Mediterranean democracy, Year 1

Athens, 12 January 2013

National Hellenic Research Foundation, Vasileos Constantinou 48, Athens 11635

Present (indicating areas of main interest): Nicos Alivizatos (law and constitutions)**; Dimitris Christopoulos** (citizenship)**; Dimitri Dimitropoulos** (Ottoman Greece)**; Marios Hatzopoulos** (Ottoman Balkans;concepts of national identity)**; Anna Karakatsouli** (book history; war of independence)**; Paschalis Kitromilides** (enlightenment and nationalism)**; Kostas Kostis** (economic history; state formation)**; Ioannais Kyrakantonakis** (Orthodox church)**; Sophia Matthaiou** (intellectuals and new Greek state)**; Michalis Sotiropoulos** (European political languages and processes of state building)**; Pericles Vallianos** (Hegel; German idealism; political thought)**; Konstantina Zanou** (transnational history of nationalism)**; Aggelis Zarokostas** (privateering and piracy)

And: Joanna Innes, Mark Philp, Eduardo Posada Carbo

Apologies, or expressed interest but didn't appear: Leonidas Kallivertakis; Grigoris Molyvas; Tassos Pechlivanidis

FIRST SESSION: THE PROJECT

Joanna Innes introduced the project – outlining the first phase of the project and explaining the form that discussions had taken. The central proposition was that (across Europe and both Americas) in the middle of the eighteenth century, 'democracy' referred primarily to the ancient world, Greece and republican Rome, and was conceived of as a primitive form, not well suited to the modern world; by the mid nineteenth century it had been re-imagined as a category central to the understanding of the modern world. To place charting and understanding this change at the centre of study did not entail affirming that 'democracy' became at any point a central political concept; it was suggested rather that charting what was involved in this change offered interesting perspectives on changes in political culture and practice. The project was concerned with both talk and action: what contemporaries used the concept of 'democracy' to talk about provided a guiding thread; the intention was to resist reading backwards our or other later notions of democracy. But 'democracy' was not then the focus of any elaborate, academic discourse: it was a word used to try to understand political phenomena and consider how to respond to them. The project was also concerned to identify and understand the challenges people saw themselves as facing and the forms of response they developed. 'Democracy' in the discourse of this period more often represented a problem than a solution. It meant broadly, the people's claim to power. Even at the end of this period, no consensus had developed as to how that claim was best dealt with, or what form a government institutionalising certain democratic elements might take. Many had come to think that representative institutions might play an important part in solving the challenge of democracy, but this was not universally accepted. Whereas discourses of ancient democracy were substantially uniform, the process of re-imagining democracy for modern times involved diversification: the development of distinct national discourses and political practices (though the challenge was perceived to be international, and much interest was shown in problems being encountered and solutions being devised in other places). Insofar as the process of re-imagining democracy took different forms from place to place, this was not a diffusionist story: it was not a matter of adapting any single model, but of taking part in a

larger, multi-national enterprise. The American and French revolutions threw up democratic phenomena and so helped to make democracy a talking point – but the French revolution also served to discredit democracy. It attracted more favourable attention post-Waterloo, in the context of debates and struggles about the nature of the post Napoleonic European order. Initially its advocates tended to operate through secret societies; in that context their ideologies were not open to inspection. In the different circumstances of the 1830s and 40s, self-proclaimed democrats began to operate in a more public way, and to form a kind of 'democratic international'. In northern Europe, calls for democracy climaxed in the 1848 revolutions.

The question to be addressed now was, what work did the term 'democracy' do in a Greek context?

Mark Philp noted that in its current phase, the project focussed on the Mediterranean. Funding obtained from the Leverhulme Trust would support a series of meetings over a three-year period in Lisbon, Madrid, Pisa and Athens; also meetings in Oxford, Paris and New York. This phase of the project had only just begun, but guiding ideas included: that once again, different political units (states, emergent states, whatever the appropriate unit might be) could be shown to have followed different paths, in terms both of the ways in which they used the term and cognate terms, and in terms of the political practices with which it was associated. The chronology of developments might differ from that that applied in northern Europe: periods of Napoleonic invasion (1797+ in Italy; 1808+ in Spain); the 1820s and 1850s-60s looked like periods of special interest. There were important interactions between the North Atlantic states – America, France, Britain and Ireland – on which the first phase of the project had focussed, but Mediterranean states seemed to share certain common experiences and develop a sense of the common problems of their region in a way that differentiated this from the previous focus of study. They all experienced subordination to northern and eastern powers (Britain, France, Austria, Russia, the Ottoman empire); they all saw themselves as having fallen away from glorious pasts, and as needing to 'regenerate' themselves. Some took arms to promote eachother's causes; the Italian Risorgimento was inspirational across the region. Mediterranean problems and solutions affected thinking in northern Europe; for the early romantics, the Mediterranean was a region of special interest and promise: Mazzini was perhaps the most emblematic figure of the mid-century European democratic international. Though current funding would support meetings in southern Europe, the intention was not to conceive of the Mediterranean as a European space only. Attention would also be given to Ottoman and Arab experiences: these would form the subject of a reading group/seminar that would meet in Oxford during the remainder of the current academic year.

Eduardo Posada Carbó indicated the structure of the programme as it would play out over this year and the two succeeding years. Meetings in the first year were to be informal and exploratory; in the second and third year, the aim was to hold slightly larger and slightly more formal meetings. In the second year, these would focus on local themes, in the third year, on cross-cutting themes. There would be a general book coming out of the project, and in some if not all cases also collections of essays relating to local or other themes.

Discussion:

People were encouraged to raise any general question before the more specific discussions started.

Nicos Alivizatos and **Pericles Vallianos** asked what rode on the use of the term 'imagining': what methodology was implied? *The primary aim was to resist teleology by placing at the centre of enquiry what people at the time did with the term 'democracy', instead of assuming that we know what democracy is, and they should have done, and tracing the steps whereby they formulated and implemented correct ideas. No particular methodology was being espoused ab initio. On the contrary, one of the aims of the project was to develop methodologies appropriate to the question being posed. Existing intellectual history and political methodologies did not seem adequate to the task.*

Nikos Alivizatos also asked about the term 'Mediterranean': would 'southern Europe' not be better? *Though the current funding supported a series of conferences in southern Europe, it had always been intended also to make some reference to other shores of the Mediterranean, esp by drawing on experts in Paris, New York and Oxford. To extend their knowledge and understanding of these regions, they would be organising a reading group/seminar in Oxford during the next two terms, in which they aimed to involve members of Oxford's Oriental Studies Faculty, to explore ways in which the wider Mediterranean framework could be conceptualised in the context of the project. Islands were noted to be particularly interesting as cross-over points.*

Paschalis Kitromilides noted that, after the collapse of the dictatorship in the 1970s, there had been some interest in the history of democracy in the region. Poulantzas had written a 'not very serious' book about the founding of the democratic tradition. His own view was that the Mediterranean context for the process was extremely interesting. A whole series of cultural transfers were involved, which created space for a re-imagining of the past as well as the future. He noted that Bentham had sought to promote his own constitutional vision not also in Spain and Spanish America and Greece, but also by writing to the Bey of Tripoli. Nonetheless, he was sceptical about the relevance of North African experience. More relevant, he thought, were the Balkans: they provided and important context for Greek political thinking and in the emergence of the Greek nation and state. He cited for example the Rumanian creation of a new Latinitas.

He also pointed to an issue that arose in relation to 'democracy' in the Greek language, in that whereas other European languages used both Greek and Latin words (democracy/republic), and had the opportunity to use them in different ways, in Greek, a single word covered all this ground. Its primary connotation was anon-monarchical regime. By the 1830s, the Greeks came to think that they needed a monarchical regime, if only to deal effectively and satisfy the expectations of other European states. That severely limited any plausible role for the terminology of democracy as an aspiration. *Accepting this, it should yet be noted that there was some slippage between the terms republic and democracy in N.Europe: both had a variety of applications, and they were sometimes closely linked, if sometimes differentiated.*

SECOND SESSION: LANGUAGE

Joanna Innes raised 8 questions relating to Greek uses of the term 'democracy' and its cognates, which she hoped discussion might illuminate:

1. In what range of ways was 'democracy 'used; what other terms fell within its broader semantic field, and how were these various terms associated or differentiated. Was it a learned or a popular term? In translations from other languages, were references to

'democracy' rendered by that term; was it used to render other terms (republic; others)?

2. How was the term used in reconstructions of the ancient Greek past? Was it used in a religious context? In relation to Byzantine ideas or practices?

3. How if at all was it used under the Ottoman regime? How if at all was it used by those imagining alternatives to that regime?

4. How were the French and American revolutions discussed, in what terminology; did democracy and republic figure?

5. Was it used in the Greek war of independence and in formulating the case for independence? What was the discourse of nationalism; to what extent and how were 'nation' and 'people' distinguished? Was there reference to a notion of the sovereignty of the people? Did Philhellenes associated Greece with democracy, and did their ideas affect Greek public discourse?

6. Inasmuch as the term connoted a non-monarchical order, did that entirely crowd out other uses under monarchy? Were there those who positively advocated a non-monarchical order? How did they develop the argument for that, if so?

7. Greece had several constitutions, with the first drafted in 1822: what were the key terms in the constitutional discourse? What arguments were made favouring a broad suffrage; was that associated with 'democracy'?

8. In what terms were the affairs of other countries discussed in the early and mid nineteenth century, esp those of European countries affected by revolutions in 1848; the United States?

Kostas Kostis wanted to know how social and economic forces figured in the project. Wasn't there too much emphasis on words, when it was these other forces that were more crucial? *Certainly the broader context was of interest, though in this first session, the object was to explore the use of words. Though word-use needed to be mapped, the question then to be asked was, What work were words being used to do? That entailed looking at the nature of conflicts and the strategies and tactics of different actors. In Britain around 1832, the word came into play in the context of conflict between Tories and Whigs about whether the constitution needed reform and if so along what lines; Tories used the word to try to discredit Whig projects; Whigs responded that in fact democracy was not such a bad thing. 'Democracy' was here a counter in a political game that needed to be glossed in other ways.*

Paschalis Kitromilides said that there could be found in the secondary literature answers to many of the questions raised. It was known when the term gained political currency in Greece; that this was rather late in the day (1850s/60s); discussion of the US model was also rather late in the day. Earlier, inasmuch as 'democracy' did have some legitimating force as a slogan, it was sometimes invoked by anti-modernising elements, who strove to present reform initiatives as anti-popular: thus by those who opposed Capodistrias, or Otto – though democracy was a less important term in their lexicon than constitution.

Work had also been done illuminating the first formation of democratic arguments. Democracy was invoked in the 1790s in connection with advocacy of a Hellenic republic. It was sometimes used to characterise self-governing communities under Ottoman rule: thus for example in an important geographical treatise. In the 1840s students used it as a legitimating slogan, in connection with clamouring against absolutism. In relation to translations, there was a translation of Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* in 1846 – not retranslated till 1950s. **Nikos Alivizatos and Michalis Sotiropoulos** added that there was also a translation of Bagehot on the English constitution, and of Jefferson also in 1846.

Michalis Sotiropulos suggested that it was worth thinking further about non-use of the term: noting contexts in which it was not used was potentially illuminating. Thus, in 1846 a professor of constitutional law gave an inaugural lecture in which he talked about liberty and offered a sweeping survey of states from Norway to Italy and Hungary, but he did not talk about democracy. He thought this a significant and meaningful absence.

Ioannis Kyrakantonakis noted that it was also used negatively, long before C19, esp in ecclesiastical sources. Democracy and republic were not always equated. Venice was discussed as a republic, but an aristocratic one; it was contrasted with an alternative model, the democratic republic.

Paschalis Kitromilides. Subsequently however democracy came to be associated with non-monarchical constitutions. In the 1830s people were looking to model or contemporary European states; they needed institutional arrangements that would make sense to their allies and would be seen as 'European'. Constitutional thinkers in this context advocated liberty but not democracy, because of its anti-monarchical connotations – overcome only with the institution of the so-called 'crowned democracy' by the constitution of 1864. The first Greek constitution of 1822 was translated into English and French, and attracted commentary from Bentham. Also by the expatriate Greek Korais, which was so radical that it was not published until 1932 (though there was an abortive attempt to publish it late C19).. Korais reflected on the alternative model of the American constitution: his text represents the most important reflection on that theme; he linked monarchy with corruption.

Nikos Alivizatos argued that the term democracy was not used in discussion of the 1820s constitutions. The chief aim of these was to constrain strong central government – hence annual parliaments. The French constitution of 1795 inspired the proposal for a 5-member executive. But the constitution was not put into practice: it was essentially a paper project.

Dimitri Christopoulos wanted to add a methodological note. He thought it was important to consider the use of neighbouring terms, that is, how terms such as nation, liberty and equality were used in relation to one another. Also to be ready to distinguish patterns of use on the part of different speakers: what 'democracy' meant to the Greek on the street was not necessarily what it would mean in all contexts. He also stressed the importance of Church-State relations as an element of Greek experience.

Mark said indeed it was possible that content conveyed by the term 'democracy' elsewhere was in Greek usage appropriated by other words; the term might lack much significant content, such that it was important to expand the semantic field in order to understand people's political concerns. He remained unclear whether in Greece 'democracy' had any real power as a slogan.

Nikos Alivizatos said that the two concepts that were more central to constitutional texts, and more prominent in popular use, were equality and constitution – liberty figured less than one might have expected. There were 5 separate articles on equality in various constitutions, none on liberty, which was a rarefied, intellectual term. Whether democracy had any power as a slogan is hard to say: the work hasn't been done.

Sophia Matthaiou agreed that research was lacking. She suggested though that Greek intellectuals of the first generation used democracy in a negative sense: it connoted above all a non-monarchical regime, which they came to think in appropriate to their circumstances. They thought that the king guaranteed national unity – they wanted freedom of the press – and they had the privilege of not having an aristocracy (because there were no big landowners). So the Greek case differed from the European case. The Greeks believed that it was crucial to stay united and that if that could be achieved then the country had the potential to become big and strong – like GB, which it resembled in being a maritime power.

Joanna asked about use of the term 'sovereignty of the people'.

Nikos Alivizatos said that this was used only much later; it didn't figure in the 1820s constitutions. He explained that there were two initial revolutionary constitutions – modelled on the French constitutions of 1793 and 1795 – 1795 in terms of the organisation of power; 1793 in terms of the declaration of rights. The third constitution was modelled more on the Federal constitution of America, for example in including a president: Capodistrias was invited in, but he abolished the constitution. Sentiment then built up in favour of a constitutional monarchy, with an elected king; the chief point of having a king would be to signal their likeness to other European powers. The framing of constitutions was always heavily influenced by pragmatic considerations. That there should be elections was taken as self-evident: given that there was no organised conflict between classes at this time, it could be expected that elections would return members of local elites. Even more conservative elements favoured elections. Suffrage was initially limited within village communities, but in 1844 all but universal male suffrage was instituted.

Marios Hatzopoulos suggested that, though they may not have had much use for the term democracy, there were well-established traditions of representation that went back to the Ottoman empire – with communities being self-governing to a considerable extent. We speak about elites or notables, but these people had the role of community leaders. However in the context of the wars of independence divisions sometimes arose within their ranks, and moreover new elements appeared, such as Phanariots and returnees from the Greek diaspora. In 1823 and 24 there are two civil wars. Capodistrias was brought in as a strong man – and there was another even bloodier civil war when he was assassinated. These events gave practices of representation a bad name. He agreed with Paschalis that the desire to present a certain kind of face to the outside world was important, but also with Sophia that there was a more purely domestic drive for national unity.

There was some dispute about whether there were elections under Ottoman rule; **Nikos Alivizatos** was prepared to accept that some form of election did then sometimes take place; however when early constitutions provided for annual elections, in fact these did not take place. **Dimitri Dimitropoulos** said that in the islands one could find accounts that said 'we vote' or 'we elect', but it was very difficult to know to what kinds of practice such phrases referred. **Joanna** noted that all kinds of elective practices took place elsewhere in Europe; elections might be uncontested. They might be conducted quite informally, with a view to

establishing a consensus. They could function as ways of endorsing people, rather than of selecting between competitors.

Konstantina Zanou said that it was important to remember that Capodistrias was by no means a democrat. He was an imperial subject, representing Czarist traditions. It was important to remember the diverse cultural roots of intellectuals: most came from the old empires. Not that affirming empire in itself foreclosed possibilities: there were many political projects that could be pursued within the framework of empire.

Michalis Sotiropoulos proposed that electing and voting did not necessarily entail 'representation': that implied some notion of the individual as a political agent. In this period, not the individual but certain forms of property were what people sought to represent. **Joanna** questioned whether representation did presuppose individual agency and choice; Michalis affirmed that in his view it did. [He has subsequently explained that he was reacting against a view found in nationalist historiographies of both right and left from late C19 which credited Greece with a native democratic culture, that revived after foreign oppression. Against that, he wanted to emphasise the need to distinguish between different kinds of voting/representational regimes].

Several participants wanted clarification as to whether what was being discussed was a term or a concept? The term democracy might be in use, but without that conforming to our concept. *The project was concerned with both language and practice, but insofar as it was concerned with language, primarily with the term – when historians explore the concept this usually means that they look for incipient formulations of some version of a later concept, in a world in which people thought about things differently. To avoid anachronism it seems better to follow the term (and its cognates). In the case of practices, when these are judged 'not really democratic' there is a danger of constructing what is in fact an overstated contrast with presumed 'more democratic' practice elsewhere. If not democratic according to our modern conceptions, Greek practices might nonetheless closely resemble what was being done elsewhere in the Europe of the time. It seems more worthwhile to try to establish what these practices were than to find them wanting by some idealised standard. We shouldn't, for example, worry that elections were not 'real' elections if they provided opportunities for endorsement more than for choice: that is what many elections in this period were like.*

There was some discussion of sources that could be used to establish use of terms. **Sophia** noted that there were now some newspapers from the period on-line, but these could not be keyword searched. **Michalis** noted that some texts for the period were in Google Books. He suggested that court-related materials might shed light on ordinary people's usage.

LUNCH

THIRD SESSION: NATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Mark Philp identified some issues that might allow for bridge-building between language and practice:

1. Popular protest and its organisation: did ordinary people organise themselves to bring pressure to bear on government? If so how, and in terms of what legitimating rhetorics? Did such organisations reflect more top-down or bottom-up initiative?

2. How did people think about 'the people'? How were 'the people' constructed in political life. Were 'the people' equated with 'the nation'? Or was there a concept of 'the common people', perhaps conceived of more as local than as national actors?

3. Citizenship: how was that conceived? Did citizenship confer political rights? How were citizenship, military obligations, property and political rights interrelated? Were there forms of privilege that had to be eradicated in order to make possible a conception of equal citizenship/political right?

4. Were there differences between public and private political discourse (and to what extent can we get at private discourse)? How did people employ political concepts in everyday life? Was there a conception of democratic practice that had implications for how non-state institutions and bodies should conduct their affairs? (in England by the 1840s, high-handed behaviour within political organisations could be criticised as 'undemocratic').

5. What experience elsewhere was seen as providing models for action, including, what constitutions were taken as models? French and American constitutions had been mentioned; was there knowledge of or interest in the Cadiz constitution? Was any interest shown in the Austrian empire and its traditions? What knowledge and ideas travelled along communication trails created by the Greek diaspora, and to what extent were ideas reworked in transit?

6. What practices were there for holding those with power to account – that seems to be one element that emerges as associated with democracy elsewhere in Europe? How successfully was political contestation institutionalised (as opposed to being expressed in civil war)? What relationship was forged between representation and contestation?

7. How has the historiography dealt with the period; what might the historiography have missed; what don't we know – and could we come to know it?

Kostas Kostis. It's not possible to answer all these questions in the time available, but what should be said first is that we cannot compare Greece with GB in the 1820s in terms of political organisation. All European Mediterranean countries were predominantly peasant societies, there was no significant urban population – so we need other comparators and other tools. There were protests in C18 – popular protests – but they were traditional peasant protests against taxation or revolts against the intrusion of strangers. Rather than thinking about political organisation as in the UK, much of the focus in the Greek case might be on the practices of banditry, that retained importance till the 1870s. In more formal politics, elites played a dominant role. His own view is that secret societies, if ever important, did not remain so after the revolution. If we want to understand what was going on in the political field of Greece we need to understand the role of the notables – it is more like Bulgaria. The political field was competitive in Greece – not as in Serbia dualistically organised (around the dissension between Obrenovich and Karageorgevich as to whether to accept Ottoman rule) – so what was in question was plural competition between notables. In Bulgaria the notables of

the capital gained a monopoly of power; whereas there is nothing similar in Greece – no important capital – so lots of local groups, which used the suffrage to consolidate their local power base

Michalis Sotiropoulos proposed to partly object: might this not be a statement about the state of scholarship? The establishment of universal suffrage seems to attest to some form of democratic impulse. **Kostas Kostis** responded yes, after 44, but in a national, not a local political context. There was a different franchise at the local level. **Michalis:** but still one needs to ask, why the change? Wasn't this the result of an intervention by delegates from the Ionian islands?

Joanna observed that it is clearly important that Greece was largely a peasant society – but so too was Ireland; and so was most of Latin America – and they were going through processes in which the language of democracy was used, and in which new practices come to be associated with 'democracy'. Peasants may be the subject of and may find ways of making use of novel political initiatives. Even if elections are driven in the first instance by elite competition, moreover, one surely still needs to ask, How did they compete? By what means did they try to build up their support bases – with what kinds of arguments or by offering what kinds of incentives?

Nikos Alivizatos There is a doctoral dissertation from about 20 years ago that looked at the quality of nineteenth-century elections. Throughout the century the quality improved. Quality means in this context that there was no violence in the course of the election and the outcome was respected. Nonetheless there remained much clientelism: elections were still above all a war of influence between notables. *Asked to clarify the character of this clientilist competition – did notables bring ready-made factions into the field, or compete for the loyalty of a common base* – he stated that they competed for the same support base. *Asked whether 'democracy' was invoked descriptively or normatively in this context* he was not able to answer that in the current state of research. *It was also suggested that it would be useful to know what they offered to get support: private benefits, such as jobs? Public benefits, such as roads*. He said that competition for benefits was more common than a contest of ideas. After 1850 there were conflicts between the modernisers and those committed to 'the deep country', whose slogans were along the lines of 'Down with taxes'.

Kostas Kostis Politics and political language was, as a result, primarily local – the national was secondary. We know about the nature of local political contest through local studies. National elections were in his view not clientilist, but controlled by the King; this was so until the 1860s. Othon drew up the lists of deputies he wanted to see elected. The opposition then had to decide whether to accept the King's preferences, or respond in a more or less violent way. In this context, politics was partly structured by a stand-off between the army and the bandits. When they emerged the 'democrats' were radicals and anti-monarchists – but that was not until after the 1860s, and towards the end of the century.

Eduardo asked about a term he had run across in his reading (in Richard Clogg's history of Greece): reference was made to a democratic-militarist party.
Kostas Kostis: 'democratic' is in this context a historians' term, not used in this way by contemporaries. The left later came to define itself as democratic because they associated this name with opposition to the king in Prussia. So democracy as the name for a self-conscious political movement is really a C20 phenomenon in Greece.

Paschalis agreed that, though the term had a role in enlightenment literature at the end of the eighteenth century, it was not a key political term throughout most of the nineteenth century.
Joanna was prepared to accept that in C19 Greece the term wasn't much used to describe poltical phenomena, but it was important to remember that in much of Europe it was more used in that way in this period than as the name for a desired ideal. In late eighteenth-century England, for example, national defence armed associations were described as 'democratic' by those who feared them as such: the politics of those bodies were if anything anti-democratic, but insofar as they represented the people in arms, they were seen by some as in their own way manifestations of 'democracy'.

Michalis Sotiropoulos asked how 'Greece' should be understood for the purposes of this discussion. Did it mean the area ruled by the Greek state? Or the larger zone in which self-identified Greeks lived? Were the Ionian islands for example part of the story? If the focus was not only on the territory of the Greek state, then the experiences to be considered were more diverse.
Paschalis Kitromilides said that the politics of this wider Greece were quite well studied. Experiences within it were certainly complex. For example, Corfu (an Ionian island) was first under Venice and then under the Russians; at Vienna, it was placed under British control. The British established a constitution and representative government. There developed there a radical 'democratic' movement looking for the end of the protectorate and unity with Greece; they favoured a non-monarchical regime. They played a role in 1864 but then evaporated. There are at least 2 English PhD theses on this [most recently Calligas, LSE, 1994].
Michalis Sotiropoulos said he believed that an Ionian island delegate was the first to use the term 'democracy' in debate in the national assembly.
Konstantina Zanou. The Ionian Islands are important – they show that you cannot study Greece in isolation – and that you cannot just set Greece in a Balkan context.

Joanna asked what kinds of justificatory languages were used to contest colonialism.
Anna Karakatsouli. It would be interesting to look at the use made of foreign idealised models, eg those Bentham or the Saint Simonians. **Kostas Kostis** however noted that the Saint Simonians were obliged to leave Greece in 1828-32.

Pericles Vallianos. Anti-imperialism was predominantly a feature of the Ionian islands – especially Kephalonia; also of Cyprus after 1878. The big obsession was with national unity – not just with the establishment of a kingdom but one united kingdom. The main theme of the historiography is the development of unity. So we need to dig beneath that to find out what was going on. There is now a developing change in the historiographical paradigm, affecting both left and right; he was uncertain whether a still older historiography might offer different perspectives. Now much greater emphasis is being placed on divisions within the nation/potential nation.
Paschalis Kitromilides observed that the theme of national unity was already paramount in romantic historiography. He said that since 1974 (fall of the military junta) there has been a renewal in the history of modern Greece, above all in the field of economic history.

Michalis Sotiropoulos suggested that Greece itself found itself subordinated to protecting powers.
Kostas Kostis did not think this was a fair representation: Greece was an independent nation, *tout court.*
Michalis said that jurists were very conscious of this protective overlordship. During the 1830s, the C18 law of nations' theorist Vattel was much cited both in Italy and in Greece in

support of the notion that there was no hierarchy among nations: all were sovereign and as such equal.

Mark Philp asked what was the unit which was expected to display unity?

There was some disagreement among Greek participants as to whether language or culture was primary.
Dimitris Christopoulos - The Greek nation was defined culturally – by language, religion. A central role was played by the Patriarch.
Ioannis Kyrakanonakis Ancient Greece is also central to the Greek imagination – taught in schools
Mark asked how language could be primary if the unity project involved among other things teaching non-Greek speakers (eg Macedonians) to speak Greek.
Paschalis Kitromilides said in this context, it was membership of the Greek Orthodox Church that marked them out as Greek, but language was seen as a critical tool for forging unity.
Kostas Kostis said this nation-building project did not really get underway till 1850s-60s.
Sophia Matthaiou said that for Greek intellectuals, these were key issues. The elements of Greek identity were not really settled until the later nineteenth century.

Mark Philp asked about the perhaps mutually-reinforcing relationship between Greekness and civic obligation. Who was obliged to attend schools? To perform military service?
Kostas Kostis. Provision of education was compulsory but attendance was not required until the 1880s. As to military service, initially there was a small army of conscripts; it only became more broadly compulsory in the 1870s.
Everything changed in the 1880s, because of the Macedonian question, creating a need to educate Slavs in Greekness, and because of linked developments in the army: the army changed the state
Paschalis Kitromilides asked if the army did not earlier play a part in building national identity: there were 14,000 in the army in 1860s.
Kostas Kostis but that is insignificant compared to later.
Pericles Vallianos already during the Crimean War there were incursions into Ottoman territory.
Konstantina Zanou: what seems to be being argued is that these elements of national identity were not really massified until the 1880s, but there was earlier a national ideology.

Dimitris Christopolous – on the question of citizenship. The 1822 and 1823 'constitutions' defined Greeks as Christian inhabitants of the liberated territories. So citizenship was defined against the claims of the Ottoman Porte: membership of the Orthodox Church was not presumed; Catholics in the islands for example were not seen as problematic. Three years after the formation of the Greek monarchy, the territory was divided into communities; this preceded any definition of citizenship. A good example of the local preceding the national. Membership of a Greek municipality became a precondition for membership of the Greek state (as it remains even today: every Greek citizen must be linked to a specific municipality). Right of blood was not established till 1835. The Greek citizenship tradition is one of overlapping constellations. Thus first, the Ottoman model, in which state and church were closely linked, was influential. Secondly, the post-revolutionary tradition, and the associated notion of national sovereignty: in this tradition, the nation was the only intermediary between individual and state. But thirdly, there was also an ethnicist constellation: there were affinities with both German and Jewish nationality laws. In a Mediterranean context, Italy had certain

similarities: in both cases diasporic/irredentist issues helped to shape notions of belonging. Italy and Greece were the first two European states to tolerate dual nationality.

Joanna Innes asked whether any of these affected rights to vote?
Dimitris Christopolous: To vote you had to be a citizen and registered in a local municipality. It was not necessary to qualify by paying tax.
Michalis Sotiropoulos asked about diaspora Greeks. In 1864, citizenship was extended to them; there were voters in Livorno, Marseilles, Trieste, Odessa. They were enrolled as Greek citizens by local consulates, who in this way became important gatekeepers.
Dimitris Christopolous: indeed, the role of consultates in issuing passports was important. Such voters voted twice both in their cities and in the municipalities in which they were registered.

Nikos Alivizatos mentioned an important book, just published in English, Konstantinos Tsitselikis, *Old and New Islam in Greece: from historical minorities to immigrant newcomers* (2012)
Paschalis Kitromilides noted that Korais called for a conception of Greek citizenship that included Muslims

Kostas Kostis. There is a critical moment for tax in the 1880s. Until then tax was on the peasantry, in the form of a tithe: the urban classes paid very little. This changed in 1883: the urban population began to pay tax. Neither the upper classes nor companies paid direct tax and companies do not pay direct tax. The most important taxes were indirect. Income tax was introduced only in 1919.
Michalis Sotiropoulos: some problems in levying taxation related to problems associated with property rights. The Ottoman period bequeathed overlapping conceptions of property.
Pericles Vallianos. The local priest was a key information source for the state. He knew who in practice cultivated what land. The Church thus served as an unofficial land registry.

Joanna Innes asked what play was made of notions of 'national sovereignty': was this term used, and if so was it equated with or contrasted to popular sovereignty? Was such a term as 'self-government' used, and if so in what contexts?
Nikos Alivizatos. It was stated in the 1864 constitution that 'all powers derive from the nation'. Nation was seen as equivalent to people, but nation was conceived as a cultural concept including some non-residents of the state.
Joanna wondered what concepts were used in the 1822 Declaration of Independence? Was 'independence' a neologism?
Nikos Alivizatos noted that this was to some extent modelled on the American Declaration of Independence; it aimed at more than just getting rid of Ottoman rule; the establishment of a constitution was also envisaged. independence was the word used. In 1864, a famous sentence was added, specifying that all powers were derived from the people, and must be 'exercised according to the constitution'.

Joanna asked if any constitutions were subject to popular ratification.
Nikos Alivizatos no, only by the assembly. There was however a very open debate in the assembly, to some extent connected to debate outside its walls. One finds references to a Montagnard party. The constitution introduced universal suffrage. The method of voting was specified. It involved voting by dropping a bullet into a ballot box. There was a separate box for each candidate. Voters thrust their hand inside the box and then deposited the bullet on either the black or the white side, to indicate their choice in each case. This practice remained

in force until the 1920s. Prior to that, voting had been on handwritten ballots, which opened the way for various forms of manipulation. Elections attracted very high levels of participation after 1864. They had to be completed within a single day, a Sunday.

Michalis Sotiropoulos. Referred to David Armitage's *Declaration of Independence in Global Context.* There was a translation of the American constitution made during the Greek war for Independence. in 1822 the text of Greek declaration was translated into French and English and was presented in various foreign courts. He noted that Mark Mazower had recently given an interesting paper at the British Academy bout the international repercussions of the Greek war of independence, including in Latin America.

In response to a question about which foreign models were known, **Nikos Alivizatos** said that he thought no one knew about the Cadiz constitution. French and American constitutions were translated into Greek, but not the Spanish to his knowledge. It would be interesting to know more about an Italian carbonaro who helped to draft the Greek constitution: Vincento Gallino. He came back after Greece obtained its independence and was honoured, but not much is known about him. He noted that there was a thesis about Italian volunteers in Greece.

FOURTH SESSION: GREECE AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

Eduardo Posada Carbo Introduced the issue of Greece in the wider Mediterranean discussion. He noted that there were a number of shared experiences – of exile, emigration and also of changing geopolitics, within the Mediterranean world. He also noted that there remained the issue of the significance of the ancient world – for all in the Mediterranean since it was their ancient world. Perhaps more might be said about forms of interchange between the different European states, eg about the sources of the Hellenic enlightenment; the role of the Italian Universities. He wondered what we know about the dissemination of texts, papers and journals and about translations – who made them, for whom. In thinking about the Mediterranean, one might also think about its links to Latin America. Bringing in monarchs to preserve national unity was also favoured by some Latin Americans in 1820s.

Paschalis Kitromilides: If you study Greek intellectual history you come to realise that the connection with Italy was essential – most ideas came into Greek intellectual culture through Italian channels. There was not much direct contact with France – mostly through Italy. The Ionian Islands played a central role as Greek communities steeped in Italian culture. Initially Padua University was the favoured site of education, then in later C18 Bologna, Pisa and elsewhere. There were Greek merchant communities in Italy for many centuries: initially esp in Venice, later in Livorno and Genoa. The visitors' book in the Lorenziana in Florence bears many Greek signatures in 1821: he assumes from Greeks crossing Italy to get back to Greece and fight.

Konstantina Zanou argued that we must not conceptualise interplay only in terms of discrete national traditions interacting. Some contexts were hybrid. Ugo Foscolo, Andreas Kalvos and Dionysis Solomos came to be acclaimed as national poets of two different countries (Italy and Greece), but all started on the same Ionian island: Zante/Zakynthos. The transition from an old world of empires to a world of nation states and new-style empires entailed people developing 'national' identities which they had not previously possessed.

Paschalis Kitromilides observed that similar things happened in the Balkans. People began their intellectual life writing in Greek, then had to reinvent themselves as representatives of a different nationality.

Mark Philp: wondered about perceptions of, and the effect of bringing in non-Greeks to be kings, first from Bavaria, then Denmark.
Paschalis Kitromilides: the three protecting powers had agreed that they wouldn't promote someone from any of their own royal houses, The King of Bavaria's son was chosen because that king was a great Philhellene. The expectation from the start was that he would learn Greek. Ludwig would not consent to his changing his religion, but it was agreed that his children should be raised as Orthodox. Prince George of Denmark was in any case married to a Russian princess, who was Orthodox.
Sophia Matthaiou: the kings learned Greek and were expected to bring up their children within the Greek orthodox church
Pericles Vallianos: the kings compensated for their foreignness by adopting aggressively pro-Greek policies and attitudes. During the Crimean War, Otto forged links with Italian patriots. He asked to be buried in Greek national costume.

Eduardo asked about Korais' influence within Greece, given that he spent most of his life elsewhere.
Paschalis Kitromilides said that he was sponsored by a Greek merchant family, who saw that his works were distributed to libraries etc in Greece. In 1827, his contribution was officially recognised by the Greek state. But he then clashed with Capodistrias, criticising his absolutist measures.
Nikos Alivizatos said that it seemed to him that Korais represented the mainstream European liberal tradition: he was effectively a Girondist. Rigas who was executed in 1798 was more of a Jacobin. These were distinct and conflicting traditions.

Joanna Innes asked if Mazzini was influential? **It was agreed** that he was not widely known, in contrast to Garibaldi.

Paschalis Kitromilides: it is surprising how open Greek thinking was to European currents. There esd a body of translation and a lively press. There were centres of Greek culture in Smyrna, Istanbul and Trieste; Thessalonica was mainly a Jewish city. There was some censorship – but probably more self-censorship.
Eduardo asked if it was more isolated when under Ottoman rule.
Paschalis Kitromilides: the Greek diaspora always provided links to Europe, especially to central Europe.

Mark Philp asked about works translated and their readers.
Nikos Alivizatos said that there has been some work on who subscribed to such books. Rousseau circulated more widely than Voltaire.
Mark asked what Rousseau?
Paschalis Kitromilides said that the Social Contract was the first to be translated, then the Discourse on Inequality. Not all books are associated with subscriber lists, eg Korais work, because it was promoted by his merchant sponsors. What we see though is a conscious effort to introduce modern scientific thinking -with the aim of integrating Greece into the modern, western European world.

Kostas thought such publications might have had more impact on diaspora Greeks than Greeks in Ottoman territories. He noted that, despite some diversification in the book trade prior to 1821, the vast majority of publications were ecclesiastical in character.
More important, he thought, were schools established by merchants to teach modern subjects.
Ioannais Kyrakantonakis argued that even if many European enlightenment ideas circulated only among intellectuals and not more widely, that did not make them uninteresting: intellectual culture also deserved study in its own terms. Greeks were following European intellectual trends already before the eighteenth century.
Michalis Sotiropoulos After the first stream of translations in C18, there was a decline until the 1830s. After that, Greek publications began to be printed for Greek universities and schools. In relation to Korais, he noted that some of his influence was indirect, through his disciples, who paid tribute to him in their writings, and thus made him better known.

All participants were thanked for their involvement, and their willingness to engage in debate.

NEXT STEPS

Minutes of the meeting would be drafted and circulated for correction.

There would be another meeting during the next academic year, on a somewhat more formal basis. Planning for that would begin soon. Possibly that might give rise to a collection of essays, to be published in English, if participants would like to aim at that. The team hoped soon to try to interest a publisher in a series of books of essays to arise from the more formal meetings that were to be held.

In due course, a project website would be established. In the meantime, a 'research interest' had been created on academia.edu: 'Re-imagining Democracy 18th-19th Centuries'. Anyone who chose to follow that would be posted with such items as others chose to tag with that research interest, and could similarly tag and thus circulate information about their own relevant work. A set of instructions and screenshots would be circulated (when time could be found to create them) showing those not familiar with this academic networking site how to sign up to it and how they could indicate interest in the project within this site. The site offered those with an interest in this theme an opportunity to network on their own initiative.