

## **ESF Exploratory Workshop**

*“Freemasonry and National Identities in Europe: Levels of Construction”*

**Vrije Universiteit Brussel – 28-30 September 2006**

### **1. Executive summary**

The workshop was organized over three days and made use of the facilities of the Etterbeek campus of Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Thursday and Friday) and of the Flemish Community Centre “De Markten” in downtown Brussels (Saturday). Four sessions were organised with paper presentation and extensive discussion: (a) Cosmopolitans, Patriots or Nationalists; (b) National Identities and Colonial Realities; (c) National, Regional and Local Identities; (d) Theoretical aspects: freemasonry, nationalism and levels of identification. The programme was finalised by a panel led discussion on further axes of research and debate, where options for follow-up initiatives were defined. Working languages were English and French. The one Hispanic participant / speaker was provided with simultaneous translation during the presentation of his paper.

Participants were mainly lodged at the Fondation Universitaire (with the exception of some junior researchers we hosted in the campus guest rooms) which provides for a club-like atmosphere allowing continuing discussion after the actual workshop sessions. The rather intensive programme was facilitated by the quality accommodation we provided for: a shuttle service to Etterbeek campus, an adapted conference room, high standard catering, full time disposition of administrative staff members for adequate reception and support of the participants. Preparation was facilitated for the participants by constructing a webpage that allowed the downloading of the papers before the start of the workshop. Other relevant literature was distributed at the arrival of the participants.

Specific provisions were to be made for participants from countries with particular economic and financial situations. Delicate visa problems involving potential liability issues were resolved in subtle manner with the Belgian diplomatic services. Pre-financing of airplane tickets further facilitated this participation. Very shortly before the actual start of the workshop a programme change had to be made because one of the speakers (Dr. Stoyanov) was involved in a serious car crash abroad. Eventually, one of the participants diligently replaced the absent speaker, what allowed the programme to be continued without interruptions.

## 2. Scientific content of the event

In studying the connection between Freemasonry and the construction of national identities, the convenors of this workshop explicitly sought to bring together academics from different disciplinary backgrounds (historians and philosophers, but also cultural studies specialists, researchers in literary studies and religious sciences) and, perhaps even more important, with fairly different fields of research: i.e. specialists in the broad field of studies of Freemasonry and its history were invited alongside a number of senior researchers on nationalism and national identities. It is to be stressed from the start that this approach has proved to be most fruitful. In this way, the classical paper presentations were not simply the basis of an “in-crowd discussion”. The availability of the papers on a limited access webpage and the distribution of a book with several stimuli for theoretical discussion allowed a thorough preparation of all participants. By dint of appointing active discussants with fairly different research perspectives as compared to the speakers, a most lively debate was stimulated which went way beyond the merely empirical level. No doubt this was partly due to the high quality of the papers, their innovative character and their delineation of intriguing parallels between several national or regional cases, but the intense discussion also drew attention to high-level theoretical issues which will provide a focus for further scientific collaboration in this field. Time and again the scope of the discussion developed in the direction of a more epistemological questioning of our field of research: how to develop common research agendas; how to transcend national or disciplinary “silos”; how to develop models allowing a genuine comparative approach; and how Freemasonry in its historical appearance can be used as a new tool to investigate further theoretical issues concerning the construction of national identities, given that this field already has a fairly sophisticated level of theoretical discussion? The convenors organised presentations and discussion through three more empirical clusters, one theory-related sessions and a final debate on results and follow-up perspectives.

The session “Cosmopolitans, Patriots or Nationalists” was most revealing as to the profound process of change within European Freemasonry in the last years of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and even more in the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Freemasonry had developed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century as an essentially cosmopolitan project and was successful in forming a transnational network, allowing persons, ideas, books and other cultural artefacts to travel across boundaries. Specific social, often aristocratic groups with high levels of geographical mobility and often a common intellectual “lingua franca” (i.e. French language) were most active in developing a Masonic sociability with a fairly stable outlook in very different settings. Andreas Önnersfors (Lund) showed how little relevant the sheer concept of “Swedishness” was for 18<sup>th</sup>-century Masonry in the Swedish kingdom, not only because of the composite nature of the state as such, but just as well for the completely different symbolical frame in which Freemasons actually operated. In a similar vein, Tatiana Artemieva (Saint-Petersburg) explained how 18<sup>th</sup>-century Freemasons in Russia actually considered their Masonic affiliation as a marker of their adherence to a more global and enlightened European culture. As was shown by Jef Van Bellingen, specific ritual regimes like the Strict Observance were even consciously developed to transcend state boundaries and to come to a genuinely transnational structures, who, in a contemporary setting, might be considered as international NGO’s. The profoundness of this cosmopolitan project makes the relatively quick shift to a Freemasonry that was more closely related to national boundaries or that was even actively “instrumentalised” to serve the formation of the new nation-states all the more remarkable. Two elements come back time and again: (a) the importance of the Napoleonic wars and the reshaping of the European state

system during the period Restoration, and (b) the transformation of membership structure of the lodges in the different states.

In this specific period, certainly after the Vienna congress, different political actors took a most active stance with respect to Freemasonry and in a most voluntary fashion approached it as a possible means of enhancing cohesion amongst the nation-state's elites. Anton van de Sande (Leiden/Nijmegen) described, mainly with respect to the Netherlands, how monarchs and their aristocratic advisors had an important part in that process. Indeed, the sheer appointment of the very young Prince Frederic as grand master of the whole of the Masonic order in the reunited Netherlands was a deliberate policy with that objective. In a very subtle manner, Jef Van Bellingen proved how "innocent" discussions on ritual to be used in the low countries' setting revealed clear political goals, i.e. to give shape to a proper type of Freemasonry, to impose a breach with all ritual tradition with too "French" a flavour, even to transform elements derived from ritual traditions with clearly cosmopolitan traits like the Strict Observance in order to use them in a specific national setting, or even better, to help them produce that national setting. With respect to this last example, one cannot but be struck by the fact that the element of "constructedness" and of the "imagining" of tradition was indeed based on the outright forgery of historical documents, on the uninhibited manipulation of Masonic history.

If princes and aristocrats played an important role in this development, the social group that was to become the most important base of this nationally related Freemasonry was the middle class. If the 18<sup>th</sup>-century cosmopolitan Masonry derived its particular outlook from what Önnersfors described as an "*all-European mobile functional elite*", as "*privileged people, diplomats, officers, artists, merchants, to the largest extent belonging to the high nobility or the new emerging state nobility*", who used Freemasonry to promote "*their mobility across different semiotic zones of Enlightenment Europe*", the post-1815 states actively engaged in the formation of a new national functional elite, which proved progressively far less aristocratic but more and more bourgeois in nature, whose cultural identification with the French language became ever less evident in a host of cases, vernaculars taking the place of the former European "lingua franca". In more than one case, adhering to Freemasonry looks as a kind of distinction strategy. The remarks go for Sweden, but there is no doubt that very similar shifts have taken place in other European countries. One of the best examples of the involvement of a liberal and profoundly bourgeois Freemasonry in the construction of a national identity is certainly the Italian case. As Anna Maria Isastia (Rome) convincingly showed, Italian Freemasons did not construct the young and unified kingdom as such, but they certainly engaged themselves most actively in a host of activities aimed at the making of Italians. In a host of profoundly pedagogical activities, reaching from the so typical "statuomania" to the shaping of national systems of education, Italian Freemasons developed a repertoire which was to mark the new secular state, e.g. the semiotic points of reference of the "*Roma laica*" until today. In this respect again, the Italian example did not stand alone: in countries like Belgium or France very similar phenomena are to be observed.

The level on which the construction of national identities is to be studied where Freemasonry is concerned does not limit itself to the geographical boundaries of nation-state as such. The session on "National Identities and Colonial Realities" showed what high degree of complexity actually characterises the relationships between Freemasonry, national identity, Empire building and the transformation of former colonial territories into new states. As far as these last developments are concerned, Freemasonry does not seem to have played a significant role in the struggles for independence by new states in Latin America, as José

Antonio Ferrer Benimeli (Zaragoza) extensively demonstrated, but its organisational forms were quite broadly imitated by these early 19<sup>th</sup>-century nationalist groups. Hosts of secret societies with structures similar to Freemasonry and specific political goals can be found in that epoch of South American history, but as far as can be found Freemasonry itself took no direct part in these movements. On the other hand, as Eduardo Torres Cuevas (La Havana) made clear, Masonic involvement in the construction of new civil societies in Latin or Central American countries could be rather important. The Cuban case is a clear example of this type of engagement. Colonial contexts still generate other ways of fostering national cohesion, i.e. as a unifying force in colonial empires as such. A study of Freemasonry in the British Empire by Jessica Harland-Jacobs (Florida) showed how networks of lodges constituted a metropolitan link, offered similar British national repertoires in symbols and ritual practices, and created sensibilities for which there was no tension between national identifications and (theoretically) supranational ones like Masonry. A most striking element that comes back time and again is the way Freemasonry, in these colonial contexts as well as so often elsewhere, constituted for important quantities of people a way of managing their geographical mobility. Lodge adherence before departure to the colonies immediately offered a network in the place of destination which could provide for hosting facilities, sociability or even a decent funeral if need would be. If these cohesive forces appear to be quite clear and unambiguous in the global context of the British Empire, Freemasonry could by contrast be a setting for more complex and fluid identifications, national or other. The research results presented by Roger Burt (Exeter) on migratory Masons in a non-colonial context showed how new groups of mobile Masons, i.e. not aristocrats or business men but worker Freemasons, developed very similar practices as the ones detected by Harland-Jacobs, more in particular when (temporarily) migrating from Britain to North American mining regions in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Clearly, mobility remained an important element in the attractiveness of Masonry way beyond the 18<sup>th</sup> century, with the “homo economicus” as a major motive for adherence, as well as clearly gendered sociability needs. Most interesting as well, is the way regime changes in colonial settings were translated in Masonic activities. The transfer of political control from one state to another, in specific cases like colonial Trinidad, where Spain, France and Britain took control in different periods, Masonic activity was pragmatically related to subsequent national obediences but at the same time continued to offer a meeting place for people with different national backgrounds, the French language remaining for a long time a privileged means of communication, as Cécile Revauger (Bordeaux) exposed.

If Freemasonry had this complex position in colonial settings outside the actual territory of the nation-states as such, the reverse question on levels on identity construction offers an image just as diverse and complex. In the session “National, Regional and Local Identities” the interventions showed that the implication of Masonic structures in the formation of national or more specifically sub-national identities was far from evident or stable. For Russian aristocrats in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as Artemieva showed, Freemasonry was by no means an instrument to construct some kind of “Russianness”, certainly not in an ethnic acceptance, but as a bridge to Europe. Their identifications were cosmopolitan and intellectual, with Masonic and scientific networks intimately interwoven, books and ideas travelling across borders, national and linguistic. There are other cases where Masonry and national or regional identifications seem at odds, at least up to a certain extent. Petri Mirala’s (Helsinki) account of the fascinating Irish case sheds a new light on the alleged incompatibility between a supposedly protestant and British-minded Freemasonry and an Irish national identity thoroughly marked by Catholicism. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century Irish Catholics did enter Masonic lodges, more, Irish ecclesiastical authorities even favoured a weakening of the condemnations of Masonry in order to allow Irish Catholics to adhere to a sociability close to the polity. It is

just as striking that early nationalist groups like the United Irishmen did count a number of Freemasons among their militant members. A major break did occur after the rebellion of 1798 when the catholic clergy made a U-turn on the matter, started condemning Freemasonry ever more violently, turning it into just one incarnation of the “other” against who Irish identity was to be constructed. Where more regional identifications are concerned, the patterns are even less univocal. The pioneering study of Eric Saunier (Le Havre) on the possible sensibility in Masonic lodges of 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>-century Normandy with regards to specific concerns of the region in which they operated showed a remarkable absence of this kind of concerns, although Normandy was a region with a rather strong regional identity. Although Normandy’s lodges acted in a fairly autonomous way as opposed to the Parisian centre, regional references lack on all levels and national issues remain the essential concern. The quite important differences between lodges of different parts of Normandy as their social, cultural and political stances were concerned apparently precluded a common identification. In Catalonia, regional identification was not absent in Freemasonry, but as Pere Sanchez Ferré (Barcelona) explained, “catalanism” only had a minor importance. Catalan consciousness first grew in a catholic context where anti-Masonic undertones were by no means absent. In the last decennia of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a Catalan lodge federation did come to the fore, which subsequently developed a complex relationship with the Spanish obediential structures, but since the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century other political preoccupations more or less marginalised concerns about Catalan identity.

The rich findings in the above sessions offered several points of attachment for a more global reflection in the session “Theoretical aspects: Freemasonry, nationalism and levels of identification”. As Montserrat Guibernau (London) clearly demonstrated, the theoretical debate on national identities and nationalism of the last decades has shown a long struggle between a modernist or constructivist approach against older primordialist or perennialist interpretations, with a set of newer, perhaps more subtle approaches trying to go beyond the classical axes of that first antinomy. If the constructivist approach eventually got the upper hand over the perennialist one and certainly advanced highly important new insights, not every problem was solved for that matter. One might even ask oneself if at a given moment a new orthodoxy has not tried to install itself. The basic issue with the constructivist stance, i.e. that national identities are more or less invented from scratch, presenting national identities and nationalist discourse as a set of signifiers without firm grounds in historical reality, does pose a series of empirical historical problems. Are national identities really constructed out of thin air? If by contrast ethnosymbolism stressed the importance of pre-modern ethnic pasts out of which modern nationalism could extract myths and memories and dig for different cultural particles by which a tradition could be reinvented, a number of problems of interpretation and fact still remained, as ethnosymbolism more in particular did not give sufficient attention to the multifaceted nature of nations and nationalism, something which is to be related mainly to its cultural focus and *prima facie* non-political line of analysis, Guibernau demonstrates in her presentation.

So definitely, one has to get away from this presumed homogeneity in the nature of nations and nationalisms. No doubt, one can detect the existence of a state sponsored nationalism, of nation-states keen on crushing local identifiers, other languages or whatever cultural marker that does not fit their overall project, but this is by no means the single form one can observe. Indeed, too strong a focus on this first variety would neglect the nationalism of dominated groups, the nationalism of the ones Guibernau qualifies as “nations without states”, a nationalism which stands for different forms of cultural and social emancipation, even if it is definitely so that this last variety of nations and nationalisms is constituted by social spheres

where “construction” of identities, “invention” or “reinvention” of tradition takes place as well. Consequently, there will be a good deal of “artificialness” to be detected here too, but again, that does not imply that everything is merely a discursive construct, that the identities in question are just products of conspiring elites, let alone that they are nothing more than particularistic anachronisms. That “artificialness” does not at all lessen the importance of invented traditions.

In Andrew Prescott’s (Sheffield) analysis of the place of invented tradition in Freemasonry, there is a intriguing challenge to be found to the too narrow interpretation usually made of the stance advanced by Hobsbawm and Ranger in their famous book, where upon closer reading they actually are more open to the investigation of invented tradition beyond the scope of nation construction or relatively recent epochs. If that project is not applied by these authors to the case of Freemasonry –which is merely looked upon as a recent invented tradition– the pre-history of the society indeed shows fairly old examples of the invention of tradition that were meant to legitimate social, economical and political objectives. Referring to results of recent mediaeval studies which seem to support a number of ethnosymbolist approaches, Prescott also proposes Freemasonry as a kind of “laboratory” (a rather ideal one as the documentary richness allows precise reconstruction of complex contexts) for the long term study of invented tradition in an explicitly cross-national perspective: *“In investigating the role of Freemasonry in the invention of tradition, we can start to appreciate that nations, while constructed, are nevertheless the product of complex cross-connections and transformations over very long time periods.”*

This view connects well to Guibernau’s perspective, which goes beyond a limited conception of nation and nationalism that refers basically to just one particular variety, which rejects an a-historic, de-contextualized view of nations and nationalism and opts in stead for an analytical cluster where nation, state and nationalism appear, not as fixed categories, but as clearly distinct social phenomena whose respective definitions are made through their interrelatedness and the tensions which characterize that interrelatedness, whose definitions are thus changing in time and space.

How does Freemasonry fit into this global picture? It is certainly tempting for a specific strand of analysis to show Freemasonry exactly as an instrument in the hands of elites for the construction of these national identities as a means of domination. That would give a quite remarkable resonance to an older tendency in the interpretation of the social role of masonry, i.e. to represent it again as an instrument of the ruling classes to weaken class struggles, notably as a presumed meeting ground of the liberal bourgeoisie and labour aristocracy. Just as this last preconceived answer –which amounts to nothing more than to Leninist orthodoxy– proved empirically false, a more subtle approach will be needed just as well where the nationalism issue is concerned. That does not imply that social and political elites did not use Freemasonry for their particular purposes in this register as several contributions have shown, but it has to be investigated if this has been the only story and to pay due attention to balancing movements of different kinds and natures. If we continue on the line of analysis of national identities we referred to before, that would imply that Freemasonry as a historical agent has to be studied in connection to this triad of state, nation and nationalism and their mutually influencing transformations.

### 3. Assessment of the results

The implication of Freemasonry in this field of tension immediately poses a basic question, which came back time and again in the papers and the discussion of this workshop. How did a quintessentially cosmopolitan society, founded and spread over Europe (or even beyond), before the elaboration of the modern nation-state or at least in the early period of its emergence, how did this society get entangled in processes of configuration of national identity, in the making of nation-states, in nationalist politics? This might seem to be a fundamental contradiction, but must this necessarily be seen so? It is not an “or/or” type of question which has to guide the investigation. It is far more relevant to ask how, in context A, Freemasonry became an instrument of state sponsored nationalism, or by contrast how, in context B, it was used by counter-movements as a tool for oppressed identity groups. So instead of preconceiving an answer, one has to investigate truly if and how Freemasonry became a competition ground where different or even contradictory identity projects confronted each other, all with their own idea of at least partly instrumentalising Freemasonry; one has to try and reconstruct truly how Freemasonry, in very diverging ways no doubt, became a kind of ideological palimpsest where different identity projects have been written one over the other, one through the other, with older scriptures eventually peeping through, cosmopolitanism being one amongst them for that matter.

To get a grip on these highly complex combinations within a Masonic historical context (where nation and nationalism are obviously not the only preoccupations), Guibernau’s analytical triad of state / nation / nationalism does not only serve as a societal context in which Freemasonry is acting. As Jeffrey Tyssens’s (Brussels) contribution showed, it can also be experimented with as a reading frame allowing us a structured analysis of dimensions which mirror Masonic positions and attitudes towards state / nation / nationalism, positions and attitudes which can show integration, opposition, variety, vanguard roles etc. In this stage I would advance a set of seven dimensions: (1) discourse, (2) political action, (3) structures, (4) membership, (5) language, (6) symbols and finally (7) ritual. One could study these with a classical chronological set-up, but nevertheless it seems preferable to privilege particular historical stages or events with high semiotic density. Periods of war –as they arouse high mobility and intense sentiment, national or other– are certainly one of those privileged stages, war as such and perhaps even more the immediate post-war years: we already saw how Napoleonic wars were of utter importance in this respect. The same goes for regime changes, independency, transformation of state structures in a more federal or a more unitary way, changes in the way suffrage is organised (an extremely important matter!), transformations of key institutions with particular relevance for the construction of identities like e.g. the (national) educational system and so on. Obviously, one must be aware of the limitations of such modelling and one should furthermore be cautious not to fall into the illusion that it would be possible to construct a globally applicable explicative model. But what is certainly necessary for further research, is at least to elaborate a descriptive frame that can be shared and that can transcend the narrow national focus which too often limits or quite simply handicaps the historiography of Freemasonry. Network analysis and transgression awareness is one instrument, comparative modelling is a complementary one. With respect to the latter item, one might plead for an analytical leap forwards, that the history writing around Freemasonry would be stuck no longer in a narration treating several squares of the analytical frame for one country but that a serious attempt would be made to get a grip on one square for several countries and then move along to the other squares. Pierre Bourdieu once suggested that making sweeping theoretical elaborations without paying due attention to the methodological consequences to be drawn from them is often a futile activity. This would at

least imply that we should adapt our own historian's individualised day to day practice and at least engage to some extent in genuinely collective research actions.

In a concluding session, the options for further concerted action were discussed. Follow-up workshop and common research are to be organised and can make use of the different parameters of the analytical model advanced during the theoretical session as guiding themes (language, imagery, rituals, cultural transfers, mobility, networks etc.). Options have been taken as the publication of provisional results is concerned. In January 2007, the convocation of a provisional steering group must give a more specified content for at least the first of the follow-up workshops. The idea of linking the activities of the informal research network on Freemasonry and National Identities with larger conferences will certainly inspire the options, as indeed it would allow to attach a follow-up workshop in the summer of 2007 to the 76<sup>th</sup> Anglo-American Conference in London, which will focus on connected matters: "Identities: National, Regional and Personal". Further workshops can be envisaged in collaboration with Rome's La Sapienza University and the Belgian Historical Institute of Rome or in the frame of the Rockefeller Foundation's conference subsidizing schemes. All these initiatives will require a progressive elaboration of a coordinating structure. The year 2007 must consequently be used to investigate the possibilities offered by the ESF Steering Committees programme and the ESF support opportunities for Network Formation: the introduction of proposals will be actively prepared by the informal steering committee.



#### 4. Final programme

**Thursday 28 September 2006**

**VUB-Campus "Etterbeek" – At the Convivium**

##### **Part 1 : Cosmopolitans, Patriots or Nationalists**

9.00-9.40 Jef Van Bellingen (Free University of Brussels) - *Ritual Practice and Transnational Projects: the example of the Strict Observance*

9.40-10.20 Anna Maria Isastia (University of Rome – "La Sapienza") – *La Franc-maçonnerie et la "construction" du citoyen en Italie*

10.20-11.00 Discussion

11.00-11.20 Coffee

11.20-12.00 Andreas Önnersfors (University of Lund) - *When did Swedish Freemasonry become 'Swedish'? The Shift from Cosmopolitanism to an Official State Order*

12.00-12.40 Anton van de Sande (University of Leiden) - *Monarchy and Aristocracy as "International" Factors in Freemasonry*

12.40-1.20 pm Discussion

Discussants: Jeffrey Tyssens (Free University of Brussels) & Henrik Bogdan (University of Göteborg)

Lunch

##### **Part 2 : National Identities and Colonial Realities**

2.20-3.00 Jessica Harland-Jacobs (University of Florida) - *Freemasonry and Empire*

3.00-3.40 José Antonio Ferrer Benimeli (University of Zaragoza) - *La Franc-maçonnerie et l'indépendance de l'Amérique espagnole (Latine)*

3.40-4.20 Discussion

4.20-4.40 Tea

4.40-5.20 Eduardo Torres Cuevas (University of La Havana) – *La Franc-maçonnerie à Cuba*

5.20-6.00 Cécile Revauger (University of Bordeaux III) - *Freemasonry in 19th century Trinidad : Spanish, French and British identities*

6.00-6.45 Discussion

Discussant: Eric Saunier (University of Le Havre)

7.00 Welcome Drink

**Friday 29 September 2006**  
**VUB-Campus "Etterbeek" – At the Convivium**

**Part 3 : Theoretical aspects: Freemasonry, nationalism and levels of identification**

9.00-9.40 Monserrat Guibernau (Queen Mary University of London) - *Nationalism in Europe: Theory and History*

9.40-10.20 Jeffrey Tyssens (Free University of Brussels) - *European Freemasonry and Nationalism in the Long 19<sup>th</sup> Century: Problems of Theory and Method*

10.20-11.00 Discussion

11.00-11.20 Coffee

11.20-12.00 Andrew Prescott (University of Sheffield) – *Freemasonry and the Invention of Tradition*

12.00-12.40 Roger Burt – *Freemasonry and Migration*

Discussant: Timothy Baycroft (University of Sheffield)

Lunch

**Part 4 : National, Regional and Local Identities**

2.20-3.00 Tatiana Artemieva (University of St. Petersburg) – *Masonry and the Hermetic Tradition in 18<sup>th</sup>-century Russia*

3.00-3.40 Petri Mirala (University of Helsinki) – *Freemasonry and Irish National Identity*

3.40-4.20 Discussion

4.20-4.35 Tea

4.35-5.15 Eric Saunier (University of Le Havre) - *Franc-maçonnerie et identité régionale: l'exemple de la Normandie*

5.15-5.55 Pere Sanchez Ferré (University of Barcelona) – *La Franc-Maçonnerie en Catalogne*

Discussant: Murray Pittock (University of Manchester)

5.55-6.30 Discussion

**Saturday 30 September 2006**

**Brussels - Community Centre "De Markten"**  
**– Conference Room 2 (2nd floor)**

10.00-12.00 Conclusion chaired by Montserrat Guibernau & led by Andrew Prescott, Jeffrey Tyssens, José Antonio Ferrer Benimeli: further axes of research and debate

12.00 - ... Farewell drink & lunch

## 5. Statistical Information on Participants

### *Age Structure*

60+	4
50-59	9
40-49	6
30-39	4
-30	2

### *Countries of origin*

Belgium	3
Cuba	1
Finland	1
France	3
Germany	1
Hungary	1
Italy	1
Netherlands	3
Russia	1
Spain	2
Sweden	2
United Kingdom	5
USA	1

### *Disciplinary background*

History	16
Literature	3
Philosophy	2
Religious studies	2
Cultural studies	1
Sociology	1

## 6. Final list of participants

**Prof. Dr. Jeffrey Tyssens (convenor / organiser)**

Department of History  
Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
Pleinlaan 2  
B-1050 Brussel  
Belgium  
[jeffrey.tyssens@tiscali.be](mailto:jeffrey.tyssens@tiscali.be)

**Prof. Dr. Eric Saunier (convenor)**

UFR des Lettres et Sciences humaines  
25 rue Philippe Lebon  
76086 Le Havre Cedex  
France  
[eric.saunier@wanadoo.fr](mailto:eric.saunier@wanadoo.fr)

**Prof. Dr. Anton van de Sande (convenor)**

Leiden University  
Faculty of Theology (History of Christianity)  
Postbus 9515  
NL – 2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands  
[a.vandesande@let.ru.nl](mailto:a.vandesande@let.ru.nl)

**Prof. Dr. José Antonio Ferrer Benimeli (convenor)**

Historia Moderna y Contemporánea  
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras  
c / Pedro Cerbuna  
50009 Zaragoza  
Espagne  
[jfbenim@hotmail.com](mailto:jfbenim@hotmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Cécile Revauger (convenor)**

UFR Pays Anglophones  
Université Michel de Montaigne Bordeaux III  
Domaine Universitaire  
33607 PESSAC Cedex  
France  
[cecile.revauger@wanadoo.fr](mailto:cecile.revauger@wanadoo.fr)

**Prof. Dr. Andrew Prescott (convenor)**

Humanities Research Institute  
Floor 14  
Arts Tower  
University of Sheffield  
Sheffield S10 2TN  
[a.prescott@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:a.prescott@sheffield.ac.uk)

**Prof. Dr. Anna Maria Isastia (convenor)**

Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”  
Facoltà di Lettere  
Dipartimento di Storia Moderna e  
Contemporanea  
Piazzale A. Moro 5  
00185 Roma  
Italia  
[annamaria.isastia@uniroma1.it](mailto:annamaria.isastia@uniroma1.it)

**Dr. Andreas Önnersfors (convenor)**

University of Lund  
Centre of European Studies  
Biskopsgatan 7  
SE-223 62 LUND  
Sweden  
[Andreas.Onnersfors@kult.lu.se](mailto:Andreas.Onnersfors@kult.lu.se)

**Dr. Henrik Bogdan (convenor)**

Göteborg University  
Department of Religious Studies  
Box 200  
Lennart Torstenssonsgatan 11  
SE 405 30 Göteborg  
Sweden  
[henrik.bogdan@religion.gu.se](mailto:henrik.bogdan@religion.gu.se)  
[relhb@hum.gu.se](mailto:relhb@hum.gu.se)

**Prof. Dr. Jef Van Bellingen**

JURI / VUB  
Pleinlaan 2  
B-1050 Brussel  
BELGIUM  
[jvbellin@vub.ac.be](mailto:jvbellin@vub.ac.be)

**Prof. Dr. Montserrat Guibernau**

Department of Politics  
Queen Mary University of London  
Mile End Road  
London E1 4NS  
United Kingdom  
[m.guibernau@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:m.guibernau@qmul.ac.uk)

**Prof. Dr. Eduardo Torres Cuevas**

Avenida 31, n° 1413, Playa  
Ciudad de la Habana  
Cuba  
[torres-cuevas@cubarte.cult.cu](mailto:torres-cuevas@cubarte.cult.cu)

**Prof. Dr. Pere Sánchez Ferré**  
Apdo. Correos, 19  
17400 Breda (Girona)  
España  
[pere\\_sanchez\\_ferrer@hotmail.com](mailto:pere_sanchez_ferrer@hotmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Roger Burt**  
Pines  
Wykes Lane  
Newton St Cyres  
Devon, EX5 5AX  
United Kingdom  
[R.Burt@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:R.Burt@exeter.ac.uk)

**Prof. Dr. Robert Peter**  
Department of English Studies  
Institute of English and American Studies  
University of Szeged  
Szeged, Egyetem u. 2  
H-6722 Hungary  
[rpeter@lit.u-szeged.hu](mailto:rpeter@lit.u-szeged.hu)

**Prof. Dr. Timothy Baycroft**  
Department of History  
University of Sheffield  
Sheffield S10 2TN  
United Kingdom  
[T.Baycroft@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:T.Baycroft@sheffield.ac.uk)

**Prof. Dr. Charles Porset**  
Le Moulin de la Forge  
61290 Le Mage  
France  
[porset.c@free.fr](mailto:porset.c@free.fr)

**Prof. Dr. Martin Papenheim**  
Rather Broich 28  
40472 Düsseldorf  
Germany  
[history@martinpapenheim.com](mailto:history@martinpapenheim.com)

**Prof. Dr. Guy Liagre**  
Kloosterstraat 216  
B-1702 Groot Bijgaarden  
Belgium  
[guy\\_liagre@hotmail.com](mailto:guy_liagre@hotmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Jessica Harland-Jacobs**  
Department of History  
Keene-Flint Hall  
University of Florida  
PO Box 117320  
Gainesville, FL 32611-7320  
USA  
[harlandj@history.ufl.edu](mailto:harlandj@history.ufl.edu)

**Prof. Dr. Tatiana Artemieva**  
4-46, Rizhskaja ul.  
St.Petersburg 195196  
Russia  
[tatart@mail.ru](mailto:tatart@mail.ru)

**Prof. Dr. Murray Pittock**  
English and American Studies  
Humanities Lime Grove Building  
University of Manchester  
Oxford Road  
Manchester M13 9PL  
United Kingdom  
[murray.g.pittock@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:murray.g.pittock@manchester.ac.uk)

**Dr. Petri Mirala**  
Francois Desmedtstraat 24  
B-1150 Brussel  
Belgium  
00 32 2 770 46 00  
[mirala@mappi.helsinki.fi](mailto:mirala@mappi.helsinki.fi)

**Dra. Anat Harel**  
M. Bauerstraat 17  
2283 LD Rijswijk  
Nederland  
[a.harel@planet.nl](mailto:a.harel@planet.nl)

**Dra. Floor Meijer**  
Jan Luykenstraat 100  
1071 CV Amsterdam  
Nederland  
[f.meijer@uva.nl](mailto:f.meijer@uva.nl)