

## Summary

### **Austria-Hungary's Ultimatum of 23 July 1914 Reconsidered: The Background of Vienna's Decision-Making in the Memorandum of Friedrich von Wiesner**

MURAKAMI Ryo

The immediate cause of the First World War was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo on 28 June 1914. Gavrilo Princip, who killed Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie, was a Serbian nationalist and a member of the Black Hand Society. The Austrian government thought that Serbia was behind the affair. In its response, Vienna sought to settle its decade-long dispute with Serbia. On 23 July 1914, the Austrian government gave an ultimatum to the Serbian government. Many researchers argue that Austria deliberately made demands that it knew Serbia could not accept. Furthermore, it is often indicated that Vienna's ultimatum was not aimed at the Black Hand Society, but at the National Defense (in Serbian, Narodna Odbrana).

Many researchers have carried out research into the diplomatic crisis (the so-called July Crisis) between the assassination at Sarajevo and the British declaration of war against Germany. Although Vienna's declaration of war caused a chain reaction in Europe, historiographic studies still do not pay sufficient attention to either the process that led to the ultimatum, or to the Austrian justification for war against Serbia. In this article, I point out the importance of Friedrich von Wiesner, adviser on international law at the Austrian foreign ministry, during the July Crisis in Vienna. He participated by drawing up the ultimatum and he wrote the document (a memorandum) detailing charges against Serbia. Consequently, this article focuses on Wiesner and his memorandum.

The first section deals with the road to war in Austria. Initially, Leopold Berchtold, the Common Foreign Minister of the Austrian Empire, was determined to commence military operations against Serbia. The discussion of the common cabinet on 7 July 1914 is crucial. At this conference, the Austrian leadership largely agreed to an invasion of Serbia. Only the Hungarian Prime Minister, István Tisza, warned of Russian intervention, which would lead to a European war. Tisza demanded that Austria should talk with Serbia about the assassination. Emperor Franz Joseph and Berchtold could not ignore his opposition. However, Tisza backed down and accepted a hardline policy until

14 July 1914. The text of the ultimatum was approved by the common cabinet on 19 July 1914. The main aim of Austria's demands was to prevent hostile Serbian actions against Austria and to declare Serbia a subordinate state to Austria.

In the second section, I describe the importance of Wiesner for the July Crisis, and the content of his memorandum. Wiesner wrote it for the purpose of justifying Austria's demands. His memorandum was based on a careful investigation in Sarajevo. In his telegram on 13 July 1914 he denied the direct participation of the Serbian government in Franz Ferdinand's assassination, but confirmed the provision of arms by the Serbian military and the participation of Serbian frontier guards in illegally smuggling the assassins into Austria. His observations were inserted into the final text of the Austrian ultimatum. After his return to Vienna he completed the final edition of his memorandum on 24 July 1914. The central elements of the memorandum were accusations against Serbia regarding its toleration of criminal machinations and the nationalistic propaganda of several associations directed against Austria, the participation of its officials and officers in subversive agitation, various plots of assassination against Austrian politicians, severe press comments on Austria, and Serbian involvement in the Sarajevo affair.

The third section focuses on the correctness of the memorandum and the Serbian reply to it. Wiesner's memorandum could not refer to the activities of the Black Hand. However, as he wrote later, we should keep in mind the very close relationship and cooperation between the Black Hand and the National Defense. Serbian Prime Minister Nikola Pašić noticed several signs of intrigue about Franz Ferdinand's assassination beforehand. However, he didn't take measures against it. On the contrary, Pašić insisted repeatedly on Serbian innocence in the Sarajevo affair. As far as the Serbian reply on 25 July 1914 to the Austrian ultimatum is concerned, it is usually regarded as almost entirely complying with Austrian demands, with the exception of some points regarding the violation of Serbian sovereignty. However, the Serbian reply contained several ambiguous expressions and false statements.

The content of my analysis may be summarized as follows: (1) Austria rejected diplomatic negotiation with Serbia after the Sarajevo assassination, so Austria should bear great responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War. (2) Wiesner played a vital role in Vienna during the July Crisis. Most of his memorandum were correct, but its delayed presentation to European governments completely diluted its significance. (3) Serbia's propaganda maneuvers and terrorism strongly influenced Austria's decision in July 1914.

---

## **Boundaries of, in, and around Early Madras: Focusing on “Christian Town” and “the Portuguese”**

WADA Ikuko

This paper examines the changing concept of the spatial and cultural/social boundaries in the historical context of early Madras (present-day Chennai) in South India. While Madras was known as one of the major port cities in South Asia under British colonial rule, it had been only a minor village when the English East India Company decided to settle there. The Company was required to set about establishing a town in addition to constructing a fort and factory in order to develop a city with the necessary facilities.

When focusing on the spatial structure of the new port city, we find boundaries both outside and inside of Madras. The outer limitation of the area granted to the Company by the local political authority was not so precisely defined, and the possibility was left open that the city could expand in due course. Within the city area, on the other hand, the two quarters were divided by walls which were completed in the early 1660s. The boundaries between the quarters were clearly visible thereafter. These inner spatial boundaries were closely related to the cultural/social boundaries among the groups of people as well. In this respect, “the Portuguese” —as they are called in contemporary sources— were the most controversial group of people in early Madras. Owing to insufficient numbers in the English population, the Company had to rely on “the Portuguese” to increase the number of inhabitants and secure indispensable personnel for the newly-built town and fort. The Company’s agents in early Madras invited “the Portuguese” from nearby environs and from San Thome, a port city to the south of Madras, in particular. In the latter half of the seventeenth century, the number of “Portuguese” living in the quarter surrounded by walls, which was called the “Christian Town” in those days, greatly increased. However, “the Portuguese” inhabitants, with their Catholic faith, were not regarded as easily acceptable in Madras under the English Company formed by anti-Catholic London merchants. Several disputes arose between those who insisted on the significant role of “the Portuguese” in this new port city, and those who were more cautious about their religious influence on Protestant Englishmen, and were strictly against their presence in “the Christian Town.” Here we can see different images held regarding “the Portuguese,” reflecting varied views on to what extent they were considered to be related to the Iberian Kingdom and/or Catholic Europe, though proponents of both views nonetheless considered “the Portuguese” as a

generic group of people.

At the end of the seventeenth century, however, a notion was introduced to divide “the Portuguese” into two different groups: one considered to be more “European” and another less. In addition, a new name, the “White Town,” started to be applied to the walled quarter in the early eighteenth century, instead of “the Christian Town,” which had been used previously. This implies that the concept of the quarter was changing. Around this time, intensifying hostility with the French East India Company promulgated a perception in the English Company that associated “the Portuguese” with the Catholic French. Such changing conceptualizations of “the Portuguese” and of the walled quarter in Madras were significant factors behind the resolution to expel Catholic inhabitants from the White Town in 1749. This case demonstrates that the conceptualization of boundaries around a group of people could be dynamic in fluctuating social contexts.

## **Politics of « *Borderlands* » in the European Union: Construction of a European Immigration Control Regime and Tunisian Refugees after the Arab Spring**

NAMBA Satoru

The power of the nation-state is said to be in retreat in the face of globalization in the contemporary world, particularly associated with the remarkable role played by transnational economic actors within a global market economy. However, this “retreat of the state” has not been observed in all of the state’s functions. In particular, the nation-state continues to maintain exclusive control over areas relating to immigration policy. In controlling borders and the movement of people, each state draws on a complex border control regime based on interstate agreements for the purposes of controlling the movement of people across borders.

The first half of this paper will examine the specific functions of the European border regime that was put into place, in cooperation with various authoritarian North African states, before the events of the “Arab Spring.” This border regime had two aspects: the power to “let die” and deportation through readmission agreements.

In spite of the increasing ambiguity of borders between states, the nation-state continues to maintain a monopoly over the process for determining legitimate means of movement. Almost

---

all states within “EUrope”, have abolished passport controls based on the Schengen agreement. However, this has not meant the abolishment of all border controls. The European Union and member states have constructed control systems against immigration flows with strict control over “illegal” immigration across the EU’s external borders. As a result, irregular migrants, including refugees, have resorted to increasingly risky routes of passage. In the EUropean borderlands, over 2000 people lost their lives trying to enter the EU’s territory in 2011. Along with stricter immigration control policies, border guard agencies have increased the risks for citizens involved in rescuing migrants. Border related deaths are thus not a “natural” consequence of risky forms of migration, but are the result of the state’s power to “let die.”

Despite the risks involved, many refugees and irregular immigrants arrive in EUrope by crossing the Mediterranean. Although claiming to provide protection for refugees, EUrope was deporting those deemed to be “illegal immigrants” based on readmission agreements between EUrope and North African countries with authoritarian governments. This meant that those who may have qualified as refugees were deported to countries where they may suffer persecution. In exchange for co-operation in dealing with “illegal” immigration, EUrope tacitly supported human rights abuses carried out by these regimes.

The second half of this paper will cover EUrope’s response to Tunisian refugees. After the “Arab Spring,” many Tunisians fled the country due to political unrest and EUrope was their main destination. However, leaders in EUrope viewed this mass flow of migrants as “economic” immigrants and moved to securitize this flow of refugees. Italy was a major destination for Tunisians, and the Italian government lacked the capacity to deal with them appropriately. Although Italy called for cooperation between EU member states in dealing with the influx of migrants, the EU authorities failed to show leadership in handling the situation. In the absence of a EUropean response, the Berlusconi government issued temporary residence permits to the migrants, granting the refugees visa-free travel to many EUropean countries. In a major incident, refugees with permission to travel headed to France and were blocked from entering the country. The French government stopped a train carrying refugees from crossing the Franco-Italian border, in violation of the Schengen agreement. The Berlusconi government was outraged by these actions taken by the Sarkozy government because it was interpreted as a denial of Italian sovereignty. The European Commission failed to provide a solution to this conflict between France and Italy, and the deal these countries reached set a precedent for the suspension of the Schengen in similar cases.

Finally, this paper will show how EUrope is strengthening systems for managing and controlling immigration in its borderlands.

# **The Evacuation Experience of an Okinawan in Colonial Taiwan Who Studied Abroad in the United States: ISHIMINE Chozo's Oral History**

SUGANO Atsushi

This paper is the oral history of Chozo Ishimine. It is one of a series of interviews which are the fruits of an oral history project that focuses on collecting the memories of Okinawan people who lived in Taiwan during the Japanese Colonial Era. The project's aim is not to record the political or economic successes of prominent individuals; rather, it emphasizes the personal lives and experiences of ordinary citizens of the time, which would not be recorded in an official history.

Chozo Ishimine, born in 1933 on Miyako Island, Okinawa, was a wartime evacuee to Taiwan for one year, during 1944–45, when he was at fifth grade in state school (*kokumin gakkō*). He was one of the 10,000 evacuees from Okinawa who were sent to Taiwan to escape from possible raids and attacks by U.S. military forces. After Japan's defeat in 1945, he was repatriated to Miyako Island and completed his secondary and higher education. Later on, he was selected as one of the students to study abroad in the U.S., receiving a scholarship from GARIOA, Government and Relief in Occupied Areas Fund. After completing his graduate studies at the University of Hawaii, he worked for the Ryukyu Development Loan Cooperation.

Although the total length of his stay in Taiwan was only a year, his first border crossing experience and his memories of cultural contacts with Taiwanese people appeared to have affected the subsequent course of his life. In his conclusion, the author underscores the importance of recording and sharing personal memories of encounters and interactions at a grass roots level, in order to prevent them from being left out of the official collective memory provided by national history. This series of oral history interviews was supported by a JSPS KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Number: 25257009).