Mediterranean democracy, Year 1

Lisbon, 8 April 2013

ICTSE, Lisbon

Present (indicating areas of main interest): Ricardo Brito (concept of revolution), **Sergio Campos Matos** (social memory, historiography, Iberianism, Iberconceptos; historical legitimation of democracy), **Pedro Cardim** (C17 Portugal-Spain, representative institutions, legal history; early modern Brazil from European perspective), **Antonio Cardoso** (*afternoon only*, liberalism, social movements), **Fernando Dores Costa** (peninsular war, in context of study of techniques of government), **Gabriel Paquette** (Brazil and Portugal early C19; romanticism and politics), **Miriam Halpern Pereira** (liberal revolutions, now working on First Republc), **Rui Ramos** (political culture of liberalism; trying to develop a project on imagining democracy in Portugal 1850s-70s, why democracy rose and then quickly fell in favour among elites 1878+), **Fatima Sa** (popular responses to liberal project; Iberconceptos – social identities), **Cristina Nogueira da Silva** (liberalism and citizenship C19, esp in relation to empire, participation by native populations; how domineering attitudes coexisted with a democratic vocabulary in liberal culture)

And: Joanna Innes, Mark Philp

Apologies, or expressed interest but couldn't make it: Nuno Monteiro and Ana Maria Pina.

INTRODUCTORY

Joanna Innes introduced the larger project:

First she thought she needed to explain why Portugal was being located in 'the Mediterranean'. In part this was being used as a shorthand for southern Europe, though 'Mediterranean' had been preferred so that Ottoman and Arab perspectives could also be considered (they were currently being explored in an Oxford based seminar/reading group). But even with this gloss, the question of whether this made sense as a context for Portugal remained to be addressed, esp. given the obvious importance of the trans-Atlantic link. The intention was not to exclude consideration of any links important to an understanding of Portuguese developments. The Mediterranean was proposed first, as a context for the development of comparisons. In this context, if e.g. the link to Brazil helped to shape a distinctive history for Portugal, then that should be emphasised. At the same time, it was thought that there were some commonalities and links within the Mediterranean region that merited exploration. Probably the most important among these was the common experience of states in this region of subordination to the great powers of northern Europe: all these states faced difficulties in effectively establishing their own sovereignty.

She turned next to outline the larger project into which the Mediterranean project fell. The challenge addressed was how to write the history of democracy other than in presentist terms. To escape presentism, the approach taken had emphasised contemporary language and discourse – what they called 'democracy' or 'democratic', and what they had to say about it. These key terms were not studied in isolation, but within a broader semantic field, in which other concepts – such as that of the 'sovereignty of the people' – were also very important.

Language was not however the sole focus of study. Democracy was not usually at this time the subject of extended theorising. People who talked about democracy were usually trying to understand or shape what was going on around them. 'Democracy' did not at the start, or even at the end of the period, clearly refer to any well-defined set of institutions and practices. But a range of practices came to be seen as the kinds of things that might constitute modern democratic practice, including voting and the formation of public petitioning movements. These practices had longer, discrete histories of their own. The focus was on how languages and practices interacted and helped to define one another. Conceived in this way, the history of 'democracy' consists of a series of discontinuous episodes: the history had no very consistent subject. Yet inasmuch as both language and practice developed by a process of constantly building on or reacting against the past, what was in question was a meaningful process of historical development.

The project had always been intended to map developments in Europe and both Americas, but had begun as an Anglo-French collaboration, and then been extended to cover the 'North Atlantic' (the United States, France, Britain and Ireland). In the context of exploring developments in this region, certain broad trends of development had been identified. In mid C18 democracy referred above all to the ancient world – esp. Rome. It was seen as a primitive form, and not very relevant to modern needs. In C19 it came to be seen as relevant to the modern world –not necessarily as a good thing, but certainly as something that needed to be faced up to and managed.

Neither the French or American revolutions were made in the name of democracy. The revolutionary process threw up phenomena that people recognised from their knowledge of the ancient world as democratic. The French helped make democracy a talking point; in the United States, unusually, it was widely accepted as a self-description from 1800. – but that was not true for most of Europe. In France, the Directory promoted the idea of representative democracy and representative government – partly as a reaction against more populist forms. But in the medium term the French revolution tarnished democracy's image. In Spain, the 1812 Constitution provided a context in which there was some positive talk. In the 1820s, British newspapers increasingly portrayed continental Europe as the site of a battle between monarchy and aristocracy on the one hand and democracy on the other – with neither being seen as wholly good. With the emergence of liberalism, there was a new entity against which to define democracy. This provided an important element in the context in which democracy was re-imagined as a modern political form. By 1840 the term was becoming a watchword for an international movement, increasingly invoked by émigré and exile communities. During the revolutions of 1848, democratic language was widely employed – but in their aftermath, once more there was retreat and disillusionment.

Nonetheless, within this broad context, important details of the history of each country's re-imagining of democracy differed. Our object in this new phase of the project is to explore the distinctive experiences of southern European and other Mediterranean territories, as they went through their own processes of re-imagining democracy.

Mark Philp addressed the issue, what might link the Mediterranean?

He noted first that its history had a different chronology, with different key periods of change and innovation. Also that there was, though unevenly, much regional interaction and interconnection.

However, the suggestion that we jointly consider how democracy was re-imagined in the Mediterranean represented not so much a hypothesis – a claim about common experience – as a question. How far was each country's experience distinctive? To what extent was there a shared regional experience? Were developments within the region in some sense driven by developments elsewhere?

As in the north Atlantic region, we expect there to be local traditions and experiences that shape thinking – in relation e.g. to representation, mixed government, anti-absolutism.

There may also be certain forces that operated particularly within the region: e.g. the constitution of Cadiz played an important role not only in Spain, but also Portugal and parts of Italy. Another distinctive element in Southern Europe was the rise of forms of aspiration for national self-determination – either in the context of the dismantling of Atlantic empires, as in Portugal and Spain, or European empires, as in Italy vis-à-vis the Austro-Hungarian empire, and Greece in relation to the Ottoman. Exile, and the formation of international liberation movements, was a common feature of life across the region.

There is probably something to be said about diffusion, or at least about the power of shared reference points. There was a common pattern of reacting against what are seen as the ideas of the French Revolution, or sometimes in favour of (some of) those ideas. Though no single idea of how to embody modern democracy became dominant, some notions became standard:

- Democracy had something to do with equality: initially, with the abolition of privilege; later with the insufficiency of abolishing only formal privilege. Equality needed to be given political form.

- Whereas in 1750 'democracy' did not strongly connote representation or voting rights, it came to be connected with these

- Popular sovereignty was often asserted, meaning at a minimum that the people were regarded as a constituent power, necessary to legitimate the formation of states

- Democracy was associated with popular mobilization and concern about how and to what extent to include the people in the political system

This agenda of concerns, first formulated outside the Mediterranean region, was one with which people in the region came to engage in wrestling with the challenges that faced them and trying to devise their own solutions.

Worth emphasising that in this period the Mediterranean was a very dynamic space for the transfer of people, goods, ideas and cultures

- European powers increasingly asserted influence in the Ottoman empire, and fully or quasi colonial power in North Africa – Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia. Those states had to find ways of responding to this situation

- People who had experience of French or American or British styles of rule moved within the region, carrying new ideas and expectations with them

In sum, there were common things reacted to, though reactions were always shaped by local traditions and contexts.

Rui Ramos - Agreed that democracy meant different things at different times. Perhaps especially potent in Portugal was the idea of democracy as a social condition: Tocqueville was widely read and quoted, often at second hand, through newspapers. It was also taken to refer to the people as an element in mixed government; it was thought that the French revolution had demonstrated again problems with democracy as such as a form of government, but as an element in mixed government it was seen to have value. The 1822 constitution was criticised for tilting the balance too far towards the democratic element. On the geographical issue: Portugal and Spain can be imagined in a South Atlantic space – with a strong trade in ideas and movement of people between the peninsula and South America, but the Mediterranean became more important as C19 progressed.

Miriam Halpern Pereira observed that the notion that Portugal has a Mediterranean context is well established and uncontroversial: the geographer Orlando Ribeiro influentially argued in his book of 1945, *Portugal, o Mediterrâneo e o Atlântico* (1945), that Portugal has both Mediterranean and Atlantic contexts. Ironic if Americans were early in thinking themselves democratic when they lived in a slave society! There are also two stories that can be told about democracy in Portugal: the one Rui Ramos has outlined, in which it figures as a popular element in the constitution; but it could be used otherwise – this is a question about how the political elite thought about it and how far they found it fruitful to use.

Fernando Dores Costa: Democracy can mean anything from the House of Commons to a mob. By early C19 no longer seen as outdated – although it always had a negative connotation, being seen as a regime of demons or as a political form that forces human nature. It is thought that it can have a place in mixed regimes, where essentially the democratic element is constituted by the middle class. Democracy as a pure regime was seen as impossible, in effect ochlocracy.

Fatima Sa said that she thought it right to resist the diffusion story: it is not that simple, and local experience and culture have a major impact on the way the term is used, even when there are common influences, like the French Revolution or the writings of Tocqueville. In Portugal, it is strongly tied to a notion of the sovereignty of the people, though that of course raised the question, Who are 'the people'?

Cristina Nogueira da Silva: she was interested in the question of the relationship between democracy and liberalism in C19: liberalism was often in tension with democracy, but it was also thought that as a regime became more liberal it would tend to become more democratic.

In Portugal, the recovery of the classical notion of mixed government was important.

Innes wondered if this last was a particularly Portuguese story – in Spain, Pablo Sanchez Leon told us that it is said that there is no politically effective aristocracy and that, as a result, the mixed constitution cannot work on any traditional basis.
Miriam Halpern Pereira doubted the idea that Spain lacked an political effective aristocracy, as they had a similar constitutional regime as in Portugal till the first republic, that is with two chambers. A new liberal aristocracy grew up with the constitutional monarchy in Portugal, didn't the same happen in Spain?

Rui Ramos said that one had to be exact about chronology: whereas in early C19 there is some suggestion that the ancient constitution could be restored (and he thought this was also the case in Spain), by the 1850s there was a growing sense that this constitutional order was outdated.

Pedro Cardim said that democracy was not a central concern in C17. But there was a movement against absolutism and an interest in participation. There was debate about membership of the body politic, its meaning and implications; in the early C17 this debate extended to Portugal's overseas territories.

In relation to the general issue of the appropriate geographical framework, the Mediterranean seems to him very relevant: Portugal was for a time a part of Spain, and of the larger religious world of Southern Europe: Catholicism provided the basis for a link with Italy. Although connections with the Atlantic world were also prominent.

Also, in his own work he has always considered it important to focus on the contemporary meaning of concepts. There are often interesting interactions between indigeneous patterns and more general trends.

Gabrielle Pacquette suggested that 'the Mediterranean' as such might be an anachronistic concept. Some contemporaries distinguished south and north: thus Sismondi and Madam de Stael; Almeida Garrett followed suit, discussing a 'system of southern liberty'. Even in an Anglophone context people talked more about N-S than about the Mediterranean.

Fernandez Sebastian suggests that conceptual genesis of ideas in 1810-30 was shaped by a dialogue within the Atlantic world.

Sergio Campos Matos wanted to return to the question of the complex relationship between liberalism and democracy. In the writings of eg Herculano and Garrett we find some fear of the mob and of equality. They tended to equate democracy with popular despotism, though Herculano at least later recognised a democratising trend, though he did not favour universal suffrage. However all this was complicated by their willingness to see democrats as allies against ancien regime despotism.

On the issue of limited sovereignty under great power domination: the Iberian peninsular was repeatedly the site of great power, especially Anglo-French struggles. It is both interesting and important to situate Portuguese and Spanish liberalism in this context.

LANGUAGE

 Joanna Innes said that she would quickly identify a number of themes of interest. She was particularly interested for what she need of Portuguese conceptual history to the special issue of *Ler Historia* on that theme.

- It seemed that in 1750s-60s charges of democracy were levelled against Jesuits, who were depicted as exponents of pactist theory. We should not lose sight of C18 discourse.
- She had the impression that in Portugal in 1820s democracy was less advocated than popular sovereignty – but how far were they companion terms, or systematically distinguished?

- She would like to know more about how people talked about aristocracy. In France in early C19 there was talk about the importance of creating a modern form of aristocracy: representation was sometimes defended in these terms; the representatives would constitute an elective aristocracy. But her sense was that attempts to characterise modern political arrangements in these terms were less common in later C19 (though enduring in the UK, where a hereditary, big-landowning aristocracy remained important and politically powerful in practice)
- She would like to know more about the influence of Lamennaisian ideas: they were said to influence liberals; did they also influence eg Miguelists?
- It is said that Miguelism was defended as an appeal to or expression of the will of the people – but was the term 'democracy' employed?
- Garrett and Herculano had a conception of the common people as the democracy; how did this sit with individualistic conceptions of democracy, with conceptions of democracy as self-determination?
- 1848 is said to have helped to cement a link between democracy and republicanism in Portugal: but what was the impact of this upon the liberals? The failure of the second French republic caused even progressives to doubt the viability of democracy. After 1848 there was elsewhere in Europe an increasing focus on local self-government, emphasising participation; should Herculano's re-imagining of the feudal constitution as a basis for a new municipal politics be set in that context?
- A related issue that she and Mark Philp had recently begun to ponder: what did people encompass within 'politics'. If they conceptualised this quite narrowly, as being about the kind of thing that goes on in the corridors of power, how did they conceptualise the broader range of extra-official activity that we might conceptualise as political?

Rui Ramos wanted to sound a note of caution about the use of very general terms such as 'liberal'. We need to pay attention to the myriad labels that people used on the ground, such as Septembrists. The civil war has a foundational impact: for the next generation, people's fundamental sense of political identity arose from their roles in that. If you took the liberal side in the civil war you remained liberal, however conservative your politics might seem to be in substance. Thus Herculano, whose politics took a substantively conservative turn in 1830s-40s, reflecting trends in France, but who remained open to more democratic notions, as became apparent later in his career, when he became a key thinker of municipalism, and an ally of the radicals against the clericals (despite his personal piety).

Innes: on municipalism, is there a broader international context? JS Mill, perhaps?
Rui: Mill came up a lot in the 1860s and 70s, but there was also a lot of reference to French thinking, esp Tocqueville; the concern with the medieval world was shared with Guizot, Thiers.

Fatima Sa wanted to respond in relation to Miguelism, and how the language of democracy figured in that connection. She agreed with Rui that the civil war was fundamental. Absolutists also used a modern political language, speaking eg of freedom of the press and the voice of the nation, but they used such concepts to critique democracy, equated with government by the populace.

Rui Ramos said that he had also found in counter revolutionary sources a critique of democracy, associated with the sense that leaders used the people for their own ends. So Don Miguel was presented as a demagogue and the populace as misled.

Fernando Dores Costa observed that negative accounts of democracy derived from the ancient world. The liberals used the concept in much the same way that people would later use communism: they associated it with the forcing of human nature under an agrarian law. Since the common people were incapable of virtue, it was argued that they must be excluded from political power.

Sergio Campos Matos: the context of the first Portguese liberalism was the king's absence in Brazil. In this context people turned to historical constitutionalism, conceiving of the Cortes as an ancient Parliament. The first liberal deputies didn't talk much about democracy because they were chiefly concerned to emphasise continuity with the past. This has led some historians to characterise Portuguese liberalism as conservative, and this is true, but it was at the same time revolutionary.
Innes: was the Cortes convened by estates? **Rui Ramos:** no.

Miriam Halpern Pereira: the 1830s saw the establishment of the liberal state, but the 1820s were also important. The deputies met for 2 years, a long time, and they discussed everything. There remains much to analyse in these discussions. Equally there is much more to be learnt about petitions addressed to them. There have been some studies of this; she mentioned her edition of the collection *A crise de Antigo Regime e as Cortes constituintes de 1821-22* (5 volumes, with different titles and authors) A variety of petitioning groups addressed the congress as the sovereign congress, an implicitly democratic/popular sovereignty concept.

She wondered when the term 'populace' began to be used: not in 1820-22 but after, when the people were seen as Miguelists.

Regarding Lamennais: he gained influence rapidly in connection with the revolt of the Canuts. His main work, the 'Book of the People' was translated and published in part in one of the three main newspapers already much influenced by his work; this was directed by priests, who had become liberal and then quite radical in 1838-1840. After the revolt of the National Guard in Lisbon, there was a split in the liberal party, part of which grew even more radical than the Septembrists. Lamennais also influenced other writers , e.g. Nogueira da Silva, who was perhaps more important to a democratic concept of municipalism than Herculano, and who saw himself as a socialist. Socialism in these years was perhaps more political than social: the focus was more about the corruption of politics than on the renovation of the social order.

Gabriel Paquette observed that Lamennais was also important to Herculano; he wrote a book, *The voice of the prophet*, which clearly echoed Lamennais.

LUNCH

PRACTICES

Mark Philp introduced this session.

Our methodology in relation to practices is not to look only at practices expressly called democratic, but at all practices that relate to things that are at some point termed democratic. These may have a prehistory of their own; they develop, and their development helps precipitate neologisms and re-descriptions; over time they may come to be associated with democracy, popular sovereignty etc; others are not so assimilated – they come to be typed as conservative, not democratic. We are interested in all these developments.
Some topics for discussion:

- Habermas talked of the emergence of a public sphere (or multiple public spheres). One doesn't have to buy into his whole analysis to use the term as shorthand. In what sense did this period see the formation of a public sphere in the Portuguese context? What have historians of Portugal had to say about this – in relation eg to the fortunes of enlightenment in Portugal?
- Popular organisations: when did they emerge? Was there organisation and mobilisation in response to French invasion? What were the repertoires of action used in 1808-22 – what models were they using? Where did the constitutional impulse come from in 1820? why did they plump for Cadiz?
- Printing: how independent was print culture, how vulnerable to state action? How diverse were forms of publication, and how broad readership? When did local presses proliferate? Was there an underground press? When did political periodicals appear? To what extent was any of this new to C19? How central was print culture to elite discourse and to popular movements?
- Representation and petitioning: from when they develop and between whom? What role did oaths of allegiance play: were they linked to occasions of identifying grievances or petitioning? How did practices of petitioning develop over time: e.g. did it become more common to seek mass endorsement of a petition? How far did participation in such occasions confer or recognise forms of citizenship, or types of political status? Were they subsequently connected to the act of voting?
- Were there distinctive relationships between political and religious activity in Portugal? Or in Catholic lands including Portugal?
- Citizenship was clearly defined in the Cadiz constitution: was this definition accepted by Portugal? Was citizenship linked to taxation? 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? How far was there an evolution of electoral practices from representation, to competition for office or spoils, to ideological contestation? When and how did parties form, and were they cadre parties or mass? Were there different local experiences and practices? How similar or different were local elections to national elections, in terms of forms or agendas?
- Popular education: when did it become a live issue? When does a civic education programme develop – by whom, with what aims, and with what experience and results? Are there workers collective educational projects – reading and discussion groups; does this become more central after 1830s or later still?
- Military organisation: how did the people related to the military? Did militias play a role, and if so what role? The military may impose order, but may also serve as a training ground in thinking.

- What was the impact of 1848? What impact had events elsewhere in Europe? Were strategies borrowed, such as public dinners, barricades, political clubs and associations?
- Who figured in the Portuguese democratic 'Pantheon'? how did they relate to the roster of national heroes? How were people commemorated, for what, in what ways?
- And, to repeat a question raised by Joanna, how did people think about politics? What forms of activity did they classify as political? How did they delimit the political world; was it seen as linked to government, or in opposition to it?

Rui Ramos. Suggested that we need to be careful about identifying the development of the liberal public sphere with empowerment; could be seen as disempowering, eg by communities which lost traditional rights and certain kinds of relations with authorities. Many local councils were abolished. In 1820s were 800; reduced by 1830 to c300. Explains some of appeal of Miguelism: those without skills, such as literacy, allowing full participation in new public sphere built on representative principles might resent change.

Also suggested that the public sphere does not necessarily just grow; it can grown and disappear as the political context changes. So during the French wars, government allowed the press to flourish; afterwards, censorship destroyed it.

1820 saw flourishing of associations, press etc among both liberals and absolutists. Songs, political colours, expressing allegiance in civil war; some suggest these colours were worn a lot in daily dress.

Fatima Sa: didn't completely agree with notion local councils a kind of public sphere which disappeared. In such small communities, an effective public sphere survived in face to face interactions; abolition of councils didn't stop formation of community sentiment.

In relation to transformation of the means of participation, she though the religious dimension was important, above all in the provinces; confraternities were very important. The liberal reform of confraternities made them more economically fragile, but they didn't disappear. Sustained sociability.

In relation to coffee houses: there is an important thesis on coffee houses in Lisbon early C19 that's never been published.

She suggested that there remained much work to do on electoral politics: related practices were not well understood.

Pedro Cardim wanted to add some topics to the discussion from an eighteenth-century standpoint. During C18, the parliament didn't meet, but it hadn't been abolished; it simply wasn't convened. During this period overseas expansion, esp in Brazil, gave many Portuguese people some experience of creating new communities and acquiring rights for them. Such practices might anticipate the more formal expression of ideas about community-building. Also, as in most colonial contexts, taxation was a focus for debate. In the 1730s-40s, when this was an issue in Minas Gerais, there was a call for a kind of representative assembly, called a congress (not having been summoned by king, it couldn't be a cortes). Those involved in establishing in drew on neo-scholastic vocabulary and theories; they argued that there should be a representative institution to approve or reject taxes.

Cristina da Silva: one theme of interest is how liberalism came to be developed in a democratic way, involving idea that in the future, when better educated, ordinary people should be able to participate. Parallels drawn between mass of people in Portugal and in colonies: both as yet unready.

Mentioned an act date? codifying who in the colonies counted as a Portuguese citizen, that is, who had the right to participate. This in turn had an impact on ideas about citizenship in the metropole.

Liberalism faces two ways: there is a discourse about past liberties lost, but also one about the future.

Antonio Cardoso: thought liberties which came and went were not sufficiently studied: thus the press, rights of assembly and association. Noted that 'meeting' is a loanword. Other things come and go too: thus there is a period when everyone invoked the classics, and then suddenly stopped doing that, though they were still being studied. He himself had completed some studies on the press, patriotic societies, on rights of assembly, demonstrations and the right to petition. When restrictive laws were passed in the 1840s there were satires and petitions. The 'conferences du casino' [1871, group influenced by ideas of Proudhon] were authorised, but then, after the third one, forbidden.

Rui Ramos: another entity worth introducing: freemasonry. Played an important part in organising support for political leaders; that freemasonry could serve this purpose just shows how narrow political life was. The effect was to blend politics and conspiracy; in the 1820s and 30s there was a general sense that politics meant conspiracy. In correspondence people sometimes ask in a joky way: are you conspiring at the moment? There was on the one hand a public sphere, but also a shadow life, associated with 'real politics'. People could use democratic rhetoric, but leaders in fact look to secret societies for core support. There were many secret societies in the army.

Miriam Halpern Pereira: a strange mixture of political cultures was evident in petitions to the Cortes. On the one hand it was addressed, innovatively, as a sovereign body, but most petitions originated from traditional institutions, eg guilds.

Debates in the Cortes were published in the press daily. This provided a real link to the people, as is shown by how quick popular reactions could be, as in the March mutiny in 1838, connected partly to the constitutional debate on the composition of the Higher chamber of Parliament. (I wrote a paper about this, and it is mentioned also in *Artesãos e operários*, reedited in the book *Do Estado liberal ao Estado Providência* S.Paulo) The press was like television today. It was easy to produce, could be suppressed easily, but then quickly re-established.

There is a lack of studies on local elections. Elections in the later C19 have been receiving more attention in the last years, recently three collections with elections in the title have appeared in the past few years. In relation to local elections, she mentioned two studies, Ana Bernardo and M. Antonieta da Cruz, which focus in professional and social changes of the electorate.   Of course, caciquismo and corruption existed, and yet elections worked quite well. When the franchise was widened after 1878, new social groups, not only in rural areas, but also in urban ones, gained access to the vote and used it.

She wanted to raise the issue of citizenship and religion. The constitutions linked Portuguese citizenship to Catholicism. Though some modifications were introduced by different legal measures, this linkage was not completely abolished until 1911. This affected attitudes to people in the colonies: not being civilised was linked also with not being Catholic.

Pedro Cardim: noted that from C17 minutes of parliamentary proceedings it seems that voting within parliament was not regarded positively; people tried to avoid resolving issues by vote if they could. Royal officers strove to produce consensus. Voting made dissension explicit.

Rui Ramos said that by contrast, in the constitutional Cortes of the 1820s, voting was routine, the normal procedure for signifying the taking of a decision.

He was struck that the recent article by Cruz showed that even under the *censitaire* regime, in fact a lot of people were able to vote.

Sergio Campos Matos noted the existence in C19 or a discourse about the absence of a spirit of citizenship; this was often remarked upon in political speeches, by intellectuals etc. Of course, this was a largely rural society, with a huge majority of illiterates. Adolph Guailo (name probably wrong – what should it be?), a smart late C19-20 intellectual, pointed out that it was perfectly possible for a largely illiterate sections of a political culture to have a political consciousness; political information and ideas could be diffused orally.

Democratic theorists of the 1840s-50s influenced federal republicans later on. They constituted a small group, and had an abstract conception of democracy and the nation; they found it difficult to transmit their message – criticisms of the Queen, and of inequality -- in an accessible form. The later republican party by contrast had a support base in popular clubs etc, and found means of establishing a relationship with the urban population.

One might wonder who was reading the hundreds of periodicals produced in the later nineteenth century: certainly the patriotic societies mentioned by Antonio Cardoso, but these were essentially elite bodies.

Gabriel Paquette suggested that one sees how politics really worked in practice when the curtain was pulled back and some conspiracy revealed. There is a methodological problem: how to uncover the secret workings of political life in other circumstances?

In relation to Portuguese intellectual life, he argued that it was important also to look at exile publications. These were important, and widely diffused, but if one looked only at publications with Portugal, one would miss them.

In relation to oaths, he noted that there were various oaths to constitutions, and debates surrounding these. Don Miguel said that he had taken no oath of loyalty to Pedro: an important element in his case legitimizing his position. Oaths to the new constitution were taken in public squares.

Rui Ramos: political choices might be made by the few, but they then needed broader endorsement. There would be public demonstrations; people would shout Viva the constitution? He thinks oaths to the constitution were a phenomenon of the 1820s and 30s.
Cristina da Silva questioned the meaning of these rituals. She wanted to know how they were described.
Rui Ramos agreed that it would be a stretch to characterise them as a form of democratic politics. But they're interesting as a retooling of traditional forms.
Philp wondered if such things were orchestrated, or whether they involved gambling on what the people would do. How much depended on existing networks of patronage?

Fatima Sa: in relation to repertoires of political action, she noted that frontiers between the old and the new were by no means always clear. The same gestures may take on different meanings in different settings – as in the case of petitions.

Fernando Dores Costa argued that municipalities which disappeared under the liberal state were suppressed because communities weren't big enough to make them viable. There were places where no one could write, so they had to disappear.

He saw oath-taking as an empty ceremony, simply sanctioning political change: what people signified was simply that they would not resist the current power.

He thought the public sphere a difficult concept because it's unclear what it includes: is it a sphere of rational discourse? Can opinions critical of rulers be accepted as rational? Does the public sphere include the revolution of 1808 (so-called at the time), or persecution in the streets of Lisbon. Concern about public opinion was not new.

Pedro Cardim wanted to comment on the uses made of oaths in Portugal. In 1640, before the coup d'etat which split Portugal, an anonymous supporter wrote advice to the rest of the group. He wrote that it would be important to organise an oath as rapidly as possible; that would add to political commitment a religious dimension. In this instance we see both an instrumentalisation of the oath and dependence on its sacred character.

Innes commented that voting could also have that character: it was important not to assume that extending the vote necessarily involved any intention of giving people a choice.

Miriam Halpern Pereira: changes in ideas about public space need to be set in the context of changes in the seigneurial system and in the access to landownership.

In Lisbon in the 1820s we can see an interesting conflict between new and old. The camera municipal was supposed to be elected according to an individualistic system of representation. But the council of 24 – the old body representing the guilds – objected to this; they thought representation should be collective and not individual. They had thought that liberalism would give them back their power, and now discovered that the opposite might apply.

Antonio Cardoso: the nation loomed larger and smaller as a concern at different times, according to context. There were periods when, in relation to Spain or the colonies, it loomed large. At those times, republicanism might have national content.

Historians sometimes question the significance of a small liberal press, but he thinks it was significant: the post worked well.

There were various media: broadsides could also be important. One of the biggest tumults in Lisbon arose in 1861 from a broadside which reported the deaths of children in the royal family: it set off demonstrations and meetings. **Fernando** said this was a case of a manuscript being stuck up in a corner: *pasquim* [English: pasquinade]

One especially important festival was the festival of the *Corps de Dieu*; this represented all classes [**M.H.P. –** especially corporations] and represented an extremely dangerous moment for the government and royal family, in for example 1840/1. **Fernando:** it was a sort of carnival.

THE MEDITERRANEAN CONTEXT

Joanna Innes invited suggestions as to what might be gained from setting Portugal in a Mediterranean context.

Gabriel Paquette noted that Portuguese émigrés in England resented the much greater success of the Philhellenes in mobilising public sympathy, though they came to see the issues as linked. Their focus was not only Mediterranean, though: they also took an interest in Belgium, as a site both for liberal Catholicism and constitutionalism.

Rui Ramos various different imaginary geographies coexisted. One was a network of small states: in that context, Portugal could be seen as like Belgium, not least in that both depended on British protection. Then there was an Iberian framework. He didn't think they looked to Italy so much. Italian jurists were important, though. Also Alfieri as a literary figure. Italy was under Austrian domination, so raised questions about great power politics. One question people asked themselves was whether Britain would sit back and let Austria destroy free countries. There were also dynastic links to Italy: Carlo Alberto died in exile in Porto. In the 1850s and 60s, the government needed to have relations with the new kingdom of Italy to demonstrate its liberal credentials; on the other hand, it didn't want to upset the church. Dynastic links were in this context a further complication.

Fatima Sa observed that links with Spain were clearly important. Esp in early C19, their histories ran in parallel. There was however also interest in Italy and Greece.

There was some conception of southern Europe as a region, see esp Almeida Garrett, *Portugal na balanca da Europa*, on the question of how to deal with the transformations taking place at that time.

There were also links via émigrés. Some Italians played a part in the Portuguese civil war.

The Miguelists had links to Italy too, from the time of Don Miguel's exile there.

Antonio Cardoso observed that Portuguese liberal exiles went to France, England and Belgium. The Belgium constitution influenced the ephemeral Portuguese constitution of 1838.

Brazil continued to loom very large, esp in the context of the war between Brazil and Paraguay.

Miriam Halpern Pereira noted that Dom Pedro was at a certain point known as the emperor of the four crowns. In Brazil, he was regarded as authoritarian, but when he came to Europe he took on the mantle of a liberator. Spanish, Greeks and Neapolitans all wanted him to help them in their fights for freedom.

The Risorgimento had to be closely followed because of its implications for the Church. It should be expected that official papers and the press would offer different perspectives.

Garibaldi was very popular among republicans, who sometimes named their children after him.

Pedro Cardim suggested that a question worth tracing over the long term was, What were the main intellectual, cultural and artistic reference points for the Portuguese elite? Nuno Monteiro has asked this question in relation to 1898. After 1640, some of the elite wanted to disconnect from Spain and southern Europe, as a way of asserting their separate identity. Also, previously, they had seen Spain as heterogeneous, but now increasingly they came to identify Spain with Castille.

Sergio Campos Matos: Almeida Garrett, in *Portugal na balanca* 1830, took into account various liberal experiences in South America and Europe.

There were close links between early Portugese and Spanish liberals. Such links were also found between early democrats and republicans. The republicans' main reference points were America and Switzerland, both esteemed as federal republics – though they had no very elaborated model.

In the press, the Risorgimento was called the Italian revolution. Italian nationalism provided an important model. It influenced Iberianists, who hoped for Iberian unification. Among other things, they aimed at creating a kind of Zollverein integrating Portugal and Spain.

Though it is often suggested that after 1640 Spain and Portugal drew apart, some studies suggest closer contact; would be good to revisit that issue.

Fernando Dores Costa suggested that 1814 marked the highpoint of Portugal's European importance. At that point, half of Wellington's army consisted of Portuguese soldiers. Yet Portugal as a state carried no weight: there was indeed no Portuguese government in Europe. During the Hundred Days, the governors of Portugal refused to take part in the coalition against Napoleon. They said it wasn't their problem: their only true enemy was Spain. They remained imaginatively within the geo-political framework of C18.

Antonio Cardoso noted that he had written an article (in Pereira et al, *Linguagens e fronteras do poder*) on the crisis of Portuguese-Spanish relations in 1840. They were allies for a time at the end of the first Carlist war, but then things deteriorated.

Portuguese relations with the UK were very important, eg relations between the liberals and Lord Palmerston. They loved him during the war, but then he took measures against Portugal in relation to issues of debts, slavery etc. Anti-British sentiment then began to develop.

CONCLUSION

Joanna Innes outlined the ways in which the project was expected to develop over the following two and a half years.