

UNHHC

United Nations Historical Council



Committee: United Nations Historical Historical Committee (UNHC)

Topic: Punic Wars

Written by: Andrés Garza López & Nicolas Rodriguez

Dear Delegates,

Esteemed delegates from the ancient Mediterranean times, this historical committee is now welcoming you. Your chairs for this simulation will be **Daniela Tapia** as your secretary, **Fernando Flomo** as your moderator, and **Mateo Montoya** as your director. The chairs are looking forward to leading you through a period when the two superpowers were fighting for control, influence, and even existence. By these few sessions, you will become the Roman senators and local allies whose decisions will shape the future of the Western Mediterranean.

We are eager to see your leadership and innovative solutions that will help you deal with one of the most intense historical rivalries. So, good luck, delegates, and welcome to the debate over the Punic Wars.

For any doubts, please do not hesitate to contact

spismunpaseo@sanpatricio.edu.mx

Sincerely,

Andrés Garza & Nicolas Rodriguez



Note:

This committee will be based on the **United Nations Historical Committee**, specifically focused on the **Second Punic War**. All discussions, speeches, directives, and resolutions must be grounded in **historically accurate information**.

Delegates are required to use **only verified historical facts**. No invented events, actions, or outcomes are permitted. The **only exception** applies to characters that have been explicitly designated as **fictional**; however, even for these characters, all background information and actions must remain **realistic and consistent with the historical context of the Second Punic War**.

Delegates are **authorized to use their computers or tablets** during committee sessions for research purposes. In addition, a **formal committee protocol** and a **reference book** will be provided and must be followed at all times.

The objective of this committee is to encourage informed debate, historical accuracy, and strategic decision-making within the framework of the United Nations Historical Committee.

You should keep in mind a couple of things for this debate:

- This Special Committee does not require a Position Paper.
- While drafting and passing a Resolution Paper is common in committees, it will not be a requirement here. Instead, focus on thoroughly understanding this background paper, as you will need to use strategic thinking and diplomacy to demonstrate your leadership.
- It is encouraged to act and exaggerate during your speech to enhance the historical atmosphere, but be mindful to avoid misconduct or disrespect.
- We strongly recommend that you print this Background Paper or the sections you consider important according to your character, it could be black and white and printed on both sides to save paper. We will provide a set of cards per person that includes the 9 acts.

I. Definitions

- *Consul*: The highest elected magistrates of the Republic, two served annually with supreme imperium, commanding armies and directing state affairs; during the war they led campaigns against Hannibal and managed Rome's military deployments.
- *Patrician*: Members of Rome's hereditary aristocracy, originally monopolizing political and religious offices; by the Second Punic War they remained the elite class, dominating the Senate and magistracies despite plebeian political gains. Ancient Origins
- *Praetor*: Senior magistrates ranked below consuls, primarily judicial officials but also granted imperium; they could command armies, govern provinces, and preside over the Senate when consuls were absent.
- *Senator*: Members of Rome's aristocratic council, whose prestige grew during the war; they shaped military strategy, allocated resources, and provided steady leadership in crisis, consolidating their role as guardians of tradition and policy. frontisca.
- *Pro-praetor*: a former praetor whose imperium (the supreme authority to command armies and administer justice) was extended beyond their one-year term. They governed provinces or led military campaigns without re-election, ensuring continuity of Roman control during long conflicts

II. Protocol:

This debate's scenario unfolds within the Curia of the Roman Senate, where the leading men of the Republic have been summoned to deliberate upon the gravest matter facing Rome: the survival of the state in its second and decisive war against Carthage. The year is not fixed, nor is the outcome certain. Across a sequence of evolving sessions set during the years of the Second Punic War, delegates will witness the shifting tides of fortune — from catastrophic defeats to fragile recoveries — as the fate of the Republic hangs in the balance. Each session represents a different moment in the conflict, allowing history to move around you rather than remain static beneath you.

This committee is designed as a crisis simulation. While its central objective appears straightforward — to determine the most effective course of action to defeat Carthage — the true heart of the debate lies in consequence. Every proposal, every alliance, every compromise will set events into motion. The Republic will not wait patiently for consensus; it will react. Military disasters, political unrest, economic strain, and foreign intrigue may arise as direct results of the Senate's decisions. Delegates must therefore think not only as strategists, but as Roman statesmen navigating uncertainty.

You are not merely representatives — you are consuls, senators, patricians, commanders, and power brokers of Rome. Each of you carries personal ambitions, family honor, political rivalries, and ideological convictions into this chamber. Some among you may favor bold, aggressive campaigns to crush Carthage outright. Others may argue for strategic patience, defensive containment, or even negotiated settlement to preserve Rome's strength. Your assigned character's interests must guide your conduct. If peace preserves your faction's influence, you must argue for it. If prolonged war elevates your standing, you must pursue it. Above all, you must adapt, for circumstances will not remain favorable forever.

*Each delegate must take into account the strengths, ideologies, and priorities their assigned character possesses. Each delegate must convince the rest that acting on what suits them best, even if it means a harder time in defending Rome against Hannibal. Each delegate must defend their character's personal priorities to make sure they're protected.

The committee operates under a cause-and-effect structure. The Chairs, in coordination with the crisis staff, will issue updates triggered by the Senate's collective direction and by the individual initiatives of its members. A decision to display mercy toward Carthage may invite unexpected retaliation. A defensive posture in Italy may safeguard the countryside — or concede initiative abroad. A reckless offensive may bring glory — or annihilation. Rome's enemies will think, react, and exploit weakness. Your decisions will directly affect how the crisis plays out.

*The main aspect of the debate is the resource chart. This resource chart will measure the war effort. During the debate every delegate must take into consideration how each solution will affect the war effort. A lower war effort means an increasing difficulty in defeating Carthage, a higher war effort means the opposite.

From this point forward, while this committee is grounded firmly in the historical framework of the Second Punic War, certain elements have been streamlined or adjusted to allow this crisis simulation to function dynamically. The real conflict was vastly more intricate, filled with overlapping commands, shifting offices, and political rivalries that evolved over years. For the purposes of this debate, some timelines, titles, and circumstances may be simplified. This is done not to disregard history, but to provide you with the freedom to shape it.

You are not bound to reenact events as they occurred. Through your decisions, Rome may rise more swiftly — or fall more completely — than it did in reality. The Republic's fate rests not in the pages of history, but in the resolve, cunning, and adaptability of the men within this chamber.

III. Edictum magistratus (Parliamentary Acts):

At any point during a session in the Curia Hostilia, all senators have the right and privilege to call upon the Edictum magistratus, which basically are proclamations or laws that

affect different aspects of the flow of the debate. The senate may call for a maximum of one *Edictum magistratus* per session, and after a specific act passes it cannot be invoked again during the same session by anyone in the Chamber. There is no specific order on how the senators are supposed to ask for the acts, it may be called upon in any order based on the particular initiative of the representatives. They may be used as to other actions in an UN-debate; whoever wants to call for it, first would address the Magistrate (the moderator) and ask for a “Motion to vote a *Edictum magistratus*”. If the motion passes, the one who called for it announces the name of the desired Act to pass, and then should address the quorum with a clear argument based on the purpose of the specific proclamation, to try to win their support to vote for the expected outcome.

Act 1: *Consilium pro Salute Rei Publicae*:

This act grants the senate the ability to increase the war effort by making propaganda against Carthage. This act would mostly target the Plebeians (commoners) and Freedmen (Free slaves) to increase field workers and food production. This would cause an increase in weapon production by riling up workers and food for troops boosting morale and efficiency of troops.

Act 2: *Edictum de Viribus Augendis*:

This act grants the senate the ability to increase the war effort by issuing a *dilectus*, (call to arms) against Carthage. This act would target all the citizens of Rome of all social classes including slaves. This would cause an increase in troops. However this act can cause certain Patricians to support Carthage and reduce funds and donations to the Roman Legions

Act 3: *Contributio ad Victoria Romanam*:

This act grants the senate the ability to increase the war effort by calling a *Tributum*, (donation) against Carthage. This act would target all the citizens of Rome of all social classes excluding slaves. This would cause an increase in funding to make or repair weapons, armors, boats, etc. However this act can cause certain Patricians and plebeians to take negatively into the newly imposed tax and increase Carthage support.

Act 4: *Pactum ad Pacem Cum Carthagine*:

This act grants the Senate the ability to improve relations with Carthage by issuing a diplomatic decree promoting negotiation and limited concessions. Roman envoys would be sent to open channels of communication with Carthaginian leaders and reduce hostile rhetoric within the Republic. This act would primarily target Patricians, merchants, and political elites whoq. benefit from stability and trade across the Mediterranean. By signaling willingness to compromise, Rome could reduce tensions and encourage trade and diplomatic dialogue with Carthage. However, this act would lower the Roman war effort by decreasing military

mobilization, reducing public urgency for the war, and diverting some resources away from the legions toward diplomacy and economic cooperation.

IV. War Effort:

War effort is a measurement of the strength Rome has to fight Carthage. War effort is a combination of money, people (field workers), food reserves and soldiers. The more of any of these factors they have the higher the war effort they will have. A low war effort directly affects the resources the committee will have to face Carthage. This means that a low effort will mean less troops, food, money, boats, etc.

The Core War Effort Formula is like a way to measure how strong a country is during the war using the following four main things: soldiers (S), food (F), money (M), and people (P). Each one is rated from 0 to 100 like a percentage. So, soldiers are the most (30%) because they are who fight, food and money are next (25% each) because armies need to eat and drink water and they have to get paid, and people which is (20%) help by working and producing resources. When you put all together, you will get one number called War Effort (WE), all these resources depend one from each other. For example, if there are fewer people working, food production goes down. This means that if food goes down, soldiers get weaker. If money drops, the soldiers will not have good equipment and food. So you can't only focus on one thing.

This shows us how decisions, called Acts, can change everything. For example, motivating people or raising salary's, probably would increase the war effort. Another example, calling more soldiers for war might help at the beginning, but it can reduce workers and food will end faster. There is also a "War Effort bar" which is from 0 to 100 that shows how stable things are. If it's dominant (80-100) this means everything is strong and under control. If it is below 60 it is strained but problems start like arguments and reduction of food. Below 40 it's critical, things will get really dangerous like losing battles or people's revelations against the government. If it is under 20 it collapses, the system passes through a critical situation. So the idea in this debate is not only war is about fighting, it's knowing how to balance resources and making smart decisions so everything keeps working together.

V. Historical Background

More than 2000 years ago there was a decisive and great war, fought between two titans of the ancient Mediterranean world. The Republic of Rome, still at the time a tiny state limited only to the Italian peninsula but with big expansionist ambitions, and Carthage, a state originally founded by the Phoenicians in North Africa but then already a significant power by its own accord, would find themselves on opposite sides of the geopolitical arena; which eventually become a rivalry by the 3rd century BCE, and this shaken the balance of power in the

Mediterranean Sea triggering a fight for supremacy in land and sea between them, and only one of the two would emerge victorious. This is what historians today call as the “*Punic Wars*”, which were actually three consecutive and decisive disputes fought between the Republic of Rome and Carthage, at the height of the Classical Age.

The First Punic War was the first big war between Rome and Carthage, and it lasted from 264 BCE to 241 BCE. Before it started, Rome was focused on land power to control most of Italy, and it had a strong army made of citizen soldiers. On the other hand, Carthage was a rich trading city in North Africa that controlled the sea and had many colonies and ports around the Mediterranean Sea. Even though Rome and Carthage had not fought in a major war before, they slowly started to become enemies because they both wanted to expand their power and protect their economic interests.

The main cause of the First Punic War was control of Sicily, an island that was very important because it produced a lot of grain and was located between Italy and Africa. Whoever had dominion over Sicily could control trade routes and military movement in the Mediterranean. Rome feared that if Carthage controlled all of Sicily, it would be too close to Italy and could become a serious threat for them. Carthage also wanted to keep its influence on the island because it already had cities and ports there, so conflict became almost inevitable.

The war officially began because of a problem in the city of Messana, modern day Messina, which was located in northeastern Sicily. A group of soldiers, called the *Mamertines*, took over the city and caused trouble in the area. When they were attacked by the ruler of Syracuse, the *Mamertines* first asked Carthage for help, and Carthage sent troops to protect Messana. Later, the *Mamertines* became afraid that Carthage would take full control of the city, so they also asked Rome for help. After much debate, Rome decided to send soldiers because it did not want Carthage controlling the Strait of Messina, which was very close to the Italian coast. When Roman troops arrived, Carthage was seriously outraged, and this event marked the start of the First Punic War.

At the beginning of the war, Rome was strong at land but had serious problems at sea because it had almost no navy. Carthage had experienced sailors and warships, which gave them an initial advantage. So, Rome built a navy by copying a captured Carthaginian ship and added some special boarding bridge called the “*corvus*”, which led Roman soldiers to fight enemy sailors hand to hand. This new strategy helped Rome win their first naval victory at the Battle of Mylae in 260 BCE, which surprised Carthage and gave the Romans some confidence at sea.

As the war continued, Rome started to become ambitious and decided to attack Carthage directly. In 256 BCE, Rome won a huge naval battle at Cape Ecnomus, one of the largest sea battles in ancient history, and then they invaded North Africa. At first, the Romans were successful, but in 255 BCE they were defeated by a reorganized Carthaginian army led by the

general Xanthippus, who used war elephants to break the Roman formations. After this defeat, many Roman ships were destroyed by storms and this killed thousands of soldiers and sailors.

After the defeat in Africa, most of the fighting was done on Sicily, where the conflict lingered for many years. Both sides fought in cities and forts, and many soldiers died in the battlefield, hunger, and disease. In 249 BCE, Rome suffered another major defeat at the naval Battle of Drepana, where bad leadership and decisions caused the Romans to lose many ships. During this time, a Carthaginian general named Hamilcar Barca became important because he used smart tactics to attack Roman forces and keep Carthage fighting even when it was weak.

Even though both sides were tired and low in money, Rome didn't want to give up. In 241 BCE, Rome built one last fleet using money from rich Romans citizens and trained its sailors very carefully. This fleet defeated the Carthaginian navy at the Battle of the Aegates Islands; they cut off supplies to Carthaginian forces in Sicily. Because of this defeat, Carthage was forced to give up Sicily, free Roman prisoners, and pay a large amount of money to Rome. Sicily became Rome's first province outside Italy and Rome became the strongest power in the western Mediterranean sea.

Even when the first conflict was concluded, and Carthage was weakened and heavily punished, losing a lot of economic power, it did not give up and still was a strong power to deal with. To recover, Carthage began to expand into Spain (or as the Romans called it, "Hispania"); which was rich in silver mines, farmland, and people who could become part of the Carthaginian domain. This expansion was led by Hamilcar Barca, who wanted to rebuild Carthage's power and prepare it for the future. Spain became very important to Carthage because it provided money and troops for new armies.

Hamilcar Barca was determined to confront the Romans because he believed that Rome had treated Carthage unfairly and had humiliated its people after the war. He also raised his young son, Hannibal, to share this resentment, making him swear that he would never be a friend of Rome. As a result, Hannibal grew up believing that Rome must be destroyed. Influenced by his father and the aftermath of the First Punic War, he later became one of Carthage's greatest generals during the Second Punic War. This suggests that the tensions and unresolved issues from the First Punic War continued to shape later conflicts. However, what evidence supports the claim that Hamilcar truly hated the Romans?

By 275 BCE, Rome had taken control of the entire Italian peninsula, but it soon faced new challenges. Just across a narrow stretch of water lay the island of Sicily, where Greek and Carthaginian forces were competing for dominance. Carthage, located in present-day Tunisia, was a powerful maritime state. It controlled key routes in the Mediterranean, with an empire stretching from North Africa to Gibraltar, including parts of what are now Spain and Portugal.

Carthage possessed one of the strongest navies of its time, reportedly maintaining around 220 warships. Although it suffered losses in several naval battles, it remained a major sea power. Control of maritime trade routes was essential to its economy and influence. However, as Rome strengthened its own naval capabilities, Carthage's dominance at sea weakened, making its territories more vulnerable to attack. Internally, Carthage also faced political and structural challenges. This contrasts with Rome, which often integrated conquered peoples as allies, strengthening its overall stability. Nevertheless, this comparison requires further evidence and clarification to fully support the claim.

Carthage only wanted to take money from them. They forced them to pay big tributes and offered them nothing in return, this led the people to look for a reason to rebel. Their government was also a mess, it was managed by a small group of very rich people, insecure men who were so afraid of their own generals that they would kill them for losing a battle or even for winning too many and becoming too popular

The first major fight between these two, the Romans and Carthage, was the First Punic War. Rome won and took Sicily, and forced Carthage to pay a really huge bill. For example, they had to pay a lot of money, follow strict rules, and give up land. Rome made this because they didn't want Carthage to become strong again because of this Carthage became weaker and helped Rome stay in control of the Mediterranean. This left Carthage broke and in a really bad position, so they went to Spain to gain their fortune.

Spain gave Carthage expensive minerals like silver, gold, and tin. This helped them pay the money they owed to Rome and continue with their strong economy. In the western Mediterranean, Carthage controlled trade and traded goods to get metals. Because of this trade and the resources in Spain. Carthage could pay large armies and make strong coins. Carthage went to Spain to replace land they had lost and to build strength to compete with Rome again.

A general who was Hamilcar Barca and his son, Hannibal, built a massive power base there. The tension finally broke around 219 BCE when Hannibal attacked Saguntum, a city which was aligned with Rome. Even though the boundary lines were unclear. Rome went into it to help Saguntim, and this was when the Second Punic War began.

Hannibal knew he couldn't beat Rome's navy at sea, so he made a risky plan. He would move his army over the Alps to invade Italy from the north. He started with around 40,000 infantry, 6,000 cavalry, and 60 elephants. When he reached the Italian mountains, the freezing cold and mountain tribes caused a huge amount of loses of his men and almost all of their elephants.

Despite all his losses, Hannibal showed to be a battlefield genius. Around 218 and 212 BCE, he dominated the Romans battle after battle. Hannibal used intelligent plans like

surrounding them at the Battle of Cannae, which surprised them. Their soldiers that came from Africa, Spain and Gaul brought different skills. Hannibal also knew the Romans weaknesses and strengths. He couldn't defeat Rome because the Romans never gave up and had many more soldiers. Over time, the long war slowly made Hannibal's army weaker. His masterpiece was the Battle of Cannae around 216 BCE. He used a smart tactic where his center line drew the Romans in and his army closed and surrounded the Romans, the Romans got into the trap. In a single afternoon, 70,000 Romans were killed and Rome was shocked with fear.

Hannibal hoped this masterclass would make Rome's Italian allies abandon them, but for the most part, Rome's group of alliances got stronger. Rome was in a position where they couldn't beat Hannibal in a fight but they refused to give up. They switched "to make the enemy weaker by the time" this was proposed and recommended by Fabius Maximus. Instead of fighting, the Romans just followed Hannibal. They burned their crops and cut off his supplies to make his army weak over the time.

While Hannibal was stuck in this nightmare in Italy, Rome sent a brilliant general, Scipio Africanus, to Spain. Scipio was a quick study, he trained the Roman army and even started using Spanish weapons like the short sword and the javelin. Eventually they destroyed Carthaginian power in Spain. In 197 BCE, Rome officially took control and they made two provinces called Nearer Spain and Further Spain. First, some soldiers left but when people in Spain started to rebel. The Romans sent their armies back to take control of more land. For years the fights continued making many lost but the wars ended in 133 BCE when Scipio Aemilianus captured the city of Numantia, cutting off Hannibal's more powerful source of money and soldiers.

Eventually, Scipio took the war to Africa, forcing Carthage to call Hannibal from Italy to defend his home. Both finally met at the Battle of Zama around 202 BCE. Scipio used Hannibal's own tricks against him and won a crucial fight. Carthage was forced to accept a peace treatment, that burned their navy and ended a world power. After losing, Carthage had to make peace, give up Spain, stop warships, and pay Rome for 50 years. Because of this victory, Scipio was given the name Africanus. Rome was now the empire that controlled the Mediterranean.

Roman war culture:

During the Second Punic War, Roman society was deeply shaped by a sense of duty and martial pride, as most adult male citizens were expected to serve in the legions and defend the Republic with unwavering loyalty. Romans saw military service not just as a job but as a sacred obligation to protect their homes, honor, and way of life, and defeats at battles like Cannae only strengthened their resolve rather than crushing their spirit. Though not professional by modern standards, Roman soldiers trained relentlessly in drills, building discipline and endurance through practice marches and weapons exercises that forged cohesion and toughness. Training was rigorous and ongoing, and the long-term expectation of service fostered a shared identity where courage and collective effort were celebrated virtues. While some citizens longed for

combat out of patriotic zeal, many went to war because refusing to serve was socially unacceptable and dented a man's standing; military success was tied to personal honor.

The legionary's life was harsh, the discipline strict, and the ethos of *devotio* (the willingness to give everything for Rome) was part of what made the Republic's armies resilient in the face of Hannibal's repeated victories. Morale sometimes dropped after catastrophic defeats, like Cannae, heavy casualties, prolonged campaigns, and the psychological shock of facing Hannibal's brilliant tactics, which made even the bravest soldiers question victory. Rome's war effort relied heavily on money, food, and field workers, as shortages of funds or grain and the loss of farmers to the army strained both the economy and supply lines. These pressures could lower morale and limit how long armies could stay in the field, making logistics as crucial as bravery in sustaining campaigns.

VI. Quorum:

In favor of Rome:

Publius Cornelius Scipio – A patrician from the distinguished Corneli family, known for its long tradition of military leadership. Recently entrusted with command in Spain, his reputation rests on discipline, organizational skill, and loyalty to Rome's senatorial elite. His relation to Carthage is primarily strategic and economic, aimed at severing their Spanish alliances and silver supply; this translates into a cautious, methodical style of warfare focused on containment and securing allies rather than reckless aggression.

Tiberius Sempronius Longus – A plebeian consul from the Sempronii, respected for his energy and willingness to take bold action. Assigned to Sicily and Africa, he is regarded as a capable commander with a record of service in Rome's overseas campaigns. His relation to Carthage is direct and political, positioned to threaten their homeland and trade routes; this fostered an aggressive, battle-ready style, eager for decisive confrontation to demonstrate Rome's dominance.

Marcus Livius Salinator – A patrician senator with prior service as consul in 219 BCE, remembered for his stern character and naval command. Though censured for financial disputes, he retained influence in Rome's strategic planning. His relation to Carthage was economic and maritime, focused on disrupting their trade and naval power; this fostered a pragmatic, hard-edged style of warfare, aggressive in cutting supply lines but disciplined in execution.

Gaius Flaminius – A plebeian leader celebrated for his populist reforms and military vigor, twice consul and a champion of land redistribution. His reputation rested on energy and independence from aristocratic control. His relation to Carthage is political and economic,

opposing their mercantile wealth as a source of inequality in Rome; this translated into a bold, aggressive style of warfare, eager for decisive victories that would secure popular support.

Marcus Claudius Marcellus – A patrician warrior from the Claudii, famed for his martial prowess and triumph over Gallic foes. His reputation is built on courage and relentless pursuit of military glory. His relation to Carthage was martial and symbolic, seeing them as a rival empire whose defeat would enhance Rome's prestige; this fostered a fierce, blood-hungry style of warfare, relentless in battle and eager to strike hard blows against the enemy.

Marcus Atilius Regulus (the younger) – A patrician senator from a family immortalized by the elder Regulus' sacrifice in the First Punic War. His lineage ties him closely to Rome's struggle against Carthage, reinforcing hostility and duty. His relation to Carthage was deeply political and familial, embodying Rome's memory of past conflict; this translated into an honor-driven, aggressive style of warfare, seeking bold confrontation to avenge Rome's losses and uphold family legacy.

Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus – Son of Publius Cornelius Scipio, he is a young patrician rising within Rome's military ranks, already noted for bravery and quick thinking. His relation to Carthage is personal and martial, forged through his family's command in Spain and his own early encounters with Hannibal's forces. This translates into a visionary, adaptive style of warfare, blending discipline with bold innovation, a commander expected to grow into Rome's most creative strategist against Carthage.

Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus – A patrician from the venerable Fabii family, renowned for his conservative statesmanship and religious piety. Known for patience and steady counsel, he was entrusted with guiding Rome through crises. His relation to Carthage was systemic and political, viewing them as a long-term threat to Rome's stability; this translates into a cautious, delaying style of warfare, favoring attrition and containment over rash engagement.

Lucius Aemilius Paullus – A patrician consul from the Aemilii, remembered for his stern discipline and loyalty to Rome's traditions. His relation to Carthage was martial and political, seeing them as a destabilizing rival whose defeat was necessary for Rome's supremacy; this translated into a cautious yet resolute style of warfare, emphasizing order and calculated risk over reckless charges.

Gnaeus Servilius Geminus – A patrician consul of 217 BCE, remembered for his naval command and efforts to secure Italy's coasts during Hannibal's invasion. His reputation rested on discipline and loyalty to Rome's senatorial leadership. His relation to Carthage was maritime and defensive, focused on protecting Rome's shores and maintaining communication lines; this

translated into a cautious, protective style of warfare, emphasizing security and stability over reckless ventures abroad.

Lucius Manlius Vulso – Praetor (218 BCE), later acting with Propraetorian authority in Cisalpine Gaul: A patrician magistrate elected praetor at the outbreak of war, assigned to Cisalpine Gaul where unrest threatened Roman stability. His command became increasingly vital as Gallic tribes showed signs of instability influenced by Carthaginian diplomacy. His relation to Carthage was indirect but strategic, focused on preventing northern revolts before Hannibal could exploit them; this fostered a vigilant, containment-oriented style of warfare centered on internal security rather than glory.

Gaius Atilius Serranus – Propraetor provincial command continuing into 218 BCE: Holding extended imperium in a provincial assignment at the outbreak of war, he represented Rome's administrative continuity. His role was to maintain order abroad while the consuls prepared major campaigns. His relation to Carthage was structural and preventative, aimed at securing Roman holdings against defection; this translated into a steady, disciplined style of command emphasizing stability and controlled projection of force.

Carthage sympathizers:

(F)**Marcus Minucius Rufus** – A plebeian consul and later Master of Horse, known for his rivalry with Fabius Maximus. His reputation was built on boldness and impatience with delaying tactics. His relation to Carthage was political, as his aggressive stance often aligned with factions eager for quick victories, even if it risked Rome's stability; this translated into a rash, confrontational style of warfare, preferring immediate battle over long-term strategy.

(F)**Lucius Calpurnius Piso** – A patrician senator from the Calpurnii, whose estates and wealth were tied to Mediterranean commerce. His reputation rested on pragmatism and careful management of resources. His relation to Carthage was economic, recognizing their merchants as both rivals and partners in trade; this fostered a cautious style of warfare, preferring negotiation and limited conflict to preserve Rome's economic networks.

(F)**Lucius Aemilius Mercator** – A patrician senator from the Aemilii, whose wealth is tied to Mediterranean shipping ventures. Known for his careful management of trade contracts, he valued stability in commerce. His relation to Carthage was economic, as their merchants were competitors but also partners in Mediterranean trade; this translated into a cautious style of warfare, preferring blockades and negotiations over destructive campaigns that might disrupt shipping.

(F)**Gaius Fulvius Nauta** – A plebeian senator from the Fulvii, with family interests in grain imports and maritime transport. His reputation rested on practical administration and attention to Rome's food supply. His relation to Carthage was commercial, since Sicilian and African grain markets overlapped with Roman needs; this fostered a pragmatic style of warfare, favoring limited naval actions to secure supply lines rather than aggressive invasions.

(F)**Marcus Junius Argentarius** – A patrician senator from the Junii, whose fortune came from silver mining and financial dealings. Known for his shrewdness in economic matters, he sought to protect Rome's fiscal health. His relation to Carthage was economic, tied to Spain's silver mines under Carthaginian control; this translated into a strategic style of warfare, focused on cutting Carthage's revenue streams rather than pursuing bloodlust on the battlefield.

(F)**Quintus Hortensius Negotiator** – A plebeian senator from the Hortensii, respected for his skill in negotiation and mediation. His family had ties to merchant guilds and overseas contracts. His relation to Carthage was political-economic, recognizing that Rome's merchants sometimes benefited from Carthaginian trade networks; this fostered a pacific style of warfare, preferring treaties and controlled competition over outright destruction.

(F)**Publius Valerius Portuensis** – A patrician senator from the Valerii, whose estates included port facilities and warehouses in Ostia. His reputation was built on logistics and infrastructure. His relation to Carthage was economic, since their fleets competed with Rome's for Mediterranean dominance; this translated into a defensive style of warfare, emphasizing naval security and port protection rather than aggressive campaigns abroad.

(F)**Sextus Terentius Pacator** – A plebeian senator from the Terentii, known for his moderate voice in the Senate and preference for compromise. His relation to Carthage was diplomatic, recognizing their role as a Mediterranean power whose destruction might destabilize trade; this translated into a conciliatory style of warfare, favoring peace treaties and arbitration over prolonged conflict.

(F)**Decimus Manlius Vinarius** – A patrician senator from the Manlii, whose estates were tied to vineyards and wine exports. His relation to Carthage was commercial, since African and Iberian markets provided both competition and opportunity for Roman vintners; this fostered a defensive style of warfare, preferring protection of trade routes and economic stability over aggressive campaigns.

(F)**Aulus Postumius Albinus Negotiator** – A patrician senator from the Postumii, known for his involvement in Mediterranean trade councils. His relation to Carthage was economic and political, recognizing their merchants as rivals but also necessary partners in balancing Rome's

commerce; this translated into a cautious style of warfare, emphasizing diplomacy and controlled rivalry rather than outright destruction.

(F)**Gaius Aurunculeius** – Praetor: A magistrate entrusted with provincial responsibility during the outbreak year. Aware of Rome's fragile logistics and grain supply, he prioritized regional security over escalation. His relation to Carthage was pragmatic and economic, recognizing that Mediterranean instability could damage Rome's commerce; this fostered a restrained, security-focused style of command.

Publius Cornelius Lentulus – Proprætor (extended provincial imperium at outbreak): Holding continuing provincial authority, he belonged to the faction wary of prolonged total war. His relation to Carthage was diplomatic-economic, favoring containment and balance rather than annihilation; this translated into a cautious, negotiation-oriented military posture.

Sources:

1. Polybius. (c. 150 BCE/2010). *The Histories*.
<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Polybiu>
Primary source; considered one of the most reliable accounts of the Punic Wars
([Wikipedia](#))
2. Hoyos, D. (Ed.). (2011). *A companion to the Punic Wars*. Wiley-Blackwell.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=DeHoLjPOtTUC> ([Google Books](#))
3. Goldsworthy, A. (2006). *The Fall of Carthage: The Punic Wars 265–146 BC*. Cassell.
4. [First Punic War overview](#)
➤ Based largely on Polybius, widely accepted by historians as a key foundation for modern interpretations ([Wikipedia](#))
5. Lazenby, J. F. (1996). *The First Punic War: A military history*. Stanford University Press.

6. Warmington, B. H. (1993). *Carthage*. Barnes & Noble.
 7. Goldsworthy, A. (2001). *Cannae*. Cassell.
 8. Lazenby, J. F. (1998). *Hannibal's War: A military history of the Second Punic War*. University of Oklahoma Press.
 9. Second Punic War overview
Daly, G. (2002). *Cannae: The experience of battle in the Second Punic War*. Routledge.
 10. Orlin, E. M. (2021). *A social and cultural history of Republican Rome*. Wiley Blackwell.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=h65FEAAAQBAJ> (Google Books)
 11. Forsythe, G. (2005). *A critical history of early Rome: From prehistory to the First Punic War*. University of California Press.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=YbIwDwAAQBAJ> (Google Books)
- 

