

Elżbieta Kaczyńska

TOWN AND COUNTRYSIDE IN PENAL JUDICATURE AND CRIMINALITY: KINGDOM OF POLAND, 1815–1914

Both the Kingdom of Poland and Russia for a long time did not have an organized statistical service or uniform system of reports, even within particular administrative branches, although already in the 18th century attempts were made to register the population. The consecutive partitions of Poland in the 18th and 19th centuries proved to be conclusive for the lagging behind of statistical information.

In 1808 a decree was issued to keep registers of the civil status of the population; beginning with 1810 such registers were established although they became uniform as late as 1825. In 1824 the first statistical bureau began to function but not much changed in the field of statistical registration. The situation was bad. One only has to mention that when in 1818 rules were made to register the population for purposes of army enlistment, the so-called enlistment delegations registered 464, 300 inhabitants of the Kingdom of Poland while according to data supplied by voivodship commissioners the population totaled 440, 600 persons.

The Government Commission of Justice in the Kingdom of Poland possessed registers of penal cases and persons sentenced but they were of little use. There was no classification of the crimes or their perpetrators, the criteria and nomenclature differed and such chaos was prevalent that it resulted in notorious divergencies. Sometimes only more important cases were taken into consideration, at other times the numbers of crimes and misdemeanours were given jointly and it is not always clear whether we are dealing with a number of cases, the number of criminal acts committed or even with the number of persons who were taken to court and charged with having committed an offense. Those who already at that time claimed that statistics were being conducted by totally incompetent persons, were correct. At times it was the rule to distinguish new cases which appeared in a given year, and at other times their number was included into that of the

unsolved cases. A single case could be found in statistics a number of times because the course of different cases in particular instances was not taken into consideration but they were simply added together; in reality the same case kept reappearing as a result of, for example, court appeals. The principles of classification within collections varied since the number of cases was published specifying the type of criminal act, according to sentences passed or the court procedure itself.

After the introduction of the Russian Code of Heavy and Corrective Penalties in 1848, the principles of penal registration changed. It became customary to distinguish deeds from cases; this was important inasmuch one case could concern a number of various criminal acts committed by a single person or by a group of offenders. Data from the period after 1847 cannot be compared to earlier ones both as a result of the change of the penal code i.e., a certain modification of the range of acts considered to be illegal and, predominantly, as a result of the complete lack of uniformity of the old statistics. New changes in registration occurred in 1861 when the heads of villages and the town mayors took over many cases which in this way did not find their way into the registers of the Commission of Justice. Moreover, only fragmentary statistics were prepared in 1860 and none at all in 1861. One could say that the years 1860–1864 were a period without any statistics since the January Insurrection also influenced the activity of the Commission. From this time three types of registers were to be kept: registers of the permanently settled population, of the temporary population i.e., such which was not „ascribed” to a given place but lived there permanently, and the registers of arrivals which included all those persons who remained in a given locality longer than 10 days. The permanent population was a category which grouped, on the whole, persons born in a given area. In reality, this system functioned badly because people were not at all eager to register their presence and even hotels were not obliged to register their guests; the Jewish population also was not always registered. Many newcomers and even the so-called temporary inhabitants i.e., those not born in a given place but its permanent residents, did not register themselves at all. Nevertheless, considerable progress was made as regards population registration in comparison to the previous period when use was made of registers which, for all practical purposes, presented fictional data which concerned only the population born in a given place and registered there (this did not pertain to foreigners i.e., aliens who were registered separately and with scrupulous care). Another improvement occurred as a result of increased political repressions following the January Insurrection (1863/4) and during the period of the emergence of the revolutionary movement when an extremely

strict control of passports and permissions for moving to another province introduced repressions against those persons who did not have appropriate documents. A great number of penal cases originated from the violation of passport regulations and rules concerning travelling within the country.

It is difficult to estimate the number of people who managed to remain unregistered. At any rate, there appeared sizeable divergencies between the carelessly kept provincial statistics and the police registers and later also the registers kept by the Warsaw Statistical Committee. Around 1890 those differences meant that the number of the legal population was, as a rule, lower than the number of the actual population and that such discrepancies sometimes grew in the industrialized provinces while the same number of the legal population would exceed the actual population in those provinces where the population emigrated (not only abroad). This is the reason for great difficulties in estimating the number of cases, persons sentenced or charged per 100,000 i.e., in preparing the criminality rate.

Penal statistics for the years 1815–1864 are accessible in their entirety only *via* a number of publications. Archive reports are useless for global research but can be utilized for slightly more detailed studies, and for this reason I have decided to omit them in this study. A detailed comparison of urban and rural criminality for the period preceding the court reform of 1876 is thus impossible. The reason for this state of affairs is the functioning of two different court procedures and different types of court. The very administrative division of the Kingdom of Poland varied and the consecutive reforms were not accompanied by changes in the division of jurisdiction. This is why the court regions did not correspond to the administrative regions. The decrees of 1864 brought essential transformations as regards the cognizance of the various courts; moreover, the Commission of Justice completely lost its control over the communal jurisdiction whose most general registration was limited only to the number of cases and charges. The general court registers thus lost a very large number of cases. The anxious officials from the remaining courts tried by all possible means to enlarge their reports to show the great amount of work with which they were burdened. As a result, information available to us can provide a rather magnified image of revealed criminality.

In 1877 completely new courts of law, different in every respect from the old court institutions, began to appear in the Kingdom of Poland. Once again, the range of the cognizance of the Communal Courts, Justices of the Peace and the remaining courts changed. The first group of courts were now excluded from the general court organization but they were compelled to prepare statistics according to principles similar to those observed by the

general courts and published jointly by the Ministry of Justice. Soon the cognizance of the Justices of the Peace was limited and this resulted in a shift of the proportions of cases conducted by them and by the other courts — a troublesome innovation. Nevertheless, reports improved radically although not immediately. Only as late as 1860 did there appear the first statements (*Svod Statcheskikh Sviedenii po dielam ugolovnym* — for 1877). Separate *Svody* for the Kingdom of Poland were published for 1877–1892; the year 1893 was not included in the statistics and from 1894 on data for the Kingdom are to be found in the general *Svody* for the Russian Empire. The Warsaw Court Chambers which were treated as a specific area of jurisdiction, were distinguished in the all-Russian *Svody* up to 1900 i.e.; not only particular court regions which corresponded to the provincial division introduced in 1867 were taken into account but the data were added up providing us with general figures for the Kingdom of Poland. From 1901 up to 1905 the particular court regions of the Kingdom were included in alphabetical order into the court regions of the Empire, without any global figures for the Kingdom of Poland. It is possible, nonetheless, to prepare, although laboriously, separate and relatively accurate penal statistics for the Kingdom (which, however, do not take into consideration all the aspects of the cases from the years 1877–1892). Since 1906 detailed data referring to the various court regions of the Kingdom of Poland disappeared from the *Svody* while only certain global figures for the region of the Warsaw Court Chambers remained. Moreover, statistics from the years 1880 and 1881 proved to be inaccessible in Poland. As a result, we have at our disposal complete comparable registers pertaining only to a rather short period of time.

I have presented these remarks in order to demonstrate the difficulties which occur in the course of a through examination of the problem approached in this study. One also ought to remain aware of the fact that the division of settlements into urban and rural is purely formal. We do not have the means for a suitable reconstruction of the statistics and material which originated directly in the courts was destroyed. A summary of the conclusions from an analysis of statistical material is given below although statistical material itself has not been included.

It is extremely difficult to find any rule as regards the geographical pattern of tried criminality. Provinces with various economic–social traits had similar rates while the non-industrialised and backward provinces differed considerably (rates of sentenced offenders). A number of such non-industrialised and typically rural provinces (with few larger towns) were characteristic for their very high rates of criminality, if not in the course

of the entire forty years under examination then at least during the last decade or so.

Table 1 shows rates for provinces grouped in three categories. The first category includes provinces with a high rate of employment outside agriculture and extensive urbanization. It is unfortunately impossible to depart from the administrative division since there are no precise data concerning the place of the committed crime. The second category includes provinces where non-agrarian activity was extremely rare. They lacked not only industry but also well-developed crafts as well as large towns whose dwellers were not employed in agriculture. The third category groups all the remaining provinces whose nature it is impossible to define in an unambiguous manner. They were rural areas with traditions of various crafts and manufacture, with a well-developed small-scale industry and a large number of peasants-workers or with centres of cottage industry which at the end of the 19th century experienced an industrial and commercial prosperity.

Originally, the industrialized provinces had the least favourable rates while the lowest ones were to be found in the rural provinces. With time, however, this difference began to diminish and from 1891 on the situation was reversed. In the course of the entire last decade of the 19th century the highest rates of court sentences occurred in the rural provinces, followed by the intermediary provinces and the industrial provinces, where the situation was the most favourable. If this was not simply the result of the principles upon which the courts in the industrial provinces acted, then one can suppose that we are observing a gradual change of the symptoms in manners and morals brought about by general economic-social transitions. It would seem worthwhile to add that the urbanized and industrialized provinces were also noted for the fact that the participation of the Communal Courts and the Justice of the Peace was much larger than in the other provinces. It is difficult to say what was the significance of this fact. Perhaps simply the lower category courts were better developed in those particular provinces or the number of petty offenses was relatively large.

In the light of court statistics theses about the connection between criminality and urbanization or industrialization prove to be theoretically deduced and unchecked generalizations. Even if for certain periods the rates from the Piotrków and Warsaw provinces were higher than those average for the entire Kingdom of Poland, one has to take under consideration the fact that, firstly, data concerning the population of these provinces were on the whole lowered which can hardly be the case in the rural provinces; secondly, in large towns such as Łódź and Warsaw peacekeeping forces were particularly numerous; thirdly, crimes were committed by incomers

from other regions. An outstandingly large number of persons from outside the Warsaw province was tried for offenses perpetrated in the area belonging to the Warsaw Regional Court. In the other provinces, the local population constituted from 80 to 90 per cent of the guilty offenders.

A comparison of the territorial pattern of persons convicted for various categories of crimes demonstrates that sentences passed in the cases of inter-personal violence were higher than the average, especially in the rural and intermediary provinces. With time, the first place in this unfavourable statistic was taken by the industrially most backward and non-urban regions.

The industrial provinces were noted for a large number of verdicts passed for larceny, especially for petty offences since the majority of the cases was tried by the Justice of the Peace. As we shall see, the incidence of criminality among children and young people was high. On the other hand, it is quite astonishing that acts of violence against officials or insults against the authorities as well as similar acts aimed against the administrative order were particularly frequent in the same provinces where the incidence of homicide and fighting was unusually high. Perhaps we are dealing here with a similar category of behaviour, part of which was limited to verbal insults or the refusal to accept orders, while another part led to violence and was classified in the category of crimes aiming to inflict bodily harm. Upon the basis of this observation it is difficult to construct a more general hypothesis concerning the features of everyday life in backward rural regions. It seems, nonetheless, that these data are noteworthy and appear to coincide with various information from the 1869s and 1870s.

Despite the fact that changes in legislation, the political system etc., make all comparison a problem, it would be interesting to determine the part played in the later period by those convicted for committing a criminal offense belonging to one of the basic groups. As a result of differences in classifications employed, one could conduct such a comparison only in the broadest outlines, remembering, of course, that we are not concerned with a characteristic of actual criminality. In 1878 crimes aiming to inflict bodily harm, upon individuals or groups amounted to 3 per cent of all the sentences, in 1888 — 7 per cent, in 1898 — 13 per cent and in 1908 — 15 per cent. In 1955–1956 this group of offenses in Poland, with the exception of all cases concerned with violations of safety regulations at places of work, ranged from 11 to 12 per cent of the total number of verdicts. These also included car accidents but at the time their number was so small that it does not seem worthwhile to subtract them. In the years 1878–1908 offences against official authorities ranged from 11 per cent to 21 per cent of the sentences passed by court, while in 1955–1956 — from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. Despite

all appearances, the most numerous group of criminal acts i.e., against individual or state property, including the latest economic large-scale cases, was on the decline. In 1878 50 per cent of all persons found guilty for committing a crime was convicted for perpetration that particular category of offense; in 1888 — 69 per cent, in 1898 — 68 per cent, in 1908 — per cent, in 1925 (in the central voivodships) — 64 per cent, in 1972 — 49 per cent (42 per cent for theft and burglary and 7 per cent for large-scale economic malversations). It appears that one can uphold the ascertainment that the structure of criminality is constant. One only ought to add that this pertains to tried criminal acts and this phenomenon is typical not exclusively for post-war Polish history but dates from the end of the 19th century and can be examined only in the case of a number of criminal acts whose legal classification or technical possibilities of perpetration have not undergone essential changes.

More precise calculations based upon the statistical reports of the Tsarist Ministry of Justice do not provide a foundation for ascribing increased criminality to the industrial areas. Similar German research on 19th century criminality revealed the absence of a connection between those two factors. At the end of the 19th century for every 1000,000 persons legally subject to a court trial, the largest number of sentences for offenses against the state and its administration was passed in the Opole regency (Silesia) and in rural Eastern Prussia, while indictable assault was particularly frequent in the Bydgoszcz, Opole and Poznań regencies, larceny — in Bydgoszcz and Poznań but also in Western Prussia, rape — in Berlin and Wroclaw etc. Hence, the political situation of the population must have exerted a greater influence than the degree of industrial development.

The examination of the structure of criminal acts committed by persons found guilty from the point of view of its territorial range and depending upon the administrative status of a given locality, is limited. We are able to distinguish only Warsaw, the remaining towns and villages (possibly also settlements). Table 2 includes a re-count of rates and co-factors. In the light of the data presented therein, we see that in 1878 Warsaw was a town of theft and burglary and all sorts of violations of state and private property, laws and monopolies. In the next period, the geographical pattern of this category of offenses did not change. On the other hand, assaults, homicide etc. dominated in the rural regions. In turn, various criminal activity, difficult to classify, was carried out more and more frequently in towns which is not surprising considering that it also included e.g., „crimes committed by means of print”. Indictable criminal behaviour in the villages was lower than the mean rate but it exceeded the average in the category of homicide and

assault. In towns other than Warsaw a particularly numerous group of crimes included those perpetrated against religion, family law, property and perjury; more detailed information shows that crimes against morality were also characteristic for the rural society. Despite all expectations, the urban population was less exposed to assault or a violent loss of life although at the very end of the 19th century the rates of these two crimes began to rise. The situation during the 1905 revolution was quite different but that particular year and the next two years were exceptional; a gradual increase of indictable criminal behaviour in the villages and its decrease in the towns was the predominantly characteristic feature. This tendency, in turn, diminished the discrepancies between the urban and rural environments. This pertained specially to the decline of the disproportion between larceny in town and countryside and a discernable improvement of the appropriate rate in Warsaw itself. The rural offenders included more and more often those accused of resisting the authorities, of insult and contempt, as well as officials who were accused of crimes committed in the course of fulfilling their duties.

This last problem appears to be very interesting and deserves to be examined separately upon the basis of more extensive source material including correspondence with admonitions and estimates of the work carried out by various officials and police functionaries. Such correspondence is to be found, although in a fragmentary state, in Polish and Soviet archives. According to universal public opinion, the Russian officials sent to the Kingdom of Poland were to a considerable degree people of dubious moral and cultural standing. This view was even reflected in satirical poems dating from the revolution which suggested that the very worst individuals were chosen as representatives of Russian absolutism and that only in the Kingdom are they able to make a career and fortune¹. With time, corruption was on the rise, officials and the police became venal and even provided protection to the professional criminals who paid them off. Russian lawyers wrote about the extremely low level of the court personnel in the provinces of the Kingdom. The administration assembled in Warsaw had to be chosen more carefully, although the example of the hated and scorned Hurko proves that even the opinion of the official representatives of foreign powers, for whom Hurko was a *sui generis* curiosity, was disregarded. The intensive Russification of offices (including schools) conducted in the last quarter of the 19th century with the help of such personnel must have resulted in an

¹ Cf. S. Kalabiński, F. Tych, *Czwarte powstanie czy pierwsza rewolucja? (The Fourth Insurrection or the First Revolution?)*, Warszawa 1976.

increase of penal rates as regards the so-called official offenses, especially in the provinces.

The decrease of the differences of indictable crime in Warsaw, as well as in other towns and villages can be measured with the help of the standard deviation, in 1878 when $s=112$ it was over three times higher than in 1898 when $s=31$. In turn, criminality in Warsaw differed from the average by 1.7 of the standard point (1878) and in 1898 — by 1.3. The remaining towns in 1878 had rates higher than the average by 0.1 while in 1898 already lower by 0,7. The situation was reversed in the villages where in 1878 the deviation from the average was lower by 0.15 and in 1898 when it was higher by 0.06. It does not seem worthwhile to calculate the standard deviations for the particular categories of crimes since the decisive role was played by fundamental groups of acts which formed the above-mentioned rates. It would be instructive, nonetheless, to examine closer the deviations which occurred in the case of offenses aimed at inflicting bodily harm. In 1878 $s=2$ and in 1898 $s=12$; in this instance the standard deviation did not fall but rose and was greatly unfavourable for the rural society. In both periods, criminality in Warsaw deviated from the average by 1.3 (below the average i.e. negative points); deviations in other towns were also negative and constant (1.25 below the average). On the other hand, the (positive) points in the rural environment remained at the level of 0.45 in 1878 and 0.5 in 1898. Therefore, the degree in which the situation as regards homicide and assault was worse in the villages than in the towns was higher than the degree in which the country side was more „moral” (to use an expression take from the period) on a general scale.

The shaping of the rates was certainly influenced by the nature of the towns themselves which in the official sources were distinguished only upon administrative bases². For example, in 1898 Sosnowiec was still not considered a town while an urban status was given to the rural and barely active township of Tykocin. Accurate research should take under consideration the socio-logical and not the formal-legal point of view. The sociological features of a town include the presence of an urban centre, prestige and functional differentiation of the urban architecture, strong differentiations and large possibilities for the development of communal space, functions

² A. Wallis, *Socjologia wielkiego miasta (The Sociology of a Large Town)*, Warszawa 1967, p. 135; B. Jałowicki, *Mierniki urbanizacji, próba teoretycznego zarysowania problematyki (Standards of Urbanization, an Attempt at a Theoretical Outline of the Problem)*, „Studia Socjologiczne”, 1966, no 3, pp. 33–47; J. Ziółkowski, *Urbanizacja, miasto, osiedle. Studia socjologiczne (Urbanization, Town, Settlement. Sociological Studies)*, Warszawa 1965, p. 133. At present it is accepted in Poland that if in a certain locality 65 per cent of the population is employed outside agriculture, then such a locality is known as a settlement. If the number of the inhabitants of the settlement exceeds 10, 000, then the settlement automatically wins the status of a town.

exceeding narrow local ones etc. Those seemingly external properties determine to a large degree the behaviour of the population and social ties. The process of urbanization is therefore seen as the sharpening of certain patterns of behaviour and their radiation from the town into the neighbouring environs. This process also furnishes modes of behaviour and customs regarded as typically urban which with time were also adapted by the countryside. Statistics as a rule accept the conventional criterion as the sole criterion which enables to maintain mensuration and comparability. This criterion is composed of a number of the population, and in 1887 the International Statistical Bureau accepted 2,000 persons as a criterion of international statistics. Various countries, nevertheless, did not conform to this rule and as a result we encounter great divergencies e.g., in Denmark 250 persons constitute the borderline between an urban and rural community, in Belgium — 5,000, in Japan, Italy, Switzerland and Spain — 10,000. At present, the majority of states regards the number of 5,000 inhabitants to be valid. The administrative criterion is used in Poland although it is based on slightly more precise principles than was the case in the 19th century. The authors of many international comparisons try to eliminate towns with a population smaller than 20,000, with the supposition that only larger communities correspond to the economic or sociological discriminants of urbanity.

Extant sources make it feasible to conduct an independent classification of urban, rural and intermediary centres upon the basis of non-conventional and non-formal or legal criteria. One can even determine the number of the actual population or make an estimate for at least a number of years from the 1815–1914 period. From the point of view of the usefulness of those operations (which no one in Poland has as yet attempted) one can resign from such undertakings in the case of research conducted at the moment, since court statistics do not provide any detailed information apart from the already mentioned categories of localities. The same criterion was applied as in general statistics i.e., crimes committed within various provinces were distinguished or, to put it differently, in court regions with one Regional Court; otherwise only criminal offenses perpetrated in Warsaw (without the suburban communities later made part of the town), in settlements with urban status and others were taken into account. There are no separate statistics concerning Communal Courts and Justices of the Peace, which were located in various counties. More precise territorial research is possible upon the basis of archive and press source materials which are extremely interesting but do not enable us to conduct the kind of statistical research which I regard as my starting point.

The introduction of sociological criteria for determining an urban centre probably would modify slightly the final conclusions. Perhaps in the light of such research urban criminality would prove to have been much higher although data for Warsaw indicate sufficiently that it did not rise in comparison to rural criminality. It is well-known that capitals of a similar nature (although from the formal point of view Warsaw was not a capital at the time), regardless whether they were important industrial centres, were characterized by higher crime rates. A large group of the *lumpenproletariat* was settled usually outside the borders of such towns but in the closest proximity (such was the case in the 19th century and continues to be so); the young people from those milieus were attracted to the town during holidays and came „to have fun”. This type of town was usually a home-ground for thieves who found refuge in the suburbs. One of the reasons for settling outside the city boundaries was certainly the high cost of living accommodations and the small possibility of finding them but also more concrete reasons such as administrative denials of the right to live permanently in town. At the beginning of the 20th century a numerous group of criminals always resided near Warsaw where they probably found themselves as a result of their extradition from other provinces. Such persons did not have appropriate references which would enable them to find work of any sort or sufficiently well-paid work, and consequently they made their way to Warsaw to seek their fortune; they remained as so-called temporary inhabitants in the suburban communities. J. K o n c z y ń s k i wrote that at the turn of the 19th century the town was a place where „passions, interests and self-adoration” collided, where sharp social differences revealed themselves, the poor sought support, the potentially dangerous social elements found perfected technical means for committing a crime, and the weak elements — a source of income in the form of cabarets, brothels, dance halls, betting shops, gambling houses etc.³ In turn, the tendency of the rural population towards fights or violent conflicts was explained by the influence exerted by the village tavern which provided the main form of entertainment apart from church or family holidays.

L. K r z y w i c k i drew attention to the differences between the town and the countryside as regards the population structure according to sex⁴. The emigration of men from the villages meant that their percentage was much lower than that of women, while in the large towns, which attracted a

³ J. K o n c z y ń s k i, *Stan moralny społeczeństwa polskiego (The Moral State of Polish Society)*, Warszawa 1911, pp. 121–122.

⁴ L. K r z y w i c k i *Nasze społeczeństwo (Our Society)*, in: L. K r z y w i c k i, *Artykuły i rozprawy 1886–1888*, Warszawa 1958, pp. 142–175.

considerable influx of the population, the situation was the reverse. Already this factor itself influenced the rate of criminality in the towns and villages since women rarely came into conflict with the law. Moreover, the relative absence of women in a developing „young” industrial centre favoured the growth of prostitution which, as a result of social and legal disapproval, became a crime-inducing factor. A characteristic trait of a capitalist town was the appearance of districts whose inhabitants, their social make-up and architecture differed. One also encounters districts which fulfilled various functions. Assorted towns in the course of their development lost their patriarchal and „family” character. This phenomenon also occurred in the Kingdom of Poland although it has not yet been examined sufficiently. It is known more or less that poor districts which were inhabited by a relatively large number of *lumpen* were to be found in Warsaw in the Powiśle quarter and certain suburban communities, in Częstochowa — in the district of the Ostatni Grosz and in Łódź — in Bałuty. Only the latter has been examined more closely in a monographic study by Helena Brodowska⁵.

During the 1890s about 5,000 persons i.e., the equivalent of the population of a typical rural small town, settled annually in Bałuty. In the population registers the number of temporary inhabitants always exceeded the number of permanent residents (the so-called legal population). As a rule, this was an area inhabited by the very poor but it is characteristic that over 50 saloons prospered at the turn of the 19th century in this one district. Bałuty is such a typical and constant example of a criminal area that it became the subject of separate research also after World War II. In the 1960s it was discovered that the majority of the criminals active in Łódź came from that particular district where the number of alcoholics and consumptives was higher than elsewhere⁶.

Table 3 includes data which makes it possible to make a comparison of the statistics provided by all the courts of Warsaw, Moscow and St. Petersburg which had identical legal and organizational conditions (the same judicial system, the same types of courts with the exception of the jury courts whose function in the Kingdom of Poland was fulfilled by Regional Courts). We can see that the rates in Warsaw were much more favourable.

The influence of urbanization and industrialization is not apparent in an obvious way. There are no constant connections between the number of persons who received court sentences or were charged and the character of

⁵ H. Brodowska, *Kształtowanie się dzielnicy Bałuty w Łodzi (The formation of the Bałuty district in Łódź)*, „Rocznik Łódzki”, vol. 15, 1971, pp. 201–215.

⁶ A. Kossowska, *Przestępczość w środowisku wielkomiejskim (Criminality in an Urban Environment)* in: *Zagadnienia przestępczości w Polsce*, ed. J. Jasiński, Warszawa 1975, pp. 140–155.

a given locality or region, while the factory workers were tried relatively rarely. Two general hypotheses come to mind: firstly, that the very beginnings of the modernization of economic, social and political relations were much more influential than capitalistic industrialization and that the destruction of old socio-economic structures in the villages played an equally important role as the introduction of modern civil legislation, the growth of monetary circulation and the circulation of ideas. Secondly, the modernization processes came later but more intensely to the backward agrarian centres, distant from industrial and city regions, which had longer traditions of capitalist relations. This is probably the reason for the higher criminality rates in many rural provinces.

If one were to reflect upon the etiology of criminality then one should place in the forefront simple material poverty which during the first half of the 19th century was so strong that at the turn of the 1840s it changed into sheer hunger. This fact is proven by the sizeable concurrence between larceny and the prices of agrarian products. With time, however, the situation became increasingly complicated. In the 1890s theft and burglary were rarer and the number of such offenses became more stable which, in turn, corresponds with our knowledge about the considerable improvement of the material situation of the working class and urban populations as a whole. Therefore, one ought to consider political, administrative and legal factors as primary among all those factors which influenced the size of criminality, both revealed and tried.

Persons who were to be found on the lowest levels of the social hierarchy i.e., part-time manual workers, people without permanent employment and without skills were prone to contacts with courts of law. This is the reason why the economic and social situation of individuals was also a factor which one can describe as crime-inducing. From around 1890 one can notice a certain professionalization of the criminals. The number of recidivists sentenced by the Justices of the Peace and later, on a number of occasions, by other courts, grew considerably. This phenomenon is also demonstrated by other sources, not referred to here, which describe gangs of thieves, specialized burglars, the *lumpenproletariat* or outright bandits, suburban milieus and such whole districts as Bałuty. The history of those social milieus is both dramatic and vivid; unfortunately, I am compelled to resign from presenting its course by the very range of my study.

Table 1. Number of Persons Sentenced Annually (per 100,000 Population) in Groups of Provinces

Period	Provinces		
	industrialized	non-industrialised north-eastern	non-industrialised and others
1877–1879	168	159	164
1882–1883	202	176	198
1885–1887	216	213	223
1888–1890	250	227	232
1891–1892	230	313	265
1894–1895	157	169	121
1896–1898	154	171	156
1899–1901	153	156	115
1902–1904	143	118	122
1906–1908	121	97	93

Table 2. Number of Persons Sentenced for Particular Categories of Crimes in Warsaw, other Towns and Villages in 1878 and 1898

Year	Type of locality	Number of persons sentenced (in percentages) in the total number of persons sentenced					Number of persons sentenced per 100,000 population						
		A	B	C	D	E Total	A	B	C	D	E Total		
1878	Warsaw	2	12	6	6	4	11	2	321	22	4	4	354
	other towns	11	24	24	34	21	24	3	144	20	6	4	176
	villages	87	64	70	60	75	65	6	116	17	3	4	176
	total	100	100	100	100	100	100	5	132	18	4	4	164
1898	Warsaw	2	12	2	8	7	9	5	186	7	5	2	205
	other towns	8	22	19	27	30	20	8	108	20	6	2	144
	villages	90	66	79	65	64	71	27	105	29	4	2	176
	total	100	100	100	100	100	21	112	25	5	2	165	

A — crimes aiming to inflict bodily harm; B — crimes against property;
C — crimes against religion, morality etc.; E — various crimes.

Table 3. Number of Persons Sentenced (per 100,000 Population) in Warsaw, Moscow and St. Petersburg

Year	Warsaw	Moscow	St. Petersburg
1889–1893 ^a	350	355	289
1894	254	360	322
1895	257	355	290
1896	235	337	329
1897	201	356	307
1898	225	364	280
1899	236	363	360
1900	238	299	339

Source: J. K o n c z y ń s k i, *Stan moralny społeczeństwa polskiego*, pp. 181–182
^aannual average