

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

From *a* Political Science point of view

TODAY

- Begin with some theoretical observations
- largely from Münkler
- The my - as a political scientist - reading of the Roman empire.

WHAT IS EMPIRE?

- What is *not*?
 - Hegemony
 - Imperialism
 - State
- What *is* it?
 - A system of interaction between two political entities, one of which, the dominant metropole, exerts political control over the internal and external policy - the effective sovereignty - of the other, the subordinate periphery,

ONLY TWO?

- Münkler: state and empire only two forms
- State: even sovereignty / control, identity
- Empire: uneven and declining control
- But: feudalism, church universalisms?

RISE

- New empires often develop from the periphery of centre of political / economic action
- lower cost: no / less competition
- "time sovereignty", decide tempo of own development, again competition
 - see Rome, mongols, US, UK

MAINTANANCE

- Augustan threshold
 - from expansion to consolidation
- Key to duration is to give the (elites of) the periphery a stake, an interest, or to invest in periphery
 - the alternative is to exploit periphery to make pay-offs to diverse interest in metropole
- Not necessarily (only) economic interest, also "civilizational"
- Why did, ia, the Mongolian empire fail to pass the Augustan threshold?

FALL

- Michael Mann: IEMP model
- ideology, economy, military, political sources of social power
- an empire that doesn't build on all, provokes its own downfall
- the enemy of empire will attack your weakest point
 - in Rome ideology, but military; today?

ALWAYS BAD?

- We tend to think about imperialism as inherently bad, but is empire always and necessarily bad?
- Peace
- Economic development, exchange of ideas
- Integration - or rather ethnicity and cultural diversity as non-issues
- Some examples of this...

RISE: TO THE AUGUSTAN TRESHOLD

- Rome a military-agricultural complex
- Only land-owners served in the army
- Decline of economy 5th CBC - concentration of land in fewer hands
- = conquer new land to mitigate discontent, and maintain base for army
- + conquest only way to handle population growth

CONT'D

- After 2d Punic war (218-201 BC) intensified concentration of land + slave labor
- Proletariat growing, base for army shrinking
- Growing empire necessitated large standing armies
- 107 BC Marius decides to allow property-less poor in the army

CONT'D

- These property-less soldiers felt greater loyalty to their generals; whereas the farmer-soldiers had felt greater loyalty to the state
- because their generals would provide them with loot and land, upon discharge
- the generals had to conquer in order to provide their soldiers with all this.....
- the state's *army* became generals' private *armies*....and "Rome" was forced to expand

CONT'D

- With these private armies, great generals could further their own ends, and the last C BC was in many ways a series of civil wars
- in which Roman generals led their armies on Rome
- Marius - Sulla, Pompey - Caesar, Augustus - Antony

AUGUSTAN TRESHOLD

- Augustus finally put an end to this competition, monopolises the army
- and thereby destroyed the republic....
- but can begin to consolidate the empire

MAINTENANCE: THE EMPIRE PROPER

- Huge infrastructural programs (economy)
- Interdependent division of labor (economy)
- Extended citizenship (political)
- Co-optation local elite (political)
- Romanization of local elites, also outside of empire (ideology)
- Pax Romana (military)
- Continuous movement of troops and commanders (military)

- Towards 5th C AD things start changing
- Economic decline, rely more on local troops than state troops - mercenaries from outside
- Growth of frontier society, neither Roman nor outside....mixture
- nucleation: landlords warlords landlords...

CONT'D

- strong local rulers challenge empire
- NOT ideology
- NOT economy
- but military and politica
- Germanic invaders - are they barbarian invaders OR
- displeased local authorities...
- BOTH, most of the time....