Mediterranean democracy, Year 1

Madrid, 11 March 2013

Casa de Velazquez, Madrid

Present (indicating areas of main interest): Francisco Acosta (democracy in a rural context), **Jose Alvarez Junco** (social movements and political culture)**, Gonzalo Butron Prida** (Napoleonic and immediately post-Napoleonic period; Spain-Piedmont-America)**; Maria Teresa Calderon** (New Granada and Venezuela)**; Gonzalo Capellan** (conceptual history)**; Rosie Doyle** (Mexico, pronunciamentos)**; Tim Gribaudi** (Napoleonic Valencia)**; Annick Lempriere** (state in Latin America; Mexico, Chile)**; Carlos Malamud** (elections and revolutions in Latin America)**; Stephane Michonneau** (nationalism; politics of memory)**; Diego Palacios** (forms of political action, Portugal and Spain)**; Florencia Peyrou** (democratic political culture)**; Juan Pro Ruiz** (state building)**; Jordi Roca Vernet** (political culture, Barcelona)**; Pedro Rujula** (political life during war of independence), **Pablo Sanchez Leon** (relations between discourse and action in social conflict), **Romy Sanchez** (Cuba and Caribbean), **Maria Serra** (liberalism), **Juan Luis Simal** (liberalism, republicanism and exile, Spain, Europe and Americas), **Louise Zbiranski** (the ideal of the armed citizen in Spain, Italy and Germany).

And: Joanna Innes, Mark Philp, Eduardo Posada Carbo

Apologies, or expressed interest but couldn't make it: Javier Fernández Sebastián, Juan Francisco Fuentes, Carmen de la Guardia, Marta Lorente, Antonio Peña, José María Portillo, Elena Postigo, Rafael Zurita **Juan Pan-Montojo** (economic policy)**;**

INTRODUCTORY

Joanna Innes – explained that the object of the meeting was to begin a conversation between the project team and Spanish scholars; this would be further pursued in two further meetings over the next two years. The basic premise of the project was that between the middle of the eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth century, 'democracy' moved from being a word primarily applied to the ancient world, to become an important (though still fluid and contested) category for understanding the modern world. The question was, what was involved in this transition. The project had begun 2004; initial discussions had focussed on the North Atlantic region; a book arising from this leg of the project would appear in June. Leverhulme funding now underpinned an extension of the project to southern Europe. An Oxford reading group/seminar was currently exploring Ottoman and Arab perspectives on the topic; the aim was also to find ways of incorporating these.

Spanish historiography on this topic appeared to be especially well developed: there have been important recent studies both of the language and concept of democracy in the Hispanic world and of democratic political culture. In that context, the purpose of this and subsequent meetings would be less to draw attention to these issues and encourage their exploration than

- To take stock of the current state of scholarship; to identify areas of consensus and debate, and topics deserving further attention
- To set Spanish experience in a wider context
  - Presentationally: to give the fruits of recent scholarship more prominence in the Anglophone world

        o   Intellectually: to explore relations between Spanish, European and American experiences; to determine what was distinctive and what was particular about Spanish experience, and how it may have influenced and been influenced by developments elsewhere

She then filled out a picture of some ideas generated so far, especially in relation to the North Atlantic leg of the project.

A key focus of attention was on how people talked about democracy. This was problematic, in that 'democracy' operated within a broader semantic field: to focus only on this word and its cognates could be misleading. But a focus on language at least guards against anachronism. In the mid eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth, classical associations strongly coloured understandings of the term: these related above all to the political culture of democracy, seen as turbulent, unstable, and prone to give rise to demagoguery and tyranny. Democracy was not initially associated with voting, and although it came to be thought that broad based voting might provide an institutional basis for democracy, it was possible to envisage democracy in other terms, and to talk about the merits of extending voting without invoking democracy. Given the term's negative associations, it was not surprising that it was not initially championed by American or French revolutionaries, though came into its own as a term to describe phenomena thrown up by revolution. The French revolution played an especially important part in raising the profile of the word (in the United States, among other places), but French revolutionary uses remained diverse – though association with equality, and the supersession of privilege, was strengthened. In the medium term, the French revolution tainted 'democracy', but in the north Atlantic region it started to acquire new positive connotations after the defeat of Napoleon, when the choice facing Europeans could be presented as one between democracy and monarchy/aristocracy. Europeans also noted that a viable, self-proclaimed 'democratic' regime had been established in the United States, though arguably this suited American frontier conditions, and was not exportable. The term gained more salience after 1830 revolutions, beginning at this time to be conceptualised as the radical alternative to increasingly powerful liberalism. By the 1840s, it had become the watchword of an international movement, and reached a (transient) peak in favour during 1848 revolutions. Even so, many continued to invoke the term's negative associations; moreover by this time a new critique began to develop from the left, in the form of socialism: socialists characteristically argued that democracy alone was not enough.

An important feature of talk about democracy in this period was that this was not an academic discourse: Tocqueville was unusual in making democracy the subject of extended reflection. Instead, talk about democracy was deeply implicated in practical politics: associated with attempts to understand or shape what was happening in the world.

Currently she was inclined to model the relationship between democratic talk and practices in terms of unstable convergence. Many practices that came to be associated with democracy – such as the summoning of consultative and/or representative assemblies, petitioning and voting – had a long history behind them, during most of which they had not been considered to be 'democratic'. But as people started trying to give institutional form to democracy, what they usually did was to take over and rework these existing practices. The British and Irish – not to the fore in promoting ideas about democracy – did play a role of some international significance in this context. Mass petitioning movements especially – like the Irish Catholic Emancipation movement, and the pan-British Isles parliamentary reform movement, both of

which achieved their ends 1829/32 – inspired interest elsewhere (certainly in France), as providing a model for a non-revolutionary form of mass mobilisation.

At its start, the project had been Anglo-French in focus; it had then been extended to the US. One conclusion that had been drawn from the study of these different sites was that the story needed to be told in non-diffusionist terms. Ideas about 'democracy' were a common European heritage; in different places, these ideas were re-imagined in different ways, in the context of different local experiences and institutional repertoires. Of course, people took an interest and sometimes drew significant inspiration from what was happening elsewhere – but what they drew from elsewhere and their ability to give local effect to it depended on local conditions. Moreover, there was no one reference point: at different times, different places – including the countries of southern Europe – were taken as models.

The book on the North Atlantic region included a chapter, 'Synergies', exploring interconnections. It was hoped in the current leg of the project to develop further the study of common experiences and interactions, while retaining a focus on individuality of local experiences. One transnational context was supplied by international law: changing ideas about how to establish legitimacy on the international stage provided one context, worth exploration, for changes in domestic ideas and practices.

Mark Philp added a few points.

- in encouraging scholars to think across the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the project challenged what were often sub-disciplinary boundaries: it would be good to attempt to do this in a Spanish context
- popular movements might be radical or conservative: conservative popular movements often also played an important part in the development of forms of political practice, and in shaping ideas about 'democracy' (to positive or negative effect).
- he illustrated differences in connotations the word took on in different places by noting that in nineteenth-century France it came to be strongly associated with social equality, more than with any particular political project ('sovereignty of the people' and 'republic' did more political work), whereas in Britain and the US the term was more often given political content.

He then enlarged on ideas the project team had so far formed about the Mediterranean region.

Chronology of developments: though the French revolution had an impact everywhere, its peak impact in different places was both differently timed and different in content: thus upon Italy esp from late 90s, leaving a legacy of positive associations; Spain especially from 1808, producing popular mobilisation that was ideologically anti-French. 1820-5 were years of revolution in southern Europe; much less so in the north.

Political heritages: though Italy also had a republican tradition, and gave some welcome to French-style republicanism, and the Greeks also initially aimed to establish a republic, constitutional monarchy increasingly emerged as a favoured political option in southern Europe – a point of difference both with the United States and with democratic aspirations in France. He noted though that the term republic was very diversely employed, and its significance in any given context was not always clear.

Empire: in this period, in Britain and France, sovereignty over national territory was relatively unproblematic, and both expanded their power over other territories (though experiencing losses as well as gains), in southern Europe, sovereignty over national territory was problematic: Portugal, Spain and Italy all experienced invasion; Spain, Italy and Greece all undertook independence struggles; Portugal and Spain lost and did not regain empires. It would be interesting to discuss the impact on Spanish political culture not merely of invasion but also imperial collapse: how was this perceived? How did it influence political thought and practice? From the 1850s, it seems that there was some renewed Spanish interest in empire (eg in Morocco), but inbetween the empire project seems to have been shelved.

He went on to enlarge on some points at which particular Spanish experience merited discussion:

Religion, church - at least initially, Spanish constitutionalism seems to have been respectful of church and religion, in this regard contrasting with France.

Nation, regions – he was unclear how much Spanish nationalism there was; was the region, and regional self-determination, more important?

History through this period:

- he found it striking that the Spanish government initially reacted negatively to the French revolution, then allied with France. Was this just a geo-political calculation, or did it reflect some rethinking of the merits of French developments?
- the Cadiz constitution had an impact in Italy, though apparently not in Greece. He wondered why the Cadiz constitution was not ultimately favoured as a basis for liberal governance
- the Spanish revolution of 1820 clearly had an impact in both Italy and Greece, worth considering further
- he wondered what impact 1848 revolutions made in Spain? Though they were echoed in Italy, other parts of southern Europe did not join in

Military force – the role of pronunciamentos, backed by force of arms, seems distinctive. These were not echoed elsewhere in the Mediterranean (except in the immediate aftermath of 1820)

Exiles – what impact did exiles from Spain have on Spanish political culture?

Repression – he wondered what if any lasting effects on Spanish political culture resulted from repression, and significant numbers of executions in 1814 and 1823: this level of repression seemed distinctive

Eduardo Posada Carbo

One distinctive feature of Spanish experience was its linkage into Spanish America. In this context, he identified a number of points as particularly worthy of discussion

Pre 1808– he wondered if there was a common understanding, on both sides of the Atlantic, as to what democracy meant pre 1808. How 'learned' a term was it – perhaps more restricted in use in Spanish America? What impact did US independence have on Spain on the one hand, Spanish America on the other? Francisco Miranda is the first Latin American he has

found talking about 'democracy'; this related to his travels in British America before the war of independence.

Spanish American independence movements – was the language of democracy employed in the context of creating new states; did it operate as a legitimacy principle? Was democracy contrasted with monarchy? What role in spreading new languages was played by an expanding press? What languages were employed in constitutions? Not all Spanish American constitutions took Cadiz as a model. Interesting words in this and other connections are pueblo/pueblos; nation; citizenship. With what practices was democracy associated, eg was it used in relation to *asambleismo*?

Chronologies – after independence, what different national trajectories were followed in different states of the Americas? It is sometimes suggested that initially relatively open political cultures became more closed 1830s-40s, but even if this has some merit, the closure of political opportunities often provoked criticism; there could be evolutions in thought even when not in practice.

Connections – what developments outside Spain affected Spanish America – eg US independence; the French revolution; Benthamism. What was the impact of Jacksonian democracy in Spanish America? – the impact of the second wave of US democratisation has been little studied. The 1848 revolutions did have an impact on parts of Spanish America. Connections within Spanish America are also understudied: eg, what was the impact of the Venezuelan Roscio in Mexico?

Spanish perceptions – did the Spanish invoke democracy when discussing Spanish American independence movements? Did Rosas, and the more general phenomenon of *caudillismo* become paradigms for anti-democrats? (there were sometimes so employed in the US, eg by Henry Maine).

Discussion

Pablo Sanchez –

- wanted to stress the importance of political-cultural traditions. Liberal perceptions of the appropriateness of democracy to Spain were inextricably bound up with narratives of the past.
- Also noted that it makes a difference to how democracy is perceived who leaders and followers were conceived to be, and whether they were central or peripheral actors (including Latin American actors). Contempt for democracy was inflected by context.

COFFEE

LANGUAGE

Joanna Innes introduced this session. She ran rapidly through six phases of Spanish talk about democracy, as these are outlined in the article on Democracia in Fernandez Sebastian et al, *Diccionario político y social del siglo XIX español*.

- C18: elsewhere, references were many classical in orientation and mainly negative, though a positive exception is cited (perhaps echoing the exceptionally positive mid-C18 account by the Marquis d'Argenson)
- French revolution: its impact on the language is suggested to have been largely negative – though a Google ngram does not reveal a peak in usage in this period, as is seen in France, America and Britain.
- War, trienio – around the time of Cadiz, the term was used in both negative and positive senses, or in a mixed sense, eg in terms of stating a need to find a modern analogue for ancient democracy. The argument that a modernisation of aristocracy was also needed, and that representative government might effect both (voters – democracy; representatives – aristocracy), expressed eg by Constant and his circle, can also be found in Spanish sources. She said she didn't derive from the *Diccionario* any clear picture of how the word and cognates were being used during the trienio, except that they continued to be employed in the context of attempts to theorise representative government.
- 1830s, era of first Carlist war: it is reported that this period saw the introduction of the ideas of the French *Doctrinaires*, in which proletarian democracy was represented as a threat to liberty. It seems though that in Spain, 'democracy' was not rejected in toto by those who followed this line of thought: they might praise middle-class democracy while repudiating proletarian democracy. If this is the case, then this positive appropriation of democratic terminology to describe rule by the middle classes seems exceptional in a European context. Other writers apparently influencing thinking in this period were Lammenais and Tocqueville (whose *Democracy in America* was very quickly translated into Castilian). Tocqueville helped to forge an association between democracy and the process of modernisation. Modern democracy was at this time pronounced to be superior to ancient democracy partly in that it involved a more fluid system of social relationships.
- Impact of 1848 revolutions: these may have helped to restore more challenging connotations to democracy; this trend was reinforced by political conflict in Spain during 1850s. This period also saw the take-off of debate about the relative merits of individualistic and socialistic forms of democracy. As elsewhere in Europe, some forged connections between democracy and decentralisation.
- The Spanish 'Glorious Revolution' made possible the instantiation of democratic institutions, as then understood. Google ngram suggests a steep rise in use of the word at this time, esp 1870-4, a rise which wouldn't be matched again until the early C20. This suggests that the historical label 'sexenio democratico' has some merit – though that phrase itself appears not to be contemporary, but to have entered the historiography in the 1950s, and to have caught on only in the 1980s.

Against this background, she proposed the following topics for discussion:

- Was this sketch broadly correct, or not (because she had misunderstood it, or because the original was incorrect)?
- Something which the *Diccionario* does not attempt to illuminate: how important was democracy and cognate terms within the broader semantic field? Were these words rare or ubiquitous, or something inbetween? What was the relative incidence of negative and positive uses? Spanish historians have charted the development of a 'democratic political culture' esp from 1840s: in using this label, are they coining their own term, or reflecting its prominence in contemporary usage?

- Something else the *Diccionario* does little to illuminate: what were the contexts of use? Were these high-register or popular terms? A paradox of 'democracy' is that it's in origin a learned word, though denoting a popular thing. Was it used of the people or also by the people? In the special issue of the journal *Historia y Politica* devoted to the origins of Spanish republicanism (2011), Jesus de Felipe observes that the word was little known in the workers' movement of the 1850s – does that apply more generally to its usage in popular milieux?

Discussion

Pablo Sanchez – he wasn't aware of much of an C18 discourse on democracy, though hasn't been looking for it. Thought the adoption of the Cadiz constitution gave rise to a reflection on the context for parliamentary politics. Though a mixed constitution might be desirable, it was said that Spain lacked an aristocracy. Instead, there was no choice but to try to balance monarchy and democracy. Cadiz was seen by liberals as necessarily but worryingly democratic. *Doctrinaire* ideas provided a basis for attempts to establish a less democratic form of constitution: the problem was to bring into being a new aristocracy for modernity,.

One subject of his recent study had been democracy and demagogy: how, having been linked, they came to be separated. Initially Democracy was seen in very negative terms and as linked to anarchy. Democracy was given a more positive spin from the 1830s when linked with the concept of the tribune.

As to republicanism: his view was that Spanish liberalism was shot through with republican tropes, but nonetheless they functioned within a liberal discourse. It was republican but anti-democratic Liberals like Joaquín María López were against democracy.

What happened in Italy, esp in Rome 1848, was important in Spain: for a moment a possibility was glimpsed of an order of things in which the Pope might preside over a republican and democratic city.

In his view, the most appropriate timespan in a Spanish context would be 1766 (when the political crisis for the first time threw up a republican language) and 1876 (when a new constitution reinstituted liberalism after the sexenio).

Florencia Peyrou – thinks the first decades of C19 very important, but may miss some of their importance if focus too narrowly on the word democracy, given its negative connotations. Better to look for popular sovereignty or representative government. Not entirely clear when democracy did come into more positive use, whether in trienio or only in 1830s and 40s. Debate among European exiles in London about Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* was very important. Mazzini and others began using the term after 1838. This debate was brought into Spain in the 1840s.

Jordi Roca – Not much use of the word in the 1820s - democracy connoted some form of popular government, not necessarily or only voting. It was also associated with the presence of people from popular sections within organs of government.

In the trienio, Italian exiles played an important role in encouraging the use of the term in a positive sense, thus esp Bartolomé Fiorilli.

Jose Alvarez Junco – found the project promising, but thought the emphasis on language limiting. Formulations are not important unless they have impact: if someone wrote about

democracy, but no one read what they wrote, does it matter? Focussing only on things called democracy would make it difficult to deal with the kinds of issues Mark Philp had raised.

He suggested looking also at other related important words like *pueblo*. It's a linguistic peculiarity of Spanish that this word has two meanings one of which is singular – 'the people is' – so that the people connotes an entity associated with the community, identified with the nation. The people considered as an aggregate of individuals are otherwise described: *la gente*.

The Cadiz constitution was drawn up in a very particular context: the context of war against the French. It was influenced by the French 1791 constitution, but couldn't be presented in those terms. So it became necessary to develop a historical myth about the Spanish, about their tradition of freedom: the constitution had to be presented as a return to roots. Spanish freedom was bound up with fighting Muslims, as now against French atheists. In this way the Spanish idea of democracy was conjoined with the idea of the nation: with ethnic, not civic notions of the national community. Liberalism, monarchism and Catholicism were all portrayed as essential national characteristics.

Maria Serra – wants to strike a more pessimistic note. She thinks that the relationship between democracy and liberalism was problematic. Representative government was imagined against democracy, as well as against absolutism – this was also true elsewhere in the world.

Also she's not convinced Spain can helpfully be characterised as Mediterranean. She thinks that it is better linked with the Atlantic world, or with France. Perhaps the project is buying into a traditional hierarchy in distinguishing northern from Mediterranean powers. *To this it was observed that – as Mark Philp said in his introductory comments – southern Mediterranean powers were conceived not to be intrinsically different, but simply in this period to share in a common geo-political location and experience of political subordination.*

Annick Lempriere – though she was interested in the conceptual framework of the project, she also had an objection, wasn't sure if it was the same as Maria's. The project's first volume had an Atlantic dimension: why not the second? Why not south Atlantic, rather than just Mediterranean? Latin America provided an important laboratory for modern politics. Is the definition really picking out a Catholic and Latin culture? *To this it was answered that the framework was to some extent just an organisational convenience. It didn't seem possible to do justice to all the states of Latin America in a single volume, and funding wasn't on a scale that made it easy to incorporate them fully. What role they should play in the current volume was still – within those constraints – an open question.*

Diego Palacios – he knows more about Portugal. There one can find something that might be called plebiscitary absolutism. This represented a response to liberalism: one of its premises was that Catholicism represented the real experience of the people. Catholic absolutist discourse played with the idea that the people can be sovereign. Liberals had to respond to this: to engage in a discussion with absolutists about different levels of popular participation. We need to ask what it means that people were on the streets cheering absolute monarchy. In Portugal in 1828 absolutists began to collect signatures for a petition for the regent to declare himself absolute. 'Democracy' was thus appropriated by absolutists. Church and King mobs attacked liberals. *It was noted that the belief the people have a role to play in constituting power was distinguishable from the idea that they should routinely play a role in constituted power.*

Maria Teresa Calderon – wanted to pick up on the idea that *pueblo* has various meanings. The idea of *pueblos* in the plural was also important. The anti-French effort was led by the *pueblos*, communities. Their understanding of what sovereignty meant was important. Discussion of article 1 of the Cádiz constitution, defining the 'nation, proved especially problematic in this context, and again when sovereignty was discussed. The French had proclaimed that sovereignty lay in the nation. However, an American deputy introduced an important note when he observed that sovereignty originally lay with the *pueblos*. This related to a Catholic understanding of the *pueblos* as natural moral entities, not deriving from law. It's important to bear this in mind in considering how constituent power was understood in the Spanish world. The idea that sovereignty lies not with the *pueblo* but with the *pueblos* was constantly reasserted. It's important to set concepts in a broader conceptual field in order to grasp their meaning.

Carlos Malamud – to understand Spanish politics in early C19 it's essential to consider both what was happening in Spanish colonies and in Portugal. Spanish American independence movement took place within two different frames: that of the Americas and that of Spain/Europe – though there was much interaction between the two, particularly between 1809 and 1825.

Juan Luis Simal - thinks one important element to contextualising political language involves seeing terms forged in interaction. Political identities are often shaped by labels, imposed on people by their enemies; negotiations then take place, whereby labels may ultimately be accepted. Democracy initially had French connotations and everyone fled from the term. But gradually it acquired some positive content, and then became an ideal – though only in the late nineteenth or even twentieth centuries.

Rosie Doyle – democracy also needs to be seen as a term that might be used in combat, and in that context employed by more than one side within a single region.

Stephane – if the Mediterranean is really the unit of study, what of the Ottoman empire and North Africa? 'The Mediterranean' is perhaps a northern European invention. Whose Mediterranean do we want to engage with? Not all 'Mediterranean' countries conceived of themselves in these terms. In the case of Spain, this may be how people see things in Barcelona and Valencia, but less so elsewhere. *It was repeated that indeed, thought was being given how to bring Ottoman and North African lands into the story (and indeed, Dalmatia might need to be given a place too). Links between southern Europe and north Africa were reforged in the context of expanding empires: in that context, it would be of interest to know more about relations between Spain and Morocco.*

Juan Luis Simal – some liberal exiles went to Morocco. Jewish merchants on the Moroccan coast were important commercial intermediaries. The Spanish government made some overtures to the Moroccans to try to get Spanish liberals returned to Spain. During the trienio, some effort was made to enlist Moroccan support.

One comparative 'Mediterranean' context that could be explored would involve setting dissolving empires alongside one another, the Spanish and the Ottoman. Some liberals in Europe drew this analogy. Also, might think about the group as Southern European – and thereby include southern France.

He also noted that the Ottoman empire had an imaginative function in Spain: it was set up as an antithesis to what Spanish government should be.

Pablo Sanchez – doesn't believe there was any contemporary conception of 'Mediterranean democracy' or a strong sense of a separate Southern Europe.

Latin America is important. One might pose the question in terms of how democracy emerges in a post-colonial environment, including the metropole as a post-colonial environment.

Spain itself provided a link between Northern Europe and Latin America; this is relevant to its role in the history of concepts.

As to the context of argument, it's also important to think about how they construed discursive contexts. What we see as debate, they might not have done.

He has studied attitudes to the plebes. A characteristic C19 fear was fear of a plebeian tyrant. There was a general southern European worry about the possibility that a part, the plebeian part, might dominate the whole. The need to protect the public good sets limits to what's tolerable in terms of self-determination. These issues can easily be set up within a republican tradition of thought – but whereas in classic republican thought, the feared outcome is tyranny, in this period anarchy was as often prophesied. Discourses about the need to protect the good of the whole relate the moral to the political, and have a special place in a Catholic context. *It was noted that he had identified what he suggested to be a southern European mindset. Though it wasn't clear that it was distinctively southern European: this worry was eg also Guizot's.*

Florencia Peyrou – Spanish democrats also worried about the possible subordination of the public good. Partly in this context, they redefined democracy as individual sovereignty. They said that in ancient democracy, the individual was subordinated to the state. In delineating a distinct modern form of democracy they took as reference points eg the American Bill of Rights). She thinks this emphasis appeared after 1848: Spanish democrats were alarmed by the way in which in France, universal suffrage produced the rise to power of Louis Napoleon, whose extension of power was then validated by plebiscite. They also read Constant etc, and this made them reflect on the implications and problems of universal suffrage.

Mark Philp asked when the American Bill of Rights was translated into Spanish?
Juan Luis Simon said he thought first in 1802. The Spanish monarchy didn't at that point see a problem in its circulation. There were translations of all the constitutions and Paine's work. He has seen many Spanish liberals quoting from these texts – but not all depended on translations; many also read them in the original language.

Maria Sierra – to Pablo, warned against laying too much stress on a supposedly distinctive Catholic context. Similar concerns were expressed by English liberals, so Catholicism is incidental to the fear.
Joanna Innes however observed that the stance taken by the Catholic church as an institution was conceivably distinctive, and at least worth investigation.

Maria Sierra– the first big petition was signed by Catholics. **Diego Palacio** added that the Church came out against free conscience in 1855 but at the same time encouraged women and children to sign petitions; this reflected the fact that they were asked to sign as souls, not citizens.

Annick Lempriere - said that in Spanish America, reference was as often to France, Britain or the US as to Spain. The US was important because republics sought republican models.

There was discussion as to whether it made a difference that the US was not a Catholic country.

Pablo Sanchez defended his use of Catholicism as a reference point. He thinks that not just the church, but a broader Catholic political culture needs to be taken into account as having shaped Spanish political avenues. It nurtured an intolerant understanding of opinion, which followed from the lack of a Reformation or religious war. It promoted organic images of the social order, embedded in the traditions of Catholic monarchy – a problem for pluralism. Parties thus were seen as a bad thing. These attitudes can be found in France too – but a third element was more distinctively Spanish/Spanish American. This was a bias against self-determination by the individual subject, a resistance to the idea that ultimate authority could rest with the individual, and idea that, to the extent it was delegated from God, it was better vested in some overarching authority. Perhaps attitudes like this could also be found in Greece and the Islamic world. In this context, 'enthusiasm', the wild belief that one could perceive ultimate truths unaided, was a standard bogey. In that context, the whole enlightenment project was open to criticism as erroneously democratic in its approach to knowledge. What he has in mind here is not so much high Catholic theology, as the kind of ideas held by village priests. *To this it was responded that there was also much concern about enthusiasm in Protestant states in C18. And some forms of Protestantism, notably Calvinism, could take just as strong a line on the need for authority to correct errant men as any variety of Catholicism: in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the church's stand against democracy seems to have helped to keep it off the political agenda until very late in the nineteenth century.*

In relation to the larger issue of appropriate contexts and frameworks, he advocated epistemological pluralism: there is no one best way of looking at things; it's worth keeping a number of different frameworks in play and considering what can be learnt from each.

Romy Sanchez - on the issue of geographical frameworks, she was working on Cuba 1838-98, when it remained part of the Spanish monarchy. The continuing existence of a Spanish empire needed to be born in mind, and might provide matter for comparison with eg the Ottoman empire. She has been looking at Cuban creoles in Ceuta [Spanish enclave in Morocco]. She thought it also worth looking at Spanish liberals in French Algeria.

LUNCH

PRACTICES

Mark Philp introduced this session.

Our interest in practices is not restricted to those expressly called democratic. Our work suggests that changes in language may follow changes in practice: new practices develop, they give rise to responses and counters; those conflicts are partly assimilated into existing conflicts and ways of describing them, but may be re-described and recontextualised. Some practices became increasingly linked to ideas about democracy, popular sovereignty, the popular, republicanism, liberalism and so on.

So we take a very broad view of practices, asking in very general terms what was new, what was changing; how were people behaving; did they see what they were doing as traditional or innovative; how were they seen by others, and how did they respond to those perceptions? How did any of these things affect their actions, organisations or institutions?

Some common forms of change in this period:

- What Habermas termed the emergence of a public sphere (or multiple public spheres). Has this been discussed in the Spanish context; if so, what features are especially emphasised?
- popular action and organisation. Is there work comparing the geographical patterns of protest in 1766 and 1808; or looking at styles and repertoires of action in those protests? Were these protests harked back to later – in 1820, or in later pronunciamentos? What were the repertoires of action used in 1808-12 – what models were employed? Why did they take the form they did? Where did the constitutional impulse come from, in terms of procedures and practices as well as content?
- Printing: what is known about the degree of independence of print culture, its vulnerability to state action; readership; diversity of vehicles for political publication – chapbooks, ballads, caricatures, as well as pamphlets, newspapers, journals and books? How local were print cultures: were they metropolitan and then distributed, or printed in multiple centres?
- Representation: what models were there; how were they developed? What role did oaths of allegiance and fidelity play: were they linked to occasions? Did occasions for making public commitments also provide a forum for *cahiers de doleances*? Did such occasions also confer or recognise (or deny) forms of citizenship – or types of political status; and how far did such notions subsequently inform eligibility to vote?
- Politics and religion: possibly distinctively related to one another in Spain, as when the constitution of Cadiz stated that elections at the local level were to begin with a mass and a sermon. Was this also found in the Americas? How did government attacks on the institutional church in the 1830s and 50s affect attitudes?
- Citizenship settled by Cadiz as being the child of two citizens: but was the fulfilment of such qualifications actively monitored, prior to 1814 and during the trienio? If so, what methods were used to establish it: tax records? Evidence from clergy? Was the status uncontested or fraught; what claims did it involve – and what duties; was there any discussion of women as citizens?
- Elections: were they contests? When were parties recognised, and candidacy accepted? Did they provide opportunities for grievances to be expressed? Was there an evolution from representation, to competition for office, to competition for spoils? When parties formed, were they cadre parties or mass? Did they have formal members? Were there different local experiences and practices? Did local elections function differently from national elections? With different types of agenda?
- Education: when did this become a live issue? and why Cadiz Art 366-71 (which specified education in civic duties plus catechism) where did this come from and what was the thinking behind it? What happened to the initiative? Was there anything earlier? When did a civic education programme develop – by whom, with what aims, and with what experience and results? Were there workers collective educational projects, such as reading and discussion groups; did this become more central after 1830s, or later still?

- The military: clearly very important, but it is not clear what the story should be. Was the army more closely integrated with the political elite, or with the people – or was it divided? Did it vary by locality? C18 military spend was high, but very top heavy military in that there were a great many more offices than could be justified by the size of the forces. Were the 1766 riots directed at all against the military? Were pronunciamentos military or essentially civil? What was the nature of church/military relations/
- Equality: doesn't seem to be mentioned in the Cadiz constitution. Was it an issue? At what point did people baulk at noble privilege? Was its removal a liberal project; a popular one; or a monarchist one?
- 1848: what impact? Were methods borrowed, such as public dinners, barricades, political clubs and associations? How widespread was awareness?
- Repression: what was the legacy of those imprisoned or executed after 1814 and again in 1823: were they commemorated, and if so by whom? were they published and written up? when did commemoration start? Who got priority; how was it done?

Discussion

Jose Alvarez Junco: two fields are important:

- Social mobilisation
- Building a collective (national) identity

Nothing would have happened without events in France: in 1807, the state was not on the verge of revolution. The power vacuum 1808 provided a forcing ground for innovation; even the most conservative had to accept that the need to self-organize. This posed the question, who are the we who will do this? To which the answer given was, 'the nation', not previously a popular word. It was previously a term of elite discourse; more commonly, people would have spoken of the kingdom.

In terms of social mobilisation: crucial were clientelistic networks, which continued through the period: it is probably unhelpful to think in terms of bourgeois revolution, since it's not clear that there were big changes in their social composition.

On the military: they were important in the old regime because it was a military state, but also they were a major vehicle for the enlightenment; they included scientists, engineers, technical experts etc, and had the support of the king. Ferdinand VII withdrew support from the enlightenment and broke the previous system of relationships; the military remained possible defenders of enlightened values.

Maria Teresa Calderon: the eighteenth century was an important period in terms of nation-building: it was a key monarchical project to nationalise the empire. Difficulties encountered in incorporating American importantly shaped what happened in 1808 (see the Portillo book (?) *Crisis Atlántica: Autonomía e Independencia en la Crisis de la Monarquía Hispana* (2006)). To the Spanish American revolutionaries, the nation was not a key concept; the republic more so.

Pronunciamentos were civil not military acts.

Pablo Sanchez: at UCLA, he was influenced by Robert Brenner, who encouraged him to look at the role of merchants in the revolution. In that context, he became interested in the effect of the dismantling of corporate structures on forms of organisation and protest. The late

1830s saw the dismantling of the guilds. An old class on the side of reform then had to come to terms with its implications for their own activities.

Similarly in the national militia between the 1830s and 50s new conceptions both of meritocracy and of authority developed.

The emergence of new professions has been researched elsewhere, but not in Spain. When old professions lost their privileges, they had to decide on what basis to operate: to accept openness or to find new forms of closure. Arguments took place between those who adopted neo-corporatist and those who adopted democratic approaches.

He looked into how this worked out in the case of merchants, starting from late C18, when Charles IV tried to impose a corporate taxation system. They responded, no taxation without representation – even before 1808. In the 30s, many merchants became *doceanistas*, and in fact elections held under the 1812 constitution brought merchants to power; this happened less under the new **constitution of 1837 and beyond**. At that point, they split, some becoming reactionary. Many were active for years at the local level, within a very open form of politics, if not precisely a democratic one. The **1845** constitution represented a backlash. In 1847, merchants in Madrid organised the first modern social movement, to protest against taxation and smuggling. After 1848, many left that organisation. After 1852, many became democratic. So their political positions were quite variable, as they reacted to changing circumstances.

He also noted a tradition between conspiratorial and open, collective forms of action. This was resolved in 1868, when a more open form of politics became possible. Different groups then came together to try to devise forms of political action.

Juan Luis Simal: agreed about the civil dimensions of pronunciamentos: they were used for political purposes, not to enhance military power. They did provide a model for others from 1820: thus in Italy, Portugal. France.

The nation emerged as an important concept early C19: everyone agreed on that, though they struggled over its definition.

On the commemoration of liberalism: this developed as an element of the process of liberal revolution in the 1820s. Then symbols were created and martyrs celebrated. They had international impact: there was a plan to build a monument in London: it was argued that it was a glory for Britain to dedicate monuments to foreign heroes, defenders of universal liberties. Yet in the end the monument was not built.

Louise Zbiranski: the militia presents a classic case of practice preceding conceptualisation: of how practice and theory can interact. During the trienio a law established relatively democratic structures (though not so described, she doesn't think). When the militia was abolished at the return of absolutism, it became more tightly associated with radical liberalism or democracy.

Eduardo Posada Carbo: wanted to press one of Mark's questions about the meaning of elections. There were early examples of competitive elections in Latin America: thus Mexico 1812, also Lima, Ecuador, and some sort of party organisation was in evidence. Also Colombia 1825; Mexico 1828: of two parties, one took the name Democrat. In Chile 1829 elections were very competitive; so also Venezuela 1835; New Granada 1836-7. Social scientists say competitive elections became normal in Europe only in the later C19 – but what

was the Spanish experience? In Latin America, contested elections were important in terms of the socialisation of the electorate.

Rosie Doyle: on pronunciamentos: they offered a way to create networks. In Mexico, these involved a coalition-building process. There wasn't really a distinct military as such. Pronunciamentos sometimes took place in the context of elections; sometimes they opposed a new law.

Also, on commemoration: Riego became a hero. There is a study of how he was commemorated.

Florencia Peyrou- In first half of C19, democracy had less to do with elections than with other kinds of participation. The trienio saw an eruption of clubs, press, and widespread discussion of politics. Doesn't know if the word democracy was widely used but citizenship was; in the clubs, they called themselves and each other 'citizen'.

The Carlist war –a distinct Spanish event- is important because a lot of popular sectors were mobilised to fight for liberalism, but then in 1837 they were largely excluded.

Commemoration of liberal heroes continued even during periods of repression: advanced liberals and democrats came together to raise subscriptions; names of subscribers were published, in a form of show of strength.

Louise Zbiranski: agrees that the Carlist wars were important. Among other things, they help to explain why liberals became sceptical about the people: they saw that the people might mobilise for absolutism.

Pablo Sanchez: in the 1830s, reconciliation between liberals and Carlists came to be seen as necessary for the nation to exist, for the war to end. That was the first priority; thinking about what sort of national community could be formed in that context came second.

More radical liberals saw in the commemoration of 1808 a chance to exploit the semantic possibilities of 'the people': to celebrate resistance as a people's war. There was debate about this in the 1830s and 40s.

His view on competitive elections is that they were most competitive in moments of political crisis. The **1840** law opened up a municipal Pandora's box: there were stand-offs between conservative and liberal parties. 1856 saw the emergence of a third-way party, the 'union liberal'. It was the political crisis that encouraged the exploration of new possibilities. Thus also in 1868.

Jose Alvarez Junco: the Carlist wars involved a confrontation between two elites, the army and the Church. the army favouring liberalism, Carlists being supported by the clergy. It was also a confrontation between progressive lay government and the religious.

On empire. Spain was losing her empire when Britain and France were expanding theirs. Liberals saw this as the King's problem, not the people's. They said the people defend themselves but don't invade; invasion had been a foreign (Habsburg) project. So the loss of empire was not a national tragedy. It was the opposite in 1898 when the remaining 5% was lost – then people felt 'we have lost the empire', which shows we are an inferior race.

Jordi Roca Vernet: the participation in the 1820s was parallel to that of the 40s and 50s. There were two types of mobilisation: pronunciamentos, which linked civil and military; and

the patriotic societies, in which diverse sectors of society were involved. *In response to a question* **Florencia** said that they were aware in the 40s of the 20s model: there was continuity of personnel.

Pablo Sanchez: patriotic societies were schools of citizenship, but not necessarily democratic; they didn't necessarily think all should vote.

Jordi Roca Vernet: the patriotic societies were important in local elections 1820s and 1840s.

Pablo Sanchez: the pattern of action in a political crisis in Spain is that one city starts things off; then there's an attempt to aggregate, involving local assemblies taking power and setting up juntas: they used the vocabulary of 1808, but the personnel were different, including middle classes and artisans. These exercises of popular power opened opportunities for elections.

Juan Luis Simal: it is important to look at different dimensions. Municipal laws providing for a wide franchise were restored, and abolished, and restored; often franchise changes prompted popular risings. But the Empire was also important. Liberals did not just think this was the King's problem; they wanted to reform the empire, to re-imagine local liberties. In exile they collaborated with people seeking independence in the Americas in translating texts and writing . But later liberal historiography reinterpreted the empire as a past that needed reclaiming, thus laying the ground for the response in 1898.

Jose Alvarez Junco: though in comparison to the space devoted to European issues, pages devoted to empire remained few.

THE WIDER CONTEXT

Eduardo Posada introduced this session:

- he noted that in Pisa, reference was made to Matteo Galdi and his scheme for a Mediterranean alliance, in which context he made references to democracy. Was Galdi's proposal known in Spain? He wondered if there were other instances of this kind of Mediterranean thinking.
- there is probably more to be said about French influence: the Doctrinaires, Tocqueville, liberal Catholicism.
- more to say about Spanish exiles and their networks
- how did Spain-Spanish American links work post-independence? Spain remained important to Spanish America as a centre for translation; also a source of anti-democratic ideas, as in the cases of Donoso Cortés, or of Balmes, whom he (Eduardo) had been made to study in Colombia in the 1970s

Discussion

Tim Gribaudi: on the view from Valencia: the Mediterranean was clearly important for Valencia and Catalonia, which had strong connections with Naples, even Piedmont.

Pablo Sanchez: Guy Thompson suggests the Italian Risorgimento influenced Spain in the 1850s-60s. Italians introduced the carboneria model, and were a source of some democratic ideas.

Translations moved in more than one direction: some American tracts translated in Mexico found their way into Spain.

Anti-democratic feeling was also shared: Charles III spoke against democracy in 1766.

Joanna Innes: noted that anti-democratic propaganda can spread democratic ideas.

Juan Luis Simal: undoubtedly there were links between Mediterranean countries, but the point of reference was Europe, not the Mediterranean. Italy Spain and Portugal aspired to be part of civilised Europe. They tried to reverse their situation through politics. In Italy and Greece, they aimed at national liberation; in Spain and Portugal at recasting nationalism.

Pablo Sanchez: they may be something to be learnt from the comparative study of nation-building: different frameworks open up different analytical possibilities.

Gonzalo Capellan: agrees that there was a common problem of resisting northern power, which led to some interest in possible common solutions. In 1822, liberal governments in Spain and Portugal tried to sign an alliance against the Holy Alliance.

Joanna Innes: in the 1820s and 50s there was a sense among liberals and radicals in the north that southern Europe was a realm of possibility, at times when things seemed to be closing down for northern Europeans.

Pablo Sanchez: the south was also a source of inspiration in eastern Europe, where the problems associated with industrial society troubling France, England and parts of Germany seemed less relevant.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The organising team will think about how to carry things forward, for next year's meeting and in terms of possible publications, probably after the final meeting of this sequence, in Lisbon in April

Attention was drawn to the possibility of linking up with the project by 'following' the research interest 'Re-imagining Democracy 18th-19th centuries' on www.academia.edu. Anyone tagging work of their own with this label would by this means draw it to the attention of others following this research interest.