in: *The Journal of Modern History*, 39, 1, 1967, p. 30.

⁴⁴ PAYNE, p. 83.

⁴⁵ E. NOLTE, *Fašismus ve své epoše*, Praha 1998, p. 330.

to defend the official party line, threatening revolution to the government in the pages of his paper in the event of intervention, with *Avanti!* hosting headlines over the whole of August such as “*Down with War!*” and “*Our Neutrality shall be Absolute!*”, and appeals such as “*Italian proletariat: do not be swept up by the calamity of war!*”⁴⁶ Mussolini criticized advocates of intervention, warmongers and in particular opposed Italian involvement on the side of the Central Powers. From the July crisis, he advocated an anti-Austrian and anti-German position due to their ultimatum to Serbia and Belgium.⁴⁷ At that time, however, he doubted whether the official line of the Italian socialist party was right, and the following weeks for him were a period of internal struggle, further intensified by the fact that the socialists in Germany, Austria-Hungary and France supported the war and urged people to fight for their homeland. Mussolini later confirmed that it was the fact that the German socialists betrayed internationalism that led him to reject international socialism.⁴⁸ While he was struggling with his conscience, the number of his friends who joined the interventionist movement grew.

In October 1914, a number of syndicalist leaders, specifically, for example, Filippo Corridoni, Alceste de Ambris and lawyer Angelo Oliviero Olivetti, alongside other left-wing intellectual groups, founded the *Fascio rivoluzionario d'azione interventzionista*, the Revolutionary Fasci of Interventionist Action, in Milan.⁴⁹ Their manifesto, written by Olivetti and published on 5 October 1914 was addressed to the workers of Italy, “*at this tragic hour which has elapsed, while the great war in Europe celebrates its bloody splendour, while the very foundations of civilization seem to be swept away by a rediscovered barbarism,*” and it stated that, “*we, combatants from various party factions, feel the obligation to state frankly and clearly that, [...] we [left-wing] revolutionaries, the working class of many countries, avant-garde elements, basically all those who have an aversion to war and the battle against*

⁴⁶ *Avanti!*, XVIII/211, August 2, 1914, p. 2; *ibid.*, p. 5; XVIII/215, August 6, 1914, p. 3.

⁴⁷ NOLTE, p. 234.

⁴⁸ RIDLEY, p. 68.

⁴⁹ It was standard practice for various radical groups in Italy to form Fasci from the 1870s. These were organized trade unions, middle-class radicals and pro-reform farmworkers. The most well-known were the Fasci Siciliani, associations of farmworkers who in 1895–1896 brought most of Sicily to revolt against contemporary political and economic structures. Thus, the establishment of Revolutionary associations was not a new practice within the Italian left. PAYNE, p. 82.

*militarism in their programme, bear much responsibility for it*⁵⁰ and it ascribed guilt to those groups, the German and Austro-Hungarian working class and domestic socialists, for not standing up to resist, “*the ultimatum of the Austrian government to the small Serbian nation,*” that there was no “*movement to the anxious shout of doom of Luxembourg and Belgium dishonoured in their sacred right to freedom and independence,*”⁵¹ and that the proletariat there did not protest against their governments in support of their comrades in the countries attacked. Olivetti further called upon Italian workers to stand alongside the great powers fighting for the freedom and independence of nations: “*War is today a tragic reality which we cannot be indifferent to as spectators without denying our principles,*” and to join the conflict on the side of the Allies against the “*barbarity, authoritarianism, militarism, German feudalism, and Austrian villainy. We must put an end to the humiliation, from now on we must accept responsibility and prepare for action!*”⁵²

Mussolini’s intellectual rapprochement with syndicalism is evidenced in his previous articles in *Utopia* magazine, which he founded in November 1913, on whose pages he did not have to hold to the Socialist Party’s official line. Here, he submitted Marxist ideology to criticism, opposing its materialist-scientific interpretation and rejecting the idea of the decline of capitalism as not corresponding to historical reality. He expressed here his sympathy to anarcho-syndicalist thought on the relationship to violence and the need for a revolutionary elite able to control the masses.⁵³ During the first two months of the *Intervento*, however, he became convinced that the socialists were unable to form such an elite. Gradually, his opinions moved ever closer to the syndicalist camp, against whom the Party journals still profiled themselves against, and expressed opinions which he no longer agreed with. His friends and readers of *Utopia* could see how he was ever more inclined towards interventionism. Corridoni aptly described his situation, when he bragged to his brother: “*My ideas are shared by the most intelligent of European socialists and the resistance. Mussolini himself, head of Avanti!, is of like mind but he does not dare to express it publicly out of fear that his Comrades would expel him.*”⁵⁴

Mussolini’s friend, advocate of intervention and editor-in-chief of the paper *Il resto del Carlino*, Massimo Rocca, decided in October to hasten

⁵⁰ A. del NOCE, *Il pensiero politico di Angelo Oliviero Olivetti*, Milano 1976, pp. 58–59.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 59–60.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 60–61.

⁵³ MILZA, pp. 173–174.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

Mussolini's decision to move to the interventionist camp, addressing an open letter to him on 7 October, in an article entitled "The editor of *Avanti!* is a man of straw", in which he said that Mussolini was not writing what he really thought and lacked the courage to express himself. The following day, Mussolini responded in *Avanti!*, calling Rocca a straw man, representing his last expression in support of international socialism.⁵⁵ A few days later, he published an article in *Avanti!*, From Absolute Neutrality to Active and Divided Neutrality, in which he attempted to clarify and defend his true position. He considered absolute neutrality to support the Triple Alliance partners of Germany and Austria-Hungary and noted that the socialists in France and Great Britain supported the war. He continued to perceive interventionism as socialist intervention to the benefit of the attacked nation, like the syndicalists. He further presented his opinion here that socialists should not always oppose war, as were their revolution to win, they would have to lead the battle against foreign governments to defend it: "*And who can assure you that the government arising from revolution might not find their congratulatory baptism in war? And if (hypothetically) the Central Powers with their returned 'ancient' regimes triumph, will you continue to be absolute neutralists who remain against the war which might protect 'your', our revolution? [...] We have the unique privilege of living in the most tragic hour in the history of the world. Do we want to be – as people and as socialists – impassive observers of this grand drama? Or do we want to be – in a certain sense – its protagonists? Socialists of Italy, remember: sometimes it happens that the 'letter' kills the 'spirit'. Let us not try to protect the 'letter' of the Party if it means killing the 'spirit' of Socialism.*"⁵⁶ The following day, at a congress of the Italian Socialist Party in Bologna, he gave up the position of *Avanti!* editor-in-chief.

The following month, on 15 November, Mussolini published the first issue of *Il Popolo d'Italia*. He declared it supportive of left-wing interventionism and joining the war on the side of the Allied Powers. The Socialist Party declared him a traitor and criticized his selling out to "French gold", although in this respect they were clearly wrong. Initially, the paper *Il Popolo d'Italia* was funded by donations from industrialists, including the founder of Fiat, Agnelli, and support from French socialists and later the French government, which saw in Mussolini an influential figure serving their interests, did not come until spring 1915. The criticism that

⁵⁵ RIDLEY, p. 70.

⁵⁶ B. MUSSOLINI, Dalla neutralità assoluta alla neutralità attiva ed operante, in: *Avanti!*, XVIII/288, October 18, 1914, p. 3.

he had “defected” for money, which the socialists accused him of, was not true. Nevertheless, he felt alone in the Party in his opinions and on 24 November he was expelled from it.

In December, Mussolini joined the Fascio rivoluzionario, shortly thereafter taking control and becoming its most important speaker. His subsequent speeches showed an influence of the revolutionary and nationalist syndicalists, stressing mobilization of the masses, for the first time within a national initiative which would subsequently become a national revolution. On 6 November in *Il Popolo d'Italia*, he announced the movement's reorganization as the Fasci d'azione rivoluzionaria, or the Fasci of Revolutionary Action, which he described as Fascist.⁵⁷ By the end of January, it had over 9,000 members.⁵⁸ At the same time, Marinetti and his Futurists, who had kept up their radical and violent pro-war doctrine, organized their own Fasci politici futuristi,⁵⁹ or Futurist Political Fasci, later joining Mussolini's Fasci.⁶⁰ In an interview published on 23 February 1915, Marinetti expressed his admiration for Mussolini's transition to interventionism and his subsequent departure from the Socialist Party, claiming that “*his recent acts, positions, and rebellions are clear demonstrations of Futurist awareness*”.⁶¹ The next day, Mussolini returned the sympathy. He continued to perceive his position as a revision of socialism, which now stood behind national goals. For him, the transition to interventionism meant co-operation with nationalism, which he had always opposed. In the article published on 10 April, “Fascists of Italy: tomorrow occupy the Squares at any cost”, he called for demonstrations the following day while also denying his affiliation to nationalism, although he had the same objectives.⁶² Two days later, he was arrested in Rome during a pro-war demonstration alongside Nationalists and Futurists. In contrast to the others, he was released the same evening. During the spring months, when the interventionist campaign was reaching its climax, their objectives markedly coincided, and the ideology of the extreme right began to penetrate Mussolini's socialism and syndicalism. This coalescence only cemented war, and later prepared the path to Fascist ideology.⁶³

⁵⁷ PAYNE, p. 85.

⁵⁸ MILZA, p. 190.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 203.

⁶¹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 55.

⁶² RIDLEY, p. 76.

⁶³ MILZA, p. 195.

Mussolini was involved in the front line of the events of “radiant” May. The radical atmosphere of the *Intervento* hit him, and on 11 May he declared from the window of the *Il Popolo d’Italia* editorial board, that, “if Italy does not declare war on its borders, then there shall be a civil war within the country, and this will mean revolution”.⁶⁴ It was exactly ten months since he had threatened exactly the opposite in the pages of *Avanti!* The violent demonstrations and bloody clashes of those May days were in fact essentially unnecessary, as the Italian government had signed a pledge to join the war within a month on 25 April, and so on 23 May Mussolini was able to announce in *Il Popolo d’Italia* that: “From today, we are all only Italians. All Italians are united as a block of steel. General Cadorna has drawn his sword and will advance upon Vienna. Long live Italy!”⁶⁵

From the very first days of the war, many of the interventionist groups volunteered for the war. In contrast to Marinetti’s Futurists, fifty-four-year-old D’Annunzio, and syndicalists de Ambris and Corridoni, who fell early, Mussolini did not immediately go to the front, although he did try to do so to silence critics but came up against the military administration rules and was forced to wait until his year group was called up. This happened at the end of the summer. On 31 August, Mussolini was called to arms, and after a fortnight’s training was assigned to the 11th Bersaglieri Regiment and sent to fight at Monte Nero.⁶⁶ Mussolini served for seventeen months in the army, during which time he achieved the rank of corporal and spent roughly eight months in active battle at the front. In February 1917, he was wounded during artillery practice, spending the subsequent weeks in military hospitals and then returning to Milan. This marked the end of his military service. During that time, his reputation meant he was not permitted to take officer exams, and nor could he take part in the “heroic events” which would have earned him awards. Nevertheless, after his return from the front he could be spotted in the streets of Milan with crutches due to his serious wounds and this partially silenced critics and partially added to his reputation.

Experience of war caused some interventionists and patriots to shift further to the right. Nationalists formed other movements to keep Italy at war and increase military morale and courage despite the increasing suffering of war. This trend, however, eliminated left-wing interventionist

⁶⁴ RIDLEY, p. 77.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁶⁶ MILZA, pp. 196–197.

groups.⁶⁷ Some of their members gave way under the trauma of war, while others tended towards right-wing nationalism. *Fasci d'azione rivoluzionaria*, in which Mussolini was criticized for being over-authoritarian, was eventually dissolved at the end of 1916. One can detect a shift to the right in Mussolini during the war too, his “commitment to nationalism became complete and extreme and his goal was to bring together nationalism and some forms of socialism which would deal with all classes”.⁶⁸ The war years, however, represented a unique non-political era in his life. After his injuries, he returned to the editorial board of *Il Popolo d'Italia* in autumn 1917 and continued to focus on journalism. In contrast to Marinetti's fiery statements glorifying war as a beautiful bloody cleansing, Mussolini never celebrated war with such soaring rhetoric. In his paper, he commemorated the heroism of Italians at the front, who were “disciplined, brave, of good will,”⁶⁹ and sometimes also gave a report on his own state of mind: “Today, my heart is drained. [...] Modern civilization has ‘turned us into machines’. War has led us to the unbearableness of this process of mechanizing European society.”⁷⁰ Mostly, however, his articles fought against desertion in the Italian army and defeatism in society. This was a battle that was needed more in 1917 than at any time before.

In June 1917, Cadorna launched an offensive known as the Tenth Battle of the Isonzo in order to occupy Trieste, in which Marinetti was also involved. The Italians did not advance far, occupying just one village, and the operation soon turned against them. Marinetti was injured and subsequently hospitalized.⁷¹ In total, the Italians lost 160,000 men. But it was not to be the last of Cadorna's debacles, with the course of battles in summer demonstrating the Italian command's failure. Cadorna, however, blamed the continuing failures on the incompetency and defeatism of his own men, leading to an uptick in mutinies and desertions in the army. Autumn, however, saw a more grievous blow. On 24 October 1917, the Austrian army reinforced by German units penetrated a fifty-kilometer wide section of the front at Caporetto. Following three days of failed attempts at halting the offensive, Cadorna was forced to issue an order for a general retreat, although at the time the Italian army was already in significant disarray. In the end, with the help of British and French

⁶⁷ PAYNE, p. 86.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 87.

⁶⁹ MILZA, p. 199.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 60.

troops, the Italian army succeeded in halting the Austrian advance on 9 November, although the Central Powers divisions had already advanced to within around forty kilometres of Venice.⁷² After the Battle of Caporetto, the Italians had lost almost half their army, with statistics stating 40,000 dead and injured, 280,000 men captured, and 350,000 Italians deserted. The Austrians also captured a lot of military equipment. The Italian government was forced to resign, with Vittorio Emanuele Orlando becoming the new Prime Minister. Cadorna was also dismissed, and General Armando Diaz became the new Chief of Staff of the Italian armed forces.⁷³ Mussolini now felt the necessity to encourage Italian faith in resistance more than ever before.

The defeat at Caporetto represented an important milestone in the ideological development of the future dictator, who still considered himself a “reformed” socialist, even though he had broken away from his party and Marxist teachings and become attached to nationalism. As it was for most of the interventionists at the time, Caporetto was a shock and a sobering-up for him. Mussolini now perceived the inability of the Socialist Party to avert the defeat or use it to secure revolution. At the start of the following year, he decided to get rid of the “Socialist Daily” subheading from *Il Popolo d'Italia*, replacing it with the subheading “Daily of Warriors and Working People”. In August of that year, under its new masthead, its readers were able to read: *“You cannot be forever a socialist, forever a republican, forever an anarchist, forever a conservative. The spirit is change above all. Rigidity is for the dead.”*⁷⁴ From early 1918, his articles demanded a dictator along the line of the ancient Romans for a period of battles.⁷⁵ His thinking was ready for change and until the end of the war he used his paper to bring together readers and advocates for his future political performance.

During the war, Marinetti was also focused on journalism, founding the new magazine, *L'Italia Futurista*, in 1916. In contrast to Mussolini, however, he attempted to enter politics during the war. War radically transformed Futurism, with the Milan group of the pre-war years long gone by 1917. Marinetti was the only one who held onto the movement's doctrine in his thinking during the war and after it. He was also the only

⁷² MILZA, p. 205.

⁷³ RIDLEY, p. 88.

⁷⁴ MILZA, p. 209.

⁷⁵ RIDLEY, p. 91.

Futurist artist for whom the reality of war had never swayed his conviction of its glory. He continued to glorify it in his works, but no longer as a vision and future need, although he did emphasize the ongoing conflict, the heroism of the men, and subsequently the veterans. In particular, he blindly celebrated and supported General Cadorna, even after the disastrous outcome of the Battle of Caporetto, when he continued to endeavour to defend him.⁷⁶ After his recovery and return to civilian life, Marinetti began the process of reshaping Futurism into a formal political movement. After Caporetto, the actions of the pro-war groups increased in total, managing to slowly raise Italians' military morale, and for Marinetti the United States of America joining the conflict in April portended the end of the war, after which he decided he would become a key player in Italian politics. As such, he founded the Futurist Political Party in 1918, publishing the Manifesto of the Futurist Political Party on 11 February in *L'Italia Futurista*. Its programme was founded on the 1913 political manifesto.⁷⁷ It was extremely nationalistic and was still based on pre-war radical Futurist positions and the idea that war would unite Italy more than any kind of political movement could.

The Futurist Political Party was meant to be separate from the Futurist art movement so that anyone could join it, including those with different cultural opinions or artistic tastes. The manifesto proclaimed a strong and free Italy which, *"is no longer a slave to its past, foreigners who are overly loved, and priests who are overly-tolerated. [...] A sovereign, united, and indivisible Italy. Revolutionary nationalism for freedom, health, physical and intellectual development, strength, progress, the magnitude and pride of the Italian people"*.⁷⁸ Marinetti continued to fight for the development of industry, infrastructure, the modernization of Italian cities, and against tourism. In his manifesto, he repeated his previous calls for the patriotic education of the proletariat and declared that if the working class stand the nation in front of a class struggle, then the Futurist Political Party would fight for its freedom. The manifesto also referred to the necessity of eliminating the political police and ending the practice of deploying the army to deal with domestic unrest. It promised social security to workers in the form of an eight-hour working day, parity of wages for men and women, pension

⁷⁶ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 59.

⁷⁷ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 203.

⁷⁸ Manifesto of the Futurist Political Party, February 11, 1918, in: MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 305.

and insurance, encroaching upon the Socialist Party's agenda. There was a deep economic crisis throughout Italy in 1917, with the rural situation particularly dire. Following Caporetto, the number of rural recruits reached sixty percent. In order to deal with the problem of veterans from amongst farm workers, Marinetti introduced a project of nationalizing the land of local authorities and church organizations, cultivating more infertile land and redistributing land to veterans at fair prices. He promised veterans who were returning to the labour market within the public sector that their war service would count towards their pensions.⁷⁹

The war transformed the view of the status of women in the way Marinetti had hoped. Futurism's political programme, as it had done before the war, stood against marriage, aiming to make divorce easier and "free" women from the chains of marriage and motherhood. Marinetti proposed setting up a state institution for unwanted children, which would educate them to become model citizens, instead of being left to parents who do not bother looking after them.⁸⁰

Somewhat surprisingly, the Manifesto of the Futurist Political Party called on a smaller army and navy once Austria-Hungary was defeated, on condition of the provision of military and sports education at schools, and the proper training of a larger officer cadre. Marinetti believed that war had militarised the Italian nation to such an extent that it could be transformed into an army if needed. As such, he saw no reason in maintaining a larger professional army as this would remove the workforce from fields and factories.⁸¹

Marinetti, who had always endeavoured to define himself against parliamentarianism, for the first time went beyond mere criticism in the Futurist Party programme and offered an alternative to parliamentary democracy. He wanted to abolish the senate and replace it with a chamber comprising the public, young people under thirty years of age elected on the basis of universal suffrage which would bring new initiative, while the chamber of deputies was to comprise representatives of industry, agriculture, business, and engineers. The age limit was to be reduced to twenty-two years, with restrictions in the number of professors, "*who are always opportunists*" and lawyers, "*who are always ultra-conservatives*".⁸² The

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 305–307.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 306.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid., p. 305.

manifesto balanced somewhere between radicalism and nationalism and was an attempt at bringing together individual and collective needs.⁸³ These principles became the foundation for Futurist democracy, a concept Marinetti developed fully over the subsequent year. In ideas, he was closer to the revolutionary left-wing than the uncompromising right-wing.⁸⁴ Futurists, according to Marinetti's words, did not contemplate democracy at a general level such as the applied socio-political system but rather spoke of an Italian democracy which would grow for the particularities of the nation: "*Our pride, like Italians, is based on our superiority due to our enormous number of talented individuals. We thus want to create a true, aware, and brave democracy which be an honest acknowledgement and celebration of 'number', as it will include the largest number of individual geniuses. In this world, Italy represents a kind of exceptionally talented minority comprised of individuals who are superior to average humans due to their creative, innovative, and inventive strength.*"⁸⁵ Thus, Italian democracy was to be based on the "*masses of talented individuals,*" who knew their rights and, "*naturally played their role in shaping the transformations of their own state*".⁸⁶

One of the foundations of the Futurist political programme remained Marinetti's uncompromising anti-clericalism, as for him the Church was in every regard a passatist institution. He would accept no less than the expulsion of the papacy and the entire Church hierarchy from Italy: "*Our anti-clericalism longs to rid Italy of its churches, priests, pastors, nuns, madonnas, candles and bells. [...] The only possible faith is in tomorrow's Italy.*"⁸⁷ In this, Fascism presented itself as a secular faith, in which Mussolini's politics would be "secularised" and the myth of *Il Duce* in contrast almost "deified", something Marinetti would contribute towards.

The Futurist Political Party was formally established in November 1918, although prior to this on 20 April Marinetti alongside Futurist poet Mario Carli and writer Emilio Settimelli founded the Roma Futurista daily in Rome as its official paper. Also, during the summer of 1918, Marinetti collected political allies with whom he could go into electoral battle

⁸³ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 65.

⁸⁴ MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 304.

⁸⁵ F. T. MARINETTI, *Democrazia futurista*, 1919, in: F. T. MARINETTI, *Democrazia futurista: dinamismo politico*, Milano 1919, p. 85.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁸⁷ Manifesto of the Futurist Political Party, February 11, 1918, in: MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 305. The text was censored after the manifesto was published in *L'Italia Futurista* and in *Roma Futurista*, and in later reprints this passage was omitted.

after the war. Through Carli, he began co-operating with the Arditi, a militant group of the “daring ones” comprising war veterans who had problems reintegrating into society and who were against the socialists and the working class. Carli believed that the Arditi and Futurists shared the same objectives and that both groups had much in common. Some Futurists voluntarily volunteered for Arditi regiments, and Marinetti was a regular guest at their barracks, where he spread his propaganda and recruited new members to his movement. The Arditi, who helped set up the Futurist Political Party and its local organizations in Italian cities, also accepted the Futurists’ help in forming their own association on 1 January 1919. With the assistance of young captain of the Arditi assault platoons, Ferruccio Vecchi, Marinetti set up the movement’s first unit in his own apartment in Milan.⁸⁸ By the end of the month, divisions from various Italian cities came together under the Arditi national association based in Milan, and they later published their own magazine, *L’Ardito*, run by Vecchi and Futurist Carli,⁸⁹ who played a significant role in shaping the Arditi association’s political programme, which was very similar to the ideas in the Futurist Party’s programme. Carli was also the author of the Manifesto of the Futurist Ardito, which represented its “*most complete, most radical and most Futurist*” political proclamation.⁹⁰ Some historians speak of Ardito-Futurism as a new ideological phenomenon after 1918.

Marinetti also attempted to establish contact with left-wing interventionists and he managed to recruit several syndicalists into his organization.⁹¹ Alongside co-operation with the Arditi, this led to a closer political rapprochement with Mussolini, whom he met in Genoa in June 1918 in order to discuss the path ahead after the end of the global war.⁹² Marinetti’s private diary gives the impression that it was Mussolini who first made contact with him in order to set up a collaboration with the Arditi and Futurists.⁹³ Mussolini, who was also looking to reorganize Italian politics, was impressed by the Manifesto of the Futurist Political Party, especially in its efforts to address the issue of military retirees. Mussolini and Marinetti shared many ideas. They agreed that Italy needed a firmer hand in managing the war, and that government weakness just

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 303.

⁸⁹ MILZA, p. 233.

⁹⁰ MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 303.

⁹¹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 77.

⁹² Ibid., p. 78.

⁹³ MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 303.

emboldened the Socialist Party, whom they both opposed. Both men denounced intellectuals and artists who did not support the war, or who held defeatist positions. They also found agreement regarding the Arditi whom they both believed should be promoted and rewarded for their bravery in battle. These common interests were founded on their shared nationalism, although from the beginning of their co-operation, Marinetti doubted Mussolini's revolutionary potential and his support for certain elements of Futurist policy, in particular the Futurists' radical anti-clericalism, with Mussolini usually responding with silence to Marinetti's anti-Church speeches. Marinetti also faulted him for an overly lax and conservative approach to the working class.⁹⁴ Following a December meeting of both men, Marinetti wrote in his diary of the impression that Mussolini gave him: *"He says: 'The republic is a sort of crowning ideal we all dream about. But I could well go beyond the republic to arrive at a monarchy.' I sense the reactionary in the making in this violent, agitated temperament, so full of Napoleonic authoritarianism and a nascent, aristocratic scorn for the masses. He comes from the people but no longer cares about them. He tends toward aristocratic thought and notions of the heroic will. He's certainly no great intellect. He didn't see the need for war. He was originally an antimilitaristic demagogue without a country. [...] He doesn't see things clearly. He is propelled by his predisposition toward heroic struggle and his Napoleonic ideal. He also aspires, I think, to riches. He can't take his big eyes off my expensive raincoat."*⁹⁵ Marinetti nevertheless saw the influence he had and decided to co-operate with him, and later to follow him.

While Marinetti was gathering support and expanding the ranks of his political party, the war was coming to an end. In summer 1918, the Austrians attempted their final offensive, which collapsed and was followed by an Italian counterattack. On 24 October, General Diaz executed an attack on the Piave River, five days later Italy had conquered Vittorio Veneto and over the subsequent week they conquered Trento and Trieste. Austria retreated and on 3 November requested a ceasefire, which was affirmed the following day.⁹⁶ At eleven o'clock in the morning on 11 November 1918, quite reigned on all fronts and the Great War was at an end. The subsequent peace conference in Paris, however, brought more

⁹⁴ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, pp. 78–79.

⁹⁵ Marinetti's Diary, December 4, 1918. F. T. MARINETTI, *A Meeting with the Duce*, in: MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 319.

⁹⁶ RIDLEY, p. 93.

disappointment for Italy. Despite the promises of the Treaty of London, Italy acquired only the province of Trentino, South Tyrol, and Istria, with the territory of Dalmatia coming under the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and, Slovenes.

During November and December, Marinetti and Mussolini jointly spoke at several victory ceremonies.⁹⁷ From December, Marinetti organized nationalist demonstrations demanding acquisition of the Dalmatian coast. On 11 January 1919, such a demonstration grew into unrest in Milan's La Scala, using the same Futurist "theatre tactics" from the *Intervento* period, and led by Marinetti, several Arditi and Mussolini.⁹⁸ A clear signal was sent that evening that Italy's nationalists would not be disregarded.

On 23 March 1919, the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento, or the Italian Fasci of Combat, was established at Circolo industriale e commerciale in Milan's Piazza San Sepolcro. This represented the birth of Fascism, which desired to be perceived as national socialism.⁹⁹ It brought together Mussolini's supporters, the Arditi, Futurists, several former republicans, socialists, anarchists, and syndicalists. Nevertheless, Mussolini later confirmed that one could not talk of anything like "Fascist syndicalism", not even an embryonic form.¹⁰⁰ In its electoral programme, however, it declared that any Fascist voters would be voting for national syndicalism. It also proclaimed it would transform the parliamentary system, create economic councils regulating the national economy, and spread and promote Italy in the world.¹⁰¹ The reason that Mussolini wanted to unite in this way a number of different political factions under the Fascist flag, and the reason that Marinetti accepted this formal alliance, was for the social and political development of the "Two Red Years" of post-war Italy,¹⁰² which required more than just spontaneous demonstrations and violent acts: *"I felt that it was not only the anti-socialist battle we had to fight. [...] There was a lot more to do. All the conceptions of the so-called historical parties seemed to be dressed out of measure, shape, style, usefulness. They had grown tawdry*

⁹⁷ MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, p. 304.

⁹⁸ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 80.

⁹⁹ NOLTE, p. 253.

¹⁰⁰ NOCE, p. 19.

¹⁰¹ RIDLEY, p. 98.

¹⁰² Italy's "Two Red Years" of 1919–1920, or the Biennio rosso, was a period of social conflict as a result of the economic crisis following the Great War, during which time the radical left grew in power, followed by a violent reaction from the fascists. It only came to a definitive end in the March on Rome two years' later.

and insufficient – unable to keep pace with the rising tide of unexpected political exigencies, unable to adjust to the formation of new history and new conditions of modern life."¹⁰³

In some of its characteristics, Fascism was influenced by Marinetti's Futurism, including the fact that over its whole era, Fascism endeavoured to build up a military nation and engender a more military perspective on the world in Italians.¹⁰⁴ In July, Mussolini wrote in *Il Popolo d'Italia* that, "*Fascism is an unprecedented movement. It does not despise contact with groups which have been ignored or denounced... Average people always preferred not to take Futurism seriously and now, despite those people, Marinetti as the leader of Futurism is a member of the Fasci di Combattimento central committee*".¹⁰⁵ The Fasci di Combattimento's took on a number of points in the Futurist electoral programme, and Marinetti and syndicalist De Ambris were authors of its political manifesto, published in *Il Popolo d'Italia* on 6 June 1919, The Manifesto of Fasci Italiani di Combattimento proclaimed universal suffrage with the passive age limit reduced to twenty-five years, and the active limit to eighteen years, including for women, proportional representation on a regional basis, the abolition of the senate and the creation of economic councils including representatives of the workers. For the first three years of the reform period, a National Assembly was to be called, which would create a new constitution. The planned social measures included introducing an eight-hour workday, setting a minimum wage, reducing the retirement age and a reorganization of insurance. The manifesto also promised a peace-promoting and competitive foreign policy, the nationalization of the arms industry and the creation of national militia to defend the state. In the financial sector, in 1919 the Fascists planned to impose a windfall tax on "*capital of a progressive nature*" in the form of the partial expropriation of all wealth, the confiscation of the assets of Church institutions, and the abolition of "*all bishoprics*", which had too many privileges and were a burden for the nation.¹⁰⁶

During April, the Futurists were involved in street battles between Fascists and socialists, and it was they who, along with the Arditi, set fire to the Milan editorial board of *Avanti!*. Marinetti later highly exaggerated

¹⁰³ B. MUSSOLINI, *My Autobiography*, New York 2017, p. 75.

¹⁰⁴ BOSWORTH, p. 68.

¹⁰⁵ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 204.

¹⁰⁶ *Manifesto dei Fasci italiani di combattimento*, June 6, 1919, https://it.wikisource.org/wiki/Manifesto_dei_Fasci_italiani_di_combattimento,_pubblicato_su_%22Il_Popolo_d%27Italia%22_del_6_giugno_1919 [2019-04-11].

his involvement in these events, boasting that, “*From that day on, Milan was transformed entirely. Although Bolshevik arrogance was not dead, it was mortally wounded.*”¹⁰⁷ Marinetti continued to promote Fascist movement propaganda, as he had initially for the Futurists. His Roma Futurista also served Mussolini in leading his electoral campaign. Mussolini generally endeavoured to support prominent cultural representatives such as Marinetti and D’Annunzio, who influenced society’s mindset and could thus serve Fascist propaganda.

Since his youth, Gabriele D’Annunzio had wanted to become a famous poet and conquering hero. He had undoubtedly fulfilled the first of these dreams as a leading Italian literary figure of the Belle Epoque. On 12 September 1919 he occupied Rijeka alongside two-thousand soldiers, mainly comprising Arditi. They later ruled it as a separate city-state for a period of fifteen months, which in Italian historiography has been described using the term *fiumanesimo*.¹⁰⁸ Corradini and Mussolini publicly expressed their support for D’Annunzio’s act, and Marinetti went to Rijeka to support his fellow poet-at-arms. D’Annunzio welcomed this support for his act, but he was disappointed by the position of other Fascists who did not join them, and he warmly welcomed Marinetti. Marinetti attempted to convince D’Annunzio of the necessity of expanding his adventure, which he saw as having the potential for giving rise to revolution, which he wanted to spread to Italy. D’Annunzio rejected such a vision. Marinetti and Vecchi managed to convince his commander, but the mission to occupy Trieste turned into a fiasco, and Marinetti gradually lost his support. In the end, Marinetti came to the conclusion that D’Annunzio, who with his act had attempted to force the government to act and hoped for Italian military support, was just a “*maniac of beautiful gestures, imprisoned in wonderful phrases and an average guy,*” who did not see the revolutionary nature of his act and “*declared that he did nothing political*”.¹⁰⁹ Marinetti then left Rijeka. *Fiumanesimo* had two important consequences. First, it demonstrated the Italian government’s weakness and the explosive power of nationalism, but it also created something which later became the “Fascist style”. D’Annunzio here managed to create a new type of political liturgy incorporating elaborate uniforms, special ceremonies accompanied by

¹⁰⁷ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 204.

¹⁰⁸ At the Peace Conference in Paris, instead of getting Rijeka, or Fiume in Italian, and other parts of the Dalmatian coast, Italy received the Brenner Pass.

¹⁰⁹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 63.

song and speeches from the balcony of the city hall in Rijeka to a mass audience in the form of a dialogue with the leader. D'Annunzio's successors adopted the black shirt of the Arditi as their uniform, implemented the Roman greeting of raising the right arm, delighted in mass gatherings, introduced the anthem *La Giovanezza* and created several special chants and symbols.¹¹⁰

Upon his return from Rijeka, Marinetti affirmed his political alliance with Mussolini and plunged himself back into the electoral campaign. For this purpose, he produced the brochure, *Futurist Democracy*: a political dynamic which brought together previous Futurist political manifestos and essays. He continued to take part in verbal and physical assaults on the socialists, continued to glorify war, accused the government of not being able to achieve Italian territorial objectives, and continued to hold a vision of intellectuals and artists being involved in the future management of the state, and anti-clericalism. He attempted to extend his influence within the *Fasci di Combattimento* and implement Futurist democracy principles within its electoral programme. During a Fascist campaign in Milan, during a speech in Piazza Belgioso, he emphasized the transformatory effect of the war, which had forever liberated Italy of its inherited enemy and allowed it to achieve a new national awareness. Two days later, he spoke right after Mussolini, who had not spoken out against the Church in his speech, while Marinetti attacked the Church and declared the necessity of expelling the papacy from Italy, and that, "*the Fascist impassioned anti-clericalism, like many of our other revolutionary desires, is neither utopian nor a false hope*".¹¹¹ Mussolini did not share his strong anti-Church position, having become a more careful pragmatist than Marinetti, in comparison to his revolutionary youth. He did not refute the speech, however, rather remaining silent. Mussolini was a stronger political figure than Marinetti, and in the long-term he alone would determine Fascism's political future. Marinetti, whose political programme was based more on left-wing notions than Fascism, resented Mussolini's "transition to reaction", which gradually led to most left-wing *Fasci* members either leaving or being expelled.¹¹²

The most significant outcome of the First World War was that it definitively united Italy. Now more Italians felt a sense of national belonging

¹¹⁰ PAYNE, p. 92.

¹¹¹ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 95.

¹¹² MARINETTI – BERGHAUS, *Critical Writings*, p. 304.

and found a new national identity.¹¹³ Besides another irredentist disappointment, the war brought about a poor economic situation. Thus, the Socialists won the 16 November 1919 elections. They proved a fiasco for the Fascists, who received just 4,657 votes out of 270,000 in Milan, a full half of which went to the Socialists.¹¹⁴ On 18 November, Mussolini, Marinetti, Vecchi and several Arditi were arrested. Over the twenty-one days which Marinetti spent in San Vittore Prison,¹¹⁵ he decided to leave Fasci di Combattimento. He did so formally, alongside several other Futurists, on 29 May 1920. The reason for this decision was that they had been unable to force antimonarchism and anti-clericalism on the Fascists. The Futurist Political Party offered a radical and nationalistic political vision which promised to defend Italy's territorial interests, resist socialism, and respond to the economic and political demands of war veterans, workers, women, and farmworkers. Its reforms would lead to an expansion of personal and political freedoms. The political reality, however, proved unfavourable to them, with the socialists and working-class taking up a position on the extreme end of the political spectrum, with little faith in nationalists (which Futurists were) who promoted a radical agency which would affect their own. In contrast, Fascists were unwilling to tolerate anything which overlapped with socialism. Although they adopted some parts of the Futurist programme, for the most radical of them Marinetti's alliance with the Fascists was doomed to failure from the beginning.¹¹⁶ Thus in 1920 the Futurist Political Party collapsed. Some of its supporters remained in the Fascist camp, while others joined the Socialists. Marinetti withdrew from political life completely for two years.

Marinetti remained more enduring in his support for D'Annunzio's initiative in Rijeka than Mussolini, still nurturing a hope that this nationalist campaign would become the embryo for Futurist revolution in Italy. This somewhat misplaced hope was extinguished in November 1920 when Giolitti, who had become Prime Minister for the last time in his life in June of that year in order to "save" Italy, signed an agreement with the government of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in Rapallo, in which Italy affirmed its possession of Trieste, Istria, and a number of smaller islands at the Dalmatian coast, but surrendered Rijeka. Thus,

¹¹³ BOSWORTH, p. 67.

¹¹⁴ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 96.

¹¹⁵ TISDALL – BOZZOLLA, p. 204.

¹¹⁶ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 106.

D'Annunzio's dream ended, and he departed Rijeka with his troops on Christmas Eve 1920.

Mussolini continued in his fight. At the end of 1920, *Fasci di Combattimento* had 88 local organizations and 20,615 members.¹¹⁷ Over the subsequent two years, they attacked the Socialists in power and almost plunged Italy into civil war. From autumn 1920, Fascism became a highly visible phenomenon, even though the word had been used within Italy since 1915. Now, it was generally associated with the ever-more violent movement, whose members were called Fascists in courts.¹¹⁸ The use of organized political violence, in a much more organized and aggressive manner than the resistance of Italy's left-wing, became an integral part of the rise of Fascism.

Once Giolitti decided to ask the King in April 1921 to dissolve parliament and call a new general election, outbreaks of violence increased markedly in Italy. Over the course of the six-week electoral campaign, Mussolini travelled across northern cities and towns, making speeches every day. In the end, the election brought triumph and 38 seats in parliament.¹¹⁹ In July, Giolitti resigned, and new Prime Minister, socialist Ivanoe Bonomi attempted to pacify the situation in the country. As such, Mussolini came to an agreement with the Socialists, and not the Communists,¹²⁰ to end the fighting, although he was unable to control his *squadristi* units. In Ravenna, Bologna, and Ferrara, where the Socialists had the greatest number of representatives and where young Italo Balbo had joined the local *Fasci* organization, the bloody battles continued. On 7 November, a nationwide congress was held at which Mussolini announced the transformation of the movement into the *Partito Nazionale Fascista*, or the National Fascist Party. A week later, they withdrew from the peace pact with the Socialists. By the final day of 1921, the National Fascist Party had 840 local organisations and 249,036 members.¹²¹ At this time, Fascism was still closely tied to the *Il Popolo d'Italia* daily, whose editor-in-chief held a dominant position.¹²² After the establishment of the Fascist Party, he became generally known as *Il Duce*, although again this term of address can also be traced back to 1915 when Mussolini addressed

¹¹⁷ RIDLEY, p. 122.

¹¹⁸ PAYNE, p. 96.

¹¹⁹ RIDLEY, pp. 111–112.

¹²⁰ The Communist Party was founded in Italy on 21 January 1921.

¹²¹ RIDLEY, p. 123.

¹²² NOLTE, p. 333.

his supporters in Fasci d'azione as Fascists, and the most militant of them addressed him as *Duce*, or Leader.

In early 1922, Italo Balbo began the transformation of his squadristi into Blackshirts on Mussolini's orders. They adopted the uniform and rules established by D'Annunzio during *fiumanesimo*, and a hierarchy along the lines of the Roman legions, with *Il Duce* at the head. Their violence increased to a peak in summer; the total number of victims of the political violence of 1919 to 1922 is estimated at almost 2,000 people.¹²³ By the end of August, the Fascists had occupied Ferrara, Bologna, Ravenna, and Milan. Demands for a march on Rome began to appear amongst their ranks. While Mussolini was meeting with the government behind the scenes, the Blackshirts were getting ready to march, announcing on 24 October: "*Either they give us the government, or we shall grab power by marching on Rome.*"¹²⁴ Four days later, they got their wish when the Prime Minister resigned. Victor Emmanuel III gave in to Mussolini, appointing him to form a government on 30 October out of fear of civil war and probably a little personal sympathy. Mussolini became Italy's Minister of the Interior, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister at the same time: "*I was the leader of the revolution and chief of the government at thirty-nine. Not only have I not finished my job, but I often feel that I have not even begun it. [...] My objective is simple: I want to make Italy great, respected, and feared; I want to render my nation worthy of her noble and ancient traditions. I want to accelerate her evolution toward the highest forms of national co-operation; I want to make greater prosperity forever possible for whole people. I want to create a political organization to express, to guarantee, and to safeguard our development. [...] I desire our nation to conquer again, with Fascist vigor, some decades or perhaps a century its lost history,*" wrote Mussolini in his autobiography a few years later.¹²⁵

Once Mussolini had taken office, Marinetti returned to the Fascists, remaining there this time until his death. The question remains as to what extent the powerlessness of the previous two years of political isolation and his fears for the future of the Italian nation,¹²⁶ linked to faith in his leader, were behind this step, or whether in contrast, it represented a purely pragmatic, or opportunistic decision. His 1918 sober assessment of Mussolini had gradually turned into a blind admiration for the Italian

¹²³ PAYNE, p. 106.

¹²⁴ RIDLEY, p. 134.

¹²⁵ MUSSOLINI, pp. 298–299.

¹²⁶ IALONGO, *Filippo Tommaso Marinetti*, p. 106.

dictator. From the end of 1922, Marinetti attempted to be accepted as a suitable partner for building up Fascist Italy and strived to ensure this partnership would give Futurism the acknowledgement of the official state art of the Fascist regime. This was his primary objective until the end of his life. His path there led him to change several key positions of Futurist doctrine, and it was certainly also one of the reasons for his blind following and defence of each of Mussolini's political steps and errors. Like General Cadorna during the First World War, Marinetti admired Il Duce over the next twenty years, accompanying him right up to his tragic end.



Традиционное воспитание детей кыргызской семье в системе труда (в конце XIX – начало XX вв. На примере юго-запада Ферганской долины)

*Сама Ра Курбаналиевна Осмонова**

In this article, based on field data and a wide range of sources, the traditional upbringing of children within the labour system of Kyrgyz residents in the south-western part of Fergana has been investigated. The main purpose was to characterize the specific features of labour education and its main stages in the schooling of labour activity. During the work on this study, the following methodological works were carried out: analysis of ethnographic materials on traditional labour education; Conversations and interviews with senior informants; Comparative analysis to determine general and particular qualities in the traditional upbringing of Kyrgyz children of south-west Fergana. Role of family in labour education, stages of labour division, gender and age division of labour were as a result revealed and the numerous proverbs, sayings connected to labour were described. All the above mentioned had to promote the child's development of interest and respect for labour. Besides many examples connected with respect and honouring of the senior generation were discovered, since the elder generation taught children to work (grandfathers, grandmothers, parents, older brothers, and sisters).

[Work; Education; Generations; Tradition; Culture; Family]

Введение

Особую актуальность сегодня приобретает комплексный анализ потенциала воспитательных средств, формирующих этническое сознание граждан Кыргызстана, прежде всего, духовно-нравственных культуры традиционного воспитания, от которой зависят само существование человека, будущее цивилизации в целом. Знания, которыми обладали кыргызы, его верования и обряды являются

* The Institute of Kyrgyz History and Archaeology and Ethnology of the Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan; e-mail: osk_8182@mail.ru.

бесценным результатом противоречивого опыта предков, который необходимо сберечь для подрастающего поколения, для выявления новых приоритетов в мировой педагогической науке и образовательной практике. Очевидно, что события ушедших лет и общественные институты, зародившиеся в давние времена, интересуют нас не из простого любопытства, а потому, что наследие прошлого актуально и востребовано и в наши дни.

Система трудового воспитания у кыргызов данного региона имеет глубокие, исторически сложившиеся традиции, в которых нашли воплощение любовь и уважение к труду и людям труда, любовь и уважение к земле, к разным видам трудовой деятельности, к созданным трудом ценностям и т.д. Эти традиции передавались в течение веков из поколения в поколение. Сложившаяся в семье система отношений и ее трудовая деятельность содержали богатый арсенал воспитательных средств. Воспитание осуществлялось в контексте реальной трудовой деятельности, и традиции были непосредственно вплетены в повседневную жизнь.

Традиционная система воспитания детей в кыргызской семье, особенно связанные с трудовой деятельностью, способные выработать у молодежи правильное отношение к труду, играли и продолжают играть большую роль в воспитательном процессе. Изучение и освоение народных традиций остается и в наше время актуальной научной проблемой, имеющей важнейшую практическую значимость.

Целью данного исследования состоит во всестороннем изучении трудового воспитания детей данного региона, дать характеристику специфических особенностей трудового воспитания, его основных этапов, приучения к трудовой деятельности.

Методологическую основу данной работы составили сравнительный анализ материалов и принцип историзма по рассматриваемой проблеме. Исследование основано на системном подходе в изучении системы традиционного воспитания, в частности связанные с трудовой деятельностью, то есть на комплексном применении методов структурного, стационарного, функционального и сравнительно-исторического анализа. Кроме того, при работе над данным исследованием проведены следующие методологические работы:

- анализ этнографических материалов по традиционному трудовому воспитанию;

- опрос и беседы-интервью с информаторами старшего поколения;
- сопоставительный анализ для определения общего и особенного в традиционном воспитании детей кыргызов юго-запада Ферганы.

Главной целью трудового воспитания детей у кыргызов считают, воспитание хорошего человека, прежде всего умелого и знающего свое дело. У кыргызов как и у многих других народов дети в семье с раннего детства вовлекались в домашние работы, участвовали во всех видах хозяйственных работ годового цикла.

На многих языках мира, в том числе и у кыргызов, семантика слова «воспитать» («тарбия», «тарбиялоо») равнозначна понятиям: растить, поставить на ноги, обучить, привить какие-то качества, навыки, т.е. сделать человеком – «адам болсун». Люди старшего возраста отмечают, что поведение ребенка, а также уровень развития способностей, как правило, наследуются от родителей, поскольку дети являются их продолжением. Кыргызы считали, что умственное развитие человека продолжается от рождения до 70 лет, после этого начинается обратный процесс. «Баладай болуп калды» – «Он стал как ребенок», – так говорят кыргызы, да и сейчас говорят о некоторых людях старшего возраста, которые остаются наивными, доверчивыми и т.п. несмотря на свой солидный возраст.

Временем, когда у детей начинался «проявляться ум», считался период, когда дети начинали совместные игры, т.е. лет с пяти. В этом возрасте они уже давали друг другу какие-то советы, свободно разговаривали, придумывали разные игры.

Этот возраст у кыргызов проживающих данным регионе считали определенным этапом в развитии умственных способностей, называя его «акыл-эси кирген мезгил».

По традиции у кыргызов юноше полагалось обязательно успеть сделать несколько дел: вырастить, воспитать, женить сына, построить дом и заняться своим хозяйством – таков был перечень дел, которые должен был сделать каждый человек.

Воспитанием детей, по свидетельству исследователей Б. Апыша, А. Асанканова, А. Кочкунова у кыргызов начинали заниматься с раннего детства. Следует отметить, что в любой кыргызской семье трудолюбие считалось одним из критериев определения воспитанности девушки или юноши, поэтому это качество прививалось ребенку с раннего возраста. Труд был не только целью, но

и средством воспитания, а трудолюбие, умение работать хорошо и в свое удовольствие – это итог и результат трудового воспитания, как отмечают многие исследователи.¹

В первые годы жизни ребенка главной задачей родителей и других старших членов семьи было содержание его сытым, чистым и в хорошем настроении. Поведением ребенка в этом возрасте управляют взрослые, как бы отвлекая от нежелательных обстоятельств и поступков, подробно объясняя, чего не надо делать, но при этом не угрожая ребенку физическими наказаниями. Следует отметить, что кыргызы к ребенку не предъявляли каких-либо существенных требований до тех пор, пока ребенок не научился понимать словесные поучения.

Кыргызы придавали трудовому воспитанию детей особое значение. Считалось, что именно через труд формируются все необходимые нравственные качества ребенка. Кыргызы рассматривали трудолюбие как одно из величайших достоинств человека. Передача трудовых навыков и производственного опыта происходила в условиях непосредственной трудовой деятельности.²

В трудовом воспитании можно условно выделить два этапа, каждый из которых имел свои конкретные задачи и цели. На первом этапе у детей вырабатывались элементарные навыки труда, закладывались основы трудолюбия (в возрасте от 2–3 до 6–7 лет). Это преимущественно достигалось в процессе игр, подражания взрослым. На этом этапе трудовое воспитание мальчиков и девочек происходило совместно. Второй этап трудового воспитания детей – в возрасте от 7–8 до 13–14 лет – предусматривал вовлечение их в непосредственную трудовую деятельность семьи. Уже к семи-летнему возрасту характером труда обуславливались особенности воспитания мальчиков и девочек: мальчики занимались традиционно мужской работой, девочки – женской. Воспитание мальчиков и девочек в этом возрасте проходило уже отдельно. Если в начале этого этапа, в 7–8 лет дети выполняли несложные трудовые поручения по дому, то к 10–11 годам они полностью овладевали основными навыками трудовых процессов в домашнем хозяйстве и сельскохозяйственном производстве.

¹ Б. АПЫШ, *Тарбия жараяны* [Текст] окуу куралы, Ош 2006, 35–6.

² Там же, 58–6.

Не может быть воспитания вне труда и без труда, поскольку без труда во всей его сложности и многогранности нельзя воспитать человека. Следует отметить, что отношение к труду в традиционном обществе являлось важнейшим элементом нравственности, духовности. Кыргызы воспринимали трудолюбие как существенную часть нравственных норм, которые воспитывались в процессе духовной, интеллектуальной, эмоциональной жизни.

А так же они считали, что трудолюбивым не может быть ребенок не думающий, не переживающий. Чем умнее ребенок, тем больше у него стремления к разным видам трудовой деятельности, а также больше эмоций и сильнее воля.

Кыргызы говорили о таком ребенке: «мээнеткеч», «иштесен – тиштейсин» – «Если будешь работать то будешь сытым».³

Как было отмечено, родители находились в постоянном труде и ребенка с раннего возраста, приучали к труду. Они учитывали, что семья должна была готовить детей к труду не только и не столько для нужд самой семьи, но прежде всего для самого ребенка, чтобы он стал человеком труда, мог сыграть свою роль в общественном производстве, а также трудился на благо своего рода, общины, народа. Стремились к тому, чтобы труд ребенка не был результатом принуждения, но имел добровольный и творческий характер. Одной из самых ответственных задач, стоящих перед родителями, являлось и сегодня является воспитание у детей желания и умения трудиться.

В трудовом воспитании можно, как было отмечено выше, выделить определенные возрастные этапы (от 2–3 до 6–7 лет и от 7–8 до 13–14 лет), каждый из которых имеет свои конкретные задачи и цели.

Первый этап – от 2–3 до 6–7 лет

– соответствует первой ступени трудового воспитания в семье, на этой стадии у детей закладываются основы трудолюбия и вырабатываются соответствующие навыки. Основными средствами освоения последних было и есть подражание взрослым в процессе совместных игр девочек и мальчиков, что можно считать особенностью этого этапа воспитания.

³ С. К. ОСМОНОВА, *Полевые материалы тетрадь №1. Кыргызстан*, Баткенская обл. 2017-г., с. 6.

В данном регионе дети до 5–7 лет, независимо от пола, объединялись в одну возрастную группу – «тезтиер» – «маленькие дети», в этом возрасте происходили совместные игры. Девочек и мальчиков от 8 до 12 лет объединяли в возрастную группу «жеткинчек» – «подростки». Они уже принимали участие в разных видах хозяйственной деятельности: в выпасе скота, обработке земли, в домашнем хозяйстве и др.⁴

С 6–7 лет практически начиналась трудовая направленность воспитания ребенка, но это не значит, что детей с этого возраста заставляли работать. Путем вовлечения ребенка в круг работ взрослых, посредством небольших посильных нагрузок прививались трудовые навыки. Дети почти не подвергались физическим наказаниям и получали одобрение взрослых при исполнении какой-либо работы, «азамат, эмгекчил, байболгур» – «Ребенка надо похвалить, приласкать», – говорили информаторы.⁵

Так, девочки 4–5 лет в бытовых играх затевали приготавливать «курут» – род кислого сыра, заготавливаемого на зиму и употребляемого в пищу в сухом виде или растертым и разведенным в теплой воде, сначала это делалось понарошку, затем условные действия становились реальными – девочки по-настоящему вместе с бабушкой и мамой готовили «курут», «помогали мыть посуду, убираться дома» и т.д. Например, перед праздниками, особенно Новым годом («Нооруз»), Орозо майрамом («Айт») и другими календарными и религиозными праздниками дети, подражая взрослым, также устраивали уборку тех мест, где они играли, так как они знали что, особенно в эти дни должно было быть везде чисто. Старшие девочки (родные и двоюродные сестры) или мама, бабушка и др. по мере возможности учили, как убирать дом, чтобы он был чистым, как мыть посуду, и т.д. Поэтому у кыргызов есть пословица: «Кыз бар уйдо – кыл жатпайт» «Если в доме есть девушка то там всегда чисто» Вначале такие мероприятия могли быть эпизодическими, но постепенно они становились систематическими, и девочки приучались к тому, чтобы дома было всегда чисто. Также девочки 5–6 лет могли принимать участие в обработке шерсти, некоторых мелких деталей (рвать шерсть на части, «жунду тытканы»)⁶.

⁴ Там же, с. 9.

⁵ Там же, с. 11.

⁶ Там же, с. 15.

Девочек учили убирать в доме, прясть и ткать. Помогая матери, они также ухаживали за маленькими детьми, занимались рукоделием и т.д. С 7–8 лет девочка умела ухаживать за грудным ребенком, с 10 лет носила воду, выполняла ряд поручений и мелких работ по хозяйству. Родители пользовались различными способами, направленными на воспитание желания трудиться. Это и поощрение стараний ребенка, и помощь ему советом, практическими действиями и т.д.

Основной задачей трудового воспитания являлось обеспечение подрастающему поколению разносторонней трудовой подготовки. Каждая семья старалась, по мере возможности, научить своих детей тем видам ремесел, которые прежде всего необходимы были в хозяйстве. В данном регионе большое значение на всех традиционных праздниках и пиршествах имело обилие лепешек. Такое предназначение лепешек обосновывалось их практической значимостью: в регионах, где занимались земледелием, зерно являлось основой существования населения и имело символическое значение для обеспечения достатка в жизни молодых. Поэтому основной семейной традицией у кыргызов, которые проживают на юго-западе Ферганы, в основном занимавшиеся земледелием, передававшейся из поколения в поколение, являлось прочно бытовавшее правило – «земледелием должны заниматься все члены семьи». Все – это значит и дети. Детям в первую очередь прививалось уважение к труду – производителя лепешки. Раннее привлечение детей к труду считалось одним из эффективных средств трудовой подготовки, трудового воспитания. Лет до семи ребенок был у взрослых «на посылках»: принеси то, подай это и т.д. Затем дети допускались к выполнению более сложных работ. Так постепенно детей вводили в общий трудовой ритм. По традиции все, что делали взрослые, в равной мере по силе своих возможностей должны были делать и дети.⁷

Мальчики выполняли более тяжелую работу, чем девочки: рубили дрова; ухаживали за домашними животными, пасли их; помогали в меру своих сил взрослым в полевых работах и др. Например, уже в 5 лет мальчика могли посадить на лошадь, запряженную в борону, и он под присмотром взрослых боронил вспаханное поле. Чтобы ребенок не упал, его иногда привязывали к спине лошади.

⁷ Там же, с. 18.

В 9 лет с мальчика спрашивали уже немало. К 10–12 годам мальчики и девочки уже знали очень многое из хозяйственных дел, девочки практически становились маленькими «хозяйками» в доме. Безусловно, в традиционном воспитании кыргызов, подрастающего поколения имела место конкретно выраженная специфика, определявшаяся, с одной стороны, производственной деятельностью людей, с другой – их классовой, социальной принадлежностью. Важным достоинством девушки считалось ее умение готовить пищу, ткать, шить, вышивать и т.д. К 13 годам девушки и юноши в семьях уже умели делать все, что требовалось в хозяйстве.

Мальчик был освобожден от таких мелких обязанностей и уже вращался в кругу взрослых мужчин. Мужским занятиям его учил старший брат: например, сажал его на подводу в качестве возницы, заставлял выполнять несложные работы по уходу за скотом и т.д. Так, перегонять вечером коров и телят, поить и кормить крупный рогатый скот – также считалось делом мальчиков. Особенно любили мальчики ухаживать за лошадьми. Таким образом, подростки работали пастухами и погонщиками тягловых животных, помогали ухаживать за скотом и заготавливать топливо, косить и собирать сено и т.д.

Включаясь в работу, мальчики выполняли различные обязанности, закрепленные за ними трудовым распорядком в семье. Постоянное участие в труде воспитывало в них трудолюбие, привычку к трудовой деятельности, помогало осваивать и закреплять за ними на длительное время приобретенные навыки. Большую роль в приучении детей к труду играл пример родителей и вообще пример старших. Прибегая к различным средствам, детям и подросткам разъясняли, как, при помощи каких орудий исполняются те или иные рабочие процессы. Так, все это освещалось в трудовых песнях «Оп майда», «Бекбекей», «Шырылдан», «Тон чык», в которых всесторонне отражен процесс той или иной трудовой деятельности связанные с охотой, шитьем одежды, сеянием зерна, доением каровы, пости лошадей, характер данной работы выполнялся по ритму песни. Такие песни являлись средством закрепления у детей представлении о связанных между собой действиях, которые составляли вполне завершенную трудовую операцию и помогали детям ответить на вопросы такого характера.⁸

⁸ *Кыргыз адабиятынын тарыхы: Фольклористика. Оозеки чыгармачылыктын жанрлары. I том, [Текст] / А. Акматалиевдин жалпы ред. астында. 2-бас, Б.: Шам, 2004, 98 б.*

Как было отмечено, дети знакомились с трудовой деятельностью взрослых, постоянно общаясь с ними и наблюдая за их работой с раннего возраста. Впрочем, и сами родители и другие взрослые стремились незаметно втягивать детей в выполнение посильных для них работ. В этом отношении представляет особый интерес общественная роль взрослых, их функции в воспитании детей. Можно сказать, что налицо в некоторой степени негласное разделение труда. Мужчины, как правило, занимались воспитанием мальчиков, а женщины – воспитанием девочек. Главная роль в трудовом воспитании мальчиков принадлежала дедам и отцам. Кыргызы данного региона воспитывали своих детей на тех же принципах, по которым жили сами. Безусловно, все воспитание детей было связано в первую очередь с привитием им трудовых навыков. Они приучали своих детей к труду постепенно и основательно, что практически приводило к тому, что дети начинали трудиться по собственной воле. Примечательно, что труд детей в обществе кыргызов подневольным был в очень редких случаях.

Известно, что в дореволюционном прошлом во многих домах кыргызов жило по несколько семейных пар и, в силу этого, совместно жили по несколько пожилых людей. Как известно, в таких семьях выделялись и глава семьи (отец, дед или другой старший, уважаемый мужчина и т.д.), которые, имея достаточно большой жизненный опыт, могли быть и были советчиками во всех вопросах, возникавших в семейном коллективе, в том числе и в воспитании детей. Старики всегда проявляли большую заботу о детях, любили их, уделяли им большое внимание, стараясь каждодневно в непринужденной и свободной беседе, в процессе общения с детьми передать им свои знания. Делалось это во время подготовки, например, к весенним работам на земле и перекочевки, когда готовили орудия труда и кочевали на другие пастбища или в других случаях, когда дети находились рядом. В основном кыргызы проживающие на юго-западной части Ферганы в конце XIX – начале XX вв. занимались земледелием и поэтому к земледелию уделяли много времени.⁹ В беседах с детьми взрослые объясняли принципы изготовления или работы отдельных частей орудий труда, их назначение и т.д. Рассказ об орудиях дополнялся, например, характеристикой местности (почвы, если готовились к пахоте, или сенокосного участка и т.д.).

⁹ ОСМОНОВА, с. 19.

Общаясь с детьми каждый день, дед или отец выявляли склонности и способности ребенка и методично развивали положительные черты его характера.

Одни дети любили занятия, связанные с земледелием, другим нравилось ухаживать за животными, третьи занимались разными ремеслами и т.д. Как правило, дети любили общаться с людьми старшего возраста (дедушки, дяди и др.), с интересом слушали их рассказы о племени и истории рода, о животных, птицах, обычаях, разных праздниках. Неторопливо, изо дня в день, месяц за месяцем складывались взаимоотношения детей с мудрыми стариками. Таким образом, в воспитании детей достаточно активная роль принадлежала бабушке, дедушке, дядям, тетям, если жили большой семьей, что бывало достаточно часто.

Несмотря на разграничение мужских и женских ролей в семье, все вопросы, связанные с детьми, родители решали сообща, основываясь на принципах народной педагогики. В соответствии с народными традициями, родители стремились постоянно укреплять авторитет друг друга в глазах детей.

Следует подчеркнуть определенную иерархию во взаимоотношениях родителей и детей данного региона: если ребенок, даже уже будучи взрослым, хотел о чем-то попросить, он всегда обращался сначала к матери, а она передавала эту просьбу отцу.

В воспитании труд был не только целью, но и средством воспитания. Результатом правильного воспитания считалось умение работать плодотворно, о чем свидетельствуют сохранившиеся памятники устного народного творчества. В колыбельных песнях, в присловьях, обращениях к детям в этом возрасте, в играх, сказках находили отражение эти мотивы.¹⁰ По данным информаторов в данном регионе, люди труда стояли на особо почетном месте: умелые землепашцы, пастухи, мастера-ремесленники и т.).¹¹ Все было направлено на то, чтобы оказать влияние на детей, молодое поколение, привить им любовь к труду – как к основе жизни, человеческого благополучия. Придание существенного значения трудовому воспитанию объясняется пониманием того, что труд – источник жизни.

¹⁰ *Кыргыз адабиятынын тарыхы*, 76 б.

¹¹ ОСМОНОВА, с. 22.

В кыргызских пословицах и поговорках это выражается следующим образом:

(«Адал эмгек астына ат, устуно тон») «Честный труд даст тебе жилье и одежду», («Адамды сөзүнөн тааныбайт, эмгегинен тааныйт») «Человека узнают не по слову а по делу», («Эмгектин наны таттуу, жалкоонун жаны таттуу») «У труда лепешка сладкая а у ленивого жизнь сладкая», («Эгин эгип мал бакпаган, эптеп – септеп жан сактаган») «Тот кто не сеит зерно – тот как папало живет», («Жаз жарыш, куз курош»), «Весной нужно спешить сеять а осенью собирать», («Темирдин кадырын уста билет»), «Цену железа занет кузнец» («Адамдын баасы эмгекте») «Цена человека – его труд», («Эмгектен эч ким олгон эмес») «От работы еще никто не умирал», («Бугунку ишти эртенкиге калтырба») «Не откладывая на завтра то, что можно сделать сегодня» и т.д. Такие первые познавательные и трудовые навыки ребенок получал в семье.¹²

Поучая 2–5 летнего ребенка, прибегали к пословицам, поговоркам, сказкам и др. Это должно было способствовать формированию у ребенка интереса и уважения к труду и негативного отношения к лени. Подобные приемы воспитания были характерны для многих народов, не только для кыргызов.

У кыргызов, впрочем, как и у других народов мира, в семье была велика роль старших детей. Для них одной из главных обязанностей считалась забота о своих младших братьях и сестрах. Старшие дети играли с младшими, заботились о них, вводили их в детское общество. В многодетных семьях старшая сестра уделяла особенно много внимания и времени младшим сестрам и братьям.

К старшим братьям и сестрам относились с почтением и уважением, что отражалось в системе обращений, взаимоотношений и т.д. Безусловно, на старшего ребенка накладывались определенные обязанности, выполнение которых давало ему право быть почитаемым и уважаемым в среде своих меньших братьев и сестер. Старших уважали не только в связи с распространенным у многих народов в прошлом институтом почитания старших, но и из-за того, что они уже имели сравнительно долгий жизненный опыт, большую жизненную мудрость.

Особенностью воспитательных средств народной педагогики было то, что процесс воспитания практически не отличался

¹² Там же, с. 25.

от реальной жизнедеятельности семьи. Трудовая деятельность и сложившаяся система отношений в семье были испокон веков арсеналом воспитательных средств; воспитание осуществлялось в контексте реальной трудовой деятельности, традиции были реально и непосредственно вплетены в процесс жизненной повседневности.

Второй этап трудового воспитания (7–10, 12–13 лет) предусматривал вовлечение детей в непосредственную деятельность семьи. Воспитание мальчиков и девочек в этом возрасте происходило уже раздельно. На этом этапе большинство детей овладевали основными навыками, тонкостями и умением почти во всех трудовых операциях, связанных с домашним хозяйством.

Трудолюбие у кыргызов, как и у других соседних народов, являлось одним из существенных показателей при определении достоинств человека. Кыргызские семьи, как было отмечено, обычно были многодетными. Старшие братья и сестры были ответственны за младших, всегда помогали в уходе за младшими. Старший ребенок, особенно дочь – были опорой семьи. Люди считали: «Счастье матери, если первым ребенком в семье будет девочка» так как, она была помощницей матери в хозяйстве, присматривала за младшими детьми и т.д. Дети в кыргызских семьях, как правило, дружили между собой, и эту дружбу и привязанность проносили через всю жизнь. Дети очень рано, особенно девочки, приобщались к заботам родителей, всей семьи, поэтому для игр у них было мало времени, их детство заканчивалось довольно рано.

Действительно, как явствует из полевых материалов, девочка с раннего возраста становилась активной помощницей матери, ухаживала за младшими детьми, прислуживала старшим, ее обучали ведению домашнего хозяйства, рукоделию и т.д.

Все заботы женской половины семьи были связаны с семьей и домашними делами: шитье, содержание в порядке одежды, обуви всех членов семьи, приготовление пищи, воспитание детей и т.д.; постепенно немалая часть этих дел выпадала и на долю девочки.

Многие авторы обращали внимание на постоянную занятость кыргызской женщины в домашнем хозяйстве, интерпретируя это как рабскую зависимость от мужа. Но в действительности, играя большую роль в производстве материальных благ для семьи, женщины имели свободу действия и самостоятельность в сфере домашнего хозяйства.

Вместе с тем, С. М. Абрамзон, А. Джумагулов, знакомясь с жизнью кыргызов, видели только внешнюю её сторону, недооценивали роль мужского труда в ведении хозяйства. Если женский труд был необходим в выполнении ежедневной работы в домашнем быту, то мужской труд использовался в сезонной работе, где нужна была физическая сила. В обязанности мужчины входили: выбор пастбища и места для перекочевки, уход за скотом и приучение лошадей для езды, установка юрты и постройка загона для скота, а также они пахали, сеяли, убирали урожай, изготавливали орудия труда и др.

Таким образом, мужской и женский труд являлся равнозначным в хозяйстве кыргызской семьи, как самостоятельной экономической единицы общества, основанной на частном производстве и индивидуальном потреблении.

Такое же четкое деление на мужские и женские занятия сохранялось и в процессе трудового воспитания детей.

Воспитанием мальчиков с определенного возраста занимались в основном мужчины, что было характерно и для других тюркоязычных народов: с 5–6 лет мальчиков начинали периодически привлекать к «мужским» занятиям, а с 9–11 лет «мальчики полностью поступали в распоряжение отца; если же в доме были дед и дядя, то и они участвовали в приобщении мальчиков к кругу мужских обязанностей».¹³ В сыновьях с раннего (с 6-лет) возраста воспитывали самостоятельность, интерес к мужским занятиям – отец обучал их ведению хозяйства, различным ремеслам, охоте, разным способам забоя скота и т.д. Так, у кыргызов данного региона отец с 6-летнего возраста брал сына на заготовку дров, чем занимались глубокой осенью, после окончания полевых работ. Мальчики, примерно с 12-летнего возраста, овладевали элементарными навыками ремесленного труда по обработке дерева, могли изготавливать простейшие предметы.

Как нам известно кыргызы с древнейших времен хорошо владели техникой обработки дерева.¹⁴ В семьях «жыгач уста» из поколения в поколение передавались традиции техники обработки дерева. Поскольку деревообделщики работали в одиночку и им, как правило, нужны были помощники, в большинстве случаев эту роль

¹³ Там же, с. 20.

¹⁴ О. Э. КАПАЛБАЕВ, *Кыргыздардын салттык жыгаччылыгы (тарыхый-этнографиялык изилдүүлөр XIX к. аягы – XX к. башы)*, Б. 2007, с. 21.

выполняли сыновья: они помогали во всем. Деревообделочные работы заключались главным образом в изготовлении остовов юрт, ленчиков для седел, колыбелей и частично посуды и домашней утвари и музыкальные инструменты, сельскохозяйственных орудий.

Мальчик в 15–16 лет, становился уже настоящим «уста» («жыгач уста»). Из детей жыгач уста выходили самые искусные обделшики так как они передавали секреты своего мастерства только членам своей семьи.

Дочерей обучала мать – экономно вести домашнее хозяйство, правильно ухаживать за скотом, искусно прясть, шить, вышивать, вкусно готовить пищу и т.д.

Значительное место в киргизском хозяйстве занимали различные домашние промыслы, большинство которых было связано с обработкой продуктов скотоводства. Из шерсти овец, которых мужчины стригли весной и осенью, женщины изготовляли пряжу при помощи ручного деревянного веретена «ийик» с пряслицем из дерева, свинца или камня. На примитивном ткацком стане «өрмөк» из этой пряжи изготовляли ткань для халатов, штанов, мешков, переметных «сум», а также тесьму для обвязывания остова юрты.

И поэтому в трудовом воспитании девочек значительное место занимала обработка шерсти, этот вид промысла считался обязанностью женской половины семьи. Начиная с 6–7-летнего возраста девочки вместе со своими матерями занимались обработкой шерсти, изготовлением из нее различных вещей, в основном предметов для использования в хозяйстве. Это представляло собой долгий и трудоемкий процесс, состоявший из множества операций, требовавших большой труд и умения. Обработкой шерсти девочки занимались в свободное от других домашних занятий время, часто вечерами, постепенно овладевая всеми необходимыми навыками этого сложного и трудного ремесла. Почти во всех операциях с шерстью, за исключением некоторых принимали участие девочки 7–9 лет.

Умение обрабатывать шерсть и изготавливать из нее разные изделия считалось одним из важных достоинств девушки и женщины. Безусловно, работы с шерстью требовали много труда, упорства и терпения. Девушки и женщины делали из шерсти сукно – «кездеме», войлочные ковры – «ширдак» и «ала кийиз», одежду, а также

национальные головные уборы «калпак». Девочек в обязательном порядке обучали шитью. Уже в 9 лет им поручали шить несложные вещи, показывали различные виды швов и т.д.¹⁵

К совершеннолетию каждая девушка должна была уметь самостоятельно обрабатывать шерсть, шить и кроить. В обязанность девушки входило ее неперенное участие в подготовке своего приданого, которое в основном собирали мать, снохи, тети и девушки-подруги. Способность женщины-кыргызки искусно вышивать издревле утвердилась в народном сознании, как одно из самых ценных и необходимых ее качеств.

Девочки учились у старших домашнему труду: стирать, убирать помещения, месить тесто, печь хлеб, готовить пищу, шить, вышивать и т.д. Одновременно девочки являлись помощницами матери по уходу за маленькими детьми. Когда матери укладывали малышей в колыбель «бешик», дети постарше их качали. Дети постарше выходили с младшими гулять во двор или на улицу (при этом несли их на руках или привязывали к спине).

Домашние хозяйственные обязанности девочек с раннего возраста существенно возрастали в семьях, поскольку они являлись единственными помощницами матери в домашних делах. У кыргызов, как и у многих тюркоязычных народов, о дочери судили по матери. Если дочь росла аккуратной, приветливой, трудолюбивой, хорошую репутацию приобретала мать. В большинстве случаев соседи и родственники сравнивали дочь с матерью и говорили: «Дочь точно, как мать» – «энесине окшош», или «энесине окшош болот» – «Будет такой же, как мать».¹⁶

В девочке обязательно стремились воспитать такие качества, как трудолюбие, скромность, вежливость и многое другое, об этом свидетельствуют все наши полевые материалы.¹⁷

Мальчика с раннего детства учили, что он ни в чем не должен напоминать девочку, его учили тому, что плакать – это дело женское, но никто не объяснял ему, как себя вести в тех случаях, когда плакать нельзя. Он моделировал свою жизнь по подобию, по аналогии с другими сверстниками или детьми постарше. Определенная суровость, мужественность в мальчиках одобрялись и поощрялись,

¹⁵ ОСМОНОВА, с. 28.

¹⁶ Там же, с. 30.

¹⁷ Там же.

кыргызы говорили «кызга окшобо», «кыз теке болбо» – «не будь как девочка».

Большую роль в воспитании маленьких мальчиков играли старшие мальчики, – те, кто поменьше, брали с них пример мужского поведения, как бы перепроверяли избранную модель и утверждались в ней. Недаром люди старшего возраста говорят: «Бир бала – жок бала, эки бала – жарым бала, уч бала – бир бала» – «Один сын – можно считать, что нет его; два сына – можно считать за полсына, а три сына – это один сын».

Кыргызы проживающие на юго-западе Ферганы к старшему сыну относились как к главному продолжателю дела отца, как к наследнику, и он находился в привилегированном положении по сравнению с сестрами. Мальчику у кыргызов, впрочем, как и у многих других народов, внушалось с самого раннего возраста, что он будущий кормилец, защитник семьи, что он отличается по своим функциям от женской части семьи, что он не похож на женщину. Во всех семьях кыргызов из поколения в поколение, из века в век воспроизводился баланс: отец – «суровый, строгий», и всегда заботливая и ласковая мать. Таким образом в сознании людей разного пола поддерживалась идея гендерных «различий» мужчин и женщин.

В процессе воспитания (за исключением раннего периода, когда маленькие дети играли вместе, т.е. примерно до 4–5-летнего возраста) девичьи игры и игрушки, имевшие трудовую направленность, были строго отделены от мальчишеских; девочки играли в куклы, имели подобие предметов, которые употреблялись в хозяйстве женщинами; это, например, посуда, пряслица, веретена – «ийик» и др. Мальчикам дарили «мужские предметы», и они играли в основном хозяйственными орудиями, которых использовали в быту, игрушечными деревянными оружием и др.

Поэтому (по крайней мере до 4–5-летнего возраста) дети жизнь взрослых людей только имитировали. Впоследствии же начиналось осознанное, целенаправленное, систематическое обучение «женским и мужским» социальным ролям.

Постоянное и систематическое внушение представлений о мужских обязанностях: то, что мальчик – кормилец семьи, продолжатель рода и многое другое, предполагало, что он (мальчик) должен постоянно работать очень хорошо, непременно соблюдать принятые в обществе нормы поведения и т.д.

Следует отметить, что большое значение имел в воспитании мальчика образ отца. Конечно, его высокий авторитет в первую очередь должен был быть создан его деятельностью – как умелого и добросовестного человека; как заступника за семью перед посторонними, как уважаемого члена общества и т.д. Сыновья старались подражать отцу, учились быть похожими на него. Несомненно, авторитет отца был связан еще и с тем, что тот являлся главным добытчиком в семье, а в силу этого – самостоятельным и властным человеком, и все члены семьи так или иначе были зависимы от него.

Надо отметить, что разделение, причем достаточно четкое, «женских» и «мужских» ролей было характерно для традиционного общества кыргызов данного региона не только в повседневной жизни, но и в праздничной. У девочек были свои места сборов и развлечений, где они рассказывали новости, происшествия из своей девичьей жизни, пели песни, танцевали и т.д. Мальчики во время праздников организовывали разные виды традиционных игр, соревновались в ловкости, в силе и др.

Существовала группа гендерных стереотипов «содержания труда», которая предполагала ориентацию девочек на женскую домашнюю работу, а мальчиков – на выполнение мужских обязанностей по дому и вне дома. Так, в соответствии с национальными традициями, мальчики могли нарубить дрова, занести их в дом, присмотреть за домашними животными, встретить гостя и многое другое, а девочки занимались женскими обязанностями: занимались домашним хозяйством, поддерживали чистоту в доме и т.д.

Важным и существенным условием жизнедеятельности любого этноса, в том числе и кыргызского, являлась и является хозяйственная деятельность, специфика которой во многом зависит от жизненных знаний и практического опыта предшествующих поколений. Передача жизненного и практического опыта от старшего поколения к подрастающему была и есть одно из важных и существенных условий жизнедеятельности любого этноса, в том числе и кыргызского.

В кыргызском языке есть термины, в прямом переводе означающие «вырастить» – «эрезге жеткируу», «тарбиялуу» – «воспитанный», «обученный», однако по смыслу они значительно глубже, поскольку, кроме природного биологического развития ребенка, они подразумевают и воспитание таких моральных и нравственных качеств, как порядочность, честность, уважение к старшим,

трудолюбие и многое другое. Воспитание подразумевало не только комплекс трудовых навыков и умений, но также знание норм культуры общения, которые имели свои национальные особенности («адептуу бала»)¹⁸

О специфике процесса обучения и воспитания многое говорят сохранившиеся до настоящего времени в обиходе кыргызов выражения: «Кимден тарбия алса, ошого окшош» – «Ты похож на тех, кто тебя обучал»; «кыз энесинен улгу алат» – «Дочь учится у матери»; «уядан эмнени корсо, учканда ошону алат» – «что увидит в гнезде – то будет брать при полете» и др.¹⁹

По поводу необходимости начинать воспитывать детей с самого раннего возраста в народе говорили: «Баланын тарбиясы жашыннан» «Баланы тарбиялоо – ташты кемиргенге тете» – «Воспитание ребенка должно быть с детства» и др. В связи с этим подчеркнем, что кыргызы с древних времен с особым почтением и уважением относились к «учителю» как к мудрому, старшему человеку, передающему накопленные многими поколениями сокровища народной мудрости. С таким же глубоким уважением относились в народе и к людям труда, мастерам в своем деле. «Чебер уста», – «Он специалист в своем деле», – говорят об умелом работнике. В каждом населенном пункте знали поименно умелых мастеров – резчиков и мастеров по дереву, железу, камню, ювелира, швею и т.д.²⁰

Трудовое воспитание мальчиков в традиционном обществе кыргызов было неразрывно связано с воспитанием сильной личности, причем сильной и физически, и нравственно, что было актуальным в силу многих причин. По народным представлениям, идеалом совершенства для человека считалось, если физическая сила сочеталась с умом. Для юношей важным фактором развития физических данных было и то, что с 7, а иногда и с 6 лет мальчиков брали на охоту высоко в горы, тем самым воспитывая в них физические качества как: бег, прыжки, преодоление препятствий, прыжки через рвы, лазание по скалам, горам. При этом мальчиков не только физически закаляли, их также обучали различным трудовым навыкам (резьба по дереву, плетение сетей для ловли птиц и рыбы; плетение лестниц для перебрасывания через рвы, провалы и тре-

¹⁸ Там же, с. 36.

¹⁹ Там же.

²⁰ Там же.

щины в горах и т.д.). Прививая воинственный дух мальчику, подростку, а затем и юноше, люди верили, что это поможет ему в будущем – в случае необходимости защиты чести своей, своего народа, земли отцов, предков.²¹

Молодежь обучали также различным промыслам, которые были довольно широко распространены у кыргызов данного региона. Так, мужчины занимались производством орудий хозяйственного назначения, изготовлением предметов домашнего обихода, седельным, кузнечным, оружейным, ювелирным производством и др. В селениях данного региона, судя по сведениям информантов и по археологическим материалам, наряду со многими другими ремеслами было развито гончарное производство. При освоении гончарного дела детям и подросткам отводилась, как и во многих других ремеслах, подсобная роль: носить воду, месить глину, делать вальки-заготовки для посуды и т.д. Естественно, каждый мастер-специалист стремился передать свое умение, мастерство вместе с секретами, навыками техники изготовления своим детям, ученикам, как свидетельствуют об этом наши информанты.²²

Согласно нашим полевым материалам, в жизни кыргызских семей данного региона имело место своеобразное наставничество. Земледельцы, скотоводы, овцеводы, а также занимающиеся разными видами ремесел: строительное дело, кузнечное дело, обработка шерсти, т.е. ремесла, связанные с шерстью (войлочные ковры – «ширдак» и «ала кийиз», одежду, а также национальные головные уборы «калпак» и др.), передавали детям, молодежи секреты своих профессий, активно приучая детей к будущей трудовой деятельности. Думается, такие народные традиции следовало бы возрождать в наше время. Они могли бы, на наш взгляд, сыграть важное воспитательное значение.²³

В процессе трудового воспитания у кыргызов данного региона большое значение придавалось умению выдерживать критику, а также принимать похвалу старшего по поводу сделанной учеником, сыном вещи. Безусловно, все, что умели делать родители, они старались передать детям, подрастающему поколению.

²¹ Там же.

²² Там же, с. 39.

²³ Там же.

Заключение

Таким образом, на первом этапе детства трудовое воспитание осуществлялось главным образом посредством имитации трудового процесса в игре, в подражании старшим, родителям, в освоении поучительных сказок, загадок. В этот период более важным было игровое начало, направленное на пробуждение интереса, любви к труду, к понятию обязательности трудовой деятельности. Именно этот этап должен был определить отношение к труду «как к внутренней потребности», когда «игра в своем развитии перерастает в труд». В этот период закладывалась основа трудолюбия и завершался процесс освоения различных видов работ, связанных с самообслуживанием. На первом этапе социализацию ребенка осуществляли в первую очередь члены семьи. Вместе с воспитательной ролью семьи с 4–5 летнего возраста возрастало влияние социализирующей функции коллектива. На этом этапе «пример» должен был превратиться в трудовой процесс – основные и подсобные занятия. В этот период многие из них сами становились «учителями», участниками социализации своих младших братьев и сестер.

Специфическими чертами традиционного трудового воспитания кыргызов проживающих в данном регионе являлись: во-первых, обязательное посильное участие детей и подростков во всех видах основной хозяйственной деятельности, с учетом их возраста и пола; во-вторых, постоянный характер трудовых обязанностей, закрепленных по традиции за детьми и подростками. Опыт трудовой деятельности передавался от совершеннолетней молодежи подросткам, от подростков детям, т.е. от детей старшего возраста – младшим.

Существенное значение имела игровая форма воспитания трудолюбия. Для привития любви к труду народная педагогика часто использовала средства и методы, на первый взгляд, не имеющие прямого отношения к трудовому воспитанию, но способствующие подготовке к трудовой деятельности. Кроме того, следует отметить, что в системе народного воспитания почти невозможно отделить друг от друга формы и способы нравственного, эстетического и трудового воспитания.

В процессе трудового воспитания детей очень редко применяли физические наказания. Выработке у детей и подростков привычек и навыков работать, терпения, упорства и настойчивости,

осознанного отношения к труду, которые упрочивались систематичностью, убеждением в важности и необходимости выполняемой работы, уделялось основное внимание. Кроме того, большое значение имели наглядность, формирование самостоятельности, инициативы и, особенно, личный пример родителей и старших. По мере взросления наиболее эффективной оказывалась воспитательная комбинация – систематическое обучение на личных примерах в совокупности с общественным мнением.

Таким образом, общий характер труда не выходил за пределы повседневных бытовых нужд: прокормить семью, приобрести самые насущные навыки для создания необходимых предметов обихода и т.п. Воспитание осуществлялось в контексте реальной трудовой деятельности, традиции были непосредственно вплетены в процесс жизни. Трудовое воспитание детей не ограничивалось только обучением их тем или иным хозяйственным занятиям. Оно включало и привитие определенных моральных качеств: любви к труду, уважения к людям труда, представления о почетном месте скотовода, земледельца в семейной и общественной иерархии. Трудовое воспитания, вырабатывавшиеся в течение веков кыргызами данного региона, могут быть использованы в воспитании и сегодня. А так же следует подчеркнуть, что традиции народа, особенно связанные с трудовой деятельностью, продолжают играть большую роль в воспитательном процессе и могут способствовать выработке у детей навыков трудолюбия. Повседневный труд, морально-этические нормы, усваиваемые при этом детьми с самого раннего возраста, служили и служат надежным фундаментом, на котором возрастает любовь к своей семье, роду, обществу и Родине. Приобщение к ценностям культуры своего народа осуществлялось всей системой социализации подрастающего поколения, в которой трудовому воспитанию отводилась главная роль.

Подводя итоги сказанному о трудовом воспитании, укажем, что одним из необходимых условий существования любой этнической общности следует считать передачу от старшего к младшему поколению жизненного практического опыта и исторически сложившихся трудовых традиций, уровень которых соответствует социально-экономическому, культурному и политическому развитию народа.



An Independent Artistic Movement in the Last Decade of Communistic System in Poland

*Agnieszka Gralińska-Toborek**

Introduction

Artistic culture in Poland after World War II, as in other countries of the Eastern Block, was subjected to strict censorship and remained either in the service of official propaganda or stayed out of the sphere of politics, remaining in the neutral theme of everyday life or autotelic modernist narrative. Over a period of more than 40 years, stylistic and thematic transformations were like changes in Western culture, however those changes were rather a result of political events than the contact with the West. The “Polish Thaw” after Stalin’s death brought the end to the doctrine of socialist realism, and the artistic community gained some autonomy and opportunity to explore formal innovations and avant-garde experiments. However, this autonomy of art in the aesthetic sphere, did not mean institutional and administrative independence nor did it mean freedom of expression. Artists were associated in unions, e.g. the Association of Polish Writers (ZLP) or the Association of Polish Artists (ZPAP), which were not only labour unions, but above all they exercised control over artistic life in Poland.¹ The union authorities were selected from artists devoted to the communist regime, who tried to recruit secret collaborators among the members who would denounce their colleagues. The unions provided the artists with social assistance,

* Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy and History, University of Lodz, Poland; e-mail: agnieszka.gralinska@filozof.uni.lodz.pl.

¹ Research on secret archives of the Security Service is ongoing quite intensively in Poland. According to them, the most-monitored community was writers, but there were also secret agents among visual artists and filmmakers. See, among others: A. CHOJNOWSKI – S. LIGARSKI (eds.), *Artyści władzy, władza artystom*, Warszawa 2010; J. JAKIMCZYK, *Najweselejszy barak w obozie. Tajna policja komunistyczna jako krytyk artystyczny i kurator sztuki w PRL*, Warszawa 2015.

state patronage, a system of prizes and scholarships, open air sessions and access to stationery, art materials and studios. In the situation of the nationalization of culture and the lack of a free art market, livelihood and artistic existence of artists depended on being member of unions. This gave authorities full control over art. However, it also gave rise to conformist attitudes and increasingly clear detachment of artists from social life of an average person. Only a few artists spoke against the communist regime through their art, but their acts had little or no scope (in the case of writing works that were not supposed to be published) and were not the voice of the community.² All the more remarkable is the awakening of Polish artists in the late 1970s, socio-political commitment during *Solidarity* and the creation of an independent culture during martial law and until the collapse of the communist system.

Solidarity and the Awakening of Artists

A wave of workers' strikes in August 1980 forced the communist authorities to sign agreements and accept 21 demands of the Interfactory Strike Committee, including in the first point the acceptance of free trade unions independent of the Communist Party and in the third point freedom of speech, press and publication, including freedom for independent publishers, and the availability of the mass media to representatives of all faiths. Intellectuals and artists collectively supported the striking workers. The Association of Polish Artists was the first to speak up, issuing a *Resolution of August 29, 1980* in which we read: "*We stand with workers and intellectuals fighting for the right to co-decide about the fate of the country*", "*Polish society without a voice and representative institutions has to defend basic human rights through spontaneous movements*", "*we are strongly joining the postulates of establishing independent trade unions.*"³ This resolution was followed by further declarations of financial assistance (thanks to art auctions) and assistance in the field of visual propaganda and information. Changes also took place in the Association of Polish Writers. Jan Józef Szczepański, an activist and member of opposition who was sentenced by state censorship

² The exceptions may be writers' protests, usually in the form of letters written to the Ministry, signed by leading writers or intellectuals, e.g. *Letter of 34* in 1964, *Letter of 59* from 1975 and *Letter of 101* from 1976. The numbers indicate the number of signatories. Those were not individual protests, nor did they represent most of the environment.

³ *Stanowisko Związku Polskich Artystów Plastyków wobec sytuacji w kraju – 29 sierpień 1980 rok, in: Ostatnie miesiące Związku Polskich Artystów Plastyków*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 30–31.

not to publish for many years, was elected president of Association in December 1980. These changes became the cause of the independent movement of artistic circles and August 1980 marked the beginning of a numerous movement of independent culture. In mid-September 1980, the Artistic and Academic Association's Constitutive Committee was established, which was an umbrella organization for artistic and academic associations. As historian Andrzej Paczkowski mentioned: "*The intellectual organizations that were part of the 'ideological front' very important to the [communist] party, were experiencing their own kind of revolt.*"⁴ The artists were present in the centre of the political events. Jerzy Janiszewski, graphic designer, designed the *Solidarity* logo and filmmakers from Documentary Film Studios managed to convince the authorities that all events should be filmed.⁵ The period of official existence of *Solidarity* from August 1980 to December 1981 was a period of great cultural revival. The artistic community tried to express their support for workers and *Solidarity* by organizing various events. Among others *Artists of Warsaw to Solidarity* concert in at the Grand Theatre in Warsaw, *The 1st True Song Review in Gdańsk*, a symposium and a huge exhibition at *The 1st National Review of Sociological Photography* in Bielsko-Biała, where photos from the events of August '80 were shown. Filmmakers from Film Group X began to record films that censorship kept hidden until 1987.⁶ In addition to professionals, students also showed considerable commitment. Student culture was dynamically developing in the 70s, although it was not independent (it was overseen by the Socialist Union of Polish Students). For young people it was nevertheless an alternative for official art. In December 1980, *The Gdańsk Student for Workers' 80 Festival* was organized to accompany the ceremony of the presentation of the monument of the Fallen Shipyard Workers.

Avant-garde artists from around the world came to see the *Construction in Process* exhibition organized in Łódź by Ryszard Waśko and the creators of the Film Form Workshops. They did it in order to show solidarity with the Polish society fighting for the democratization of the country. The exhibition was interrupted by the introduction of martial law, and the

⁴ A. PACZKOWSKI, *Revolution and Counter-revolution in Poland 1980–1989: Solidarity, Martial Law, and the End of Communism in Europe*, New York, 2015, p. 18.

⁵ Documentary photos later became part of such films as *The Man of Iron* by Andrzej Wajda or *The Case* by Krzysztof Kieślowski.

⁶ They were, among others: *A Lonely Woman* by Agnieszka Holland, *Interrogation* by Ryszard Bugajski, *Mother of Kings* by Janusz Zaorski. From 1981 to 1983 several films were made, which could not premiere until 1987.

artists left their works in Poland as a gift to *Solidarity*. There were many more local events and *Solidarity* usually was their patron. Martial law, announced on December 13, 1981, also interrupted the *Congress of Polish Culture* which was supposed to be the first meeting of this type to summarize post-war culture in a critical way.

Martial Law and Boycott

Martial law, announced by General Wojciech Jaruzelski on December 13, 1981, is assessed by historians as a coup d'état. Its introduction affected the whole society and caused huge changes in the functioning of culture. Unions and associations of writers, visual artists and journalists were suspended. Having artists and intellectuals among 5,000 imprisoned people caused the official cultural life to freeze for a moment. Because of that the artists became entrenched that their attitude was not only a matter of personal choices, but a social matter, because as a community they constituted an important part of society. So, they spontaneously boycotted official cultural life, especially the regime press and television, as well as art galleries and festivals. In the community of visual artists, the boycott was confirmed by the proclamation of *Voice, which is a Silence* in April 1982: "*participation in official exhibitions organized by state institutions, both in the country and abroad, individual and collective is considered as unethical, [...] [including] participation at the Venice Biennale and the Paris Biennale, and in the country at the Poster Biennale or the Graphic Biennale. We would also consider unethical to participate in painter's open air organized by state institutions, performances in mass media and making them available for distribution through said media. These are the basic assumptions of proceedings during martial law.*"⁷ The *Solidarity of Stage and Film Artists* also published the *Statement*, which established the actors' code of conduct: "*A collaborator is the one who lends his name, face, voice or talent for propaganda and justification of violence.*"⁸ At the same time, the direction of further actions was set: "*we must, however, create an unofficial circulation of art, through vernissages and exhibitions in private apartments, creating discussion groups and symposia on culture and art.*"⁹

In 1982, the Committee of Independent Culture (KKN) was formed and consisted of artists associated with various fields of culture as well as

⁷ A. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Czas smutku, czas nadziei*, Warszawa 1992, p. 108.

⁸ "Statement of Solidarity of Artists from the Scene and the Film", May 1982, in: *Wezwanie*, 2, 1982, pp. 130–131. The theatre, children's shows and film production were not boycotted. <http://encyklopediateatru.pl/hasla/264/bojkot> [2020-03-06].

⁹ *Ibid.*

critics and publicists. KKN inspired and organized artistic life, supported cultural initiatives such as: exhibitions, Home Theatre, Christian Culture Weeks, independent competitions, symposia, meetings of artists and publishing activities.¹⁰ KKN also provided financial support to artists in the form of grants, scholarships and fees for created works. It also awarded *The Solidarity Cultural Award* in 5 categories: theatre, fine arts, literature, film and music, and collaborated with independent publishers.¹¹

That way, the rapid development of independent, underground culture began. However, it is worth noting that, due to patronage and transmitted content two trends in underground culture can be distinguished.

Art at the Church and "Second Circulation"

The greater part of underground culture was politically and ideologically associated with *Solidarity* and found its support in the Catholic Church. If we consider that there were about 1,700 artists who collaborated in this movement and we add writers, and intellectuals to this, we will get a huge group mastering most of Polish culture and forming opinion, political and historical awareness and moral values of a large part of society for several years. Extremely important and unheard of in other countries of the Eastern Block was the involvement of the Catholic Church in the underground culture on the one hand, but also the rapprochement of the artists with the church on the other. Church and art were far apart during the time of Polish People's Republic (PRL). In the mid-70s the Church made the first attempt to open itself to contemporary culture, when cycles of Christian Culture Weeks were organised thanks to the initiative of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński and Fr. Aleksander Niewęglowski. Nevertheless, the undoubted reason for artists' interest in religion was the support that the church gave to *Solidarity*. The cause of the changes was also Karol Wojtyła being elected the Pope. For every Pole it was an event filled with pride and hope. The "pro-church" mood deepened even more after the first visit of John Paul II to Poland in June 1979.

Even before the declaration of martial law, opinions about the necessity of pluralizing the patronage of art appeared, and here, for the first time,

¹⁰ See: A. RUCIŃSKI, Działalność Komitetu Kultury Niezależnej w latach 1982–1989, in: *Przegląd Prawniczy, Ekonomiczny i Społeczny*, 4, 2013, pp. 47–54; Komitet Kultury Niezależnej in: *Encyklopedia Solidarności*: http://www.encysol.pl/wiki/Komitet_Kultury_Niezale%C5%BCnej [2020-03-06].

¹¹ See: J. OLASZEK, Kultura, która nie kłamie. Szkic o Komitecie Kultury Niezależnej, in: *Wolność i Solidarność*, 10, 2017, pp. 82–116.

Solidarity and the Catholic Church were mentioned. In a resolution of 1981 ZPAP, responding to the growing socio-political tension, quoted the words of Pope John Paul II, calling for peaceful resolution of conflicts. It was a proof of the Church's authority in this matter. The fact, that participants and supporters of *Solidarity* took a shelter in the Church during the martial law was something natural and specific in the Polish tradition of combining religiosity with patriotism and the church with opposition to the authorities imposed from the outside. Church has become a meeting place, where help was organized for political prisoners, victims and their families, information was exchanged, and gifts sent from abroad were distributed.

The first meeting of artists with Cardinal Józef Glemp dedicated to the organization of artistic life based on the Church took place in 1983. Thanks to this initiative, the already existing cultural institutions – such as diocesan museums – as well as all free places in parish buildings: porches, basements and even church naves and chapels were made available to artists. There were so many churches where cultural events were organized, that it is difficult to list all of them as the schedules of the participants of this movement are incomplete.¹²

The general turn of artistic circles towards the Catholic Church was quite unexpected, but it also had a deeper than just organizational and political background. Some artists and theorists felt the vanishing of the avant-garde in the late 1970s. One wondered what the end-century art would be like, especially since news about postmodernism came from the West. Independent artistic journals published translated fragments of the writings of Daniel Bell, neoconservative sociologist, who criticized capitalist, secularized and de-sacralised society, and called for a revival of religiosity, and texts of Leszek Kołakowski's, especially *The Revenge of the sacred in secular culture*.¹³ This way, the ground for art referred to Christian values was created.

¹² Among important publications containing calendars of cultural events in the 1980s are: A. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Czas smutku, czas nadziei*, Warszawa 1992; T. BORUTA (ed.), *Pokolenie. Niezależna twórczość młodych w latach 1980–1989*, Kraków 2010; J. KROKOWSKA-NAROŻNIAK – M. WASZKIEL (eds.), *Teatr drugiego obiegu. Materiały do kroniki teatru stanu wojennego 13 XII 1981–15 XI 1989*, Warszawa 2000, <http://www.encyklopediateatru.pl/ksiazka/177/teatr-drugiego-obiegu-materialy-do-kroniki-teatru-stanu-wojennego-13-xii-1981-15-xi-1989> [2020–03–06].

¹³ L. KOŁAKOWSKI, *Odwet sacrum w kulturze świeckiej*, in: L. KOŁAKOWSKI, *Cywilizacja na ławie oskarżonych*, Warszawa 1990.

The advocate of bringing art closer to the sphere of the sacred in Poland was the art theoretician and curator Janusz Bogucki.¹⁴ At the end of the seventies he created his theory: EZO, POP and SACRUM as a diagnosis of contemporary culture. EZO corresponded to the previous, egocentric attitude of the avant-garde – attached to the “sacrum of art”, POP was “total desacralization of art, it’s incorporation into the scientific, technological and administrative mechanisms of civilization and mass culture,”¹⁵ a tendency characterized by the “civilization of haste and success”. Finally, the third attitude with which Bogucki associated his hopes was SACRUM – the desire to rediscover the relationship between the sacrum of art and the primal sacrum, manifested reflection on the timeless and non-material sense of human existence. This third way of understanding art as a meeting of two autonomous areas, in which none of them can dominate, but where both co-operate harmoniously, was supposed to rebuild universality of meanings in art, overcome the artist’s alienation through community action, and finally save from insanity or exhaustion those artists who seek spiritual change on their own.¹⁶

Janusz Bogucki was the organizer of several famous artistic undertakings that set a new curatorial approach in Polish exhibitions. In 1983 exhibition *The Sign of the Cross* was arranged in the church of God’s Mercy in Warsaw, a temple ruined during the Warsaw Uprising in 1944 and then being rebuilt by its parishioners.¹⁷ Artists used the whole interior, including debris and construction equipment, and placed abstract works and installations in it. This way they created a coherent and extremely expressive environment, a result of negotiations and arrangements with themselves and parishioners.¹⁸ This way not only a community of artists and recipients was created, but also an environment and a place for

¹⁴ On the problem of the sacred in Polish art of those times see: A. GRALIŃSKA-TOBOREK, The idea of Sacrum in Polish art of 1980s, in: *Inferno. Journal of Art History*, 7, 2003, pp. 31–37.

¹⁵ J. BOGUCKI, *POP – EZO – SACRUM*, Poznań 1990, p. 24.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ See D. JARECKA, Janusz Bogucki, the Polish Szeemann?, in: <https://artmuseum.pl/en/publikacje-online/dorota-jarecka-janusz-bogucki-polski> [2020–03–06].

¹⁸ In the 1980s, Bogucki organized other exhibitions: *The Road of Lights – ecumenical meetings* (1987) – at the Divine Mercy Church at ul. Żytnia in Warsaw, *Artists to shipyard workers* (1984) – in the Church of St. Nicholas in Gdańsk, *Apocalypse – light in the dark* (1984) – in the Church of St. Cross in Warsaw, *Labyrinth – underground space* (1989) – in the Church of the Ascension in Warsaw. The calendar of events organized by him is in the book: J. BOGUCKI, *Od rozmów ekumenicznych do Labiryntu*, Warszawa 1991.

the development of culture outside the official stream. In addition to exhibitions, also meetings with artists, symposia, concerts and theatre performances were organized there. The most famous was the performance *Wieczernik* directed by Andrzej Wajda.¹⁹

An important place in the capital was the Museum of the Archdiocese of Warsaw, where actress Hanna Skarżanka organized about 700 performances, which were shown in different parts of the country. In Poland there was around a dozen similar places although not everywhere the artistic level of organized events was equally high. Local artistic circles of Kraków, Łódź, Wrocław, Lublin, Gdańsk, Katowice organized themselves at parishes, where artists from all over the country were invited.

The church gave artists a sense of community and security – values that became particularly valuable after the proclamation of martial law. It also provided a huge audience consisting partly of people who previously did not have much experience with modern art. Church, however, was not a neutral place, it required a specific attitude and content.

The participation of artists, including actors, in cultural events organized in churches was a substitute for opposition activity. The quality of the spectacle or exhibition was less important than the very fact of undertaking such action and participation. It should be noted that especially during the boycott (which was cancelled in 1983), the artists' community stigmatized all those who were breaking the rules. Such artists were unmasked in the underground press, where their names and circumstances of their appearances in regime media were given.

The end of 1980s was the time of a crisis in the relations between the Church and the artistic community.²⁰ One could hear the discouragement and lack of faith in the further development of "church art" in the statements of the participants of the movement: "*Both sides – the artists and the Church – are already a bit tired*"²¹ said Aleksander Wojciechowski, a participant and an attentive observer of the movement. "*An independent mass movement, demonstrating its artistic and patriotic credo in temples, has already fulfilled its role. The time has come for far-reaching selection so that what*

¹⁹ Twelve performances were watched by around 6,000 viewers. E. MAŁACHOWSKA, Kościół a kultura niezależna w latach 80, in: *Pokolenie*, p. 89.

²⁰ See A. GRALIŃSKA-TOBOREK, Plastyka w Kościele w latach 1981–1989: trwałe przymierze czy epizod?, in: *Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość*, 4, 7, 2005, pp. 181–201.

²¹ W. WIERZCHOWSKA, *Sąd nieocenzurowany czyli 23 wywiady z krytykami sztuki*, Łódź 1989, p. 279.

really valuable is not present in the envelope of mediocrity."²² At the end of the 80's, church exhibitions were getting smaller and the notorious exhibitions of young artists, the so-called "New expression" were organized in official galleries.²³

There were not only church exhibitions and performances in the second circulation, but also events under the auspices of *Solidarity* and independent student organizations. Meetings with artists, performances, lectures were organized in private apartments. A special place was occupied by the so-called "Home Theatre" showing political performances in private homes for a small audience. The same name – "Home Theatre" was used by the theatre founded by actors: Ewa Dałkowska, Emilian Kamiński, Andrzej Piszczatowski and Maciej Szary, which, according to the *Encyclopedia of the Polish Theatre*, gave about 150 performances, including *Marast* by Pavel Kohout (premiered October 1984) and *Largo desolato* by Václav Havel (premiered November 1986) directed by Maciej Szary.²⁴

Independent culture was also created by underground publishing houses and other initiatives under the auspices of *Solidarity*. Samizdat has been developing in Poland since 1976 and during the martial law, despite the repression and confiscation of some equipment, it achieved increasing expenditure and continued to expand.²⁵ Publishing houses published books and magazines, among which 77 titles were considered to be typical cultural and literary magazines.²⁶ In addition to literary and critical texts, these magazines also had translations from foreign languages of authors censored in Poland.

Illegal publishers expanded the scope of their activity in the mid-1980s by including cassette tapes with song recordings (sung poetry and ballads of "Solidarity bards" were extremely popular), lectures and video cassettes with independent documentaries and feature films. The NOWa was the largest publishing house, operating since 1977, which, until June 1990, published 294 books and a dozen or so omitting the editorial

²² Ibid.

²³ See J. CIESIELSKA, (ed.), *Republika bananowa. Ekspresja lat 80*, Wrocław 2008.

²⁴ Teatr Domowy, in: *Encyklopedia Teatru Polskiego*, on line: <http://encyklopediateatru.pl/hasla/265/teatr-domowy> [2020-03-05].

²⁵ See S. DOUCETTE, *Books Are Weapons: The Polish Opposition Press and the Overthrow of Communism*, Pittsburgh 2017.

²⁶ See M. MARCINKIEWICZ – S. LIGARSKI (eds.), *Papierem w system. Prasa drugoobiegowa w PRL*, Szczecin 2010.

board, 144 magazine issues, 39 audio cassettes, 21 video cassettes, 4 video sets and 4 “Orwellian calendars”.²⁷

There were some critical voices towards underground publications, as well as art exhibitions, indicating the uneven level and danger of printing everything what is oppositional rather than what is literary valuable. Publishers, editors, curators faced difficult choice: should they reject artistically weak works if those were politically involved? They were aware that this could be regarded as internal censorship and that recipients expect specific content and that any criticism of independent culture is used extensively by regime journalists. Therefore, many discussions among the creators of the second circulation focused on how to understand independence.

What Culture? Independent, Autonomous, Alternative, or Free from Anything?

Andrea F. Bohlman in a book on independent music explains that: *“The Polish language distinguishes between state independence (niepodległość) and an individual’s autonomy (niezależność), and activists deployed both, along with the concept of ‘freedom’ (wolność). Niepodległość concerns collective sovereignty. In contrast, the niezależność flagged in the journal’s title [Kultura Niezależna] referred to individual autonomy, a core foundation of the opposition’s model of civil society.”*²⁸ The underground culture of the second circulation was independent of regime power, but not always autonomous. Critics believed that culture liberated from under the state patronage surrendered to the patronage of the Catholic Church or oppositional political organizations, and in both cases art could not be considered autonomous.²⁹ The creators of independent culture were aware of this, but they accepted this patronage gratefully. Teresa Bogucka, the head of the Committee of Independent Culture, said in 1985: *“By abandoning state patronage, independent culture would become very intimate, it would only reach elites, but for church there would be no other place which could gather several thousand people for anniversary performance, large series of exhibitions and concerts like ‘Znak Krzyża’ in the church on Żytnia in Warsaw or Gdańsk celebrations of the 4th anniversary of August. [...] Art has found its place in the Church – is it not so that while striving to*

²⁷ http://www.encysol.pl/wiki/Niezale%BCna_Oficyna_Wydawnicza [2020–03–06].

²⁸ A. F. BOHLMAN, *Musical Solidarities: Political Action and Music in Late Twentieth-Century Poland*, New York 2020, p. 42.

²⁹ Zygmunt Hubner uses term “semi-official” to describe performances in church. Z. HUBNER, *Theatre & politics*, Evanston Illinois 1992.

be free from restrictions, there are other restrictions? So far, this is done on the basis of mutual respect: in principle, priests do not interfere in what the artists would like to show, and the artists try not to present in the church anything that could offend believers."³⁰ The church welcomed artists and gave them space to present art, but expected their work to be in line with its hierarchy of values. Not all artists, shared the same hierarchy, though their aspirations for freedom were as strong as those of the opposition activists. As the art historian Piotr Piotrowski wrote, there were some artists who: *"rejected all that black and white political structure en globe, they rejected the language of martial law, whether it was defined by communists or by underground Solidarity as the language of power par excellence. As a consequence, they rejected the great 'narratives' of the political opposition and the art associated with it – art created in Catholic churches. [...] They reached for a different language, defining reality as if 'from the side', and in this language sought their identification."*³¹ Among them there were the creators of alternative theatre, young rock and punk musicians, some neo-avant-garde artists and the Orange Alternative student movement. They formed separate groups not related to each other, they were apolitical and manifesting their independence. Some of them were of anarchist nature – they proposed freedom from everything. We can call them, with no other terms, the "third circulation".

The "Third Circulation" – Outside the System

The alternative culture, separately to the "patriotic" trend of the Church and the political opposition was created primarily by young people, usually students. To a large extent they focused on theatrical activities born in the 70s and the influence of Western counterculture was visible in it.³² However, this theatre was not only an echo of Western student performances and the result of visits of avant-garde experimental theatres in Poland, but a natural way of artistic expression, because, as Kathleen M. Cioffi notes: *"in Poland, where that heritage includes more than two hundred years of opposition to the powers that be, the theatre has often found itself at the centre of many political controversies."*³³ Alternative theatre brought new means of expression, direct contact with the audience, community action,

³⁰ W świecie kultury niezależnej. Z rozmowy z członkiem Komitetu Kultury Niezależnej, in: *Tygodnik Mazowsze*, 114, 1985, quoted in: OLASZEK, p. 111.

³¹ P. PIOTROWSKI, *Znaczenia modernizmu. W stronę historii sztuki polskiej po 1945 roku*, Poznań 1999, p. 226–227.

³² See S. MAGALA, *Polski teatr studencki jako element kontrkultury*, Warszawa 1988.

³³ K. M. CIOFFI, *Alternative Theatre in Poland 1954–1989*, Amsterdam 1999, p. 4.

pursuit of authenticity and emphasizing spiritual values to this tradition. It was called contesting, countercultural, open, searching, young, experimenting. Today the term “alternative” is used because it was an alternative to mainstream theatre. But alternative theatres were active in various official youth organizations and universities, it was subject to censorship and the subject of those performances were universal, existential and not directly political, so it’s hard to call it independent.³⁴ Student theatres have been operating since the late 1950s (after the “Thaw” in 1956) and in the late 1970s they were already in most academic centres, there were even a dozen in some cities.³⁵ The repertoire of these theatres was also very different, from poetic evenings which consisted of the classics of Polish literature. The repertoire of such theatres consisted of the performances loosely based on texts created by the whole group. Those performances were largely improvised even up to the level of a cabaret. After the declaration of martial law, alternative theatres intensified their activities, and new ones were founded.

Some researchers also include the Orange Alternative movement in the alternative theatre, but it seems that these activities were less in the field of theatre and more in the field of happening. The founder and leader of this movement was Waldemar Fydrych called “Major”, who was a student of art history at the University of Wrocław.³⁶ Despite the fact that Fydrych was a participant of student strikes in 1981, his activities from the beginning were more of a mockery and anti-system nature than strictly political. In April 1981 he published *Manifesto of Socialist Surrealism*, referring in his New Culture Movement to the surreal and dadaist tradition. Initially, i.e. in the first half of the eighties, the activities of P.A. boiled down to painting graffiti, mainly in the form of dwarfs. In places where municipal services painted over opposition political slogans, simple figures of dwarves were painted on spots of paint, which Fydrych’s “Major”

³⁴ See G. KONDRASIUK – A. GÓRA-STĘPIEŃ, Teatr studencki i alternatywny w Lublinie, Ośrodek “Brama Grodzka – Teatr NN” in: <http://teatrnn.pl/leksykon/artykuly/teatr-alternatywny-i-studencki-w-lublinie/> [2020-03-04].

³⁵ It is difficult today to provide a specific number of alternative theatres, even more so because some have ceased their activities, others have begun, and many still disappear today. Lublin was the most dynamic centre, where as many as 9 such theatres operated, including: Teatr Provisorium, Grupa Chwilowa, Ośrodek Praktyk Teatralnych Gardzienice, Scena Plastyczna KUL. The most famous theatres in other cities include: Akademia Ruchu in Warsaw, Teatr 77 in Lodz, Teatr Dnia Ósmego in Poznan, Kalambur in Wrocław, Jedyńka in Gdansk.

³⁶ See <http://www.orangealternativemuseum.pl/#homepage> [2020-03-06].

justified ironically by Marxist dialectic: “*The Thesis is the [anti-regime] Slogan, the Anti-thesis is the Spot and the Synthesis is the Dwarf*.”³⁷ The main way of artistic expression of this movement were happenings organized since 1986 in the centres of large cities – primarily Wrocław, then Warsaw, Łódź and Lublin.³⁸ They usually took the form of public celebrations of imaginary or real holidays, such as Militia Day, St. Nicholas Day, the eve of the October Revolution. Gathered participants, usually young people and students, brought some attributes and banners, chanted slogans that were a travesty of regime and opposition slogans, e.g.: “*Santa Claus is the hope for reforms*”, “*The Warsaw Pact – Vanguard of Peace*”, “*Connect Africa to the USSR*”. In these joyful manifestations reminiscent of carnival processions (hence the Bachtin’s term “carnavalesque” is often used in the description of those), a dozen or so to several thousand people took part. Happenings were difficult to control by the governmental services because the slogans raised were clearly affirmative towards the authorities and the system. So, irony turned out to be the best anti-system weapon.

Irony was also characteristic for artists associated with new media: photography, experimental film, performance.³⁹ In these circles it was called *Kultura Zrzuty* (Culture of whip-round i.e. a cash payment for publishing and organizing events). The main assumptions of this culture are intellectual nihilism, anarchism, absurdity, fun, and unproductiveness. Artists met in private apartments and created places of art and exchange of ideas, which were combined in the so-called Network. They also adapted the attic in a tenement house in Łódź, where they organized social gatherings, film festivals and performances from 1981 to 1985. The most active and the most radical, anarchist attitude was adopted by members of the Łódź

³⁷ A detailed history of Orange Alternative can be found on the official website of the Orange Alternative Foundation. Story about Dwarfs is as follows: Major and his friends were arrested twice while painting dwarfs. During one of these times Major while detained at a police station in Łódź, proclaimed yet another artistic manifesto of the so-called “dialectic painting” in reference to his own graffiti art. “*The Thesis is the [anti-regime] Slogan, the Anti-thesis is the Spot and the Synthesis is the Dwarf*” – he announced, furthermore defining himself to be the greatest successor in the Hegel and Marx tradition. – “*Quantity evolves into Quality – the more Dwarfs there are, the better it is*”, <http://www.orangealternativemuseum.pl/#homepage> [2020-03-07].

³⁸ One of the happenings took place in the summer of 1988 on the top of the Śnieżka Mountain, at the Polish-Czech border, under the code name of *Brotherly aid always alive*. It recalls a very important event – the date of marks the anniversary of the Warsaw Pact’s invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 21st, 1968.

³⁹ Most of them were somehow connected with the Łódź Film School.

Kaliska group. Their para-artistic activities – interventions, happenings, actions, were aimed at causing scandal and embarrassment, ridiculing not only socio-political systems, artistic institutions but also the art itself and its tradition.

The artists from several groups: Luxus, Koło Klipsa, Gruppa took a stand against the existing reality as well as against the opposition political activity. Their art, including painting, installation, graffiti and graphics, was not literally oppositional, patriotic, nor was it nihilistic, which is why it was shown in places of the second and third circulation.

The final part of independent culture of the third circulation was rock music. Youth music in the Polish People's Republic never aroused the enthusiasm of regime – from big-beat in the 60s, through rock and roll and then rock focused under the banner of Young Generation Music in the late 70s to punk rock in the 80s, whose largest place of presentation was the Jarocin Festival (1980–1994). The festival organized in a small town attracted several thousand young people and dozens of performers every year. Songs sung and more often shouted out by bands were anti-systemic and disregarded censorship. The authorities discounted the Jarocin phenomenon, as they did not see it as a political threat.⁴⁰ They overlooked the fact that it shaped the views of a large number of very young people who did not join the opposition, were apolitical, but drawing patterns from the West aroused their longing for freedom. The organizers and participants of the festival said after many years that people “were caught by freedom” in Jarocin.

Summary

Independent culture of the last decade of the Polish People's Republic was undoubtedly a phenomenon fascinating researchers. Therefore, it has received many detailed publications on specific fields: theatre, music and fine arts. There were also several exhibitions on this topic, the Jarocin Festival was reactivated, and 2009 year was declared the Year of Independent Culture. The Polish underground has to a large extent prepared the culture for functioning in the new reality. Many artistic groups continue their activity, some private galleries have survived and independent publishers have evolved into private publishing houses. Not all trends have survived. In contemporary culture, little remains of

⁴⁰ See K. LESIAKOWSKI – P. PERZYNA – T. TOBOREK, *Jarocin w obiektywie bezpieki*, Warszawa 2004; T. TOBOREK, *Niezależna muzyka rockowa*, Łódź 2010.

the “church movement”, apart from activities related to Archdiocesan Museums. Sacrum is not an attractive topic for art, on the contrary, in the 90s in critical art there was a discussion with religiosity, clericalization and with superficial patriotism. There is no doubt, however, that the independent culture in both its circuits was a powerful movement and contributed to the fall of communism. Often, individual communities on the wave of veterans’ memories claim greater credit for themselves, but only seen as a whole, it gives an insight into the scale of this phenomenon and makes one aware of the resistance that Polish culture was at the end of the communist regime.

Filip PAULUS, Šárka STEINOVÁ et al.

Krajina a urbanismus na rukopisných plánech z 18. století – Landscape and Urbanism in Manuscript Plans from the 18th Century. Translokační plány židovských obydlí v zemích Koruny české v letech 1727–1728 – Translocation plans of Jewish Settlements in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown from the Period of 1727–1728

Praha: Národní archiv 2020

ISBN 978-80-7469-088-4, 446 pages

An extensive, representatively-conceived, Czech-English collection of studies, the work by a team led by Filip Paulus and Šárka Steinová, professionals working at the National Archive in Prague, is focused on a significant collection of archival documents – Jewish settlements translocation plans in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown in 1727–1728. Having importance for local, national and general histories, the collections of these plans deposited in the National Archive in Prague, the Moravian Regional Archive in Brno, the Regional Archive in Opava and the State Regional Archive in Litoměřice acquired the “archival cultural heritage status” under Nos. 172–175 in 2018, at the present time, they are aspiring to be put on the UNESCO Memory of the World Register.

The publication summarizes the outcomes of an interdisciplinary methodical study of these unique sources. Their origin related to implementing so-called Familianten or Familiant Law,

the laws from 1726 and related translocation rescript. The genesis of these broadly conceived documents is presented in two introductory contributions by Ivana Ebelová. The first of them sums up peripeteia of coexistence of Jews and Christian population in the Czech Lands from the beginning to the late 17th century. The next chapter details interventions in the coexistence of Jewish and Christian population during the reign of Charles VI (1685–1740), especially the establishment of the Jewish Committee (1714) and introduction of the so-called Familiant law in 1726 aiming to regulate the number of Jewish population in the crown lands. They forbade rural Jews from moving to Prague, introduced the *numerus clausus* and regulated the natural growth of Jewish people by restriction of granting them wedding concessions so possibility to start a family. Also the register and check on respecting the set number of families were introduced.

The essay describes the period steps restricting the possibility of placing Jews freely in the areas delimited for them by the ruler's agreement, the regulation in the sphere of obtaining *Inkolat* (the right to settle in the country), and the ban on free movement and residency in the country without a valid passport. The set of measures included regulation of conducting craft, trade and business related to the ban on running mills, breweries, distilleries, sheepfolds, potash factories, tanneries, and the like by the Jewish population, on Jewish rents, duties and tolls, and trade in selected types of goods, and more.

Virtually, the so-called translocation rescript regarding displacement of the settled Jewish population came into force at the same period, in 1727. It followed the medieval principles of segregation between Jewish and Christian populations. The translocation rescript determined places of residency for the Jewish population. Jewish habitations close to churches, Christian towns and villages had to be removed from their proximity. So the practice of ghettos, separated streets, Jewish dwellings separated by a high wall, windows walling up and the like was re-established. The regulations applied to approximately 30,000 Czech and 20,000 Moravian Jews. However, it should be noted that the translocation rescript, as a consequence, was not effective, and had not ever been fully enforced nowhere, except some localities.

The fundamental deed as to implementing this regulation was drawing

over two hundred plans of Czech and Moravian localities and Silesian Oso-blaha (Hotzeplotz). Their contents, restoration, digitizing and making them accessible by a form of a Web application are dealt with in further studies of this reviewed collection. The final, most extensive part of the publication consists of their catalogue added by quality reproductions.

The translocation plans derived from activities of land and aristocratic authorities in Bohemia and Moravia. They ordinarily depict the overall picture of the given locality or area with exactly marked Jewish habitations, synagogues and cemeteries and their distance to churches. A portion of plans also pictures construction appearance of single buildings. The execution of most plans goes back to 1727–1728, some of them come from the 1730s–1740s. Single plans and maps were co-drawn by land surveyors, military engineers, urban builders on one side, and town or aristocracy's scribes or laymen on another. The plans demonstrate a variable quality ranging from perfectly created works to schematic sketches. Anyhow, the plans present the collection of tremendous value giving a reliable image of the interior development of settlements and their typography, as well as they document economic and social conditions of Jewish population in the Czech lands.

The comparison of the translocation plans with other sources described in one separate chapter of this collection, especially with indicative sketches of the stable land register,

enables to trace the development of the Jewish settlement within over one century (until the mid-19th century). However, the plans reproduced in the final section of this publication have far greater importance. They present a reliable image of the interior development of settlements and their topography. They are used for history of architecture and urban planning, and for identifying minute immovable relics.

It also serves to analyse the settlement structure, to discover the history of landscape and garden architecture since they contain new findings about

landscape interventions that no longer exist, and changes only preserved in relics or terrain indications. Besides economic history they are used for art history, history of cartography, ethnography, paper manufacture, and the like.

The reviewed publication is an extraordinary work devoted to the exceptional collection of sources, which are used by a range of researches in many different spheres. It is worth home and foreign professional public's attention.

Michal Wanner

