

# USKOKS' WAR ECONOMY AND THE MAKING OF THE EARLY MODERN EMPIRE

## RATNO GOSPODARSTVO KOD USKOKA I STVARANJE CARSTVA U RANOM NOVOM VIJEKU

**Isao KOSHIMURA**

Tokyo Zokei University  
Utsunukicho 1556,  
Hachioji-city,  
Tokyo, 192-8588  
Japan  
koshi@zokei.ac.jp

Primljeno/Received: 14. 5. 2016.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 16. 12. 2016.

Rad ima dvije pozitivne recenzije

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Original scientific paper

UDK/UDC: 341.362.1(436-89:510)"15"

338.245(436-89:510)"15"

### Sažetak

*Namjera autora je da izloži dva primjera koji bi mogli poslužiti kao polazište za komparativnu analizu uskoka i wokou-piratstva Južnokineskog mora. U prvom radu, autor namjerava raspraviti slučaj uskoka. Analizira određene procese i pojave iz povijesti uskoka, da ih kasnije koristi kao elemente analize u usporedbi uskoka i wokou-piratsva. Kao prvo, autor ispituje odnos Habsburške Monarhije sa susjednim silama, kao osnovu za usporedbu vanjske politike kineskog carstva dinastije Ming. Oba dva carstva dosegla su veliku prekretnicu s problemom gusara u svakom od carstava, u drugoj polovici 16. stoljeća. Kao drugo, autor obrađuje narod koji se naziva Vlasima. To su bili polu-nomadski stočari koji su živjeli diljem Balkana, koji su služili u raznim imperijalnim vojnim jedinicama, a koji su činili veliki dio pripadnika uskoka. Vjerska i etnička pripadnost uskoka bila je prilično složena, baš kao u slučaju istočnoazijskih gusara. Kao treće, autor razmatra politiku Habsburške Monarhije prema Vlasima, kako bi se usporedila habsburška politika restrikcija i dalekoistočna politika zabrane pomorskog trgovanja u kineskim lukama Mingovog carstva. Konačno, na temelju proučavanja i istraživanja autor tipizira aktivnosti uskoka kao »ratnog gospodarstva«, kako bi kasnije napravio distinkciju obrađujući primjer wokou-gusara Južnokineskog mora. Što se tiče termina »ratnog gospodarstva«, ovaj članak se bavi nepredviđenim i ekonomskim aktivnostima za vrijeme ratnog stanja u vrijeme tranzicije ranog modernog doba.*

**Key words:** Uskok, Wako piracy, Early modern empire, Military Border, Vlach, War economy

**Ključne riječi:** Uskok, Wako pirarstvo, Carstvo rano novog vijeka, Vojna granica, Vlah, ratna ekonomija

### INTRODUCTION

It is the Uskoks who appear as the pirates in »The Mediterranean Sea« (Fernand Braudel). In recent years the pirates attracted the attention of historians who attempted to review the process of making of modern nations from a new angle<sup>1</sup>. In recent years I also noticed that pirates of Croatia which I have studied, and pirates of East Asia where I grew up lived in almost the same period. Among the pirates of East Asia, one of the most important groups was Wako. Wako originally means Japanese pirates. Today's globalization is the third wave of the globalization, the second wave brought by the Industrial Revolution, and the first by the Geographical Discovery. In the first globalization, I want to think about why the

<sup>1</sup> Cf.: for example, C. R. Pennell ed., *Bandits at Sea: A Pirates Reader*, N.Y. and London, 2001. Pennell says in this book, »...thus, any attempt to understand piracy has to balance the tension between the government and the individual, and this is at a time - in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries - when the nature of the state was changing.« (p.18)

ordinary people joined in pirates and what was the reason for such people in the west and east edge of the Eurasian Continent to fight against the national forces? In that way, I want to finally characterize the fight of Eurasian common people under today's globalization. (Against what? Have they been connected or rather divided between »West« and »East«?)

My intention is to make two articles, which could serve as a departure point for a comparative analysis of Uskoks and Wako. In this, first, article, I intend to discuss the case of Uskoks. I will address selected processes and phenomena from the history of Uskoks (and closely the related history of the Vlach people) that can later be used as analytical units in the comparison of Uskoks and Wako. In the second article, I will discuss the pirates of East Asia, concretely the late Wako, which increased their activities in the 1550s.

When people imagine pirates, they may first think of the pirates of the Caribbean (or Atlantic). Most of such pirates were infamous during »the golden age of the pirates« from about 1650 to the 1720s. They were outlaws who usually targeted the Spanish ships transporting wealth from the New World. These 'pirates for profit' were often also called Buccaneers. However, the Uskoks and the Wakos, or pirates of East Asia, were active in the earlier period. Actually, they appeared more than a century earlier, and disappeared before the »the golden age of the pirates« had begun.

It may be said that most of the Uskoks were the underprivileged that only marginally participated in the economic expansion of the 16th and 17th centuries and the political and military change that occurred soon after the start of the Age of Geographical Discovery. On the other hand, the Wakos and other pirates of the East Asia seas, were included in these global changes and reacted to them, in about the same period.

Moreover, when I looked into the history of the two groups, I realized that it wouldn't be possible to compare the two in terms of their images of social bandits that also implies some positive social image. While Uskoks do have such an image, the image of the Wako is negative, and the image of government troops is rather affirmative.

As a result, I decided to compare the actual activities of the two groups, one that operated primarily in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea, and another in the East Asia seas. I did this particularly in terms of their differing economic activities, relating them, not only to their common background of pirate activities but also to their regional characteristics.

Therefore, I made a project to compare Wakos of the China Sea with Uskoks of the Adriatic sea and organized an international symposium as the part of this project (September 2015). As a result of the symposium, it became apparent that the characteristics of each pirate group could be better recognized and analyzed by comparing the functioning of Early Modern Empires to which pirates were related.

## THE IMPERIAL PERSPECTIVE

As said above, in this first article I focus on Uskok and the Habsburg Empire. I believe that the Habsburg Empire, where Croatian pirates lived, and the Ming Empire, where pirates of the East Asia or Wako lived, were two early modern states derived from the common world called the Mongol Empire. Taking that into consideration, I ought to analyze the differences in the relations of the imperial administration and the pirates in both areas. As a result, I will specify differences and common points in those two cases.

First, I will question the relation of the Habsburg Empire with the neighboring powers (the Venetian Republic, the Ottoman Empire) as a basis for the comparison of the foreign policy of the Ming Empire. Second, I will address the people called Vlachs. These were semi-nomadic cattle breeders who lived across the Balkans, who served in various imperial military units, and who made a large part of the Uskok population. The religious affiliation and ethnic background of Uskoks were rather complex, as well as in the case of East Asian pirates. Third, I will discuss the policy of the Habsburg Empire towards the Vlachs, in order to compare the Habsburg policy with the Sea Ban policy of the Ming Empire applied to

the Chinese marine commerce. Finally, based on reading and research, I decided to typify the activity of the Uskoks as the 'war economy' in order to later make a distinction with the case of Wako.

The term 'war economy' often hints to the set of contingencies undertaken by a modern state to mobilize its economy for war production. In addition, this paper focuses on economic contingencies and activities in the state of war during the early modern transition period.

## THE 'MESOSCOPIC SITUATION' AND WAR ECONOMY

From a macroscopic perspective, after the empire of the Eurasian scale called Mongol Empire declined, some new early modern empires emerged in Eurasia over the time when the whole Eurasia recovered from economic stagnation. Habsburg and Ottoman Empires that Uskoks were related to as well as the Chinese empire related to Wako in the 16th century.

This project is questioning the function and practice of two piracies while taking into account the 'Macro situation' on the Eurasian scale and the specifics of the 'Mesoscopic situation' or local situations on both of its ends (east and west of the Eurasia). It narrowed down to the analysis of the 'Micro situation' around Uskoks and Wakos (in this very article exclusively Uskoks).

The Uskoks lived in two empires (Habsburg and Ottoman) and the Venetian Republic. The inhabitants were engaged in a sustained state of war in the 16th and 17th centuries. The economic activity and methods of Uskoks were often regarded an integral part of the state of war and I want to call this activity War Economy. To compare the Uskoks and Wakos that appeared almost at the same time, it seems to be effective to analyze the contents of the war and economy in a transition period.

In piracy of Uskoks, the economic activities are important, but comparatively, they were small sized. While the war unfolded from the official to unofficial phases complicatedly Uskoks used the situation to their benefit. On the other hand, in piracy of Wako, the war was mostly limited to the sea brush fires, and, as for the economy, a fierce struggle developed over the trade rights.

Therefore, at present, I would call the piracy of Uskoks the war economy and the piracy of Wakos the economic warfare.

## CHAPTER 1. THE »DIMENSIONS« OF SITUATIONS AND THE WAR IN THE ADRIATIC SEA

At the above-mentioned symposium, the following questions and answers were discussed the concrete relations of pirates with the early modern state.

A (Croatian historian)

Until the 16th century, the pirates on all sides attacked ships in the Adriatic Sea, often protected by the respective states and even serving as (semi-)official military troops. However, in the 17th and 18th centuries state powers became stronger, and pirates moved to smuggling as their main activity. In addition, during that time, the concept of the border was changing from the border-zone to the borderline, while the control of the border on each side became more comprehensive with time.

B (Author of this paper)

In the case of Japan, it is known that one Chinese historian suggested that Portuguese existed as the first intermediary as merchants or priests between Japan and foreigners. »The zone to the border« is a key phrase that appeared in nearly all today's reports

C (Chinese historian)

The border-line was definitely created by Hideyoshi Toyotomi when he banned pirates in Japan (in 1588). The smuggling called »Nukeni« became a major activity after that time. The marine powers move to become politically independent was led by Zhen Zhilong and Zhen Chenggong. During their struggle



**Fig 1.** Uskok engraving  
[http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Ilustracije/HE11\\_0773.jpg](http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Ilustracije/HE11_0773.jpg)



**Fig 2.** Wako painting  
[http://www.asahi.com/culture/news\\_culture/images/TKY201012020278.jpg](http://www.asahi.com/culture/news_culture/images/TKY201012020278.jpg)

with the Edo Shogunate and the Qing dynasty, there appeared the border as the boundary line, not as a vague zone between the political powers<sup>2</sup>.

In both Croatia and Japan, the pirates experienced the reinforcement of the power of the state from the 16th to the 17th centuries. I would try to explain the background of this reinforcement, judging from a world system theory and analyzing the making of the early modern global economy.

The early modern global economy was not a monolithic space of commerce. »What is needed here is to reconstruct the structural reality of early modern regionality in the shared context of the early modern globality<sup>3</sup>«. In order to approach the historical construction of the early modern regionality, it may be helpful to rethink the concept of the »long sixteenth century«.

## 1. THE CHANGE IN LATER 16TH CENTURY JUDGING FROM A WORLD SYSTEM THEORY, THE 'MACRO SITUATION'

The global climate change is considered to be what happened to the Mongol Empire that used to be a Eurasian empire. As well as the population issues or the loss of political unification, this global climate change could be one of the direct causes of the collapse of the Mongol Empire.

It was during the so-called »long-term 16th century« that productivity was restored, and the population began to increase again. A problem is that the word »long-term 16th century« was used only in the context of European history. It is due to Wallerstein and others, having categorized Europe by considering that their world and their economy was equivalent to Eurasia.

As far as the fifteenth-eighteenth centuries are concerned, Wallerstein's concept of the modern world-system covers only a European portion of the globe. And Wallerstein assumes that the other regions were dominated by pre-modern world-systems, »world empires«, whereas the European modern world-system

<sup>2</sup> Cf.: Isao Koshimura ed., *Marine Merchants and Pirates during the 16th and 17th Centuries: Uskok of the Adriatic Sea and Wako of the East China Sea*, Tokyo, 2016, pp. 98-99. Here the Croatian historian is Nataša Štefanec (Zagreb University), Chinese historian is Makoto Ueda (Rikkyo University).

<sup>3</sup> Norihisa Yamashita, »Empire or Post-Empire?: the Concept of 'Long Century' and the Consequences of Globalization« in Kimitaka Matsuzato ed., *Emerging Meso-Areas in the Former Socialist Countries: Histories Revived or Improvised?* Sapporo, 2005, p. 338.

is defined as »world economy«. This picture with a »world-empire«/»world-economy« dichotomy is »too reductive and unfairly underestimates the early modern globality that Andre Gunder Frank has shown in his *Reorient*<sup>4</sup>«.

A. G. Frank and Norihisa Yamashita (the historian who studied under I. Wallerstein) have tried to revise these elements of the Wallerstein theory. In other words, space (the Mongol Empire had once ruled it) opened globally in the early modern times, where some »worlds = empires« coexisted and each of the five »empires of early modern times« had a common space and a spacing order within this concept.

Among these five »early modern times empires,« the Ming empire was concerned with the Wakos, the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire with the Uskoks. So it seems that we can analyze two »banditries« in the common frame called »the empires of early modern times« in this sense.

Next, the aspect of the sustained expansion shows a sharp contrast between the first and the latter half of the long-term 16th century.

The first phase of the long sixteenth century (until the 1550/70s) is the period of sharp economic vitalization after the »medieval crisis«; »the European economy saw a recovery of basic socio-economic productivity in this period, which entailed very active, entrepreneurial and even adventurous commercial activities<sup>5</sup>«.

The second phase is the period of stable economic institutionalization. As the returns of experimental activities in the previous phase became somehow clear, those new commercial channels turned out to be sources of rent and various political forces attempted to intervene to »protect« them<sup>6</sup>.

If we overview the global picture of the first period from the 1450s through the mid-sixteenth century. The Ottoman Empire underwent vigorous westward expansion, symbolically from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to Suleyman's golden age of the 1550s and 1560s. Therefore the Habsburg Empire came to make the military border for self-defense.

Then »in the second phase of the long sixteenth century, these parallel outward-looking expansionism reached the point of refraction with major political re-organization, which essentially resulted in the regional consolidation of trade circuits, often intertwined with taxation/redistribution circuits<sup>7</sup>«.

The geo-economic orientation of the Ottoman Empire was reversed after the defeat of Lepanto (1571). Istanbul »bolted its gate and started to function as the center of the Ottoman redistributive system of staple goods<sup>8</sup>«.

So, in terms of structure of spatial imagination and its effect on regional formation, in spite of the apparent contrast between the centralized world-empires in the »Orient« and the de-centralized world-economy in »Europe«, it seems better to say that there were five early modern empires, all of which were variations of the same type of regional system.

And the change of Ottoman/Venetian relations after the sea battle of Lepanto and the rise of the Uskoks occurred at the beginning of the second phase. Of course, it was the time that saw a change from a zone to a borderline in the East China Sea as the Chinese historian described in the discussion within the above-mentioned symposium.

## 2. THREE BIG POWERS AND USKOKS, THE 'MESOSCOPIC SITUATION'

In 1522, the Emperor Ferdinand I concluded a treaty with the Croatian Ban that obligated himself to protect the Croatian coast, especially its main fortification at Senj. The cost of the defense of Croatia and the whole Christendom was to be borne by the estates of Inner-Austria (Styria, Carniola and, Carinthia). However, due to the political struggle between their Habsburg ruler and the estates, this treaty did not

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 338.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> Cf.:Ibid,pp.338-339.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid,p.339.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid,p.340.

guarantee a steady funding source to the troops and fortifications on the Croatian military border. It went into full swing only when the territories of the estates were threatened by the Ottoman expansion.

As for the Uskoks, despite the damages given by Uskoks to the Ottoman subjects, Ottoman officials still made use of Uskoks as their diplomatic instruments. The Ottomans used them as a political (not military) device, in order to prevent the political unity between the Habsburgs and the Venetians, that is, against the Christian league which won the Battle of Lepanto in 1571.

### »Military stagnation«

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the Austrian defense system on the military border assumed a more centralized and efficient structure. In 1578 the estates of Styria, Carniola and Carinthia agreed that the Archduchy of Inner-Austria should take direct responsibility for military administration of the Border. This change of administrative responsibility increased tensions between the imperial and archducal courts of the Hapsburg dynasty. The imperial court (Vienna) made an agreement with Venetian diplomats to control the Uskok's behavior at Senj in order to foster mutual bonds. The archducal court (Graz), however, failed to follow imperial orders. The archducal court, rather, did not wish to enforce the agreement because they used the Uskoks as defenders for their Croatian territories.

The treaty of Adrianople concluded between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans in 1568, never produced a state of complete peace at the border between the two early modern states. »It was characteristic of Ottoman-border warfare to keep the enemy in a constant state of alarm by raids led by mobile cavalry troops, the *akinci*. This pattern of Ottoman military tactics reveals the aggressive character of the Ottoman foreign policy during this period<sup>9</sup>«.

The expansive character of the Ottoman foreign policy can be explained partially through the Islamic concept of Jihad. Also, specific economic and social structures were underlying this military expansive policy, as well. The structure was produced by the timar system. Timar was a sort of fief which belonged to and was recognized by the sultan. »The reward of a timar became especially important in the second half of the sixteenth century when inflation of the entire European market undermined cash payments to the military<sup>10</sup>«. This inflation is due to the fact that silver has flowed into Europe from South America. »Under the strains of devalued currency, another war became quite desirable to obtain new timar for payments<sup>11</sup>«. Consequently, this was, as we will see in later chapters, related to the war economy. The further Ottoman expansion ended at the beginning of the seventeenth century and that led to a serious crisis of the Ottoman military system because no new land was available for the granting of timars, though the military stagnation was caused rather by the inner social crisis at the end of the sixteenth century.

A consistent trait of Ottoman foreign policy has prompted this military stagnation. The aim of Ottoman political agents was to avoid a simultaneous war on the European and Persian borders. After the Persians attacked Ottomans in 1603, the calls for peace with Habsburgs were intensified.

### »Bilancia - Venetian diplomatic policy and its economic background«

Venice, like the Habsburg Empire, tried to prevent Uskok raids only after the peace treaty of 1573. Until then, the Venetians had even employed Uskoks irregulars during a conflict over Cyprus before the treaty. But the peace treaty obliged the Venetians to ensure the safety of Ottoman shipping in the Adriatic as a condition of Venice's rule over the Adriatic.

During 1573 and 1604, Venice's political attitude was usually expressed with the term *bilancia*. Venice was keen on not endangering peaceful relations with the Ottoman Empire since the peace treaty

<sup>9</sup> Ruth Simon, The Uskok Problem and Habsburg, Venetian, and Ottoman Relations at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century, [www.essaysinhistory.com/articles/2012/102](http://www.essaysinhistory.com/articles/2012/102), p.3

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

of 1573 and the loss of Cyprus. Here, I will address the meaning of the loss of Cyprus from the economic side including the Levantine trade.

In the 16th century, the Venetian Levantine trade depended on the dealings with the Ottoman Empire. If respecting the arrangement, the Venetian merchants could maintain predominance in the Levantine trade until the early 17th century. Roughly speaking, the Levantine trade of Venice was weakened for a while since Venice entered into the second war with the Ottomans in 1499, but when the Ottoman war of 1537-40 years ceased, it recovered to assume the early 1560s a peak, and recuperation continued again after Cyprus war to the early 17th century and the stagnation period brought by the emergence of plague. In sum, Venetian Levantine trade looks to be at the revived state after the stagnation of the early 16th century.

### »The beginning of the end«

In the early 1590s, the Ottoman Empire invaded Sisak and middle Croatia, expecting further expansion. In 1593, the Ottoman invasion of Hungary began. Both sides insisted on exclusive rights to collect taxes in the zone between the Ottoman Empire and Hungary, which was one of the important reasons for war. The Ottoman vassal states of Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia also revolted against the Ottoman Empire.

The war increased the innovation of the military technology of the Habsburg side. The Ottoman Empire caught up with the new technology of the Austrian military and attempted to restore the territory.

The military innovation introduced by the European powers, as well as the Habsburgs, was visible in the Italian style and art in the construction of defensive objects such as castles and fortresses, the improvement of the gun and the development of the infantry firearms. It stimulated the development of the firearms-centered martial arts. Against this, the Ottoman side reinforced its best corps and gathered the foot soldiers who could handle firearms from the villages of Anatolia. It solved at least this problem rapidly. But the overwhelming predominance of the Ottoman forces like the ex-16th century collapsed.

The Ottoman main objective was to seize Vienna while the Habsburg Empire wanted to recapture the central territories of the Kingdom of Hungary controlled by the Ottoman Empire. The turning point of the war was the Battle of Mezőkereszte. Despite this victory, the Ottomans realized for the first time the superiority of Western military equipment over Ottoman weapons.

The Long War with the Ottomans and the peace-treaty of Zsitva-Torok (of 1606) can be interpreted as signs of change in the relationships between the two Empires because they showed the inability of the Ottomans to penetrate further into Habsburg territory. The circumstance made it necessary for the Ottoman political agents to start accepting the equal status of their opponents in international politics. The end to further aggression accelerated the emergence of a comprehensive juridical and formal solution to the state of Habsburg political and military relations with the Ottoman Empire. The warfare on the Adriatic Sea and in the Croatian territory thus became a more modern, more calculable, part of a formalized relationship in which anarchical and informal elements, like the Uskoks, did not fit anymore<sup>12</sup>

### »From religion to law (but in complicated process)«

What was Venetian attitude towards the two Empires during the war? In 1604 they capitalized on Ottoman political weakness by extricating themselves from their duties, which had been carried out under threat.

One can observe the attitude of Venice towards the Uskoks on the level of political decision-making. Venice was moving away from using the Uskoks as irregular troops against the Ottomans in conflicts which still recognized the unity of the Christian league. This evolved towards the establishment of a juridical basis for relationships with the Ottomans. »This reveals the development away from a foreign

<sup>12</sup> Cf.,p.4.

policy based on religion and toward a more secular way of establishing a foreign relationship. This did not, however, detract from the importance the Venetian population and its political agents placed on Christian belief<sup>13</sup>« (p.5)

The Habsburgs were at that moment involved in an open conflict with the Bohemian Estates and wanted at all costs to keep the frontier zone stable - if not totally peaceful, then at least in a neutral state. It was necessary for them to keep the risk of a new conflict with the Ottomans as low as possible. Venice and Habsburgs now followed convergent political aims in the Adriatic region, which resulted in the Uskoks' expulsion from Senj.

The peace treaty of 1617, prescribed that the Uskok pirates of Senj should be relocated from their abode.

A European or international system of powers was in a nascent state in 1600; its participants were still involved in the process of state-building. Growing tensions between the different Christian confessions complicated the state-building process during this period, finally leading to the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618.

### **3. CORSAIRS, REFUGEES AND THE EARLY MODERN EMPIRES: THE 'MICRO SITUATIONS'**

It is the time to compare the 'Micro situations' within the development of Early Modern Empires.

#### **»Official and unofficial«**

The Q/A of the latter part of the discussion (above-mentioned symposium) was as follows:

A (Venetian historian) There was Zrinski, who developed piracy and maritime trade. How about his goods/products? If a product becomes formal as soon as they fall into the hands of a merchant, then where is the dividing line between the formal and informal?

B (Croatian historian) The issue of formal-informal (official and unofficial) procedures was, above all, only a question of power and control in the political area. The nobility could afford to be informal (unofficial) when no restrictions or penalties were being imposed on them by the authorities (authority, states or rulers)<sup>14</sup>

Strengthening the formal reach of governments of the 16th century reduced the possibility for informal reactions in the sphere altogether. While Zrinski, for example, initially could play a major role in both formal and informal sphere, towards the end of the 16th century they were starting to feel the pressure and their room for maneuver had been reduced. There were also the original self-organized, more powerful groups, who were now more and more prevented from using the unstable situation on the border to their advantage due to the improved tools and reach of governments.

#### **»The Corsairs recognized by state«**

There were also Corsairs, who were engaged in plunder, but they were recognized by state authorities. The Corsairs were active during a period that partly overlapped with the Uskoks<sup>15</sup>. Actually, in certain periods and situations Uskoks could also be labeled as corsairs of the sort, since they were recognized by state authorities as regular border-guards. However, most Uskoks were, at best, only semi-official border-guards, and were often unpaid, and thus poor people.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p.5.

<sup>14</sup> Cf.: Isao Koshimura ed., Ibid, pp. 103-104. Here Venetian historian is Miki Iida (Senshu University), Croatian historian is Nataša Štefanec.

<sup>15</sup> Cf.: C.R.Pennell ed., Ibid, p. 125.



It is the Sovereign Military Order of Malta that represents the corsairs well. The Order performed piracy Jews and others, and Malta became the center of a Muslim and others. This contributed to the great accumulation of capital for the Maltese order, which is in contrast to the Uskok piracy.

## THE RELIGIOUS WAR

Religious wars in the early modern transition period could be fought as informal wars, and very often, as diplomatic wars.

The Dalmatian population under the Venetian rule, especially during and after the siege of Klis in 1596, identified more and more with the Habsburgs, because it lacked, like the Uskoks, any understanding of why Venice did not openly support Habsburg, and Christian. military aims. The local clergy planned uprisings against the Ottomans and played a large role in inciting the population against the Muslims rule.

The refugees from the Ottoman Empire, who will appear in the following chapter, fought the formal war for the Habsburg Empire. Mainly Orthodox population settling to the Habsburg area from the last decades of the 16th century, often fought a less formal religious war against the Catholic church. This case-study could be well compared with the micro-situation of the Wako and the Sea Ban of the Ming Dynasty.

Concerning the China, the 14th century was a time of chaos throughout East Asia. The epidemics raged in the first half of the century. Existing revolts over the government salt monopoly and severe floods along the Yellow River provoked the Red Turban Rebellion. The declaration of the Ming in 1368 did not end its wars with the Mongol remnants in the north and in the south.

The initial wave of Wakos, Japanese pirates had been independently dealt with by Jeong Mong-yu (1338 – 1392) and Imagawa Sadayo (1326 – 1420), who returned their booty and slaves to Korea. Yet the raids on China continued. However, by the 16th century, the »Japanese« pirates were mostly non-Japanese.

Nonetheless, because the Sea Ban was applied by the Hongwu Emperor in 1371, it continued to be broadly enforced by the rest of the Ming dynasty. In the meantime, the private trade was prohibited while the dynasty performed the official trade.

For the next two centuries, the rich farmland of the south and the military clash zone of the north were linked almost solely by the Jinghang Canal(Beijing - Hangzhou). Bribery and disinterest occasionally made much room into the society, as when the Portuguese began trading at Guangzhou (1517), »Ningbo«, and »Quanzhou«, but crackdowns also carried out, as with the expulsion of the Portuguese in the 1520s, on the islands off »Ningbo«, and »Quanzhou« in 1547. The Portuguese were permitted to settle at Macao in 1557, but only after several years of helping the Chinese suppress piracy<sup>16</sup>. Although the policy has generally been ascribed to national defense against the pirates, other explanations have been rather counterproductive.



Fig 4. Map of China

Source. 上田信、『中国の歴史 海と帝国—明清時代』、講談社、2005年、156ページ (Makoto Ueda, »The Chinese History: Sea and Empire - China of the Ming and the Qing dynasty«, Tokyo, 2005, p.156)

<sup>16</sup> About the sharp increase of Wako who attacked the Chinese coast see Isao Koshimura ed., Ibid, pp. 65-71.

## CHAPTER 2. THE REFUGEES' WAR AND ECONOMY - IN CONTRAST TO THE 'SECOND SERFDOM'

It is assumed that marginal figures with a unique position and identity played an important role in this war economy.

The people who fled from the Ottoman rule were admitted into the military border system of the Habsburg Empire. Those who became soldiers partook in a specific landholding system that could be best described through the concept of the free farmer and soldier (Karl Kaser). On the other hand, the so-called 'second serfdom' or stricter serfdom spread through other areas of Central-Eastern Europe, partly as an unavoidable measure of the Habsburg Empire to continue the anti-Ottoman war.

Most of the Uskoks were people who at one time or the other fled from the Ottoman rule. Therefore, I will trace who were the people who joined Uskoks through time<sup>17</sup>.

### I. From the Habsburg territory until 1551

The number of paid soldiers in Senj increased rapidly since Venice prohibited the inflow of soldiers from the Ottoman territory in the 1540s.

The Habsburg Empire concluded a peace from 1547, but still, new soldiers flowed into Senj. A salary pay list of 1551 showed the inflow of soldiers in large numbers to Senj. Most of these soldiers were eventually from the Habsburg territory, according to Catherine Wendy Bracewell who detected those families from a list according to their names and place of origin.

### II. From various countries in the 1550s and 1560s

From the end of the 1550s to the 1560s, the number of Ottoman subjects and Venetian citizens in Senj's army began to increase. Persons arriving in this period were sometimes criminals and wanderers.

In the 1570s, the Ottoman raiding from the Kupa valley to the Una valley continued. The situation on the border was rather unsettled. The name of Senj as a town of the plunderers became widely known. The »recruits« in Senj were, according to the Venetian documents, not only from the Habsburg territory but from the Italian lands too. Actually, »not only subjects of the Turks who have escaped from their places and have gone to live there are given refuge under the name of Uskoks, but also many who have been banished from Ancona, Urbino, and Apulia, and also exiles from all the islands and nearby towns of your Serenity (Venice), and deserters from the galleys, who act as guides and leaders for their wicked man<sup>18</sup>«.

### III. Influx from Ottoman Empire increased since the 1570s

The emigration to Senj continued in both the 1570s and the 1580s. The main home country of the recruits began to change over these years. The Ottoman raiding to Croatia continued, but the number of recruits coming over from the Habsburg territory largely decreased. Military Border was about to be established in 1578 (as mentioned above), a commanding hierarchy was set, the fortress network was renewed and maintained. Habsburgs attracted »recruits« from its inner area, but they were also counting on the steady inflow of Christian (Orthodox) people from the Ottoman area, especially in continental parts. People who drifted from the Ottoman territory reached the hinterland of some important port towns too.

These coastal territories and the area of hinterland were damaged in Ottoman-Venetian clashes that lasted from 1570 to 1573. Many Ottoman subjects who became Venetian soldiers were unable to go back to their original life and, therefore, arrived at Senj. In addition, many people joined the army which

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Catherine Wendy Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj: Piracy, Banditry, and Holy War in the Sixteenth-Century Adriatic*, Cornell University Press, 1992, pp. 51-88.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, 59.

attempted to recapture the Klis fortress in the 1580s. After the failure, they came over to Senj. Around 1588, about 90% of Uskoks of Senj was to be said to be from the Ottoman territory.

In the Ottoman periphery, the inhabitants were prone to resistance when imposed a sudden tax increase or new burdens, among other things. The proclamation that the judge of the town called Gabela (along with the Neretva River) gave in 1590, could well exemplify the dispute.

Those among Christians who converted to Islam obtained some special privileges reserved for Muslims. Some Ottoman soldiers (though Christian) could also obtain some privileges in return for military service. Others might decide to confront Ottoman's rule if given opportunity. Many Vlachs were among those who decided to confront the Ottoman authorities. A good example is the case of a big group called Krmpote Vlachs. They were awarded some privileges, having served in a garrison of Lika Sanzak Bey. Those privileges were infringed upon by the Ottomans and individuals among Krmpote Vlachs reacted by emigrating to Senj, for several years. Afterward, they escaped from Obrovac, the Ottoman territory, to the hinterland of Vinodol, which was a Habsburg territory. This was already a group migration, at the beginning of the 1600s. The process started due to the dissatisfaction with the Ottoman treatment, primarily due to the reduction of social and economic privileges awarded to them in return for their service in the military system of the Ottoman Empire.

### »Vlachs – main characteristics«

Vlachs cultural model consisted of several important traits: the priority of paternal line blood relatives, the father's side residence, the ancestors worship, the priority of the group to an individual and the bride buying. The position of Vlachs near, or along, the Ottoman border changed following three phases<sup>19</sup>.

The first phase of the early 16th century overlapped with the first wave of the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans (from the mid-15th century). In that period, Vlachs were in the position of soldiers. The second phase lasted from the first half of the 16th century until about 1620 when Vlachs' position became closer to the position of Raya (common people). At this time, a military role of Vlachs included various duties such as cargo work, restoration of the fortress and the food transportation, similar to the compulsory labor of the serf. Their name changed several times, too. Firstly considered as herders, after the mid-16th century they were perceived in Ottoman sources as people running »a Balkan family pattern«<sup>20</sup>. Soon it came to the point that people who respected »a family pattern of Balkan« and people who did not belong to this pattern were also called Vlachs. In the third phase, from c. 1620s, the distinction of Vlach and Raya began to dissipate. In about 1620, Muslims exclusively were enrolled as regular soldiers (paid salaries), while Vlachs were demilitarized. The distinction with Raya finally disappeared in the 18th century.

In the 1580s, the negotiations began to move large Vlach groups systematically into the border of the Habsburg side from the Ottoman Empire domain. It was followed by escalating collisions on both the Croatian and Slavonian borders. A muster roll from 1577 and the related military documents of this time confirm that even prior to the 1580s one could encounter Vlach names and surnames in the pool of autochthonous names in the Croatian and Slavonian area, although the very term Vlach was not used. Some of them were even commanders of paid Habsburg cavalry and infantry units. The number of those names in military population strongly increased towards the 1590s and in the early 17th century. From the 1590s the new settlers directly called Vlachs in sources, started to arrive at the Habsburg side of the border with families, in dozens and hundreds.

These families settled down orderly by 1630. And this process was concluded when »Vlach's Statutes« of 1630 guaranteed royal privileges to all Vlachs. As K. Kaser pointed out, it was thought that

<sup>19</sup> Nenad Moačanin, *Introductory Essay on an Understanding of the Triple-Frontier Area: Preliminary Turkologic Research*, in Drago Roksandić ed., *Microhistory of the Triplex Confinium*, Budapest, 1998, pp. 133-135.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127. Moačanin detailed the elements of the family pattern as follows: principles of patrilineage, patrilocality, ancestor worship, priority of the group over the individual, bride purchasing, blood vengeance, and an inclination towards a perpetual creation, multiplication, or dispersion of groups connected by a common origin, real, or perceived.

in the Varaždin Generalcy 6000-7000 Vlachs were mobilized as soldiers in emergency<sup>21</sup>. In 1630, Vlachs were given some lands to settle, legal autonomy (criminal, civil affair) and local jurisdiction and were thus recognized as special strata in the Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom.

It seems that the merchants in China achieved a similar function to Wakos as the Vlachs to Uskoks. This is because the leaders of the Wakos were created from the marine merchants' group.

### »War Economy - Plains, Hills, and the Sea«

The logic that the central government office of Vienna used for the estates of Croatia and Slavonia was two-folded. Two logics were used from the 16th century, but the policy was finally formulated in the middle of the 18th century. First, if a private noble fortress is transferred to the care of the Emperor, the fringe area around the fortress also should belong to him. Second, as far as the Croatian estates financially failed in the defense of their country, they lost the right to control the military border zone which was hitherto mostly financed and controlled by the Inner-Austrian Estates. By the 18th century, especially after the Great Turkish War (1683-1699), it was planned to detach the military border from the civil jurisdiction of the Croatian-Slavonian kingdom, in order to defend Croatian-Slavonian, and other Habsburg territories in the hinterland more effectively<sup>22</sup>.

By the end of the 16th century, the border area (the Military Border or Military frontier) has been formed with the military command located in Austrian Vienna and Graz. But, this domain was mainly depopulated and uninhabited. This was a big problem. Border fortresses could not function without people who will serve in them, or maintain them. Labour was needed and an organized supply network that was missing until the 1570s. The only improvement in supply and general organization could eventually eliminate the Ottoman threat. Because there was no surplus production in the area, the military units were not able to feed themselves with the food from the surrounding area. They had to buy the food in the Croatian inland. The maintenance cost of the military unit thereby rose.

In such a situation, the re-settlement by Uskoks (not of Senj) and Vlachs to the Croatian and Slavonia military border, that began in the early 16th century and increased towards the end of the 16th century, took on decisive importance.

So-called Vlachs had begun to cross the border from the Ottoman to the Habsburg side from the 1530s. In the 1590s, it followed their large-scale immigration from the Ottoman to the Slavonian and Croatian side. Supported by the ruler, they settled in the depopulated feudal tenure, which enraged local landlords. They also obtained many special privileges from the Monarch. They were also given autonomy, and exempted from all tributes and subordinated directly to the emperor. The feudal lord remained a landowner in legal terms, but he could not collect the profit from the occupied tenure, nor he had a possibility of the intervention.

It happened mainly along the Slavonian border. It turned it into a stable military province. The area that was unmanned and agriculturally completely neglected for half a century was now settled by Vlachs. In Croatia, depopulated areas were mostly occupied by the Ottoman Empire. The remainder was in a dangerous situation at the time of the influx of Vlachs (it begins in 1600<sup>23</sup>). That is why the incoming Vlachs had to live near Kupa river, in the depths from the border. Also, the feudal lords still kept the traditional positions in this specific area, so that the military commanders felt the need to negotiate with them (Zrinskis and Frankopans mainly) about the way of the settlement. As for the settlers, some special privileges were surely given to them, but more often than not they were forced to accept the rule of the feudal lord.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Karl Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik: Povojačenje agrarnog društva u Hrvatsko-slavonskoj Vojnoj krajini (1535-1881)*, Zagreb, 1997 (originally *Freier Bauer und Soldat: Die Militarisierung dser agrarischen Gesellschaft in der kroatisch-slavwonischen Militargrenze(1535-1881)*, Wien, 1997, Tom I str. 109.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, Tom I str. 50.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, Tom I str. 53.

In the next article, I actually intend to compare the processes in the Žumberak - Varaždin - Karlovac military region with the process of alleviation of the Chinese Sea Ban policy, in order to question the level of control that the empires assumed over specific social groups (from which some of the groups pirates were born).

Incidentally, A. Rieber examines in detail the different ways used by the Eurasian empires (including Habsburg, Russian, Ottoman, Iranian and Chinese) to defend their military frontiers and impose 'order in the borderlands'. Therefore, in my article of the next, I intend to take his argument into account also<sup>24</sup>.

### **I. Žumberak as a precedent—the first soldiers, peasants settled in the 1530s.**

It is the small Žumberak district on the Croatian northern boundary that was the oldest part of the Croatian-Slavonian Military Border. It was the starting point of the peasant-soldier system.

All participants agreed only on one point; that Uskoks (Vlachs was thus called at this time) should remain in the country. They had to serve as a living example of the new settlement pattern and give a good impression to the refugee who might come over in the future from the Ottoman side of the border. The manner of Uskoks was to obey the rule of the feudal lord only when a strict promise to exempt them from all tributes was accomplished for a certain period of time. It was a feudal demand commonly imposed during the settlement, or the re-settlement in Croatia. However, feudal lords were afraid of strains being born between the newcomers that got a special privilege and the native population that did not have a special privilege. The violence cases were taking place many times between Uskoks, older settlers and serfs. The Uskoks occasionally used force, stealing animals or robbing peasants, if they did not receive enough supplies. This was damaging to the serfs. In May 1533, Uskok families were given 31 shared land parcels. The first 68 families increased to 529 families in 1746<sup>25</sup>.

The farmland which already became insufficient in the 1550s and 1560s started to present a problem. Uskoks required the expansion of the district because their lands were too small, from the estates of Carniola in 1558, and from Archduke Charles in 1566.

What happened if the ratio of the family size and the land size became problematic and if one family could not live from its land?

Being able to own land without tributes, Uskoks assumed an obligation to participate in the war against the Ottomans as unpaid units. They had a duty not only to serve in the case of the Ottoman attack but also to carry out the works all over the border (monitoring of passages, roads and forests), bearing an expense by themselves for several days a year in a time of peace. In addition, they assumed an obligation to engage in the fortress building in the border for 1-2 months in a year. However, Uskoks were not in a condition to easily accomplish an unpaid war duty because of economic difficulties. While they were on military duty, they got some money but had to feed themselves.

The Žumberak district was a model for the nascent military border in two important instances. First, all the main elements which were important for the future peasant-soldier society could be found here, well before other border areas started to be settled. Second, Uskoks settled in the Žumberak district with special privileges were to be a precedent, not only to push forward the re-settlement of the depopulated border area, but also to promote the armament of the border, even outside of a few military bases<sup>26</sup>.

### **II. The Long War and the making of the Varaždin Generalcy**

As previous war had already caused an inflow of Uskoks to Žumberak, The Long War (1593-1606) became the opportunity for the so-called Vlachs. Approximately 10,000 crossed the border into the

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Alfred Rieber, *The Struggle for the Eurasian Borderlands: From the Rise of Early Modern Empires to the End of the First World War*, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 303-308, pp. 166-292.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Karl Kaser, *Ibid*, Tom I str. 58-60.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, Tom I str. 74.

Habsburg side (the Slavonian Border) from the Ottoman side. The overwhelming majority of the immigrants went over the border from 1597 through 1600. If the character of this movement is questioned, it was evident that most of Vlachs were invited by the military authorities but many came without the invitation or a firm solution of how and where to settle. Therefore it was impossible for them to prepare systematically and with premeditation. Such situation and the enormous number of settlers brought serious problems.

K. Kaser, based on sources, estimates that the Vlach settlers of Vlachs amounted to approximately 5,000. There were also many people from around Slatina and Pozega. Around 1,218 families have already settled in 1610. Since these families had approximately 8-9 people on the average, the total number of the settlers should be approximated to 10,000 people<sup>27</sup>.

At the stage when the resettlement began, it is not clear whether each family got the as much land as they could cultivate? They probably land in abundance, and there was no need to limit the land parcel to a constant scale. Such viewpoint agrees with the fact that the first regulation about the size of the land parcel was made only in the 18th century when population already considerably increased in the Varaždin Generalcy.

The future of border society consisting of peasant-soldiers could be imagined already in the settlement of Vlachs. The people who settled newly knew that there was enough land to live in the Varaždin generalcy. They were exempted from any tax or forced labor, and had to obey military duties instead. But it was unknown whose jurisdiction they entered. According to the »Statuta Valachorum«, an entire Vlach population that settled the area was subordinated to the Varaždin Generalcy. The district included all villages where Vlachs settled in, not taking into consideration the number of Vlachs among the local population. It runs into disapproval of local landlords because they lost lands and subjects alike. Serfs were more than eager to join the Vlach status. Vlach district embraced all villages where Vlachs were awarded lands.

The resettlement did not play an important role in the Karlovac Generalcy as in the Varaždin Generalcy. The examples that show the exclusion of the feudal lord in the re-settlement of Vlachs were extremely few. The process of the re-settlement advanced in a controlled and slow pace. Therefore a feudal lord was enabled to supervise the migration and maintain jurisdiction as well.

### III. The Karlovac Generalcy and feudal lords

The early resettlement in the Karlovac Generalcy, in comparison with the Varaždin Generalcy, was also supported, but the thickly populated villages with defensive duties alone were not established here according to the Slavonian pattern. When people settled, an almost consistent principle was followed. Vlachs and Bunjevac were not allowed to settle in the villages where native people lived in. Therefore, the most of the Vlachs' villages formed around those older conglomerations where native people lived in. Around Oglin, for example, Vlachs' villages such as Brlog, Vilic etc. were formed.

In the Varaždin Generalcy, all the villages where Vlachs settled down became the free border villages in concordance with the »Statuta Valachorum«. The village where only native people lived in were considered civil territory, and the inhabitants maintained their status of serfs. On the other hand, this principle was not applied to the Karlovac Generalcy. A village inhabited by Vlachs was not automatically as Vlach village, while the village inhabited by the native people was able to become the free border village.

Therefore, villages around Brinje and Otočac became free border villages regardless of whether they were inhabited by Vlachs or native people. The inhabitants seemed to be free owners of the land, but no special privileges or documents related to their status are known. The Aulic War Council of Vienna gave a warning that peasants-soldiers of Karlovac border were only usufructuaries of the land, but they treated the land as their possession and transferred it freely<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ibid, Tom I str. 89-90.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Ibid, Tom I str. 135-136.

Vlachs of Gomirje were, based on the agreement with Count Juraj Frankopan, prompted to temporarily settle his feudal tenure Bosiljevo. Similarly, Frankopan agreed that they were exempted from the tax for several years. Due to some circumstances, the settlement was not realized and Vlachs remained in Gomirje which generated further problems. Vlachs were promised to be handled as free peasant-soldiers but they lived in the feudal tenure of Frankopan family who did not intend to exempt them from taxes forever. As for the Vlachs, they would rather return to the Ottoman Empire than become the serfs of the Frankopan family. During the debate, they were incorporated in a border system. Some 60 Vlachs were employed as paid soldiers, and two Vojvodas were their commanders<sup>29</sup>.

Based on the agreement of 1632, in 1657, a contract was concluded for the first time, introducing important changes. Vlachs were given the land for »the free use« not in possession. A member of the Frankopan family remained the owner of the land. Vlachs have only leased the land for a rent, basically as peasants. They could use the land and benefit from it. They could solve their internal problems without the intervention of Frankopans. They could also leave the land. Because they paid large amounts of land rent by themselves, the military authority was not able to let other immigrants settle in those parts without the consent of Vlachs. Their control of the land contained some elements of possession. Some peasant-soldiers' villages stood out, among others, by not obeying the jurisdiction of the feudal lord. But others were under the jurisdiction of the feudal lord.

In Karlovac, there was no unique social and legal framework which would embrace the entire new population of the district as in the Generalcy of Varaždin<sup>30</sup>.

### CHAPTER 3. USKOKS' WAR ECONOMY ~ ECONOMICS OF INFORMAL WAR

The war economy was related to the border areas that were exposed to long-term wars among big powers. It allowed people to perform various economic activities, including unofficial and illegitimate ones such as plunder and smuggling. First, I intended to compare the economic systems of the Uskoks with the economy of the peasant/soldier of the Croatia military border. Uskoks were also involved in piracy. During their raids on land, Uskoks took a lot of cattle. Ransom agreements were another, less formal, an element of Uskoks' War Economy. Uskoks demanded inland villages to pay tributes to them to spare them from plunder. Demanding tributes may be the most informal economic activity, but it is the most characteristic economic activity of the Uskoks.

#### »No land, little salary«

The activities of the Uskoks began in earnest greets after the fall of Klis fortress (1537) and their golden age lasted until the 1590s. The Uskok of Senj did not have a magnate protecting them like the smaller groups of the Uskoks of Bakar<sup>31</sup>. (Question is why to Senj?)

Usually, the settlers to the Military Border were given abandoned lands and were exempted from taxes on livestock and crops. Some of them managed to enroll into the army and received a wage. During wartime, they were not able to work effectively in their lands so they started to plunder. Sometimes, they continued even when raids were prohibited, which earned them a bad reputation.

As for the Uskoks that settled down around several small fortresses (Brinje, Otočac, etc.) in the hinterland of the Senj captaincy, they had good conditions for the agriculture and the livestock farming. Such Uskoks joined the actions of Senj Uskoks only during the largest expedition.

On the other hand, the Uskoks that settled down in Senj did not have sufficient land. Senj is located at the foot of the upper Velebit mountain range. The shore is sterile karst, and there is no fertile land in the neighborhood. Several vineyards under the city walls could not supply enough wine to several hundred

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, Tom I str. 138.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, Tom I str. 161.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Isao Koshimura ed., *Ibid*, pp. 23-25.

Uskoks in the town. The Uskoks owned some land, but the income from it was uncertain because the land was scarce. Grapes and wine were often forfeited by the Venetians.

The Aulic War Council was not able to give lands to the Uskoks of Senj so that it granted little bigger salaries to paid soldiers in Senj than in other areas of the border. In addition, Uskoks *Stipendiati* registered as paid soldiers did not appear on duty only during mobilization and war. They received a subsidy through the year. Also, military authorities used a part of the budget assigned to Uskoks to buy cereals for the whole garrison, instead of a direct payment of salaries. However, this system never functioned smoothly, because Uskoks rather received cash<sup>32</sup>.

The low-class soldiers in Senj, as well as the Border officers, were not satisfied by this haphazard financial dealings, but it did not improve over time. Numerous letters of complaint about a delay of salary and supplies were delivered from Senj to the Military Border administration or to the Archduke and the Emperor during the 16th century<sup>33</sup>.

One of the causes for the delay of Senj's salaries was difficulties in the collection of subsidies in Inner Austria. In 1522, Carinthian and Carniolan estates promised that they would regularly contribute to the maintenance of the Military Border and took responsibility to finance the Croatia Military Border in 1578. However, payments were irregular. In addition, only part of the money was paid in cash and some of it was never paid at all. The Inner-Austrian estates might postpone the payment even if they approved it. For example, they agreed to pay the soldiers of Senj in 1610, but the actual payment was carried out the next year<sup>34</sup>.

As time passed, Uskoks were able to buy less and less provisions, even if a salary appeared in full. Most of their wages remained the same, whereas prices rose throughout the 16th century like mentioned above (cf. page). According to the salary account book of 1551, the salary of the Uskoks was from 3 to 5 Florins, growing by a rank. These salaries did not rise until 1579, and in this year the mean monthly amount of the standard Uskok salary was 4 Florins. A salary of Uskoks in the border fortresses of the Senj captaincy remained 4 Florins until 1601, whereas the Uskok salary in the Senj city rose to 6 Florins from 5. Besides, towards the end of the century, it is thought that the actual economic potential of the Uskok salary was reduced by inflation<sup>35</sup>. Regarding the circumstances, it remains to be seen, what kind of attitude did the Military border authorities have towards the Uskok plundering? It is likely that they tacitly tolerated to their practices as an act of economic self-preservation.

In the first place, the Habsburg authorities did not have enough financial power to continually support border soldiers in promised quantities and the Uskok booty was considered part of the salary of border soldiers and officers, thus contributing to the financing of the military border. Furthermore, the Uskok booty, particularly some high-quality articles, were offered to the upper echelon of the border authorities. The control over Uskoks was strengthened when plunder became the serious diplomatic issue with the Ottomans and Venetians<sup>36</sup>. There followed a severe control reinforcement at the turn of the 17th century. For the Uskoks, the plunder remained the only the way of self-support. However, Uskoks could not accumulate such riches as the Knights of Malta. One of the reasons was the trade in captives.

### »Fighting at sea?«

The Uskoks of Senj raided mainly three areas. First, the Ottoman district of Lika and the east side of the Velebit mountain range. Second, the hinterland of Herzegovina on the border with Dubrovnik. Third, the Adriatic Sea area<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Catherine Wendy Bracewell, *Ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-97.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 107.



Lika was the place that early Uskoks attacked many times because it could be easily reached from Senj. However, the goods were scarce, because both the Ottoman soldiers and Uskoks raided the area often. In the 1580s people settled down in Lika and defense was strengthened. Uskoks started to make expeditions to more distant lands.

To the south, they advanced to Bosnia and the inland of Herzegovina, often departing from the coast of Venice and Dubrovnik. It also increased their sea plunder. However, they did not capture the ships themselves, like North-African and Maltese Corsairs did. They repacked the prize in their small ships. They were able to quickly strike the village on the coast and to make a surprise attack on the bigger ships which had taken down an anchor. Small ships ran around between islands hastily. Uskoks were able to abandon these ships when they encountered an unexpected chase. The Uskoks were not the pirates who ran the ocean.

### »Capture of cattle on land«

The main booty provided by the raids to Lika and the Ottoman hinterland were livestock such as sheep or goats. It was a way for the Uskoks to make up for the unreliable food supply from the Graz Military Council. Easter and Christmas, the two big religious festivals in spring and in winter (in times when provisions were short), were the opportunity when Uskoks raided semi-nomadic herders Vlachs (though, one must say that many of Uskoks were Vlachs). When Vlachs left a sheep or a goat out to pasture Uskoks caught them and slaughtered for the celebration. Livestock brought into Senj was usually quickly distributed and immediately used. A part of the meat might be saved for later consumption, but the salt to store a large quantity of meat was not readily available. Venice carefully managed the trade of the salt of the Adriatic basin, and the Provveditore Generale limited import of the salt from Istria to harm the Uskoks of Senj who attempted to preserve the meat over longer periods. In order to provide meat, Uskoks had to plunder more often.

The most of the livestock came from the Ottoman territory, but taking the booty from the Lika at the end of the 16th century became increasingly difficult. The problematic Uskoks began to fetch the food from the islands and the Venetian citizen of the coast. They often paid the price for livestock which they took away. However, there were times when they used the violence to satisfy their hunger. Venice collected the documents enumerating Uskok attacks in order to use them for diplomatic negotiations. According to one such document, in 1606 Uskok made 62 raids during February and April in northern Dalmatia. They carried away the livestock (from 1 to 60 pieces each time) totaling to 495 various types of cattle<sup>38</sup>.

It would be legitimate to ask why did Uskoks steal livestock rather than food like crops or flour? Unique border economy includes one of the answers. It continually shifted from livestock farming to agriculture. Otherwise, fertile farmland often transformed into the grazing land under the long-term wars followed by Ottoman raids.

In Zadar, for example, it was easier to bring up the livestock than to produce the crops when they faced an intense Ottoman invasion. At other places, inhabitants farming the livestock obtained abandoned the land and only slowly converted it into farmland. A sheep and goat herds were easy to move and were instantly consumed in times of needs. They were also available in border economy<sup>39</sup>.

### »Taking captives«

The second most important target of the Uskoks were captives. They were captured on land and during Uskok raids of the Ottoman ships. The system, or the set of rules, according to which a slave was released in exchange for ransom money, was in use between the Christian knights of Malta and the Muslim Barbary »kidnapper« in the Mediterranean Sea. In Malta, there were the agents who received

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, pp. 98-100.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, p.100.

ransom money, and taking captives was well organized. At first, the leaders of the Knights took 10% of the profit, while government officials who dealt with the accomplishment of the voyage took their share. A captain took 11% of the profit. One-third of the remainder (the above percentages exempted) would be the share of the crew. Finally, the people who financed the building of the ship and provisions would be paid too. Among these people, the bond holders were paid first. Each obtained the amount of money based on the agreement (next to the sum that each invested)<sup>40</sup>. Whether a voyage succeeded had a great influence on the whole of the island of Malta, where various social class lived. The remaining money was paid to investors (mainly an entrepreneur) in proportion to the amount of investment. Judging from the above, the capture and the trade in slaves was big business in Malta.

However, in Senj, ransom money was paid with the goods more frequently. The Uskoks accepted, in times when food was lacking, a more »realistic« solution in form of crops or meat, refusing to accept ransom money. In addition, during negotiations and the delivery of the ransom »money«, it might become the public issue that political centers and authorities participated in the enterprise because the supply of the food was important to the entire town of Senj. For example, in 1588, captain of Senj organized a marine expedition of Uskoks to catch large quantities of grain as ransom »money«<sup>41</sup>.

### »Did the Uskoks trade the captives as slaves?«

No! A slave was sold regularly and it occurred more frequently that the captive was held as a hostage in return for ransom money than sold as a slave. The demand for the Turkish slaves in Europe tended to decline from an end of the 15th century (naturally, the rowers on the galley ships were often convicts from various countries, acquired cheaply). Even if a rower was quickly needed, the price of the slave seemed to be considerably lower than the ransom money that Uskoks were provided from a hostage. The speculation has it, that the rower of the galley ship along the Croatian coast cost from 35 to 60 ducats in the 16th century. In contrast, the ransom money for a subject of Ottoman Empire was from 80 to 150 ducats. It was not rare that the rich Muslim or a particularly important person cost more than 200 ducats<sup>42</sup>.

Interestingly, women also made these deals in Senj. They would buy the right to claim the ransom money for some hostage and use it to pay the ransom money for a husband or a son arrested by Ottomans. That reminds us of the plan of one woman who bought a Turkish captive to repay her husband which ended in disappointment because captain Rabatta failed to bring this Turkish captive by negligence<sup>43</sup>.

### »Demanding tributes (*harač*)«

The Uskoks took the tributes from the surrounding villages and they refrained from plundering them. Since about 1576, the Uskoks, instead of overlooking raids, collected tributes (usually called *harač*, a word for tax in the Ottoman Empire) from the villages in the Ottoman territory. The tribute system apparently began after an unofficial agreement of villages and the chief of the Uskoks. By around 1579, various attempts to make this agreement official were done<sup>44</sup>.

The Habsburg authorities were afraid of the people who paid the tribute and protected the Ottoman mercenaries and spies. The captain of Senj seemed to worry more about the Uskoks' daily bread if they could not raid the Ottoman inhabitants. The commander was ordered to use the tribute for military needs, not for personal purposes, but, actually, it rarely happened.

However, it is not exactly known how much of this income reached the Uskoks. While Uskoks and Ottoman villagers agreed about the tribute unofficially in the 1570s, the official officers on the border

<sup>40</sup> Cf. デイヴィッド・コーディングリ編、『図説 海賊大全』、東洋書林2000年 (Japanese translation of David Cordingly ed., *Pirates: Terror on the High Sea*, Atlanta, 1996.), 189ページ。

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Catherine Wendy Bracewell, *Ibid*, pp. 100-101.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, pp. 102-103.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, p. 103.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, p. 104.

received a part of the income. As the tribute payment was institutionalized, the military commanders strengthened the management of this money. The military administration attempted to secure this money for the military border, but they hardly handed any of it to the Uskoks. The tribute payment came to be considered as »the prerequisite« of the captain of Senj and Border general until the beginning of the 1600s.

After having concluded peace with the Ottomans in 1606, the Uskoks were forbidden to raid Ottoman villagers. They required the tribute money to be paid to them, not to the senior officer of the military border, insisting that the Ottoman villagers paid the tributes because they were afraid of Uskoks' bravery. The emperor Rudolf II even punished the Border general that had taken the tribute and confirmed that the Senj crew has every right to collect the tribute<sup>45</sup>.

The Aulic War Council of Graz did not seem to be pleased with this decision because the general would lose a considerable income. In any case, the Uskoks seemed to continue collecting the tribute from the Ottoman villages and sometimes raided those villages that delayed the payment.

## EPILOGUE

Among the Uskoks' economic activities, the capture of cattle on the land was an activity peculiar to Vlachs. Demanding of tributes (*harač*) and trading the captives as slaves were activities peculiar to the war economy that was particularly important in unofficial religious warfare.

Uskoks' economic activities did not contribute to the economic development of early modern states. Those were activities that prevented the starvation of refugees.

From the end of the 16th to the beginning of the 17th century, Uskoks are entrenched in the memory of Croatian people as crusaders against the Muslim threat and defenders of Christianity, that were doomed to decline due to new political circumstances and processes.

As for the Wako, first I want to think about why the time-lag of about 30 years occurred between the peak of the Wako activity (around 1560) and the peak of Uskok activity (the 1590s), while comparing the situation of the Ming Empire with that of the Habsburg Empire in the second half of the 16th century. Then, I will analyze the control that the Empires assumed over its inhabitants (merchants and refugees in particular) as well as the Sea Ban policy and the Military Border policy. Finally, I want to discuss the activities of the Wako.

One has to have in mind that there is a great difference in the evaluation of the Wako in Japan and in China. Wako in China is perceived as a base criminal. It could also be viewed as an invader. Some historians think that Wakos are free marginal persons stepping over the border zone between Japan and China. These historians interpreted it as follows: Japan and China, Japan and the Korean official cross-national relations declined in the first quarter of the 16th century. However, from then to the mid-17th century, private interchange became popular, and its leading figure was late Wako. Historian Yasunori Arano, above all, called such situation the »Wako situation«<sup>46</sup>. (Can we compare the »Wako situation« with the Uskoks' situation in the 1570s when the »recruits« in Senj were, not only from the Habsburg territory but from the Italian lands too?)

In Japan, the analysis of the visual document such as the Wako paintings came to reveal that most of the people who said to be Japanese pirates were actually of Chinese origin, and the Chinese art historians started to recognize these findings<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. 村井章介、『中世倭人伝』、岩波新書、1993年、198～211ページ(Shosuke Murai, »Medieval Wajin-Den«, Tokyo, 1993, pp. 198-211).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. 須田牧子、「『倭寇図巻』再考」/ 朱敏、「『明人抗倭図巻』を解読する—「倭寇図巻」との関連をかねて—」/ 陳履生、「功績の記録と事実の記録：明人『抗倭図巻』研究」、『東京大学史料編纂所研究紀要』、第22号、2012年 (Makiko Suda, Reconsideration of »The Volume Chart of Japanese pirates« / Zhu Min, Decrypting »The Volume Chart of the Ming Force against Japanese pirates« – comparing with »The Volume Chart of Japanese pirates« / Chen Lvsheng, The record of the Achievement and the Record of the Fact - Study of »The Volume Chart of the Ming force fighting against Japanese pirates«,

In terms of the Wako, the suggestion that the Chinese inhabitants of the coastal regions of Fujian joined the Wako in the resistance to the rule of the Ming dynasty has been proposed. Seiji Katayama considered the Wako revolt of the Jiajing period (1521-66) as people's »revolt led by the small and medium size groups who are going to let the government of the Ming dynasty accept the private trade when a citizen of coastal poverty supported such a revolt<sup>48</sup>«. Thus, to re-examine the Japanese latest studies, one should also take into consideration some relatively old studies. Above all, I want to analyze those problems by examining the Asian, European and United States' studies on Wako. For example, James K. Chin in London observes that »whenever there was a famine, a huge number of fishermen and farmers would join pirate groups and take to maritime plundering, and piracy can thus be understood as an alternative strategy for survival when agriculture failed<sup>49</sup>« – quite similar to Uskok routines described above.

## SUMMARY

The intention of the author is to make two articles, which could serve as a departure point for a comparative analysis of Uskoks and Wako piracy. In this, first, article, the author intends to discuss the case of Uskoks. He will address selected processes and phenomena from the history of Uskoks that can later be used as analytical units in the comparison of Uskoks and Wako.

First, the author will question the relation of the Habsburg Empire with the neighboring powers as a basis for the comparison of the foreign policy of the Ming Empire. These two empires reached a major turning point and had the problem of the pirates in each in the latter half of the 16th century. Second, he will address the people called Vlachs. These were semi-nomadic cattle breeders who lived across the Balkans, who served in various imperial military units, and who made a large part of the Uskok population. The religious affiliation and ethnic background of Uskoks were rather complex, as well as in the case of East Asian pirates. Third, the author will discuss the policy of the Habsburg Empire towards the Vlachs, in order to compare the Habsburg policy with the Sea Ban policy of the Ming Empire applied to the Chinese marine commerce. Finally, based on reading and research, he decided to typify the activity of the Uskoks as the 'war economy' in order to later make a distinction with the case of Wako.

Concerning the term 'war economy', this paper focuses on economic contingencies and activities in the state of war during the early modern transition period.

---

Review of the Tokyo University Historiographical Institute, No. 22, 2012).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. 片山誠二郎、「嘉靖海寇の一考察」、山崎宏編『東洋史学論集』4所収、不昧堂書店 (Seiji Katayama, A Consideration of the Piracy of Jiajing Period in Hiroshi Yamazaki ed., Essays of Orient Historical Study Vol. 4, Tokyo, 1965)

<sup>49</sup> Cf. James K. Chin, »A Hokkien Maritime Empire in the East and South China Seas, 1620-83« in Stefan Eklof Amirell (ed.), Persistent Piracy: Maritime Violence and State-Formation in Global Historical Perspective, London, 2014.

*Ekonomska i ekohistorija*  
*Economic- and Ecohistory*

Časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša

Journal for Economic History and Environmental History

---

Teme broja / Topics

**Iz povijesti ekoliša Istre**  
*From environmental history of Istria*

**Iz gospodarske povijesti Hrvatske**  
*From economic history of Croatia*

Volumen XII / Broj 12  
Zagreb - Samobor 2016  
ISSN 1845-5867  
UDK 33 + 9 + 504.3

**Nakladnici / Publishers:**

Društvo za hrvatsku ekonomsku povijest i ekohistoriju  
*Society for Croatian Economic History and Environmental History*  
Ivana Lučića 3, HR - 10000 Zagreb  
tel.: +385/1/4092-148, fax: +385/1/4092-879  
sites.google.com/site/ekoekohist/

Izdavačka kuća Meridijani  
p.p. 132, 10430 Samobor  
tel.: 01/33-62-367, faks: 01/33-60-321  
e-mail: meridijani@meridijani.com  
www.meridijani.com

**Glavni i odgovorni urednik / Editor-in-chief:**

Hrvoje Petrić  
Paul Hirt (guest editor)

**Uredništvo / Editorial Staff:**

Dragutin Feletar, Željko Holjevac, Mira Kolar-Dimitrijević, Dubravka Mlinarić, Nenad Moačanin,  
Hrvoje Petrić, Drago Roksandić, Mirela Slukan Altić, Ivica Šute

**Međunarodno uredničko vijeće / International Editorial Board:**

Drago Roksandić - president/predsjednik (Zagreb), Daniel Barić (Le Havre-Pariz, Francuska), Slaven Bertoša (Pula), Zrinka Blažević (Zagreb), Tatjana Buklijaš (Auckland, New Zealand), Goran Đurđević (Požega), Josip Faričić (Zadar), Borna Fürst Bjeliš (Zagreb), Boris Golec (Ljubljana, Slovenija), Hrvoje Gračanin (Zagreb), Paul Hirt (Tempe, SAD), Andrej Hozjan (Maribor, Slovenija), Halil Inalcik (Ankara, Turska), Egidio Ivetic (Padova, Italija), Silvije Jerčinović (Križevci), Karl Kaser (Graz, Austrija), Isao Koshimura (Tokio, Japan), Marino Manin (Zagreb), Christof Mauch (München, Njemačka), Kristina Milković (Zagreb), Ivan Mirnik (Zagreb), Mirjana Morosini Dominick (Washington D.C., SAD), Géza Pálffy (Budimpešta, Mađarska), Daniel Patafta (Zagreb), Hrvoje Petrić (Zagreb), Lajos Rácz (Szeged, Mađarska), Gordan Ravančić (Zagreb), Marko Šarić (Zagreb), Mladen Tomorad (Zagreb), Jaroslav Vencalek (Ostrava, Češka), Milan Vrbanus (Slavonski Brod, Zagreb), Frank Zelko (Burlington, VT, SAD), Zlata Živaković Kerže (Osijek), Ivana Žebec Šilj (Zagreb)

**UDK oznake članaka / Article's UDC markups:**

Ivica Zvonar

**Prijelom / Layout:**

Saša Bogadi

**Za nakladnike / Journal directors:**

Petra Somek, Hrvoje Petrić

ISSN 1849-0190 (Online)

ISSN 1845-5867 (Tisak)

**Tisak / Print by:**

Bogadigrafika, Koprivnica 2016 .

**Adresa uredništva / Mailing addresses:**

Hrvoje Petrić (editor/urednik)  
Odsjek za povijest, Filozofski fakultet  
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb  
e-mail: hrvoje.petric@ffzg.hr  
ili Vinka Vošickog 5, HR-48000 Koprivnica

**Tiskano uz potporu Ministarstva znanosti, obrazovanja i športa RH i Koprivničko-križevačke županije**

*Print supported by Ministry of science, education and sport of Republic of Croatia and Koprivnica-Križevci county /*

**Na naslovnici / Cover:**

Put Istarskog razvoda (foto: Slaven Bertoša)

Ekonomsku i ekohistoriju referiraju:

CAB Abstracts

HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS, ABC CLIO Library, Santa Barbara, California, USA

AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE, Washington, USA

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC LITERATURE (JEL), Pittsburgh, USA

CENTRAL AND EASTERN ONLINE LIBRARY, Frankfurt am Main, Deutschland

ECONLIT - AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION, Nashville, USA