Mediterranean democracy, Year 2

Pisa, 16-17 December 2013

Dept of Politics, University of Pisa

Present, Italian specialists (indicating areas of main interest): Marcella Aglietti (*citizenship and representative institutions in Italy and Spain*); Paolo Benvenuto (*Italian political exiles in Paris 1848 and after*); Paul Blokker (multiple *forms of democracy in the modern world*); Alessandro Breccia (*Tuscan political history*); Cristina Cassina (?); Carolina Castellano *(judiciary Naples; sectarianism in Risorgimento);* Antonio Chiavistelli *(C19 Italian constitutionalism);* Nico de Federicis *(political philosophy)*, Gian Luca Fruci (*electoral democracy and plebiscites*); Luca di Mauro (*politics in Naples and Sicily*); Mauro Lenci (*intellectual history of democracy and liberalism*); Marco Manfredi (*Italian culture during the Restoration*); Luca Mannori *(ancient regime states, C18 and C19 Italian constitutional history);* Viviana Mellone (*revolutionary movements in southern Italy during the Risorgimento*); Alessio Petrizzo *(Risorgimento political rituals and festivals);* Anna Maria Rao (*Naples in the revolutionary era*); Danilo Raponi *(transational history of Risorgimento)*; Francesco Renzetti *(exile in the Risorgimento)*; Roberto Romani *(political economy and the Risorgimento)*

With other specialist interests: Gonzalez Butron Prida *(influence of 1812 Spanish constitution on Piedmont 1821)*; Eleni Calligas *(Ionian islands);* Ian Coller *(Ottoman-Arab-French contacts);* Roberto Giannetti (*Mill*); Paolo Girardelli *(Italians in Istanbul, esp architecture)*; Juan Luis Simal (*Spanish exiles*)

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

Apologies, or expressed interest but didn't appear: Stefano de Luca, Marco Meriggi, David Ragazzoni**,** Lucy Riall, Nadia Urbinati, Rafael Zurita // John Davis, Victoria de Grazia, Mathieu Grenet, Miriam Halpern Pereira, Adam Mestyan, Nuno Monteiro, Federica Morelli, Rui Ramos

DAY 1

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Maurizio Isabella said that today's discussion would focus on the rethinking of democracy in terms of language and terminology and the context in which they were used.

The association between democracy and the Risorgimento is now new – a good deal of post-war historiography has interpreted the Risorgimento as being characterised by a struggle between moderates and democrats. But this has often involved the retrospective application of modern understandings to the period, disregarding how people used terms at the time. This has obstructe a more sophisticated understanding of contemporaries' positions. Moreover focus tends to be on political alignments, not the content of ideas. We need now to remedy this.

Attention must be paid to the specificity/particularity of the Italian case. The historiography has tended to construct it as exceptional, because of the existence of a plurality of states, of intellectual traditions and institutions. When comparisons are made, they tend to be with

France, presented as representing a desirable form of modernity, from which Italy fell short. – there is reason to doubt that there was a widespread sense that France was the superior model of political modernity to be imitated or aspired to. Certainly French influences were important, but may not be best conceived in those terms. And other parallels should be explored. We want particularly to encourage exploration of parallels and differences among Mediterranean countries, to see if this might yield new perspectives..

Mark Philp explained how the project had first taken shape around an exploration of the various trajectories followed in North Atlantic states re-imagining democracy. This story is often told backwards, as the origins of present practices are traced; but in doing that we risk missing the distinctiveness of past ideas and practices: elections for example were not in many contexts a key focus. Both Italian and Greek historiographies construct stories around the emergence of modern nation states. We need to be aware of influences shaping historiographies, and to avoid being trapped by them.

He noted that this meeting marked the start of the second year of a three-year project. This year the focus would be on the histories of particular regions (here and now, Italy); in the third year, workshops would be thematic in focus.

Joanna Innes welcomed specialists in other national contexts, and encouraged them to contribute to discussion with observations or questions.

FIRST SESSION: LANGUAGE

Paper 1: Anna Maria Rao, 'Democrats and democracy in the revolutionary triennium'

Noted that she was drawing on the work of others who had studied political vocabulary, notably Andrea Dardi (*La forza delle parole. In margine a un libro recente su lingua e rivoluzione*, Firenze, 1995), Erasmo Leso (*Lingua e rivoluzione. Ricerche sul vocabolario politico italiano del Triennio rivoluzionario 1796-1799,* Venezia, 1991) and Luciano Guerci (*Istruire nelle verità repubblicane. La letteratura politica per il popolo nell'Italia in rivoluzione (1796-1799),* Bologna, 1999).All of these referred to R.R Palmer's pioneering analysis of the language of democracy in the age of the French Revolution. Palmer noted that the terms 'democracy' and 'representative democracy' were more widely used in Italy in the 1790s than in most other countries, including France. Even though it has not been systematically demonstrated that this was the case, Dardi sought to explain it. He suggested that in France, Thermidor brought a reaction against the term – and some remarks suggest something similar in Italy: it was suggested, thus, that the terms democrat and aristocrat would be lost in history like Guelph and Ghibelline.

In what sense were such terms used in Italy? Guerci said that democracy connoted above all an alternative to aristocrac. It was not linked with universal suffrage; on the contrary, to the extent that there were plans for representative government, this was on the basis of a limited suffrage, usually on the model of the 1795 constitution, the model for most Italian constitutions. During the trienio the principle of popular sovereignty was however endorsed. The term was widely used in republican catechisms, where a distinction was drawn between direct (or pure, or true) democracy and representative democracy. The trienio saw attempts to put representative democracy into practice.

Was there continuity between C18 and revolutionary usage? Ferrone said that even if the phrase democratic representation cannot be found in Filangieri, the idea was already there.

But Dardi, Leso and Guerci all take a different position, underlining the novelty of the ideas of the revolutionary period: both patriots and counterrevolutionaries thought what was in question was innovative. Dictionaries supply interesting evidence. They were printed in this period in part to record and explain linguistic innovation. They introduced terms such as counterrevolution, émigré, 'désorganiser', 'fanaticiser'. Democracy was defined as entailing attachment to popular government. A Jesuit dictionary upheld as good terms like pur, civilisation, amour conjugal and prudence, and presented democracy negatively, as something threatening to all these.

Change in understandings of the term can be illustrated through the work of Compagnoni, who held the chair in constitutional law at the university of Ferrara (Lombardy). See his *Elementi di diritto costituzionale*. He devoted two chapters to democracy and democratic representation. In his account, natural law gave way to constitutional law. He contrasted democracy, associated with republics, and ohlocracy, associated with anarchy. He defended representative democracy, saying this was needed in big republics. But he thought representative bodies needed to be kept in check by occasional 'comices' [Fr: a form of association], a form of direct democracy. He said that the right of property must be as broadly disseminated as possible, though did not favour an agrarian law. We can find similar formulations in the Lombard press, and in the work of Matteo Galdi.

She suggested that virtue was a central concept in this formulation. What was in question was not just a form of government, but a moral order dependent on the moral conduct of the good citizen. Education was needed to foster this, in order to give people a basis for voting and exercising civic rights.

She thought that more work needed doing to explore the ways in which patterns of use might differ depending on the genre of a text and the audience to which it was directed.

Discussion

Innes noted that Palmer's explanation for more use in Italy (if he's right about this) is that 'republic' had more historical and current associations in Italy than in France; a new term was needed. However she thought that the point might be made differently: the idea that republics might be aristocratic or democratic was already established, and this made reference to democracy more natural in those contexts, thus in Holland, Switzerland, in both of which there was talk of democracy and democrats in a modern political context before the French Revolution. She wondered if this applied to Italy. She also suggested that we don't know enough about the use of the language under the Directory and Napoleon; thought Rosanvallon too ready to play down its use in France; had the impression the Directory positively championed *representative* democracy as an alternative to excessively participatory democracy. The phrase democratic revolution comes into play only after 1800, not necessarily meaning something negative. Napoleon's strategy was to be linguistically inclusive – to co-opt terms to serve his own purposes. She also wondered how Italians read the American case: the claim that representative government was necessary in large republics sounded like something from the *Federalist* papers.

Anna-Maria Rao said there was increasing interest in the history of Italian republics in later C18, and also interest in America; less interest in current Italian republics – Venice, Genoa, which represented a hierarchical form of republicanism. The Napoleonic empire was also often compared to the Roman empire, though seen as more liberal, Napoleon being a son of the revolution. Compagnoni and Galdi both compared ancient and modern governments.

Compagnoni said the Ottoman empire was not a despotism but a moderate republic; Galdi characterised Venice as an aristocratic republic. Recent studies have emphasised that representative government was an important concept under the Directory: thus Serna, *Antonelle*. The term democracy was also applied to military organisations founded on citizen soldiers. In that sense, Napoleon could be seen as democratic.

Ian Coller said that France also had a republican tradition. Marseilles claimed to be a republic right up to the revolution; Corsica also. Accounts of the French revolution are often too Paris-centred. He noted that people also spoke of Algeria as a republic – and indeed the dey was elected, by acclamation, by 10,000 janissaries. He wanted to know when elections became definitive of democracy. Use in an Algerian context reinforced negative images of democracy: unwanted deys might be killed. He thought that Corsica might play an important role in France's re-evaluation of the democratic tradition.

Gian Luca Fruci said that he thought in an Italian context 'democracy' was not necessarily positive or negative. Modifiers were needed to make its meaning more specific. The idea that Napoleon brought democracy did however add a new dimension of fear. Comices provided arenas of deliberation, even though after Thermidor they weren't supposed to be deliberative. In general democracy was understood in Condorcetian terms, as involving constant interaction between electors and elected.

Anna Maria said that the democratisation of municipalities was very important. She thought 'democracy' inspired less fear than 'republic' or 'revolution'. In addressing the Directory, Italian refugees said that they wanted a republic founded on democratic representation; this was seen as meaning something not anarchic, a polity in which laws were respected.

Viviana Mellone was struck by stress on Agrarian Law at the beginning of the revolutionary period; by the 1830s and 40s emphasis had shifted to formal elements of democracy; only a few democrats highlighted the need for social change.

Philp said that in C18 democracy could be construed either as a political or as a social form. Those who opposed popular participation tended to suggest that the real object was social levelling. Across Europe, those two dimensions rose and fell independently to some extent over the period, with particularly intense moments of contestation of meaning being associated with their coincidence as issues. Making democracy safe might entail sealing off its social from its political implications.

Juan Luis Simal: thought there were Spanish parallels. Talk of Agrarian Law reflected concerns about how to turn poorer people into relatively independent social agents – the kind required if democratic and republican institutions were to survive. Later these concerns were recast as 'the social question'.

Innes suggested that the term 'social question' was coined partly in aid of the project of conceptualising politics and society as distinct.

Roberto Romani: a central issue for both democracy and republics was virtue. The failure of Italian republics of the 1790s could be explained in terms of the people's lack of virtue: thus Cuoco. This had important implications in terms of what people saw as practical options in the Risorgimento/

Anna Maria wasn't persuaded by Philp's distinction between the political and the social. Insofar as possession of property determined the right to vote, the two were linked. Property was used as a proxy for independence. In Pagano's draft constitution for Naples, it was necessary to have learnt the republican catechism in order to vote.

Paper 2: Luca di Mauro, Democracy as revolution? Political language in Naples under the kingdom of Murat.

In the kingdom of Naples in the Napoleonic era, the drive was to separate administration from politics. Under Massena, the Sicilian Bourbons were punished for their long standing anti-French attitudes. The return of the tricolour was important for opponents of the dynasty. Joseph Bonaparte founded an administrative monarchy [to adopt what seems to be a slightly later French term] in which talents were valued, especially if the talented had already shown sympathy for France. It's not obvious that there was much reference to democracy under either Joseph [1806-8] or Murat [1808-15], though there's a source problem: police papers from the era of Murat were later burnt.

Bonaparte was portrayed as a liberator; censitary suffrage was accepted; changes to the state were seen as a form of modernisation. Old republicans tended to take a pragmatic attitude, to think that change was at least in the right direction; the word republic went out of use. A few were not reconciled: one exile eg went to Paris and joined in various anti-Napoleonic conspiracies; back in Italy 1806, he tried to stir up the masses against Joseph; he published a memoir setting out his intentions, saying that he favoured independence and popular participation. [his name was Antonio Belpulsi, he actually never published the memoir, since he was clandestine until his death, allegedly in 1809. It was simply found on him when ea was arrested] Those critical of Napoleonic rule might form alliances with pro-Bourbons; clandestine politics were not the peculiar preserve of any one party. Cuoco was the founder of one branch of Carbonarism which aimed at independence, and escape from the Napoleonic yoke. Among those who collaborated with the Bourbons, again there was a good deal of pragmatism on display.

Some opponents of the regime had democratic programmes, eg the Patto costituzionale dell'Ausonia favouring an Italian federation, to be governed by a common assembly; to have two kings and a third elected by the people. Citizens were to be promoted on talent only; taxation was to be progressive; communes to find work for all, and to support those unable to work; feudalism to be abolished. 'Democracy' and related words did not appear in this text, perhaps because of their negative connotations.

General Guglielmo Pepe said in his memoirs that he was excluded from employment because he was seen as too democratic.

Memories of popular opposition to the Neapolitan Republic were still vivid. Democracy had gained association with being anti-religious. People preferred therefore to talk of popular government.

Discussion

Gianluca Fruci wanted to know how voting was to be organised in the constitutional project: was it to be by degrees?
Luca di Mauro In the Ausonia constitution there was explicit mention of equality in relation to the possibility of being elected, there's no direct mention of the electoral system.

Isabella wondered what language was used by those who advocated compromising with the regime in order at least to modernise. Were there references to Cuoco, and was it thought that virtue had still to be achieved?

Luca di M: Pepe said republicans had temporarily to renounce freedom, but that new regimes gave them instruments with which they might ultimately attain liberty. Both Joseph and Murat promised constitutions; Bonaparte promised to implement the first Bayonne constitution, but this was never acted on by Murat. Even Ferdinand IV promised a constitution: an extension of the Sicilian constitution.

Innes could see all kinds of reasons why democracy went out of fashion, and anyway it had little clear content, so there were limits to the work it could do. But she wanted to know more about the associated semantic field. What if any related terms were used, eg equality, popular sovereignty?

Luca di M said that the term survived, but only negatively. In Bourbon propaganda it was associated with revolution and outsiders. As far as the content goes there were two discourses: one aiming at the distribution of the land and fiscal propaganda against the taxation of peasants and farmers; the other associating it with disorders. The Carbonari in theory aimed to include all social classes, including farmers and labourers, but leaders were always of bourgeois origin, often drawn from people who had participated in the revolutions. They had a political understanding among themselves, but they talked to the people about taxes and land.

Philp said that in England he had found more positive references to democracy/democrats in private correspondence than in publications; he wondered if that might be the case in Italy. He also wondered what was understood by 'extreme democracy', to which Luca had referred.

Luca di M said that he couldn't quantify usage, but had the impression that there was more talk of the republic. Under Joseph and Murat, the focus was on 'good government': people expected Napoleonic rule of Europe to endure into the future, and focussed on its form. Extreme democrat or anarchist were critical terms used by moderate democrats, denoting eg those who had more problems with property qualifications for voting. There were debates about the various French constitutional models on offer. Extremists were those who rejected the Napoleonic system.

Philp pushed further on the core of their resistance: was the problem foreign rule, or insufficiently democratic rule?

Luca di M said that there were many varieties of patriot and therefore many answers to this question. Extremism was seen above all in terms of impracticality of attitude.

J-LSimal said there were obvious Spanish connections, in the persons eg of Joseph and Pepe (who fought with Napoleonic armies in Spain). Can we compare Spanish and Italian Bonapartists? In Spain, the extremists who challenged and resisted the French become more moderate in their later years.

Luca di M: the traditional way of seeing the Italian process is one of progressive moderation of ideals, But in fact a theoretical democratic commitment seems to have survived, simply being tempered by pragmatism. Pepe was among others who fought on the Napoleonic side in the Peninsular War. There were uprisings against the French in southern Italy, and there were attacks on afrancescados; even patriots who supported the regime recognised the patriotic aims of the Calabrian brigands. The word patriot was however used by collaborators, in contrast to Spain, but they did start wondering if they shouldn't be aiming at national independence. And some looking back on their resistance/collaboration under Bonaparte begin to question their own stands by the 1830s.

Isabella asked Juan Luis how the afrancescados defined themselves?

Juan Luis said they neither called themselves patriots nor accepted the term afrancescados. They tended to cite King Ferdinand's direction to collaborate with the French – though he later joined with liberals in denouncing them as traitors and prosecuting them. Only during

the trienio did many of them return to Spain, and were able to recover their property and gain positions in government, though their relations with the liberals remained difficult.

Viviana Mellone wanted to underline the importance of the carbonari to the democratic tradition in the 1830s in Southern Italy – where the tradition of secret societies continued through the 20s to the 40s, not being superseded by the Mazzinian tradition, but where democracy was conceived in an elitist way, in terms of bringing instruction to the people. **Luca di Mauro** said he did not completely agree. In the southern Italian context, he thought secrecy less a tradition than a necessity. It's true they failed to find a way of incorporating the peasanty, but he didn't see that as elitism. He wouldn't want to contrast Mazzinian and carbonarist traditions too sharply.

Carolina Castellano: on the elitism of the carbonari in the South: there was elitism in the sense that there were distinct levels within carbonarism, people at different levels being admitted to different degrees of knowledge.

On patriotism: she thought this term problematic, because it is applied by historians for various ends. There were also counterrevolutionary secret societies; historians have termed both kinds patriots.

Anna Maria Rao spoke about Gaetano Rodinò, whose unpublished memoirs from the 1830s, detailing his participation in conspiracies 1814-15. He said of patriots that they were those now termed liberals. He said that the intention at the time was not to attack monarchy but to impose limits on royal power; they had accepted constitutional monarchy as the best form.

Gianluca Fruci said that he did not think that an oscillation between resort to armed force and secret society activity was an Italian peculiarity; such pragmatic calculations were also found elsewhere. In the 1830s, people have ideals that they saw as practicable elsewhere, but limit their ambitions in an Italian context.
Luca di M said he agreed.

Paper 3: Mauro Lenci, Legitimacy of Power in Italian Political Thought 1815-61

Victor Emmanuel was crowned in 1861 by the grace of God and the will of the nation. These two forms of legitimation were combined despite their inherent contradiction. The legitimacy of the state was challenged from the start both left and right. The Risorgimento was completed under moderate auspices. They drew on European models, mainly French, to offer alternatives to the forms of state established by the Congress of Vienna.

Guglielmo Ferrero, in *The reconstruction of Europe: Talleyrand and the Congress of Vienna* (pub in French, 1940; Eng trans 1941) found in Talleyrand's *Memoirs* what he saw as a key to subsequent European history. As Talleyrand saw it, there had been a proliferation of illegimate governments -- governments not accepted by the majority of the people, such that they had to depend on force and fear. He argued that it was necessary to promote legitimate governments, starting with France: the Bourbons should be restored, but at the same time democratic principles that had been part of daily life for the previous two decades had to be taken into account. Talleyrand said that the only legitimate powers were those which had lasted for many years; now sovereignty could find support only in public opinion, so the king of France needed to rule with representative institutions. Napoleon had fallen because he didn't grant the right to oppose his rule; now the Bourbons had the chance to improve on this.

These ideas were taken up by Gentz (Metternich's secretary), and by Adam Muller. Previously there had been no distinction between the legitimate and the legal. Gentz was among the first to say that legitimacy was a distinct issue. He opposed Muller's theocratic principles. He said that it was important to accept consent as part of the spirit of the time.

These were key principles of restoration diplomacy, posing problems for ultras who didn't want such compromises. Constant said there were two possible bases for legitimacy: active consent or the hereditary principle: he said that inheritance engendered habit which was itself a sort of will. He said that hereditary monarchy was best for freedom. The ultras challenged this notion in the name of divine right: Bonald writing against de Stael said the only way to save the revolution from the horror it had provoked was to reaffirm it on the basis of legitimacy. Romagnosi suggested that representative government could solve the problem of transition from old to new regimes. He said that representative national monarchy was an entirely new conception. Luigi Blanch, in 1824, similarly said that what was needed was a representative government supported by public opinion – in this way it might be possible to escape being crushed between legitimism and carbonarism. Similarly Ugo Foscolo 1825 said that Italy could be reordered only as a just monarchy, as in England.

The challenge was to work out how to establish a monarchy on democratic principles. The Prince of Canosa found this hard to imagine, pointing out that even Napoleon had had to re-institute trappings of the old order. Solaro della Margarita (Piedmontese nobleman) said in the 1850s that monarchy had a future only in conjunction with the nobility; the bourgeoisie were incompetent. Vienna in his view had restored conditions as they were in France in 1789, not averting future trouble.

By the 1840s, public opinion was clearly becoming a political force. Cavour talked about nations being on the march towards democracy. In 1846 he said that at Vienna, appeal had always been to the strongest. This was not sufficient – but in Italy the liberals were also not strong enough successfully to challenge a political order whose legitimacy was problematic; the democrats did not have the support of the masses.

Due to pressure of time, he had to cut the next section, expanded here from his written paper:

D'Azeglio saw the need to relegitimate monarchy, so that it would not crash. Gioberti increasingly opened the Risorgimento to democratic ideas, stressing the importance to liberty of the free approval of the people. Increasing criticism of Vienna for not having provided effective foundations for a new political order.

He turned in conclusion to Cesare Balbo, who penned the most original and profound views on this subject. In 1857, he engaged with the concept of representative monarchy in a posthumous work. He said that Louis XVI made a key mistake in giving to the Assembly the power to change the nature of the state. He did not approve of Italian democrats' desire for a constitutional assembly. Balbo showed the problem of reconciling the two principles of legitimacy. He thought it was necessary to recognise sovereignty as coming from God, though government should aim to promote the good of the people.

In 1873, a posthumous work by Manzoni compared the French 1789 and Italian 1859 revolutions: said Italian the greater because it sprung from the mutual respect of king and country. The French revolution had substituted abuse for law, but it was all but over.

Discussion

Isabella asked if the argument was that a central problem for the Risorgimento was to reconcile the two principles? He thought that the paper brought together authors who were offering very different solutions, even addressing different problems: some were more concerned with how society is structured.

Mauro said that liberals saw it as a problem that the French revolution hadn't achieved consensus. Tocqueville in *Souvenirs* said that democrats didn't engage with the problem of transition. This helps to explain why Gioberti and other moderates distrusted democracy.

Joanna Innes said she found the paper interesting. She thought that the Restoration, often represented in terms of a clash between conservative and liberal principles, in fact represented a moment when all had to confront the problem of legitimacy, often in the context of quite similar ideas: thus, there was much common ground between Talleyrand and Constant.

She thought that this might also mark an important moment in terms of a shift towards historicising democracy: coming to see it as something that existed in time, but not just in the past; also in the future. Democracy could be conceptualised as an end point towards which history tended, but the process could not be rushed. It was possible to think this way in C18: to think eg that a shift was underway from a more aristocratic to a more democratic form of society, but this form of historicisation became much more common in C19. Perhaps the Restoration was a moment in which the relationship between the two principles could be seen as a historically contingent one.

Luca di Mauro: didn't understand how Balbo fitted in. He surely didn't stand in a democratic tradition.

Mauro said that he was not however a reactionary, and among the moderates, those more to the left began to open up to democracy as a principle of legitimation. Solaro and Canosa by contrast were not moderates, but reactionaries who saw moderates as introducing a Trojan horse, admitting democracy into monarchy.

Mark Philp said he thought this was an interesting set of issues. The problem of legitimacy was not a big issue in C18 political thought, but became so in C19. Some related ideas were present, as in the notion of public opinion, but they weren't deployed in the same way. Burke articulated a wider perception that the people have to be ruled by a power out of themselves – that is, that the very project of *popular* legitimacy and legitimation is potentially self-defeating, because popular legitimacy provides no stable basis, so one needs to look for other elements: the church, tradition, institutions, legalism and constitutionalism. But for states that had been turned upside down there was no guarantee that any of these legitimising projects will succeed; so people had to broker competing interests, but that in turn could be seen as corruption and conspiracy, subverting the attempt to claim legitimacy for either the process or the outcome. Difficulties of establishing legitimacy opened the way to pragmatism.

Roberto Romani: argued that moderates hated even the word democracy. Balbo recognised that to seek any pure form of government was a mistake , and that there was a need for a compromise between nobles and popular elements, but others did not. He thought you could only have liberty under mixed government – but what he meant by the popular element in the British constitution was the Whig Party! Although he was influenced by Guizot, he was more influenced by Burke. In contrast someone like Gioberti held that everything should be for the people – but nothing by them!

Innes thought it wasn't necessary that people be pure democrats or self-described democrats to be worth talking about at all. The shift among the more conservative to accepting representative government and the importance of public opinion represented an important shift in the context in which democracy was discussed.

Paper 4: Paolo Benvenuto, Democracy in Exile: European 48ers and the use of a term in context

Pi y Margall, in his *La reacción y la revolución* of 1854 [written following the revolution that brought Espartero to power] wrote that democracy was still a term of uncertain meaning. Massimo d'Azeglio in 1849 wrote that the language of democracy was like a knitted garment that could be stretched or shrunk to fit anyone. After 1848, the term became ever more polysemic.

Those in exile used 'democracy' in many different ways: in relation to a historical process; a political practice etc. He aimed to present a little democratic lexicon, charting the ways in which the term was used by exiles from a number of different countries. Rosanvallon has said that though the term was widespread after 1848, it lacked a clear meaning. He wanted to distinguish four categories of use within the same linguistic field.

- Association with socialism: some exiles post 1848 formed societies or established journals in which the concepts of democracy and socialism were conjoined. In this context, there were few references to democracy alone. This association led some to reject the term. Kossuth said different things to different audiences, but in the US and in Copenhagen Fields London he said he was a democrat; to his compatriots he said that he was not socialist or communist. He aimed to introduce a constitution into Hungary that would be both monarchical and democratic. In Spain in the 1860s Pi y Margall and Castellar debated whether socialists should be counted among democrats or not.
- Voting. Pre 1851 French exiles tended to link democracy with universal suffrage and a republic, though afterwards some became disenchanted with the notion. Victor Hugo talked about the comedy of universal suffrage. Gioberti devoted a chapter to democracy and demagogy. He said that voting was not essential in a free society. Mazzini said that universal suffrage would be abused by an ignorant people.
- Ancient/modern. Louis Napoleon's actions cast doubt on the efficacy of representative democracy. Several exiles said there was a problem about departing from the ancient model of government by the people.
- Positive/negative; true/false. French radicals said ancient democracy had been a self-serving system – though they referred to democracy nonetheless in positive terms, equating it with truth and justice.

The concept of democracy had become an empty box.

Discussion

Joanna Innes recounted discussion in the French constituent assembly about what it might mean to term the new state a democratic republic; it was agreed that it was simplest to agree on the term and not debate what it meant.
Maurizio Isabella said that although after 1848 the meaning of the term was contested, it was inescapable.

Innes said that although it was very popular in and around the time of the revolutions, it did seem to experience some decline in use thereafter.
Ian Coller, Viviana Mellone agreed that 1848 seemed to represent a disillusioning turning point.

Paulo Benvenuto: said that many exiles concluded that not representative but some form of direct democracy was needed.

Roberto Romani said that it was clear that events in France shaped political culture of Italy (and other countries) to a remarkable extent. But if the aftermath of the revolution made democracy look problematic, the revolution also made socialism the main bogey for many, replacing democracy in that role. Thereafter reference to democracy became commonplace. Of course some worried that it might represent a first step to socialism, but others saw a moderate form of democracy as a way of avoiding socialism.

Anna Maria Rao wondered how vocabulary at this time compared with that used in the first French revolution. Also how the relationship between democracy and religion was conceived.
Paulo said the basic lexicon was the same, indeed old revolutionary dictionaries were reissued. The question of the relationship to religion was interesting. Many Catholics had endorsed democracy before the revolution.

Paper 5: Antonio Chiavistelli, The Moderate constitution. Discourse and the political project of the middle-of-the-road liberals.

Focus on what might be specific about discourse of Italian *liberali di mezzi*, or moderates. Will ask when term 'moderate' entered Italian political vocabulary, and whether one can distinguish a moderate political project.

Term first given political sense during trienio, a political shock that generated much new vocabulary. Jacobins used the term to attack non-democrats. Matteo Galdi eg said politics of moderation the most tyrannical invented by aristocrats, in both France and Italy.

In the Napoleonic years, the term acquired a positive value. Cuoco eg said democracy the best form, but could only flourish with a wise people; a moderate sovereign might not be just but at least might be wise, more likely than in case of people in comices. Said also that whereas once thought middle merely a temporary position, now seemed it was the wisest.

In the Restoration period, the attempt to found a state without a public precipitated a reaction: didn't have to be a revolutionary to think there should be some role for public opinion: could see England as exemplary. Thinks events of 1820-1 presented these reformist sentiments with their first test. Balbo 1821 distinguished a citizen constitutional party from a largely external faction convinced everyone wanted Spanish constitution: interesting in revealing an embryonic conception of distinct political families.

Political/constitutional models which circulated in this milieu were extremely varied – some looked to English model, some extremely municipalist. Effort focussed on rationalising things as they were, not calling an Italian nation into being. The idea of a constitution which recognised more than establishing things the hallmark of moderate constitutional thought until the end of the 1840s.

That decade saw a reconfiguration of moderate political discourse, arising from the publication of important works by Gioberti, Balbo and others, which aroused public debate and led to clearer definition of a moderate discourse. Context created in which some people for first time could conceive of themselves as part of a group, organised around questions of nationality, liberty and the reform of the state. Again, Balbo offered a helpful diagnosis, distinguishing three parties: those opposed to all change, conservatives; those wanting total change, reforms or revolutions: revolutionaries; progressives or less extreme liberals, calling themselves moderates, not wanting either form of purity.

Historians from de Ruggiero to Romanelli have been dismissive of moderate thinking, arguing they had no fresh or programmatic ideas. But he thinks there were certain recurrent themes. Thus, use of party as distinct from faction, linked with idea one might be able to have a dialogue with government. And thinks they did have a programme, with the following elements: respect for order; reform of state, favouring decentralisation; shaping of constitution by dialogue between ruling classes and sovereign – latter seen as indispensable. They conceived society as a composite, made up of different groups, perhaps traditional in character, but conceived in modern terms as a public sphere. A quasi-modern nation, conceived as plural and properly remaining so. Source of projects for aristocratic, corporative or municipal constitutions put forward on eve of 1848. Not merely a subordinate variety of more elevated liberalisms elsewhere in Europe. Balbo in his most significant work, Piedmontese constitution, praised representative monarchy for its capacity to represent all interests. Favoured mixed forms of government.

Such a project should be evaluated in terms of its capacity to offer an alternative approach to the problems encountered by the Restoration system. In that sense, they contributed to the re-imagining of democracy.

In this context, was much debate about Piedmont 'moderate' Statuto/constitution of 1848. Marked emergence of a more advanced set of moderates, Cavour above all: hoped not just to preserve order in plural society, but to guide public opinion towards national progress: role of constitution, according to Cavour, not to maintain equilibrium, but something more dynamic.

Discussion:

Isabella said that another important context for 'moderate' is, after 1848, in relation to constitutional engineering, drawing on Constant's idea of a distinct constitutional function of moderating. There was a European discussion about this in which eg Balbo joined, esp after 1848, when the question was, how might constitutional monarchy be made to work.
Also, he didn't agree with the distinction drawn at the end between those moderates who wanted merely to maintain balance such as Balbo and others favouring change such as Cavour. He thought Balbo also had a dynamic vision, though of a more conservative kind. He wanted to create a new aristocracy, along doctrinaire lines, a moderate elite based on virtue. They would promote progress including economic change.
Antonio agreed that Balbo was progressive and not reactionary, but still thought he was different from Cavour, who assigned a different kind of role to public opinion.
Isabella disagreed: Balbo did assign an important role to a certain kind of public opinion: he had a Guizotian ideal of a rational public opinion.

Exchange between **Luca di Mauro** and **Antonio** about federalism and its relation to moderatism. Luca thought democrats were also federalist, so not constitutive of moderatism. Antonio said he did not think the word itself was being used by the 1840s, but what he meant was something other than a centralising national project. Luca repeated that he thought

democrats espoused that too; Antonio disagreed: he thought they were nationalist and centralising. **Maurizio Isabella** said that Balbo opposed municipalism. Antonio said there were various tendencies among moderates. Also that muncipalism was not a moderate position, more Sismondian. Maurizio said the most radical carbonarists were muncipalists; he thought it was a modern presumption that radicals favoured a central state.

Joanna Innes objected that the terms of discussion were unclear. We had vowed to focus on contemporary uses of terms, but seemed to be drifting into argument about the boundaries and contents of our own categories

Maurizio wanted to underline that localism was not just a conservative solution and centralisation not just a radical one. **Paolo di Benvenuto** agreed that in 1848 many on the left favoured municipal liberty.

Joanna Innes had questions about vocabulary: did people use the term 'juste milieu'? What was the antonym of moderate? In Britain, 'radical' emerged from 1780; 'the positive identity of being a moderate reformer didn't take shape until later, around the 1810s.

Antonio said that he thought in the 1790s the antonym was democrat; in C19 exaltado.

Alessio Petrizzo said he thought not; in C19 it was still mainly democrat.

Joanna asked if moderates argued about the application of the term among themselves – I'm a true moderate, you're not – or only used it to distinguish themselves from others, with the implication that it perhaps took its meaning as much from what it was defined against as from its own content.

Antonio said sometimes they argued among themselves about its application.

Eduardo Posada Carbo observed that when such names become the standard names for parties, the question of meaning becomes more complex: it becomes a declaration of allegiance as much as of belief. Was 'moderate' the name of a party?

Antonio: hard to say, because party itself was not widely legitimated, though Balbo implied that party was legitimate, faction not.

Vivian Mellone said that liberals rejected the concept of party, seeing party as factious and themselves as inclusive.

Luca di Mauro: Croce thought that liberals should eschew party until 1948.

Antonio thought it was not so straightforward; British parties were seen as OK and as conducive to liberty.

Juan-Luis Simal said that in Spain there certainly was a moderate party; its role as a party was to a broker jobs, contracts, and in general exercise patronage, making government work by creating obligations and possibilities. But in Italy when those opportunities didn't exist, how would one construct a party?

Mauro Lenci said that reactionaries opposed party because they didn't accept the representative principle.

Paper 6: Roberto Romani, A matter of passions: Risorgimento moderates on democracy

Before 1848, the moderates rarely talked about democracy (except for Gioberti, whose stance he didn't have time to consider; he noted that there was a good paper by Traniello about Gioberti and democracy, in his *Religione cattolica e stato nazionale : dal Risorgimento al secondo dopoguerra*, 2007**)**. This is unsurprising, because whereas in France at this time, democracy was used to describe a 'levelled society', in Italy there was no such levelled society. Moreover 1830-48 the moderates were chiefly concerned to promote their own programme, dismissing everything else as sectarianism or faction. There was no significant popular mobilisation to come to terms with. They did talk about secret societies; also about

Mazzini, but they saw him as republican rather than democratic. However, from 1848, the terms republican and democrat became synonymous: republicans were understood to favour mass popular participation.

Gioberti, by labelling the brief government he headed (Dec. 1848- Feb. 1849) 'democratic' introduced the term into Piedmontese debate. All moderates followed Guizot in saying politics was the business of people of capacity.

Moderates defined themselves as almost anthropologically different from democrats. Following Manzoni's *Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica* (1819) and Pellico's *Dei doveri degli uomini* (1834), they argued that they represented a group who accepted the aid of religion in moderating passion and enthusiasm – and as such found themselves under attack from extremists of left and right. Whereas other approaches produced sharp oscillations, they saw themselves as best placed to foster gradual progress. He cited Gioberti, Balbo, Luigi Carolo Farini and Rosmini along these lines. (Risorgimento ultramontanes, by contrast, accused liberals of passion.) As well as echoing a strand of French thought, this line of argument drew on a strain of enlightenment Catholicism reaching back to Muratori, who thought that the "passions" of citizens – stemming from an inexhaustible desire for new pleasures – were not to be harmonized by either the market or a Hobbesian monarch, but by a Christian ruler applying compassion (*carità*) and justice.

In the 1850s, it was a staple of moderate discourse to represent themselves as standing for reason against Mazzinian passion. Mazzini certainly did avow and encourage passion for liberty, equality etc. Moderates did not follow the French in linking democracy with narrow materialism: this did not fit Italian circumstances. What they did was to link democracy, passion and extremism.

Noted that he is working on a paper on moderate sensibility. His view was that the moderates had an idiosyncratic formulation of civic virtue, involving justice, fortitude, endurance, compassion, mildness and operosità

Discussion

Maurizio Isabella asked in what sense was the moderates' idea of civic virtue idiosyncratic? Mazzini would surely have claimed some of these qualities too. **Mauro** added Saint Simonians too.
Roberto thought it was distinctive in arising out of Catholicism; this made it different from the republican version. There was no appeal to reason of state, or to notions of public and private, traditional notions of corruption, cicisbeos etc. It was defined against unruly passion; this became an esp important discourse in 1850s.

Philp said he wasn't persuaded by the contrast with republicanism. Thought this period saw the break up of traditional republican concepts: the extremism of the Terror presented a new challenge. The new vision developed was compatible with commercial society, and eroded single-minded commitment to public virtue.
Roberto defended his account inasmuch as his moderates were defining themselves against Mazzini.
Mark also argued that there were a range of discourses about the passions available; in some they were rehabilitated as components of human experience. And there were competing conceptions of how to regulate them.

Juan-Luis Simal wondered how the language of class, middle class etc were used in this context. The idea of moderate virtue sounds very much like the kind of thing that gets typed as. middle class.

Roberto said they were aristocrats trying to appropriate middle class virtues. They didn't use the language of class, but a language of shared Catholicism.

Mauro Lenci said there were a number of different Catholic traditions: Jansenist; Giobertian – he developed an idea of universal priesthood; Muratorian. Which was in question?

Roberto said they were in effect fused: it is really a case of the passion and enthusiasm of Mazzini and the left being challenged as inimical to the virtues necessary for political rule, by the moderates.

Paulo Benvenuto said that Christianity was also an influence on moderate democrats.

Gian Luca Fruci argued that the idea of the sovereignty of reason could also be found among democrats; the sovereignty of the people was in its own way a capacitary discourse. Universal suffrage was meant to reconcile competing passion.

Roberto said indeed, the moderates were avid readers of early Lamennais, but then he became a democrat. They resisted the idea that the Bible endorsed equality.

Paolo Giradelli: suggested that the same languages might take on different meanings in different contexts. The old Marxist view was that after 1848 the bourgeoisie became reactionary. Were they conscious of talking to a different group?

Roberto said that in the 1840s they were trying to convince as many people as possible; theirs was a wide enterprise in social renewal; in the 1850s the Risorgimento became more a state-building project, and talk about the democrats' passions became a kind of propaganda. D'Azeglio epitomized this shift, coming to argue during the turmoil of 1848-9 that the moral conditions of the day were not suitable for a republic. The focus was on a moral not a social context: thinks the social conflicts so important in France were not so pressing in Italy.

Francesco Renzetti: this is a sort of self-portrait of the moderates. In practice, didn't they too use the passions in propaganda, and in their novels and poetry.

Roberto: In the 1850s propaganda they were very anti-passion – the Piedmontese accused the Austrians of behaving in ways that would arouse the passions of the people, thereby subverting order and threatening revolution. Mazzinian discourse in Rome was much more successful in recruiting volunteers. The Moderates found it hard to provide a justification for their stand and their principles to a popular audience, beyond claiming that people should do as they said because God wanted them to. Both agreed however in rejecting utilitarianism.

Joanna Innes observed that Roberto cited Michael Drolet, but Drolet was clear that the same kind of discourse was being used by both moderates and democrats in France. However, it's not necessary for all elements of their discourse to be distinctive for them to have a distinctive line. Distinctiveness might lie in the particular combination of these ideas and the conclusions drawn from them.

She noted that Roberto had said that the moderates did not talk much about democracy before the 1840s, whereas earlier it had been suggested that democrat was enduringly the antonym of moderate: which was right?

Roberto said it was possible that the term was used in casual denigration earlier; his point was that there was no sustained engagement with it in public texts. Gioberti was an exception.

Mark Philp wanted to know who moderates conceived of as their audience: Mazzini after all was a European figure.
Maurizio noted that some moderate work was translated into English and/or French
Roberto said that it was nonetheless not cited in English or French debates; essentially the moderates were engaged in a dialogue with other Italians.
Viviana Mellone noted that Neapolitan patriots translated their propaganda into French.

DAY 2

SECOND SESSION: PRACTICE

Paper 7: Luca Mannori, Qu'est-ce qu'il était une constitution démocratique pour les patriots du Risorgimento?

His aim was to explore what a democratic constitution meant for those Italians who, from 1830s, began to call themselves republicans or democrats. They often weren't very specific about institutional forms – not something they had the opportunity to flesh out in practice. But also republican ideals were in nature more ethical and literary: the imagined republic provided a context in which differences were erased by fraternity. Many were sceptical about whether a republic was realisable in a corrupt and ignorant society. An avowed democrat like Guerrazzi could say 1847 that though he loved the republic, he never expected to see it.

Even those who were prepared to fight to establish a republic, following the example of the French revolution, were often quite vague about its form, specifying only universal suffrage, cheap government etc. Dominating the thought of these democrats was above all the idea that there needed to be a fundamental rupture, a revolution, to create the conditions for a constituent assembly; thoughts about form were properly postponed until then. The chief problem was seen to be creating a democratic society: constitutional forms would follow. Mazzini was typical in thinking that a republican constitution would be simple in nature, merely expressing the will of the people.

But on two occasions the problem had to be confronted. First 1831-2, when Mazzini and Buonarroti struggled for control of the Italian revolutionary movement within the exile community, and during the Roman Republic. From these instances, it seems possible to identify two archetypes.

First might be called radical; took as its point of reference Jacobin constitution of 1793. Exemplified by Buonarroti's constitutional project of 1831, following the plan by the French republican Charles Teste. Key characteristics of this were the idea of the permanence of the sovereign: people continually to exercise power through electoral comices, and a monist form of government: insofar as authority delegated at all, only to a single body, the legislative assembly. An executive authority needed to execute laws – members to be chosen by assembly from lists of names submitted by comices.

Quite different were various plans drawn up in the Young Italy milieu, which looked rather to Napoleonic constitutionalism or the carbonarist imaginary (for example, a plan drawn up by the Parma patriot Luigi Mussi, probably annotated by Mazzini himself). Here, representation crucial; deputies to wield authority. Suffrage to be universal – though Mussi envisaged it being exercised indirectly through five levels, as in the Spanish constitution of 1812 or the project for the republic of Ausonia which circulated in Naples 1820. Science and lumiere needed to exercise power. The nation was imagined as a cascade of intermediating bodies. In

this vision, government was not monist. The people were to elect three parallel authorities: legislative assembly, senate and president, who was to hold executive power for ten years. In effect a capacitary democracy, legitimated by popular vote, but with power vested in a notable elite.

In 1849, the debate in the constituent assembly still revolved around these two conceptions, though European institutional experience in the 1840s had produced changes and streamlining. After 1848, no more talk of the continual intervention of the people (the idea was abandoned in the constitution of the French Second Republic) nor of indirect election – had its last hurrah in Italy 1847; not endorsed even by monarchical Statuti. General acceptance of direct universal suffrage helped to bring the two models much closer together. Moreover all shared the sense politics not about reconciling different interests, but about defending liberties against the attacks of evil individuals. But still deep divisions about the proper form of the state. The first constitutional project, presented to the assembly by Mazzini's secretary Agostini, was much like Mussi's (the people were to elect not only a legislative assembly but a tribunate with a suspensive veto and three consuls). But most deputies couldn't see why a single people needed these different authorities – esp tribunate seen as unnecessary hangover from ancient class-divided Roman republic. In final form, tribunate suppressed, assembly left to elect three consuls for 3-year terms.

Lack of belief political institutions in a democracy would have to adjudicate conflict and reconcile competing interests survived brief political experience. An 1851 *Dizionario politico populare*, from Turin, manifests this continuing utopianism: democracy evokes a space without classes.

Joanna Innes welcomed its paper for its clear exposition of these two forms of democratic constitution. She asked about the roots of the turn against indirect election. She also questioned whether the idea of continuous intervention from the people was altogether abandoned: in the United States in the later nineteenth century practices of referendum and recall were developed in some states to give effect to it.
Luca M said that it was natural in Italy for there to be indirect elections; all constitutions of the 1820s envisaged that. The 1848 French constitution was the turning point. As to the active citizen: his point was that no provision was made in the constitution of the Roman republic – the distinction made in 1793 in France between decrees which didn't need popular sanction and laws which did was abandoned. There was indeed some continuing interest in participation, on the part eg of Pisacane. But thenceforth the mainstream idea was that representation was sufficient.

Luca di Mauro asked why he dated the Ausonian project to the 1820s. He said that in the context of the Ausonian constitution the federal system wasn't meant to distance people from the government but, on the contrary, the national assembly was formed by the delegates from the local assemblies (democratically elected), in order to give voice to the local specificities.
Luca M said he dated it then simply because it was published then. He noted that he thought it was possible to combine representative democracy with localism, even if that was of no interest to Mazzini himself: there was more than one strand of Mazzinian thought, and some Mazzinians had a less Jacobin concept of the nation. It's possible to conceive of indirect election as a way of representing the complexity of local societies.

Gianluca Fruci suggested in relation to the shift against indirect suffrage that crucial was a big debate in France 1817 in which the liberals attacked the practice, while it was espoused by ultra-royalists. Although the outcome of that was a restricted franchise, the same

arguments could be mounted against indirect election in the context of universal suffrage. This influenced eg Marrast, Louis Blanc.

Roberto Romani wondered, given that parties were excluded in principle, what role was left to the good citizen. Was he to help shape public opinion?
Luca di M said it wasn't clear to him how they thought the opinions of the people would be transmitted to parliament; he agreed this seemed to be a problem. He thought they were suspicious of public opinion, though maybe it was OK if it functioned at a strictly local level.

Ian Coller was interested in the 3-consul element of the model. He saw this as a recurrent theme – he remembered Luca di Mauro's mention of 3 kings the previous day. This didn't look like convergence on a 'modern' presidential model.
Luca M said this was the subject of debate in Rome 1848. Some recommended one man. But recent French experience was seen to tell against this: after all, France was then besieging the Roman republic. He thought that the model of the Consulate continued to be important even after 1848.

Maurizio Isabella said that, contrary to Luca M's suggestion earlier, he had the impression that Mazzini valued public opinion, saying it was an engine of civilisation, though he nonetheless conceived of it as unitary, and in that sense a parallel to the concept of popular will.
Mark Philp noted that this meant the terms of debate were very different from revolutionary America, where a premise was that opinion would always be divided.

Paper 8, Gian Luca Fruci, Suffrage universel et pratiques plébiscitaires dans l'Italie révolutionnaire et napoléonienne

Expressions of popular approval by yes or no vote, which we retrospectively call plebiscites, had a long history in Italy and played an important part in Italians' political socialisation. Between spring 1797 and autumn 1798 hundreds of thousands of men, and occasionally also women and children participated in primary assemblies or in fetes of federation which sometimes replaced them to ratify sister-constitutions. Thus Cispadane, Cisalpine and Ligurian republics 1797, Rome 1798 and Cisalpine republic again for a revised version of constitution. Following French usage, describe as 'liberi voti di accettazione e ratifica'. Ratified at the same time a territory, a constitution and a person. Name of Bonaparte hung over everything, and in some instances present. Point not the outcome not the process, the mobilisation involved. An apprenticeship both in voting and in the control of voting. Echoing to some extent procedures in France of 1793 and 95, they also set the scene for 99, and for the votes of 1804, extended to Elba and the annexed parts of Piedmont, sanctioning hereditary rule in Bonaparte family. From 1805, declined in Italy – that year that ancient word 'plebiscito' revived. In that year citizens of Genoa and Lucca were asked to sign or consent silently, in the first case to union with French empire, in the second to the establishment of a Napoleonid dynasty; in each case associated with ritualised expressions of gratitude to king-emperor. Will highlight three points: role of Bonaparte; symmetry between expansion of electorate and contraction of deliberative space; development of practice of correcting and ameliorating outcomes.

Notes that public official discourse presented voting and oath taking as evincing gratitude to Napoleon, who played a role in drafting early constitutions. 1797 Cisalpine fete organised in

tandem with Directory in place of vote, after Cispadane consultation had been deemed unsatisfying. Iconography developed further between first and second constitutions.

Voting control: April 1798 Batavian republic endorsed by people following purging of electoral lists. In Italian republics, a different course was pursued: the electorate was enlarged, more broadly than civic rights in constitutions endorsed, which required some tax payment to be either an active or passive citizen. Thus, in Cisalpine case, servants and young men of 17-18 included; in Cispadane case, minors as young as 15 participated. Various instances of women participating in acclamation. No accident term '*voto universale*' entered circulation; same time that Sieyes and Mallet du Pan were propagating term universal suffrage. Instead, control exercised by avoiding deliberation. Most common way of expressing wishes of electoral body was by acclamation. Though in Cispadane and Cisalpine cases were instances of comices unanimously rejecting constitutions. Dissent perceived as an unfortunate accident: encouraged more management. Local patriots developed various techniques to achieve unanimity, such as exemplary approbations, subsequently used in France. No votes represented as strange, work of fanatics, ignorance, egoism. Counterrevolutionary plot at point of election became a standard topos. Numbers of positive votes centrally reported.

If all this not enough, might retouch results, not in order to change direction of vote, but to bring it closer to unanimity. Practice of totalling individual votes experimental in 1797-8: in France 1793 had reported numbers by assembly, though 95 by head. In Cispadane case constitution often rejected in rural departments. Junta of General Defence directed counting body to count as positive votes of all who were entitled to vote but hadn't. Subsequent practice in France, to make Bonaparte look good compared to earlier constitutions. 1805 system of public registers first developed in France, then applied in Genoa and Lucca. Practice of counting abstentions as positive votes enshrined in law.

Prepared the way for the plebiscites of the Risorgimento, employed in 1848, 60 and 70 in context of extending and confirming position of house of Savoy.

Discussion

Ian Coller liked the idea of a laboratory, but wondered who was doing the experimenting. The French? Italians? The laboratory metaphor suggests a controlled process, but perhaps it was more undirected and cumulative.
Gianluca said that he saw the process of experimentation as being undertaken in both France and Italy. [He subsequently clarified that he did not mean to imply any intentionality].
Viviana Mellone had a related question: did these practices promote local leaders?
Gianluca said that the iconography was entirely Napoleon-centred.

Juan Luis Simal said that in the Spanish case, the first cases of mass participation seem to have been at local level, in ayuntamentos – were there also local elections in Italy?
Gianluca said that primary assemblies took place at parish level, and did also provide occasions for electing local officials and representatives in the legislative assembly, but there has been no Italian study of these processes.
He mentioned that fetes also provided an occasion for the assembling of militias; in that sense they drew on ritual practices developed elsewhere.

Gonzalo Butron Prida suggested that the closest Spanish parallel was the constitutional oath
Gianluca said in Italy this took place in the same ceremony

Joanna said that it was worth reflecting more generally on the relationship between elections and oath taking**.** In Britain until 1723 mass oath taking was directed from above. But in the 1790s, when people were sometimes asked to take loyalty oaths in the context of the perceived Jacobin threat, these were initiated locally, as a device for marginalising the disloyal.

Gianluca said that after Campoformio all citizens of Venice over 16 were asked to vote to accept the outcome of the treaty (their submission to rule by Austria) by casting black or white balls.

There were other instances in which people signed registers to endorse appropriate sentiments during the 1790s and the Risorgimento. In the 1870s, the practice was adopted in the context of attempts on the life of the royal family.

Paper 9: Viviana Mellone, Democrats and the 1848 revolution in Naples: the conquest of the capital

She said not much attention had been paid to southern democrats' relationship with society, or to political mobilisation in Naples during the 1848 revolution: more attention has been paid to peasant risings, perhaps because the city's political life is imagined to have been dominated by elites. In fact, popular demonstrations of support for liberals and democrats were important in persuading the king that the people chiefly inclined to them.

Extreme liberals in Kingdom of Two Sicilies were men from the provinces; some were from entrepreneurial backgrounds, some landlords and nobles, subject on the one hand to enlightened, on the other to romantic influences. They tended to have histories of rebellious activity, having participated in 1820-1 revolutions, or having carbonarism in the family; some had even supported the 1799 republic. The revolution began January in Sicily, with demands for a constitution; by February there were already problems, with Sicily pressing for autonomy, and disappointment in the limited pace of reform. The democrats drove street protests in Naples late Feb, attracting support from various groups, including landlords, intellectuals, students, working class and soldiers in the national guard. In March news arrived of uprising elsewhere, and there were further protests, culminating in the fall of the second constitutional government on 29 March. April to mid May, a final wave of popular demonstrations ended when troops got the upper hand and opened the way for the third Restoration.

Her paper focussed on the issue of public sector reform, and the way democrats exploited that, by way of contributing to an understanding of how democrats were able to mobilise such diverse social groups. Following Banti and his school, she wanted to recognise the importance of non-ideological popular subjectivities; but unlike them, she wanted to stress the importance of party leadership.

Radicals (she used the term to avoid too casually employing the label democrats) criticised the first revolutionary government for not having tackled the problem of layabouts and corruption in public service: in February they made this an issue alongside extension of the right to vote to students and have-nots, and peace with Sicily. The public sector reform issue seems to have been important in leading moderate liberals in Basilicata to align themselves not with the liberal government but with the democratic committee in Naples. In March, radicals started exploiting this issue more extensively, now changing tactics and denouncing individual public servants. Naming and shaming articles were among other things intended to amuse. This encouraged protests in offices aimed at individuals, and also demonstrations at individuals' homes. Of 23 demonstrations Jan-May, 11 were against individuals. The issue

was among those that attracted support of the young, since their superiors or professors might be among those criticised. In the national guard, merging of new recruits and the old city militia was a source of much tension, and the election of officers emerged as an explosive issue: members of the old militia thought they had a right to these positions and refused to stand.

By late March, radicals were demanding the reform of the constitution, to remove the upper house and return to the constitution of 1820. In the national guard, the opposition of some old militia officers to constitutional change encouraged fusion of the two conflicts. The attempt to draw students into a liberal protest against the proposed change had the opposite effect.

Though the democrats' slanderous tactics were very effective, they did raise questions about ethics: Luigi Settembrini, who had been among their supporters 1848, subsequently criticised their conduct on this score.

Discussion

Maurizio Isabella wanted to know more specifically which bits of government were targeted. And was the driving force resentment against individuals? The desire to open up careers? To restructure government?
Viviana said there were different levels of protest. There was a case for reform: people had been promoted by the personal intervention of the king; those close to him had urged the need to reform this practice before 1848. But there was also a question of the unsatisfied ambitions of skilled people, and then there were personal resentments.

Caroline Castellano: was struck by the reference to hospitals. She could see a basis for conflict in the relation between doctors wholly based there and professors coming in from outside.

Joanna Innes asked whether corporations figured in this discourse, as monopolising power – were there artisan corporations ?
Viviana said that artisan corporations did exist, but they were not controversial.

Mark Philp asked if she was suggesting that there was an important distinction between problematic, purely personal attacks and more structural complaints, eg about king's role in promotions?
Viviana said that she hadn't heard of similar personal attacks elsewhere.

Danielo Raponi asked if heads of administration were often clergy, and if there was an anticlerical dimension. Were the clergy blamed for backwardness, a common account given by foreign observers.
Viviana said that clergy were indeed seen as a problem. But the Church itself was not attacked. Pius IX in 1847 was seen as someone who had the allegiance of the ordinary people, as a result eg of his having given land to peasants, and the radicals were aware that an anti-clerical discourse would be problematic.

Roberto Romani commented that on the one hand it was common in moderate propaganda for the Papal States to be criticised on the grounds that the clergy were not fit to rule; but on the other hand some clergy claimed that they were the real democrats, the ones closest to the people. The Jesuits made this argument in the 1850s.

Gian Luca Fruci said the account suggested a pattern opposite to that prevailing in 1799: now the provinces were revolutionising the capital. Were there references to 1799?
Viviana said yes, but more commonly to 1820-1. In fact, administrative reform quite often involved attempt to reinstate older staff dismissed in that period.
Luca Mannori wondered if there was such a contrast as Gianluca had suggested. Even in 1799, the typical 'Jacobin' was a student from the provinces who has come to Naples to study. He noted that the word Jacobin continued to figure in counterrevolutionary propaganda, but it was not a term of self-description.

Paper 10: Carolina Castellano, Rituals and identity languages: the political culture of the Carboneria

She said the Carboneria was a difficult subject: a historical black box. We can look at some personalities involved, and at what was written about them, but not at their activities. We don't have a clear history of their origins: Barruel's theory of a Masonic plot is still alive – indeed there is a right wing historiography which still attributes the Risorgimento to Masonic plotting. What is clear is that they played an important role in politicising society, esp until the 1820s, but even in 1848.

She planned to say something about their origins, and at what happened when they were introduced into the southern provinces. Sources for this included Bartholdy, *Memoirs of the secret societies* (1821). He came from the Prussian reformist milieu of Hardenberg, spent time in the Papal States, arriving in Naples probably in the spring 1820, before the constitutional revolution. He had good relationships with the Neapolitan government before the revolution but was very active in collecting information and source material about Carbonarism, and was an informant of the Troppau conference. He published his findings, details of formulas, catechisms etc, probably for commercial reasons, initially in London, though the book was later translated into German and published in Berlin. The effect of publication was to enlarge debate over secret societies and carbonarism. Bartholdy insisted on the division between the Freemasonry, "diffused amongst all ranks" and the Carboneria, recruited from the popular classes by the imperial police of Fouché.

The *Staatslexicon* of the 1830s contrasted Carboneria (for which it seems they drew information from Bartholdy) and the Tugendbund – the latter had been formed by the Prussian government in 1813 to promote action against the French army. It was suggested that the latter was preferable, representing a use of the associational form by the government, to defend the nation. The larger context can be seen as a clash between British and French empires which made politics a concern for more than just courts. According to Bartholdy, Carbonarism was imported into Italy by the Napoleonic police, by Fouché, who wrote to Wellington of the need for the active interference of the multitude, to engage with the working masses. (Suspicion that he had plotted with Wellington led to his rejection by Napoleon's parliament). If this is right, then the parallel is closer.

Another important text was a pamphlet by the prince of Canosa, a former minister of police under the Bourbon Restoration, who returned to his ministry during the 1820-1 revolution, when he was accused of having given weapons to the Calderari (a sect deriving from the Sanfedisti, which was politically opposed to Carboneria after 1815). In 1822 he wrote a pamphlet, published by a British journal. He claimed the society had its origins in the workers' organisations of Palermo. Like Fouché, he focussed on the working masses, who gained a new significance in the context of imperial conflict. By his account, the Calderari

were formed after the publication of the Bourbonic constitution of Sicily in 1812, which had deprived them of their juridical status as guilds; the social background of this sect was, in contrast to the Freemasons and Carbonari, popular, which in his account led to their accountability and pure morality.

As regards the very origin of Carboneria, which was very widespread in the South of Italy during the Napoleonic era, in spite of the dichotomy imagined by Canosa, the two societies shared a common ground from their very beginning, when amongst the Carbonari there had been groups of strong opposers of the Murat regime, who had been migrated (spontaneously or as a result of expulsion) in 1813 and merged into the Society of the Trinity, which in turn gave rise to the Calderari ('coppersmiths'). These societies were distinct from the Carboneria.

We don't know much about the geographical diffusion of cells ('vendite'), though do now have an initial map of this. It seems that the societies first took off in Calabria and Abruzzo, in the boundary region between England and France. This fits with the view that the origins of the societies are associated with the clash of empires.

The societies used a specific language of mobilisation, including symbols taken from French compagnonnage. They were apparently introduced into the Kingdom of Naples by a French functionary, Pierre-Joseph Briot (he probably wrote the constitution of Ausonie). Compagnonnage symbols were designed to allow members to recognise eachother. A paradox is that, though they used the symbols of a secret society, these societies also wished to make their existence visible in public space.

Discussion

Maurizio Isabella observed that the picture was complex. Indeed it was hard to see how a secret society could set itself the goal of enlightening the masses. He suggested that the nature of the public sphere changed during the 1820-1 revolution: as it developed, they became more public.
He wondered what part their language and rituals played in shaping the new political culture. Also how far their own structure shaped their ideas about desirable constitutional forms.
Mark Philp added that in England the London Corresponding Society hadn't started with a clear view about how to organise themselves: once they had to cope with rising membership, they introduced a rule that when a group reached the number of 20 it should split into two groups of 10. Their practical experience may however subsequently have influenced their thinking about politics.
Maurizio suggested that in the case of the Carboneria there might be some mirroring between their hierarchical structure and the electoral system, with its local base linked through tiers to the centre.
Carolina said she had the opposite impression: in the revolution there was a tendency towards centralisation. Before the revolution there were two 'summits' of the society, one at Salerno (it had moved there in 1816, to protect the societies) the other remaining in Naples; this developed into a conflict within the societies between rural and urban.
It's a problem that it's so difficult to penetrate the world of the societies. They did have elections, but we don't know how they worked.

Ian Coller asked what happened in later C19 – did they persist?
Carolina said that they survived until 1848, and indeed after, some until now. She suggested that their secrecy was not just the product of necessity and repression: there is a kind of religion of the secret. In the rites they explain why secrecy is necessary. The sect is a keeper of a pure morality, an evangelical morality; the first Christian societies are portrayed as secret

organisations; Dante is said to have been initiated. They claim to be acting for the regeneration of society. Benedito Mussolino rejected bourgeois constitutionalism on the grounds that it was not consistent with evangelical morality

Juan-Luis Simal wanted to ask about international dimensions of the societies. She had mentioned German, French, Latin American and Italian societies, but there is a problem between what is real and what is imagined in this world. Both reactionaries and society members had an interest in exaggerating their role, particularly in the post-Restoration context.
He wanted to know more about Bertoldi and his links to authority.
Carolina said it was not clear that he was sent by anyone, but he did have links both to the Prussian court and to Consalvi in the Papal States. The *Staatslexicon* entry may have been based on his report, suggesting its circulation in Prussia, but this can't be proved.
Juan Luis objected that the Prussian government including Hardenberg worried about the Tugendbund, believing that it had been colonised by ultras, so it seems strange that it should have been positively contrasted. It seems they wanted information partly to assess the real extent of the threat. Hardenberg sent a spy to the Hambach festival who reported that it was not as revolutionary as was being suggested.
Carolina said that the orientation of the societies could certainly change through time. Though founded with French input, the Italian societies became anti-French. The good feature of the Tugendbund was that it had formed in response to government initiative, in contrast say to the student Bursenschaft.

Luca Mannori wanted to press on why the societies were secret. Is she suggesting that this was not so much because they wanted to conspire as because of their ideas about truth, a notion that different truths should be communicated to different people? How democratic a notion was that?
Carolina reported that one of them said the point was not to plot but to open a space where they could organise themselves, instead of being organised by others. Secrecy had a social function, but also a religious significance.

Paper 11, Alessio Petrizzo, Quelle légitimation pour les parlements italiens de 1848?

He would be concerned with the process of legimating parliamentary institutions esp during the first half of 1848 in the four main states: Naples, the Papal States, Tuscany and Sardinia-Piedmont, underlining the multiplicity of voices and strategies, especially at times of institutional transition,

He did not find 'democracy' invoked. Parliaments conceived rather as ways to ward off democracy, associated with violence and tumult.

On the part of courts and their supporters, finds the primary impulse is to camouflage the extent of change, and the making of potentially dangerous alliances with liberals. While a liberal discourse might celebrate parliaments as 'thrones of nations', court discourse stressed the continuance of monarchical sovereignty, using notions of gift and paternalism when characterising new initiatives. Subjects normally called 'peoples', in the plural, presumably to avoid any notion of a single, even sovereign people.

To avoid any possibility of parliaments representing themselves as constituent powers (likely to different degrees in different places), court discourse strove to anchor them in older historical traditions. Presented as extension of reforms already begun 1847 in Rome, Florence

and Turin (in terms of liberty of the press, mayors, civic guards, consultative assemblies etc). Also represented as perfecting older dynastic instruments, as under Peter Leopold's late C18 Tuscan constitution; the Savoy estates; the C13 Roman senate.

For an alternative view, may turn to liberal press. Problem there was that in 30s and 40s liberals had largely rejected the kinds of institutional solutions crowns were now offering. So, except for those who read foreign news, parliaments were pretty unfamiliar kinds of institution to the many who, esp in urban regions, had been mobilised during 1848. Had to legitimate these bodies as in some way capable of representing extended social interests, even if electorate tiny, maybe 2% of population, of whom many abstained, and members of upper house perhaps named by monarch.

Liberal press used three strategies in this context. It tried to arouse interest in parliamentary spaces, and in the formalities of procedure. Highlighted certain orators, wrote of 'duels' etc. A kind of legitimation as spectacle. But this has more to do with trying to make them interesting than legitimate. First legitimate tactic was to invoke principle of publicity – argued to show Italian politics had attained a new level of civilisation. Parliaments, as in Rome, which maintained a degree of secrecy in voting were criticised for this. Opportunities for public to attend were emphasised. Also invoked ideas of 'nation' and 'people'. Public opinion a linking concept in this context. During 1847, had been invoked by people such as d'Azeglio. Babble of voices in 1848 to some extent undermined idea of a unitary opinion. But still attempts to invoke this, either by speaking of people (esp after insurrections of Palermo, Milan and Venice), and of the 'Italian nation' (supposed subject of the Risorgimento) – establishment of parliaments portrayed as a contribution to national revival. Even those who are never considered democrats, such as Farini and d'Azeglio, might invoke these concepts – d'Azeglio explicitly celebrating not the people as manifested in 1848 but those who in 1847 welcomed the new dawn.

These remained important justifications in Piedmont in the 1850s and then in the Kingdom of Italy from 1860.

Discussion

Joanna Innes wondered what word they used for voters, and how they represented them.
Alessio said they were spoken of as 'comitati elettorali' – sounded more impressive than just 'voters'. When electoral results were proclaimed, a wider group was assembled.
Joanna observed that this suggested a lack of confidence in the basis of their power. Do they not offer any kind of legitimation for the narrowness of the electorate? Say that they were the most educated elements, for example?
Alessio said that that would have been difficult in the political context of the time. Voting was not the only channel for representation: there were clubs etc looking for other forms of representation.

Roberto Romani asked how the relationship between the different powers was imagined. Did they talk about concord between powers? In 1859, concord was a key term.
Alessio said that there was always a threat of conflict, though how much this developed varied: more the case in Rome and Naples than in Sardinia-Piedmont, though it threatened even there.

Luca Mannori asked what nation was invoked.
Alessio said that it could be the Italian nation, or something more local: Sicilian or Neapolitan. More difficult in the case of Rome: there was no notion of pontifical nation. He

stressed that to invoke the nation was not necessarily to imply that there should be political unity.

Gianluca Fruci asked if the people entered the picture in the character of volunteers.
Alessio said that they might be invoked either as a *people combatant* or as the nation. He suggested that war provided a context which made it possible to invoke the people without any democratic implication.

Joanna asked if parliaments used religious ceremonies, eg prayers
Maurizio said that in Naples in 1820 proceedings started with a Te Deum. **Juan Luis** said it was the same in Spain.
Gianluca said in Italy new parliaments did meet for a Te Deum.
Mark suggested that church and parliament might both think they needed the other.

ROUND TABLE

Specialists in other Mediterranean regions were invited to make final comments on what had struck them.

Eleni Calligas:

She had found the discussion very stimulating. She thought that Greek debate was totally dominated by issues of establishing the state and then building the nation: not much attention was given to institutions, elections etc.

In the Ionian islands, there was a desire to be part of Greece, but most young politicians active in the late 40s had been students in Paris, Pisa or Naples in the 1830s. They engaged in more debate about power and legitimacy. Their political system was not entirely free, but between 1847-51 there was a window of opportunity, with freedom of the press. Then they started translating material from foreign presses, bringing the wider European discussion to the Ionian islands. But there has not been enough discussion of these links in the historical scholarship.

Paolo Girardelli:

One thing that should be emphasised is the considerable migration that took place towards the eastern Mediterranean in this period. There has been little work on the political migration into the east in the Napoleonic period and in 1820s, 30s and 40s, but it was considerable, esp after 1848.

Regarding Neapolitan-Ottoman connections, it was interesting to learn from Anna Maria Rao that Filangeri was one writer who avoided the stereotype of oriental despotism, which was a largely Venetian and Hapsburg construction. Naples had an embassy in Istanbul as early as 1740, soon after having gained independence from Spain. In the 1830s about 2,000 Neapolitans resided in Istanbul officially or otherwise. Many of them were members of the Carboneria or other secret societies and became prominent people; the Neapolitan architect Carelli went to Istanbul in 1831, he taught privately architecture to Armenian practitioners, designed an imperial palace which was not executed, and then ended up in Moldavia. Paolo had learnt from Carolina Castellana that the Neapolitan network extended as far as Palestine.

It is often said that the Risorgimento fuelled constitutional reform in the Ottoman empire – but concrete forms and channels of influence should be studied in more depth, and we should not think of this as a one-way traffic. One French writer wrote that what attracted him to the Ottoman world in the Napoleonic period was liberality and freedom. There were freemasons in the Ottoman empire from C18; they interacted in various ways with Ottoman society – and were seen as simply a western counterpart of Sufi brotherhoods.What was most striking to European residents and observers was the pluralism of the Ottoman world. They were surprised eg by the relative absence of anti-semitism.

France is usually considered as the model for the Ottoman attempts to reform in the 1830s - 70s – but in fact Italy was kept under constant scrutiny in this period by members of the Ottoman establishment and by those supporting the 1876 Ottoman constitution. Just as some Catholic Italian writers of the Risorgimento claimed that their ideas on democracy were essentially 'Christian', Ottoman modernizers also had an interest in showing that the origins of the reforms and constitution they advocated went back into the Ottoman and Islamic past. It was originally intended that the convention to establish an Ottoman constitution of 1876 would meet in a mosque, but this didn't work out, and instead they met in the imperial palace.

Liberty, equality and solidarity take on very different meanings in different contexts. In the context of Euro-Ottoman encounters, liberty was mainly conceived in terms of economic liberty, and as such was strongly supported by members of the mercantile community.

Ian Coller:

There are some geographical points worth bringing out, for example that Marseilles is as close to Algiers as it is to Paris. And it's clear that Italy, esp islands such as Lampedusa (in the news again now), played a major part in linking N and S. Diderot saw it as a point at which Christianity and Islam might coexist. The dey of Algiers went into exile in Naples after the French invasion because he spoke the language, Italian being the lingua franca in North Africa. Though a distinction also needs to be drawn between experience and attitudes in northern and southern Italy.

He was glad to see Italy being repositioned historiographically. Chakrabarty wrote an influential book, *Provincialising Europe*; the challenge within Europe is to provincialise France.

The chief thing he takes away is the idea of a shared revolutionary period, with influences going both ways.

He was now very confused about democracy, though fruitfully so – he thought the workshop had done a good job of problematizing the usual story. He wanted to emphasise three things that he thought had been achived:

1. The inevitability of our current model has been challenged
2. We have a basis for rejecting the view that there is a single track on which some people are trying to catch up
3. It's clear that there is a very complex relationship between religion and secularisation processes within democratic thinking – religion sits alongside these – contra the dominant trend in French history to see them as irreconcilable. And it then becomes important to rethink the relationship with the Ottoman world.

Juan Luis Simal:

Both Spanish and Italian historiographies are now getting to grips with the concept of exceptionalism, conceived in terms of backwardness. The idea of a failed revolution has been challenged by new forms of political history which focus on culture, gender, transnational links, now emotions. Every European country is exceptional, so the concept loses value; the question is, what kind of fruitful comparisons can we construct.

In relation to nation-state-building, Spain and Italy followed completely different paths. Italy unified itself; Spain had to reinvent itself in the context of imperial disintegration.

There was no 1848 in Spain. The moderate party retained hegemony.

There was a notable transfer of labels and terms between Spain and Italy – moderatos, liberales, secret societies, the constitution of Cadiz – and there were common elements such as the connection between education and religion; the importance of political catechisms; the backward reference to a past Golden Age, and the reinventing in Spain of the Cortes as a medieval institution with democratic elements in a mixed monarchy.

There may be differences – but there's a lot to be learned through the comparisons.

Two final points: religion and education need to be connected as themes; catechisms represent one point at which they cross. In Spain, many offered definitions: What is a constitution? What is a constitutional king? But he's never seen one that asks What is democracy?

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mark Philp

He wanted first to refer back to the question of legitimacy, raised by Mauro Lenci's paper. A related issue was authority – as a subject of discourse, as an organisational objective, as a problem of how it can be created by design; but also as a practical problem: who, and which groups, have it on what basis, how secure/fragile is it. It seems clear that in many cases there was an aspiration for a political order that had sufficient authority (independently of the agents who fill the roles) to command authority in setting the 'rules of the game', yet in all states that had experienced revolution or invasion and internal reordering, the problem was to get people to sign up to such rules. That practical problem in political sociology seems to illuminate many of the difficulties these states face, and helps make sense of a good deal of the political discourse, as a mix of claiming, vying for, or challenging authority.

Secondly, he observed that a good deal of the discussion of ideas had tended to focus on intro-group positions: we have been trying to understand different schools or positions of thought. The objection to this is that these positions are also practical political positions, forged in contestation, where positions taken by one group were shaped and reflected by the positions taken by other groups. The implication is that we might need to see how the terrain looks when it is read as a process of struggle and locate political ideas in that context.

Joanna Innes

Thanked paper givers and discussants for their hard work and for making this such a stimulating event – and especially Mauro Lenci for his indefatigable work as host.