Mediterranean democracy, Year 2

Madrid, 10-11 April 2014

Casa de Velazquez

Present (indicating areas of main interest): Marcella Aglietti (comparative history of political/.parliamentary institutions, esp Spain and Italy); **Mónica Burguera** (cultural esp women's history); **Gonzalo Butrón** (political history esp c1820s); **Gonzalo Capellán** (political thought and conceptual history); **Jesús de Felipe Redondo** (history of labour, republicanism); **Carmen de la Guardia Herrero** (political and cultural history); **Héctor Domínguez** (James Bryce); **Javier Fernández Sebastián** (conceptual history); **Carlos Ferrera Cuesta** (theatre); **Javier Lopez Alos** (political concepts, anti-modern trends); **Stephane Michonneau** (memory and nationalism); **Darina Martykánová** (comparative Spanish-Ottoman history); **Juan Pan-Montojo** (economic policies); **Florencia Peyrou** (popular political culture, democracy, republicanism in Spain and transnationally); **Romy Sánchez** (Cuba); **Juan Luis Simal** (history of liberalism, exiles); **Pablo Sánchez León** (concepts and action); **Guy Thomson** (Mexico and Andalusia)

Specialists in other places: Arthur Asseraf (North Africa); **Michael Drolet** (France); **Mauro Lenci** (Italy); **Constantina Zanou** (Greece).

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

Apologies, or expressed interest but couldn't make it: Jose Alvarez Junco, Teresa Calderon, Marta Lorente, Carlos Malamud, Antonia Pena, Juan Pro Ruiz, Pedro Rujula, Adrian Shubert, Maria Sierra, Jordi Vernet, Louise Zbiranski, Rafael Zurita.

DAY I: PRACTICES

INTRODUCTORY

Stephane Michonneau welcomed all participants to the Casa de Velazquez

Eduardo Posada Carbo also bid everyone welcome and gave thanks to the Casa de Velazquez, Stephane and Florence Peyrou for their support and assistance in organising the meeting.

He explained that the Re-imagining Democracy project had originated in 2004 and had initially looked at the wider Atlantic world. The first part of the project had been informed by three main ideas: that during the period, 'democracy' moved from being a learned term to becoming a more popular one, coming to play a part in the way in which the modern world was understood; that it was more fruitful to focus on how contemporaries used the word than to read modern expectations backwards; that a diffusionist model was not appropriate: though there were certainly rough parallels in developments in different places, each country developed its own set of associations between the word, meanings and practices.

Now the project was in a three-year phase, funded by the Leverhulme Trust, exploring concepts, meanings and practices within the Mediterranean. In this context 'the Mediterranean' was widely understood, meaning especially southern Europe (where the official project partners were all based) but incorporating the Ottoman and North African. world. There was no intention to suggest that this was a homogenous region; the object was rather to explore in an open-minded way commonalities and differences. Perhaps the most striking common feature was that all these nations operated in a geo-political context

increasingly dominated by northern Great Powers. Each country had to struggle to assert national sovereignty in an international context, at the same time that it grappled with the new conceptions of popular sovereignty.

He noted that in the Spanish case, the conceptual historiography was already well developed, thanks to the work of Javier Fernandez and his collaborators.

He noted that those present included guests who were specialists in other regions and who had participated in meetings of the project elsewhere; their role was to add a comparative dimension.

LANGUAGES

Session 1: Pablo Sanchez Leon, Nameless Democracy, Feared Multitude: Conceiving Disorder and Citizenship in the Riot of Esquilache (1766) and its aftermath

He said that the theme of his paper would be a shift from the definition of democracy by default to invocation by exclusion. [Is this what you said? I'm not quite sure how it fits with what follows, if so].

C18 Spain was in the difficult position of having lost its pre-eminence. After the War of the Spanish Succession, it ceased to be a hegemonic power. Spain was seen as irrational and unpredictable, eg by Montesquieu, such that external surveillance was needed. But within Spain perceptions differed. The monarchy had survived. During the Baroque period, the spectre of decadence was haunting; in the enlightenment, people set about overcoming it. In this context, Machiavelli was reappraised. In the 1730s, his ambiguity was pointed out – was he in favour of tyranny or democracy? Spain was seen as a rare phenomenon, in that it had decayed as an empire and yet survived as a political entity. Efforts were made to identify the conditions that had led to the glorious past, esp the Siglo d'Oro. Conceptions of democracy developed in this framework.

A literature came into being that developed new theories of the moral roots of human action: in commerce, in accordance with natural law. Political economy spoke to these ideas. It brought a new vocabulary, revolving around such concepts as value, wealth, trade and labour.

Pedro Rodriguez Campomanes (1723-1802) re-worked Montesquieu. He considered the characteristics of democracy in that context. He said that equality might be useful for survival, but monarchies needed a different base, a hierarchical one. He developed a theory of emulation as necessary for monarchy in a commercial society. In this context, the market was conceived as the source of regeneration; the interested individual was good. The king was the first citizen. He also argued in favour of patriotism, which he saw as a matter of aggregating individual interests so as to arrive at the common good. Vassals needed to become citizens. He diagnosed a vicious lack of unity among Spaniard, linked to their heritage of decadence, and associated exaggerated attachment to old ways. Doux commerce had the potential to serve as an instrument of moral change.

Even higher level bureaucrats were influenced by these ideas. Under Charles III, they accordingly reorganised exports and food supply. In 1765, a new system designed to promote internal supply of food was introduced. The idea was that if vassals were allowed to follow their interests, that would bring commercial virtue. However, in 1766 a grain shortage accompanied attempts by Esquilache to promote a new dress code: traditional capes and hats were said to be inappropriate to a civilised society. This precipitated rioting in Madrid, echoed in other major cities. The house of the Marques was attacked, as was the personal

guard of the King. There were demands that the minister resign, and that the law should be repealed.

In a European context, such a popular reaction against enlightened reforms was exceptional – when reaction came, it was usually later in the policy cycle, not right at the start. The effect was to discourage moves to empower the lower social orders. Though this was in no way a republican movement, it did represent a politics from below. What evidence we have of the discourse of riots shows them reorienting the language of commercial society. They didn't demand elections of magistrates. Official accounts of the events were also not cast in terms of democracy: the episode was not seen as an instance of popular government, but of plebeian violence.

However, the concept of democracy did surface in the aftermath, in the context of repression. The Conde d'Aranda favoured a balanced and mixed constitution – drawing on the traditions of Aragon, from which he came. 'Democracy' was invoked in association with 'aristocracy'. Aranda dreamed of restoring a system of parliaments at central and local level. In 1768, he introduced alcaldes, and sindicales de commune. This was linked to his efforts to revive old institutions of participation. He published a *Discourse on Politics* to justify his aim of reinvigorating popular confidence. As he saw it, oligarchies had taken hold of all offices belonging to the commune. Alcaldes were judges (not tribunes) who were to be elected by male labourers. Their function was to preserve order. Sindicales were representatives of the commune, but only in relation to consumption: they left core decision-making untouched. This was not a venture in citizenship-building, but an attempt to incorporate people more effectively within corporate structures. When revolutionary juntas were established, one of their first acts was often to remove alcaldes, who were associated with the control of economic and social space. These initiatives were rooted in ideas of government as police – as discussed eg by Daniel Gordon, *Citizens without sovereignty* (in relation to France). The idea was to harmonise interests.

It is notable however that there were other institutions that he did not seek to revive, such as guilds, and corporations of nobles. Privileged companies, associated with consulates, extended over 80 ports. There were also societies called Amigos des Pais, who focussed on mutual recognition as citizens, and who created new roles for the middle classes.David Ringrose has charted changes in Spanish social structure.

Renteria's Discourses (*Discursos que don Joseph Agustin Ibañez de la Rentería presentó á la Real Sociedad Bascongada de los Amigos del País en sus juntas generales de los años de 1780, 81 y 83*), published in 1790, revived the debate on the best form of government. He proposed that at the local level only the wealthiest should hold power, but that they should be subject to election, to put a stop to the monopolisation of such offices by particular families or factions. He called this democracy, and a university for citizens; he suggested that cities could resemble republics.

Jovellanos similarly argued in the 1780s that confrerias were like small republics, and could be called democracies.

Following on through this train of thought, given the importance of cities in Spain, one can see that it would have been possible to conceive of Spain as taking the form of a democratic monarchy – democracy being reduced to popular participation in the election of magistrates, without erasing privilege as such. There was as yet no notion of popular sovereignty.

DISCUSSION

Joanna Innes wanted to ask some questions setting the story in a comparative context. It seemed to her that often early references to 'democracy' related to offices of government, rather than to legislatures, as in his cases. She was also aware of interest in Madrid in the 1760s, she thought by Campomanes, on what the English did to involve ordinary ratepayers in poor relief administration. In relation to the abolition of privilege, she wondered if there was a fiscal dimension: was privilege seen to be interfering with the efficiency of tax extraction? She had been very struck by the emphasis he reported on trying to incorporate the poor in the aftermath of the riots in Madrid: although this was a period when bad harvests brought public disturbances to many parts of Europe, she wasn't aware of other responses which pointed to a need to incorporate the people more effectively into government.

Pablo said that it was a peculiarity of the Spanish situation that in towns and cities the elite held power but lacked the means of self-organisation: older forms of representative institution not been summoned for a very long time. The corporation of nobles in Madrid was among those who apologised in the aftermath of the riots. Aranda's group promoted debate about the role of nobles: it was suggested that they should be able to become merchants. But this failed. It proved impossible to invent a new social role for the nobility. They didn't have a place as such in city government.

Patriotic writers were in a sense backward-looking, stressing corporate roles. Their idea was that subjects were first and foremost members of communities, which functioned as systems of control. Yet at the same time they worried about guilds as obstacles to prosperity.

If there was no role either for nobles or guilds, though, then what you were left with was an unstructured population. Was this the people? Or the plebs?

Javier Fernandez Sebastian wasn't wholly convinced by the presentation. He wasn't clear that it was helpful to read the riots themselves as a 'nameless democracy'. But he did think that the question of the connection between the local and the national was very important, and the focus of much political discussion, and not just by Renteria: see also the constitutional project of León de Arroyal. The idea was to institute a system of mixed government at the local level.

The next set up upheavals in Spain took place in the 1790s, when there were conspiracies in various parts of the Spanish empire, including Venezuela. (He noted that there were similarly echoes of the Esquilache riots throughout the Spanish monarchy). He agreed with the historians who suggested that the aristocratic party, including even Aranda, were in some way mixed up in these riots.

There were republican upheavals in many places in the 1790s: eg Denmark: there were certain commonalities with the revolt against Struensee. One might say that this period saw the discovery of national politics: prior to that politics was seen as a feature of cities.

Pablo: agreed that the rioters lacked a distinctive language, and didn't have a discourse of democracy. But his point was that they shouldn't be seen just as reactionary: they did represent a bid on the part of the people for a voice. Democracy appeared instead in the context of a discourse of repression. He thought that an alternative discourse of democracy took a long time to take hold. The early date of the 1766 riots meant that they were not usually counted as part of the Atlantic revolutionary process.

After 1789 in Spain the reform process collapsed: there was no more enlightenment project, and therefore a new context for new revolts. It was at this time that the language of democracy became oppositional.

As to central/local: the constitution of Castile was based on cities from C15, but in C18 that had somehow forgotten: that vision of how the polity might be constructed had to be reinvented. The idea that cities always played this role is a retrospective myth.

The French invasion represented a final blow to the nobility: they were seen as having failed to protect the country.

Several questions were collected:

Florence Peyrou asked in what sense did the rioters have a vision of self-government: how did they express this? In relation to the role of municipalities, was it envisaged that even Madrid might form a self-governing municipality?

Javier Lopez Alos said that he found the question of attention to the common good very interesting; he wondered who defined it at central and local levels? He thought this related to the history of the concept of sovereignty in Spain. He also thought that the question of 'police' related to new concepts of legitimacy that had more to do with the centre. He also wondered how people thought about the situation outside the big cities: in smaller towns, or rural areas.

Pablo said there is little documentation of how the rioters talked, though they did produce a statement of principles in 20 articles, which made a case for self-defence and military self-organisation. The riots themselves were clearly a product of coordinated action. Assemblies were held, in which there were debates about whether to accept the King's concessions. When the concessions were ultimately not forthcoming, yet there was no return to collective action. From what we know about their discourse it mixed a critique of favourites and of reforms, using the reformers' language: they said they were not mere consumers. The Jesuits helped to create this discourse. They said that they loved the king, but the king must also love the people.

As to towns: in Spain, each town had a territory of its own; all villages belonged to cities. In 1822, consulates were established in cities. Only Madrid did not have one. But in 1829-30 this system was cancelled. Consulates used merchant law as an alternative to civil law. Madrid was completely different. Madrid guilds were basically guilds of speculators. It was a big city but not a productive city: a rentier city.

Police and sovereignty: Foucault and Agamben would say this was a new development. In a way it represented the opposite of democracy, though at a local level it could entail participation, and so could take on different meanings

He hadn't had time to talk about people like ???Arequipa and Caruso???, who in the 1770s? produced conditions for the notion of opinion: a space in which it was possible to talk about habits and opinions, a precondition for the emergence of representation and public opinion that operates at a national level.

Mauro Lenci noted that the concept of 'royal democracy' developed in the early period of the French revolution. He wondered if anyone in Spain read d'Argenson, whose work, invoking democracy in the sense of government in the general interest, was published in the 1760s.

Pablo said yes; Renteria was familiar with his work.

Session II: Javier Fernandez Sebastian: **Re-Appraising Democracy in Spain: 1808-1849: a waning past, a waxing future**

During the first half of C19, the term 'democracy' underwent profound changes. It was increasingly applied to the present and the future; it acquired more positive connotations, and even came to be seen as inevitable. This patterns of development was common to many places; he would stress elements particular to Spain.

He suggested that 1840 marked a milestone on the road to seeing democracy as inevitable. In Spain, this year marked the end of the Carlist war, the coming to power of Espartero, and the resignation of the regent, Maria Cristina. These events provided a context for some theorising in the press about what democracy was. For example, an article of 1841 discussed the future of democracy in Europe and America. This article proposed that democracy was a western, Christian phenomenon, but that it did not take such a uniform form as Tocqueville claimed. In Andalucia and the Basque country, it suggested, people still yearned for the middle ages; the country people remained true to old customs and traditions, whereas in cities, there was more support for democracy. Spain was an amalgam of different political cultures.

In 1843, the manifesto of the so-called Democratic Party called on people to vote. It harked back to 1810, and thus associated the cause of democracy with that of radical liberalism. Democrats were conceived of as those liberals who had advanced furthest along the path of progress. They sought to persuade people by reason, not violence. However, this manifesto did not make much impact until 1849.

During 1840-3, there were several attempts to define democracy, but not much grandiose theorising. Some attempts were made to historicise Spanish democracy: its origins were suggested to lie in the uprising against Napoleon. It was suggested (1838) that democratic attitudes and practices antedated theory: they lay in the Spanish temperament and tradition, indeed if anything the country was too democratic: the aristocracy was weak, and in consequence, there was a lack of philosophical work, and no obvious ruling class. In this context, democracy was said to 'wield its levelling axe everywhere'. Another commentator decribed Spain as the freest nation in Europe. This became a commonplace from the 1830s. Spain was said to have been egalitarian since time immemorial, as evident from the way people mixed on the streets of Madrid. The traditional political system was described as a democratic monarchy. The Spanish past was often harnessed to such accounts. Struggles against Muslims are said to have had the effect that feudalism never really took root. The proletariat was said to be easily able to participate in government – when in fact it would have been better to restrict government to the most competent.

Democracy was set in a religious context. Equality, liberty and fraternity were said to be in origin gospel maxims. It was suggested that the clergy were largely recruited from among the lower classes and that the Church was democratising. Suarez, Molina and other scholars were noted to have attributed a significant role to the people; some liberals used scholastic tools in the Cadiz Cortes.

1808 was often identified as a starting point in empowering the people – with the effect that it was subsequently hard to exclude them.

He concluded by emphasising the variety of meanings associated with democracy. Even Carlism was sometimes described as a royalist democracy. The same speaker in parliament might use the word in different ways in different speeches, sometimes to refer to crowd politics, sometimes to representative government.

The term was initially mainly political in focus, and might be contrasted with monarchy, but from 1834 uses shifted towards the social, and it was more often contrasted with aristocracy. It was associated with talk about class struggle and with calls for the extension of the franchise.

By the mid 1830s, everyone wanted to use the term. Constitutional liberals for example praised the ordered democracy of the middle classes. The term's ambiguity was noted by mid-century commentators. The founding of the Democratic Party fuelled rather than calmed disputes.

DISCUSSION

Mark Philp suggested a contrast between the social constructions of the 1790s and 1830s. Whereas he thought that the revolutionary contrast between aristocracy and democracy was about parasites vs producers – thus in the writings of Sieyes – he thought that by the 1830s, Tocqueville (while derivative in many respects and owing much to Guizot) popularised the association between democracy and social equality.

Joanna Innes thought it was possible to overstate Tocqueville's importance. It was hard to disentangle his influence from the rise of liberalism, and the development of a critique of liberalism using democratic language when the liberal reforms of the late 1820s and early 30s (e.g. the Reform Act in Britain) were seen as disappointments.

Javier agreed that the meaning changed, but did not think there was an ancien regime discourse of democracy in Spain – or at least, much less of one than in France. By the 1830s, it was linked to socialism. He agreed with Joanna that disappointment with liberalism was important: there was a reaction against the new regime in Spain. He had been surprised to find Larra describing himself as a democrat as early as the mid 1830s, before the term was commonly employed to define political identity. Also said that in fact he saw Guizot as in many respects more important in Spain than Tocqueville – he was cited in some places ten times more often than Tocqueville. The idea of equality of condition was clearly anterior and widespread prior to Tocqueville, as was its association with democracy.

Several comments were collected:

Juan Pan-Montojo questioned whether in the 1840s democracy was understood in terms of class. He thought it related to 'the people', not 'the proletariat'. He thought new modes of understanding followed the establishment of the Second Republic in France – and again following the rise of Napoleon, which stimulated critical reflections on the reliability of the people in democratic systems.

Pablo said that whereas Javier had stressed variety, he thought there were sharper cleavages. Some thought it was good, some bad that the Spanish constitution was democratic. He also thought one should distinguish democracy with and without citizenship: the notion that Spain had a democratic culture did not imply that it offered people citizenship in any meaningful sense.

Michael Drolet said that he thought there was a contemporary discourse in which social equality posed the problem of how to avoid oscillations between anarchy and tyranny – constitutional checks and balances might come into play here. Political participation could be welcomed because it performed the function of getting people to identify with the common good.

Javier Lopez Alos wondered if differences between 1789 and 1830 had to do with differences in conceptions of the 'people'? Were they a multitude, needing government, or were they a populous, potentially self-governing?

Javier FS agreed that 'who are the people?' was the question that all talk of democracy inevitably raised. In response to Pablo

In response to Pablo, he agreed that to understand the full meaning of quotations it is necessary to set them in a particular context, e.g. the idea that the Spain was too democratic was sometimes made by conservative liberals in relation to discussions of the 1837 constitution .

For people, various words were used: sometimes pueblo, sometimes plebe – but the plebe could be talked about approvingly, e.g. in relation to the role they played during the war of independence.

He agreed with Michael Drolet that there were really two different discourses, from the side of government and from the side of society. His intention was to understand the sources, from which clear theoretical understandings did not often emerge.

He observed that the phrase democratic monarchy was first used in Cadiz in a constitutional framework: it was then seen as a form of rule. In the 1830s and 40s, by contrast, emphasis was more on society.

Session III: Marcella Aglietti: Democracy in the Parliamentary Discourse of early Spanish Liberals

Her object was to present a semantic map of terms used by Spanish deputies between the end of September 1833 and October 1840: that is, during the regency of Maria Cristina, following the end of the attempt to restore absolutist monarchy – until the rise of Espartero An amnesty at the start of this period allowed some exiles to return. Two charters were passed during this time, in 1834 and 1837: both provided for a bicameral Cortes. Under the second, the senate was partially elected. In all there were 8 different legislatures/constitutional congresses during these years. These were years before there was talk of a 'democratic party'.

In 1146 days of session, she had found about 100 occurrences of democracy and cognate terms. She didn't count repetition within a single speech, unless the word was used with different meanings at different points. Clearly then its use was quite limited. Only 40 deputies used the term, most only once or twice; only 7 used it more often, though these were leading politicians, who spoke a lot. They were distributed equally between moderates/conservative and progressive/liberal camps. It was used only 8 times in speeches by ministers. Positive uses predominated over negative: positive c 52, negative 33, neutral 29. Conservative delegates used it negatively, but progressives didn't use it much more positively. Neutral uses included references to it as the spirit of the century. Arguelles varied his use between positive, negative and neutral.

It was most commonly used to denote a generic political principle; next most commonly, a concrete system. More rarely, it was used to indicate a specific political group, or part of the electorate. In 1839-40 it was associated especially with opinion. Antonyms included representative system, monarchy and aristocracy; synonyms included freedom, popular power (meaning the power of the middle classes) and prosperity. Its relation to monarchy was complex. Some blamed democracy for weakening monarchical power; just as many placed the monarchy's legitimacy on a democratic basis. In 1837-40 there was a change of perspective: people invoked the term in defending the modern system of representation. They suggested that monarchy and democracy could co-exist. The antonym was chaos. Olózaga in 1837 said that democracy was inevitable. Universal suffrage was generally criticised. It was presented as opposed to what was just and liberal, and as inevitably a prelude to a republican regime.

She displayed some graphs showing the topics in relation to which the term was used. She noted that most references related to Spain, but sometimes to other countries: about 55% to Spain, otherwise most commonly to France; then the US; the Belgium constitution was not always seen in a positive manner. International examples provided a framework of reference.

DISCUSSION

Constantina Zanou wanted to know if there were any references to modern Italy.
Marcella said she had found a reference only to ancient Rome; of two references to Greece, one was to ancient Greece, one (positive) to modern Greece.

Several comments were collected:

Florencia Peyrou welcomed the presentation as showing the importance of context to understanding terms. She thought that the circulation of models was important: France and the US were clearly two important models, though we needed to know which of their features were being discussed. She thought people disagreed about democracy in relation to whether they conceived of it in 'pure' or 'representative' terms.

Javier FS agreed with the methodological point. He didn't think that there was disagreement about the merits of representation. He thought that those who were most critical of universal suffrage tended to be the most progressive – those who needed to distinguish their position from a still more radical one.

Joanna Innes noted that whereas Javier had suggested a shift towards social meanings, that didn't emerge in Marcella's account. That might be accounted for in terms of the specific context of debate, but she wondered if Marcella could comment. She also wondered if people talked about democracy in relation to war. In the British Parliament in the context of discussions of constitutional reform people argued about whether democracies were more warlike.

Darina Martykánová asked how the relationship between democracy and reason was constructed: was it thought that reason must be established first, in order for democracy to flourish?

Marcella said that certainly her view was that context is very important. Even within short periods of time, different legislatures might foreground different uses. The legislature which prepared the constitution of 1837 found more reason to talk about democracy. She noted that she had looked for the word, not for discussions of related concepts expressed in other ways.

She thought that the question of the circulation of models was very interesting. Those who made the 1837 constitution often had exile experiences behind them, especially in England; they brought ideas about possible models from that experience. And this was a period of high awareness of the larger European scene. Reference to other models was less common in the Restoration period (after 1874). The French example was always cited negatively; the Anglo-Saxon one often positively. Belgium was partly positive. Pure democracy was always a negative concept.

In relation to Joanna's question, she said that although social issues were debated, she had not found the term democracy used in that context. When it wasn't used to refer to a political system, it tended to mean a spirit; it was linked to the modernisation of Spanish society. She

noted that the 1837 constitution granted a number of rights, included freedom of the press and freedom of expression; it also abolished slavery.

In relation to democracy and reason, she said she hadn't found the connection directly made, but it would be possible to look further into discussions of how to prepare people for participation in voting. A different approach might be needed to illuminate this.

There was some further discussion in relation to reason and passion:
Javier FS said that he thought the contrast between reason and passion was crucial, paralleling the contrast people/mass. Spanish doctrinaires took from Guizot the idea of the sovereignty of reason. They had some interesting theories about how reason spread, especially through the middle class. In the 1780s, we find the idea that the monarch must take lights from the people – this is democracy.
Pablo though that reason was a pre-requisite, but that further progress in enlightenment was thought to remain possible. Spanish political economists of the late eighteenth century, eg Jovellanos, were interested in education; they thought that many people were not fit to be citizens as things stood and that that was a moral issue.

Further comments were collected:

Mark Philp asked about their understanding of the US: was it seen positively at a popular level but not by the elite? In the UK at end C18 the US was seen by the elite as a primitive order that would develop along European lines, but could not be taken as a model, whereas those inclined to reform (particularly in more popular discussions) saw it as a model society. By the 1830s the elite view was changing and becoming more favourable, but so too was the popular view: radicals increasingly found the example of the US difficult because of slavery. What were the discourses in Spain – and were they affected by both the North American and the South American experiences?

Michael Drolet said that Guizot's critique of democracy was that sovereignty should not be located either in the people or anywhere else in society, so he located it in reason, and self-interest rightly understood – here he drew on Say.

Juan Luis Simal said in relation to exiles that he wanted to challenge the idea that exiles brought the English model back with them. In the various constitutions the two-chamber system was adopted – but it's not clear that this was a case of people adopting the English model. Discussion of these matters went back to the trienio; there were lots of other possible models, and there was much debate among Spanish liberals about this. He thought England just provided one among other points of reference.

Eduardo wondered whether 100 uses would have marked an increase over an earlier period: was it clear what the trend was over the longer term?

Marcella said in relation to models that the US model was always seen as the most democratic, and it tended to be seen as good in its own terms, but its applicability to Spain was questioned. She hadn't meant to imply that the English model was always positively regarded, but it was seen as more relevant to Spain. In relation to Eduardo's question, she could only talk about the period she had studied; in that context, as her graphs showed, there was no clear trend; rather there were marked fluctuations and peaks.

Session IV: Gonzalo Capellan: 1849 as a turning point in the Public Discussion of the Concept of Democracy in Spain

The major effects in Europe of the 1848 revolutions is well known. In Spain, the first party to include democratic in its name issued its manifesto in 1849. Not enough attention is paid to this moment: it's cited as a milestone, but not systematically examined; historians then tend to jump ahead to the later fulfilment of democratic aspirations. He wanted to suggest that it represented a crucial moment in the language of democracy.

A classic history of the Democratic Party in 1961 tended to equate democracy with republic, but he argued that they were not synonymous. The Democratic Party initially defined itself as both anti-socialist and anti-republican, or at best agnostic about forms of government.

He made three main points:

- That in 1849, theories and practices of democracy changed. A group successfully claimed the name for themselves. They set out to demarcate a particular kind of political space, defined by exclusions. He cited Cortina defining his position in terms of a series of negatives: not socialist; not republican; not revolutionary, and not prepared to ally with Carlists. Those who diverged from the programme were excluded, e.g. Castellar. The Spanish version of a political dictionary translated from the French included the programme of the Democratic party. It stated democracy: this is the ultimate fact of our time and the fact of the future.

- The programme acted as a catalytic force. Democrats saw themselves as embodying a historical trajectory and an expression of the hope for the future that lay within democracy. Through their propaganda they thought they could bring about the future. They even wrote about a 'science of democracy'.

- Guizot's *Of democracy in France*, also published in 1849, was a more significant publication, going through 3 editions in the same year. It was also published in instalments. Guizot wrote very negatively about democracy, but he also portrayed it as unstoppable. This book did even more to make democracy the subject of discussion.

DISCUSSION

Mark Philp said that he wasn't persuaded that having a party successfully claim the name necessarily entailed their determining all understandings of the word. He thought that a comparison with the US Democratic Party might be fruitful.

Gonzalo said his point was that in Spain the name was taken up by a party fighting for a political pace on the left; the meaning that they gave to the term was coloured by the specific disappointments arising from the 1848 experience. He wanted to focus on the moment, rather than to look to far ahead and run the risk of defining its significance retrospectively. The breadth of its programme was important. It did succeed for the moment in setting the terms of debate in parliament.

Several comments were collected:

Mauro Lenci asked how they justified identifying democracy as the final goal from within a monarchical state?

Michael Drolet said that Tocqueville talked about the need for a new science of politics; Saint Somin wrote about the need for a new positive science. He wondered if those who spoke of a science of democracy were influenced by those ideas.

Pablo agreed that the idea of the inevitability of democracy gained force at this time, but thought the analysis was too narrowly focussed on the parliamentary world. Five years later the republicans came to the fore, picking up on elements of the programme, and the democrats were wholly marginalised. Was this just a move within political infighting? What was the wider use in the public sphere?

Guy Thomson suggested that all this emphasis on what democrats weren't might be read as a tactical presentation to a parliamentary audience; it wasn't incompatible with the notion that democracy was really a mask for republicanism. He thought it wasn't surprising that a new party should have emerged in the stalemate in 1848: there was a desire to show that Spanish politics could change gear; the French had provided the example, but this needed to be turned to Spanish use. The democrats attracted a lot of progressives into their camp, which meant that the label probably doesn't convey all the ideas held by those who adopted it.

Joanna asked who was the primary audience for their manifesto/self-presentation: parliament or public? Also, what was the effect of the Napoleonic coup on their thinking – or had they already despaired of France when Louis Napoleon was elected president? She too wondered how they made the case for identifying democracy as the end towards which history was moving.

Florencia did not think that all the people he had cited were clearly democrats: Cortina for example was a progressista. She thought though that in 1849, distinctions between republicans, democrats and socialists were not really so clear (even if people rhetorically made distinctions). The 1849 programme seemed to her to be quite wide open. Pi y Margall would later invoke this programme to say that socialism was possible.

Gonzalo responded to Florencia that she knew most about this, but still, he didn't entirely agree. He thought that they did reject socialism; socialists then had to redefine themselves. As to the question of audience: things said in parliament were available in a wider context. The impact of the programme outside parliament was huge: many writers, workers etc signed. Cortina was not the only one to say the sorts of things he had quoted, but he was himself quoted by others. His own object had been partly to provoke debate about the supposed republicanism of democrats: he thought that Suarez Cortina was wrong to situate them within republicanism. He thought that the idea of a science of democracy was essentially another legitimating strategy. Democracy was said to have its roots in the nature of man, and to make possible the betterment of most people: the American example showed what was possible in a way the ancient republics did not, for America was commercial and modern.

Session V: Monica Burguera: **Rethinking the gendered grounds of democracy in C19 Spain**

She would review recent contributions on women and gender, focussing especially on the sexennio democratic, an important period for the development of discussions of feminism and the woman question.

The cultural turn in politics has encouraged new approaches to gender. New analytical frameworks suggest that identity categories were unstable, and the process of incorporating women more diverse than had previously been assumed. Different liberalisms picked up on different kinds of enlightened conception of women. Constructions of modern citizenship in the context of the developing state led to criticisms of the position of women.

Recent work on late C18 and early C19 has sought to problematise the position of women. Previously the focus was on the exclusion of women, and the effects of the public/private

category. More cultural approaches however have encouraged attention to the diversity of representations and practices. Women had played a central role in tertulias etc. There was a female associative tradition linked to liberalism – in turn growing out of enlightened debates about the effects of the presence of women in sites for the production of knowledge. There were competing presentations of women's intelligence etc, but general acceptance that they had a charitable and educational role. War provided stimulus for a variety of female responses: the public/private distinction broke down in wartime.

The 1837 constitution marked the emergence of a new political class in the course of developing itself, and needing to create a new form of liberal respectable identity. In this context, there developed a discourse about the demoralisation of the working classes, associated also with the creation of stereotypes associated with the working classes, proletarianisation, and working women. Women working outside the home came to be seen as emblems of demoralisation.

Theories were developed about the social economy and social revolution. Civil associations were linked to the idea of an active civil society, which should include all classes and both sexes: organisations developed ladies' sections. Debates developed around women's role in the public sphere, and around tensions between equality and difference. Moderate interest in reforming the constitutions of 1837 and 1845 was linked to a desire to regulate civil society. Increasingly, the focus was on the need for individuals to be able to internalise self-regulating values. In this context there developed the ideal of the civic-minded middle-class lady. Moderate circles close to Maria Cristina defended women's activity in a philanthropic context.

These changes also had an impact on democratic and republic circles. A moral feminist imaginary arose out of Christian philanthropy. Utopian socialists favoured women's 'emancipation'. She said she was not suggesting that democratic language was explicitly linked with this imaginary.

Family remained central to these understandings of society. The discourse of separate spheres became more fixed, in association with a re-emerging Catholic discourse. Still, ideas that women could and should participate remained.

She had tried to show that representation and practices round masculinity and femininity, public and private, profoundly shaped the way in which women could conceive of themselves as citizens. She saw the account that she had given as complicating an older story of the delayed emergence of feminism in Spain.

DISCUSSION

Marcella Aglietti said she had three questions, about citizenship, education and the economic sphere. First, she wondered if there were different conceptions of citizenship at the national and local level?. In Italy, she said, debates around the two spheres were completely different. It was unthinkable that women should participate at the national level, though they might locally. Also, in French historiography it was suggested that mixed public schools played a part in creating new expectations for women. She wondered what was the case in Spain. Finally, she wondered what debates there might have been about women's work, and whether these were framed in terms of tutelage or equality.

Monica said her emphasis had been on social citizenship, not political, so the question of a 'national level' didn't really arise. Education for the two sexes was differentiated: there weren't mixed schools. Public education was only at secondary level. [is this right?]

Joanna asked if women's political participation was not positively advocated, were there instances in which it was evoked to negative effect: to make a mockery of certain positions, as it sometimes was in England? She also wondered if there were instances in which legislation affected women so directly that their lack of a political voice seemed problematic – as in England in the case of laws bearing on women's property rights.

Monica said certainly there were instances in which women's activity was portrayed as a matter of turning the world upside down; she couldn't say if those images were evoked to any particular end. In this period there was hardly any legislation; nor did they feature in constitutional texts. There was debate in 1873 about women's work. There was no civil code until 1889. Education was a big issue. By 1857, the publication education of women in secondary schools was sanctioned. Debates over this had taken shape from the 1830s. She wanted to say however that despite the lack of legislation, there were still changes.

Pablo asked about women as petitioners. Since the basic model is judicial, no reason to exclude them. Participation in wars could give women rights on which they could found petitions: thus, after the Carlist wars, widows and orphans petitioned. on practice without identity – right of petitioning – women are involved. Right of petition is as a subject not as a citizen. Women not just signing petition but initiating them. After Carlist wars have widows and orphans who can petition.

Monica said that many women were involved in petitioning. She thought this was a period in which the political was being redefined.

Several questions were collected:

Michael Drolet asked about the reception of Wollstonecraft, and Le Play's writings on the family.

Mark Philp asked whether letting the crown pass to women prompted debate about there public role. Also if there were any cases of women being executed for having played a public role. And was there an Olympe de Gouge type of discourse asking why, if they can die for the republic they cannot vote for it?

Guy Thomson said that he thought the place of women in secret societies was interesting. The wives of male democratic leaders seem to have had an important place in this world when they revived. He noted that the activities of Anita Garibaldi attracted a lot of attention in Spain. He thought petitioning was important: he thought it provided a context in which women asserted rights in relation to conscription: they argued that those on whom families depended shouldn't be liable.

Arthur Assaraf asked whether women were seen as more pious, and therefore less desirable as liberal subjects?

Monica said that she hadn't found references to Wollstonecraft (**Javier FS** interjected that in 1792, *The Rights of Women* was translated in a Madrid newspaper). Monica said nonetheless she wasn't a common reference. In 1830s when debates resumed then people weren't talking about late 1790s debates. There were however many references to Le Play, on women's mission, education etc.

There hasn't yet been much work on assertion by women in the popular classes. Certainly they were very visible in debates about conscription.

And yes, there were stereotypes of women as pious Catholics. In 1931 debates on women's suffrage, this was a crucial theme.

DAY 2, PRACTICES

Session VI: **Florencia Peyrou**: **Becoming a Citizen, Spain 1818-1840**

She said that she would be floating a hypothesis, which related to methodology. She would propose that in this period citizenship was a form of identity, not yet institutionalised. She suggested that the early nineteenth century saw the development of a civic identity among both urban and rural populations, though it had no legal form. Politicisation took place in the context of both liberalism and absolutism; processes of political mobilisation took place in conjunction with the development of civic discourse.

The years following 1808 were years of intense political experience for many sectors of the Spanish population, in the context of almost permanent threat. This period lasted through the Carlist wars. Exaltados, later called radicals, set up institutions to involve the people in defence, eg the national militia, whose social range included artisans. In the 1820s, the militia was open to all who could pay for their own uniforms; in 1821, town halls started paying for uniforms; in 1822, following the failed counterrevolutionary coup, militiamen were paid salaries. With the outbreak of civil war, the militia was re-established; by 1836, it included 400,000 men. Militia officers were elected.

Many political newspapers appeared, whose aim was to shape public opinion. Javier Fernandez Sebastian has shown that over 300 newspapers were published 1809-14. They were read and commented upon in patriotic societies. Such societies were round in 164 towns 1820-3. Their aim was to instruct people, to control the government and to denounce tyrants. Women and children might also listen to proceedings, in separate rooms. Between 1833 and 1840, a leading role was played by secret societies – whose total number we don't know. Visual means were also employed to focus attention: thus monuments, civic festivities and the theatre. There was a proliferation of discourses on citizenship, conceived as entailing individual liberty, personal security, participation and vigilance. It was supposed to confer dignity and emancipation.

The constitution of 1812 instituted a regime close to universal suffrage, though with three levels of voting. Entitlement to rights was seen to follow from autonomy and capability. Political rights were not seen as a natural right but rather a public function.

The 1820s brought counterrevolution, electoral fraud and the rise of moderatism. In this context, exaltados reconceptualised political rights as natural rights, and increased their stress on vigilance. Many popular sectors became politicised. People found it easy to identify with a discourse which explained economic problems in political terms. Riots and disturbances erupted in the public sphere. The emancipator project was inherited by democrats and republicans. They targeted popular sectors who had been politicised but then excluded after 1837.

She suggested that citizenship was experienced as a particular form of identity. It was not specifically related to voting. This has implications for how democracy was conceived by those who called themselves democrats from the 1840s. Democracy was not a matter of procedure, but something more substantive. Not much thought was given to how to institutionalise it. Rather it was a matter of collective identity: the 'good people'. Inclusion was given more emphasis than liberation. This conception of democracy remained dominant until the 1860s, when alternative understandings developed.

DISCUSSION

Several questions were collected:

Eduardo wanted to know more about the experience of war, both the war against the Napoleon, and the effect of wars in Latin America: 40,000 people returned from wars in Latin America. He also asked about anti-conscription revolts.

Pablo said that he thought something was missing from the account: juntas. They were the most important form of collective action, and people were elected to them from low levels in society. As Florencia had presented it, he thought her story was too top down, too much about educating the people, not enough about empowerment. Opinion could come from the bottom up; government found itself challenged for failing to represent the people. By 1838 we can certainly find complaints that the views of the people are not being effectively expressed. He also thought that ideas of citizenship might be linked to the existence of guilds, eg in Barcelona.

Maurizio wanted to hear more about the Church as a politicising agent, eg at masses where priests talked about the constitution. Some revolutionary sermons told people what it meant to be a citizen. He also wondered what part banquets played.

Florencia said that war was certainly important. When the King returned and abolished the constitution, people said, what of all the blood was shed? She didn't know what impact the wars of Spanish American independence might have had.

Of course juntas are important: in a longer version of the paper she talked about them as providing a model of how to start a revolution. She hadn't meant to tell a top-down story, but rather to emphasise experience. Nor did she mean to categorise people as 'democrats' or 'republicans': these labels had limited use. They had their own ideas, and we need to try to understand these, though lack of source material makes that difficult. She agreed that guilds were important, and said that she thought William Sewell's analysis useful in this connection.

She agreed that the Church was important, as also in the Carlist wars, though it's hard to say to what extent the Church promoted civic discourse.

She doesn't know if there were banquets in the 1820s. (**Javier FS** interjected that there were). There were some in the 1830s, but she thought they didn't involve many people. **Maurizio** said that in Italy a single banquet could involve 500 people. **Pablo** asked who paid. **Maurizio** said that rich people paid.

More questions were collected:

Jesus De Felipe wondered about the applications of the term 'politicisation'. Can one talk about conservative politicisation? How about depoliticisation: what might there be to say about that? It seemed that the masses were sometimes mobilised and sometimes not, so politicisation wasn't a one-way process.

Mark Philp wanted to know more about more conservative forms of organisation. He thought politicisation might not be a very helpful term: it was unclear what it involved. Did it imply people having certain ideas? Or just the expectation that they would play a role. He noted that the term was applied not only to people but also to spaces, issues, practices, institutions, etc: what did it mean in that context?

Juan Pan-Montojo wondered if it was useful to talk about an urban-rural gradient. Much of her discussion was urban in focus. counterrevolutionary and loyalist mobilisation were very widespread: perhaps one needed a dialectical form of analysis to understand what was going on, at how people learnt and then deployed vocabularies of 'right and liberties'. He agreed that politicisation was a problematic term. He would prefer to talk about the creation of a national political horizon. Communities already had traditions of local political action.

Arthur Asseraf wanted to build on the idea of counter-revolutionary politicisation, which he thought was especially interesting. How can we understand mobilisations against citizen's rights?

Javier FS said he was wondering about her approach to citizenship as a form of identity. How was that different from thinking of it as a status – setting aside the question of whether or not one was talking about a legal status. He was reflecting on a pamphlet which discussed citizenship in terms of extending nobility. He thought that a distinctive feature of the Spanish context was the importance attached to the status vecinidad, the member of the local community. That phrase appeared more often in the constitution. Holding this status conferred a right to vote locally.

Michael Drolet wondered whether there were notions of human character implicit in citizenship discourses? He thought conservative forces developed their own models of the desirable human personality: law-abiding, pious. These were the traits they sought to cultivate.

Joanna wanted to know more about the forms that 'vigilance' took in practice.

Florencia said in relation to politicisation, that she conceived of it not in terms of particular ideas, but as a matter of acting politically. She thought one of the crucial effects of wars was to bring the national horizon into view. She had focussed on the liberals because she wanted to look at the construction of democrats, but of course there were also processes of absolutist politicisation: absolutists also provided opportunities to act politically. She said that there was no legal status of citizen at this time, but that did not mean that it could not be a social identity. (**Pablo** objected that one could be political without conceiving of oneself as a citizen. **Joanna** noted concern running through comments about categories, both politicisation and citizenship).

In relation to depoliticisation, she agreed that politicisation was sometimes made to sound like a one-way process. She said when she went to Cambridge and met Gareth Stedman Jones, her first question to him had been how to understand depoliticisation.

She said that there was a project currently running in Andalusia on rural democratisation in late C19-early C20, in association with John Markoff. There was certainly a rural politics during the Restoration.

In relation to vigilance, she said that it could entail denouncing people to patriotic societies: the idea was that citizens should denounce people. It was also associated with discussing and approving laws.

A final set of questions were collected:

Javier LA wondered if citizenship as identity had any implications in institutional terms and in terms of the production of law.

Darina Martykánová thought that making complains about political matters, including by such formal means as petitioning did not entail identifying oneself as a citizen: this happened in the Ottoman empire too.

Javier FS said that he thought vigilance had a role in relation to the Cadiz constitution, which did not provide for a constitutional court. In that context, the Cortes received complaints about infractions of the constitution. The public was imagined in this context as an Argos, with 1000 eyes.

Florencia thought democrats didn't think much about institutions, so weren't so concerned with those implications. Their impulse was rather to occupy the streets.
In relation to the question of complaint, that might not suffice, but in the context she was discussing that was only one element in a more complex process.
Recognition of some rights at a local level had a significant impact on people's consciousness, she thought.

Session VII: Carlos Ferrera: Theatre as a Stage for Democracy in C19 Spain

Theatre was an important leisure activity, accessible to everyone, even the illiterate. Plays were acted in upper and middle class homes, also on coffee houses, and in sites in the countryside: thus some farmers arranged a play to celebrate events the first anniversary of constitution of Cadiz. Liberals saw the theatre as a tool with which to educate the population, and as a school for manners, especially given the fragility of the educational system. Sentimental comedies, for example, suggested a moral: that compassion was good. Emotion was attached to the distinction between good and evil; a happy ending meant the restoration of community values. Absolutists used it too.

From late C18, the speech hierarchy was broken by the variety of performances; the commercial theatre thrived. Different political groups struggled to control this as other spaces. In 1814, the council of Murcia decided to convert theatres into primary schools. During the trienio, there was a debate about exclusion. Performances were forbidden at Easter on the whole, though during unstable periods, such as the Trienio, demands increased in order to widen the schedule. Likewise, rural troupes were usually excluded from urban theatres, reserved to the urban ones. However they also fought to get the permission connecting it with freedom, and, in fact, they performed when government control loosened.

A new law allowed the erection of halls in all provinces.

During the war, news was announced in the theatre. Participation was encouraged: the audience sang patriotic songs, eg Riego's song. Political community was associated with unanimity of opinion. When artisans song, ladies in the boxes were required to join in. According to Ridolfi, democratic thinking was encouraged by the sentimental environment. The theatre could convey ideas about: participation; the role of the people; relations between monarchs and subjects; the idea that the people had innate values. Absolutists might be unsympathetically portrayed. Members of the lower classes might perform high class characters. In 1831 it was ruled that theatres should not incite political passions. As a school for manners, the theatre suggested ways of thinking and acting, There was continuing dispute about whether or not it functioned as a civilising institution. Some democratic leaders wrote plays, also intended to improve manners according to the Enlightenment ideal.

From the 1860s, the theatre became extremely popular.

DISCUSSION

Several questions were collected.

Florencia thought that the question of depoliticisation could be pursued again in this context. Even when there was repression, people could still sing the Marseillaise in the theatre. The revolution of 1854 started in the Plaza de Toros.

Juan Luis Simal asked whether propaganda plays were set in the past as well as in the present. – have you analysed the plays with democratic intent in terms of setting the plays in

the past or the present. Lots set in olden times. Those set in the present might need different strategies.

Pablo though that the topic needed to be set in a wider context. In the 1830s, the conservatives won the final battle to defined the limits of romanticism, against Quintana, a politically active radical. Conservative politicians became poets, with an emphasis on channelling emotions – they reacted against the suicide of Larra; they thought that the romantic vision had to be moderated. The conservative line was that art is for entertainment, otherwise we are back to the age of Robespierre.

Carlos said plays were very diverse; some related to the past, some very clearly and critically to the present. To Pablo he said he thought that there was room for argument about who won, but in C19 Europe censorship was generally strong, though there were also many strategies for evading it.

Several questions were collected:

Marcella said that in France, esp 1791-3, there was a big debate about actors and citizenship. Was there something similar in Spain? Also in the later C19 there were plays against caciques [local political bosses]; this was a period when the parliamentary system was being relegitimated. Was there anything similar in early C19?

Eduardo: wasn't sure quite what claim was being made about the relationship between democracy and the theatre. To what extent was the word used?

Jesus wanted to know whether audiences reacted in ways playwrights intended. Also, was theatre purely urban?

Carlos said that the period saw an improvement in the condition of actors, who came to be seen as symbols of liberty. As to caciques, he didn't know. Certainly there were portrayals of people talking about politics, eg under a tree in a village

As to the word democracy, he hasn't seen many references to it. It was seen as a polluted word, related to the French revolution.

Theatre wasn't just urban: there were travelling actors

The study of audiences is in its infancy. However, this was a period of revolution in the theory of the theatre, associated with sentiment: the idea was that people must commit to the play. He thought there was very strong participation.

Jesus said he would like to know more particularly how the audience responded to political messages.

A final set of questions was collected:

Constantina said that she was interested in Pablo's point about connection between romanticism and conservatism. She knew the Italian and Greek cases better. There neo-classicism and romanticism were connected with nationalism and liberalism. Could he say more about interconnections between artistic schools and politics?

Michael Drolet wondered how opera fitted into the story.

Guy Thomson said that in the 1850s and 60s, travelling companies of actors sometimes played important parts in local democratic uprisings.

Carlos said that he didn't know much about opera in this period. In the second half of the nineteenth century, it was said to be identified with the aristocracy. In the first half of the century, it was quite common though to have music on the ordinary stage. Performances were very diverse, and might also include dancing.

To Guy, he said that he didn't have much information about this. City halls were rented to actors in return for their making donations to local charities. In Madrid, there was a hospital for actors, but actors who performed only in rural areas were not admitted.

Pablo responded to Constantina. He said that theorists of art assumed that Spain had a democratic structure. There was a theory that, if you were not to have anarchy, you needed poets who could channel popular feeling, to maintain the constitution. In the 30s, it was argued that the theatre should be depoliticised, so as to promote public morals; the idea was that in the trienio, expectations had been too exalted.

Carlos said that he didn't agree. There were always two sides to debate, even in C18..

Session VIII: Jesus de Felipe: Democratic Unions. Democratic Practices among unionized Spanish Workers 1840-60

He said that organised workers and democrats shared political conceptions. These were: that all productive workers were citizens, and should have corresponding rights. Workers' associations could be described as democratic: certainly they were organised in a democratic way. They aspired to democratic control of social and economic relations.

But did these experiences encourage workers to support democrats? Most didn't until the late 1850s in Spain. This was later than elsewhere

Workers understood their associations as voluntary associations of free individuals defending their common interests and rights. They saw association as a natural right, and they ruled their own associations. These came into existence in the 1820s. They incorporated workers from different trades, and broke with old corporative traditions. Members were required to participate, and to choose committee members etc.

From the 1830s, liberal leaders promoted friendly societies, which they saw as promoting moral values. However, they came to realise that they also promoted social disorders, in that they served as trade unions. Between 1844-54 they were therefore subjected to various restrictions.

The ideology of unions and friendly societies was similar. Unions aimed to defend workers' dignity as free citizens in a workplace setting. They proclaimed that they wanted to 'make owners recognise workers as free citizens, not slaves'. Their rules aimed to encourage civilised behaviour. The need to try to negotiate with owners was stressed. If negotiations failed, then workers were enjoined to leave the workshop, but to maintain peaceful conduct.

From the late 1840s, democrats promoted associations among workers with a view to recruiting them as democrats. Some began to participate in the early 1850s, but many saw universal manhood suffrage as irrelevant. By the late 1850s, most were indifferent or hostile.

In 1854, Garrido said that workers were the best sellers of democratic newspapers. But it was said that the majority of the Catalan working class had no sympathy for 'democracy'. They preferred the progressistas.

He asked, what were the historical meaning of these associative experiences? What conceptual framework should we use to understand them? And what ideas about political participation and representation shaped workers' actions?

He suggested that workers saw progressive politicians as good representatives for them During periods of progressive rule, they sent manifestos identifying themselves as liberal citizens, defending their rights of association. They didn't see themselves as needing to vote, or have their own party. The society of weavers of Catalonia, the ATV, even allowed a non-worker to serve as director of their association: they thought it was sufficient that he as an honest citizen. They saw representation as a function: the question was who would perform it well He suggested that they distinguished between the social and economic spheres on the one hand, the political on the other. The role of political institutions, as they saw it, was to preserve individual freedoms. They rejected state intervention in labour issues. Progressives in Barcelona included workers on their electoral lists from 1854 – a symbolic act. Progressive authorities 1840-3 tolerated unions, whereas moderates in power from 1844 suppressed them. Therefore in 1854 they supported the progressives.

They did participate in politics, but not through the suffrage. They joined para-military organisations to defend individual rights. From the 1850s the national militia incorporated members of the popular classes. They saw this as the best way of participating in the political regime and shaping its character: they aimed to be watchful citizens.

The ATV was the first union in Spain and a model for others. Their first meetings were held in militia local headquarters In 1841, the ATV circulated militia members asking them to support people who favoured their association.

Why then did workers and democrats converge in the late 50s? After 1854 progressive politicians were initially pro labour, but from 1855 a conservative tendency developed within the progressive government; the right to associate was no longer recognised, and workers were excluded from the national militia in Barcelona. Unionised workers began to think they needed to intervene in politics to defend their interests. They began to see suffrage as crucial– and so to approach those advocating universal suffrage. During labour conflicts in 1856, they began to ask for the right to vote, and approached the democrats in that connection. They collaborated with them on the establishment of the first union newspaper.

He concluded that the associative experience of workers had no democratic implications in and of itself. It was only when progressives' actions didn't fulfil expectations that they began to see their associative experience as the basis for a democratic politics.

DISCUSSION

Several questions were collected:

Eduardo wanted to know whether the Church played any role in organising workers? He thought the workers' situation might well have given rise to a variety of political visions.

Michael Drolet said that he was interested in the drawing of distinctions between the economic and social and the political sphere – a theme which had also come up in discussion of Florencia's paper. He wondered if the language of interest, deriving from political economy, facilitated the making of this distinction. He wondered how they were then yoke together again: when they supported the democrats, what understanding of the relationship between economics and politics were they working with?

Pablo noted the disjunction identified: you could have democratic practice without a discourse about democracy – as presumably also democratic party politics without a democratic culture. It seemed to him that the kind of language they were using – a language of 'good men' and 'honesty' was the language of the guilds. The guilds survived until the 1830s in Barcelona, and had a lasting influence even on liberal political culture.

Florencia thought his distinction between progressives and democrats was problematic; between 1840 and 43 at least there was no clear distinction. Even when the democratic manifesto was drawn up in 1849, it is not clear that those involved saw themselves as founding a separate party. Rather, they saw themselves as the true progressives, and hoped to democratise progressivism. As late as 1854, the democrats supported Espartero. Only after that was there a clear separation.

Jesus said that the church didn't play any role – or not in the 1840s; only at the end of C19. (**Eduardo** reported that in Colombia the church was already involved with unions in the 1840s).

To Michael he said indeed, workers operated with a notion of interest. Collective negotiations represented for them a way of pursuing their common interest compatible with individual freedoms. He didn't think that changed in the 1840s, though from the 1860s it did. Then groups of organised workers began to see society as having its own life and laws, and reconceived the relationship between state and society.

To Florencia he said yes, she was right: there was no democratic party as such in the 1840s. Before then, though the democrats had a distinct identity, but within a larger group. A distinct party began to arise in the 1850s partly because of support from the labour. movement, but even then lines were fluid.

To Pablo he said that he didn't agree that the workers' discourse had pre-liberal elements. He said that he discussed this issue in his book. He sees no connection between the guilds and the unions. Guilds lost their prerogatives in Spain during C18, though they had some residual, social presence in Barcelona till the 1830s. There were fraternities of journeymen in the 1830s, but these were again different from the unions which appeared in the 1840s.

Pablo asked if there weren't elements of protectionism in their perspective?

Jesus said no, he thinks that they formulated their arguments in liberal terms: they thought that the role of the state was to protect Spanish citizens.

Further questions were collected:

Mark Philp said that he thought his paper delivered a salutary message: what we see as antecedents, in terms e.g. of patterns of organisation, do not necessarily amount to necessary and sufficient conditions for the things we see as arising from them. We shouldn't operate with the expectation that people will see the patterns of action they adopt in one context as relevant to all contexts. It may be that the national arena just didn't seem very important to them. Perhaps initially unions were seen in mainly instrumental terms, and only later was their organisation seen as expressing certain political values. But he thought that later interpretive move needed explanation.

Guy Thomson asked if there was a link between friendly societies and unions from the 1820s? He noted that in Barcelona friendly societies seem to have survived the return of absolutism. He also wondered how clandestinity was regarded: was there a tension between that and liberal values?

In relation to the Church, he agreed that in the second half of the nineteenth century workers were touched by anti-clericalism, but thought this was less marked in early C19. He said that in Andalusia he found priests involved in lay organisations. Similarly, religious processions could be exploited by lay groups as a way of occupying public space.

Javier FS said in response to Florencia that he agreed that boundaries between different political groupings were blurred. Nonetheless, from their first manifesto in 1843, democrats emphasised the differences between parties – their sense of distinct identity was very strong. They saw themselves as standing for a future distinct from old liberalism.

He wanted to ask about the reception of Saint Simonian theories about the relation between the individual and society. Alexandre Laborde's *L'esprit d'association* (1818 and various later editions) was influential - but not set within a liberal framework.

Jesus said that he thought associations could be instrumental, but even then that presupposed a right to associate, so there was still an ideological dimension. He thinks that's how we can understand their emergence at this particular moment, as one manifestation of a new culture.

To Guy he said that many friendly societies emerged from old fraternities. What was new in the 1820s was associations bringing together people from different trades. Some had a religious dimension. Conservatives and liberals feared these associations partly because they realised they could be used for various purposes other than self help. From the 1840s, government therefore made efforts to control them, eg through the office of the mayordomo, a rich sponsor who might act as patron; a church or a bishop could also be a patron. Even if they had a religious character, that doesn't mean they didn't also have new elements, though: the emphasis on voluntarism was distinctive.

In relation to clandestinity: it is an interesting question how they responded to, and were able to survive repression. They saw themselves as having natural rights and not just class interests to maintain.

To Javier, he said that socialist ideas did have some influence on middle-class politicians and intellectuals between the 1830s-50s, but he thinks not much on the labour movement, or at least, he hasn't found evidence of that.

Session IX: Carmen de La Guardia: **Democratic momentum: Public Sphere**

Her object was to reflect on what brought changes in movements.

She considered first the term democracy and its meaning. In 1817, it was defined as meaning popular government. 1853 brought the first and only change in its definition. It was not said to mean a form of government in which the people dictated and sanctioned laws; it was said that it could be defined as the government of laws without kings. But in 1869, the former definition was reinstated.

The process that led ultimately to the establishment of democracy was dynamic, involving the participation of more than one group in the political system. She intended to focus on change in who held rights and the meaning of right. She saw transformation in civil society as an essential component of this larger change.

She said that her approach would be very eclectic. She would cite authors who were very critical of Habermas. She was influenced by the cultural turn, which involved a focus on the meaning of politics, and called for a broader definition of the political. The public/private distinction had been question by eg Paula Baker, *The moral frameworks of public life: gender, politics, and the state in rural New York, 1870-1930* (1991). According to her, as

women expanded into the public sphere, notably into philanthropic work, boundaries between the public and private were blurred. Other groups also expanded into the public arena, eg in the course of the Second Great Awakening. The values of the private sector then penetrated public life. We should discard the idea of the public sphere as a sphere of rationality. The C19 public sphere was plural, anarchic and unregulated, and not dominated by a conception of the public interest. It was rather a space of controversy and negotiation, although political requests might be formulated in a universalistic way.

She proposed to look at Spanish abolitionists as an example of a group operating in this public sphere. When freedom of speech and of assembly was proclaimed, new organisations proliferated, sometimes exercising the right to petition. They hoped to be able to transform the public arena. There were many representations from minorities about their rights. One of the most active was the Abolitionist Society. There were debates about the participation of women and of minorities in the public sphere.

Many leaders of the Abolitionist Society belonged to the tiny Protestant minority in Spain. They had links with American and European Protestants. Under Isabel II they were persecuted, but drew support from international networks. They contributed to the porosity of the public/private interface, working in their houses, the pulpit, the press and the university.

The American Civil War made slavery as an issue more visible. 1864 saw the foundation of the first Abolitionist Society in Spain. It included Spanish American members. Many were Protestant, and many were active freemasons. Women were involved. They held meetings, published speeches in pamphlets and also ran their own newspaper. They talked a lot about 'democracy', which they understood as an open concept. Their meetings were always held in the theatre. The first was in Madrid in 1865. There was a separate Women's Abolitionist Society. In 1866, there was a new wave of repression, which affected many social and political reformers. The Abolitionist Society was closed down.

But in 1868, abolitionism revived. Local revolutionary juntas included it in their programmes. The new movement was more radical. Again, it met in the theatre in Madrid. Many women came and read poems. The visible presence of women led to the formation of a new Ladies Abolitionist Society. Carolina Cornaro was president. The meeting built up emotions, visibly affecting the women. It was also militant in tone. This led some women to withdraw; they saw it as too emotional, and too political. They argued that women should find other avenues of influence. The fact that women did not have political rights was seen as problematic; this was seen to make it questionably proper for them to formulate their demands in the public sphere.

DISCUSSION

Arthur Asseraf said that he was interested in the timing of the movement, and wondered why the issue wasn't taken up earlier. Was this a matter of international context, social structure, or what?

Carmen said this was not the first time that abolitionist sentiments were expressed – they had appeared in poems, literature and in the theatre. Transnationl networks played an important part in the formation of the first association: one key individual had lived in the US.

Joanna remarked that according to a study of Dutch anti-slavery activity that she had recently read, the Dutch decided that the British model wasn't appropriate for them and deliberately organised theirs differently. She wondered if there was such explicit discussion of the applicability of models in the Spanish case.

Carmen said that she knew of no equivalent in Spain. It's evident eg from the women's magazine *La Violetta* that they did know a lot about the English movement.

Juan Luis Simal wanted to share something he had found in French archives: a letter to Wilberforce from Arguelles in 1822, and also one from a Spanish woman aristocrat. Wilberforce was pressing Arguelles to act, but Arguelles didn't want to go public on the issue, though he in turn wanted Wilberforce to press for the application of the treaty to Spain.
Carmen said the Cuban question did make it politically difficult to push the issue in Spain.
Javier FS said someone brought up the issue in relation to the Constitution of Cadiz.
Carmen said yes; they almost killed him.
Juan Luis said that religion seemed to be a factor; Arguelles was sympathetic to the Church of England. He wasn't sure how it all hung together: it needs more research. French secret services intercepted the letter: he can't be sure that its genuine. There was a relationship between Wilberforce and Blanco White at this time, where again religion played a part.

Michael Drolet wanted to know more about portrayals of English women in *La Violetta*. How were questions about what was and what was not acceptable negotiated?
Carmen said the text could be found on the Biblioteca Nacional website. This was a typical women's magazine, with fashions and recipes, but also descriptions of meetings; it published writings and proceedings of the abolitionist movement. All this can be seen as the culture of the 'angel in the house', which did allow women to play a philanthropic though not an explicitly political role.
Monica Burguera said the question of how one should read papers like this was raised; it's not clear that what women took away were just the ostensible messages.

Darina Martykánová said that in Bohemia in the 1830s and 40s, in the context of cultural nationalism, it's possible to find the role of women explicitly defended as political. By the 1870s, it's possible to find that in the Ottoman empire too. One political role was to transfer patriotism to their children. (On being pressed by **Joanna** about exactly what word they used to make the point, she said the words were patriotic or national).

Several comments were collected:

Guy Thomson remarked that the uprising in Cuba made this a particularly difficult moment.

Pablo wanted to know in what ways it was being suggested that this changes our notion of the public sphere. Although it may enrich it, he didn't think it changed it. He said that 'the public sphere' was an analytical device, one on which Habermas had no monopoly. He saw it as coming from the enlightenment. It related culture to the production of ideas: it was a way of thinking about how culture is distributed: not under anyone's control.

Marcella Aglietti wanted to know whether they talked about Olympe de Gouge and her Declaration of the Rights of Women? Or about the Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiment? ;

Carmen said yes, she had found some reference to Seneca Falls – the example she has in mind concerns a very well-networked woman. But she wrote to her friend saying she didn't want to be involved in active politics.

To Guy: she agreed that the Cuban uprising might be significant: one result was that the issue began to be discussed in parliament.

To Pablo, she said she herself liked Paula Baker's definition of the public sphere. She thought that the relations between public and private were more complex than Habermas allowed, and

also that emotions needed to be given a place in the public sphere. **Pablo** asked whether women thought of themselves as acting in public? **Carmen** said yes, some did.

Session X: **Gonzalo Butron Prida**: **The Insolence of the Anarchists: Liberal conspiracy and the secret societies under restored absolutism**

He would focus on how absolutist authorities responded to conspiracies, especially in Cadiz during the second restoration.

There was then a heavy French occupation, but still, under French protection, oppression was less indiscriminate than elsewhere, and many liberals congregated there. The French commander and Spanish government clashed over this: many Spanish absolutists felt frustrated by the French attitude, seeing it as a matter of 'victory betrayed'. The liberals were able to maintain relations with Gibraltar. Local Spanish authorities sent worried reports to Madrid about this. They referred to liberals as conspirators, incorrigibles, regicides, anarchists etc. They maintained a policy of vigilance, identifying liberals and their movements and connected, including among Cadiz merchants. Gibraltar had its own colony of refugees, via whom they maintained contact with American liberals; another axis of contact was in Seville. They were able to move freely to both north and south America.

Liberals endorsed an insurrectional strategy, involving secret societies, military coups and juntas. Their political aims were varied: they included both those who favoured the Cadiz constitution and moderates. After 1823 The Cadiz constitution was no longer mystified as the only possible way forwards. Some clandestine discourses were still more radical: it was noted that in order to avoid suspicion it might be necessary to conceal the ultimate aim of democracy.

One example of a conspiracy prepared in 1824 will illustrate the influence of the Americas. The minister was convinced that a secret government existed, supported by secret societies across southern Europe, called 'cycles' each with four officials, under a general directorate. There was an American connection. They did not intend to restore the 1812 constitution, but a republic like Mexico. In that context, they aimed to organise Spain as a federation of states. One of those involved had been important in Cadiz 1812 and also in Mexico 1824; he defended federalism.

DISCUSSION

Mark wanted more clarity as to which Americans were involved. **Gonzalo** said that Mexican and Columbian attaches in London both gave support to the exiles.

Guy Thompson said that the Mexican federal constitution was influenced by the US constitution – and US intervention helped shape Mexican politics through the 1820s. He noted that there were North American merchants involved in trade with Cadiz, and wondered if there was any direct US influence there.
Gonzalo said that he had only run across one suggestion of that.

Eduardo asked if this set of connections was unique to this case. **Gonzalo** said this was the only conspiracy reported to be aiming at the establishment of a republic.

Juan Luis Simal cited an 1828 example of a Mexican treaty with a junta. The junta said they would recognise American independence in return for support.
Maurizio said Italian would-be revolutionaries developed similar links.

Constantina cited the Greeks asking for help from Haiti: the Haitians said they couldn't send arms, but the Greeks recognised them anyway.

Pablo asked who used the term democratic? **Gonzalo** said the terms used by the authorities were Jacobins and anarchists.

Juan Luis asked which archives Gonzalo had used. He wondered whether there were relevant archives in Gibraltar. He also asked if there was evidence relating to exiles in North Africa (who were getting protection from local authorities and British Consuls). Was there evidence from Tangiers for example?
Gonzalo said he had used archives in Madrid. He was aware of the Tangiers connection through French documents. The Spanish government asked the French to protest about Tangiers' reception of political refugees.

Joanna wanted to know what the French thought they were doing.
Gonzalo said they had something of a bad conscience about helping the absolutists, and therefore also wanted to make concessions to the other side. When the French saw how Spanish authorities acted, they remained in Spain for 5 years. They saw themselves as defending basic rights.
Joanna asked who was the senior French commander, and what we know about his career? Was he ex-Napoleonic?
Gonzalo said he wasn't sure about that. The French followed a similar policy in Barcelona. The French army HQ was in Madrid. They told their commanders in all cities to stop Spanish government repression.
Mark asked if they were worried about how their actions would be viewed internationally?
Maurizio said it was the spirit of the Congress of Vienna to preserve stability; they were acting in that spirit.
Juan Luis said that the French had had a similar experience themselves after the 100 days. The army of occupation in France remained till 1819. It represented a significant financial burden on the French. The Austrian and Prussian occupation force in France similarly operated to contain ultra forces during the White Terror.
Maurizio said it would be interested to compare with the Austrian in Naples. Metternich did not think reaction the best policy in the paper states

Mark wanted to know where the denigratory label 'anarchist' came from. He thought that it was not much used before 1800. **Juan Luis** said it was certainly present in the documentation from this period. **Mark** said that he was specifically interested in the shift from 'anarchy' to 'anarchist'.

Guy wanted to move away from semantic debate. He wondered whether the relatively free conditions in these cities persisted after the French left in 1828.
Gonzalo said that the King was concerned to make a good impression in these critical cities. Therefore he made Cadiz a free port in 1829-30. In 1830 the governor of Cadiz was assassinated. But in the initial years there was a more liberal regime there than elsewhere.

Session XI: Juan Luis Simal: **Spanish Secret Societies and the Universal Conspiracy**

The Swiss jurist van Heller was the chief ideologist of the 1824 restoration. He wrote a report to the French government on the Cortes of 1820, in which he said that a sect of sophists had

conspired in conventicles to take possession of the sovereign power. The revolution was the work of conspirators who had deceived the Spanish people. In this, he followed Barruel etc. Interpreting outcomes as intentional, but unable to determine who had willed these ends, they interpreted revolutions as conspiracies. Conspiracy and plot were common words in the correspondence of European governments at this time.

There really were secret societies, but it's hard to reconstruct their organisation. They included the carboneria, Bursenschaft, Filki Hetairia and the Decembrists. There were also reactionary secret societies. Many were involved in insurrections, but still more were attributed to them. Sometimes what they did was the work of agents provocateurs. They were often associated with Satan. When Ruge was arrested, they were said to be Jews, Jacobins, heretics and freemasons. Some believed there was one or more coordinating centres, but this was exaggerated.

These beliefs however had implications for decision-making processes. The pope opposed freemasonry;,and see also the Carlsbad decrees. Though the assassin of the Duc de Berry was shown to have acted alone, he was still believed to have been supported from Spain. At the prosecution of the French carbonari, it was said that they had established a partnership with Spanish liberals, and that they were plotting European revolution. Some societies did get members into influential positions, but there was also a good deal of paranoia.

One consequence was that the Spanish government was continuously accused from abroad of fomenting revolution elsewhere. At the Laibach Congress, it was suggested that all revolutions came from a common centre. Sardinian and French diplomats in Spain affirmed that there was a plot linking Spain, Britain and Italy (by so-called 'comuneros'). The basis for the doctrine of intervention was formulated at Troppau in 1821: this justified intervention in Spain, on the grounds that they had promoted the Cadiz constitution in Italy

Repression was to some extent self-fulfilling: it encouraged cooperation and clandestinity, and drove people into exile where they forged international connections. Repression enhance the influence of the secret societies. Ideals came to be expressed universalistically; conspirators came to believe that it was possible to promote a general uprising.

Ferdinand VII in a decree of 1814 had abolished the Cortes, accusing them of copying the revolutionary democratic principles of 1791. The Cortes was said to be a popular government, not a moderate monarchy but a democracy, or a republic disguised as a monarchy. Secret societies had a role in these circumstances, but continued to exist after the revolution of 1820, though this allowed them to operate in public space. With new repression after 1823 they were forced to become clandestine again, but they were not less completely secret. They set up juntas (eg in Paris – where who should lead the junta was decided by a vote across the community of exiles, which was reported in the press.). This has been seen as part of the process which led to the formation for political parties – although secret societies remained outside the formal party system.

One problem with secret societies was that it was unclear that they could claim to be representative or of whom. The effect was that democrats among their members had an ambiguous and fluctuating relationship with the people.

DISCUSSION

Several questions were collected:

Maurizio said that he had found the paper very helpful: he liked the idea of universalising conspiracies being encouraged by repression. But he thought there were two big

problems/ambiguities which he wanted to put on the table. First, the relation between public and secret; second, the matter of undertaking secret plots in the name of the people. Partly the problem is ours, in that we just find it hard to comprehend their world view. When revolutions started in Naples, the carboneria made political propaganda and tried to recruit – but still they thought they needed to hang on to some element of secrecy. He thought it was a mistake to trust Mazzini's account of his predecessors: though he said he was renouncing the tradition of secrecy, it's not clear that he was so different. The idea of conspiring in the name of the people linked to their political culture: they also thought it was possible to be both hierarchical and democratic: they saw a need to enlighten the people and thought they could act as tutors to them. When the revolutions failed, however, they did decide that they needed to think harder about how to draw the people in.

Arthur Asseraf was also interested in a dialectic -- between transnational and the patriotic. He thought the fact that they endorsed both tells us something about democracy at this moment, in an era marked both by the growth of personal mobility and by the emergence of nation states. Luc Boltansky (*Engimes et complots. Une enquete a propos d'enquetes* (2012)) suggests that these things shaped the emergence of crime and espionage novels. A space came into being in which plots had political salience He wondered in what ways the moment of the 1820s was different – either from what came before, or from what came after.

Florencia wanted to continue Maurizio's line of thought. She agrees that everyone did politics that way, even in the 1830s. This reflected a form of democratic thinking in which democrats were afraid of the people.

Juan Luis said he agreed about these tensions. It was perhaps important to note that there were at this time no political parties. The whole notion of forming political associations was seen as problematic, because the nation wasn't supposed to be divided. He said something similar went on in Mexico

To Arthur, he said yes, he agreed: the nation was built in a transnational context. There were conspiracies in novels of the 1830s, eg in novels by Stendhal and Hugo. What was new at this period plots were moving away from their earlier focus on the royal court.

Further questions were collected:

Marcella Aglietti said that in the eighteenth century there were two great fears: fear of the masses, which was linked to fear of the Jacobins, and fear of aristocratic plots. Secret society plots combined elements of both.

Guy said secret societies included a lot of aristocrats. He questioned whether repression was responsible for the failure of the secret societies. There were many reasons why they failed. During the Risorgimento, secret societies rebuilt themselves, and this time were more successful: a wider press improved communications; also they had a stronger domestic base.

Javier FS said of course 1820 was not a failure: the constitution was re-established.(**Guy** said, a fragile success.) He said that early secret societies were wrongly associated esp exiles, especially after 1823, exile was a school of moderation; those who stayed often remained or became more radical. Secrecy could be necessary under despotic rule.

Pablo suggested that secret was opposed to public but also to open. Even when secret societies operated in public, that didn't mean that anyone could join. You had go undergo rites of passage, and attest to your belief in the ideology. He thought this helped to explain why even when secret societies could operate legally, they retained an element of their older

character. He thought that things changed fundamentally only with the establishment of universal suffrage. Then you could belong to a party.

Juan Luis thought that in terms of success and failure the record was mixed. (**Guy** repeated that he thought they didn't have much success: they remain quite shallow) He agreed that for some exile was a school of moderation: people were forced to compromise to focus on fighting on a common enemy.

FINAL PANEL

Constantina Zanou said that she had three comments, relating to geography, empire and religion.

In relation to geography, she said that for Spain the Atlantic dimension was clearly important. This made her think that the Greeks equally need to think about Russia, the Baltic and the Balkans: the Mediterranean was not an enclosed area.

In relation to empire, what she thought came across was the Mediterranean transformations of the meaning of democracy involved the renegotiation of imperial spaces. She wanted to know more about how the dissolution of the Spanish empire played into the story.

In relation to religion, its relation to all this needed further thought. Secret societies were not opposed to religion; religion also played a role in the liberal process. Could democratic values be seen as Christian values? Or was there a tension between Christianity and democracy, as the Greeks thought – they sometimes represented the Muslim tradition as having a republican element alien to Greek culture. Religion is always a source of political ideas.

She also had two further small comments.

Filiki Hetairia was Greek only in a broad sense: it developed in the context of a transnational Greek culture. The Greek War of Independence started in Romania.

Finally, in relation to the people. They couldn't be taken for granted, but had to be created: only then was it possible to have democracy.

Michael Drolet said that he had learnt a lot.

He had been struck by the recurrent theme of porousness between the public and private. He had been struck by the idea of a range of private virtues moving into the public sphere. Though whether moving into the public sphere entailed moving into the political sphere was another question.

He would have liked to hear more about the influence of Lamennais, or other French writers in Spain.

In relation to secret societies, he wondered if they got transported into Spanish America, and whether there was movement back and forth.

He was interested in internal exiles: Tocqueville was in effect an internal exile after 1851. He then undertook a different kind of writing: The *Ancien Regime*

He wondered if the Spanish echoed the French distinction between active and passive citizenship.

Mauro Lenci from the perspective of a historian of ideas he had been very interested in issues around words. He had been listening for points of similarity and difference between Italian and Spanish experience. 'Anarchy', it seemed to him, was usually something brought

on by others, and so too democracy. The Duke of Canosa considered even liberals to be anarchists

Reference had been made to democratic monarchy. Burke said democratie royale is an oxymoron. There is a problem about combining two principles of legitimation.

He wondered if there was a Tocquevillian moment in Spain. It sounded to him as if the major influences on understandings of the term were domestic.

Arthur Asseraf had found it an interesting trip, and had enjoyed the way that papers had complicated the standard story. He agreed with Constantina about empire and religion: he thought it would have been possible to say a lot more about religion. He had been interested in Pablo's remark in his paper that institutions of local government could be quite repressive.

He was surprised not to have heard more about the racialisation of the concept of democracy, eg in relation to North Africa, and settler democracy there.

There were many circulations, but we needed to be alert to to circulations which didn't happen: to impossible solidarities.

DISCUSSION

Pablo said that he thought the discourse about Islam was that Muslims were fanatics, whereas Spaniards saw themselves as no longer needing to be fanatic. On active and passive citizenship: he said he thought citizens were often passive; becoming an active citizen goes against the grain.

Javier LA said in relation to fanaticism that it is always the other side who is fanatical. The first mention he has found of the term socialist is in 1811, when a reactionary writer said that socialists and liberals are like Muslims.

Guy Thomson recalled Andalusian democrats similarly being likened to Moorish raiders.

He noted that in 1857 everyone signed up to fight in Africa. Radicals were profoundly racist and anti-Moorish. 1812 explicitly excluded people of African descent from the constitution. In Naples and Sicily didn't see the need to echo this.

Joanna noted that exclusions varied with national circumstances: the Portuguese included the Africans and excluded the Indians, the Spanish the reverse.

Michael Drolet noted that Tocqueville drew on a different stereotype, characterising Muslims as passive. **Pablo** said the more eastern the more passive, hence Oriental despotism.

Javier SF said there was an association between equality and despotism; in Europe hierarchy was seen to underpin liberty.

Guy Thomson said there were indeed internal exiles. It produced a different way of doing politics, though memoirs.

Mark Philp thanked everyone again, especially Stephane Michonneau and Florencia Peyrou