

DOROTA KICIŃSKA

**Eating habits of English citizens in the second part of 17<sup>th</sup> c.  
on the basis of *The Diary* by Samuel Pepys**

“Tell me what you eat, and I will tell you who you are”, this maxim is worth to remember also when we talk about the past ages, because eating habits were important part of every-day culture also in 17<sup>th</sup> c. England. By analyzing habits connected with eating and drinking we can better understand the customs and culture of past times.

It is worth to notice, that in the second part of 17 c. it was very common to hang around in inns (also in ale-houses, mum-houses and vine-houses). Taverns offered tasty food and various drinks (common bear, most popular ale, also mum, vine, buttered ale and other), but those places played also a different, even more important role, as informal clubs, where people could share political information, talk about popular books and theater plays, sing ballads and dance.

Beside drinking alcoholic drinks, it started becoming fashionable to drink tea, coffee and chocolate. Water, milk and whey still were popular. Many of those drinks were expected to have medical properties and were especially supposed to heal gastric illness.

The menu of a middle-class citizen was rather simply. Breakfast could consist of ale soup, porridge soup, sometimes bread with butter and milk. It was common to eat breakfast outside the house, usually in inns. Dinner was eaten about noon. It was the biggest meal in the whole day, therefore very hearty and stodgy. Different kinds of meat, fishes and vegetables were served, everything with a big amount of salty butter. Supper was as small as breakfast and usually consisted only of fruits, cakes or bear. It was common and conventional to invite friends or family for dinners.

MALGORZATA KARKOCHA

**From the Estates-General to the Parisian uprising (5 V – 6 X 1789).  
The beginning of the French Revolution in the light of “Gazeta Warszawska”**

This text aims illustrate the conditions prevailing in France in the early months of the Great Revolution (1789–1799). The time framework of our deliberations are marked out by two events: the opening of the Estates-General on 5 May 1789 and Paris Insurrection (second) on 5–6 October the same year. This period is full of the number of events and is undoubtedly one of the most turbulent in the history of the French Revolution. Then the National Assembly was constituted, two uprisings of

Parisian people took place, the cities of the province had been revolutionized, finally, there was the Peasant Revolt, known as the Great Fear.

During this period, two acts of a very major importance, also were passed. That is the Decree of August 4, which abolished in France the system based on feudal dependency, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, outvoted on 26 August, which next had introduced universal, at least in theory, the equality and the freedom.

We will discuss the issue of our interest on the basis of the information placed on the pages of the “Gazeta Warszawska” – the main magazine being published in a capital city of the Polish Republic in years 1774–1793.

MARTA PIESTRZENIEWICZ

### **Benevolent Society for the Christians in Piotrków 1885–1914**

Benevolent Society for Christians in Piotrków was founded in 1885 on the initiative of local intelligentsia. Its aim was to abolish the street begging, mitigate the emergence of poverty and helping the needy. The aid could be beneficial to the poorest inhabitants of the town, first of all the elderly, the disabled and orphans. Within the framework of its activities the shelters for children, free reading and classrooms for useful courses were created, summer camps were organized, entries for poor students were paid, scholarships were allocated and free dinners were given. Beyond the tasks of the social assistance resulting from the idea of mercy, Benevolent Society for the Christians in Piotrków spread education, supported the national spirit and developed Polish culture under the banner of charity. The outbreak of the World War I did not interrupt the activities of the Society but limited it to a great extent. It functioned until March 1948 when the last subordinated institutions were closed.

PRZEMYSŁAW PIOTR DAMSKI

### **The Theodore Roosevelt’s position towards “The Hay–Pauncefote Treaties” of 5 II 1900 and 18 XI 1901**

Clayton–Bulwer Treaty of 1850, assured to both Americans and British the equal rights to take the enterprise of a building a canal across the isthmus in Central America. It hadn’t been satisfactory to the United States. The Question raised later after the American–Spanish war of 1898. The United States realized that the canal in

Central America was essential to their interests. It could assure the faster way from one coast of North America to another. Defending of Philippines would be also easier if the isthmian canal would exist under the American control.

John Hay, the United States' Secretary of State, asked on 1899 British ambassador at Washington, Sir Julian Pauncefote, for renegotiation of the treaty of 1850. Great Britain, because of disputing her imperial position during the Boer War, and her alienation in the international arena, agreed on this proposition.

The First Hay–Pauncefote Treaty was signed on February 5<sup>th</sup> 1900. According to American law it had to be ratified in the Senate. However, Cushman K. Davis, president of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, launched a frontal attack on the Treaty. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge argued that it hadn't given to the United States the sufficient assurance. He claimed that – truly raised in the treaty – the question of a neutrality of the Canal which the United States were going to build and invitation to other countries to accept the treaty, stated in Article III, were the violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Opponents of the Treaty weren't satisfied in spite of that the United Kingdom renounced their rights to build the Canal over the Isthmus.

After the, so called, Yonkers Conference to the people opposed to the signed arrangement joined the Governor of New York – Theodore Roosevelt. He stated that USA should violate Clayton–Bulwer convention and build the Canal under the proposed by William Peters Hepburn *Canal Bill*. His actions were quite irritating, especially because of his widely connections with the press. McKinley and his people decided to involve him to the presidential campaign. Roosevelt became the candidate for Vice President of the United States. This substantially limited his against-treaty actions.

Counter-treaty operations were continued by Lodge and Davis. Indeed Senate ratified the Treaty, but also added amendments. First was the statement in Article II which gave to the United States the right to close the Canal to their enemies, even if they not intended to violate its neutrality. Secondly, the addition in the Article VIII abolished Clayton–Bulwer convention. Thirdly, the Senate removed whole the Article III.

London decided that the form in which additions had been communicated to him was unacceptable and rejected the Treaty on March 12<sup>th</sup> 1901.

However, neither Great Britain nor the United States wanted to throw away their agreement which should be the entrance to their future cooperation. The new negotiations begun on April. John Hay had involved the Senators this time. At the same time, the new Vice President, Theodore Roosevelt, weren't showing much attraction to these actions. Only after the unexpected death of McKinley we can recognize his commitment to the case of the agreement with Britain. This time, however, he was in favour of Treaty. This turning was caused by the fact that the British ambassador wanted to accept most of the amendments that had been added to

the last Treaty. Still, Roosevelt didn't take part in negotiations. He focused on the winning over the Senators. Those actions brought what had been intended. So called, Second Hay–Pauncefote Treaty was signed at the November 18<sup>th</sup> 1901, and, after the passionate speech by Roosevelt himself, on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, the Senate ratified the Treaty on December 16<sup>th</sup>.

JACEK GOCLON

**“Ignacy Paderewski’s government. Origin, composition and activities  
(16 Jan. 1919 – 9 Dec. 1919)”**

Ignacy Paderewski’s cabinet was not a strictly coalition government and its composition did not include anyone from the contemporary extreme right wing. However, it was neither the government of “national reconciliation” nor the coalition cabinet (it could not be also called the government of professionals). The ministers represented mainly the moderate directions and could win the support of both the right wing and the centre, less of the socialist left-wing. It was only the government of compromise between J. Piłsudski and the right-wing circles (it lasted almost 11 months). Paderewski did not have any greater political experience although his ability to appropriately select the people with whom he cooperated was quite significant. The prime minister’s absence in the government sessions was greatly influenced by his activities connected with the post of the minister of foreign affairs that he held at the same time and which was connected with frequent foreign trips (he was then substituted by Stanisław Wojciechowski, the minister of the interior). The most important issues that Paderewski’s government dealt with included the organisation of state administration structures, the problems connected with the supplying of Lvov which was free from the Ukrainian terror, however, the Ukrainians had still military advantage in the vast territory of Lvov land, the matters connected with the retirement pensions for the Polish National Government of January Uprising, the urgent problem of bribery among the state officials, as well as the issues connected with the organisation of the temporary administration in territories in the East, the issue of “high prices for bread sold without bread ration coupons” and the determination of the maximum price for such bread, the solution of a problem of railway strike (in this case, the government took the uncompromising stand on the railwaymen’s demands, especially the political ones, in spite of the fact that significant social unrest was growing in the country). The government also coped with the problems of severe shortage of rolling stock for transportation of coal which clearly could not be overcome by the government, and with problems with premises for its own government departments. The cabinet sessions were often dominated by the foreign trade issues and the matters connected

with the establishment of the Office of the Attorney General, the administrative division of the territories of the former Kingdom of Poland into voivodeships and military districts, and the issues related to “the system of voivodeship authorities”. The cause of the collapse of this cabinet was mainly the discord between the prime minister and J. Piłsudski concerning the stand on the Bolshevik Russia which was not recognised by the Chief of State, while Paderewski – although he generally agreed with Piłsudski in the scope of eastern issues and theoretically accepted Piłsudski’s “federalist plan” – was rather willing to reach at least temporary agreement with the Bolshevik Russia.

JUSTYNA PIĄTEK

### **British Diplomacy towards the case of sinking the schooner “I’m Alone” by the American patrol cutter (March – September 1929)**

“I’m Alone” was a British notorious smuggling schooner of Canadian register anchored between 10,8 and 15,5 miles off the coast of Louisiana. The incident took place on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1929 when an American patrol cutter sank the vessel after two-day pursuit. This date establish a turning point for a prohibition problem, which covers a period from 1920 to 1933, on account of his indirect consequences placing the future of the Anglo-American Liquor Treaty of 1924 under a question mark. The article relates to the British direct response to the event. It is an attempt to specify the determinants of the Foreign Office’s policy.

Convention between the United States and the United Kingdom is a starting point to analyses the British reaction, primary second and the third point of article II which caused some misunderstandings.

First of all it was difficult to determine the one hour distance from the U.S. shore of a suspect vessel which dependent on the speed and weather conditions. Although three miles of territorial waters were accepted, U.S. patrols were searching up to distance of twelve miles from shore which was extended by the Tariff Act of 1922. Customs authority was illegally applied to the treaty. The sinking of the schooner have raised two more doubts – whether the doctrine of hot and continuous pursuit could be in force in cases where the pursuit have started outside territorial waters but within treaty limits and whether the sinking of the vessel and endangering the lives of her crew ware justified.

From the very beginning the British policy was based on allowing Canada to take the lead in handling this case with a support. In fact that meant taking into account Foreign Office’s suggestions. Ottawa’s stubbornness was a problem. In the light of the facts it has appeared to London that only two questions were important and innocuous. They regarded the hot pursuit and the sinking. Any wider discussion

at issue was inconvenient on account of the advantages due to article III. The privilege of bringing sealed liquors into U.S. territorial waters played a key role in London policy. The British were convinced that the best way to close the case was to provide it under article IV of the Liquor Treaty. They did not want to magnify its importance and endow with unnecessary publicity because the treaty was far more advantageous for them than for U.S.

By reason of Ottawa's tough attitude the British had to think about reaching a compromise. They have considered it had been necessary to apply the doctrine of hot and continuous pursuit in the case of ships hailed within treaty limits but outside territorial waters in order to not incline the Americans to abrogate the treaty as being useless to them. In the issue of sinking it was fully agreed by Canada and Great Britain to condemn cruelty of the United States Coastguard.

Although the case was settled under joint commission of the Americans and Canadians, it has unhappily raised a question about the value of Liquor Treaty to the United States and subsequently began great discussion around the convention of 1924.

NINA KAPUŚCIŃSKA

### **The contemporary reflection about the queen Barbara Radziwiłłówna and her role in the history**

This article is an attempt to recapitulate historical judgments and opinions presented after 1976 concentrating on Barbara Radziwiłłówna as a queen and on her influence on history. The year 1976 was accepted as the line of division opening deliberations about the contemporary reflection on the pondered subject. It is due to the fact that a new biography of Radziwiłłówna by a prominent Old Polish culture authority – Zbigniew Kuchowicz, a historian from Łódź, was issued for the first time that year. The contemporary historiographical concept of the Renaissance queen is presented on two levels: her function at the royal court as well as her influence on the course of both domestic and foreign policy. The image of Barbara Radziwiłłówna is balanced, as it is one of a good, wise, Catholic queen, whose inherent attributes were her legendary beauty and love.