Mediterranean democracy, Year 2
Lisbon, 21-2 March 2014
ICTSE, Lisbon

Present (indicating areas of main interest): Ricardo Brito (concept of revolution – Thursday only), **Gregoire Bron** (Italian volunteers in Portugese civil war), **Sergio Campos Matos** (social memory, historiography, Iberianism, Iberconceptos; historical legitimation of democracy), **Fernando Dores Costa** (peninsular war, in context of study of techniques of government – Thursday only), **Ana Mouta Faria** (religious and political history in relation to the 1820 revolution), **Maria Alexandre Lousada** (urban cultures in C19-20), **Nuno Monteiro** (political communication in the Portuguese empire), **Diego Palacios** (comparative state formation in C19 Portugal and Spain), **Miriam Halpern Pereira** (liberal revolutions, now working on First Republc), **Rui Ramos** (political culture of liberalism; trying to develop a project on imagining democracy in Portugal 1850s-70s, why democracy rose and then quickly fell in favour among elites 1878+), **Fatima Sa** (popular responses to liberal project; Iberconceptos – social identities), **Cristina Nogueira da Silva** (liberalism and citizenship C19, esp in relation to empire, participation by native populations; how domineering attitudes coexisted with a democratic vocabulary in liberal culture – Thursday only)

Specialists in other places: Paolo Benvenuto (Italy), **Idriss Jebari** (North Africa), **Paschalis Kitromilides** (Greece), **Florencia Peyrou** (Spain – for the second day only), **Michalis Sotiropoulos** (Greece)

And: Joanna Innes, Maurizio Isabella, Mark Philp, Eduardo Posada Carbo

Apologies, or expressed interest but couldn't make it: Antonio Cardoso, Pedro Tavares de Almeida

INTRODUCTORY

Mark Philp described the background to the project which has been running for nearly 10 years and which issued last year in the edited book *Re-imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions* (Oxford, 12013). The current 3-year Leverhulme project on Re-Imagining Democracy in the Mediterranean had now reached its half-way point; this was the second Lisbon meeting. The aim was to trace how certain themes played out in the Portuguese context; a number of specialists in other regions had also been brought in to raise comparative questions.

He explained that the project was concerned with 're-imagining' because during the period studied, democracy moved from being a relatively learned and elite term, used to describe institutions and arrangements, chiefly in the ancient world, to being a word with some currency in popular culture, at the same time shifted from having a largely negative application in the contemporary context towards sometimes being used positively. It gained impotance not only for its supporters but also for conservative forces as a category for thinking about events in the modern world. The project aimed to chart shifting meanings pf the term, but also the shifting political lexicon and furthermore how practices and institutions changed alongside. Words developed new meanings – representation, for example, came to be seen by many as an element of democracy, whereas it had not always been so, and was once opposed; at the same time there emerged new practices, some designed to give

substance to ideas and concepts – such as constituent assemblies or representative forms of government. Certain practices were identified as expressions of popular sovereignty – such as petitioning, uprisings, mass voting – while others were distinguished.

In the first phase of the project, which focussed on the North Atlantic (America, France, Britain and Ireland) one major finding had been that there was no *single* story of the invention of new meanings and their diffusion; instead, local traditions and practices, and the path dependencies they generated, made the re-imagining of democracy a multiple story.

The second stage of the project, concentrating on the Mediterranean, added a new group of countries to the mix, but did not aim simply to add new stories. It was hypothesised that regional experience had some distinctive features. Events in the south of Europe seem to be punctuated by different points – 1799, 1808-12, 1820-3, the 1830s and 1860s. There were often close relations between southern European states – for example connections between Spain and Piedmont and Naples, or strong volunteer support from Italy in Greece. Moreover, both Greece and Italy had a certain talismanic status as the original homes of democracy and free political rule. However, these countries also shared with the Ottoman World in experiencing this period as one of decline from historic strength: they experienced domination by the emergent great powers of Britain, France, Russia and Austria. One common that experience was one of losing empire. All this generated a sense of the need to catch up and to modernize.

Some issues were still under discussion. Was it the case that in Spain and Portugal, Greece and the Ottoman world, the military played more important internal roles than in America, France, Britain and Ireland? What role did religion play? The region was marked by the long-standing existence of universal churches – Catholicism and Greek orthodoxy -- and by the development of national reactions to forms of Church influence: attempts to tame or capture churches for national projects. Finally, it was in this region, not in the North, that the terms liberal and liberalism first came to be used and debated and linked often negatively, sometimes positively to democracy.

He said that himself was curious about the language of republicanism, and how that figured in a Portuguese context. He noted that it did not appear in the index to Gabriel Paquette's book. Was it less important in Portugal than elsewhere?

He also noted that he would be organising the project workshop in Lisbon next year on the theme of What is politics? He thought that it might be profitable to begin exploring this question in discussion.

Rui Ramos observed that he would be arguing that republicanism was crucial in the Portuguese case.

LANGUAGE

Session 1: Nuno Monteiro, Political vocabulary and political communication in Portugal before and during the early constitutional period. Between language and practices

He aimed first to characterise the practices of the Portuguese corporative monarchy in its multi-continental dimension, questioning the tendency to contrast these the Anglo-American tradition. He would then talk about new meanings 'democracy' took on between 1808 and 1834 – between the French invasion and the secure installation of a liberal monarchy. Finally he would indicate new meanings the term took on after 1834.

There is of course a danger of reading later liberal ideals back into earlier practice, but at least doing this serves to problematise the contrast between Portuguese and Anglo-American traditions.

Territories in America as well as the Iberian peninsula sent representatives to the Cortes, thus the states of Brazil Maranhão, esp after the Restoration of 1640. At the beginning of the nineteenth century no one knew this, however: it's a later historical rediscovery.

In early C18, the imposition of new taxes in the newly created captaincy of Minas Gerais involved negotiation with local representatives. The body which sent them has been described as a parliament. Such phenomena deserve attention.

What needs emphasis above all was that there was lots of interaction on paper between centre and localities: interaction with local business groups as well as with individuals, though it's moot whether these interactions should be described as administrative or political.

Groups sending petitions were very diver, including villagers, artisans, farmers confraternities, and confraternities of freed slaves.

Petitions from municipalities (and annual averages) 1640-1807

Tempo	1640-1700	1701-1750	1751-1777	1778-1807	Total
Évora	160 (2,6)	81 (1,6)	12 (0,5)	14 (0,5)	267
Viana	29 (0,5)	36 (0,7)	17 (0,7)	42 (1,4)	124
Faro	16 (0,3)	55 (1)	09 (0,3)	25 (0,9)	105
Vila Viçosa	26 (0,4)	20 (0,4)	15 (0,6)	08 (0,3)	69
Salvador	141 (2,4)	45 (0,9)	51 (2)	15 (0,5)	257
Rio de Janeiro	98 (1,6)	165 (3,3)	55 (2,1)	66 (2.3)	494
São Paulo	02 (0,0)	84 (1,7)	33 (1,3)	17 (0,6)	143
São Luís	17 (0,3)	54 (1)	14 (0,5)	36 (1,2)	128
Vila Rica	00 (00)	115 (2,3)	72 (2,8)	09 (0,3)	201

Fonte: Compol

Requests from other local groups

	Évora	Viana	Faro
1621 – 1640	7	2	8
1641 – 1668	12	2	9
1669 – 1702	36	15	18
1703 -1713	11	15	10
1714 – 1750	75	19	29
1751 – 1777	9	24	7

1778 – 1807	8	24	28
TOTAL	**158**	**101**	**109**

VIANA	Total
Villagers	7
Nobility and people	4
Merchants	10
Seafarers and brotherhood	9
Artisans	13
Militaries	6
Inhabitants (of rural parishes)	22
Farmers	2
Misericórdia	2
Confraternities	6
Regular religious	23
Secular religious	7
Others	4
TOTAL	115

MINAS GERAIS	Total
Moradores das vilas	7
Negociantes	3
Crioulos pretos	1
Crioulos pretos e mestiços forros	1
Mesteres e oficiais mecânicos	2
Militares	1
Militares e secretários do governo	1
Moradores do termo (incluiu moradores dos arraiais, distritos, freguesias e comarca)	16
Moradores de Minas Gerais	1
Confrarias	18
Religiosos regulares	6
Religiosos seculares	22
TOTAL	79

Many petitions were from corporate groups that had a more than ephemeral existence. In the 3rd ed. of Abbe Raynal (1782), it was said in relation to Brazil: "There is no city or considerable village without a municipal assembly.' Their privileges included the right to

petition the king against local government. This should seal the small interests entrusted to it and regulate, under the inspection of the commander, the rates they need. Was granted several privileges, especially that of criticizing power to the throne, the head of the colony '
Locate original

Petitions were a hallmark of the old corporate monarchy. In the case of Brazil, more than 150,000 were sent. In the peninsula, there seemed to be a sharp break after the establishment of Pombal's power, also evident, though less sharp, overseas. Pombal limited the range of things that could be discussed.

Printing and press freedom to be sure were limited. There was no printing press in Portuguese America, and in Portugal only at intervals, and always subject to censorship.

In terms of associational life, the role of fraternities esp. deserves stress. There were confraternities even of freed slaves, and even slaves could make representations through cultural intermediaries. It's not clear this was so different from Anglo-American 'civil society'.

So there were systems for the representation of views. But the word democracy was not used much, and mainly in an erudite context to refer to the classical world. Thus Bluteau:

DEMOCRACIA «é um governo político, direitamente oposto à Monarchia, porque he popular, & nelle a eleição dos Magiíteados depende dos sufragios do povo». «Nas Republicas de Roma, & de Athenas floreceo a *Democracia»* ; «Divide-fe o governo em Monarchia, Aristocracia & *Democracia.».*

Under Pombal the Jesuits are accused of promoting democracy – which was an attack on the intermediary classes and institutions supporting them.

In the 1813 Dicionário of Moraes, a new definition is found: «Democracia, forma de governo na qual o sumo império, ou direitos Majestáticos, residem no Povo, e são por ele exercidos»

In December 1820, deputies were elected in indirect elections, with no known limitations of voting rights on the basis of wealth or education. In March 1821, 'Bases of the Constitution' were voted where it was determined that 'sovereignty' resided 'in the Nation. The form of suffrage became direct (unlike the Spanish constitution) without censitary restrictions but excluding those under 25, dependent, or belonging to religious orders. In the future, the illiterate were to lose the right to vote. As in the Constitution of Cadiz, it was necessary to own property is to be elected deputy. Moreover, after much discussion, the courts consecrated a variant on the Cadiz Constitution by granting Portuguese citizenship to 'slaves who obtained an enfranchisement letter'. Freedmen could vote, although not be elected.

None of these arrangements were however habitually qualified by the term 'democracy'. Use of that term changed much less in this period than the use e.g. of 'liberal'. It was used most frequently by counter-revolutionary press. When MPs used it, they did so in a pejorative manner – in fact they rejected both aristocracy and democracy, seeing themselves as supporters of representative monarchy. The Roman term 'pleb' was linked to anarchists and jacobins. So the word was not central in the first period of constitution, and no one presented themselves as a democrat, though the first constitution did proclaim the sovereignty of the nation.

After 1834, and esp from the 1840s, it was argued that the crown should be surrounded with republican institutions. In this context came semantic change.

DISCUSSION

Maurizio Isabella said he sympathetic to revisionism: it was important to challenge exceptionalist accounts of southern Europe. In this connection we need to rethink what we mean by modernity, and what was the relationship between pre- and post-revolutionary cultures.
In that context though he wanted more clarify about what was new about political communication in the age of revolutions. What difference did it make once the Cortes existed and provided a focus for discussion? Were petitions differently framed? What was the effect of a freer press? Was politics now conducted in more individual and less corporate terms?
Nuno said that it didn't seem to him that the intensity of petitioning was necessarily greater in C19, though he saw more continuity in America than in Europe in this regard. The press clearly represented a new element. Early C19 libraries were stocked with a body of Spanish political writing that had no earlier equivalent.
Corporate groups came under attack in this context. There was literature attacking them, including municipalities.

Paschalis Kitromilides wanted more detail on printing and popular press: what happened when?
Nuno said that in C18 the press functioned episodically – under Pombal there were no regularly published journals. And there was no printing in Brazil – a contrast with Spanish America. After 1808, printing started in Brazil. However, before the proliferation of printed materials there was a large diffusion of mss, sometimes in hundreds or even thousands of copies. Letters were copied and circulated.

Joanna Innes asked about continuity and change in the political lexicon. Some terms were probably in use in both C18 and C19 – e.g. justice, regeneration – others new or used in radically new ways in early C19, like liberal or constitution. Could he say more about patterns of change?
Nuno stressed that traditional concepts could be manipulated to make a variety of points: thus regeneration could be invoked to talk about the sugar monopoly. It's crucial to consider context and purpose.
Fátima Sá thought that continuity could be overdone. She agreed that 1834 marked the greatest rupture. Before then, however, the exile press had disseminated liberal ideas.

Miriam Halpern Pereira Wanted more detail on the paperwork Nuno had talked about. Were these petitions, memoirs or what? Were they long or short? To whom were they addressed – to administrative departments or to the crown? It seemed to her that the main change in 1820 was the emergence of a new addressee: the congress. The question then was, what did the people expect from it? They might be demanding respect for ancient rights, but still these matters were now being discussed in the public sphere; the proceedings of the Cortes were published in the press.

Nuno responded to Fatima that he in no way meant to deny change, but sometimes it was useful to see things from a different perspective. He didn't think he was in danger of becoming a fascist nationalist.

To Miriam, he said that more than 100,000 petitions from Brazil are preserved – issued over perhaps 100 years. They were generally directed to the king. Conversely, the monarchy communicated with the territories by sending laws, sometimes printed, sometimes not.
Not all petitions in the 1820s went to the congress.
He thought that a kind of revolutionary public sphere came into being in the immediate aftermath of the French invasion, about responses to it. Habermasian expectations can be too constraining.

Rui Ramos took the point about rethinking change, but thought the fact that these legacies were forgotten is significant. Liberals weren't continuing a tradition that was known to them. Liberals intended to break with the past, even if they did talk about the middle ages – thus for example the historian Joaquim Pedro de Oliveira Martins (b. 1845) portrayed traditional monarchy as democratic in character by emphasising its religious dimension, and the people's identification with the crown. Why didn't they try to build on traditional institutions? The point was that they saw them as corrupt and in decline, ill suited to help Portugal regain its place in the modern world.
Cristina Nogueira da Silva thought liberals felt some anxiety about whether the people were ready for change, in relation e.g. to the introduction of religious toleration. It was argued in the legislature that it was important to be sensitive to popular traditions. It seemed to her though that that idea was in itself new, and not part of an older political culture.
Nuno said to Rui that indeed no one knew about representatives from overseas in the Cortes, that historical constitutionalism was to a large extent rhetoric and fiction, and that the liberal project was to redesign everything, and to draw a new kind of distinction between public and private. Still, he would qualify this. Americans at Cadiz talked about a modern head being put on a Gothic body. He thought in both Spain and Portugal, there wasn't so much re-imagining of imperial as of domestic relationships. In the peninsula, Pombaline period brought a break in Portugal; this was what liberals understood by absolutism. New taxes introduced in the Pombaline period were not subject to discussion, a notable break with past traditions. But the liberals understanding of past practice was inadequate.

Session 2: Fátima Sá, Talking about the people in the context of civil and political conflict 1808-51

Napoleon's exploits brought change to the Iberian peninsula as of course to many other parts of the world. Javier Fernandez Sebastian has characterised one of their effects as 'a veritable politico-conceptual earthquake'. The lexicon changed, as old words changed meaning and gained new significance (thus people, nation and citizen) and new terms were coined (such as opinion and public opinion). The special significance that the term 'people' acquired is shown by the way in which it was attached to other terms to produce new meanings: as in the case of people's rights, or popular sovereignty. Certainly there was some contamination between old and new meanings of the word, but it is clear that it played a central part in justifying the rupture with former regimes and their conceptions of sovereignty.

In the oldest dictionary definitions, the Latin root of the term is evident. Thus in the first 1789 ed. of the Dicionário of António Moraes Silva, people was defined as the inhabitants of a town, city or place; related terms were 'povo miúdo' (little people, menu people); 'plebe' (rabble); gentalha (ragtag) and nation, folk. A later version of the same dictionary added a

political sense: people were contrasted with nobility and clergy. In this context, it would not have been appropriate to talk about rabble.

In contemporary accounts of the French invasion, such as José Acúrsio das Neves' famous *History of the French Invasions (História dos Invasões dos Franceses*), the people appeared as protagonists in the fight; they were then presented as a source of sovereignty in the first liberal revolution. These new meanings of people were always in tension with older meanings – either the approach which made the people one of three political elements, or the usage which associated the people with the common people or rabble. In the same way vulgus or vernacular, once denigratory terms, were rehabilitated by the Romantics, who saw popular culture as fundamental to national identity – thus Almeida Garrett in his *Romanceiro* of 1843.

She had written about these matters elsewhere, but wanted now to focus on the new prominence given to negative terms for people, such as rabble, populace, mob etc. A starting point was provided by a *Dictionary for Vernacular Use*, translated from the French and published in Porto 1840. This said of people: 'when it means the totality of citizens it contains strength, power, wealth and majesty. When applied to artists, it should be read as the most useful part of the nation. The rabble is its scum.' Of crowd, it was written 'colossal body full of rage without passion, enthusiasm without feelings, that plays a great role without genius and is successful without glory'.

If we trace crowd through older dictionaries, we find that in Bluteau's Vocabulary it is glossed simply as a large number, but in the Moraes dictionary of 1789, it appears as 'a crowd of people, of enemies'. But neither has a definition of populace; the word appears in Moraes only in the 1844 ed, when it is glossed as 'lowest of the rabble, riffraff.'

In C19, there was a growth of derogatory neologisms. Canalha is found in C18 dictionaries, but ralé (from relé, caste or species, came to mean rag, tag and bobtail), laia (ilk – a person of low caste), gentalho (riffraff) or popolacho, which entered the dictionary only 1878 were all new. And the terms appear in many sources.

In Acúrsio das Neves' History, an interesting distinction is made between the active people – in effect the third political element – and those who commit 'excesses' or 'commotions'. When a junta was organised in the northern town of Arcos-de-Valdevez, Acúrsio das Neves' wrote that to calm the 'orderless rabble' a street procession with the Holy Sacrament had to be organised. But on the whole, he writes positively of the people. Even though they committed some excesses, because wrong or themselves abused, he says, they made the revolution 'and the people know no other way of conducting revolutions'.

Following the revolution of 1820, derogatory terms for people – including those already mentioned and also vulgo (vulgus), geninha (little people), paisanos (bumpkins), turba (mob), rotos (tatterdemalions), miseráveis (wretches) and farrapões (ragamuffins) – became frequent in both liberal writings and counter-revolutionary texts, though the lexicon of disparagement was more diverse in the latter (as Telmo Verdelho has noted).

The explosive growth of publications was associated with much reference to the people, given new and solemn personality. There was a clear link to the growth of negative uses, which can be understood partly as attempts to draw a line between the people and its margins.

At the start of the period, some thought that public education could conflate the two. But as the counterrevolution advanced, the liberal press started using derogatory terms for those who supported anti-constitutional movements in the provinces – thus in 1826/7, when there were massive risings against the charter in towns in the north. Counterrevolutionaries attacked the concept of popular sovereignty itself as implying sovereignty of the canaille.

A common form of denigration involved representing the common people as instigated by demagogues – both liberals and absolutists used this idea in relation to popular assertions in the political realm. The implication is clearly to deny the people agency. Crowd was not a very negative term until the last decades of C19, when French and Italian schools of criminology helped to make it so.

Following the revolution of 1836, when the liberal radicals seized power in Lisbon with support from part of the population and the National Guard, Herculano published *A Voz do Profeta*, an emblematic work in this context, which bitterly censures the supposedly illegal means that had been adopted to bring the liberal left to power, when the constitution provided legal avenues for political change. He adopted a biblical tone, following Lamennais' *Paroles d'un Croyant*, and contrasted the civil war, when the object had been the freedom of the people, and the present, when the rabble fought for license.

But in the following years, derogatory terms were absent from the jubilant press, as again from clandestine republican pamphlets in 1848 – where the people was directly addressed and called to action, even sometimes appearing as a collective speaker: We, the people.

In the Maria de Fonte revolt, phrases such as people in tumult, popular riot and mutinous people were constantly used, but also more demeaning expressions, such as vandals, riffraff. We don't though find such terms in the memoirs of one of the main leaders of the 1846 revolt, the Miguelist Father Casimiro José Vieira, who negotiated on people's behalf with civil and military authorities. His famous letter to the queen, setting out to explain the insurgency, there are interesting fluctuations in the meaning of people, from the Lusitanian people, the nation, who live in slavery, to people as inhabitants of particular provinces or villages, or those who take up weapons, acclaim or follow him. But didn't write of rabble. But his use was not the liberal one: he foregrounded the relationship between people and sovereign.

The new centrality the 'people' acquired clearly helped generate a proliferation of negative as well as positive meanings.

DISCUSSION

Paschalis said he was reminded of Chevalier's *Classes laborieuses, classes dangéreuses.* He asked if people were contrasted with nation in the sources.
Fatima cited the work of someone who had worked more on political vocabulary. She said that in 1820-3, people and nation were often equated, though nation was a more common term. She thinks that there was less reference to nation in this sense later.

Fernando Dores Costa said he was reminded me of the remark by? to the effect that the bourgeoisie was caught between oligarchy and the plebs and was unable to create the people. He thought that that captured a key problem of Portuguese modernisation. The events of the

French revolution were seen as having revealed the evil and sinful capacities of men, and especially of the lower classes. Liberal thought had a counter-revolutionary dimension. Though liberals hoped that the people could be educated.
Nuno said that he generally agreed with what Fatima had said. He wondered when 'plebe' became a pejorative term? He suggested that classical texts were often the reference point fos such discussions. A 1749 Portuguese law relating to the use of knives quoted by Raynal distinguished the plebe from the best of the people. This was also the first law that distinguished black people as a category. He thought it worth attention. Later adjectives such as anarchist and Jacobin were used to qualify 'plebe', but he didn't think those phrases were in common use 1820-3.
He also noted that the rise of the 'middle class' as a semantic category in this period must have had some effect on conceptions of 'the people'.
He thought that the counterrevolutionary coup was legitimated by reference to 'the people'.
Fatima agreed that conceptions of the people were affected by the French revolution. She cited Ana Pina's work on fear of 'anarchy' in 1820-3 – but anarchy was not associated with 'the people' so much as with 'the canaille'.

Mark Philp suggested that it would be worth looking at William Sewell, *Logics of History* for his account of the way in which the fall of the Bastille had meaning ascribed to it retrospectively in the debates and discussions of the time. The attack on the Bastille did come to be seen as an authentic act by 'the people', but only in the course of a few days. His essay provides a good example of how to link events and language, rather than treating them as distinct.
He also stressed the importance of determining who claimed to speak for 'the people'. The people as such can never speak; they can only be represented..
Maurizio Isabella asked how far one could distinguish between liberal and counterrevolutionary discourse on the people. Did both not tend to associate the people with anarchy? Did they use similar reference points, eg 1808?
Fatima said to Mark that there were some texts that used the phrase 'We the people'.
She thought the chief difference between liberal and counterrevolutionary discourses lay in their targets: each attacked those who supported their enemies, even if they attacked them in similar term.
She thought that the French revolutionary paradigm was most invoked 1820-3: then we find the idea that social life itself might be in danger.

Paolo Benvenuto offered an Italian perspective. He said that in Italy in the 1830s historical novels were very popular. One object of such novels was to put the modern salience of ancient democracy into question. The challenge for liberals was to work out how to exclude those kinds of people or forms of popular participation that were deprecated.
Maria Alexandra Lousanda thought that initially negative images of the people were linked to the French revolution, more than to anything that had happened in Portugal itself. Only after it became clear that there was popular support for Don Miguel did liberals encounter problems with the Portuguese people.
Michalis Sotiropulos wondered to what extent the people were differentiated. In Greece moderate liberals, influenced by French doctrinaires, didn't conceptualise the people as homogeneous. On the contrary, they thought it was crucial to distinguish among them.
Fatima agreed with Maria that Miguelism was crucial in changing the terms of debate. The French revolution was invoked in this context: people spoke eg of a Miguelist Terror.
She thought that the denigration of the people had a moral dimension. and to the negative image of the French Revolution.

To Maurizio, she said that the boundaries between liberals and anti-liberals were indeed not clearly drawn.

Session 3: Rui Ramos, Characterising a changing social order

He had decided to engage with this topic by asking the question, Did the liberal revolution express social change? How did people at the time think about this?

He suggested that the terms revolution, regeneration and restoration all implied harking back to an earlier stage, but at the same time they acquired connotations of disorderly action by the people, effecting a change of regime. Liberals added the idea of a new beginning. He thought they talked only sparingly of revolution because of its negative connotations, but they did develop notions of revolution as change; this is clear in legislation of the 1830s. By the 1850s, it was thought insufficient to aim merely at political revolution: that was equated with mere turbulence. The only good form of revolution was that which moved society forwards. Hence the notion of a Regeneracão.

In C20 Portuguese historiography there has similarly been a tendency to discount the revolution of 1820 as merely political, and to think that real change in social structure came only with industrialisation. It is suggested that the middle classes remained in thrall to aristocratic values.

He argued however that in the 1830s there was a belief that society was changing, and in the 1840s this idea was invoked to support the case for certain constitutional solutions. Thus 1832-4 it was argued that there should be no second chamber because the aristocracy was anyway finished. Memoirs similarly convey the sense that new kinds of people were getting access to power, people who didn't know how to behave in the context of the royal court. There was moreover a sense that styles of life were changing: this was happening in the economy but also in administration.

Mouzhino de Silva in an article in French on the Portuguese revolution said that Portugal had last had a social revolution in [C13/15?, and was/was not having one now?] [Also something about Almeida Garrett, old and new Portugal?]

He asked how contemporaries' belief that society was changing could be reconciled with the lack of an industrial revolution, and continuing rural dominance of the economy.

He argued that rural societies can also change: an illiterate rural society is not necessarily a 'traditional' one. Liberals did not in general aim to industrialise: they did not aim to make Portugal like Britain. But they favoured and celebrated other forms of change, eg a massive change in the status of the aristocracy - ???? has written extensively about this. Also a reduction in the influence of the church; in the 1870s and 1880s both clergy and lay commentators wrote of a de-Christianized society. There was furthermore a real break in municipal traditions. New local councils represented something completely different; their role now was to assist the operations of government in the provinces. Furthermore, new forms of civil association cane into being, commercial associations, professional, cultural etc in 1840s, 50s and 60s, and started to structure urban life. Changes in social relationships were reflected in new forms of address: this has been studied by XXXXXX?

These changes gave rise to a new kind of politics, involving mobilisation around political issues. French visitors recognised the changes that were taking place, commenting that public life was now more like public life in France. They sometimes described Portugal as 'democratic', meaning by this that careers were open to talent.

In the 1850s and 60s, novels written about C18 made it seem like a different era.

He suggested that what he had presented was a new approach to thinking about social and political change in the 1830s-50s.

DISCUSSION

Several questions were collected:
Eduardo Posada Carbo asked for more information on church/state relationships.
Diego Palacios said he had in mind one day to write a paper called waiting for the social question. In the 1860s Portuguese commentators reported that there was no social question yet – but they were all waiting for it to happen!
Michalis Sotiropoulos wanted to know what the term 'social question' meant to those who used it.
Miriam Halpern Pereira argued that the idea that the liberal revolution was a social revolution was not new in historiography. Piteira Santos or even José Arriaga talked in just these terms. Congresses discussed financial, economic and social issues from the 1820s through the 1850s. The urge to replace the trade treaty of 1810 reflected the need of change. How could he say that there was no interest in developing industry: liberals were very aware that this represented the future.
Sergio Campos Matos though that Rui had posed a central question. He agreed that the liberal revolution was seen both to constitute a break with the past and yet to embody continuity. Ideas of the democratic origins of sovereignty, of Portuguese exceptionalism, and of a contract between kings and people were all invoked to create a sense of continuity with the past. The invocation of the past in such concepts as restoration and regeneration seemed to him to rest on that partly imagined past.
There was a historiography which suggested continuities with the ancien regime, thus Magalhães Godinho [see his conception of Portugal as a 'blocked society', in the influential but controversial *A Estrutura da Antiga Sociedade Portuguesa*, 1971], and in Spain Zamora ??. He agreed though that among elites at the time there was a sense that the liberal revolution had brought real change, though at the same time that there were sectors of Portuguese society which remained profoundly untouched.
Nuno Monteiro noted disagreements among historians of later C19 about what were the periods of most significant change: some said the 1820s; some played down the 1830s and stressed the 1850s. He thought that Garrett, writing in the 1870s, was ambivalent about change: he did not suggest that liberalism had transformed Portuguese society.
Idriss Jebari wanted to link Fatima and Rui's papers. He wondered how important to the experience of change was the entry of the people into politics? He thought this question probably linked to Mark's concern with the changing meaning of 'politics'.
Fernando Dores Costa – It is difficult to disagree that there was a sense of change, because change can take so many different forms. Liberals for example saw themselves as among other things reinventing nobility, in a way that made is appropriate to modern times: reshaping social distinction rather than eliminating it. Herculano in this vein invented a heroic Mousinho da Silveira, for his own purposes. [Is this right? Could you expand?] However, this did not matter much to the majority of the population: the new regime affected

them chiefly by giving more power to the pater familias [and something relating to property rights?]
Maria Alexandra Lousada wanted to know people whether, insofar as they sought to create something other than an aristocratic society, people talked about a bourgeois society? What term did they use when they wanted to talk about the middle classes? **Fatima** interjected that they talked about the middle classes, taking the term from the French doctrinaires.
Joanna Innes suggested that the story he was telling could be linked with a wider story about the development of the category 'social' and the ways people worked with that to think about change. She suggested that this was a European development, even if it took different forms in different places.

Rui Ramos offered some responses.
He said that he thought historians tended to undervalue the role of imagination in the past. Mousinho did imagine something new. He imagined creating a meritocracy, even if in fact there was still a social elite.
He agreed with Nuno that literature was ambiguous in depicting change, but thought that in being so it partly reflected contemporary debate.
He had not meant to imply that there was no discussion of social and economic problems before the Regeneracão: he was trying to get at the self image of that generation.
The 'social question' as it was conceived in late C19 was in fact a political question: it related to the political organisation of the lower classes. It had surfaced previously in discussions of the 1840s, when it meant something rather different: the living conditions of the lower orders.
To Sergio he said that he thought continuity was bound up with the notion of return: of going back to something which we used to have but which has been lost because of absolutism.
To Idriss he said that the question of the people's own perspective was always a problem. When people became involved with the public sphere they used languages which were probably not their everyday languages. Conceiving of oneself as part of 'the people' was one of the things that could happen in that context. People were affected by political upheavals whether they wished to be or not: there was no deep Portugal unaffected at all by change.

Session 4: Grégoire Bron and Fernando Dores Costa Fernando, Portuguese perceptions of the European world order

They explained that Fernando would start with a few observations on the period up to 1820; Grégoire would then talk about 1820-32, then Fernando would pick up again on 1832-1847.

Fernando: Pombal distinguished the nobility that travelled from those who didn't. Only for a subsection of the nobility was the European order an issue.

Portugal didn't have a role in the European balance of power – she fell within the British sphere of influence from 1373 until C20. She always faced a possible landwards threat from Spain, which British influence moderated, though Spain's own limitations helped: Pufendorf argued the Spanish could not maintain a sufficiently provisioned army on the border; the adversaries were therefore less unequally matched than might be supposed.

Characteristic of this period was the idea that certain nations were more civilised: Portugal aimed to be among them. Pombal's constitutions for the University of Coimbra announced that the object was to follow the example of civilised nations. This idea was invoked in many

different contexts: thus in relation to the creation of a corps of engineers and to the cultivation of cotton.

Grotius said that Portugal was only important in European history three times. In 1580 it became part of the Habsburg dominions. After throwing off Spanish rule in 1640, it then defeated further attempts by Spain in 1659, 63 and 65. In 1668, Spain recognised the sovereignty of the house of Braganza.

That Portugal ranked among small powers may seem odd, given its possession of the huge colony of Brazil. As the Dutch decayed, and French and British power grew, the Portuguese possession of so large a colony looked odder. There was a Portugese enlightenment fantasy that it might be possible to use Brazil to leverage a change in its power.

It wasn't Portugal's choice to be the place where, in 1808, a stand against Napoleon was taken. The British were initially successful against Junot, but this success ended with the defeat of Moore's army: in 1809, they were expelled. Wellington however needed Portugal as a base so as to be able to maintain a British presence in the peninsula, and make Spain an effective ally against France. In 1811-12, Portugal served both as a base and as a source of recruitment – Portuguese soldiers fought in Spain and France in 1813 and 1814 and until the defeat of Napoleon. In 1812, Wellington attacked Madrid, hoping to force the Spanish into an alliance. Wellington's strategy was much discussed in England: some thought it would be better to find a more powerful ally than Spain; the Wellesley brothers argued that the Peninsular War served by tying down the French. Portugal was an ideal base because no other power would have provided troops without seeking political direction. Britain was clearly using and acting for Portugal – when they signed peace 1814 they also did so in the name of Portugal.

Grégoire proposed to discuss how Portuguese liberals saw their place in the world, between 1820 and 1834 – taking the latter date to mark the definitive establishment of parliamentarism.

To set the scene: this period saw Brazil establish its independence (1822/5). At the Congress of Vienna, the great powers claimed the right to regulate Europe. Britain exercised a kind of tutelage over Portugal. Portugal was weak – the period when liberals struggled with Miguelists saw frequent interventions by great powers; liberals in exile also strove to build up European support. Portugal was seen from outside as the site of a struggle between liberty and despotism; this provided a basis for international solidarities. The rise of Portuguese liberalism prepared the way for Portugal to take a new place in the European order. 1820 saw the emergence of rival conceptions of the international order. The 1830 revolutionary wave in Europe finished with the liberal invasion of Portugal 1833-4.

British ascendancy in Portugal during the Napoleonic wars threatened to make Brazil a colony of a colony. Liberals and counterrevolutionaries agreed in seeing Portugal's subject state as a symptom of profound decadence. In the vintista period, the object was to regenerate the nation. When they proved unable to hold on to Brazil, liberals had to rethink their place in the post-Vienna order in that context. Two rival visions emerged: moderate and radical. Radicals believed in a Europe of peoples; they hoped to see the emergence of a European order of nations, founded on natural law; in this context, nations could be regenerated in conditions of freedom. Like all European liberals, they defined themselves against the order created by the Congress of Vienna. When the Spanish revolution of 1820 challenged that

order, the Portuguese resolved to claim their own freedom. They saw Britain as imposing the order of Vienna on them; they also resented the unequal commercial treaty which gave the English great privileges in Brazil. They saw the Miguelist coup d'etat as a result of British diplomacy - even when Canning sent troops to try to protect the constitutionalist regime. They saw Carvalho as a Trojan horse for Miguel. Their only consolation was that other nations were equally subject to English despotism. They hoped to gain from an alliance with Spain – even though only a small minority wanted this to take the form of a union. There was a sense of solidarity across southern Europe, associated with the idea that the south was the birthplace of liberty, as the scene of the 1820s revolutions, which had fallen prey to the 'sultans du nord'. The 1823 coup overthrew Portuguese liberty, but they could still see themselves as conspirators for liberty; after 1828 they nurtured a sense of solidarity among victims. Almeida Garrett, in *Portugal na balanca da Europa* wrote of a 'système de liberté mériodionale'. He thought that southern nations might hope to establish liberty without passing through the violence of the French Revolution.

The moderates had a different conception. They saw their own revolution not as part of a wider revolution of peoples but simply as a way to establish local liberty. They hoped to build a robust local parliamentarism. They thought that southern nations were too weak to overturn the European order. Nonetheless they were sincerely liberal and internationalist. They hoped to see community among liberal nations: they believed in nurturing links though commerce among other means. There ceased to be a distinct afrancescado group in this period; there seemed little prospect of an alliance with France: they were unlikely to be able to emancipate themselves from the grip of Britain. They aw Britain as providing the best guarantee for the Portuguese constitutional order in the face of opposition from conservative great powers. They opposed the Miguelist coup as illegitimate, and lobbied against it in the courts of Europe.

The 1830 revolution in France confirmed the distinct identities of these two strands of thought. The radicals saw France as the model. Their pamphlets called on the Portuguese to rouse themselves, and follow the French example of civic heroism, in order to create a Europe of peoples. Garrett bears witness to this radical vision. He saw a European order in crisis, but thought that Portugal could hope to find a place of itself in a new era, characterised by a 'sainte alliance des peuples' against oligarchs. The period saw some evolution in radical culture. It came to be expected that the progress of civilisation would be gradual. The task in hand was seen as difficult but not impossible; European civilisation would carry Portugal with it. Union with Spain continued to be seen as a possible fallback position.

The moderates also welcomed the 1830 revolution, but for them this marked a break point: a point at which Europe itself emerged as clearly segmented. They hoped that Iberia could join with the English and French in a liberal western bloc.

Fernando said that in the 1830s and 40s, all problems in Portugal were seen as European problems, because great powers were seen as making all the decisions about the fates of smaller nations – as in Greece. This was also Portugal's experience, especially 1846-7, years marked by a second civil war within the liberal regime, in which each side used its European connections.

Queen Maria of Portugal was born in 1819, the same year as Victoria; they corresponded in French. Maria wrote to Victoria 1847 remarking on the continuing unhappy war, and saying that Britain must force the rebels to submit: so we see her looking to Britain to solve her

problems. The struggle pitted critics of abuses by the regime, who charged it with tyranny, against a regime which presented itself as defending order against anarchy. In his view, the disintegration of the political elite is something that historians still haven't fully explained: neither economic interests, nor differences of ideology seem to explain it. Miguelists were also players, also presenting themselves as a group with a popular base, and having their own diplomatic links. The traditional explanation counterposes Chartists and Septembristas. Despite the elusiveness of difference between the two groups, they did employ extreme rhetoric, using the language of tyranny and anarchy, but we should be wary of following the historians who take this at face value. The moderates held power 1834-6; the radicals 1836 – a new constitution was agreed 1838. Then in 1848, the older 'charte' was restored, and Cabral initiated a policy of authority and state-building. He was presented as a new Marquis Pombal. To do anything, he needed to make fiscal innovations, but these prompted a popular rising in 1846 – against road taxes, and defending existing burial practices. Cabral was expelled and civil war, the so-called Patuleia, followed. The governments of London and Madrid followed events closely, and the war was ended by foreign intervention – not a case of foreign aggression, but of the parties invoking outside aid. Cabral had gone to Spain, from where he hoped to organise his return. The Queen asked Spain to intervene against the rebels. London was not keen to get involved, though did bring war vessels to serve as a refuge for the royal family in case of need.

During this period, the army was a central political instrument: it played an irregular but common part. One might assume that the army was a powerful corporation within society, but in fact there were two small armies: the Saldanha government was unable to raise large forces. This helps to explain why militias and guerrillas were so important. This helps explain why both sides turned abroad for assistances.

DISCUSSION

Sergio was interested in the relationship between conceptions of a contrast between southern and northern countries and the radical conception of a Europe of peoples. He said that Garrett had a theory of the necessary interdependence of small countries: only by cooperating with eachother could they hope to preserve independence. We know that he lived in both France and Britain, and was influenced by the British system. He questioned whether Garrett can properly be called a 'radical', especially after 1820.
He thought that though military revolutions were important in constructing liberty, people didn't participate in them in a 'modern' way. He thought there were important contrasts between northern and southern revolutions.

Nuno noted that the two speakers had different emphases: whereas Fernando suggested (of the later 1830s and 40s) that there were no strong programmatic differences, Grégoire used ideological difference to structure his account. He himself was not persuaded that there was an identifiable and consistent group of 'radicals'. In 1826, liberals of all kinds rallied round the Carta. It is possible to identify radical *positions*, but he thought that individuals didn't adhere to these with any consistency. He suggested that distinctions of view were retrospectively imposed on the 1820s from the perspective of the 1830s and 40s.
Grégoire agreed that the distinctions were not always clear, but thought that a distinct radical position did develop in the later 1820s, being manifest eg in declining admiration for the Cadiz constitution. And he thought that perceptions of the international order served to distinguish people particularly clearly.

Mark Philp asked quite how much difference there was between admiring France as it was in 1830 and admiring Britain at the same date.
Grégoire said that there were Portuguese reasons for regarding Britain with hostility and France with hope.
Michalis commented that international lawyers often came from small nations. He wondered if Portuguese liberals talked about international law.
Fernando said that hostility to Britain was already evident in C18. Pombal said that Britain was unbearable, but still we have to put up with them. He said that it wasn't correct to describe Portugal as having been occupied by Britain during the war: this was not the case either de jure or de facto. Beresford was a military adventurer, who stayed in Portugal to head the Portuguese army. There were also other high ranking British officers on the scene. But this was only possible because the government in Rio de Janeiro supported them against the council in Lisbon, and that in turn was because Beresford sent troops to Brazil to support the campaign against Montevideo, against the wishes of the British.
Grégoire said that there was a proposal from whom? in the 1820s for a League of the South against Britain: for a Grand Federation of Free Peoples (Spain, Portugal, Greece and the Latin American republics). And again in the late 1830s there was some interest in some sort of Mediterranean union.
Paolo Benvenuto asked why Italy was not intended to be included in the federation.
Grégoire said because it was not yet free.
Maurizio said he recognised in Grégoire's sketch many ideas held by Italian revolutionaries, and circulating more generally in Europe about Britain. Nonetheless, he urged caution in the use of models which entail inflexible ideas about what particular countries stand for. Italians who advocated regenerating the south looked to Britain for support in 1815 and again 1824-5.
Mark Philp also said that one needed to allow for rhetoric and tactics, and not take everything that people said as an expression of a well-worked-out ideology.

Joanna Innes said that inasmuch as schemes for federation and leagues of the south don't seem to have got beyond the stage of paper projects, interesting though they were as indications of how people saw the world, it might not be worth probing them too hard. She was curious though to know whether anyone envisaged a reformed Congress system: did they think that the idea of a structured European state-system was good, even if they didn't like those currently dominating it? In the Americas at the same time there was interest in and experimentation with pan-American congresses. Or did they envisaged cooperation unstructured by institutions?
Grégoire said he didn't know whether anyone envisaged such a thing.
Maurizio asked if they cited Vattel; **Grégoire** said yes, often.
Michalis thought they might have wanted to be able to call on the great powers, or at least some great powers, to redress threats to their independence.
Mark Philp wondered how they responded to instances of intervention, for example by the French in Algeria, or the British destruction of the Egyptian fleet at Navarino.
Maurizio suggested that Vattel could be used to back up a vision in which Britain played a protecting role. This was what Ugo Foscolo hoped in relation to the Ionian Islands, and what Sicilian liberals hoped.
Mark said that it was to be expected that people would treat Vattel as a resource from which to construct arguments useful to them.
Grégoire said that the liberals did see Miguel's usurpation as a violation of international order. Some Europeans saw the British by contrast as playing a legitimate international role in the Ionian islands. However, Portuguese exiles also thought they were badly treated by Britain.

DAY TWO - PRACTICES

Session 5: Maria Alexandre Lousada, Developments in the public sphere: the emergence of new sociabilities and associations

She noted that associations are often regarded as a sine qua non for democracy; this links to the idea that democracy requires a healthy civil society. This view has however been criticised by e.g. Mark Warren, who says that not all associations have a positive effect, and Olin Wright, who warns that associations may claim to monopolise the representation of interests. In this context, the Portuguese case may be of interest.

She suggested that Portugal conforms to the model developed by Bermeo and Nord in their *Civil Society before Democracy*. The first phase of associational life might be termed bourgeois. A second phase, lasting between the 1840s and 1860s/70s, many more professional/occupational associations developed, some with a working-class base. Portugal at this time saw a mania for associations. The third period saw the spread of associational culture to rural society, and a furore of unionisation. Finally, the fourth period, the early twentieth century, marked the high-water mark of associational life in Portugal, until the coming of the dictatorship. As the coming of dictatorship suggests, however, having a flourishing associational culture doesn't seem to suffice to secure democracy. Indeed, Antonio Costa Pinto (? Was this the Pinto referred to?) has argued that these associations reflected more the fragility of Portuguese democracy than the health of its society.

Today she would focus on the period before the mania for assemblies, between the birth of an associational culture in the late C18 and the democratisation of social and political life.

Sociability has been seen, e.g. by Habermas among others, in England, as having played a crucial part in promoting new forms of interaction, bringing together old and new elites in salons, coffee houses and taverns, in a non-court space. It's suggested that new discourses and practices were consolidated: first in the literary public sphere, and then in the political public sphere. Values informing these practices are suggested to have included equality and the use of reason. In the Portuguese case, literary academies appeared in C17-18, but suffered a decline under Pombal. However, some new academies were then created. These were non-aristocratic in origin and conducted in a spirit of equality; members adopted Arcadian pseudonyms. Divisions on literary matters arose within them – perhaps partly because members included people who hadn't previously been socialised to this form of discussion. In the French case, salons were important: Chartier suggests that these were the first sites in which a literary public sphere was developed, emancipated from curial and academic supervision; their organisers often included women. These were private spaces, to which access was restricted. Few salons are documented in Portugal. However, the practice of hosting people in eachother's homes did become common; in this context, nobles socialised with other social strata.

Urban groups were also influenced by the 'mania' of gathering. It was observed (in the 1820s?) that in this setting 'the aristocracy mingled with the democracy'. In late C18, the first clubs called 'assemblies' appeared in Lisbon. In early C19, they functioned as recreational clubs. In 1819, a group of Portuguese merchants formed an assembly of this kind; it was frequented by both merchants and nobility. In 1820 it acquired a political dimension, the King being the most important guest. The assembly was closed under Don Miguel, but reopened after the liberal victory.

It is clear that cafes and taverns also played a political role: they served as meeting places, and sites of sociability. Following the first French invasion, surveillance of such sites increased. Conversations about the war were reported, the singing of revolutionary songs and the like. During the revolution, they provided a context for the plebeian version of the public sphere.

The first patriotic or literary societies appeared in Lisbon in September and December 1820. These built on models provided by academies, salons and by freemasonry; they were also inspired by French and Spanish models. They organised elections, and shaped speeches given in the constitutional congress. They had a democratic structure and inclusive character; those attending them included artisans. They had both a cultural and a political function. Some met in bookstores, some in people's homes. Political societies could provide a public face for secret societies. A 'club', as the term was used in memoirs of the period, could be a loose political pressure group with no formal organisation, or a conspiratorial association. In 1823, the members of one club were arrested.

The term 'club' first appeared in dictionaries in 1818, when it was defined as a gathering for pleasure taking place in English towns; figuratively 'a society'. The next definition dates from 1831. It was then said to be a new term, taken from English, meaning a junta which met for discourse especially on public matters. By that time it seems from newspapers as if the term was in wide use. It could have negative associations, being linked with notions of political conspiracy. This may simply reflect the fact that people were distrustful of attempts at political organization. Masonic lodges had their own dynamic, and Jacobin associations. Clubs could be seen as threatening because they represented an alternative to the domains of church and state.

In sum she suggested that early C19 was in Portugal critical to the formation of new forms of sociability, in which different social groups encountered one another. The absence of the court in Brazil during this period was important: one traditional site of elite sociability had simply disappeared. The French invasion and British presence also helped stimulate new practices. Portuguese circumstances – the tussle between liberalism and absolutism and the Miguelist civil war – encouraged the politicisation of sociability. Civil war and counterrevolution must also have helped to shape the public sphere: their impact deserved attention. And it was important to explore what went on outside capital cities. She suggested that these new forms of sociability may have played an important role in the construction of new forms of social elite, combining elements who had once lived separate lives.

DISCUSSION

Joanna Innes said that she had always been a bit sceptical of Habermas' model in which societies of this kind had positive political implications. Instead, one might simply say that in this kind of context, a would-be authoritarian state will need to proceed differently, ie. by either repressing or coopting societies (or both) – as the French state did after 1792. Such accounts also tend to understate the continuing importance of older sites of sociability: in the British case, churches for example. She wondered whether there were in Portugal fraternities and confraternities? And if so how they related to or changed in the context of the new forms of sociability described.

Maria Alexandre said she had intentionally focussed on new forms of sociality. There were indeed religious fraternities, but in late C18-early C19 in Lisbon elites were tending to

abandon these, or at least partially to withdraw, in favour of newer social sites. In the second half of C19, by contrast, confreries underwent a revival, and index of the growing importance of the church at that time. She thought the church played a more important role in introducing the associational principle into rural society, as it did also in other parts of Europe. She didn't see herself as Habermasian, and didn't want to portray these social forms as democratic: she liked the contemporary formulation that they provided sites for aristocracy to mingle with democracy.

Rui Ramos said this was fascinating material, very new in Portuguese historiography. He had two questions. One was about whether the decline in literary academies under Pombal also applied to cafés and other forms of associative life – and was it a matter of changing fashion or actual constraint? Secondly, following on from the previous question, he wondered whether the religious reaction after the French revolution spurred new forms of sociability.
Maria Alexandre said that she didn't know whether the Pombal era affected the fortunes of salons and clubs: the evidence related only to literary academies, which were positively repressed. It's sometimes suggested that cafes were frowned on, though she has found references to them. It is possible that the earthquake, by disrupting old patterns of life, might positively have contributed to the development of new forms of sociability. There hasn't been much work on religious organisations, except at elite level.

Several questions were collected:
Idriss Jebari asked whether meeting in these new ways was linked to changes in the content of what people talked about – or was it just a matter of new vehicles being developed for the same discussions?
Nuno thought it was important to distinguish the early and late C19: the period when liberals and counterrevolutionaries fought for control of the public arena on the one hand, and the period of liberal hegemony on the other. He thought the atmosphere changed in the 1830s and 40 (**ML** agreed). He also wasn't convinced that masonry was so tightly connected with liberalism. Possibly many people were masons; some may have been masons but attended only once. Might it be fruitful to see the period as one characterised by dispute about proper forms of sociability? He thought that counterrevolutionary sociability found a more comfortable home in a church or tavern, but not in the new forms of public space.
Mark Philp talked about his project creating an on-line version of the engagement diary of the British philosopher and writer William Godwin. He had been struck how some forms of sociability remained hierarchical in a way one might not think from Habermas' account: so Godwin called on the nobility, but they never called on him, or indeed acknowledged him in the street.. Social mixing didn't entail the dissolution of all social manifestations of hierarchy
Maurizio Isabella wanted to pursue further the question of the relationship between secret and public. His research suggested to him that revolutions could open a space for formerly secret societies to play a public role. What was the continuing significance of their 'secret' character in that context? It seemed that the two were not completely opposed.
Florencia Peyrou said that in her own research, on Spain, she had been interested in the question of the forms of sociability and associated politicisation to be found in plebeian societies in the 1830s and 40s. Liberal and radical groups organised societies that were meant to be open to ordinary people – but who came exactly? How was the spread of liberal messages managed in practice? And with what consequences for the emergence of civil society in Portugal?

Fatima Sa thought that the question of the politicisation of sociability was a very interesting one. Dom Miguel was suspicious of sociability: he closed cafes, theatre and opera. An Italian journal of the era describes everyone joining confreries because there was pressure to do that.
Miriam said that she liked the work a lot, but asked why she had not talked about confraternities – some developed into other sorts of association. There are some continuities and some changes. Confraternities tended to be very hierarchical; we might conceive of associations by contrast as more democratic. However, in an artisanal setting the distinction might not be so clear. A new trade confraternity in the 1830s mixed new egalitarian ways with the old corporate spirit.
Maria Alexandre said she thought a recurrent theme in the questions and comments was about competing forms of sociability, or interactions between different forms of sociability. She noted that the same name might be applied to things that were in fact very different. Perhaps there were distinct forms of liberal sociability and counter-revolutionary sociability, but she wasn't sure this was right, because the new forms of sociability antedated the liberal/counterrevolutionary split. It's hard to study processes of change. She didn't think Dom Miguel closed coffee houses: she has seen many documents about coffee houses in that era.
Fatima said that she hadn't meant to suggest that all cafes closed, but she had seen testimony to the closure of the principal cafe. [Of course, closure might be for a limited period, to discourage opposition when the regime seemed fragile].

Session 6: Diego Palacios Cerezales, State building and establishing a monopoly of force

He remarked that barracks were also sites of sociability, and sometimes egalitarian ones, as when they served the National Guard.

In 1872, the government said that Portugal was not Spain – this was in the context of reassuring investors (in just the same way that they now say, Portugal is not Greece), in a pamphlet on the constitutional life of a nation of the Latin race. In the course of 40 pages, Portugal was suggested to be like various other small countries – Sweden, Holland and Belgium. Among other things, Portugal was one of the constitutional countries to establish a national guard, but also to recognise the inconvenience of having one: it had been closed down thirty years before. This was cited to show sound political judgement, and to be the result of a process of institutional learning – also a theme found in other publications of the 1860s and 70s. The National Guard had been accepted as a democratic institution in 1822 and 1838, but was not re-established by the constitutional charter of 1852.

During the civil war, the national guard had been presented as an integral part of the constitutional system. But clearly attitudes later changed.Interesting to think about how the National Guard's role and image is changing. The worry came to be that the national guard was more likely to serve as an arm of the state than a bulwark against it.

A view of the National Guard as part of the civic state was still a feature of the thinking of Manuel Passos, when his government introduced the civil code of 1836. This provided for elected juries, local authorities, police and sheriffs, coexisting with a parallel bureaucratic state that was supported by taxes. The National Guard fell within the civic state. The National Guard was not closed down by law. However, after some sections of it rebelled in 1838, the government stopped calling citizens into service. The idea that this civic state could work

disappeared. It came to be supposed that citizens couldn't be relied on: the Guard would be pollicised by the more active. This ideal disappeared from the collective imagination.

DISCUSSION

Mark Philp asked whether citizens ceased to want a national guard, or was it the political elites who turned against it?
Diego said that both things happened. On the one hand, it was common for people to try to dodge service: those who wanted to serve were derided: they were called 'fried fish'. People paid for substitutes – usually people who weren't full citizens and in theory didn't have a right to serve, but who could do so if serving as substitutes. Ordinary citizens might be happy to appear in uniform, but they didn't like policing their own neighbourhoods. In this context, radical elements, even if small, could be very powerful: some sections of the Lisbon National Guard were very active in 1838. What's not clear is whether serving contributed to their politicisation.

Paulo Benvenuto asked who was the author of the manifesto/advertising brochure in 1872?
Diego said this wasn't clear: it wasn't signed. It was first published in Paris; later also in English and Portuguese. **Paolo** was struck by its use of the idea of a 'Latin race'. While this was a theme that can be found in earlier propaganda, he thought that it was becoming more visible between the 1860s and 80s; it was in turn linked with ideas of occidental superiority.

Nuno said that he thought this was an interesting question: it seemed that a major change took place in the course of C19. At the start, there were no real police outside Lisbon. The tradition was to rely on local militia. These played an important part in counter-revolutionary mobilisation. In the 1820s they were suppressed by the liberals: they were seen as a source of public disturbance. He wondered why the balance of views shifted.
Diego said one way people made the case was to say that a national guard did not fit with a pluralistic society: ideas of liberty had to be adapted to a world of groups and factions. In the late C19 Portugal was unusual among European states in not having a gendarmerie: instead they relied on the army to maintain order. They were able to subordinate the army to civil government, though it wasn't very effective. They perceived Spain by contrast as a militaristic society.

Several questions were collected:
Rui Ramos noted that as well as the National Guard there was a voluntary militia that carried on into the 1840s. It operated as a partisan force during the civil war. It was suppressed in the context of moves to end the war: armed partisan forces didn't seem like a good idea. This didn't betoken a shift in opinion against democracy as such: on the contrary, from the 1850s workers were encouraged to form civil organisations, but the emphasis was on building civil society.
Michalis suggested that its first formation the national guard may have been intended to have a homogenising function: to emphasise equality among all who were full citizens. Or was its purpose rather simply to meet the threat posed by the older style of local militia?
Miriam said she was interested in the 1872 brochure; she knew of other similar texts, setting out geographical and statistical data, but with a propagandistic motivation.
She said that she thought that the problem with the National Guard was that it became politicised. Outside Lisbon, its politics were mainly counterrevolutionary, so in practice it posed a threat to liberalism and democracy. This was why after 1838 it was reorganised

Sergio had a question about the role of army in the 'civic state'. He wondered whether it might be possible to distinguish two strategies for civilising the nation: a radical one, in which the militia was seen as an instrument for creating citizenship and a moderate one, in which it was thought better to rely on the regular army. He noted the development of regimental schools in the 1850s and 60s.
Fatima recalled a questionnaire after the civil war, in which the civil authorities asked the military authorities if conditions existed for forming an effective national guard in the various districts. The responses were very eloquent and illustrate series concerns about their political trustworthiness.
Joanna Innes said she had two questions. First, a factual question: as she understood it, in France being a member of the national guard conveyed certain political rights: was this the case in Portugal? Secondly, a more conceptual question: she wondered what model of change over time Diego had in mind. Did he see himself as describing a modernising process? Or did he see the situation as ambiguous and unstable: did he think the older way of thinking could have survived, but happened not to because of contingent circumstances?
Maurizio said that although there might be rhetoric about the National Guard as a civic force, he thought in practice their function was always to control revolution: officers were usually people of higher rank, responsible for seeing that force was deployed appropriately.
Diego said that his intention had certainly not been to suggest any kind of teleology. He thought reliance on the army didn't reflect any sort of theory about how the state should work, but the simple fact that to give out arms in the countryside was always to lose control. During the Patuleia, the liberals found it hard to recruit for the National Guard. The idea of the army as a form of educational experience for citizens developed only later in C19, he thought, and then didn't get very far in practice. He said there were both counterrevolutionary and liberal militias. Local bosses in the countryside headed national guard battalions. This made it difficult to use these forces against them. So can't use it against them. In the law of 1834 gives weight to national guard.
Miriam said that in 1838 there was a new rule associated with a new system of qualifications, that made holding leadership positions in the national guard conditional on wealth. **Diego** said not, he thought these qualifications were instituted in 1834. **Miriam** said yes, but the selection based on census had been abolished after the revolution of 1836, that was the main issue.

Session 7: Ana Mouta Faria, State, church and religion during the first liberal revolution (1820-3)

She said that since 2005 she had been working on a different topic. However, now she would return to older research, and consider how the relationship between political and ecclesiastical powers changed during the revolution. To understand the changes it is necessary to distinguish between the church as an institutional reality, the clergy as a social group, and a set of ideas. She had never come across the word democracy in her various sources – newspapers, speeches, petitions; she hadn't found it used by either political or ecclestiastical protagonists – despite their need for new terms to conceptualise a changing world, as the status of clergy, both male and female changed, and a new legal framework for religious matters was devised

The forging of the new religious framework drew on new ideologies. There was a great diversity of opinion, also within the ranks of liberals and absolutists. During the history of the Catholic Church, church discipline has changed more than doctrine. Since the early modern

period, Catholic states have claimed the power to make laws for the Church; this was the other side of their duty to protect, but it was exploited by liberal policymakers for other ends.

The later C18 was a period of population growth in Portugal, but there was a decline in religious recruitment, especially to the regular orders. By 1820, secular clergy made up about 75% of the total. The clerical order was itself deeply stratified. The high clergy both regular and secular depended on land rights. Public opinion saw them as parasites, dependent on tributes.

5 sets of reforms or changes affecting Church and clergy were set in train in the Vintismo period: reforms of national church structures; of the high clergy, as part of the seigneurial class; in the context of wider fiscal changes; of the clergy considered as state functionaries, and of the Church and clergy as ideological powers.

- In the name of freedom of thought and of the press, the inquisition was suppressed, as was ecclesiastical censorship of the press; the power of the civil state increased as parliament passed laws relating to education.
- Former tax exemptions were abolished in the context of new taxation to support public debt.
- In the name of equality, immunities were suppressed, and ecclesiastical courts deprived of power to impose serious sanctions except in relation to religious infractions. A clear distinction was drawn between political and religious spheres of power.
- Changes to seigneurial rights included some specific to ecclesiastical dues, and some general to all forms of landownership. Instead, parishes were directed to support their parish priests. Liberals aimed to promote productive agriculture, and in that context to reduce religious fiscal claims to a single tax. Tithes were to be returned to parishes, but the clergy put on a salaried basis so they were not left dependent on gifts, extorted or otherwise.
- Clerics were conceptualised as ecclesiastical civil servants. As such, they had to take oaths of allegiance. Bishops were ordered to diffuse pastoral letters affirming to the population about the new regime's legitimacy.

Liberal policies didn't attack Catholicism as such. Liberal leaders repeatedly affirmed their Catholic beliefs. Both parliament and government sought legitimation from religion. Nonetheless they promoted the secularisation of the state, in the context of promoting freedom of expression, equality and regalism considered as a nationalist policy.

DISCUSSION

Maurizio said there were parallels in Spain, Naples etc. He wanted to know how important within political conflicts were conflicts over the Church? And were priests divided among themselves? In Sicily, there were even conflicts within church buildings involving priests on different sides. He would also like to know more about the role of religion in popular culture. Mark Mazower has talked about new cults appearing in Greece. In Naples, there were new prophecies (which liberals attacked). Were there similar phenomena in Portugal? (**Nuno and Fatima** both said Yes).
Ana said that one of the most striking conclusions to emerge from her research was that the clergy were largely favourable to the changes: they expected the new state to help them in their parishes, and to improve their conditions. However a part of the clergy did become

involved in counterrevolutionary activity; she thinks this was as a result of conflicts arising from the new political ideologies. Popular political vocabulary was certainly full of religious references. Some clergy were freemasons: one man was a judge of the inquisition and a freemason; it would be wrong to assume that freemasons were necessarily religiously radical. It was said that St Bartholomew was the saint most venerated by liberals, but she doesn't know if this is true. There were prophecies of the end of the regime, and also an apparition of the Virgin, which the absolutists took up (as the fascists would later).

Miriam was interested in the phenomenon of state religion. On the question of ending ecclesiastical control of the press, though this was true in general, various constitutions did give the Church control in religious matters.
Ana agreed. She said that religious unity was seen as crucial to the unity of the nation; there seems to have been unanimity on this. Differences arose over other matters, eg what line to take on religious toleration. However, she didn't think 'state religion' was the operative concept: rather Catholicism was said to be the religion of the Portuguese.
Miriam noted the relationship between religion and citizenshipand questioned whether non-Catholic Portuguese were citizens and allowed to vote. In fact in the 20's and 30' most non-catholics were foreigners. Naturalized foreigners were allowed to vote in 1836-1838.

Nuno questioned quite how egalitarian the 1820 revolution was: he thought this was a backwards projection by 1830s republicans.
Ana said she thought they tried to reduce inequality, even if only up to a point
Nuno said that the plan to suppress monasteries could be seen as a plan to remodel the Church on more English lines – it was seen in these terms at the time. He also noted some revolutionary iconoclasm, for example, the destruction of an image of Faith in the palace of the inquisition. He also noted the proposal to build an obelisk to celebrate one year of revolution: a non-religious symbol was chosen.

Fatima wanted to underline something that is generally known: that the local cult which was pitted against the revolution endured beyond the immediate circumstances which gave rise to it. The image of the Virgin in question was taken to Lisbon by the authorities – although the locals demanded its return. In the second half of C19, a basilica was built on the spot: Our Lady of Carnaxide?

Several questions were collected:
Paschalis had some questions about the place of religion in the constitution. Did the constitution provide for a state religion? Did it provide for religious toleration?
Rui Ramos asked why clerical recruitment declined during the later C18? Also, though it was true that the liberals claimed to be Catholics and to support the Church, yet they tried to turn it into a state religion, which was seen as anti-religious by some Catholics.
Maria Alexandre asked why the cardinal refused to take the oath to the constitution?
Ana said that two bishops also refused – as in France, they said they had to wait for instructions from the Vatican. It was argued that if taking the oath was compulsory then it had no force: they didn't focus on the content of the oath.
The apparition of the Virgin was near the royal palace. She noted that there were no manifestations until the arrival of the court in Lisbon.
As to why the decline in recruitment: probably a partly a matter of the development of alternative careers; being a cleric became more a matter of choice, when previously many had become clerics for pragmatic reasons, to survival or to help the rest of the family. The liberals

were critical of the effect of such pressures – but in fact the liberal era saw a spiritual renewal of Catholicism.

Session 8: **Miriam Halpern Pereira, Citizens, subjects and social relations**

She said that much had been written on this subject. She would select just a few themes which interested her more. She would focus especially on how citizenship was presented to people, and how it was appropriated and used by some of the groups concerned. Some essential aspects of the topic have been overlooked in recent works. She would consider four of the main new instruments of the exercise of citizenship: the right to petition; freedom of speech; freedom of association and the suffrage. The 1820s were the founding years; the 1830-50s years of strong social and political conflict, and renewal. The timing echoed that found in other countries in southern Europe.

To be a 'citizen' in the 1820s was to have a new and resonant identity. Some people proudly signed themselves 'Citizen X', rather than using their traditional title. There was contemporary encouragement to do this: to override previous distinctions. Using the word citizen expressed both a sense of right and a sense of belonging. Lynn Hunt has suggested that ideas about moral autonomy and empathy laid foundations for ideas about the rights of man. The article on citizenship in the constitution stated that one could become a citizen by birth, naturalisation or merit. But what did it mean?

Citizenship is a relational concept implying a category of individuals, the citizens, and the State. A new form of relationship between the individual and the State took shape in the Declaration of Individual Rights, the founding text of citizenship in Portugal, which stood as an introduction of the Constitution since its first draft. The trilogy of Freedom, Security and Property of each citizen opens the Declaration of Individual Rights. It is its head, as everything else derives from this trilogy. Freedom is of course the first one, its existence stated as being dependent of the guarantee that no imprisonment would ever take place without formal charge. The following statement that the right of individual property was sacred, indicates the social stem of this Declaration, pointing to both the actual way of life of the liberal elite but also to that of an utopian view of society seen as a world of owners, either present or future ones. Work is nowhere mentioned. Freedom of thought came next and was further on object of a special law. Still, religion matters remained under the bishops' surveillance. Equality under the law was enshrined in clause 11, articulated to the abolition of privileged courts, the equity in penalties and the abolition of all physical forms of torture emphasized; the right to present petitions in a late addition, clause 14. In theory, the old system of private and special privileges was superseded. Office was open to all who met a literacy requirement. People were given new rights, namely to intervene – via freedom of expression and petition. No right of association was provided for: this reflects distrust of corporations.

The right to present petitions was widely employed. Congress attracted most. Many different issues were highlighted. That they chose to petition Congress (rather than the government) seemed to her interesting; she wondered what was the case in other countries. Congress was in effect seen as taking on roles previously associated with the crown. MPs were asked to undertake surveys of their own regions: the constitutional congress did not confine itself to purely constitutional matters. The right to petition was taken up by many different social strata. Nuno documented an older tradition in his paper, but the vast numbers of petitions

presented in such a short time deserves emphasis. As regards "mémoires", there over one thousand covering the main domains of activity, according to Isabel Vargues.

What did citizenship mean for the groups concerned? Artisans seem to have transferred old regime conflicts into the new political sphere. They defended corporate privileges, even obscure ones, against liberal laws – from as early as 1809. In Lisbon in 1822, they even asked to have their own representative: they rejected the new elected municipal council, in fact not accepting juridical equality. Another example was the group of petitions from the town of Setúbal against the abolition of the monopoly on salt, organised by the confraternity do Corpo Santo representing the different trades involved in the local salt works. They argued that it was necessary to take into account inequality of circumstances. Could it be right that people should destroy each other based in false equality?

Freedom of the press gave birth to an important political press, as well as the wide dissemination of printed works. During the triennium, 112 newspapers were founded, of which 71 were political. Their longevity varied, many ran for less than 10 issues. The press could also be used as a counter power, some papers being in the hands of absolutists. As has been underlined by Isabel Vargas political terminology was widely disseminated in the public sphere, and as stressed by Javier Fernandez Sebastian also for Spain, major changes took place even in the language used, previously highbrow terms entering now much wider circles. A formative wave had its expression in a number of publications, even in some sections of political newspapers. Specially impressive was this special type of brochure that named itself as political catechisms and manuals, aiming at the civic education of a wide public.

When freedom of the press was again established after the liberal revolution of 1830, for the first time the press acquired a national scale, some newspapers lasted longer, suggesting a wider and larger public was being reached. The connection between newspapers and political groups became clearer. From the late 30's on, restrictions based on political reasons occurred, in connection with moments of quite open conflict between liberal governments and democratic tendencies. Successive measures of tight administrative control, higher taxation and repression of editors by frequent lawsuits and imprisonment became frequent, associated to occasional suspension of constitutional guarantees, all culminating in the law of 1850, known as the law of *das rolhas (caps?)*.

(She didn't have time to discuss freedom of association, so would pass on to the right to vote.) Notwithstanding the restriction based on religion, in her opinion mainly connected to the imperial nature of the Portuguese State, the point is who could be benefit fully of the political rights of citizenship along this whole period from 1820 to 1852 in Portugal. Two different concepts of the source of power were the basis of the abyssal divergence between the Constitutions of 1822, that of 1838 and their respective election laws on one side, and the Constitutional Charter of 1826 on the other side. The conflict between the two political conceptions behind these constitutional laws was central, and became overt in the 30's, after the liberal revolution of 1834. This conflict had an European dimension and was crossed by different foreign pressures and overt interventions. The different distribution of power determined the voting system, its object and its scope. Her emphasis here, is that this should be seen as a whole, without isolating the suffrage in itself, as it has been quite frequently the case. Two main guidelines should be followed as regards the voting mechanism, regarding the right to vote and the right of eligibility, and also the election mode, direct or indirect. The object of election is fundamental to seize the power of the vote, whether one chamber or two chamber system, and in this case the nature of the second chamber, whether elected by the

citizen or nominated by the Crown. The debate that began in this period, echoed through the whole XIX.th century till the 1st Republic. Some historians who have studied only the period after 1852 have lately forgotten this. It is important to remake the lost connections.

In the 1820's, Nation is defined as the basis of all power, represented by one elected assembly. A model inspired by the Cadiz constitution, and like the Southern European revolutions of the 20's, not in at all in consonance with the dominant political systems in Europe. The suffrage had a wide scope in the Election law before the *Constituintes,* in the new Constitution as well as the electoral law of 1822. In the future, actually not defined, illiterates above 25 years old, that were under 17 years in 1822, would be excluded. (This can be seen as a stimulus in the fight against illiteracy). And in both electoral laws that applied the rules of this constitutional's text, that is in 1822 and in 1836, illiteracy was not a criterion of exclusion. The main exclusion was that of women. It is interesting to underline that property, so relevant in the Declaration of Individual rights had no explicit place in the right to vote, only in eligibility. Interesting is the inclusion of "libertos" (liberated slaves), and their children. It is usually obliterated, that this law is nearer the masculine universal suffrage than the later electoral law of 1878, which was actually of limited scope, as it coexisted with a nominated second chamber.

As regards eligibility, the established level of economic resources demanded seemed a sufficient filter to guarantee moral autonomy. Eligibility conditions according to elections laws of the whole period and actually till the 1st Republic, only varied on the resources' level and the basis of their evaluation, with one exception except, the electoral law of 1836.

The Constitutional Charter of 1826, implemented for the second time in 1834, under Pedro IV's leadership, with both the support of England and France, defined a dual source of power shared between Crown and the people with consequences in the concept of citizenship. This model was clearly inspired by the English and French monarchy. The access to vote and the bicameral system defined in the Constitutional Charter of 1826 represented a strong limitation of the rights of citizenship, as citizens only could choose the lower Chamber, whose decisions were then submitted to the second chamber, nominated by the Crown. More, the moderating power attributed to the Crown, and the veto system unbalanced the partition of power in an unfavourably direction for the citizen. Some important international questions, as treaties, belonged to Crown's exclusive power. This was a fundamental problem at that time, the treaty of 1810 signed with England standing as a dark cloud over Portugal. Both eligibility and the right of vote were based in individual resources, indirect elections restricting even more the access to vote. The *libertos* or freed slaves had of course lost the access to vote.

The election law of October 1836, following the September Revolution, strangely a forgotten text, allowed for the widest electoral universe ever considered during the whole Constitutional Monarchy and even of the 1st Republic. It comprises no resources selection at all, the universe of voters being equal to that of eligible citizens, and naturalized foreigners could both vote and were eligible. The September Revolution of 1836 involved mostly urban middle classes as well as also lower popular strata and used the Constitution of 1822 as a banner. But after two years in power, they were obliged to compromise with the chartists in the Constitution of 1838, the pressure of England being quite relevant. It brought back the right to vote based on the resources, though at a lower level than established in the Charter, and established also a bicameral system. The elective or nominated nature of the second chamber, fundamental in the distribution of power between the Crown and the citizen became the focus of the final constitutional debate. In was in this context, that the upheaval of 1838 in

Lisbon, which involved the National Guard, took place and that a *plebeian* and radical press made its appearance, bringing about a critical approach on dominant conceptions of citizenship. Masculine universal suffrage was sustained and even the republican ideal, though in cautious terms. This radical current did not disappear in 1840. It supported the movement of the *A Coalisão*, that brought together all the different political forces against the coup of Costa Cabral and its reposition of the Constitutional Charter without reform. Their involvement in the civil war of 1846-1847 needs to be elucidated. This war culminated the strong fight since 1836 between those in favour of the constitutional Charter of 1826 and all those who were against it, whether just favouring its reform or its replacement. It even associated the more moderate absolutists that by then accepted the new rules of the liberal State. The *A Coalisão* lost its battle in the military field in 1847. But not completely at the political level.

There was a clear link between the radical press of 1838-1840 and the new wave of republican and socialist outburst in 1848, under the influence of the February Revolution in France. It is quite obvious not only from an ideological point of view, but also because of the figures are involved. The six clandestine newspapers openly republican were in favour of universal suffrage, social justice, the right to work, now associated openly to the idea of Fraternity, which was quite absent before. All this came together with a pro-Iberian spirit and of international solidarity. It would take around four decades for these new ideals to spring out from small intellectual circles and some cultivated artisans, to a wider population, into the middle classes and the working - class.

A stable and moderate compromise of the spirit of 1822 and the Constitutional Charter of 1826 was achieved in 1852, in the Additional Act, perhaps the republican danger approaching monarchists. Both constitutionalists and chartists made important concessions to achieve this compromise, that stayed on the whole unchanged till the end of the monarchy in 1911. In the act of 1852, elections became direct, the access to vote became based in taxation, not in resources, and international treaties could only be signed by the Crown after being approved in the *Cortes*, which was not the case before. This was a main question at that time.

To conclude: The path of liberalism and democracy in Portugal from 1820 to 1852 was far from smooth, on the contrary it represented three decades of a very conflicting road. Besides the expectable opposition of absolutists, that took the form of a open civil war and then of a sort of hidden civil war in rural areas, as shown by Fátima Sá, a longstanding opposition between reformist chartists and the democratic current was at the origin of a urban political revolution in 1836 and a civil war in 1846-47, among other signs of discontent. The main lines of the political debate of this early period regarding the access to the vote and the distribution of power persisted till the end of the constitutional monarchy, specially after 1870.

DISCUSSION

Mark Philp asked whether there was an embarrassment about the language of citizenship, given its associations with the French revolution?
Miriam said not in the 1820s, but in the 1830s it more or less disappeared from use.

Nuno said that he thought corporate bodies loomed large among petitioners to the Congress, though they would later be suppressed.

Miriam The corporations were suppressed in 1834, but not the confraternities, these were later submitted to a light state control as other associations.
Maria Alexandre clarified that so were all other such associations at that time. There was an evolving discussion about what sorts of associations were acceptable in a liberl culture, The merchants were the first association to be recognised by the liberal state **(Miriam** agreed – in the 1830s). In 1861, there was a special law on confraternities, expropriating them.

Michalis asked whether representatives saw themselves as representing their nation, or their locality, and did that change?
Miriam said this was an interesting question, which she hadn't thought much about. They represented the nation first and foremost, but they also represented their localities, sometimes talking in their name. The were required to live in the area from which they were elected.
Michalis thought that the pattern elsewhere for there to be a trend away from representation of the locality.
Nuno said that many MPs intervening in debates in the first parliament claimed to speak for the nation, though the case of Brazil complicated the picture: MPs for Brazil were seen as representing a specific territorial base..
Michalis said this was compatible with trying to speak for local interests in the legislative process.

Diego wanted to explore further the issue of corporate survival in the liberal world. Traditionally petitions came from 'nobility, clergy and people' – this phrase can be found even as late as 1834, in the case of petitions asking for the king to become an absolute monarch: all sorts of people signed these petitions, including women, but as the people, not as citizens. He thought that when women presented petitions, they didn't claim to be citizens.
Miriam said that in this connection she would want to reread petitions by widows of shopkeepers asking to be allowed to keep their deceased husband's right to economic activity.

In the time remaining, she wanted to say something about religion. Most Portuguese were Catholics. In Constitutional Charter, article 145 stated that no one would be prosecuted for a religious opinion. This is said to have been a compromise. She thought the main reason why Catholicism was in effect a state religion until 1911 is connected to the wider imperial space and the need to confine citizenship to Christians.

FINAL ROUND TABLE

Scholars expert in other regions were invited to comment on their overall impressions from the discussion.

Paschalis Kitromilides said that it seemed to him that there had been a remarkable historiographical renewal in the history of Portugal, as a result of a dialogue with the social sciences.
He had learnt much about the Portuguese component of the liberal tradition in Southern Europe. He had been struck by many parallels with countries emerging from Ottoman rule. From the evidence presented here and from the comparisons it suggests, we are in a better position to develop a comparative history of Southern Europe. He said he awaited the next project volume with interest.

Idriss Jebari said he had known little about the history of Portugal until two days ago. His own expertise is in North Africa. He had been struck by many parallels between the courses history took in Portugal and Morocco. The nineteenth century was for both states a period which saw the formation of modern politics, and proto-nationalism.
Three points of comparison or contrast had particularly struck him:

- The role played in the dynamic of change by external pressures. North Africa came under pressure from the west. In Portugal, there seemed to be more domestic pressure for a new form of politics.
- The role played by the circulation of ideology in making sense of events. Different actors competed to disseminate their understandings.
- The reconfiguration of power was associated with the emergence of new actors, especially 'the people'. This made the question of how 'the people' were conceptualised very important. At the same time, traditional actors like the Church were becoming less important.

Paolo Benvenuto thanked everyone for their company during the previous couple of days. He wanted to focus two points:

- The need to link practice and languages. He thought it might be useful to think in terms of the weight of tradition bearing on practice, while language provided a tool for trying to challenge or recast traditions. The reinvigoration and changes in meanings associated with petitioning represented an interesting case in point. Petitioning also became very common in Italy in this period. During the 1840s, universities became important centres of petitioning. Professors linked up with notables in the cities to promote petitions.

- Changes in language were very interesting. Sometimes old terms were given new significance, sometimes new terms were coined. There were parallel processes in Italy. The liberal Catholic philologist Mazzeo represents an interesting case: his revolutionary memoirs record his endeavours in the era of the Roman republic (ie 1849? Or ancient??) .

Michalis Sotiropulos said that he had been reflecting on the theme of similarities and differences, and wanted to pick up on a theme Joanna Innes had raised earlier, about what significance should be attached to contingency, during a long revolutionary moment, in a Europe increasingly subordinated to northern great powers. Clearly there were common themes, yet at the same time experience differed: events intersect with languages; all revolutions feed on circumstances. Continuity vs change is a fake dilemma: there are always elements of both.
He would particularly like to know more about processes of state formation in different countries. He thinks that historians have stopped problematising this, but it's a topic of central importance, which intersects with many others, including religion and representation.

Florencia Peyrou said that it had been very interesting, and she was sorry that she hadn't been able to attend on the first day. Clearly there are grounds for comparison, and the network provides encouragement to think about this. There is also clearly space for a transnational perspective. We need to understand connections; how images circulated; what use people made of the models provided by developments elsewhere.

In relation to how democracy took shape in southern Europe, she saw spaces of sociability as important. Civil society preceded democracy, but was an instrument of politicisation. She herself is especially interested in plebeian societies: how they constructed an identity from their experiences, even in the absence of a formal discourse of democracy. Interesting too was the question of what kinds of politicisation took place? What were the contingent paths that people followed towards democracy?

Of course, these have to be considered in relation to other sites of politicisation. The national militia has also played an important part in the formation of modern democracy, in Spain too – not in a teleological sense, but in the sense of having been important in one phase in which definitions of democracy emerged, especially more pluralistic ones. The concept of the 'nation in arms' was a communitarian one, which seems to have been modified as conceptions of the nation changed

The Church also played an important part in shaping conceptions of a democratic social order. Religion didn't present a problem, but the Church did. State-Church relations differed from place to place in ways mediated by historical context, eg in terms of ways in which reactionary movements related to the Church.

Citizenship is another important topic. We know something about how it was conceived by liberals, radicals and republicans, but less about how it was conceived by the people, about how discourses of citizenship were received. But this is a hard topic to research.

At a more general level, she was also interested in conceptions of the relationship between individual, community and state, in tensions between participation and security, and choices between direct and mediated participation – tensions which are present in all democratic discourses.