

고대 그리스 역사의 소개

아테네의 민주주의

- ✓ **Instructor:** Prof. Donald Kagan
- ✓ **Institution:** Learners TV
- ✓ **Dictated:** 전유진, 홍현석, 박금란, 구민지, 천지은

🔊 [00:00]

Okay.

We are talking about the development of the Athenian Empire changing from the original character of the Delian league.

I think we've gotten to the battle of Eurymedon which is generally dated to 469 that great victory at land and sea over the Persians and feeling that it generated certainly in some portions of the empire that threat from Persia was over and that created the problem of keeping the allies satisfied and willing to make the kind of contribution that had been necessary.

The Athenian certainly had no plan of abandoning the league, abandoning the leadership of giving up their assaults of Persians and all of that... so that if there was a falling away the Athenian would be wanting to do something about that.

Still another turning point in the character of the league, a very important one I think occurred in the year 465 when the island of Thasos in the Northern Aegean Sea rebelled and this time, the quarrel was not about doing... the duty that the members of the league had to do.

It was not about something that was an issue not wanting to take the part of campaign.

It's not wanting to make payments nothing to like that.

There was a quarrel between the Athenians and the Thasians about some mines that were worked on the land opposite Thasos.

Gold and silver.

Very rich, precious metal sources for the ancient Greek world of which there were not many... located on mount. Pangam on the main land opposite Thasos.

Both states claimed those mines.



That was a quarrel.

It was really just about money.

That was also a trading post up there that both sides claimed to have.

The Athenians had established a colony at a place on the Strymon River up in that region called enne hodoi, the nine roads which will lay their... when the Athenians established it as the colony would be called Amphipolis.

All of that led to and the Thasians didn't like that.

The Athenians were moving into their sphere of influence and giving them trouble.

So Thasos, as a consequence of all of these quarrels rebelled, and it was a very difficult siege that the Athenians had to employ.

Thasos is relatively big island.

The Thasians were pretty tough group to put down and the siege actually the war between Athens and Thasos actually took something like two years which is quite long strategy for any Greek combat and certainly had not been typical of what the Athenian had been able to do against other rebellions.

🔊 **[03:20]**

When the Thasians finally force to surrender, the Athenians gave them to the usual treatment to rebellious states.

They made them take down their walls, to give up their ships and of course the Athenians took control of mines and placed an indemnity on the Thasians requiring that they should pay the costs of the war for Athens.

And imposed upon them there after the same kind of retribute that they imposed on what came more and more to be and we call subject states.

Well... that wasn't the first time such a thing had happened to one of the members of the league but what made it different was that the quarrel was not over anything that had to do with the league.

It could easily be seen and certainly was a way in which the Athenians used the forces and the funds of the league to achieve strictly Athenian advantages.

After all, there was no way that the league benefited from having either Athens or Thasos exploit those mines.

It was not an issue for the league it all and yet the Athenians had taken their position as leaders of the league to gain that advantage, and that's I think a very important turning point.




We should see that in the course of that siege of Thasos important events were happening back in the mainland at Greece which would change the nature of things too.

But if we just think about the league for a moment I think the Thasian rebellion is a critical moment.

And that is a good place for us to look at the evaluation that the ancient writers made of this transition.

Our two sources, our major source of course Thucydides and then also Diodorus of Sicily deriving his opinions from contemporary writers too come up with descriptions and explanations of why the league changed from what had been a free association of states pursuing a common goal to what was legitimately called an empire.

Here is what Diodorus says in general, Athenians were making great gains in power and no longer treated their allies with decency as they had done before.

 **[06:00]**

Instead they ruled with arrogance and violence.

For this reason most of their allies could not bear their harshness and spoke to one another of rebellion.

Some of them even disdained the league council and acted according to their own wishes.

So Diodorus depicts a combined situation of which there are thoughts of defection and actual defections from Athens and blames this on the behavior of the Athenians of a kind of a tyrannical sort.

Here's what Thucydides says now while there were other causes of revolts the principal ones were the failures in bringing in the tribute or their quota of ships and in some cases refusal of military service.

For the Athenians exacted the tribute strictly and gave offense by applying coercive measures to any who were accustomed or unwilling to bear the hardships of service.

In some other respects, too.

The Athenians were no longer equally agreeable as leaders.

They would not take part in expeditions on terms of equality, and they found it easy to reduce those who had revolted.

Now here's where Thucydides differs from Diodorus.



For all this the allies themselves were responsible for most of them on account of their aversion to military service in order to avoid being away from home got themselves rated in sums of money instead of ships which they should pay in as their proportion of contribution.

Consequently the fleet of the Athenians was increased by the funds which they contributed while they themselves whenever they revolted entered on the war without preparation and without experience.

So Thucydides certainly agrees with what Diodorus says about the high handed manner in which the Athenians had become accustomed to behave and the offense they gave to their allies.

But he points out that the allies had gotten themselves into that fix because many of them and this is an element Diodorus doesn't mention voluntarily said okay, we are not going to do this service anymore.

Instead of going supplying ships manning them doing the service ourselves.

We will pay the equivalent sum into the league treasury and when they did so the Athenians took that money and used it to pay for Athenian ships with the Athenian rowers.

So that as the league forces grew smaller the Athenian navy grew bigger.

🔊 **[09:02]**

So Thucydides says it's their own fault.

In some cases, it was not but certainly in many case it was.

I think we should not think of Diodorus and Thucydides as contradicting each other.

They really are complimentary.

They are both telling the same story but emphasizing a different perspective.

One looked at it from the Athenian point of view one from the allied point of view.

But they certainly are telling it as it was, and if we look ahead toward the end of the fifth century by the time we get to the Peloponnesian War.

All the hundred and fifty or more states that were members of the original Delian League only three still had a navy and real autonomy by the time the war broke out.

The three great islands of the coast of Asia Minor Lesbos, Chios and Samos were those states and sorry, I should have said two because by 440~439 Samos lost its independence.

So there were only two states in that category.

Looking ahead that's what will happen.

That's what will be the end of the Delian League.

It will be the Athenian empire in every respect.

Now, while this development was taking place we need to take a look at what was happening back in the Greek world on the mainland and chiefly I think we should focus on Athens at this time.

There was right after the Persian War as I said a few words about it before a rising competition for a place of standing in the Greek world.

That is to say before the Persian Wars were over, Sparta had been unquestionably the leader of the Greeks when challenged by an outside force.

After the war Themistocles you recall and obviously with the Athenians at his back asserted at the very least equality with the Spartans and certainly independence of any position following the Spartans or any grant of leadership to the Spartans.

As I think I mentioned last time, the next fifty years or so are the story of the competition between these two great powers within the Greek world for who would be the leader, and there would be many a clash in the course of that time.

In Athens the remarkable thing is if you look at the internal development of Athens I think you would have said in 479.

Themistocles is bound to rise to the top and become the dominant politician in Athens because of his extraordinary role in bringing victory to the Greeks.

🔊 [12:09]

But these things don't always happen that way.

I think of course about the Second World War, where one might have thought the same thing about Winston Churchill's future in English politics but no sooner was the war won, and I think Churchill would have had to gain and was given enormous credit for bringing about that victory.

There was an election almost immediately after the war, and Churchill was thrown out and replaced by his opponents which tells you about the first rule of democratic politics the first important question that has to be put to all politicians which is what have you done for me lately?

Well he had done quite a lot lately.

So there is another question that you have to put it.



What are going to do for me next?

I think that was really what was Churchill's problem.

That was not Themistocles problem.

Themistocles ran into trouble because he was a kind of a maverick in Athenian politics.

Anyway although on the least on one side of his family he was a nobleman like the typical Athenian leader.

He was not of the real sort of center of the aristocracy.

He was some kind of a less than extraordinary nobility in part of his family, and his personality amid his rivals found troubling because he was not averse to basking in the glory that he had won.


But think back in the eighties, in the years between Marathon and Salamis, on the one hand Themistocles had been able to convince the Athenians to do what they needed to do to survive to build that great fleet out of the silver mines that they had been lucky enough to have.

But also, he had managed if my reading of the facts is correct to get rid of everyone of his major political opponents by making use of the device of ostracism.

If you look t the eighties you will see that just about every important Athenian political figure is ostracized with the exception of Themistocles who was left in great shape while the other folks are gone and when the Persians come the ostracized men are recalled and play a role in the war and when the war is over.

It's obvious.

I think that they are both not happy with what Themistocles had achieved against them and also worried about their prospects for the future with Themistocles being a bigger hero than he ever was.

 **[15:07]**

So what I think we need to understand is in Athenian politics in the years after the Persian War.

We must understand that there is some kind of a coalition formal or otherwise in which all the great leaders of the Athenian political world combine to keep Themistocles down.

Amazingly enough when we take a look at the early actions of the Delian League and which in every case, you remember, the commander of every expedition is an



Athenian.

It's never Themistocles whom you would never imagined would have been leading all these expeditions.

He just didn't have the political clout to get the assignment.

The man who did was a relatively young man by the name of Cimon, a nobleman he was the son of Miltiades the great hero at Marathon, and he started out his political career with problems.

His father had been condemned just before his death he had also left a very great debt that Cimon had to repay but Cimon established himself as a great figure in the Persian Wars and very soon afterward we see him taking the lead in every campaign pretty much that the Delian League launches.

He is stunningly successful.

He's obviously a great commander on land and at sea.

He's in charge of the great victory at Eurymedon.

So as Athens goes from greatness to greatness, from success to success and glory to glory and from wealth to wealth, Cimon becomes this extraordinarily popular with the masses.

It's interesting because he was not the sort of a man who appealed to the lower classes.

He was a nobleman himself and he never backed off that and as we shall see in a moment his prejudices about foreign relations were not the popular ones.

He was a great supporter of Sparta, a great friend of Sparta, who regularly spoke about the virtues of Sparta and the Spartan system and how Athens could learn something from Sparta.

How such a man could have been elected general year after year by the masses of the Athenians is a question we need to approach.

But the virtues that he had were to some considerable degree personal, that is, not only was, I think first and foremost, was the enormous success he had in commanding the Athenian forces that brought all the things I had mentioned and wealth, because the league expeditions attacking various Persian territories brought booty, which was to some extent, divided up among the armies that did the fighting.

🔊 [18:17]

So, the Athenian soldiers and sailors actually made a profit out of these conquests of the Persian territory, or raids on Persian territory.



Naturally, their commander was popular on that score, but he had those personal skills that are successful in democratic politics.

People liked him.

I'm reminded of the same political phenomenon in America in the case of Eisenhower.

Eisenhower, of course, had first become a popular politician because of his victory in the Second World War.

He was in command of the European theater and got all the credit or a lot of the credit for the victory, but he had these qualities that made people like him, of which trivial things can be very important.

In Eisenhower's case they liked his smile, people talked about it all the time.

It turned out he was unbeatable in politics, and it was a little bit like that in the case of Cimon.

Even though, again, Eisenhower was not on the sort of the populous side of these things, he was after all a republican, and it turned out he was pretty or orthodox in that sense.

Well, Cimon held to a very conservative position, as I will tell you about in just a moment, but the fact is he becomes the dominant politician in Athens.

If you think of him rising to the top as early as 479 when the war is over, and then we know that his period of political success in Athens ends in the year 462; that's a seventeen-year stretch, which is a very, very long time for a politician to continue to be the leading figure in the state in Athens.

Remember, an Athenian general, and it turns out that the development of the Athenian democracy was that it was the generals, who came to be the leading figures politically in the state, and the generals have to be elected every year.

So think about how consistently you have to be popular with the masses in order to achieve the leadership that Cimon did.

His pro-Spartan foreign policy I think is a very critical part of the tale, and I think things would have been very, very different, if Themistocles had been the dominant politician, because it was clear that from what he'd already done and what he will do later that he was anti-Spartan and urging Athenian independence from Sparta and really hostility between the two sides.

🔊 **[21:08]**

Cimon to the contrary; he was the official representative of Sparta in Athens.



He had long family associations with them; he went around explaining, as I said, the virtues of the Spartans and how good it would be for Athens to emulate some of them, but more important than that, he was always in favor of a policy that had Athens and Sparta allies together, equals as they had been in his mind, in the great Persian War when fundamentally the Spartans had led and won the great victory on land at Plataea, the Athenians had led and won the victory at Salamis at sea, and the two states collaborated, cooperated, and that's how the Greeks were free from the Persian menace, and that's how Greece would prosper and be safe in the future and it worked.

Some part of the fact that the Spartans did not object to the developments in the Aegean and across the Aegean in which Athens moved from being merely the leader of the coalition to becoming an imperial power, stronger every day.

The Spartans didn't do a thing about it in those early years.

Why not?

I think a major reason was because Cimon was the dominant figure in Athens.

They trusted Cimon; they knew that so long as he was in that position he would not be a menace to Sparta and that they could indeed live side by side in this way.

It was a stretch of time fifteen, seventeen, something like that years, which was peaceful, and as I say probably would not have been without the phenomenon of the internal developments in Athens itself.

Cimon also his control of Athenian affairs by virtue of his personal standing and his persuasive abilities are also surprising.

Marathon was a victory for hoplites.

It was the farmers, the middling group, and those above them that had won that battle, but Salamis was a victory for the poor in Athens.

Of course that vast fleet was rode by poor Athenians, and now they had the glory for the victory and, of course, after the war, when the fleet became the basis of Athenian strength and glory, it was the common man who was and the poorest of the Athenians, who was involved in achieving that desirable status.

🔊 [24:12]

So, you would have thought, and if Themistocles had been in control, I'm sure he would have been right that there would be a movement towards greater democratization of the state.

Remember where we are before the wars begin is Cleisthenic democracy, which is pretty much a hoplite democracy, which excludes the poor from many of the activities of the state.



Cimon ran against that.

He basically never tried to unravel Athenian democracy.

He was not an enemy of Athenian democracy; he was in favor of keeping it the way it was and in some ways actually rolling back some degree of democracy.

The way it was somewhat rolled back was that and not by any legal position, legal action, but rather by sort of the way events went forward.

Aristotle in the Constitution of the Athenians describes the stretch of time that I'm talking about, about 479 to 462, as the period of the Areopagites' constitution.

What that means is the old aristocratic council, consisting of former top magistrates, gained unofficial, informal, but very real power.

Scholars have had a hard time understanding exactly what it was that was the nature of that power, but it looks as though a couple of elements were certainly there and they were very critical.

That is, the Areopagus, it was said, sort of regained the oversight of magistrates.

They were, as in the aristocratic past, in the position of being able to criticize magistrates and to take action against them, if they acted in a way that the Areopagus did not approve.

It also seems very plausible that even though there continued to be a council of five hundred, which was continuing to function as it had, ever since the Cleisthenic Constitution had established it, the fact is that more and more the Areopagus was taking decisions about foreign policy, was putting to the assembly when they desired motions, they were usurping some of the powers of the five hundred.

They were not doing this as I keep saying, by any change of the law.

They were doing it, because they thought they could, and the people accepted it.

🔊 **[27:02]**

One reason for it, according to Aristotle, is that they had played a particularly heroic role in the Persian Wars at the moment when the Persians invaded Attica, and the Athenians were forced to flee their homes, and to go to Salamis, and to the Peloponnese to escape for that moment.

Now, the poor had nowhere withal to keep themselves alive when they went into exile in this way, and so the Areopagites used their own money to keep the poor alive and in good condition during that period of the time.

They volunteered that action, and that generosity and patriotism, and goodwill



allowed the development of this Areopagite Constitution in the years that came, and that's what Cimon I think really had in mind.

He wanted to have this sort of dual policy of conservative, moderate democracy.

Conservative in that it did not take any recognition of the changing circumstances that would have given the poor a better claim to political power and also conservative in the sense that it was not going to challenge the dualism of Greek international relations as it had emerged from the Persian War, and that's the policy that Athens followed with tremendous success during the late career of Cimon while he was at the head of affairs.

Remember, I keep saying he's at the head of affairs and he has running things, but remember he's just one of ten generals, who is elected every year.

So all his power it's better to speak of his influence because it's all unofficial.

He is able to have these things happen because people do what he urges them to do when they don't need to.

There is no compulsion necessary.

He is the one who sets the tone, and they followed him.

Centuries later when Augustus becomes the boss of the roman world his own statement of the situation put the way he wanted people think about it was that he was foremost not in power protestus as the Latin word, but rather in terms of his influence.

He wanted to say it was not a tyranny, it was not a monarchy, it was a republic, as it has always been Augustus as the leading citizen in the eyes of my fellow Romans and able to persuade them to do these things not because they have to be because they want to well that was his story and it wasn't true because he had a great big army at his back, and if you want to move him out of anything. You would just have to get yourself killed.

This was not the situation with the Cimon.

🔊 **[30:17]**

Cimon could have made that speech, and that would have been true.

So all that cruises along until we get to the Thasian rebellion, Cimon is in charge of that expedition, and it proves to be a much tougher problem than any that he has had to face before the work stands for a long time, no successor, expense no payoff and of course there's some question as to the legitimacy indecency of what is going on here.

So the enemies of Cimon in the moment out tell you about them take advantage of



discontent that Thasian rebellion is causing to launch an attack on Cimon politically for the first time and anybody's memory.

The opponents the enemies of Cimon are in the first instance a man call Ethleetees and a very soon it becomes clear that he has as a kind of a lieutenant younger man who was important but subordinate to Ethleetee things that young man is Pericles, the son of sense that this sense if that's the great Persian war hero.

We are told it's very hard to disentangle the facts from the stories here but Ethleetees was supposed to have been associated with [? 31:49], and that's very plausible because certainly Ethleetee deserves to be thought of as a democratic leader with the underlining of the democrat.

He is clearly attempting to make a change in the constitution day fact at the very least which would allow the naval crowd for the poor people of Athens row in the fleet to have more political power and opportunity.

And he is also very strongly anti-Spartan so that he is opposed to both have of the Cimonian approach to things, and he works at trying to undermine and to do defeat the Cimon. They have no [32:40] until Thy___ ups and then they bring charges against Cimon, you know, he hadn't done anything wrong.

All he had done was not win the war very quickly, but you know you make up charges world of politics you've heard of that much of twice.

They said that well the reason he had won the war so quickly was because he had been bribe by the king of Mesedonia which is right behind the territory we're talking about.

🔊 [33:12]

Not to conquer Mesedonia and guess what?

He wasn't under orders to conquer Mesedonia.

He had no plan to conquer Mesedonia didn't need to be bribe not to conquer Mesedonia on top of which pretty hard to bribe Cimon because of [? 33:28] started out poor from his father's death he was now enormously rich guy because of the booty which he had a legitimately acquired in his role as commander of those expeditions.

Everybody knew he was incredible rich and he was very generous with his riches and gave it away in all source away.

You know if you want to say that Rockefeller is a no good low down pull cap that's fine, but if you want to say he's being bribed with his money or you're going to do is get laughter as something like that and in some way that was the situation with Cimon.

There so... the trial nonetheless launched against Cimon the complaints is Pericles this young up-and-coming democratic politician who makes the case against the Cimon.

He loses. Of course, he loses, Cimon has not lost his support and at the case is absurd.

It's just assigned that for the first time there's some kind of serious political opposition and who is involved in it.

Even before that trial, Ethleete had tried another technique by attacking the Areopagus through attacks on particular Areopagites

If you don't have any success in the general political arena, one device that is as old as the hills and as his new as yesterday is you tried to discredit individuals in the regime that you're trying to unseat, and so various charges were brought against particular Areopagites they might've had merit.

They might not the goal was to discredit the Areopagus as a whole.

Again, did not succeed in the years that I'm talking about. These are just the signs of what we're talking about which takes us to the years just after putting down of the Thysian rebellion.

Enormous argument among scholars that never will go away about just what is the date of the terrible earthquake that hit the Peloponnese in whatever time, the most common opinion is that it was around four sixty four, and that's appeals to me too.

And the earthquake was so serious says to disrupt life in Sparta and Spartan territory in general and thereby to encourage a great helot rebellion so that the latter even after the earthquake was over was what occupied and terrified the Spartans, and it was serious enough that they sent out to their allies.

🔊 [36:24]

And I'm not now talking merely about their allies in the Peloponnesian league.

In their allies who have joined them in the Greek league against perjurer, which was still on the books, asking them to send help against the helot and a number of them did.

It's indicative of what the relationship between Athens and Sparta was that they also asked for help in Athens, two Athens.

There was a great debate in the Athenian assembly as to what answer to give the Spartans in there request for help,

And Cimon of course made the case for doing so, and in fact he proposed at the Athenian sent a very large force as these things go in the Greek world of four



thousand hoplites.

That's a very big army. The Athenians very rarely send an army of that size outside of Athens.

Into the Peloponnese to help the Spartans against the helot, he made the case that the Athens should not abandon its former ally he's spoken panhellenic terms using a nice folk expression that he said Greece should not allow this kind of a split Athens should not lose its yolk fellow.

And the image was a team of oxen drawing a plow Athens and Sparta being that team, and so long as they're in the same [? 38:06] doing the thing, all will be well, Greece will be safe, there will be no internal strife, there'll be no war, that's what we ought to do.

Etheeltee spoke bitterly against that and spoken in terms of this story is all told in the [? 38: 24] of Cimon. You want to have a look at that.

He seems to have evidence about what was said at this debate in the assembly, and Etheeltee is supposed to have said something like the arrogance of Sparta must be trampled underfoot.

And he lost the argument Cimon once again won the argument.

Athens sends a force of these four thousand hoplites down into the Peloponnese.

They would called on a special Spartans wanted to them because they helot said runaway to mount a Mecinia which was a fortified place on a mountain very hard to attack.

The Spartans have failed in their efforts to procedure to storm the position there.

🔊 [39:13]

And the Athenians had a reputation now of being very good at siege warfare, which they had gained at the end of the Persian wars.

You remember [? 39:25] and then assessed us in a very effective way.

Well, the Athenians went had a shot out and failed at which point the Spartans or a little bit less keen on having them there; and then very soon after that the Athenians went to the... the Spartans went to the Athenians and said "Thank you very much for your contribution. We have no further need of your services. Have a nice trip home."

Instead of being very grateful and happy that they didn't have to fight anymore, the Athenians were insulted.

None of the other allies was asked to leave. None of the other allies was gone.

The Athenians were clearly had been sent away, not for out of friendly reasons.

[? 40:10] tells us what was on the mind of the Spartans who made these decisions they had developed a fear of the Athenian soldiers who were in the Peloponnese.

You know typically you don't... the Spartans don't get to see or know anybody else.

The only time they ever get to see farness as they've been fighting side by side briefly.

But not you can imagine the scene with these ordinary every day the Athenians having been born and raised in a democracy with their absolute freedom, and freedom of speech, and where their style of life is not bad for Greeks by Greek standards.

And you can imagine these inviting these Athenian soldiers in for a meal, and feeding them a Spartan meal, black soup, and the Athenian think....

This is what you get the hell out right. You're not going to eat that stuff. You want us to eat that stuff.

I would feed it to a pig. I'm invented conversation, but you got the general idea, and the Spartans couldn't have enjoyed that very much.

And then as they looked around and so what kind of a status was in which they were all these in slave people, in vast numbers of slave people, not the kind of slaves they knew about the ones who were you had a handyman just as you knew on the farm.

The vast numbers of them doing all the work while the Spartans didn't do any; and then they saw that business was run by small group of people with the average Spartan soldiers had nothing to say about what was going on, and being Athenian no doubt says something about that.

🔊 [42:00]

[? 42:00] says that the Spartans became fearful that they would in fact help the helots in a rebellion against the Spartans, and that in general he feared, the Spartans feared, their revolutionary sprit.

And it was on that ground that they sent them away.

In any case it was no doubt in the minds of the Athenians they've been sent away not an honorable way in which friends treat friends but they have been dismissed.

And when they came home they were furious that they've gone in the first place angry with Cimon for sending them and for of courses pro-Spartan position in general, and in the spring of four sixty two, for sixty one is it.

They ostracize Cimon, and that was the deadly stroke in what was now fairly could fairly be called a political revolution in Athens.

It was not brought about by force was brought about in constitutional way.

But it nonetheless put an end to a whole stretch of time in which the state was run in a certain way and brought about new kinds of, a new development, let us say it, the development towards a [?43 :41] democracy, but it's a immediate consequences were a complete reach with Sparta.

The Athenians renounced their old alliance made in the hellinically in 481. That was over. They turned around and made alliances with Argos, Sparta's bitter Peloponnesian enemy.

They made an alliance with people in the North [? 44:04] with famous for their cavalry, and the implication of that being that the Athenians had a war like intentions against the Spartans signing up first of all with their most of the famous local enemy and then signing up for the opportunity to have a cavalry to use as well.

And indeed as we will see it deedly very soon to a war between Athens and Spartan and their two sets of the lies and what modern historians call the first Peloponnesian war.

But before we get to that I think we want to attend to the great changes in Athens internally that were brought about by this great revolution.

I think first thing we need to do is to dispose of Ethltees which was what his enemies did almost immediately.

🔊 [45:07]

This he was murdered somebody came unstuck in Iceland it's very interesting this is the only political assassination that we know of in the entire history of the Athenian democracy.

When you think of how few worthy methods for protecting anybody in the Athenian state, it really is a remarkable thing sometimes i think when you look back at history of the united states and the year a number of presidents whether you have been killed or shot at you attempts made to kill them it's quite extraordinary that the athenians this is the only case we know.

Nobody knows to this day of committed, there are various rumors that one is obviously inspired by uh... political considerations and hard to believe uh... claims that Perikles kill them in order to clear the way from his own leadership of the democratic faction.

I don't think we need to take this seriously but that was one of the charges.



More likely it was murder was brought about by disgruntled chemo neons disgruntled conservatives disgruntled aristocrats people who were very angry at the turn of events that have changed everything in Athens.

But if we look at the situation in Athens and four sixty one four sixteen.

So on, we are seeing a movement towards a democratic i don't want to say revolution i suppose but uh... rapid movement to make a state the city of Athens more democratic than it ever had been.

And I'd like to turn next to the story of what that full blown in democracy and how it worked.

Let me just remind you that in the decade before five hundred if we go back to the clyde senate world the Greeks who lived in the city state called Athens established the world's first democratic constitution.

But this is a new kind of government was carried to his classical staged by the reforms of Pericles a half a century later in these years between for sixty and four fifty as really when most of the actions took place.

And it was in the Athens shaped by Pericles that the greatest achievements of the Greek world took place.

We should remember that the rest of the world continued to be characterized by monarchical rigidly hierarchical commences sides while in democracy, while in Athens democracy was carried as far as it would go before modern times.

🔊 [48:07]

Perhaps if you look at it in a certain way further than at any other place and time, and I'm going to start asking you to those be aware of your prejudices and through hold them lightly so that you can have the most full understanding of things that may have the same names but really were very different from things that we are accustomed to.

For one thing it's worth pointing out right away was Athenian democracy access to the political process was limited in Athens to adult males of native parentage.

Athenian citizenship granted full and active participation in every decision of the state without regard to the wealth or the class of the citizen.

Before fifties under paraguay's leadership cutaneous simply passed a series of lost by that went far towards establishing the constitution that was as thoroughly democratic as the world has ever seen.

It gave direct and ultimate power to the citizens in the assembly and in the popular law courts where the people made all decisions by a simple majority vote and it

provided for the selection of most public offices by allotment for the direct election of a very special for you and for short terms of office and close control over all public officials.

We need to have a clear understanding of the kind of the Pericles' reforms produced for i don't think it's easy for citizens of what are called democracies in the twentieth century twenty first century to comprehend the character of the democracy a nation Athens and the role that it played in the life of its citizens.

To a degree that's hard for us to grasp politics was primary in the ancient Greeks city and a form of the constitution was understood and it's expected to shape the character of its citizens.

The art the literature the philosophy and all the great achievements of Pericles and Athens cannot be fully understood apart from their political and constitutional context in a democracy established by christ in these and then extended by Pericles later.

I had a good place to start there's a description obviously democracy is with some attempt at a definition of the term.

🔊 [51:04]

Developments in the modern world make that really hard for the word has become debased and is almost meaningless.

Few modern states will admit to being anything but democratic.

That is confusing enough but there are further complications.

Many people today would insist that to qualify as a democracy estate must offer a full constitutional and political protections and opportunities to all who have legal permanent residence within its borders and who desire citizenship.

But they have Athenians limited the right to vote to hold office to serve on juries two adult males who was citizens.

Slaves, resident aliens, women and male citizens under the age of twenty would denied.

Modern critics of ancient athens question the democratic character of the Perikles regime because of the presence of slavery and the exclusion of women from political life.

And excluding such groups the is Athenians were like ever other society since the invention of civilization about three thousand b.c. until just recently so it's really not too interesting or amazing to point out this short truth coming from our point of view what sets the if there is a park or not these exclusions.

But the unusually large degree of inclusion as well as the extraordinarily significant



and rewarding participation of those who were included.

It's useful to remember that it will work has been called the jack solely in democracy in the United States co-existed with slavery in its fullest moments.

That women were everywhere denied the right to vote until the twentieth century and that we continue to limit political participation to those of a specified age.

To deny the title of democracy to paraguay an absence because of those excluded would be to employ parochial and anachronistic set of criteria their produce paradoxical results certainly no contemporary Greek doubted it that aspirins was a democracy.

The only argument was whether a democracy was good or bad which is almost an unthinkable question to put in our own time.

🔊 [53:48]

But take a look at it and the other end via sean's whatever this time at the claim of modern states to that title even such states as the united states in great Britain forty of them and essential feature of democracy was the direct and full sovereignty of the majority of citizens.

Government by elected representatives checks and balances, separation of powers, an appointment to import officers unelected that bureaucracies, judicial life tenure, terms for elective office of more than one year.

All of these would have seemed clear and deadly enemies of what reasonable people might understand by democracy.

So these differences between ancient and modern ideas require a brief examination of how the Athenian if we need the rockers who worked if we are to shed our prejudices

And grasp the character of a form of government that is a rare as any in the history of the world and that probably never existed in anything like the same four have to be an end of Athenians in Qatar.

So I'd like to use a helpful if anachronistic advice by considering the three familiar branches into which we divide government.

Legislative executive and tradition at the heart of what we would call the legislative branch of the as seen democracy was the assembly their word was etc lacia.

It was open to all the adult male citizens of Athens during Pericles lifetime these may have been forty thousand possibly as many as fifty thousand men.

Now most of scenes live many miles from the city.



Few own horses so attendance required a very long walk to town.

So as a result a number taking part normally was well short of that it was probably from five to six thousand people.

One reason for saying that is that there was a quorum for some actions that you had a have at least six thousand votes on the one hand that tells us I think that there were probably more than that who attended the assembly you wouldn't make a quorum being everybody whoever attended the place but on the other hand it suggests that there were many assemblies with fewer than six thousand votes.

Meetings took place outside on a hill called mix not far from the acropolis and overlooking the egorup.

Since sat on the birth of this sharply sloping hill and the speakers stood on the low platform was not easy for them to make themselves heard.

🔊 [57:03]

You can imagine it's an outdoor place they don't have microphone the great fourth century archers a set of practice but demain sinisa greatest of them is set for practice speaking at the seashore over the crashing surf to make his voice strong enough to be heard on the next a good loud voice was really terrific asset for Athenian politician.

We have some idea of the opening of these meetings from a comic version that is given to us and harassed offerings comedy performed in the year four twenty five.

Speaker is a typical para stuff and i comic hill an old-fashioned farmer from the backwards who complains about the war more is now about six years old because it keeps him in Athens away from his farm in the country i quote now from the actual fact passage.

It is that they have an assembly he sixties a by the way sitting there all by himself on the pics nobody's come here and there he is complaint.

It is the day of an assembly he says.

By the way he is sitting there all by himself on the phoenix.

Nobody is come yet. There he is complaining.

It is the day of assembly already morning, but phoenix is deserted.

They are chattering in the agora dozing the rope dripping with the red dye.

That is the reference of the fact that Athenian are always slow to come from the market place the agora the city center and make it up the hill to the phoenix they said busy talking with just wouldn't get going.



So they officials had the guy caring of a rope dipped in the red dye, they circled the agora and kept closing the circle until everybody was out.

You would be running away from them in the first place because you don't want to get you caught for a red dye.

That is what is referring to.

You said even the president of your assembly not arrived.

They will be late.

One day they finally come and they'll push and fight each other for a seat in the front row.

Streaming down all together you can't imagine how.

But they'll say nothing about making peace.

"Oh, my Athens.

I am always the first to make the return voyage to the assembly take my seat and since I'm alone, I grown, I yawned, I stretched my legs, I fart, I don't know what to do."

"I right. I pull out my loose hairs. I add up my account looking upper my field, longing for the peace, hating the town, seek for my village home which never said by my chuckle my vinegar my oil.

The word by is unknown there where everything is free." "So I have come here fully prepared to shout to interrupt to abuse the speakers if they talk about anything but peace."

🔊 [60:02]

Here comes these noon time president.

"Didn't I tell you? Didn't I predict how they will come? Everyone is jostling up to the front seat."

Next, the harold of assembly says. "Move up! move up within the concentrated area."

Then recited the regulated begins debate in the Assembly he simply says who wishes to speak which...somebody raises their hands and game gets start.

Okay, that's the comic version.

But the real meeting is on the phoenix were rarely comic.



They dealt with serious questions.

Assembly had four fixed meetings in each of the ten periods into the which the official year was divided.

And also special edition of meeting recalled when necessary.

Topics included approval or disapproval of treaty, making decorations of war, assigning generous campaign, deciding what forces and resources they should command, conforming officials or removing them from office, deciding whether or not to hold an ostracism, question concerning with religion, question of inheritance.

In fact anything else that anybody wants to bring up in the assembly.

Just specially amazing for a citizen of a modern representative democracy to lead of this great town meetings, dealing directly with question for foreign policy, they could mean lie for death for those president at the debate for their entire city.

To get some idea of distance between ancient and modern democracy we need only to consider how an emergency say...the season of American embassy would be dealt with today in the United States.

It probably arrive first as secret information at some bureau of the government other complex vast complex, complex intelligent service, it could also show up CNN before the government knows.


But it would be treated as highly confidential and revealed only to a few people in the white house the state and defense department.

The policy would be discussed in a small closed group, and the decision made would made by one man ultimately, the president of the United States.

If one leaks, only big if, people would hear of it only when the die had been cast, mother for this those of my vintage were a missile crisis which was kept as the great secret those days the press actually would keep secrets in behalf of the national security.

But and then they have been kicking out around for a week when the president got on a television and told us what demand was what is he doing about it?

Too late to have any discussion an argument about it.

 **[63:05]**

That's the way and it works in our system.

Questions of war and peace rows more than one Perikles in Athens in each time the popular assembly had a full debate and made a decision by raising their hand in a



vote determined by a simple majority.

I don't think there is any stronger evidence of the full and final sovereignty of Athenian people on the most important questions that fact that is the way they made those decisions.

An assembly of thousand of course could not do its business without bill.

For that will be lied on the council of five hundred chosen by allot from all Athenian citizens.

Although it perform many public functions at the larger body could not handle efficiently, its main responsibility was too prepare legislation for consideration by people.

In this respect as in all others.

The council was the servant of the assembly.

The assembly could vote down the bill draft by the council.

They could change it on the floor.

They could send it back for with instruction for redrafting or they could replace entirely different bill.

Full sovereignty and the real exercise of public authority wrested directly with the assembly.

Almost no constitutional barrier prevented of majority of the citizens assembled on the phoenix on a particular day from doing anything they wanted to do.

Turning to the executive, we called executive, these distinctions did not exist for Athenians.

They didn't make this division, but help us understand I'm using this terms.

But we might called executive, what severely limited, extent, discretion, and power.

And the distinction between legislative and judicial authority was far less clear than our own society.

Begin with there was no president, no prime minister, no cabinet, there was not any elected official responsible for the management of the state in general for formulating or proposing a general policy.

Nothing that Americans would call administration or British would call government, the chief elected officials, 10 generals and vote for a year term.

As their title indicated, they were basically military officials who commended the army and the navy.

They could be reelected without limit and extraordinary man like kimonon were elected almost every year, but they were very exceptional.

The political power such man exercised was limited to their personal ability to persuade their fellow citizens in the assembly to follow their advice.

🔊 **[66:06]**

They have no special or political or civil authority and accept on military and naval campaign they could give orders to anybody

Even in military man powers of general with severely limited.

Leaders of expeditions were selected by vote of the full Athenian assembly which also determined the size of the force and what goals it should pursue.

Before the generals took office they would subjected to a scrutiny of qualifications by the council of 500.

After completing their year of service, their performance are on the job, and especially their financial account would subjected to audit special process called *Authouna*.

No, this is the only control by people over a few officials chosen by election.

10 times a year the popular assembly voted to determine whether the general conduct the military affairs appears satisfactory.

If people vote against someone's confirmation on office, he is trial in a law court.

If he found guilty, they assess his punishment or fine.

If he is quitted, he resumes the office.

Since elected office confer prestige, elected officials were carefully controlled rather less they should undermine the rule of the people.

That's what is behind all of this careful check on the generals.

Even with this severe controls the Athenians fulfill only a few public offices by election, choosing them military officials, their naval architects, and only some of their treasures as well as super intendant of city water supply in that manner.

All other officials and they're good number of them.

We chosen by allot.



Allotment was the characteristic device by which the Athenians chose their officials in accordance with dominant democratic principle which was equality, which held at any citizen who is capable of performing civil responsibility well enough.

And it's corollary that feel allowing executive administrative power to hands to the few man.

Even those who were experienced or have special abilities.

For these reason, the Athenian filled the book of their offices by allot and limited tenure to one year term per man and each office except for the council of 500 or man could serve twice in the course of his life.

Generals, however, could be reelected forever because of it is so obvious that issues of skills and ability were literally vital in that job and it is limited for a very short term.

🔊 [69:10]

To agreed that amazing to the modern mind, the Athenians kept the management of their public life in the hand of ordinary citizens away from professor, professionals, experts, bureaucrats and politicians.

I will pick up the rest of the story next time.