

Liberty Reassumes her Throne: The “Revolution” and the Press in Spain, 1808–1812

SCOTT EASTMAN
Creighton University

In 1810, Manuel Quintana—poet, writer, editor of the influential periodical *Semanario Patriótico* and political activist during Spain’s War of Independence—proclaimed that “the Spanish people are the reunion of all the individuals in Spain that have the right to be represented and to represent in national congresses” (Seoane, *El Primer Lenguaje Constitucional Español* 128–29).¹ This was, in many ways, a call to revolution, reflecting attempts across the Atlantic world to convene representative assemblies, promulgate constitutions and grant individual rights and freedoms. In his *Diccionario crítico-burlesco*, published in 1811, Bartolomé Gallardo defined the ideology of liberals by highlighting “the panic and terror that the idea of liberal men gives to the *serviles*, that is to say, to those who honor the title of servants” (97–98). Gallardo, the librarian of the Spanish Cortes, played upon the multiple meanings of the term *servil*, insinuating that the archetypal conservative was a figure both abject as well as literally vile. In the pages of his satirical dictionary, Gallardo repeated the claim that fear was at the root of the conservative mantra. Accordingly, to those conspiring to reinstate an absolutist regime, the emergent doctrine of liberalism had spread like an infection throughout the nation.

Gallardo argued that Spanish liberalism built upon the republican tradition of the classical world. He stated unequivocally: “it is not from the French from whom we have taken the expression *liberales*, but from the Romans” (100). In addition, he endowed the word *liberal* itself with tremendous significance, connoting it with

the struggle against the oppressive French occupation begun in 1808:

Now that we have shed our blood liberally fighting to ensure our liberty against all vestiges of tyranny, we should give all our latitude to the word *liberales*, establishing its legitimate meanings, impressing them deeply in our soul, to not have a thought, deed nor word that becomes unworthy of a SPANIARD, that is to say, of a strong man, constant, free, and *liberal*. And a man that screams and shouts against the mob of antiliberals (101–02).

Gallardo portrayed liberal freedom-fighters waging a war to break from the shackles of tyranny symbolized by both Napoleon and reactionary absolutists. Thus, a restored polity would resemble the virtuous republics of classical Greece and Rome. Conversely, Quintana explicitly modeled the liberal experiment upon revolutionary France, arguing that “the French revolution is for us like the remains of ships destroyed on the shoals; they teach the sailor to avoid the dangerous reefs, but do not distract him from his path.”² Yet above all, Spanish liberals aspired to build a state upon the ideals of liberty and equality, shorn of the vestiges of the feudal past.

In circumscribing the boundaries of Spanish liberalism, liberals such as Quintana and Gallardo believed that constitutional government would guarantee freedom, especially freedom of expression. Gallardo emphasized the ideal of press freedom as a central element in the struggle against the remnants of the Old Regime. Just as enlightened Spaniards called for rational governance and fostered scientific investigation during the reign of Carlos III, Gallardo believed that the political edifice of liberalism rested upon the foundation of reason:

Liberty is the right of all rational creatures to order their lives *conforming to reason and justice*. There are three types: natural, civil, and political: or in other words, liberty of men, liberty of the citizen, and liberty of the nation. Natural liberty is the right that men enjoy regarding their own free-will, conforming ultimately to the way in which they were raised. Civil liberty is the right which society guarantees to all citizens so that they can act in any way they please as long as it is not contrary to established laws. And ultimately, political or national liberty is

the right of all nations to work for themselves, free from dependence on another nation, whether servile subjection or any form of tyranny (103).

Political freedom demanded the freedom to write and publish with impunity. Armed with a writer's tools, Gallardo imagined that "paper and words would save us!" (106–07). He decried the censorship characteristic of absolutist monarchy, stressing the positive impact of print culture upon the structures of modern society.

As Spaniards on both sides of the Atlantic constructed the institutional foundations of a new government between 1808 and 1812, the public sphere emerged as the locus of a new political culture. While news had circulated in official publications such as the *Gazeta de Madrid*, a de facto freedom of the press accompanied the turmoil and chaos of the French invasion.³ Contemporary historians, such as Geoff Eley, have noted that, across Old Regime Europe, a public sphere "took clearest shape where the overall context of social communication was being institutionally reformed" (296). Thus, he maintains that "the emergence of nationality (that is, the growth of a public for nationalist discourse) was simultaneously the emergence of a public sphere" (297). Accordingly, nationality and the public sphere were mutually constitutive in that both required the reordering of political and cultural spaces that had opened up as a result of the collapse of the Spanish Bourbon monarchy (Habermas 133). In "Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas," Keith Michael Baker likewise defines public opinion as "a political invention appearing in the context of a crisis of absolute authority in which actors within an absolutist political system appealed to a 'public' beyond as a way of reformulating institutional claims that could no longer be negotiated within the traditional political language" (192). Both paradigms clearly apply to the case of the Spanish Monarchy during the first decades of the nineteenth century. The Old Regime state faced a dual crisis of political legitimacy and liberal revolution during the War of Independence, which had ramifications in all of the Spanish dominions. The 'public' found expression in the Spanish periodical press. Newspapers, such as *Semanario Patriótico*, were a vibrant expression of a public sphere in civil society, emerging out of

enlightened currents of Spanish salon society and impacting the culture and political development of the period.⁴ Periodicals concurrently hailed the advent of public opinion as a portent of representative government, liberal values and an emergent nationalism had taken root.

The Spanish Revolution, 1808–1812

Between May, 1808 and March of 1812, all of the territories of the Spanish Monarchy experienced a profound transformation which broke with Old Regime norms, values and institutions. The economist Álvaro Flórez Estrada, author of the 1810 *Introduction to the History of the Revolution in Spain*, argued that the transition to liberalism in Spain was the most important event of its time and would alter Europe's political landscape (6). Although Spaniards had suffered through the “deplorable” reign of Carlos IV and the machinations of his minister Manuel Godoy, Spain would not stand idly as its religion was insulted and its independence threatened. Spaniards rose up in defiance of French occupation, which began with the forced abdication of King Carlos IV and his son Fernando VII in May of 1808. At first, Spanish resistance, characterized by both *guerrilla* struggles and conventional military campaigns, successfully impeded the advances of French troops.⁵ Spaniards lauded the victory at Bailén in July of 1808 as a harbinger of national liberation. Accordingly, this revolution was “not an ordinary war of cabinet against cabinet . . . in which there is no motive other than the caprice of a foolish minister or of bad faith. This involves the happiness of the entire nation.” (45)⁶

The theory of divine right, which had underpinned absolutist governments across Europe, posited that God granted a benevolent monarch the right to rule over a people. Absolutists such as Joaquín Lorenzo Villanueva, in his 1793 tome *Catecismo del estado*, insisted a king's subjects possessed no inherent rights vis-à-vis their sovereign, even if a monarch pursued unjust policies or abused authority. God would castigate any and all who disobeyed or rebelled. Such ideas were rejected resoundingly when Napoleon invaded Spain and broke with the Bourbon dynasty, placing his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne. Accordingly, the Spanish people reassumed legitimate power and ruled in the

absence of Fernando VII, unjustly denied the crown and imprisoned in France.

The war against the French refracted the language of authority and legitimacy. The meaning of the term 'people,' *el pueblo*, had shifted dramatically from connoting the working classes, or peasants, to being synonymous with the nation.⁷ In 1778, the Catalan Antonio de Capmany wrote a discourse in defense of the political, economic and cultural traditions of artisans and trade guilds. He identified the people of Spain with the popular classes and praised their admirable customs and traits:

What kind of thing is the people? In Greece and in ancient Rome, it signified the entire Nation, but among us, that are neither Greeks nor Romans, it only signifies a part of the nation. . . . The people, who are the most numerous class and the only one that works, form the physical force of a Nation. They also form the moral force in another sense, because the true character and the customs of a Nation are found in the private life of the most numerous class, that is the people; and the reason is that only with the people are these customs natural, constant and uniform (Etienvre 45).

Yet in his influential *Centinela Contra Franceses*, written between August and October 1808, Capmany wrote unequivocally: "You have now been made to see that the people are the nation" (133). Gallardo similarly conceived of the 'people' as an egalitarian community no longer riven by class distinctions:

Back in the times of the king through which the people suffered, when it was said that men were not all one, but some had red blood and others had blue blood, it appeared that some were men of God and others were men of the Devil; and in addition when there were Lords of the manor and Kings that were great men of wealth: in those times, it is said, *pueblo* was understood to mean peasants; or a vile race of wild animals. . . . But now in modern times . . . it is possible to see that we peasants and noblemen are all made of the same material: and as a consequence, it has varied the significance of the word *Pueblo*, fixing it in two senses. In the higher and more sublime sense it is a synonym for nation, and means the union of individuals of all classes of the State. In this sense it also refers to (with the pardon of señor Lardizábal) *the sovereignty of the PEOPLE*. . . . This is who, on the second of May, dis-

armed, slandered, and abandoned by the weak government of Madrid, launched themselves at the army of the perfidious Murat, giving the first cry of Spanish independence. . . . Eternal glory to the people of Madrid, and to all the towns of Spain (138–40)!⁸

Although he did not include *nación* in his dictionary, Gallardo satirically illustrated the rapid evolution of the concept ‘people,’ from a signifier of base peasants to a rendition of the national body, by equating *el pueblo* with the courageous and indefatigable insurgents who rose up against the French on May 2, 1808. Gallardo espoused a new vision of Spanish nationalism, a discourse that dominated the liberal newspapers, pamphlets, and literature of the time. Even conservatives described the situation in terms of a project of national reclamation. One prominent aristocrat opined: “The nation, outraged and offended in its imprescriptible rights, reclaims them and reassumes the exercise of sovereignty, null and illegally taken by a weak dynasty” (*Primer lenguaje* 60).⁹ A liberal editorial similarly explained:

The people recently placed Fernando on the throne when his excessive filial respect made him resign the crown to his father in Bayonne; and the people returned to spontaneously and generously crown him when the violence of the perfidious usurper forced him to renounce his hereditary rights. What more is there to say; I am the true Sovereign, from me springs all authority over myself.¹⁰

In September of 1808, Quintana inveighed that “the Kings are for the people, the people are not for the Kings.”¹¹

Local committees, known as *Juntas Provinciales*, sprang up across peninsular Spain and Spanish America in May, June and July of 1808. Justified on the basis of Hispanic juridical tradition, they reclaimed power and formed an interim coalition government. The Juntas claimed to speak for the people, as they had been established on the basis of “popular will,” and declared themselves sovereign in the absence of the king. Quintana described the creation of the Juntas as a spontaneous generation of the people:

Perhaps the most important and most characteristic aspect of this great movement [which rose up against the chains of tyranny] is the

universalism and uniformity with which it proceeds in all parts. Almost on the same day all the Provinces, even though separated and without communication between them, launched a cry of indignation and of resistance against the usurpation. No one could say in particular; I have directed it, to me it owes its existence: all have made it happen, the glory is for all; and whoever takes away the solemn and popular character that distinguishes shaking off this political domination neither will consider from where it has come, nor will realistically portray what has been. Wrongly, then, it has been said that the populace have done it; as if they should give this low name to the dignified Spaniards that were the first to express the general will: the people it is properly said; the people alone could do it; only the general will of all could obtain such advantages; and alone their well guided force and energy are the advantages to which we will owe our triumph.¹²

The resistance against Napoleon, in this romanticized view, emanated from the "force and energy" of the people. Quintana painted a picture of a universal uprising born out of countless localized struggles—a revolt which lacked internal communications and coordinated action.

The Juntas of León and Sevilla, in their initial proclamations, explicitly linked their newly constituted authority to declare war on France to a legitimacy grounded in national sovereignty. In a broadside addressed to all the towns of the region, the Junta of León declared itself as the legitimate local power in the absence of Fernando Séptimo:

To make known to all the Justices, Town Magistrates, Military and Political Authorities, employees in both branches: to the patriots, to the Parish Priests as well as the secular and regular clergy, and to all the inhabitants of the Province, that stirred the greater part of the provinces that compose the Kingdom against the Government established by force, after the emigration to France of our Father King D. Fernando the VII, their August Fathers and Brothers los Señores Infantes, the people of this City have become excited at their example, *and with eight hundred auxiliary armed men*, sent by the Prince of Asturias, created a Junta composed of the individuals from the Town Hall and of other notables that wanted to join, some of a similar class, and others from the Town Council itself, in whom Sovereign authority was placed, and

disposed to exercise it in the name of the Province, dictated all the judgments that they had from opportunities to throw off French domination, and to oppose the reign of another over the Throne of Spain and the Indies, in agreement with the rest of the parts that compose this vast Empire of the Father King D. Fernando the VII or another from the Royal Family. The Junta, forced in these circumstances, and desiring the good of the Country, of public tranquility, and from all the rest of the circumstances that constitute a true force and resistance to the intentions of the enemy, has decreed the following. 1. To reassume all of the Sovereign authority of the Province. . . . All of that which is published by proclamation in this Capital for the good of the People, imprinted and circulated to the rest of the Province in the ordinary form, so that it penetrates their inhabitants with the just causes of these ways, for the effect of their patriotism, recognizing the authority of the Junta, and to dispose them to obedience and the most punctual and rapid execution of what we progressively send them and communicate to them. (Delgado 30–31)

Similarly, the Junta of Sevilla recognized that the sovereign power of the king had been returned to the people in the wake of the extraordinary circumstances of the French occupation:

The people legally reassumed the power to create a Government, and this truth has been openly confessed by the various Juntas Supremas. . . . The power then legitimated has remained in the Juntas Supremas, and through this power they have governed and govern with true authority. . . . The situation has not changed: the danger lasts: no new Authority has survived: all legitimate authority resides then in the Juntas that the People have created (Delgado 91).

In establishing their sovereignty, the Juntas necessarily legitimized their authority in the name of the people, creating a new bond of loyalty upon which to build their government. Thus the proclamation issued in Cádiz on May 30, 1808 began by addressing its audience as “*Pueblo Español*” (Delgado 99). The language of popular sovereignty represented a vision of a revived Spanish Monarchy. The lion, the symbol of Spanish identity and strength, had been reawakened from its slumber, and the people had reassumed authority.

In the following months, the loosely connected network of regional resistance movements moved toward a nationalized structure. On September 25, 1808, the Junta Central took command in Madrid in order to coordinate the actions of the provincial organizations and to fight against the French army of occupation. As the basis for a new system of authority slowly began to take shape, an emergent liberal nationalism displaced the old structures, language, and symbols of the monarchy. The Junta Central and the Regency gave way to a reconstituted Cortes, and rhetoric shifted to emphasize the national character of the newly elected body in place of the locally constituted Juntas.

The "People" and the Press: *Semanario Patriótico*

One of the primary vehicles through which the new language of liberal nationalism was spread was the newspaper. The press, free from royal constraints and censorship for the first time in the unoccupied areas of Spain, began printing a flood of newspapers, pamphlets, and books which espoused a myriad of ideological positions. Of the liberal newspapers of the period, Quintana's weekly *Semanario Patriótico* was the most influential and important. Beginning publication in Madrid on September 1, 1808 in the wake of Joseph's flight from the city, the newspaper initially grew out of Quintana's *tertulia*. It started off with extraordinary success and counted three thousand subscribers in the first several days (Seoane, *Historia del periodismo en España* 30).¹³ Quintana continued to publish, even as he moved to Sevilla and to Cádiz in advance of the French march southward. He vehemently expressed the liberal sentiments characteristic of the age, decrying the French occupation and extolling the virtues of the heroic Spanish people and the struggle for independence. In the first sentence of the first issue, Quintana invoked the power of the people and the printed word as the driving force behind the opposition to Napoleon's army of occupation, proclaiming that "public opinion is much stronger than authority which is detested and the armed forces."¹⁴ Quintana's *Semanario Patriótico* couched the language of liberal nationalism within a discourse of rediscovered traditions and liberties, suppressed since the rise of the Habsburgs in the sixteenth century.

Quintana, in his third issue, mapped out the liberal conception of *patria* in an article titled "Reflections about patriotism." He described patriotism as "an eternal source of heroism and of political prodigies."¹⁵ Accordingly, the people were "ardent in their most pure and heroic sentiments of loyalty and patriotism."¹⁶ Quintana argued that "*La Patria* . . . is a power as ancient as society, founded on nature and order. . . Patriotism, similar to the light, to the fire and the rest of the great agents of nature, is the same for all men, and in the same manner . . . inspires the Chiefs of the Republic as well as its very last members."¹⁷ He asserted the following week that "in that happy instant that the People recover their rights and make use of them, to castigate tyranny, defend innocence, or extol virtue, the sacred fire that burns in their chest receives new nourishment from each new event."¹⁸ Quintana presented constitutional government and patriotism as elemental, symbiotic components of the natural world; one could not exist without the other. He juxtaposed love of country with the unnatural oppression of tyrants, which pitted patriots against absolutists in an epic struggle of good against evil. Quintana demonized the exclusive privileges enjoyed by the wealthy few under the Old Regime:

The fundamental principal of this power so repugnant to nature, so contrary to the general interest of the Nation, in particular to individuals, consists of ignorance. Ignorance makes people irrational, and makes them see the usurpation as right, and their servitude as a duty: their oppressors appear as natural superiors, created to give orders and enjoy their comforts, while they were born to obey and suffer.¹⁹

Contrary to the Old Regime, epitomized by an ideology of difference and inequality, the *patria* was a just and benevolent entity, governed with an overriding concern for equality:

La Patria is a tender mother who equally loves all her children; and only distinguishes between them when they distinguish themselves through their actions. She suffers if there has been opulence and mediocrity; inequality necessarily produced by industry and fortune; but she does not want there to have been indigents in her bosom; she does not permit the oppression of one by another; and reestablishes equi-

librium between them by making all equal under the law, and facilitates the path toward principal employment.²⁰

Quintana developed a narrative of the people and the nation as the inheritors of an ancient natural order, while absolutism and the usurper king thrived on ignorance, despotism and privilege based solely on birthright. Linking words such as *patria*, *nación*, and *pueblo*, liberals constructed a discourse simultaneously vilifying the invasion of the French and the Old Regime of Carlos IV and his minister Godoy.²¹

Quintana and many likeminded liberals had appealed for a revitalized Cortes to be reestablished as a representation of the national will. Quintana claimed that "The Cortes was, in a different time, the bulwark of our liberty and independence: it formed an essential part of our primitive constitution: the people desired it, and the prosperity the people deserve due to the long suffering and incalculable sacrifices that the rescue of the country has cost awaits their deliberations."²² His pleas reverberated with countless others, including calls from clerics for a reformed government. As early as 1798, for example, the influential Capuchin Miguel de Santander had advanced a similar agenda for political representation that harkened back to the medieval representative institutions which had flourished across the peninsula (Elorza 102–06).²³

Electing officials to represent the regions of the Spanish Monarchy elicited a range of opinion. One liberal periodical published in Sevilla, *El Voto de la Nación Española*, pushed for a representative system that allowed for all heads of families, regardless of status and wealth, to vote. This would have provided a counterweight to the pretensions of the clergy and the nobility, as all males twenty-five and over could have voted for representatives of the third estate. On January 10, 1810, the paper advocated individual clerics serving as representatives of the people: "we judge that far from being prejudicial, it will be very useful that the same individuals of the clergy are called to the service of representation which the towns desire."²⁴ Not only did clerics serve as national representatives, they also mediated between the sacred language of the church and the vocabulary of partisan politics. Proclaiming the Constitution of

Cádiz in the cathedral of Valladolid in 1812, the friar Manuel Martínez captured this ambivalence in his sermon:

I will speak: in a ceremony or political assembly I would speak only as a political philosopher; but at this site, in this sacred temple, in a ceremony that while political is perhaps the most religious ever seen in this land, I would be guilty of lese majesty, if I disdained speaking the idiom of religion, that harmonizes so well with the language of healthy politics (Álvarez García 231).

Demonstrating the interplay between politics and religion during the era, Martínez emphasized the harmonious blend of a religious idiom with the political language of constitutionalism.²⁵ Parishioners could also read this participation as evidence of a politico-religious public sphere in which they were engaged in their daily lives as members of a parish.

Representation of all the territories of the Spanish Monarchy occurred for the first time in Cádiz beginning in September of 1810. Elections took place across the monarchy—a three-tiered indirect process which ended with electors choosing from among a final list of candidates.²⁶ One third of the deputies that served in the Cortes of Cádiz were clerics. In the inaugural decree of September 24, 1810, the Cortes declared that “national sovereignty resides in the Cortes generales y extraordinarias” (Seoane, *Primer Lenguaje* 55).²⁷ The decree further stated that “the Cortes declares null, of no value, nor effect, the transfer of the Crown by Napoleon, not only because of the violence involved in those unjust and illegal acts, *but principally because of the lack of consent of the nation*” (Varela Suances-Carpegna 102). Authority had to be grounded in the consent of the nation, or, in other words, in the will of the people. Thus power could no longer be wielded arbitrarily and required consent before action could be taken.²⁸

The Press in Cádiz: *El Conciso*

During the first months of 1808, the French army pushed Spanish forces south as they drove toward the urban centers of Andalucía. The Spanish fiercely resisted, but the port of Cádiz was the only city to hold out through the entire war. After the fall of Sevilla and the convocation of the Cortes in Cádiz in September, 1810, the news-

papers of Cádiz became the most important sources of information on government activities during the years 1810–1814. According to Ramón Solís, "the newspaper was the one point of contact between the people and the Congress" (Solís 238). Dozens of periodicals were published, many with competing political agendas. Some contemporary observers decried the seemingly unlimited number of publications available and their unmitigated defense of liberalism. One satirical paper, written by "Dr. Pedro the Strong," ridiculed the flourishing print media with the title *Diarrhea of the Press: Memory of this Epidemic Which Actually Struck Cádiz*. The publication offered a description of the epidemic's origins and symptoms and suggested a possible "cure" (Seoane, *Historia del periodismo* 41).

Yet consumers in Cádiz displayed a seemingly inexhaustible appetite for the written word. *El Conciso*, for example, became one of the most influential papers in the city and carried detailed transcripts of the debates in the Cortes. It had a press run of close to 2,000, the largest of any periodical in Cádiz during the war (Schulte 129). Unlike Quintana's weekly newspaper, *El Conciso* initially came out every other day and was a daily by 1812. Published in Cádiz beginning in August, 1810, the editor, Gaspar María de Ogirando, closely reported on the proceedings of the Cortes. Covering the opening day of the sessions, Ogirando praised the elected representatives gathered in Cádiz: "Spanish people! Now your sovereignty is represented with dignity in the Deputies that your election and propitious luck have brought to the sanctuary of the Country!"²⁹ The paper continually referred to the Cortes as the culmination of the desires of *el pueblo*, the expression of the will of the people.³⁰ Ogirando quoted a speech by the deputy Agustín Argüelles in which he "declared the Spanish people incapable of disobeying the mandates of a body which they have so desired, which they have formed, in whom they deposited their rights, and to whom they will defend and sustain against the power of tyranny."³¹ A subsequent issue posited that "all these kinds of propositions, born of justice and rectitude, produce such an effect on the people that they become enraptured in pleasure and penetrated with love toward the august congress where they resoundingly give consolation to the innocent and oppressed, and infuse the others with terror."³² Editorials in *El*

Conciso employed the image of the people as a symbolic embodiment of the promise of liberalism. Throughout 1812, for example, Ogirando printed a nationalist call to arms under the date of each issue: “Year V of the glorious struggle fought by the Spanish people against tyranny.” On March 19, 1812, the day the new constitution was proclaimed, *El Conciso* declared that “today starts the great epoch in which justice rises above the ruins of despotism on her liberal throne.”³³ Increasingly, the idea of the people was all-encompassing—they served in defense of the country and as champions of the liberal cause.

Over the course of two years of deliberations, representatives in the Cortes pushed for the consecration of liberal ideals such as free speech and the elimination of state censorship. According to *El Conciso*, “the people decidedly patronized [the debates over freedom of the press].”³⁴ In the same issue, Ogirando highlighted the importance of public opinion in relation to freedom of the press: “The opinion of the people is that they should be consulted in order to prevent mistakes. And how do we know the general opinion, if we deny freedom of the press?”³⁵ Elected representatives were beholden to the general will of the people, and freedom of the press was critical. Without the right to publish, according to Ogirando, the people would not be able to express themselves. Deputies such as the cleric Diego Muñoz Torrero urged the Cortes to stand up for individual rights of expression as a guarantor against arbitrary and despotic government:

the Nation has the right to fulfill its duties and to examine the conduct of all its officials and Deputies, as the only judge that must know if they complete their obligations, a right which it cannot relinquish as a Nation . . . it is necessary as a safeguard to restrain the will of the Cortes and of the executive power, in case they want to separate themselves from the will of the Nation: this safeguard cannot be anything else but the peaceful tribunal of public opinion; that is to say, the ability to speak and to write.³⁶

This polemical statement drew criticism from conservative members of the Cortes, because the freedom to speak and write outside of the authority of royal censors signified a radical break with established norms. Yet liberals fought back, as one deputy argued that the

right to express one's thoughts came directly from God: "Sr. Morales proves that the ability to express one's thoughts comes from heaven, being the auxiliary to the spoken word and to the invention of written language, that is, to deprive a man of such a precious prerogative, would be to usurp tyrannically from him a gift that the same God granted to him."³⁷ No longer did the monarchy wield absolute authority but the representable populace, the people of the nation, mediated political power through the periodical press and the voices of their elected officials.

Liberals at Cádiz, including prominent ecclesiastics such as Muñoz Torrero, put restraints on freedom of expression and separated ideas concerning politics from those which touched upon Catholic doctrine. Yet deputies had enshrined Catholicism as a fundamental part of the liberal state in Article 12 of the constitution. This produced the paradoxical effect of stifling religious dissent while encouraging political debate. In *El Robespierre Español*, Fernández Sardino had argued that legal limits be placed upon freedom of speech but did not specify where to draw the line. While some deputies such as José Mexía "asked to extend freedom of the press even to religious works," the majority of representatives rejected such a radical proposal.³⁸ The constitution ultimately retained censorship of all matters pertaining to religion and deferred to the rulings set down by the Council of Trent. The right to express political ideas was protected by law; religious matters were not covered by the legislation. Deputies claimed that this would prevent the abuse of the newly established right to free speech.

Public Opinion in Cádiz: *El Robespierre Español*

A medic and officer in the military as well as a Spanish nationalist and admirer of the French revolutionary cause, Pedro Pascasio Fernández Sardino published *El Robespierre Español, amigo de las leyes* with his wife in Cádiz from 1811–1812. He was jailed by the Cortes for his outspoken views on the pressing issues of the day: military matters, the prosecution of the war effort and the political tumult in the city. After attacking two generals and the Minister of War in issue number seven, the government detained him and confiscated his papers; yet the enterprise carried on under the auspices of his wife, María del Carmen Silva.

Fernández Sardino, along with prominent architects of Spanish liberalism, viewed the public realm of political discourse as a font of reasoned debate articulated through individual free speech, political representation and freedom of the press. He described public opinion as founded upon prudent judgment and rational criticism. Fernández Sardino praised the effects of public opinion, “which the representatives of the people should incessantly consult. . . . This is the touchstone, where the purities of the law are tested, to ascertain if it is true: this is the crucible, where the fire of true reason cleans, purifies, and refines.”³⁹ He considered the formation of public opinion a process grounded in reason rather than emotion or sentiment. In a stylized manner that paralleled religious catechisms from the time, he composed a dialogue of rhetorical questions followed by detailed responses to drive home his argument: “Q. I am impatient to know what public opinion is. A. It is public judgment that the majority of citizens form around an interesting subject for the common good of the country.”⁴⁰ Significantly, he did not claim that all citizens shared a common opinion, but that public opinion formed from the majority position. This clearly pointed to an interpretation of public opinion as a process that involved discussion and debate among a plurality of views, ultimately leading to public judgment. Fernández Sardino advanced the notion of a sphere of dialogue and rational-critical thinking that would, in due course, generate a consensus, or, in Rousseau’s terms, the general will. Although the majority of citizens’ judgments formed public opinion, minorities did have their voices heard. This vision of the public sphere encouraged rather than stifled a wide range of opinions and ideological dispositions.

The public sphere, as understood by Fernández Sardino in *El Robespierre Español*, emerged along with constitutional debates over free speech and freedom of the press. Fernández Sardino outlined a paradigm of public space in which public opinion was expressed through “speech, with works, and with a free press.” In a follow-up issue, he further explained the three categories that were essential to the rights of the Spanish citizen and to the existence of public opinion. He asked: “How does one manifest speech? A. Each citizen speaking with their friends secretly in their house, and publicly

in the streets, plazas, cafés, salons, theaters, etc." Freedom of speech correlated with the responsibilities of elected officials to represent faithfully the views of the public. He qualified this point by noting that not all free speech constituted the manifestation of public opinion, as elected officials could not always discern the plurality of opinions concerning a political issue: "But that public opinion, as is plain to see, is insufficient; because Deputies cannot go gathering opinions in private and public spaces, to calculate exactly the plurality, and thereby arrive at a knowledge of the general will."⁴¹ Fernández Sardino invested the power of all citizens "to print freely and frankly their opinion, without violating the rights of the society, nor of any citizen in particular," with a great deal of significance.⁴² Citizens could most clearly articulate their views on public matters through the avenue of print media. Freedom of speech, accordingly, had to be complemented by freedom of action and of the press.

Fernández Sardino decried arbitrary and despotic rule as antithetical to liberal government. He defined freedom of action in terms of the right to revolt against unjust and illegitimate authority: "in modern States this idea of public opinion as action, when it is verified, is properly called revolution. These revolutions succeed, almost always, because despotic Governments do not consult nor do they respect public opinion."⁴³ As absolutist regimes were not concerned with the rights and opinions of the people, they did not retain legitimate recourse to state power in the liberal age.

Within this model of the public sphere, Fernández Sardino claimed that ideas representative of all classes circulated in a vibrant print culture. In a rhetorical dialogue from 1811, he wrote:

How can the free press verify the manifestation of public opinion, being that in a nation not all citizens have the talent necessary to print their opinion, but only journalists, the lettered and the wise, and some writer or another with limited abilities, scarcely more than the common mass of the people? A. The general opinion of journalists, the lettered and the wise is enough to express and represent public opinion; just as two hundred Deputies are enough, for example, to represent all of a nation, composed of many million citizens. . . . The people competitively buy their writings to read with ardent desire, joyously seeing in them their own opinions.⁴⁴

Comparing political representation with the process of producing and distributing the periodical press, *El Robespierre Español* argued for a democratic vision of liberal society. Just as elected representatives calculated public opinion and governed accordingly, the press responded to the spectrum of public opinion. Due to the market forces of competition as well as to the critical faculties of readers and their lettered correspondence with editors, Fernández Sardino claimed that the public sphere accurately conveyed the voices of all Spanish citizens.

Following in the path of influential figures such as Quintana and Ogirando, Fernández Sardino exalted *el pueblo* and condemned the privileges of the aristocracy. For example, he sustained the idea that the people served as a counterweight to both tyrannical government and to the abuse of press freedom: "The representatives of the people, that unite national sovereignty, are the restraint of *El Robespierre Español*, so that it cannot degenerate into despotism. Only they are inviolable."⁴⁵ In a subsequent issue, he interpreted the resistance of the Juntas Provinciales and their defiance of the orders of Murat as an expression the will of "*el Pueblo Soberano*," the sovereign people.⁴⁶

Fernández Sardino, in a passage similar to Quintana's "Reflections about patriotism," discussed at length the role of the people in the War of Independence. In issue number six, he posed the question: "Should hereditary privilege be proscribed in Spain?" In the stylized manner common to each issue, he put forward a provocative question as the headline of the paper and proceeded to examine it in detail. Contrasting the role of the people and the aristocracy in the war, the answer to his question was a resounding affirmation of popular sovereignty:

Only the plebeians rose in fury shouting *liberty* . . . only the plebeians, that people [*gente*], to whom the grandees in their fanatic pride call *low*; in spite of finding in them souls elevated without number, capable of the sublime and the heroic. Only the plebeians brought down tyranny: the grandees breathed it. Only the plebeians, undaunted, destroyed the chains on the second of May: the business magnates were afraid to resist the barbarous oppressor. Only the plebeians, instantaneously intractable in all parts, with an electric aura, looked for arms, insulting the French: the grandees remained indecisive. Only the plebeians,

stirred by a saintly furor, pulled out victories against the enemies in the first campaign: the grandees amazed, scarcely resolved to believe that which they saw.⁴⁷

Claiming that the people desired a liberal government in place of the tyranny of the French (and by implication the absolutist and corrupt Spanish monarchy), the people were portrayed as the heroic defenders of the nation. Fernández Sardino claimed that "only the people have legitimately sacrificed for the Country, and have recovered much with rivers of blood."⁴⁸ After having distinguished between the heroic lower classes and the ambivalent grandees, Fernández Sardino proposed the principle of equality define the nation. Through their heroic and self-sacrificing actions, the plebeians had become the people of Spain, as those with hereditary privilege were denigrated as indecisive and indifferent toward the war. Fernández Sardino therefore advocated the elimination of the landed estates owned by the nobility. He viewed the aristocracy of Spain as composed of three classes:

1. The first is understood as the highest traitors to the Country, those who have formed the court of Joseph Bonaparte.
2. The second includes those who have given relevant tests of heroism, offering to the sacred altar of the Country the generous sacrifice of their lives and property.
3. The third consists of those who have kept their eyes on the national parliament, watching the proceedings as tranquil spectators, without making exorbitant sacrifices, that the nation imperiously demands in them.

1. The first, having lost all right to their estates, are deserving the most terrible punishment. . . . 2. The second (who are very few) should have much consideration. . . . 3. The third, who have not been eager either by guarding or by recovering that which the nation tacitly consents to them, they are excluded from taking up at their old estates, that the people by force of their blood have earned and will earn for themselves. Will it be just that that they have been scandalously mispending such a sum of the gold and the diamonds in Sevilla and in Cádiz that they could salvage in Madrid from the rapaciousness of the French, the people, the magnanimous people, whose gentle innocence, whose having suffered the repeated blows of the bloody enemies' bludgeon as vile slaves, only to conserve their Excellencies' vast possessions, the abundant lands fertilized with the blood of their *humble* feudal dues? . . . *Humble?*... They work the land with their

vain arrogance; and they extract from it sustenance! The Spaniards are not now slaves.⁴⁹

Even those aristocrats who supported the Cortes and the idea of a representative government faced scorn; the only ones who could escape the confiscation of property were those who have contributed to the war effort. The nation, by way of contrast, was imbued with the strength of God. As the blood of Jesus was symbolically presented as a holy sacrament, the people sacrificed themselves at the national altar and shed their blood freely. The souls of the people were elevated into heaven in countless numbers, and they persevered in their struggle against the French shielded by a mystical aura.

Issue number eleven began with the question: "How will the Spanish people always be free, happy and independent?" The answer, placed directly underneath the headline, read: "Only the sovereign people can dictate the laws to themselves."⁵⁰ Fernández Sardino followed with an exposition of the rights and privileges of the Spanish citizen, written in the form of a catechism. Rather than identifying with the trinity of God, King and Country, *El Robespierre Español* advanced an individualistic conception of a citizen's rights under constitutional law. A comparison between the *Civil Catechism*, published by Sevilla's Junta de Gobierno in 1808, and *El Robespierre Español's* dialogue illustrates the divergence between liberalism and the politics of the Old Regime:

Question: Tell me, what destiny do you have in this world?

Answer: I am a Spanish Citizen.

Q: Do you fully comprehend the dignity, nobility, and majesty of this august name?

A: I understand, through preserving it and in sustaining those qualities I will lose this indigent life and the thousand that I had.

Q: But what is a Spanish Citizen?

A: A free man, a constituent part of the Sovereign Spanish People.

Q: Why are you free?

A: Because I am the absolute master of my will.

Q: And to whom do you owe this privilege?

A: To the same God that endowed me with birth, the same as all other men.

Q: Can you do all of the things that you want to do with impunity?

A: Certainly not; because I am now a member of a society, and I am subject to its laws. I can do all that I want that is not prohibited by these laws; this is what the liberty of the Citizen consists of.⁵¹

Question: Tell me Child, how are you called?

Answer: A Spaniard.

Q: What is a Spaniard?

A: A good man.

Q: What are the obligations of a Spaniard?

A: Three, to be a Roman Catholic, to defend your faith, your country and King, and to die before being defeated.

Q: Who is our King?

A: Fernando VII.

Q: With how much love should he be honored?

A: With the most that his virtues and disgraces have merited.

Q: Who is the enemy of our happiness?

A: The Emperor of the French.

Q: Who is this?

A: A new man infinitely bad, greedy source of all evil and exterminator of all good, the epitome and depository of all vices.⁵²

Fernández Sardino’s catechism contrasted greatly with the civil catechism published in Andalucía in 1808. While the civil catechism was dedicated to the nation in arms against the “great beast of France,” the more secular and radical catechism of *El Robespierre Español* asserted a liberal doctrine of free will premised upon the sovereignty of the people (Delgado 294). The latter espoused the political rights and privileges of the citizen, while the civil catechism, ostensibly written for the soldiers in the field fighting against Napoleon’s armies, appealed to a more traditional base of loyalty—God, King, and Country. The duties of the subject obliged Spaniards to fight against the evils of French domination. The civil catechism thus maintained a traditional conception of Spain as based upon fidelity to the church and to the monarchy. Its patriarchal language, referring to a Spaniard as a child, more closely resembled the language of the Old Regime, while the catechism of

El Robespierre Español appropriated royal language in order to place the people on the throne. The words “Spanish Citizen” took on the qualities of nobility and majesty previously reserved for the king and the court; the king was not mentioned at all. Freedom and liberty were the principle guides of the Spanish Citizen. Fernández Sardino’s nationalist rhetoric focused on a restructured society under the auspices of liberal government. Although a growing political divide separated these disparate views, they coexisted along a spectrum of nationalist ideologies in Spain between 1808 and 1814, each with adherents in the Cortes of Cádiz.

Conclusion: Liberalism and its Critics

The Constitution of 1812 ultimately enshrined the liberal ideal of popular sovereignty, establishing the nation as a supreme entity and severely curtailing the powers of the king. The constitution definitively stated that “the Spanish nation is the union of all Spaniards of both hemispheres. Sovereignty resides essentially in the Nation.”⁵³ Thus in transposing these definitions, the constitution forcefully declared that sovereignty resided in the people of Spain. The newspaper *La Triple Alianza* spelled out the intentions of the constitution in declaring that all Spaniards, in the Americas as well as in peninsular Spain, were equal participants in “the sovereignty of the people” (Seoane, *Primer Lenguaje* 73).

The liberal print culture in ‘revolutionary’ Spain articulated a radical redefinition of politics and identity during the War of Independence. Drawing its ideology from roots in the Hispanic Enlightenment and nineteenth-century European liberalism, the periodical press circulated new conceptions of state authority and sovereignty in the public sphere.⁵⁴ Newspapers used a language common to all public figures by 1808, steeped in an oppositional nationalism and liberal thought. Implementing the doctrine of popular sovereignty in place of royal absolutism and creating citizens in place of subjects changed the political landscape by 1812.⁵⁵ The public became endowed with considerable power over elected officials charged with the functions of national government in the name of the people.

Not all Spaniards viewed the rise of the periodical press in a positive light. Vitriolic denunciations, such as the 1813 *Pastoral*

Instruction written by prominent bishops from Cataluña and Navarra, warned that the plague of publications in war-torn Spain was having adverse effects on the populace. The bishops claimed that "the press today ridicules everything, from sermons to the sacred figures of the saints themselves." They pointed to the great risk of perversion among the young if measures were not taken to abate the contagion, "an epidemic of so much pestilent writing" (*Instrucción pastoral de los Ilustrísimos Señores Obispos de Lérida, Tortosa, Barcelona, Urgel, Teruel, y Pamplona* 188). Similarly, other publications denigrated the efforts of liberals such as Quintana and insisted that they did not reflect public opinion. The anonymous author of *Apología de la Inquisición* railed against an issue of *Semanario Patriótico*: "The opinion of the Spanish people is not that of four authors or editors of public papers; the opinion of the people, or of a corporation, is not that of everyone: *the good Spaniards* detest the abuses and the infractions against wise laws that should govern us. . . . The largest part of the kingdom, invaded by enemies, cannot manifest to us their desires and opinions" (5). Accordingly, true Spaniards—*los buenos españoles*—represented a silent majority whose voices had been ignored by the periodical press in Cádiz. Virulent newspaper editorials advocated controversial and polemical positions. Conservatives were waging a war of words against those who would claim to speak on behalf of a liberal nation. In May of 1814, with the nation's liberty and independence restored, absolutists successfully appealed to King Fernando VII to rescind all legislation enacted by the Cortes, including the freedom of the press. The opening of the public sphere, facilitated by war and disorder in the summer of 1808, had closed, and liberals would have to wait six years for a second revolution to revitalize the popular press in Spain once again.

Works Cited

Archival Sources

El Conciso, 1810

Diario de Madrid 1808

Diario de las Sesiones de las Cortes Generales y Extraordinarias,
1810–1813

El Robespierre Español, 1811

Semanario Patriótico, 1808–1811

El Voto de la Nación Española, 1809–1810

Books and Articles

- Álvarez García, Mariano. *El clero de la Diócesis de Valladolid durante la Guerra de la Independencia*. Valladolid: Diputación Provincial de Valladolid, 1984.
- Álvarez Junco, José. “La invención de la Guerra de la Independencia.” *Studia Histórica-Historia Contemporánea* 12 (1994): 75–99.
- Apología de la Inquisición. Respuesta a las reflexiones que hacen contra ella el Semanario patriótico número 61, y el periódico titulado el Español número 13, y breve aviso a los Señores Arzobispos, Obispos y Diputados en Cortes*. Cádiz, 1811.
- Baker, Keith Michael. “Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas.” *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Craig Calhoun, editor. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992.
- Benson, Nettie Lee. “The Elections of 1809: Transforming Political Culture in New Spain,” Kathryn Vincent, editor. *Mexican Studies* 20, no. 1 (Winter, 2004): 1–20.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. “La Ilustración hispanoamericana: una caracterización.” *Revolución, independencia y las nuevas naciones de América* Jaime E. Rodríguez O., editor. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, 2005.
- Capmany, Antonio de. *Centinela contra franceses. Centinela contra franceses*. Françoise Etienvre, editor. London: Tamesis, 1988.
- Delgado, Sabino, editor. *Guerra de la Independencia: proclamas bandos y combatientes*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1979.
- Eastman, Scott. “Las identidades nacionales en el marco de una esfera pública católica: España y Nueva España durante las guerras de independencia.” *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1808–1850*. Jaime E. Rodríguez O., editor. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, 2008.
- . “*La que sostiene la Península es guerra nacional: identidades colectivas en Valencia y Andalucía durante la Guerra de Independencia*.” *Historia y Política. Ideas, procesos y movimientos sociales* 14 (Noviembre, 2005): 245–270.
- Eley, Geoff. “Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century.” *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Craig Calhoun, editor. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992.
- Elorza, Antonio. “Cristianismo ilustrado y reforma política en Fray Miguel de Santander.” *Cuadernos hispanoamericanos* 214 (October, 1967): 73–107.

- Esdaile, Charles. *Fighting Napoleon: Guerrillas, Bandits and Adventurers in Spain 1808–1814*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Fernández Sebastián, Javier. "España, monarquía y nación. Cuatro concepciones de la comunidad política española entre el Antiguo Régimen y la Revolución liberal." *Studia Histórica-Historia Contemporánea* 12 (1994): 45–74.
- Flórez Estrada, Álvaro. *Introducción para la historia de la Revolución de España*. London: Imprenta de R. Juigné, 1810.
- Fuentes, Juan Francisco. "Concepto de *pueblo* en el primer liberalismo español." *Trienio, Ilustración y Liberalismo* 12 (November, 1988): 176–209.
- Gallardo, Bartolomé. *Diccionario crítico-burlesco: Diccionario razonado manual para inteligencia de ciertos escritores que por equivocación han nacido en España*. Madrid: Manuel Bueno, 1820.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.
- Herr, Richard. *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Herzog, Tamar. *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Instrucción pastoral de los Ilustrísimos Señores Obispos de Lérida, Tortosa, Barcelona, Urgel, Teruel, y Pamplona. Al clero y pueblo de sus diócesis*. Mallorca: Imp. de Brusí, 1813.
- Los inicios del constitucionalismo español: de las cortes de Cádiz a la crisis de la monarquía absolutista (1808–1833)*. Valencia: Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación, 1980.
- Lovett, Gabriel H. *Napoleon and the Birth of Modern Spain*. 2 vol. New York: New York University Press, 1965.
- Popkin, Jeremy D. *News and Politics in the Age of Revolution: Jean Luzac's Gazette de Leyde*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Rodríguez O., Jaime E. *The Independence of Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "The Transition from Colony to Nation: New Spain, 1820–1821." *Mexico in the Age of Democratic Revolutions, 1750–1850*. Jaime E. Rodríguez O., editor. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1994.
- Schulte, Henry F. *The Spanish Press 1470–1966: Print, Power, and Politics*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
- Seoane, María Cruz. *Historia del periodismo en España: 2. El Siglo XIX*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1983.
- . *El Primer Lenguaje Constitucional Español (Las Cortes de Cádiz)*. Madrid: Editorial Moneda y Crédito, 1968.

- Solís, Ramón. *El Cádiz de las Cortes: la vida de una ciudad en los años de 1810 a 1813*. Madrid: Sílex, 2000.
- Tone, John Lawrence. *The Fatal Knot: The Guerrilla War in Navarre and the Defeat of Napoleon in Spain*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Toreno, José María Quiépo de Llano, conde de. *Historia del levantamiento, guerra y revolución de España*. Madrid: Atlas, 1953.
- Tortella, Gabriel. *The Development of Modern Spain: An Economic History of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Translated by Valerie J. Herr. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Varela Suances-Carpegna, Joaquín. *La teoría del estado en los orígenes del constitucionalismo hispánico (Las Cortes de Cádiz)*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1983.
- Villanueva, Joaquín Lorenzo. *Catecismo del estado según los principios de la religión*. Madrid : Impr. Real, 1793.

Notes

1. *Semanario Patriótico* (November 22, 1810). Published in 1835, the conde de Toreno's *Historia del levantamiento, guerra y revolución de España* was one of the first histories to explicitly use the phrase the "War of Independence." He does not use the new name exclusively, as he also refers to "la revolución." See Quiépo de Llano, José María. Conde de Toreno. *Historia del levantamiento, guerra y revolución de España* 107; Álvarez Junco, José. "La invención de la Guerra de la Independencia." *Studia Histórica-Historia Contemporánea* 12 (1994): 84–85.

2. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 9 (October 27, 1808).

3. Despite the liberal rhetoric of the Constitution of Bayonne, which postulated the establishment of freedom of the press two years after the promulgation of the constitution, Napoleon utilized the power of political propaganda by manipulating the press. Newspapers such as the *Diario de Madrid*, previously the mouthpiece of the court, were co-opted by the French and became instruments of the occupation, eliciting contributions from notable *luces* such as José Marchena and the conde de Cabarrús. The government, the paper argued, "without doubt knows better than the people [*populacho*] the situation of the State and the urgent need to prevent the ruin which threatens, and that without the aid of an extraordinary power was inevitable." See *Diario de Madrid* no. 130 (May 9, 1808).

4. A number of conservative periodicals also dotted the political landscape. For example, newspapers such as *El Procurador General* and the daily *Atalaya de la Mancha* articulated a reactionary conservative vision of Spain and sought to turn French philosophical principles against the liberals.

5. On the War of Independence, see Gabriel H. Lovett, *Napoleon and the Birth of Modern Spain*, 2 vol. (New York, 1965); Lawrence Tone, John. *The Fatal Knot: The Guerrilla War in Navarre and the Defeat of Napoleon in Spain* (Chapel Hill, 1994); Esdaile, Charles. *Fighting Napoleon: Guerrillas, Bandits and Adventurers in Spain 1808–1814* (New Haven, 2004).

6. On the rise of nationalist sentiment during the War of Independence, see Scott Eastman, "La que sostiene la Península es guerra nacional: identidades colectivas en Valencia y Andalucía durante la Guerra de Independencia," *Historia y Política. Ideas, procesos y movimientos sociales* 14 (Noviembre, 2005).

7. Juan Bautista Picornell, the principal architect of the 1795 Conspiracy of San Blas, has been cited as one of the first prominent figures to deploy the word *el pueblo* as a nationalist rallying cry. Picornell, a republican from Mallorca influenced by Hispanic Enlightenment ideals, printed his *Manifiesto al pueblo de Madrid* in which he decried the misery and poverty of the nation under the government of Carlos IV. In proclaiming that "the people [were] clearly convinced that all the miseries and calamities that afflict the Nation are effects of bad government," Picornell undermined the legitimacy of the monarchy with his virulent criticism. Cited in Francisco Fuentes, Juan. "Concepto de *pueblo* en el primer liberalismo español." *Trienio, Ilustración y Liberalismo* no. 12 (November 1988), 188. This language mirrored the first sentence of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. Yet Picornell's vision was ultimately more aristocratic and paternalistic than radical and democratic, and it remained for a subsequent generation to elaborate a romanticized concept of *el pueblo*.

8. Many absolutists disputed the notion of the sovereignty of the people. For example, the Bishop of Orense emphatically denounced popular sovereignty in his 1810 *Manifiesto del Obispo de Orense a la Nación Española*: "Si se pretende que la Soberanía está absolutamente en la Nación, que ella es soberana de su mismo Soberano, u que el Estado y sucesión de la Monarquía depende de la voluntad general de la Nación, a quien todo debe ceder; esto no lo reconoce, ni reconocerá jamás el Obispo de Orense."

9. *La Triple Alianza* (October 28, 1809), cited in Seoane, *El Primer Lenguaje Constitucional Español*, 53–54.

10. *Tribuno del Pueblo español* (January 5, 1812). The title was inspired by the populist Babeuf's *Le Tribune du Peuple*.

11. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 4 (September 22, 1808).

12. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 12 (November 17, 1808).

13. According to the figures of Gabriel Tortella, the population of Madrid in 1787 was approximately 206,000. See Tortella, Gabriel. *The Development of Modern Spain: An Economic History of the Nineteenth and Twentieth*

Centuries. Trans. Valerie J. Herr (Cambridge, Mass., 2000), 257. To compare the press runs of some of the most important newspapers of the period with that of Quintana's *Semanario Patriótico*, see Popkin, Jeremy D. *News and Politics in the Age of Revolution: Jean Luzac's Gazette de Leyde* (Ithaca, 1989), 120–21. Popkin has noted that the *Gazette de Leyde's* peak run reached over 4,000 in the mid-1780s, other Dutch papers reached 6,000, and the most successful London papers sold about 4,500 during this period. The *Hamburg Correspondent* was likely the most widely read newspaper in the world on the eve of the French Revolution with a press run of 20,000.

14. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 1 (September 1, 1808).

15. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 3 (September 15, 1808).

16. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 2 (September 8, 1808).

17. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 3 (September 15, 1808).

18. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 4 (September 22, 1808).

19. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 9 (October 27, 1808).

20. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 3 (September 15, 1808).

21. A growing literature discusses the language of nationalism in Spain. For example, see Fernández Sebastián, Javier. "España, monarquía y nación. Cuatro concepciones de la comunidad política española entre el Antiguo Régimen y la Revolución liberal." *Studia Histórica-Historia Contemporánea* 12 (1994), 45–74.

22. *Semanario Patriótico* no. 1 (September 1, 1808).

23. José Marchena, in a pamphlet published in France in 1792, also advocated convoking the Cortes: "let *Cortes*, *Cortes* be the universal cry." See *A la nación española* (Bayonne, 1792), cited in Richard Herr, *The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton, 1958), 276.

24. *El Voto de la Nación Española* no. 5 (January 10, 1810).

25. On the Catholic public sphere, see Eastman, Scott. "Las identidades nacionales en el marco de una esfera pública católica: España y Nueva España durante las guerras de independencia." Jaime E. Rodríguez O., editor. *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1808–1850* (Madrid, 2008).

26. On elections across the Spanish Monarchy, see Nettie Lee Benson, "The Elections of 1809: Transforming Political Culture in New Spain," Kathryn Vincent, editor. *Mexican Studies* 20, no. 1 (Winter, 2004), 1–20; Rodríguez, Jaime E. "The Transition from Colony to Nation: New Spain, 1820–1821," Rodríguez O., editor, *Mexico in the Age of Democratic Revolutions, 1750–1850* (Boulder, 1994); Rodríguez O., Jaime E. *The Independence of Spanish America* (Cambridge, 1998), 92–103.

27. The idea of "extraordinary representation" was also used to describe the convocation of the Estates-General in 1789.

28. As the language of national sovereignty became a common referent, arguments over whether the nature of this new political order was transi-

tory and circumstantial or permanent and revolutionary began to take form on the floor of the Cortes.

29. *El Conciso* no. 17 (September 26, 1810).

30. *El Conciso* no. 18 (September 28, 1810); no. 26 (October 12, 1810).

31. *El Conciso* no. 18 (September 28, 1810).

32. *El Conciso* no. 22 (October 4, 1810).

33. *El Conciso* no. 19 (March 19, 1812).

34. *El Conciso* no. 30 (October 20, 1810). Women were barred from participation, although many dressed as men in order to witness the proceedings. See Seoane, *Historia del periodismo en España: 2*, 104.

35. *El Conciso* no. 30 (October 20, 1810).

36. *Diario de las Sesiones de las Cortes Generales y Extraordinarias* (October 17, 1810).

37. *El Conciso* no. 30 (October 20, 1810).

38. *Diario de las Sesiones de las Cortes Generales y Extraordinarias* (October 21, 1810).

39. *El Robespierre Español* no. 14 (Cádiz, 1811).

40. Ibid.

41. *El Robespierre Español* no. 15 (Cádiz, 1811).

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. *El Robespierre Español* no. 15 (Cádiz, 1811).

45. *El Robespierre Español* no. 1 (March 30, 1811).

46. *El Robespierre Español* no. 10 (June 20, 1811).

47. *El Robespierre Español* no. 6 (May 23, 1811).

48. Ibid.

49. *El Robespierre Español* no. 6 (May 23, 1811).

50. *El Robespierre Español* no. 11 (1811).

51. *El Robespierre Español* no. 11 (1811).

52. *Catecismo Civil* (Cartagena, 1808), cited in *Guerra de la Independencia*, Delgado, ed., 295.

53. Texto íntegro de la constitución de 1812, in *Los inicios del constitucionalismo español: de las cortes de Cádiz a la crisis de la monarquía absolutista (1808–1833)* (Valencia, 1980), 119.

54. On the Hispanic Enlightenment, see Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. "La Ilustración hispanoamericana: una caracterización." Jaime E. Rodríguez O., editor. *Revolución, independencia y las nuevas naciones de América* (Madrid, 2005), 87–98.

55. On citizenship, see Herzog, Tamar. *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America* (New Haven, 2003).