

*Mediterranean democracy, Year 3*

## ON POLITICS AND THE POLITICAL IN THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1750-1860

Lisbon, 20-1 April 2015

ISCTE

**Present:** **Antonis Anastopoulos** (Ottoman institutions, provincial society and centre-periphery relations, and tombstones), **Gregoire Bron** (volunteers in Italy and Portugal), **Sérgio Campos Matos** (social memory, historiography, nationalism and iberism in Portugal and Spain), **Pedro Cardim** (Portugal and its empire in the seventeenth century), **Fernando Dores Costa** (Portugal in the peninsular war), **Marios Hatzopoulos** (empire and nation-state formation in SE Europe, religion and nationalism in 19th century Greece and the Balkans), **Mark Knights** (English politics and culture in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries), **Maria Alexandre Lousada** (Portuguese religion and political culture), **Javier Fernández Sebastián** (history of Iberian concepts), **Nuno Gonçalo Monteiro** (political communication in the Portuguese empire), **Cristina Nogueira da Silva** (Portugal and its empire), **Miriam Halpern Pereira** (Portuguese politics and public policy), **Florencia Peyrou** (origins of democracy in Spain), **Anna Maria Rao** (Italian politics and thought in the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras), **Rui Ramos** (Portuguese politics and culture), **Fatima Sa** (Portuguese political culture and conceptual history), **Jose Miguel Sardica** (modern Portuguese political history), **Juan Luis Simal** (Spanish exiles, political culture)

**And:** Joanna Innes, Maurizio Isabella; Eduardo Posada Carbo

**Apologies:** Mark Philp, Ricardo Brito, Diego Palacios, Gabriel Paquette, Ana Maria Pina

### Day 1:

#### **Joanna Innes, Introduction**

She explained that the workshop grew out of a line of questioning that Mark Philp had started: it was a great pity that he could not be there. His starting point had been the sense that people in this period didn't talk about politics in the way we do now. The questions were: was this true; how did they talk about these things; and what were the implications?

She said that precirculated papers from herself, Mark, and Fernando Dores Costa suggested different approaches to the topic, intended to help launch discussion.

Her own paper focused on language: it explored how people talked about 'politics' in Britain. She had initially composed it not for circulation but as part of background discussion for the workshop. She had started from Mark's original notion, that people in the period didn't talk about politics in the way we do now. She said that in English and so far as she could see in French (and probably in other languages too), this seemed to her to be right. In Britain now, politics (she suggested) connotes above all a form of activity – people doing politics; then it was in her view a *sphere*, or realm, of activity – essentially the sphere of the state. It wasn't then clear that people *not* in high public office could take part in politics, though they could talk about it, and could do other, related things: notably manifest opinion. Did this matter? She didn't want to make great claims for its significance, though suggested that it might be

taken to imply that we should be careful about formulating people's goals or experiences in terms of 'political participation'. And that surely has some implications for how we think about democracy, if it's not about the people 'participating in politics'.

She stated that the course of change, and the ultimate destination of the terminology, were not the same in all languages. Mark's briefing note – partly drawing on a paper of Javier's, to which he would be talking – identified as another usage shifting in this period the relationship between what in English we now distinguish as 'politics' and 'policy', though in French these two ideas are still denoted by one word, 'politique' and -- as they had discovered in workshops in France – it remained hard to develop conceptual grids in this field in the two languages which really mapped on to each other. 'Police' and 'policy' didn't have much currency in Eng during the eighteenth century - except that in the later eighteenth century 'police' came to connote law enforcement (the words had a little more currency in Scotland, which was better linked to continental traditions of discourse). People in eighteenth century Britain didn't talk about governments having policies but rather 'systems of measures'; in the nineteenth century they talked of questions. In France in the eighteenth century it was common to link police and politeness – and indeed well into the nineteenth century the French wrote of 'sociétés policiées' when the English wrote of 'civilisation': in English there was no such perceived etymological and conceptual link; politeness and politics were disconnected terms.

- Mark's new note circulated for the conference focused on theories about politics. She observed that in all the accounts he surveyed, politics was considered as a form of *activity*; in her view, none of them accordingly mapped on to usage in the period studied. But she suggested that they might be taken as conceptualising things one might want to have concepts for, and therefore used to help develop notions about the fields of human activity whose conceptualisation was to be the focus of discussion. The three main approaches that he surveyed were
  - Schmitt: who saw politics as a matter of making claims about sovereignty
  - Arendt: who saw it as a way of ordering plurality through deliberation and decision
  - Rancière: who saw it mode of resistance, making oneself heard

These might be termed by way of shorthand authoritarian, liberal and democratic views. A fundamental tension ran through all of those accounts: between politics as sphere of norms and of arbitrariness – of values and of choices. Mark wrote of politics that it was a form of activity which operated 'not *simply* through brute force and violence [her emphasis], but with some attempt to claim some legitimacy'; one might say, it represented a site in which concepts of sovereignty and the common good come into an uneasy relationship. She suggested that, in so far as people in the period in question thought about these issues, it was probably more in terms like that – in terms of sovereignty, authority, order, public good, public opinion -- and probably not in terms of 'politics', though she was ready to be proved wrong.

- Fernando, finally, offered some thoughts on the character of the political order in our period specifically, suggesting (as she read him) a way of re-conceptualising monarchy, aristocracy and democracy so that they fit a changing political order: meaning basically government, the political/governing class, and subjects. He offered a pessimistic reading of the meaning of modern democracy in this context to which she said that she personally was entirely open: she suggested that the field of discourse about democracy was now a field of discourse about

consent as much as about voice. (She said that she had been struck recently when she re-read the 1849 manifesto of the Spanish Democrats how prominent a theme in it was the idea that political stability was proving elusive because the whole people were not on board: in the context of that concern, the goal was unity and the question was how to achieve that).

She observed finally that one theme not outlined in any of the papers, which she had been thinking about recently, which linked in to some of the themes that she had touched on, and that might provide one focus for discussion, was the question of what people thought governments and legislatures existed to do. She suggested that now we expect governments to react to challenges – international or fiscal say – *and* to manage a continually evolving programme of activity to shape society and economy; the second entailed an expectation of active, creative legislating. In this context, competing candidates for office were assessed in terms of how voters judged them likely to those tasks. But she wondered whether the rolling-programme-making notion was really an expectation in the period studied, or in how many countries it was an expectation? It was only developing as one in nineteenth-century Britain, chiefly from 1830. But if you didn't form your views about who to support in politics on those grounds, how did you form them? It might be more a matter of thinking about the style in which you wanted the country to be *governed*, in the sense of how executive government should be constituted and operate: so, what kinds of people you wanted controlling law and order, or resolving disputes. In which context, constitutions or quasi-constitutional legislation, determining what kinds of people hold power at various levels, could be the kind of thing you would most care about. If what *government* should be like was what people formed their political opinions about, that implied a rather different notion of what was at stake in politics from the programmatic notions that she suggested we tend normally to entertain now. And that might set a scene in which '*participating* in politics' in order to shape a rolling programme wasn't something you would set particular store by.

But these were issues to be explored in discussion.

### **Pedro Cardim, Religion, Justice and Government. The Scope of Politics in Early-Modern Portugal (ca. 1550-ca. 1715)**

He said that in early modern Portugal, debate about things we might broadly call political was carried on in a legal or academic mode, in juridical treatises, as well as in pamphlets or books. He understood politics to comprehend discussion of the communitarian order. This was however not called political thinking or politics at the time. Until the sixteenth century, such words were rarely used. The relevant lexicon foregrounded concepts such as ruling, lordship, the administration of justice and the common good. 'Society' was not a term in much use; 'respublica' was more common. The term citizen was rarely employed; sometimes to designate the elite in certain urban centres, but otherwise not. The king was called 'lord', or from the late sixteenth century 'your majesty'. The word 'sovereign' was rarely used. The term vassal, for in effect subject, was in common use and was used by the population. It connoted a subject of European descent. Native peoples under Portuguese rule were by contrast called subjects, and seen as existing in a relationship of subjection.

As to territory, the kingdom on the mainland was called the *reino*; other territories were called conquests. The term empire was employed in literary and historiographical contexts, but not for ordinary practical purposes. Talk of 'empire' usually implied praise for the king. The term 'colony' was barely used before the eighteenth century. It implied the plantation of

people in a place acquired by context; it implied the use of force and had rather negative connotations.

State could refer to social status, or an estate: in the sense of land and an associated jurisdictional framework.

The communitarian order, entailing the rule of people under a king, was conceptualized in organic terms. The basic unit of this order was seen as the domestic unit. Central to expectations of the king was the administration of justice. Royal officers were mainly jurists. There were few agents to implement executive actions. When the king or system of rule was criticized it was often in terms of justice. The order was seen as the product of divine action. It was expected that governing activity should take place within the framework of Catholicism. Unjust conquest was condemned. Kings stressed that they acquired all new territories by just means.

Kingship was considered as a set of duties, not so much as a route to power. More authoritarian rulers were called tyrants. They might treat vassals as mere subjects, like American Indians or slaves. The relationship between lord and vassal was conceived as a relationship between fully accomplished human beings; it was a relationship set up by the will of two free persons. The status of subject by contrast was not something that came about by choice.

Few people discussed government matters: there was not much of a social sphere of debate. Those who did speak about such things were mainly theologians or jurists. In their view, a precondition for engaging with government was the ability to govern oneself. It was supposed that there were a variety of political entities, including the ecclesiastical.

Much of this didn't change substantially during the eighteenth century. Portuguese people found this vision of things satisfying. They saw pluralism of power structures as important.

From the late sixteenth century however there was an increasingly intense process of reflection on the communitarian order and kingship. This led to a more specific understanding of politics, and favoured the development of a new lexicon. There were changes in the meaning of some established terms, not as the result of innovations by influential thinkers, but as a result of challenges posed by the need to conceptualise rule over an increasingly complex variety of people and territories. This was a slow, uneven process: there was no sharp Protestant rupture.

Imperial expansion encouraged a more grandiose notion of kingship, and a more authoritarian conception of monarchy. On the one hand, we find triumphalist visions; on the other, concern about the impact of these developments on communal life. There was concern that if the community became too heterogeneous it would not be able to provide for the well-being of its members. It might become too vast to be effectively governed. For part of the period (1580-1640) Portugal came under the still larger Spanish monarchy. There was also reflection on the implications of the different sort of order obtaining in territories outside Europe, as, among other things, racial discrimination became intrinsic to order and rule.

These challenges led to reforms and the creation of new institutions. Overseas possessions provided laboratories in which new juridical forms were experimented with. There was no massive plan or strategy, no highway to modernity. From the late sixteenth century, new

forms of taxation were introduced to finance wars. New institutions were established to assist in the government of the complex variety of territories. Many saw parliamentary consent as crucial. There were debates about the relationship between parliament and representation throughout the peninsula. In this period, 'reason of state' came to dominate debate. There developed a more secular and a more executive understanding of government. Increasingly, the concept of 'necessitas' justified this. There was more talk of government – in Latin, *gubernaculum*. The Council of State gained importance, and from 1630 esp the role of secretary of state.

The term 'political' came to be more used, not the noun but the adjective. Several meanings were attached to it. It was used to classify people or treatises inspired by Machiavelli or Bodin; it connoted actions not limited by justice or religion; someone skilled in courtly intrigue, and in dissimulation. It could refer to the government of a city, though that was not common. Politics as a noun was rare.

From the mid seventeenth century, 'state' acquired a new meaning. The term was used in relation to the most sensitive aspects of royal government. It came to be connected with secrecy. There was talk of 'matters of state'. The word statesman was sometimes used, though it wasn't very frequent. It connoted someone pragmatic, perhaps amoral. From the mid seventeenth century, the new style of governing was sometimes termed 'absolute' (the word 'absolutism' was not used). The term often had negative connotations.

There were many riots and revolts during the seventeenth century, and also more printed material. Both developments were associated with a broadening of debate; more people were politicized. Rulers became more concerned with the opinion of the people. But this was not called 'politics'.

Debate sometimes centred on nationhood. National origins attracted more debate and discussion within the multiple Spanish monarchy. There were also debates over contrasting views of kingship. Some favoured the new model, some the old. Some had a more contractual vision – though he's never seen explicit reference to a 'contract' until 1640. Dozens of treatises and pamphlets came to be published. French monarchs were increasingly seen as representing a more absolute style of rule. Portuguese and Spanish writers contrasted their kings with Louis XIV. The contrast was drawn in the context of French intervention in the Catalan revolt (1640-59).

The history of the reception of Bodin's work is both complex and discontinuous.

See:

Gil Pujol, Xavier. "Del estado de los lenguajes políticos, del centro de la periferia: Dos décadas de historia política sobre la España de los siglos XVI y XVII". In *El Hispanismo Anglo-norteamericano: Aportaciones, problemas, y perspectivas sobre historia, arte y literatura españolas (siglos XVI-XVIII)*. Edited by J. M. de Bernardo Ares, vol. 2, 883-919. Córdoba: Oficina Social y Cultural Casalur, 2001.

It was placed on both the Portuguese and the Spanish Index, but his views did circulate, and did inspire some who endorsed more authoritarian views of kingship: *señor assoluto* was the term used. But such views did not derive only from Bodin, or indeed from the French model. They also drew on the contrast between rule in Europe and the new world. The latter was said to be more absolute.

Concern about the legitimacy of rule in overseas territories declined in this period, as the French, Dutch and English all piled in to the game. A more pragmatic attitude took shape, with more emphasis on force of arms. Consideration was given, for example, as to whether

some lands should be ceded to buy help against the Spanish: this was not seen as a breach of duties to their inhabitants.

This period also saw the erosion though not the disappearance of a Catholic conception of rule. There was a striking increase in reform proposals, so called **arbitrias**[?]. It has been suggested that ideas about government became more ‘scientific’: more professional and technical. Tacitus was frequently quoted in these writings. They stood for a more executive version of rule, and a more pessimistic vision of community.

At some points during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there were debates about republican politics as then understood, especially in the Portuguese parliament. Some thought there should be a more contractual relationship between king and parliament. But this shift did not take place. Radical ideas coming from England, which were associated with Protestant views, were explicitly rejected. From the early eighteenth century, parliaments were no longer summoned.

Royal authority was constructed through the repression of violence, the establishment of a secure monopoly of power. There were various forms of resistance. Portuguese lower groups sometimes said they were being treated like slaves. Some critics developed alternative views of the communitarian order, eg in artisan guilds (thus in Barcelona): thus, pactist views. Similar things could be said about people of African or Amerindian descent: more work is now being done on their conceptions of justice and equality, though there are very few sources to work from.

Nonetheless, the new developments which took place didn’t change the deepest aspects of the communitarian order: there were just some changes, making the system more open to the build-up of executive power, and to make this acceptable, but without fundamental change.

## **Mark Knights, Politics and the Political in Early Modern Britain 1550-1750**

He would be providing an account of change between the sixteenth and mid eighteenth centuries, during which the word ‘politics’ came into more frequent use in English. He listed words commonly joined with politics, including body, laws, observations, affairs, society, state. Not many books published had politics in the title, and those which did were often commenting on Aristotle. Still, the word was increasingly used: it occurs only 42x in sixteenth-century text databases, but 4065x in the seventeenth century, especially after 1640.

He suggested that the Protestant Reformation had a significant impact both on language and on conceptions of politics. Religion stirred up popular passions. Some slogans were at once religious and political: thus ‘anti-popery’, a cry directed both against Catholicism and against tyrannical government. In the process of working through these issues, people came to talk more about state, nation and empire.

The common conception of the political body is well captured by Patrick Collinson’s notion of a monarchical republic. This was a polity in which subjects also governed, in the localities if not in the centre, one in which it was appropriate to use such terms as citizen, public good, public interest, and to assess institutions as more or less oligarchic or democratic: republican categories found ready application.

The two seventeenth-century revolutions transformed both state and language. ‘Revolution principles’ were developed. A language of rights was developed as a basis for resisting tyranny. Rights were asserted to freedom of worship and freedom of speech.

Moreover after 1640 there was an explosion of printed material, within which such matters were discussed.

Politics in this context related to monarchy; interstate affairs and parliament. But how these bodies behaved and should behave was contested. There was a broader ‘political culture’, as historians say, a framework of values and set of practices of debate, in which such things were discussed. Derivatives of politics appeared in the title of some newspapers, thus *Mercurius Politicus*. ‘Opinion’ was another key term. In the later seventeenth century, party politics began to crystallize, and political clubs formed, with some popular element. The term ‘mob’ was invented in the 1680s to capture the idea of a mobilized people. There was a good deal of activity in the form of oaths, covenants, petitions, remonstrances and associations (in effect leagues) – things that people signed. Parties were constructive and deconstructive: they channeled political opinion and engagement, but were often criticized as deforming the political realm. Those accused of factional opposition might justify themselves through the language of patriotism. A pamphlet of 1748, *Manchester Politics*, argued that Tory principles were consistent with the ancient laws of the kingdom. But there was also a reaction against politics, involving for instance attempts to create non-political spaces. Some societies specifically banned political talk. The ethos of politeness can be understood partly as a means to contain political passions.

Politics did come to be to some extent separated from religion, once it was accepted that there should be a measure of religious toleration. Politics itself was portrayed as a secular arrangement. Political economy emerged as a form of technical discourse in which to discuss some of the concerns of the fiscal-military state. But this also marked the separating out of economics from its moral and religious roots. Adam Smith’s attacks on political forms of economy opened the way for the economy to be considered as another autonomous category.

Another context for political discourse was literary. There was much discussion of politics in literary contexts, even if the word itself was not always used. A variety of metaphors were used: metaphors of the ship, the body, of gaming and of love. Some poems dealt explicitly with politics, perhaps in the form of satire.

In sum he thought that a recognizably political sphere, overlapping with but distinguishable from other spheres, did emerge in Britain during this period.

## Discussion of papers by Pedro Cardim and Mark Knights

Several questions were collected:

**Juan Luis Simal** said that he was interested in religion and politics, how they should be seen in relation to one another. Exile had often been related to religion. Did that make it political?

**Nuno Monteiro** said to Pedro that he was impressed by his feat of condensation, but had some doubts. For example, in relation to the word colony, he thought that in the seventeenth century it could be a positive word, contrasted with conquest. He thought the town Colonia in Uruguay illustrated this. He also wanted to know more about how slaves and Amerindians:

how could one find out about their views. Did confraternities play a role? He thought that the question of naturalness and nationhood was fascinating. The Spanish and Portuguese monarchies both consecrated the idea of the naturalness of the community; the status of the nation was more difficult. To Mark, he said that England was often contrasted with the Mediterranean; he wasn't sure whether he wanted to stress contrast or to find points of convergence. The much greater development and freedom of the press in England was certainly a difference; also the development of a political opposition enjoying some legitimacy as such.

### **Responses:**

**Pedro:** *to Juan Luis.* He didn't want to suggest that politics and religion were distinct, just that there was some separation. Even though Catholic language continued to shape how society was imagined, and had many normative implications. Exclusions were usually justified with reference to these. He thought that exile was an interesting topic, and worth further thought. *To Nuno*, he said that it was true that talk of colonies wasn't always negative, though he hadn't seen Portuguese Americans using the terms in relation to themselves during the seventeenth century (Nuno agreed). They referred to Spanish colonies. As to incorporation of indigenes: the source problem was serious. It was possible that the records of confraternities would help. Or more might be learnt from looking at the internal structures of Maroon communities, which could be quite complicated; they interacted with colonial authorities, so there is some documentation. As to naturalness, the Spanish word *naturaleza* [natural world] was a vexed term.

**Mark:** said that exile was often represented in Britain as an effect of a regime being popish or popishly inclined. Much emigration to America fit that pattern. In this way, politics and religion could be brought together. *To Nuno*, he said that the British saw themselves as exceptional because Protestant. In that regard, they might be seen as more naturally comparable to the Dutch or Swiss. But this perception of difference may well have masked a lot of convergence, for example in relation to the power of elites.

### **More questions were collected:**

**Marios Hatzopoulos** would have expected to hear much reference to absolutism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and had been surprised to hear Pedro say that was not the case.

**Fatima Sa** asked Pedro if politics was a rarely used term, how did people translate ancient texts, notably Aristotle. She was also interested in the comparison between vassal and subject. She notes that **Andreo Domingos** claimed in his book that Indians became vassals in the course of the eighteenth century.

**Pedro** said *to Marios*, that kingship was strengthened, but it was not celebrated as absolute. Contemporaries did not see themselves as replacing their complex body politic, with all its checks and balances, with something different. That change came only in the early eighteenth century. *To Fatima* he said that there were not in fact many translations of Aristotle; he was known chiefly through the Thomists; the language was therefore already mediated. Terms like the common good were much more common. When they talked about participation in local affairs, they tended to invoke the tag *quod omnis tangit*. In Catalonia it was different: it seems that more reference was made to politics in Catalonian discourse. As to vassal and

subject, he said that it was a subject that deserved further exploration. He had had the book *When Indians were Vassals* in mind in making his remarks. He said that it seemed that the status of Indians changed when they moved out of mission villages and into a more municipal context. **Nuno** noted that there were petitions from Indians. **Pedro** said indeed, and some claimed vassal status.

**More questions were collected:**

**Fernando Dores Costa** said that surely the view was that the limits of authority were set in human nature itself. No authority could make individuals virtuous. Issuing pardons was he thought a crucial activity for rulers. He noted that in the Corts of 1668 there were claims that the king had been elected.

**Rui Ramos:** wanted to address three questions to the speakers. First, Mark had not given much prominence to empire/overseas possessions in his account, but did he think that they should be given an important place? Secondly in relation to republican culture, why was this associated with Protestant politics? Was it so associated in England? Thirdly, he noted that Pedro had talked of a trend to strengthen the hand of the executive, and had seen talk of 'politics' as associated with that. But in Mark's account, politics seemed to be associated rather with the idea of setting limits to power through law, as set out eg by Fortescue. Were the associations indeed quite different in the two cases?

**Responses:**

**Mark** said that indeed empire was important in the British context. In the seventeenth century the issue of what the form of rule over the empire was to be was already a live subject: there was a lot of constitution-drafting, in which context people had to think about how democratic they were prepared to let such constitutions be. Colonising was however commonly undertaken by companies, not the state. These companies had constitutions themselves, which provided one possible model. In relation to Protestantism and republicanism, he thought there were links through the role accorded to congregations. Moreover religious choice could be conceptualized as a privilege of the citizen, and thus assimilated to property. He noted that for a long time the favoured translation of *respublica* was commonwealth, but after the civil wars and interregnum, that term acquired problematic local connotations. A new set of words were then developed around the word 'public'.

**Joanna Innes** asked if it was the case (and she thought the two papers left this hypothesis intact) that 'politics' at this period denoted more a subject matter than an activity, what words were used for the activities we think of as politics? Were there multiple words: petition, vote, remonstrate etc.

**Mark** said yes, and words like people, popular, will of the people, *vox populi* were asked to do a lot of work. He agreed that there was a linguistic gap which we now fill with 'politics'. **Joanna** said that she thought there were words that contemporaries used when they wanted to talk about things like the Sacheverell affair, the Excise crisis, the fuss over Wilkes etc as part of a series, but she couldn't now call to mind what noun or nouns they used in this context.

**Anna Maria Rao** said that clearly the classics were a common reference point, but she thought that there were important differences in cultural formation. In Spain, Italy and France much secondary education was in religious colleges. She also noted that there was a wide circulation of political models: in Britain, thus, reference was made to the Italian republics, to Venice and to Florence. The question asked in relation to them was, which institutions were

best to preserve a state? In relation to religion and state, she noted that the church's view was that it was not a sin not to pay taxes.

**Mark** said that much education took place through practice: that was the core of Philip Withington's argument in his study of the politics of commonwealth. Cicero's account of the duties of an officeholder was a key text. There was something of a backlash against Aristotle, who was seen as too academic, not sufficiently focused on practice. He thought that the question of ideas about Italian republics was fascinating, and there was certainly a large contemporary literature on them. In the case of Venice, much admired, one challenge for British admirers was to celebrate political institutions from Venice's regrettable religious affiliations.

### **Antonis Anastasopoulos, The Ottoman Empire: Politics in an Absolutist Context**

He noted that there is no accepted scholarly definition of politics. One textbook says that it is the activity through which people make, challenge and amend the rules under which they live. In this formulation, it's linked to cooperation. But it has no 'true' meaning, and there are various rival concepts, such as state, public life, distribution of power, all of which can capture some meanings also associated with politics.

He said that Ottoman 'political' ideology focused on the house of Osman, the only dynasty there ever was. It was an absolutist regime, in which authority lay with the sultan – the word means authority, power or government. There was only one brief experiment with a constitution and parliament (1876-8). The only accepted limit on the sultan's authority was that imposed by religion: *din-i-devlet*, religion and state, were twin concepts, always appearing in that order. The sultan appointed a grand vizier and a superior council, which he presided over in theory, though in practice the grand vizier did. Among other things this council examined petitions. Decrees were issued in the sultan's name alone. The legitimacy of the ruling dynasty was not questioned (though it was possible to question whether the current representative of the dynasty was fit to rule).

The sultan appointed all officials in principle; in practice, patronage was the best means of securing office. High officials initially had the status of personal slaves of the sultan; until the seventeenth century, to be a slave of the sultan continued to be a status of honour. There was no blood aristocracy. The scribal service never played much of a political role as a group. Religious scholars were however politically important inasmuch as they influenced the population. By questioning the legitimacy of a sultan's actions they could open the way to his deposition. The army was also a factor in politics: it could be mobilized for or against those in power. By the end of the eighteenth century there was some blurring between military and civilian identities. The effect was to enhance the political leverage of both.

Provincial administration was military in nature. From the late sixteenth century, the state gradually dismantled the cavalry. Government came to be entrusted to local elites. The state all but collapsed as power passed to the 'ayan'. Only from the 1810s did the central state briefly reassert control over most provinces. There was an immense web of interconnected interests. Tax collecting rights served as a powerful glue for interest groups. Tax farmers needed to build networks to protect themselves from rivals and opponents.

Subjects were called the flock (raiya). Justice was central to the ideology of rule. Muslims were legally superior to non-Muslims; the state was manned by them. Conversion was quite a simple and quick procedure. This rule was formally overturned only in 1839; the impetus for change first provided then was picked up again from the mid 1850s: these were key dates inaugurating the so-called Tanzimat period, which marked a break both in ideology and in practice.

What was the place of politics in this order of things? The modern Turkish term for politics, *siyaset*, comes from the Arabic. According to the Encyclopedia of Islam, it didn't acquire its modern meaning until the nineteenth century; previously it meant statecraft or governance, or, even more commonly, punishment, especially physical punishment for offences against the state. Other reference works equate *siyaset* with governance. The classical understanding of politics also focused on governance. The concept *siyaset* embodied a top-down view of politics. It excluded the raiya: they were objects of *siyaset* only.

However, the sultan could be advised. There was an established genre of advice books, so-called *nasihaset names*. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these have been characterized as 'decline literature', because their premise was that the state was in decline. Usually such works suggested restoring the institutions of the past, and an end to corruption. They urged the restoration of kanun (sultanic law) and sharia (Islamic law). They saw the intrusion of the raiya into the ranks of the military officeholding elite, the askeri, as an abuse. They argued that religious scholars, the army, merchants and peasants should each play their allotted roles. During the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries there was a shift in focus: increasingly such advice books urged internal reforms, to improve the state's ability to face up to Christian Europe. An important spur was defeat at the hands of Russia. This prompted the formation of a new-style army, the nizam-i cedid. Honouring the new as opposed to the old marked a change within the genre.

Sultans sometimes actively sought advice, by convening emergency councils. In 1789, shortly after the accession of Selim III, he convened an assembly of over 200 high-ranking members of the army, bureaucracy and religious scholars. In 1808, there was a meeting of powerful ayan, the sened-i ittifak. The document or agreement that they drew up has not survived. For the first time in Ottoman history the sultan then negotiated limits to his power. In 1845, in a Tanzimat context, two men were sent to Istanbul from each province, but this served little practical purpose, since most representatives were reluctant to speak their minds.

There was no concept of the 'citizen' until very late in Ottoman history. Modern scholarship talks a lot about politics, but it's not usually spelt out what is mean. Even Bernard Lewis in his *Political Language of Islam* devotes only two lines to exploring the term *siyasa*. Modern scholars don't restrict the term to things that concern the state apparatus. They see petitions and revolts as forms of political action or protest. They imply that there was politics at all levels, in all matters that related to the production, use or distribution of resources. Petitions were a legitimate form of action – they implicitly endorsed the sultan's role as fount of justice. Revolts by contrast were disapproved of. But they did happen. In Istanbul, it was not unusual for the ulema to legitimize them. Islamic law doesn't recognize the legal existence of collectivities. Local communities were understood as collections of individuals. Petitions therefore were conceived as emanating from the individuals who signed them. They were usually handled through local courts of law, which doubled as centres of administration. A central response might take the form of a decree. Was petitioning 'political'? It depends on how we define the term. They were addressed to the highest authority in the state, which

seems to make them political in the modern sense. They might make threats, such as the threat to abandon their homes if their grievances were not alleviated.

Local communities had their own internal politics, relating for example to the allocation of tax burdens. They interacted with the centre: links to the centre provided prestige, patronage, power and opportunities for networking.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the legitimacy of the sultan's rule came to be questioned by some of his Christian subjects.

Only increasing interaction with Christian Europe created a felt need for words equivalent to European 'politics'. However, there did exist something we might term politics.

### **Discussion:**

**Joanna** asked whether there was a word to denote the local elites who were represented in more or less formal local councils, eg in cities. How were they conceptualized?

**Antonis** said that the state bureaucracy had no word for them. Little evidence of non-state usage has survived.

**Joanna** asked if this changed in the Tanzimat period, when these arrangements were increasingly formalized.

**Antonis** said then some terms were coined, the equivalent eg of mayor: a European model was translated. Some old words were repurposed for this.

**Nuno Monteiro** said that he was fascinated by the account of petitioning. He said that it was always difficult to know where to draw the line between the administrative and the judicial, which had implications for demarcating 'politics'. He observed that petitions engaging with local issues might have implications for wider issues: for the organization of taxation or military force. He noted that in Portugal in the late eighteenth century there was equally hostility to collective petitions, but later there was a shift in attitude. He wondered whether there was an Ottoman parallel to that.

**Antonis** said that in the Ottoman empire petitions characteristically protested about oppression by local officials. They did not challenge sultanic power as such. **Nuno** said that that was a point of similarity. **Antonis** said that Islamic law pervaded everything. The state usually responded by asking local officials to think again – or threatened them with punishment if the problem was not solved. They didn't themselves propose a solution. He said there was no change in attitudes to petitioning over this period, including during the Tanzimat. There wasn't so much evidence for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the Tanzimat, there was a new administrative set up, but petitions were still directed to the centre, although there were more intermediary councils.

### **Several questions were collected:**

**Pedro Cardim** said that portraits of the Ottoman empire as a despotism dated from the late sixteenth century. The Ottomans were used as a limiting case in terms of conceptions of ways of doing politics. The notion was that Ottoman subjects were not the equivalent of vassals, but more like slaves. He wondered if the Ottomans knew about this perception?

**Marios Hatzopoulos** wanted to know more about the role of the ulema, esp in relation to the decrees of the sultan.

**Eduardo** noted that Mark Knights in his remarks had contrasted politics with absolutism. He wondered if absolutism in southern Europe was like or unlike Ottoman rule.

**Antonis** said to **Pedro**, that the higher echelons must have been aware of this image, but they didn't bother to counter it. They just thought themselves superior. Only in the eighteenth century did more interest develop in Europe as a possible model. The first permanent Ottoman embassies were established in the 1790s, but these only lasted a few years. Such arrangements were really only institutionalized from the 1830s.

To **Marios**, he said that in principle the authority of the ulema was independent of the sultan; they could judge everything. The Sheikh al Islam was in a theory not a member of the imperial council. But in fact, ulema with state positions owed their positions to the sultan. In theory, ulema could not be killed. But they were sometimes appointed governors so that they could be killed in that role. All depositions of sultans were underwritten by legitimating fetva. To **Eduardo**, he said that it was difficult to compare when there were so many possible levels of comparison, and southern Europe was itself not a uniform entity. During the past twenty years, when historians have developed comparisons this has mainly been with France or the Habsburgs. They can be seen as having faced the same problems.

**Joanna** noted that by the later nineteenth century, some writers from the Ottoman world – Midhat Pasha, Khayr al Din – were positioning the Ottoman empire along a scale from liberalism through to despotism, arguing that the Ottoman empire was not so far along the despotic end of that scale as the Papal State or Russia.

**Antonis** said that moves to promulgate constitutions at that time were largely directed towards making an impression on Europeans.

### **Javier Fernández Sebastián, What did They Mean by Política? Debating over the Concept, Value, and Place of Politics in Modern Spain.**

He noted that his presentation was based on a chapter he had written in Steinmetz ed, *Writing Political History Today*.

He said that historians had projected an essentially modern concept of politics backward on to an Iberian religio-jurisdictional culture, where the modern concept did not neatly fit. In that culture the idea of sovereign power was inconceivable. In the mid eighteenth century, 'politica' was defined as the government of the commonwealth; it was the sphere of 'police'. The term was rarely heard outside governmental and diplomatic concepts. It could be applied to both high and municipal contexts. In the former, it often had negative connotations.

But in 1808 – with the crisis of the monarchy -- patterns of usage changed. There was suddenly a need to encourage discussion among a much larger group. Newspapers provided vehicles for this; manifestos were published, and moves were made towards establishing a Cortes. Much use was made of the phrase 'public opinion'. There was much talk about 'politics', meaning the science of government, constitutional law and political economy.

During the later eighteenth century, a number of authors had moved from discussions of political economy towards a form of constitutionalism: thus **Aguirre, Aural, Cibarnes, Foronda, Jovellanos, Vilanova**. They were influenced by their readings of such authors as Montesquieu, Hume and Smith. They were interested in questions about representation and the division of powers, in relation to the question of how to make the public interest the

driving force in government. They thought that representation was needed in order to guarantee to members of the polity their rights to property, liberty and security. By this means politics became associated with constitutions.

The summoning of the Cortes suddenly created an arena for national politics. Political languages of virtue, the general will, and patriotism came into unprecedented use; interest was another term in play. Lexical databases show that references to politics grew steadily and rapidly during the next two centuries. There was also a substantial broadening of its range of meaning, and adjustments in relation to other disciplines, in terms of what was and what was not included. Jovellanos said that history was essentially experimental politics, and that law was rational politics. He saw these as two aspects of the same phenomenon. It was thought that in the past the Cortes had acted to limit the power of the monarchy, and to secure peace, and that it would be good to recover these things. Spanish disciples of the ideologues thought that politics could be reduced to a science if only a clear nomenclature could be developed.

In the mid nineteenth century politics par excellence was liberal politics: the term was virtually synonymous with liberalism. Diatribes against politics were directed against liberal politicization. There was talk of 'politicomania', esp from the 1820s, with the civil war, and associated large-scale mobilization. The term entered everyday vocabulary. Debate about its proper limits focussed on such questions as should everyone take part in elections, and should petitioning be restricted.

The category 'social' also acquired new significance at this time. There was debate about whether the political should prevail over the social, or vice versa. Radicals said that the political should prevail; conservatives the reverse. These conceptualizations were associated with a theory of representative government in which the role of government was to represent society. Some thought that social science would one day absorb political science. Balmes said that on the surface a question may be political that is in another sense social. Politics was seen as volatile and contingent: a deeper level of analysis and action was needed. Donoso Cortes [conservative Catholic political theorist] said that all political questions also involved political questions. Mid nineteenth century liberals debated voluntaristic and Jacobin forms of constitutionalism. They wanted to return to the eighteenth-century approach, to promote a science of administration. After 1848, the social question became a talking point. It was said that politics was exhausted; it had no more potential to transform. Garrido said that social science would displace political science. Across the spectrum, observers called for an end to politics.

## Discussion:

**Joanna** said that in her own research on Britain she had found the categories 'political' and 'social' quite fluid in meaning. Some conceived of 'social reform' as something quite limited, to be carried out by philanthropic action; to others it connoted social upheaval, something that would change the very foundations of public life.

**Javier** said his perception was that a series of people took up the category 'social' as a tool, first conservative liberals, then progressives. Class was similarly first invoked by liberals such as Tocqueville and Guizot.

**Eduardo** wanted to know if questions about the Church, clearly so important in Spain, were political questions?

**Javier** said that the idea of theology as a base of knowledge changed after 1848. He linked this change with a famous speech on dictatorship by Donoso Cortes [which urged authoritarian rule, and helped to lay the foundation for the doctrine of papal infallibility].

**Florencia** said that she wasn't entirely clear from his account how politics and administration were seen to relate.

**Javier** said that he thought that in the eighteenth century, the science of administration, 'politics', developed into political economy. In 1851, conversely, **?????** said that politics was unnecessary; what really mattered was administration.

**Several questions were collected:**

**Maurizio** said that the idea that religion should underpin the political order did not come only from the right. He cited an article by **????** in the 1830s, which pointed to religion as the source of problems.

**Juan Luis Simal** wondered why the appeal to medieval institutions [as models for representation] if politics was equated with liberalism and conceived as a tool for change. He thought that the idea that constitutions would fail if they weren't adapted to social conditions provided an important way in which contemporaries linked the social and the political. He noted that modern historians were also attracted to such formulations.

**Javier** said to **Maurizio** that in general he agreed, but Donoso Cortes' statement was very strong and distinctive.

To **Juan Luis** he agreed that the question was debated.

**Juan Luis** clarified that he wasn't talking just about social conditions, but about national character. The question was, could this be reframed by politics?

**Javier** said that the point he most wanted to stress was that the terms 'social', 'political' and 'civic' were all in flux. The Latin translation of the Greek *politica* was *societatis civilis*: originally, polity and society were different names for the same entity. Now translations began to differentiate meanings. But what meanings attached to each term remained fluid.

**Several questions were collected:**

**Fatima** wanted to pick up on the term 'politico mania'. She noted that some traditionalist groups rejected politics as such – thus the Miguelists, who denounced the liberals' politicomania.

**Rui** said he welcomed the paper, not least because he would have told much the same story about Portugal and now no longer needed to say all these things. He agreed the politics was often equated with liberalism and with revolution. Was revolution the highest form of politics, or a denial of politics? He said that in the 1830s and 40s, the question of the role of revolution was a big one in liberal politics.

**Mark Knights** wanted to hear more about the emergence of a conception of private interest as a driving force for public happiness.

**Javier** said to **Fatima** that the first strong criticisms of politicomania came during the liberal trienio. He cited *Los Espanoles pintados por si mismos* [orig 1843], a founding work of costumbrismo [study of manners and customs] relevance? He said that politicomania was linked with an appetite for discussion.

To **Rui** he said the rising against Napoleon was called a revolution. Modern politics were associated with liberalism and therefore with revolution. Debate then focused on the question, has the revolution achieved its end? Or does it need to continue? Some thought that it should continue but now in the social sphere.

To **Mark** he said that the eighteenth-century Spanish reception of Smith encouraged such writers as Campomanes and Jovellanos to think that it was beneficial to promote the pursuit of private interest. He thinks this was an idea that spread throughout Europe at this time.

### Several questions were collected:

**Fernando** said that he thought Donoso Cortes meant that no effective authority can present itself as a human intervention. He said that disappointment with liberal politics came very rapidly, and there was then a return to charismatic solutions.

**Gregoire** [Sorry, I didn't follow this]

**Miriam** thought that this account mapped on to the Portuguese case well. In the mid 1850s, there was a shift in emphasis towards administration. She thought the social question as it discussed in the later nineteenth century was connected with the situation of the working class: it was relatively narrowly conceived. In 1848, those who used the phrase were thinking much more broadly, about universal suffrage and other new ways of participating in politics.

**Javier** said that **Gregoire and Miriam** had asked much the same question. He thought that the revival of the idea of a social order was associated with a more traditionalist shift within liberalism. To **Miriam** he said that he didn't mean to imply that the social question abolished politics. He said that with the creation of a Democratic Party in Spain, some reformers became much preoccupied with 'the social question'. In our sense of the term, they saw it as a political question. They were convinced that the social revolution needed to go further.

## Anna Maria Rao, Politics and the Political in Italy, 1760-1815

She would be talking about what politics meant in Italian texts, between the 1760s and the early nineteenth century. *Politica/o* was both an adjective and a substantive. *La politica* denoted both a practice and a science.

The 1760s saw elements of crisis and change in Europe. Tuscany, Rome and Naples faced the spectre of famine. The Seven Years War brought different political models into confrontation. Russia and Prussia, once seen as barbaric states, now gained an implicit place in the European system. There was a discourse about the relationship between barbarism and civilization. Franco Venturi, who identified this decade as a hinge of change, described a range of crises within Italy. The same decade saw the appearance of various important texts: in Milan, texts by Beccaria and Verri; in Naples, by Genovesi. Rousseau's writings were discussed. Dragonetti's *Delle virtù de' Premi* [of virtues and rewards, Naples, 1766] was translated into numerous European languages, including German (two editions) and Swedish.

He was seen as continuing Beccaria's Crime and punishment. His publisher said that public rights had until recently been ignored, but new works were now engaging with this.

Dragonetti said that political science consists in determining the point at which men can be free, and determining which is the best government. Meanwhile, the statutes of freemasonic clubs said that talk of politics and religion should be avoided, because they threatened universal fraternity.

At the base of all writings about politics in this period were Cicero's texts; also Machiavelli, Bodin, Montesquieu and Rousseau. *Raison d'etat* was an important notion – but it was an associated with an emphasis on conserving the state, not on changing it. Filangieri's Science of legislation praised the tribunal of public opinion. He conceived of politics as a science for determining the form of government most conducive to happiness. **He also published a periodical which surveyed the general state of the sciences [?]** *La politica* was among the sciences discussed there. It was grouped with the intellectual sciences – alongside jurisprudence, theology, languages and agriculture – as opposed to those of the material world. (Maruti has written about all this). His work offered a sort of synthesis of political debates to this moment, drawing on Aristotle, Bayle, Grotius and Pufendorf. All concerned with how to govern men, and with such questions as What is the origin of government? And What is the best government? Mario Pagano said that it didn't matter what the form of government is. What's crucial is that liberty is protected by law, and that men are made better, esp. the common people; there is therefore a need for public education.

Erasmo Leso's analysis has shown that, during the revolutionary trienio, 1796-9, there was an explosion of references to 'politics' in the titles of books and journals, eg the Lombard *Political Thermometre*. Journals served as ventilators of the political atmosphere. The word was most commonly found in the form of the adjective 'political', though there was also an explosion in the use of the substantive, *la politica*, often accompanied by an adjective, such as good, healthy, former, new or democratic. A science of politics was conceived of as something that would allow the political machine to function. Or, in another image, it was suggested that the political body had evolved through time and needed to be given a right direction to achieve health. Matteo Galdi said that everyone had the right to talk about politics, yet he insisted on the concept of political virtue. He thought it important to achieve a political balance among nations, and political legality among nations. He aimed to construct a universal social science, a political cosmography, applicable to the whole world. Civil and political rights were both asserted. It was suggested that one needed specific kinds of competence to exercise these, though that shouldn't exclude the common people. Pervading much of this talk was the sense that politics was potentially divisive. What was sought was a way of creating universal fraternity.

## Discussion:

**Joanna** observed that the emergence of an idea of specifically 'political' rights was an important theme. In England it was said to happen in the 1760s.

**Eduardo** noted that Anna Maria had introduced an international dimension to the political, which had not been mentioned before.

**Anna Maria** said that indeed **Galdi's [just his?]** new politics encompassed what was happening internationally.

**Eduardo** said he had another question about Italy: this was about the relationship between politics and secret societies.

**Anna Maria** said that an article appeared in Naples 1799 by Gregorio Mattei, under the title 'Le conjuration'. It argued that conjuration is necessary when there is no freedom of expression; then it is only through conjuration that one can introduce change. By contrast, under democracy, there will be no need for secrets. The French revolutionaries decreed an end to freemasonry.

**Florencia** noted that there was a moment of political explosion in both Italy and Spain, a moment at which it was thought that through politics one can realize oneself and solve everything. Politics was seen as something very immediate, not as something mediated. But it was difficult to know how this worked at the level of the population. How did this work in Italy?

**Anna Maria** said that it was indeed very difficult to reconstruct patterns of popular thought and action, not least because there were differences between different groups.

She cited Della Crusca's dictionary of 1610, which listed among occupations the most noble one: to regulate the life of the community according to justice. But this idealistic notion coexisted with a notion of politics as dangerous and degraded.

### **Marios Hatzopoulos, From Theo-politics to Politics and Back Again: Early Modern Greece**

He said that he was experimenting with the term 'theo-politics'. His starting point was Byzantine political theory. That was concerned with the end of time. People approached the deity when there were decisions to be taken: politics was determined by the will of the deity. There was scope for intervention by religious activists, but he wasn't going to dwell on this.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw a pendulum-like swing between theo-politics and other politics.

He wanted to start with two premises from Byzantine political theory. The empire would last until the end of time. Divine agency would at some point operate through a messiah, ruler or others to deliver the people within this term. They would regain their lost sovereignty and resurrect the empire. The theme of resurrection was therefore a resonant one. It was important to the art of the painter called El Greco. A variety of traditions came together to inform thinking, eg the tradition of sleeping kings. Messianic notions were abroad in the late Roman empire. But the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans set a new scene.

Messianism intertwined with the second theme, that of collective regeneration. The Bible provided the narrative template for a story of an exiled chosen people, who ultimately returned.

These ideas informed action during the Greek War of Independence, when the Greeks initially aimed to massacre both Christians and Jews. Many had been embedded in the system of Ottoman administration that they now strove to overthrow. Oracular prophecy played an important part in the progress of the rebellion; it is said to have smoothed the progress of the Friendly Society. It complemented formal nationalist education, and validated actions that would otherwise have seemed unacceptably revolutionary.

Then the pendulum swung the other way. Ypsilantis spoke of the resurrection of Greece. The Patriarch appealed to European courts; he invoked the aid of the civilized nations of Europe. Christ has risen became a toast. Christian resurrection was among the motifs on the flags at Jassy.

This vocabulary survived into the post-independence period.

The Orthodox iconography of resurrection is different from the Catholic one. Christ leans forward, holding the hands of Adam and Eve and pushing them out of the grave.



*From Chora Church, Istanbul*

Similar motifs can be found in patriotic art, As in a well-known image of Rhigas and Korais lifting Greece to her feet.



*Lithograph from Benaki Museum*

## Discussion:

### Several comments were collected:

**Maurizio** wanted to comment on how this might relate to the rest of the Mediterranean. He said that a prophetic, messianic language also existed and was employed in Catholic southern Europe. Such notions were constantly being reinvented. For example in the 1830s, by Saint Simon and Lamennais: *Le Peuple* became a touchstone of much political rhetoric.

**Joanna** said this was in fact also the case in the Protestant world. The years after 1796 saw an explosion of missionary enthusiasm following the French imprisonment of the Pope, which many hoped might herald the Second Coming. English Protestant missions, which spread to the Mediterranean in the early nineteenth century, had their roots in that wave of enthusiasm. She suggested that what was in question here was a language for thinking about what we might call politics which was not itself political.

**Ana Maria Lousada** said that in Portugal such imagery was also used by counterrevolutionaries.

**Anna Maria Rao** asked how many words there were for resurrection in Greek? She said that in Italy 'risorgimento' became the watchword of the national independence movement; this was chosen over 'regeneration', which recalled the French too much.

**Javier** suggested that links between religion and politics could take two different forms. One involved the transfer of sacrality. [Not clear from my notes what the other was]. Lucien Jaume's recent book on the religion of politics in the French revolution discussed the centrality of the concept of regeneration.

He said that in Spanish politics regeneration was an important concept throughout the nineteenth century, and indeed down to the present day.

**Fernando** said that he was also reminded of Portuguese imagery. The restoration of Portuguese independence in 1640 for example was portrayed as the end of 60 years' captivity.

**Antonis** said that such images were good for transmitting messages. He pointed out that Christ used his right hand to raise Adam, his left hand to raise Eve. Korais and Rhigas both used their left hands.

**Marios** said yes indeed, such imagery was common throughout the Christian world. Marjorie Reeves showed that Joachim of Fiore produced his own synthesis of Byzantine and Latin apocalyptic literatures. History was expected to have an end, There would then be a more just and peaceful world. There was a notion that there would be a last emperor who would chastise the Church: that image was used at the time of the Reformation, notably when Charles V sacked Rome. But he thought putting the people at the centre of messianic language was new.

**Maurizio** said he wasn't convinced about that.

**Marios** said that Greek nationalists used regeneration and resurrection interchangeably. Apparently they borrowed the former from the French. There were two words.

## **Juan Luis Simal, Exile as a Political Act: from Émigré to Political Refugee in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century**

He would be focusing on the semantic field around exile. Now exile, refugee and migrant are associated concepts. He would be arguing that an important transformation took place at the end of the eighteenth century, though others may disagree with this.

The key terms used were émigré and refugee. The revolutions generated many of what we might call exiles of all kinds, but exile was not the main term used (though it did exist). It derived from a Latin term, referring to the privilege of the Roman citizen to escape the death sentence. It did not necessarily have political connotations. Asylum is another relevant term. The US was seen as an asylum, after it became independent. Condorcet referred to it as such, saying that only the oppressed would have the motive to overcome obstacles to going there.

The American Revolution itself created many exiles, notably the Loyalists, who were called refugees (who have been discussed by Maya Jasanoff). Refugee was an established term by that date. In French the term was used in 1694 in relation to the Huguenots. Other groups talked about as refugees were the Austracists, those who left Spain when the Bourbons were installed 1714, and the Jesuits when they were expelled from various European states 1759-73.

Émigrés was a new term which appeared with the French Revolution. It connoted nobles and clerics. Similar words came into use in other European languages, e.g. in Spanish emigrados. It was remarked at the time that it was a new term, applying to those either banished or fleeing to escape harm from tyranny. Once it came into use, it was also applied retrospectively.

The French constitution of 1793 said that France should serve as an asylum for those banished for the cause of liberty. He suggested that the term asylum deserves more study.

Initially there was no specific bureaucracy to deal with refugees, but by 1830s one had been established in some countries, especially in France. It's in this period that we begin to find the adjective political being used to qualify refugee.

He suggested that there were three moments in the process that led to the establishment of the category of the political refugee.

First in Spain during the trienio hundreds of Italian and French refugees were received. An Asylum Bill was brought into the Cortes. There was a debate whether international treaties that Spain had already signed had implications for the treatment of political offenders. The committee which studied the treaties said there was nothing in them about political opinions; some definitions were offered. To count as a political refugee, someone had to have manifested orally or in writing their views about government matters. A law provided against extradition in cases where people were wanted because of their political opinions, so long as they had not committed crimes.

In Britain relevant legislation was the Aliens Act, which operated 1793-1826. In the 1820s and 30s, Britain did not in fact refuse to admit people on political grounds, but such people were not positively supported, and might be regarded with suspicion. There were some private attempts to assist them, but supporters of these saw it as best to represent the issue as humanitarian rather than political. In 1824 a committee was set up to aid Spanish liberals. It was suggested in that context that previous efforts had run into difficulty because there had been too much party feeling. Restrictions on supporting aliens were repealed in 1826, but only in respect of those who had helped the British Army, though in practice others were not expelled either. Talk was of 'distressed Spanish refugees'.

In France in the 1830s, Spanish refugees were feared as a source of destabilization. A comprehensive administration was established to control them. It's in this context that we see the emergence of the distinct category of the 'political refugee'. In contrast to Britain, the state provided aid. France once more constructed itself as an asylum of liberty. Legislation regulated the reception of refugees. But the initial welcoming attitude quickly changed. They came to be seen as a source of problems, to be interfering with the establishment of the new monarchy, and as a possible source of international problems. Riots in Paris were blamed on political activists, refugees, criminals, workers and students. They were moved into refugee camps, called depots. But previously passed legislation enshrined the more welcoming attitude. The category of the political refugee was defined to distinguish those who were to be allowed to stay. They had to prove that they had not been included in amnesties at home (as in the Spanish case once passed after the death of Ferdinand VII). In fact, only a few were excluded [ie allowed to stay? Or sent back?]. Many wrote to supply supporting evidence, including some women; some of these applications were accepted.

## Discussion:

Several comments were collected:

**Mark Knights** wanted to bring in the case of the Palatines: Protestant refugees who came to England in 1709. They were seen as both religious and political refugees, fleeing tyranny. [Though those terms were not used]. Parliament opened a collection for them, and naturalization bills were passed enabling them to settle.

**Antonis Anastopoulos** said that if he correctly understood the argument, the point was that the category 'political refugee' was developed by receiving countries as an administrative tool.

**Marie Alexandre Lousada** wanted to know if just liberals were treated in this way. How were others treated. She was also curious about what evidence of their political activity women presented.

**Juan Luis** was interested to hear about the Palatines. Counterrevolutionaries were also accepted, eg Carlists; the French state placed them in the same category. Examples of women included present in evidence included the widow of two liberals who died in action in conspiracies or insurrections. She herself had once been stopped by the French for carrying correspondence.

**Anna Maria Rao** said that in the 1790s Italians in France had the idea that the French themselves were responsible for their persecution. That doesn't seem to have been an element in the later situations he had described.

**Fatima Sa** said that often the receiving country was often able to exploit the situation in ways that favoured their own politics. Many Miguelists exiled themselves. Some went to Rome and later to Spain; some would serve as volunteers in the Carlist army.

**Maurizio** said that he was interested in references made to classical practices. He had found among Italians earlier the idea that an exile should show Stoic virtues. Later play was made with the idea of the patriot; it was suggested that true patriots could be found in exile, those who had no patria where there was no liberty. In that context, exiles might identify with Dante Alighieri [who was exiled from Florence by the papal faction then in power].

**Gregoire** wondered whether extradition treaties ever operated in such cases. Even Austria never claimed that the power to extradite applied to political refugees.

**Juan Luis** said that most Spanish exiles in France were in effect prisoners of war. Most had been in the army. Paradoxically, they might choose to go to France to escape persecution. Provision for them to do so was included in the terms of surrender.

## **Florencia Peyrou, Visions of Politics: Democratic Dictionaries in mid-nineteenth-century Spain**

She would be focusing on the 1840s, on encyclopedic dictionaries written by individuals who called themselves democrats. This was the century of the dictionary. In the 1830s, commercial and technical developments allowed for the blossoming of books, including dictionaries. Some of these aimed not just to instruct but to effect moral and social change. They included Catholic, liberal and from the 1830s democratic dictionaries, eg Pierre Leroux's *Encyclopedie Nouvelle*. She had looked at what such dictionaries said about keywords like government and administration.

She noted first that the history of these dictionaries illustrated transnational circuits. A Spanish version of Leroux's dictionary was published in Paris in 1842 by a republican. **Marras, Garnier and Paget** were among his contributors. The aim was to present a positive theory of political science. The dictionary was published in Spain in 1845 by Eduardo **Cao**. The preface to the 1850 edition said that it aimed to explain all political and social systems, to spread knowledge and popularize rights.

Another case in point was the *Diccionario Nacional* of Ramon Dominguez, a democrat and lexicographer. This was published in Madrid in 1846, and was one of the most important dictionaries of nineteenth-century Spain. Democrat was defined here as a friend of the people, one who wanted to see an end to the king's tyrannical rule.

In Cao's dictionary, politics was defined as the science of government, based on metaphysical knowledge of the human being. It was said that by the mid nineteenth century no one believed that there were naturally different orders of men. All men were free, and should be treated as civilly and politically equal. The object of politics was the improvement of society. It was stated that society could not reach unity so long as transmissible inequalities among men were preserved. Government was a function delegated from society, with responsibility for applying the political contract in the interest of all. Monarchy and aristocracy did not qualify as proper forms of government. Rousseau's legacy is evident. It was stated that minorities had to defend truth in order to survive and become majorities.

In Dominguez's dictionary, politics was strongly linked to police and administration. It was described as the art of rule, meaning providing the state with peace, abundance, order, security, stability and dignity, and regulating relations with other countries to those ends. This was not a vision of politics as a mechanism for arbitrating different views. There were noted to be different ways in which this dominion could be exercised, and that a unitary people trying to exert its will might meet a party of resistance ignoring public opinion. Politics was not seen as a process of negotiating interests, but rather of applying moral law. To accomplish this, it was necessary to guarantee all rights, and to be a democracy. Only then would it be possible to achieve a perfect synthesis of all interests.

These emphases fit with the idea that France and Spain were slow in developing pluralistic understandings of politics. It's important to take into account that the context was a European civil war, between competing political visions.

## Discussion:

### Several comments were collected:

**Javier Fernandez Sebastian** asked about the dimension of temporalisation: the idea that democracy represented the future of humanity. He found this encompassed in several definitions of politics, for example Orense's idea that politics was the science of planning for the future. **Florencia** said she too had seen that kind of discourse. **Javier** wanted to underline its novelty

**Joanna Innes** wanted to test the dichotomy pluralism/unity. It seemed to her comprehensible that in deeply divided countries, people should stress the need to create unity, without that meaning that they were intolerant. She wondered if even the British were as pluralistic as was sometimes supposed. She would be interested to know how these dictionaries dealt with the concept of 'interest'.

**Florencia** said that in Spain and in France in the 1840s she thought achieving unity was seen as the great challenge. But some British radicals indeed similarly emphasized the need to overcome sectionalism.

**Antonis Anastopoulos** wondered what the significance was of some definitions talking about politics as a science, others as an art.

**Eduardo Posada** asked if it was the aim of politics to improve, was there some perceived tension between that and democracy?

**Joanna** wondered what democracy implied in these contexts: was it sufficient for people to vote, or did they need to participate in other ways too?

**Florencia** said that some did think it crucial that people participated, as a means to self-realisation and self-improvement. If one did not take part in politics one could not be a man. **Joanna** said that train of thought could lead to advocacy of decentralization, so more people had a chance of exercising real power.

**Florencia** said indeed, Spanish democrats tended to favour political centralization but administrative decentralization.

**Anna Maria Rao** said these were commercial dictionaries, which needed to find a market. This must have had some influence on their content. Were there not other forms that were more straightforwardly politically partisan, like political catechisms?

**Florencia** said indeed the one called 'national' was not so partisan.

**Javier** objected that it claimed to be neutral, but was in fact highly partisan.

**Florencia** noted that its first, 1846 edition was published in a period of great repression, a time when there were few newspapers. Forms of political expression were restricted.

## Day 2

### Sergio Campos Matos, A Historical Legitimization of Politics: Tradition and Modernity in Portuguese nineteenth-century Liberalism

He began by noting that 'constitution' was a concept used both in liberal culture and by supporters of the old regime. It had a modern ring but was linked to a political heritage.

He wanted to ask of constitutions, were they seen as framing politics? And, what was the political function of historical constitutionalism?

The 1822 constitution was explicitly referred to as a political constitution. The 1826 Carta regulated the political association of Portuguese citizens.

He noted that the modern concept of citizenship first emerged in Portugal in the second half of the seventeenth century. All Portuguese were citizens, but not all held all the rights of citizenship. There were no property requirements restricting the right to serve as deputy, though for legal-practical reasons not all were allowed to vote. Citizens were distinguished from nationals. [Who was national but not a citizen?] It was said [by whom?] that the republic contained both virtuous and vicious citizens.

It is possible to find references to the deceitful 'politics' of the court, and to 'political' vices, mainly in counter revolutionary sources. Throughout the nineteenth century it is common to find critical references to politics, most notably by caricaturists.

Heated civil conflict in the 1820s affected the very concept of politics. Debate polarized between supporters of Don Miguel and Don Carlos even before the Portuguese civil war over the succession. Miguelists were described by their opponents as a 'usurping faction', alien to the nation and to constitutional legality. It was said that it would be a political tragedy if Don Miguel succeeded; that only degenerate Portuguese supported him.

There was a concept of a broader European politics.

Following the accession of Joao VI in 1826, there developed a common political vocabulary, in which key words were fatherland, kingdom, nation, faction, citizen, Cortes and ancient constitution. Both sides described their opponents as forming cliques distinct from the political nation and challenging its fundamental laws.

Modern constitutionalism was associated with an ideal of rationality, and a new concept of sovereignty, national sovereignty. The aim was to replace traditional domination with rational legitimacy. In Weber's account, this is a clear dichotomy, but perhaps the difference wasn't seen as so stark at the time.

The importance of the absentee court in Brazil has been stressed by Guerra and Fernandez Sebastian. They have noted that both Iberian revolutions were revolutions in favour of an absent monarch, in this unlike France and America. Both civil wars had a dynastic dimension.

In Portugal, to legitimate the monarch, the medieval parliament was summoned. The ancient political culture was marked by pacts, and neo-scholastic ideas about natural law. Apocryphal acts were forged to legitimate the succession at the restoration in 1640. Contract theory was invoked.

In Portugal, the liberal manifesto of 24 August 1820 aimed to restore the ancient constitution, and in this way to restore lost collective happiness. Similar ideas were expressed early in the French revolution. Radical deputies did not invoke fundamental laws as grounding the constitution, but moderate liberals thought more in terms of a restoration, though with a difference, in that aristocratic and democratic components came together. For Almeida Garrett, the principles of tempered monarchy were an inheritance from northern Europe, especially from the English historical tradition. The idea of fundamental laws had been developed by Pufendorf, Burlamaqui, Wolff and Vattel, and remained in favour among conservative liberals during the nineteenth century. Their hope was to approximate the English constitutional system, imagined as the flexible institution to which English jurists referred. It was seen to have deep roots in the tradition of the popular origins of power, and lawful resistance to unrestrained power.

After the 1820 coup, groups of people demonstrated in the public squares demanding a constitution.

The two different constitutions of the 1820s became fundamental reference points, dividing two camps in politics. This reinforces the idea that the idea of a constitution could be either backward or forward-looking.

## **Discussion:**

### **Several comments were collected:**

**Joanna** asked when the word 'constitution' came into use in a political context. She also asked whether or in what sense the radicals were opposed to historic constitutionalism – she hadn't been clear about that. She noted that in England, some radicals made great play of ancient constitutionalism: they thought history mattered.

**Nuno Monteiro** said that in the Pombaline period it was said that there was only one fundamental law, the law of succession. The liberals were extending the concept.

In relation to the right to vote, he noted that in the first Portuguese liberal constitution, there was no censitary criterion, only a literacy test, which was to come into effect in the next generation. There was a discussion as to whether liberated slaves should have the right to vote, and it was agreed that they should. However, the dependent could not vote. To stand for deputy you had to have property, so that was effectively restrictive. The constitution followed the Cadiz model, with only small changes.

**Juan Luis Simal** had been struck by similarities between the Portuguese and Spanish stories and was looking for differences. In Spain, there were two kinds of historic constitutionalism. One looked to the British example, as embodying tradition and consent. The project was to identify an already existing constitution: thus eg Jovellanos, though documents and evidence had to be sought to demonstrate its existence. An alternative view was that there had been a constitution in the middle ages, but it had been lost, the need was to recover it. He wanted to know if there were Jovellanos equivalents in Portugal: people who thought there was implicitly a constitution, which just had to be brought to consciousness.

**Sergio** said that the word constitution entered discussion a little bit after Pombal. There was a polemic in which eg Dos Santos and Melo Freire joined, the first emphasizing the despotism of Pombal, the second talking more generally about the abuses of absolute monarchy.

He said that in Portugal in 1820 radicals clearly wanted a rupture with the past, as in France. Later, in the 1870s and 80s, republicans invoked a democratic past. He had found a tract of 1820 which criticized the British constitution.

He thanked Nuno for his comments.

To Juan Luis, he said that some historical research was undertaken, but it shouldn't be taken too seriously.

**Nuno Monteiro, Conceptions of the Right of Petition and Political Participation in the Portuguese Monarchy, 1640-1834**

He said that he would be building on the presentation he made at the workshop last year, on the use of petitions under the traditional monarchy. He would report on one more year of research and identify some unanswered questions.

He noted that both corporate groups and individuals had sent in petitions; they were a fundamental feature of monarchy. They were used both inside and outside Europe. Various forms of corporate institution, including municipalities, merchants and artisanal confraternities were seen as possessing voices; also American Indians and liberated slaves. These were regular channels of communicating, directed towards Madrid when Portugal was under Spanish rule, then towards Lisbon. This pattern of integration into a broader monarchy differs from Anglo-American traditions. Collective bodies usually had a local territorial base, and the group might claim a wider regional dimension: this was more common in America than in Europe. The local base gave them authority to speak, though the issues with which they engaged were not necessarily wholly local. In the seventeenth century, petitioning sometimes implicitly involved a refusal to follow orders from the crown.

But individual requisitions were the most common. They sought eg offices, rewards, distinctions. A central function of the monarchy was to reward subjects. The reward system was an instrument which worked to integrate the peripheries. In a sample from Brazil, 95% of petitions had this character.

It's difficult to distinguish between judicial, administrative and political subjects.

What was politics and the political in this context? Is it possible to distinguish the national from the local? Later, under the liberal system, it's often said that local questions dominated elections and factional rivalries. Nonetheless, he thought the nineteenth century saw the development of a distinct political culture.

He did not think that dictionaries were a good source to employ to find out how people understood concepts. They all relied on certain classic sources. From the mid seventeenth century onwards, political chronicles and diaries are more revealing. They give us a sharper sense of what was understood to be political.

External alliances were always a political question, so too appointments to major offices, and the reward of services. Many administrative papers were concerned with these matters. Different secretaries dealt with big and small offices.

The picture changed in the later eighteenth century, when more use began to be made of rhetorics of law, and a desire to change things, to put Portugal among the most polite nations of Europe, was expressed. During the 1758 campaign against the Jesuits, municipalities were asked to copy 700 pages of decrees against the Jesuits, as propaganda.

How was petitioning affected? During the Pombaline period, there was a more critical attitude to petitions. For example, when the first monopoly company was created in 1756, in relation to trade with Brazil, the merchants of Lisbon protested, but they were all sent to prison. Challenging the decrees of the king was said to be *lese majeste*.

French invasions introduced more changes in the political culture. Petitions came back into use. The first liberals were prepared to accept a corporate world. By contrast, the liberals of the 1830s were hostile to corporate groups: thus eg Mouzinho da Silveira, who was hostile to guilds etc. The old corporate culture was defended in counterrevolutionary discourse. Don Miguel was proclaimed king on the basis of a petition from the nobility and municipality of Lisbon.

## Discussion:

### Several comments were collected:

**Mark Knights** noted that David Zaret, in his account of seventeenth-century English petitioning as ‘the origins of democratic politics’ argued that printing was crucial. He wanted to know what was the impact of printing on Portuguese petitioning?

**Cristina Nogueira da Silva** asked what did it mean that after the 1820 revolution people sent lots of petitions to the Corts. Did they think of the Corts as a kind of king? She said that it was very difficult to distinguish old and new under the liberal regime, because sometimes new words were used for old things and sometimes the reverse.

**Anna Maria Rao** asked what words people used when they talked about a ‘right to petition’.

**Antonis Anastasopoulos** asked how long it took to get a reply to a petition? And if petitioners weren’t satisfied with the reply, did they follow up?

**Nuno** said that the story of the press in the Portuguese world was a sad one. Printed petitions were not very frequent, except during liberal periods.

As to why they petitioned parliament, this was because the central administration was no longer working – a practical reason. But also parliament was now conceived as sovereign. There was a mix of reasons.

He said that in a judicial context a petition might be a necessary instrument.

There was no normal time in which answers were returned. Sometimes petitioners anxious for a response would bribe people in an attempt to speed things up.

### Further comments were made:

**Javier Fernandez Sebastian** said that he was interested in how private grievances became debateable issues. When Jovellanos was in prison in Mallorca for two years, he sent petitions to the king, which he said he intended for the public benefit of the nation. He noted that the circulation of judicial tracts has been studied in France. He also mentioned a [forthcoming?] book by Palonen and others about theories of the constitution. He said that the Spanish Cortes appointed a receiver of petitions.

**Marie Alexandre Lousada** said that there was a liberal pocket dictionary commenting on the changing meaning of terms, similar to democratic productions. It was translated from French and Italian examples, but included specific Portuguese references.

**Nuno** said that he was still thinking about the role of the press. He thought it was not the same in Portugal as in England. But manuscripts were widely circulated.

## Fátima Sa, The Concept of the People in Portugal in the First Half of the XIX Century - Between Old and New Senses

Noted that a Junta was summoned (in the absence of the monarch) to declare war on Napoleonic France. Don Joao, on leaving the country, left a Council of Regency behind. But he instructed them not to resist. In February 1808, Napoleon appointed a new administration. Frenchification was associated with the suppression of Portuguese royal symbols.

Consultation was undertaken with a view to devising a constitution on the model of the Warsaw constitution. But juntas took power locally and organized military resistance. They appeared at the same time in the north and the south, but in the north they were more complete and organized. Most towns proclaimed the restoration of the king. The central junta was supposed to coordinate, under the bishop of the diocese.

She wanted to look at the political language of the juntas. There have been some studies about this in Spain, but not in Portugal. In Brazil, since the king was there they were not needed. In the mainland, they didn't operate after Cintra.

The second French invasion was shorter, and its impact was mainly military.

The juntas served as a political laboratory. We find associated with them a mix of old and new vocabularies.

The formation of juntas had its origins in a popular movement: in practice, that was the source of their legitimacy. A complex dynamic operated, in which juntas exercised power in the name of the king, on the basis of support from the people; municipal powers mediated.

Juntas were constituted in a chronological sequence corresponding to the hierarchy of towns: thus first Porto and Lisbon, then smaller towns. They were structured according to the three orders of the old society, though might add new orders, eg the municipality; the people; traders. We find references to many people being out in the squares and streets. Acts of acclamation attracted many signatures; it is clear that illiterates were involved.

There were also pamphlets published after 1808 which proclaimed the success of the restoration of royal rule. The term 'revolution' was much used, often appearing in the titles of pamphlets. Sometimes it was called a 'happy revolution'. But we also find revolution conceived as something to be feared. It was suggested that a fixed point was needed to maintain order. Without that, ordinary people would suffer.

'People' were talked about in relation to the three orders; there were also references to the 'people' of specific towns. But we also find the word being used in the broader sense of the community.

The military were the first to proclaim the revolution, but they then ceded leadership to the bishop. They were seen to have acted on behalf of the people.

The people came to be conceptualized as actors, in a way that would have been hard to imagine beforehand. Thus in the pamphlet, Notice from the people to the same people.

She has found few references to sovereignty, except with reference to the absent king.

In sum: sovereignty and royal were words whose application did not change. Revolution took on new connotations, both positive and negative. Fatherland, patria was used to mean the country and not the region. Nation was used to mean the community of Portuguese.

## **Discussion:**

### **Several comments were collected:**

**Joanna** asked if there were references to vassals, and if so in what context.

**Sergio Campos Matos** was struck by the apparent prominence of the term restoration, which sounded rather traditional.

**Nuno Monteiro** wanted to know if different juntas deployed different languages. He noted that traders/businessmen were already understood to form a distinct group in the seventeenth century.

**Javier Fernandez Sebastian** said that Pierre Vilar had written about this topic in a Spanish context. He found references to the partia and the nation, but on the whole the juntas were more traditional than the Cortes.

**Fatima** said that there were frequent references to vassals, but she hadn't paid special attention to these. The word restoration was everywhere. **Joanna** asked if she thought Sergio was right to see it as a traditional term. She noted that in England, Cromwell talked about the need for restoration meaning basically settlement, stabilization, not the restoration of the king. **Fatima** said in response to Javier, that she had yet to reread Vilar in this context. To Nuno, she said there were isolated cases where juntas tried to do something different, eg to bring about a local revolution, but this ended badly, with the protagonists being condemned to death.

**Further questions were collected:**

**Fernando Dores Costa** said that in the Cortes, the people as such were not an estate. The third group represented were the governments of cities, who were really lesser nobility.

**Rui Ramos** wanted to hear more about 'revolution'. Was the positive/negative distinction that it was used positively in unofficial writings, but not in official ones?

**Gregoire Bron** wondered whether new words always reflected new perspectives. **Marie Alexandre** said she had wanted to make a similar point.

**Mark Knights [or Maurizio? I have Mark making the remark, and then Fatima responding to Maurizio]** wanted to know if the desire for a constitution was ever expressed at this time.

**Fatima** said that she agreed with Fernando. To Rui, she said that was true, but she didn't know how to explain this pattern. Revolution was feared, but didn't turn out to be dangerous to the traditional order in fact, since restoration was achieved. To Gregoire, she said she did think new words meant new perspectives. As to a constitution, she said no, at this time only Napoleon was proposing that – and a group of liberals who responded to him and went to Bayonne. **Nuno** said however that he thought there was also a group in Oporto who were interested in the idea.

### **Rui Ramos, What Have Liberals Done to Politics? Statesmanship, Republicanism and the Nation in Portuguese Liberal Sources (1820s-1840s)**

Rui said that some of what he had intended to say had been said much better by Javier yesterday. The other part of what he wanted to say revolved around things on which he hadn't yet properly sorted out his thoughts. He wanted to present a number of problems.

To the Liberals, he said, politics was above all statecraft, the skill and ability of a statesman.

When the minister of commerce was criticized in the Portuguese exile press for a trade treaty they said was treasonous, he in a note said that their minds were 'anti-political': they didn't grasp statesmanship. The hostility of liberals to the Miguelists was similarly described as not very political, meaning not very prudential. It wasn't political because it was too ideological, too doctrinaire.

In the 1820s, use of the adjective political exploded. In the first three years of liberal rule, the following were qualified with the adjective political: constitution, history, ideas, knowledge, matters, business, structure, associations, sects, vices, fanaticism, turmoil and storm. Political professionals were described in one article as the equivalent of a clergy in politics: they held power; others, like the faithful in church, listened to them and were expected to repeat what they were told. In a dictionary it was said that these days every man and his dog talks about politics as about a headache. It was said of the word politician that it used to mean a statesman; but now every student who knows Latin, smokes a cigarette and grows a beard is a politician. [This doesn't sound like the 1820s to me – beards surely came later, and cigarettes much later]. It was said of contemporary philosophers that for them everything is political; faith is the least of their concerns. It was said in the liberal press that the fury that inspired the mob was religious, but the motives of the leaders were political.

The repeated comparisons and contrasts with religion are striking. The question was posed, if politics is replacing religion, what does politics have to offer us? Religion could be seen as a source of consensus and cohesion; politics couldn't offer that.

There was a sense of malaise with the political. Almeida Garrett's writings after the experience of 1820-3, when he was exiled, really have as their subject the limits of liberal politics. He wrote about the role of the army; dependence on the balance of power and diplomacy, and citizens' lack of involvement. The leadership might be enlightened, but they lacked a connection to society.

When liberals triumphed 1834, the question of how to conceptualise Dom Pedro's leadership had to be addressed. He was given the title of Liberator, as Bolivar had been 1813. But he was also described in parliament as a dictator – in a positive sense. Carl Schmitt says that Machiavelli doesn't call the Prince a dictator because he is a prince. Dom Pedro was described as a dictator because he was not a sovereign prince. In a speech denying Dom Pedro the right to serve as regent for his daughter, the example of a dictator cited was Robespierre, who was said to have provided a foundation for freedom at the cost of his own reputation.

In 1837, Passos Manuel had to defend himself against the reputation of having established a dictatorship after the 1836 revolution. He became Home Secretary, the political leader of the government and began issuing decrees without waiting for parliament, including a new administrative code; he also founded a high school. In his own defence, he said that dictatorship was a Roman institution; that Dom Pedro had been a dictator too, and that dictatorship was needed to destroy the foundations of despotism. He said that he had not been cruel, had avoided repression and civil war; he had been disinterested. All government had been dictatorial until the present: no budget had ever been voted through during three years of liberal rule.

An alternative narrative might focus on politicization and participation (the British model), or on violent uprisings (the French model). But what Passos Manuel conjured up was a pattern of things in which freedom was supplied by despotism. Dictatorship operates outside politics, but may achieve administrative and economic reform.

## **Discussion:**

**Several comments were collected:**

**Maurizio** wanted to propose a third narrative, which he saw as a Mediterranean and transatlantic one. This involved/or was defined against?? such heroic leaders as Robespierre, Napoleon, Bolivar, The same idea was present in the Greek revolution. **Rui** agreed.

**Joanna** said in the developing theory of how revolutions should unfold, the ‘provisional government’ phase was effectively a dictatorial phase.

**Fatima** said that Costa Cabral was also called a dictator. It could mean simply ruling in the absence of parliament, so there was some ambiguity about its significance.

She asked how liberals viewed their adversaries, and whether they were prepared to try to integrate them. Passos Manuel was prepared to try to integrate Miguelists.

**Juan Luis Simal** said that it might be important that Dom Pedro was at one point an emperor. Spanish liberals were able to imagine him as someone under whose rule Spain and Portugal might be brought together, in a constitutional empire (an idea one can find in Spanish liberalism). He wasn’t sure if Dom Pedro himself was a liberal, though various people wanted him to be.

**Javier Fernandez Sebastian** said he was interested in the idea of the ‘liberator’. In Spain, the term was applied to Riego. The emphasis was on making a revolution without blood (which didn’t apply to Bolivar). **Joanna** remarked that Daniel O’Connell in Ireland was also called ‘the Liberator’.

He noted that pronunciamentos represented a way of engaging the people. The people have ‘manier [??? Didn’t get this word] politica’: a kind of political activity in which politics was done by the people.

**Fernando Dores Costa** was reminded of Rousseau’s construction of the legislator, as someone without restrictions. Rousseau calls this a divine activity. This isn’t quite the same as a dictatorship.

**Nuno Monteiro** said it was a fascinating account, but dictatorship was also invoked negatively.

**Rui** said that Passos Manuel used it in a republican way, saying it was acceptable in particular circumstances. Dom Miguel by contrast was called a despot. Later in the nineteenth century, dictatorship came to be negatively understood, as a violation of the constitution. It became rarer to evoke the term’s republican heritage. To Fatima he said, that had the 1822 constitution been restored, then Dom Pedro would have been a dictator; his argument was that there was no constitution, so he was not overriding it, but founding freedom. To Joanna he said that Napoleon said to Portuguese liberals who asked for a constitution, first you need to destroy all your institutions. He said that later arguments for dictatorship were made in terms of overcoming factions, but at the start it was rather on creating a liberal community.

### **Jose Miguel Sardica, Reconceptualizing ‘Liberalism’ and ‘Democracy’: Public Policies Without Party Politics in the Portuguese 1850s**

He said that from the 1880s the ‘Regeneration’ period in 1837 came to be seen as the start of a happy story. And indeed it did open up a new cycle in Portuguese political life. Since the 1820s, many had tried to regenerate the country. The problem was now addressed once again in the aftermath of the 1848 revolutions. By 1851, the general mood was disillusioned. Revolution had previously been the democrats’ goal, and the bogey of the right wing. Now a

new culture of conciliation was formed. There was much talk of the need for a union of all good men, and an amnesty for all, of the need for a normal politics (this was, he stressed, his phrase not theirs). Tolerance and openness to compromise were linked to a technological mindset: attention focused on the development of railways, roads and seaports. Before his accession, Dom Pedro V said in his diary that the age of ideology was finished; now was the age of entrepreneurs. Order, progress and peace became key words. Liberalism and democracy were reconceptualised in this context.

Liberalism had initially been a party banner. In 1851, it became a regime banner, connoting the embrace of reformism. Constitutionalism came to be understood as evolutionary, as part of a progressive project that might culminate in democracy, even in a republic.

Democratisation was seen as a natural process. The challenge was to discipline it, and undercut its utopianism.

In July 1851, in a long and often quoted article, **who?**, a liberal patriarch, wrote that we (Portuguese) are poor, ignorant and trapped in a cycle of revolutions. It was sometimes supposed that classes were divided by irreconcilable interests, but in fact, they could easily be reconciled on a basis of education and justice. What was needed was a public politics, without party politics. Though if things were so simple, one might ask, why had this not yet been achieved.

This was a general zeitgeist, not peculiar to Portugal. The mid C19 saw the transition to what Hobsbawm called the Age of Capital throughout Europe. In Britain, Chartism expired; in France, Napoleon III worked hand-in-hand with Saint-Simonians; in Italy, Cavour came to the fore; in Spain, Murillo. It was generally supposed that the French revolution was now over, and what was needed were reforms. Democracy was increasingly understood in this context as a means to achieve the good of all. Railways were said to be more democratic than barricades; economic reform was to be preferred to constitutional reform.

In fact, revolution did not disappear, but a new political culture did materialize. The chief instruments of this miracle were:

- A political programme of the middle, which coopted most of the left
- A renovation of political personnel: many departmental ministers now appointed had no prior political experience
- The demilitarization of the regime
- The constitutional reforms of 1851
- The reform of public debt

It was said that numbers now counted for more than oratory.

In conclusion he said that the Regeneration did not mark the end of history, but it did mark an important moment of political modernization. Politics came to be understood as a set of procedures to overcome faction and difference.

## **Discussion:**

**Several questions were collected.**

**Eduardo** said that he thought Isabel Burdiel described a similar process of postponing democracy in the case of Spain. He wondered if Comte might not have been more important than Saint Simon. He thought Latin America followed the same path a couple of decades later.

**Javier** thought that the presentation had in a way been about depoliticisation. It came to be thought that democracy need not have to do with politics. He wondered in that context how it was conceived: was it understood more socially than politically?

**Sergio** said that in the longer term this period came to be remembered negatively, and wondered why.

**Rui** suggested that the period saw the neutralization not only of the army but also of the monarchy. There was an attempt to get Miguelite peers readmitted to the Chamber. Liberalism replaced Catholicism as common ground

**Joanna** said there was a somewhat similar period in Britain a century earlier, 1750-60, when there was an attempt to move beyond dynastic and religious strife; ‘union’ became a watchword.

She wondered if Javier was right to suggest that what was happening was a process of depoliticisation. How did contemporaries talk about that? Might it not have been seen rather as a move against ‘politicomania’, an attempt to put politics back in its proper place?

**Fatima** wanted to know more about how they talked about revolution. Was revolution really over, as thought or practice?

She also wanted to hear more on the themes of depoliticisation and political modernization. Following her master Agulhon, she thought more than just normalization was at issue; there was a process of involving people as citizens.

**Jose Miguel responded:**

He said to Eduardo that positivism came to Portugal in the 1860s and 70s. There was a need to research what kinds were dominant, and what was its impact.

He had cited Saint Simon because some radicals quoted him a lot (as did Louis Kossuth, and also French radicals)

To Javier he said yes, democracy came to be conceived less as a political programme and more as a matter of social betterment.

To Sergio, he said that he thought the period’s reputation sank in the context of a debate over economic improvement vs moral virtue: the republicans criticized mere materialism, saying that it produced an incomplete form of development. Materialism came to be associated with electoral fraud. Then in the 1920s and 30s all forms of liberalism came under a cloud

To Rui, yes, the Legitimist party **????** in 1856. Even outlaws were absorbed.

To Joanna, he said he had Miles Taylor in mind. **Joanna** said though in fact Taylor said that radicalism didn’t end with Chartism, but lasted a few more decades.

He noted that words like fusion and union didn’t imply eliminating difference, but taking a first step to reconcile differences.

To Fatima: he agreed that the term revolution did not disappear. Mouzhino talked about ‘our revolution’, a revolution effected by law, and bringing material improvements

In relation to normalization, he agreed that the longer term goal was to draw more people in.