

In the quest of Republic: How to build authority during Rio de la Plata's Revolution (1810-1812)¹

Gabriel Entin

Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales - University of Buenos Aires.

entin@ehess.fr

Introduction

The concept of 'republic' is often used with a general and vague meaning in the Latin-American historiography of the first half of XIX century, a period marked by the Spanish monarchical crises, the revolution and subsequent independence wars and the first attempts to build Nation States. In most cases, scholars consider that in this context it is not necessary to explain what the republic is: if the problem of 'republicanism' is that "once it has been defined, (...) it could be found everywhere", the problem of the 'republic' is that it could be found everywhere because it has never been defined².

The republic in Latin-America is often associated with the arrival of anti-absolutist republican regimes after independence: conceived as the institutional regime under which the Nation States would be based upon, the republic appears in Latin-American historiography as a direct consequence of the crisis of the Spanish empire and the Hispanic-American revolutions³. In other words, a republican order would be adopted by default all over the continent during 19th century, in which the republic meant "a non monarchical form of government and not more than that"⁴. This assumption is frequently based on the belief that Latin-American republics were 'assimilated' or 'influenced' by the "Atlantic republicanism political thought" and by the English, the American and the French "modern representative systems"⁵.

Conceiving the origins of Latin-American republics as based on political models that were thought up overseas and assuming them as original, many scholars compare the differences between the political forms developed in the continent and the Atlantic political models already consolidated⁶. Additionally, Latin-American actors, constitutions, governments and the new order created with the revolution are described as republicans without asking if the concept of republic reveals something else than the political regime of the new territorial entities that would be called Nation States. This descriptive approach to the republic (the republic as an adjective) does not allow us to understand what the republic meant, neither what was implied to be the term 'republican' in Latin America and particularly, in the *Rio de la Plata* during the time of revolution.

The republic acquired in Latin-American historiography of the 19th century a "theoretical and almost free character" with the use of the said concept in a sense which is believed to be inherent. If we do not perceive that the republic was not only a political regime, but also a social value of the Spanish American political culture during the three centuries of the empire, we cannot understand that the problems on the construction of modernity in Latin American are also the problems of the republic⁷. A republic, it must be said, on the one side had not been born with the revolution, and was not always defined in opposition to monarchy; on the other side, it had to be created by the revolution to replace monarchy.

The question that we are interested in this essay is the following: what was the republic for the actors of *Rio de la Plata* revolution? Have they shared the beliefs that historiography assumed they had? In other words, if it is not possible to affirm that there was an accurate conception of republic during the revolution, what then what is meant when we refer to Latin-

American republics at the beginning of 19th century? These questions give our research a new historiographical perspective where the differences between Latin-American political experiences *vis a vis* the European or the American political experiences of 19th century are “not thought as degenerations of the political system but as other ways of their realisation in a precise context. In this sense, Latin America is not considered as a passive agent of the western political process of modernisation but rather as a part of it”⁸.

In the following pages we will analyze the meanings of the republic from its constituent values (law, liberty, virtue and common good) in *Rio de la Plata*'s revolution, which was developed in the framework of Hispanic revolutions⁹. We will try to show that the republic was not, at the beginning of revolution, thought as a political regime but as a social value, which articulated a new horizon of reference in which the revolutionaries legitimated their actions. The period we have chosen started in 1808 when Napoleon invaded Spain forcing the royal family to abdicate to the throne. It concluded in 1812, with the first attempts to constitute a government in the new legal and political order opened by the 1810 revolution. We focused our research in the laws of the first revolutionary governments and in articles appeared in the official newspaper *La Gaceta de Buenos Aires* (the only paper that was published regularly between 1810 and 1821) and other newspapers that appeared in these years¹⁰.

***Rio de la Plata*'s revolution in context**

A problem appears when trying to classify Latin-American republics in an old and corporate order, in a modern and individual one, or in a “hybrid order”, when it does not respond to the first two alternatives. The problem arises when we include a concept in a horizon of intelligibility that was not already consolidated and that would be developed in a very different way from those that we assume as models of modernity. If we analyze the early Latin-American republican experience as paradoxical, absurd or hybrid compared to our ideal models of modern republics, we would be expecting that Latin-American revolutions assume the same characteristics of the American or the French experiences of political modernity¹¹. But a model cannot give a modern character to the events of a revolution. On the contrary, it is a new context that causes the actors to think, to act and to react against the main stakes of revolution. For the early 19th century Latin-American revolutions these stakes could be summarized by one question: How to find and legitimate rules of obedience when all the references to the world in which the actors lived are debated?

Exploring the concept of republic and political languages in *Rio de la Plata* during the 1810 revolution could help to illuminate and understand a shady reality; that of Latin-American revolutionary years where new republics started to be conceived after empire's disintegration. As long as we refer to the republic as a concept that explains its own meaning, we would not be developing but foreclosing many questions related to the process of rupture of social representations that we call modernity. In the contrary case, we would give to the concepts the unity, the transparency and the consistency which they did not have¹².

In *Rio of Plata* it is striking to note that debate on republic had not been important throughout the Spanish monarchical crisis, taking into consideration debate on sovereignty and representation. The monarchical crisis was precisely a crisis of sovereignty, which implied the building of some form of representation. Although there was not a debate on the republic, one can wonder which kind or what ideal of a republic the political elite had in mind when they wrote about republic, law, liberty or virtue. *Rio de la Plata* revolutionaries were at the same time intellectuals of the new order they looked to construct. They were an enlightened elite of

young lawyers, military and priests who during monarchy integrated the main political corporations of Viceroyalty. All of them were creoles (Spaniards born in America) and agreed that it was necessary to create and to fight against an enemy, the European Spaniards who had historically administrated the legal, social and economical institutions of the colonies and who would come to personify the “old tyranny”. Nevertheless, between the Creole elite there were different and sometimes incompatible projects for the organization of a new authority in a revolution that would suddenly turn into a revolution for independence. This revolution was, in fact, less a combat between creoles and Spaniards than a civil war between creoles factions.

Before the monarchical crisis caused by Napoleon’s invasion, the only nation that existed in Spanish America was the Spanish nation, integrated by the European part of the monarchy (the *Iberian Peninsula*) and by the American part (the colonies). This second part included an immense territory from *Tierra del fuego* to Cuba and was divided into four Viceroyalties. One of these viceroyalties was *Rio de la Plata* Viceroyalty, which integrated the current territories of Argentina, of Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia and a part of Chile and Brazil. The capital of this Viceroyalty was the city of Buenos Aires.

The revolution in Latin America searched, at its beginnings, for formal solutions within an order where the most stable references were modified by new events in Spain. With the 1808 abdications the monarchical decline acquired the form of an irreversible crisis: at both sides of the Atlantic new authorities were autonomously organised on behalf of the king and out of the legal framework that existed before the crisis. In September 1809 the insurrectionary *juntas* (governing committees) of the Peninsula which fought against Napoleon’s troops, delegated their authority to a central assembly established in Seville (*Junta Central del Reino*)¹³. Although this assembly acted on behalf the king, it also represented the Spanish nation (in which they included the Iberian and the American territories). In May 1810 news of the fall of the *Junta* of Seville and its decision to delegate sovereignty on a Regency Council arrived to *Rio de la Plata*. The local militias of Buenos Aires considered that neither the authority of the Viceroy of *Rio de la Plata* (who was designated by Seville assembly) nor the authority of the Regency Council were legitimate.

Based on the pact with its king, a council opened at Buenos Aires (the *Cabildo abierto*) integrated by 251 *vecinos* (who represented the “most healthy and principal part” of the city) determined that the provisional institutions established at the Peninsula were illegitimate and that sovereignty had to return to the people¹⁴. This council of Buenos Aires created therefore the first *Rio de la Plata* autonomous government (*Primera Junta*) on May 25, 1810. Because the king was captive, the new government assumed the authority to prevent the danger of “a general dissolution of the State or a terrible anarchy which would ruin the provinces”¹⁵ and rejected the Regency Council (and later the *Cortes* in Cadiz¹⁶). Thus, the *Primera Junta* established by the city of Buenos Aires in the name of Ferdinand VII, presented itself as representing all of *Rio de la Plata*’s Viceroyalty territory and justified its right in the hierarchical order of the city. It was a not assumed political rupture which would have allowed to make a revolution and at the same time to lend an oath of fidelity to the king: in one of its documents, the *Primera Junta* rejected the “ignominious character of revolutionary and insurgent” that was endorsed by the cities opposed to Buenos Aires and affirmed later that “every change of government is a revolution”¹⁷. These cities and the main institutions of the Viceroyalty that had recognized the Regency Council would refuse the *Primera Junta* authority. The prudence of the government would be ephemeral: the beginning of the revolution was at the same time that of the war, and the revolution would cease to present itself as a process and instead, it would start to assume as a rupture with the old regime.

Between 1810 and 1812, all the *Rio de la Plata* governments would be organised in the name of Ferdinand VII, who represented the unity of the population. But if the revolution started with an “unconditional love” to the king (a voluntary relation that allowed lending oath of fidelity while at the same time excluded any possibility of political obedience), at the end of 1810 this love would be conditioned by the liberty of the nation. Later on, for the most radical revolutionaries Ferdinand VII would be seen as an “inutile and hateful mask for the free men”¹⁸.

Thus, the crisis of the Spanish monarchy took the form of a revolution. As different as it could be to the English revolution, the North-American revolution and the French revolution, they shared a political struggle aiming at establishing who would hold the sovereignty, and how this sovereignty is exercised, as well as the origin of such legitimacy. However, it is necessary to underline an essential difference with the French revolution: in *Rio of Plata* (as well as in the rest of Latin-America) there was neither an anticlerical republic nor an aristocracy against which to make the revolution, but furthermore, there were not a people with whom to found a nation. The *Rio de la Plata* revolution just like the American and the French ones represented the foundation of a new society and new forms of representations thereof, but in *Rio de la Plata* this creation remained restricted to a local group of men -the creoles of Buenos Aires- for whom the revolution was a “history of political regeneration”¹⁹.

No answers for the monarchical crisis

The republic in Latin America indicates the beginning of a new political regime in the 19th century. There exists a problem, in that the republic represents much more than this. “What is called a *republic* is not any *particular form* of government. It is wholly characteristically of the purport, matter, or object for which government ought to be instituted, and on which it is to be employed, *res-publica*, the public affairs, or the public good”, affirmed Paine, trying to emphasize, after the American revolution that the republic was a government for the interest of the public, “opposed to the word *monarchy*” and associated with “the representative form”²⁰. “I (...) call Republic any State ruled by laws, whatever may be the form of administration (...). Every legitimate Government is republican”, wrote Rousseau in his *Du Contrat Social*, paradigm of the modern conception of people sovereignty that the French revolution took into a representative democracy²¹. “*Republican government is that in which the people as a body, or only a part of the people, have sovereign power*”, affirmed Montesquieu²². All of these authors were known by the revolutionary elite of *Rio of Plata*²³.

Did they understand by a republic a representative government different from the democracy as Madison had written by upsetting all the republican tradition²⁴? Or rather they believed that the republic indicated not only a democracy but also an aristocracy and a monarchy insofar as the government is “guided by the general will, which is the law”, as Rousseau underlined it²⁵. Finally, did they think, as Montesquieu did, that the republic could indicate a democracy and an aristocracy or, still more, a parliamentary constitutionalism as in England “where the republic hides under the form of monarchy”²⁶ ?

But the question is more complex than to determine the meaning of the concept ‘republic’ from definitions of philosophers who thought it in contexts hardly similar as the one seen in the Hispanic world during first half of 19th century. If we want to analyze the beliefs that *Rio de la Plata*’s revolutionaries had on the republic, it is necessary first to identify the practical problems they had to overcome to build another political order.

Argentine historiography commonly assumes that *Rio de la Plata*'s creole elite tried to justify the revolution by the legal bases of the Spanish tradition which, recovered by the Enlightenment of 18th century would make it possible to give a response to the crisis²⁷. Nevertheless, if we consider that the Spanish tradition had answers to the crisis of monarchy, it is hard to understand why this crisis would take the form of a revolution. The Hispanic revolution is not the history of a corporate world which found in tradition a response to the vacuum of power. The revolution is, to the contrary, the history of a corporate world which had to cease being such, when such vacuum of power not only defied it by forcing it to think of itself differently, but also to occupy the place of a king who had never been left vacant before.

What was new in the Spanish empire sovereignty crisis was the *vacatio regis*: in the French revolution, the king's sovereignty was transferred to the people. In the case of Hispanic revolution, there was sovereignty dispersion between the cities and provinces of Viceroyalties - called themselves *los pueblos* ("the peoples") - who wished to preserve their local autonomy and the centralizing tendencies of the capitals which sought to build people's indivisible sovereignty. As A. Annino underlines it, "one of the most relevant consequences to understand the governance of the future republics was the unsolved ambivalence of the problem of sovereignty"²⁸. The doctrines of the transfer of sovereignty were the direct answer to the *vacatio regis*. Nevertheless this answer generated many questions: Who had to govern when the king was absent? How to legitimate a revolution which was made in the name of a king deprived of his freedom and with rules of an empire which broke down without the least resistance? Did the revolutionists made the difference between the concrete and multiple sovereignties of the *pueblos* and the abstract and single sovereignty of the People, as a political body integrated by individuals? All of these questions show that the transfer of the sovereignty of the king by the pact of constraint did not express in itself the development of the new republics in Latin America.

The case of *Rio de la Plata* falls under this logic: its revolution of May 1810 meant the organization of an unified State under the political form of an independent republic, and the search for a stable order which would make it possible to articulate the sovereignty of the peoples with a concentrated exercise of authority. The *vacatio regis* was the starting point for the replacement of monarchical legitimacy by a new political legitimacy. "Whatever the origin of our association is, it is certainly that we form a political body", wrote Dean Gregorio Funes (who integrated the first revolutionary governments as a deputy of Cordoba), when it sought to legitimate the new authority through the existence of a political body which he called "republic"²⁹. For Funes, the republic indicated neither a form of government in which the people had sovereignty, like Montesquieu suggested, nor a government directed by the general will, as Rousseau understood it. For him, the republic was "a whole of men always driven by the same spirit" that needed a social order. In his opinion the elements of this order were: "individual or collective sovereignty, laws and magistrates"³⁰. This formula of individual or collective sovereignty, explains the constant ambiguity in the definition of the sovereign subject during revolution: the secretary of the *Primera Junta* and Rousseau's *The Social Contract* translator, Mariano Moreno, stated in 1810 that royal sovereignty returned to "the peoples" after the imprisonment of the king and he wrote at the same time that "the real sovereignty of a people had never consisted but in its general will"³¹.

The existence of the People and of the nation would be shown as "truths so known that the fervour is useless to prove them and degrades them"³². But against an imagined nation there would be concrete cities who would resist the new authority or who, by accepting it, would claim to be accepted as "small republics which are governed like such"³³. Thus, the

revolution represented a transfiguration of reality, not only with a new and only political subject (people's sovereignty), but with new political subjects ("the peoples" or cities). The retrocession of sovereignty to the peoples was one interpretation of the pact of constraint and its political subject. If this was one possible answer to the crisis, it is precisely because of the status of the city in the Spanish American corporate order. In the old regime, the city constituted the "natural" place of politics³⁴: a space of deliberation and decision of the community, integrated by those who had the quality of *vecino*. The city was designed like a republic that governed itself with its own laws and government and whose objective was the common good³⁵. This good was not only political but also moral and religious: it was associated to the Augustinian ideal of the Christian republic and the Roman ideal of the *res publica*. In the legal and religious culture of the Hispanic Old Regime, the republic was thought as the political body of monarchy or as the whole political community. As follows, the republic was a common reference of the Spanish monarchical order and was associated with the "good government" of the kingdom, or of the city, which was thought as a condition to reach the ideal of the common good³⁶.

Thus, the cities, small urban republics already constructed, thought of themselves as the only sovereign subjects based on the pact with the king and the recovery of their rights by the *vacatio regis*. Through which institutional mechanisms could the cities identify themselves with the order that the fragile revolutionary authority of Buenos Aires was building? And how to transform reality and affirm new principles of political obligation through an abstract entity (the people, the nation, the republic) that the revolutionaries seemed obvious but which, in practice, was denied by the cities which were proclaimed sovereigns?

A new horizon for *Rio de la Plata's* revolution

If the history of a word is at the same time the history of an idea, the history of the republic is the history of several ideas. The idea of a republic is also the idea of law, virtue and liberty: all of these are concepts of the republican tradition of thought (or as Q. Skinner described, the neo-Roman theory of free states). If we have to summarise this tradition, we could say with Machiavelli that the people have "only the desire to not be dominated"³⁷, with Montesquieu that the virtue, the fundament of the republican government, is "the love of the laws and of the fatherland"³⁸ and with Rousseau that "we are free under the submission of laws and not when we obey a man"³⁹. Hence, liberty, virtue and law make sense all together. One is the condition for the other in order to reach the main objective: to remain a free state and therefore, to ensure the common good. Only in a republican regime (where no individual interest are fostered) is it possible to follow out the common good, to guarantee the city's liberty and consequently, to exercise the individual liberty⁴⁰. So, for the republican tradition the republic does not refer to a theory of democratic participation, but to one where liberty is analyzed as an exercise and not as an opportunity⁴¹.

With concepts from the republican tradition, the revolutionaries of *Rio de la Plata* wanted to build (sometimes with the pseudonyms of "citizen", "patriot" or "vassal of the law") a reality which would have been used as a basis for the new political legitimacy. As the radical revolutionary Bernardo de Monteagudo wrote it: "All the discussions and essays that had been published up to this moment are reduced to prove that America have right to its own liberty, that the Spanish government had executed in America a real despotism, that the time to take revenge of the dignity outraged of men is arrived, and that it is impossible to do it without a practice of social virtues"⁴².

Just like the North-American revolutionists of 1776, the men of *Rio de la Plata* revolution lived in a context where the authority was not recognized (or if it was, it had a doubtful legitimacy) and in which a stable form of union between sovereign states was required. None of them thought of setting up republican principles of government, but once they did, law, liberty, common good, virtue, fatherland and the virtues of the classical republics were turned into the own principles of the revolution. “I proposed myself, in all the newspapers I publish, not to use any language except that of a true republican; and never congratulate or criticize my fellow-citizens if not for their virtues or their vices”, wrote Monteagudo in 1812 in his *Mártir, o Libre* (Martyr or Freeman) newspaper, where he wrote about classical republics, criticized through Rousseau the conception of liberty in Grotius and Hobbes, and reprinted speeches for the anniversary of the North-American revolution, in which “people made themselves free”⁴³.

Sovereignty had to be rebuilt: it was then a question of affirming a new source of political legitimacy through the invention of a people, a nation and a rule of law. But how to create rules of law in a revolution that was initially justified by “the first principles of public law of Nations and by the fundamental Laws” of the kingdom? Moreno, the lawyer of the revolution, would argue that the pact between the colonies and their king was illegitimate because it was based “in the force and the domination and not in conventions, which make born and constitute the peoples”⁴⁴. So, if the pact was illegitimate, it could not exist any “legitimate obligation” with the king, nor legitimate laws. Moreno’s argument was described by the newspaper *Gaceta de Montevideo* (one of the cities which resisted Buenos Aires government) as “criminal” since it was “perfectly identical to those of the sanguinary philosophical despots who made first cements of the theatrical French Republic”⁴⁵.

The *vacatio regis* was at the same time the *vacatio legis*. “The laws of *Indias* were not established for a State and we have already formed one”, said Moreno asking later: “Would the king pretend that we conserve our old constitution? Precisely, we would answer him that we do not know any constitution, that the arbitrary laws dictated by lust for the slaves and colons could not rule the life of men who desire to be free and there is no authority in the world that could deprived us from this right”⁴⁶. In the same direction, Funes would affirm: “Our revolution annulated the laws that the Spanish kings imposed to America (...) and now we would keep them only as a stimulant for our emancipation”. The revolution had created a new legality denouncing the pact with the king and distinguishing between the old laws associated with slavery and the new laws related to liberty and independence. It was a legal rupture with the past. The *vacatio legis* not only aimed to fill the lack of authority in the absence of the king, but also to build a new legitimacy on which the new authority could be established. In this context, Moreno wrote: “How to establish people’s obedience without risking bringing dejection or how to promote liberty without the dangerous consequences of furious licence”⁴⁷. The creation of the law would be the answer to this question. Therefore, the law would represent the foundation of a new political order.

The law was a tool to transform the provinces that were united only by the Spanish king and the territory, into one sovereign and independent republic. The law also became an instrument of a new revolutionary political culture. The revolution built up its people, a new source of the authority, through the law and, with it, a group of soldiers and lawyers, all from the same social group, would broaden a local revolution and would establish -not without resistance- rules of political obedience for a political unit in construction, the nation, which they presented, as if it had always existed. In other words, the law would become the political operator of the new authority. “We do not have a constitution and without it the happiness that

was promised to us is a chimera”, wrote Moreno claiming a “fair and liberal constitution” which would prevent against “the tyrants”. For Funes, “the new constitution (...) will repair the disasters that the injustice, the interest and the arbitrary have produced”⁴⁸. The law will thus be used for the double objective to found a nation and to build a State on people’s sovereignty. Furthermore, the law would take an active role: it creates the conditions that do not naturally exist to constitute a free government, that which is called a republic. It prevents the people from sacrificing their own interests stimulating the practice of the common good, what we know as virtue. The law also constitutes the political liberty, that is, the liberty of the republic, which will be defined in opposition to oppression and despotism. It is a question of creating a new world and of imposing it as the only possible solution. In this sense, the law represents not only a tool for institutionalization but also a tool for the unity and the equality of a fictitious people. Therefore, Montegudo could claim in 1812: “sovereignty resides only in the people and in the authority of laws”⁴⁹.

Against the “old” and “arbitrary” laws the revolution represented the uniform and impersonal character of the law that was shown as a condition of liberty. What kind of liberty was this? Initially it was the liberty to preserve for the king the free American territory of the Spanish monarchy. Afterwards, it was a liberty opposed to slavery: the liberty as the right of a people that had been neglected during three hundred years of “despotism”. Moreover, liberty was compared to equality, justice and reason. Finally, liberty would be the synonym of independence: “liberty or death”. The enemies of the revolution would become thus, the enemies of liberty and the revolution will be associated to the “sacred cause of liberty”⁵⁰. Each of these conceptions of liberty would be related to the “reign of the law”⁵¹.

In a world still corporate it is not surprising to note that the revolution used republican values - which privilege the liberty and the common good of the State before particular interests -, to affirm the unanimity which did not have. The struggle of the revolution was also a battle against particularism: selfishness is, according to Funes “the perpetual enemy of public good”. It should be confronted to approach the citizens with their government: “at that moment the love of the fatherland will be a feeling”, concluded Funes by calling himself “a citizen”⁵². Even the newspaper *El Censor*, which defended the monarchical unity between America and Spain, criticized the government in 1812 because its organ of Justice “had failed in the holy law of the states (*Salus Reipublicae suprema lex esto*) while making appeared individual goods as the goods of the community”⁵³.

The republican language of the revolution

Based on the virtues and vices of ancient republics, the men of 1810 built a language for the order that was being created with revolution and war. The use of a republican rhetoric had a specific goal: it consolidated an ideal of society and a model of behaviour for a “new-born people (...) which could not be flattered yet to have left childhood”⁵⁴. Through this language the revolutionaries searched to make of the neighbour or plebeian (which did not profit from the advantages of the city) citizens-soldiers. To transform patriotism into a virtuous feeling which transcends the limits of the city and which identified with the public interest, the love of glory and the love of the fatherland, promote the cause of the revolution. In short, it is a question of identifying independence with law, liberty and virtue, by creating for these words new meanings incompatible with monarchical absolutism. “I know well that there are many generous souls which, now that they are free of any servant sentiment, do not have other enthusiasm but the love of glory”, affirmed Montegudo when he called the People to have

“patriotism”, a virtue that he defined as “the capacity to be free”. For him, the People had to “imitate the intrepid Roman who immolated his own sons to save the fatherland and be inspired from the virtue of 300 Spartans who had sacrificed themselves in Termopiles to obey their holy laws”. These men, explained Monteagudo, were “those who had expelled the Tarquins from Rome, who had given the LIBERTY to Beotie, Thessaly and all the cost of the Aegean Sea, who had obtained the independence of North America in these days and those who will form in South America a People of brothers and heroes”⁵⁵.

Similar to the American and French revolution the classical republics represented models of civic virtue and political organisation. The *Primera Junta*, as Funes remembered, recalled “always the names of Sparta, Rome, liberty, patriotism”⁵⁶. The references to the ancient republics were articulated in a language of a revolution which needed unanimity for the war but that did not generate adhesion apart from a local elite which was also divided. Moreno wrote: “the destiny of the states have strong principles, and the history of the old peoples present true examples for those who desire the success”. The classical past was read through Tacit, Cicero or Tite-Live but its recuperation was oriented by the interpretation of the 18th century men of the Enlightenment. “Sparta perished, said Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which state could be proud of having a durable constitution? Nothing is more difficult than to set up the principles of an interior administration free of being corruptible”, explained Moreno⁵⁷.

Like Rousseau, Monteagudo believed that the Romans were “the most free and powerful people on Earth” and from Rome gloriousness and decadence he thought a manual for the instruction of “the incipient people”. On the inaugural session of the Patriotic Society he wrote: “When I see that the free Rome produced as many heroes as citizens (...), I see well that there is no place for any usurper in Rome because I see that the people hold its rights and respect its duties; but when I see that (...) the legions of the Republic are only the legions of illustrious persons and that the citizens practice a hateful traffic of their rights I have no doubt (...) that the Republic is close to its end”⁵⁸.

The republican virtues were exalted by the revolutionaries as the virtues of patriots who fought against the “tyranny” of their enemies, who would be called the “conspirators”, the “real enemies of the state”, the “parricides of the fatherland”⁵⁹. They would be also associated with the particular interest and the corruption generated by luxury, which as Montesquieu affirmed, caused the decadence of Rome and could destroy any republic⁶⁰. “We expect that every citizen (...) would be immediately disposed to the urgencies of the state, instead of promoting a destructive luxury favourable to the interest of our rivals”, noted Monteagudo for whom luxury was “the opposed virtue” to temperance, which was “the base of liberty and the cement of republics”⁶¹. New institutions were also designed with the terminology of the old republics: triumvirs, dictators, protectors, comices, plebeians.

Later on, in his project to reform the programme of the University of Cordoba, Funes proposed to follow the examples of the “republican governments” of Athens and Rome in order to promote “the speech art” and talk “the same language of liberty”⁶². He also suggested to study Roman laws “which ruled the time of the free republic” and to translate the writings of Cicero, Sallust, Tite-Live and Tacit. Finally, he imagined the position of “Decurions” (the Roman leaders of ten citizens-soldiers) for the most advanced students “that would have to take lessons near others”⁶³. The language of freedom, law, virtue, fatherland and common good would be used without any discrimination like a tool to legitimate governments and actions of the different factions in *Rio de la Plata*. “There is among us men who, by masking the ambition and the anguish with the invaluable names of FATHERLAND, VIRTUE AND LIBERTY, look with the anxiety of passions a way which will lead them to the supreme

mandate” wrote *El Censor* newspaper when it described the “republican fury” of a revolution that had broken with the old order, that had built a republican ideal but that had not managed to constitute a form of government⁶⁴.

Is it possible to distinguish a republican horizon during revolution from the references to ancient republics? It is not an easy question to answer because concepts such as republic, law, liberty, virtue, fatherland, etc. belonged to the Hispanic culture that exalted since the Scholastic of 16th century, the values of classical republics through the use of Latin, the interest for classical antiquity and the admiration for the Italian republics of the *Renaissance*⁶⁵. Thus, monarchical obedience in the Hispanic world was articulated with the aesthetic worship of the “excellent laws” of “the Republic of the Roman People”, with the image of the patrician as the “Father or founder of the Republic”, with the literary republic formed by “erudite and wise men”, and with other roman formulas that were commonly known in the Spanish empire like “Father of the fatherland” or “Restorer of the republic”⁶⁶. Moreover, Spain was seen as a kingdom which “combines the free statute of a republic with the constraint with its king and his lord”⁶⁷. As J.A. Maravall wrote it, “liberty and absolute monarchy go together and support each other. By the end of 16th century, the first declined under the second one which as years passed, would be imposed more strongly”⁶⁸.

However, during the Spanish empire the worship for republican values did not represented a threat to monarchy absolutism while during *Rio de la Plata* these values were articulated in a language that was being shaped against absolutism. In other words, *Rio de la Plata* revolution met a “political culture of the Baroque” in which “the republican virtues were largely venerated during centuries of absolute monarchy”⁶⁹. With the revolution, those virtues designed a new political culture based on assumptions that would have been impossible to endorse in the past. Not only the idea of common good of the republic would be thought outside the pact with the king; it would be also considered against it. Moreover, the common good would represent the good of the fatherland that would not longer refer to the Spanish monarchy, but to a territory (that did not have defined geographic boundaries) that the revolutionists conceived of as a single political unity separated from Spain. The republic and its values, reinterpreted through the Physiocrats and the Enlightenment men, will be thus changed in meaning, passing from an aesthetical republican language towards a political republican language where the republic would be associated with independence. To summarize, the references to classical republics were articulated in a new political culture of a revolution which, as well as the rest of Latin-American revolutions, broke with the past.

Conclusion

The republic was not born with the revolution but the revolution did build the theoretical support of Latin-American modern republics. The creation of the modern republic implied the institution of a common political experience. If we analyze this experience as inconsistent or incoherent compared to the experiences of the so-called “the age of democratic revolutions”, we would be considering the spontaneous action like an accomplished fact; the beginning and the invention of the possible (what we called the revolution) like a casual and completed process. *Rio de la Plata* revolution (as well as the rest of Hispanic-American revolutions) implied a transformation from a concrete republic (a society-republic) towards an abstract republic (a Nation-republic) founded in an undefined People. Thus, the revolution was both a rupture and a creation. The rupture of a republic as a political body in a corporate society, along with the creation of a republic as a political regime in an individual society.

Concepts such as fatherland, liberty, law and virtue were associated, with the revolution, to a republican tradition in which the political regime is founded in citizens' virtue and in their subordination to the common good. The idea of the revolution would be inseparable from an idea of the People with duties towards a new community. *Rio de la Plata* creoles did not consider themselves any longer as Spanish Americans subjects, but as American citizens. "Now that the man is a citizen, he has to give to the fatherland a generous love and all the sacrifices he is capable (...). He has to show obedience and respect to the laws and magistrates, he has to give protection and fraternal sensibility to his co-citizens; he has to give to himself the honour, the dignity and the virtue. Nobody can ignore its duties", quoted Monteaugudo in 1812⁷⁰. The republic was meant to represent an ideal of unanimity, liberty, independence and brightness as opposed to the "old system": "tyranny", "slavery" and "shadows". "More than three centuries of servitude taught us that despotism starts when there is no more liberty (...). Liberty will come once America will have dignity, fatherland and virtues (...). Humbleness, obedience, suffering, were our virtues as the quality of good slaves: generosity, courage, love of glory will be now the virtues that will honour all the citizens", affirmed Funes⁷¹.

In *Rio de la Plata* the language that we identified as republican was defied by the context that emerged with the monarchical crisis: the laws that were seen as the assurance against tyranny were constantly violated and modified; the new governments searched to legitimise their authority in a people more virtual than virtuous. Rather than a political regime opposed to monarchy this republican language revealed the practical problems of *Rio de la Plata* revolution. And, as we sought to evidence, these problems were related to the construction of an authority, of political obedience and of legitimacy. The republic and its values would be articulated in a process of political invention by which there would be space for one project only: that of the revolution. The horizon shaped by the revolution would create a world of contrasts that beyond the factious struggles, would be shared by the political elite of Buenos Aires: law or anarchy, liberty or death, fatherland or sepulchre. Hence, the republic would be the project of "creation of a political body and a whole society" independent from Spain and its king⁷².

Nevertheless, this horizon where "all the factions shout liberty, liberty"⁷³ and where the patriotism, the empire of the laws and the virtuous of the citizens were venerated, was developed in a reality where the proclaimed political equality coexisted with an accepted civil inequality. On the other hand, the single and abstract sovereignty in which the revolutionary power was based coexisted with a fragmented authority which was spread over multiples communities that even if they shared the same language of the revolution, would redefine the idea of sovereignty depending on their own circumstances and interests. In summary, *Rio de la Plata* revolution appeared as a totality but due to its own context (characterised by a war carried out by the lowest sectors of the population) and its efforts to keep the independent process under control, it was limited to be a revolution more represented than executed in relation with the declared principles.

It is precisely the double dimension of the republic -political regime and social value- which was relegated by most of Latin-American and Argentinean historiography of 19th century. This distinction makes it possible to understand why many revolutionaries, who considered themselves as republicans and who fought for independence, could defended monarchical forms of government. Only if we assume the republic as a problem and as an ambiguous process of Latin-American political modernity construction, we would be able to understand the fact that *Rio de la Plata* revolution was at the same time associated with

republican values but with a sceptical opinion about the political regime being adopted. As Manuel Belgrano, a leader of the revolution wrote in 1816: “As well as the general will of nations, during the previous years, was going towards the ‘all republic’, in these days it rather leans towards ‘all monarchy’”⁷⁴. The *Rio de la Plata* was the only political territory in Spanish America that was not conquered after the 1814 absolutist restoration. Throughout the decade monarchical and republican constitutions would be proposed and a sovereign would be sought, not only between European royalties, but also between the heirs of indigenes empires.

Notes

¹ This paper is based in a previous work presented in the *Introduction to Conceptual History* workshop of the Helsinki Summer School (August, 2006).

² J. Appelby, “Republicanism and Ideology”, *American Quarterly*, vol. 37, n°4, 1985, p.461. The concept of republicanism presents three limits at its employment in our essay. Firstly, it has such a wide dimension that it makes possible to explain various conceptual systems corresponding to various historical periods (D. Rodgers, “Republicanism: the career of a concept”, *The Journal of American History*, 79, 1992). Secondly, contradictory political alternatives to the monarchical crisis which were “equipped with sufficient ductility to function in a wide field” are described as a Latin-American republicanism (N. Botana, *La tradición republicana. Alberdi, Sarmiento y las ideas políticas de su tiempo*, Buenos Aires, 1997). Finally, this concept was inexistent in the Hispanic world for the period analyzed.

³ In the only book dedicated entirely to 19th century Hispanic-American republicanism it is stated : “The Hispanic-Americans who fought against the Spanish yoke (...) had one type of government in mind: the republic” (J.A. Aguilar, “Dos conceptos de República”, in J.A. Aguilar y R. Rojas (eds.), *El republicanismo en Hispanoamérica*, México, 2002, p.57).

⁴ *Ibid*, p.72. For the notion of republic as “monarchy negation” see also J. Fernández Sebastián and J.F. Fuentes (dirs.), *Diccionario político y social del siglo XIX español*, Madrid, 2003, p.622.

⁵ For example, it was said that “the ideas that inspired the emancipation of the American colonies were those of the Enlightenment, more of the French and Spanish Enlightenment of the 18th century than of the 17th century British rationalism” (M. Jorrín and J.D. Martz, *Latin-American Political Thought and Ideology*, North Carolina, 1970, p.24). See also R. Freeman Smith, “The American Revolution and Latin America: An Essay in Imagery, Perceptions, and Ideological Influence”, *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 20, 1978, p.421-441 and C. Stoetzer, “L’influence française au Rio de la Plata à travers les régimes politiques et les textes constitutionnels”, in *Cahiers des Amériques Latines*, 10, 1990.

⁶ Based on similarities and differences between Latin-American experiences and political models abroad, it is affirmed, for instance, that there were “aristocratic republics” and actors “more or less *Jacobins*” in Latin-America. Moreover, it is said that the new Latin-American nations were characterised by their “democratic anomalies” (J.A. Aguilar Rivera, “La nación en ausencia: primeras formas de representación en México”, in *Política y Gobierno*, 5, 1998). In this perspective J.L. Romero affirmed that the revolutionaries of Buenos Aires developed a “*sui generis*” liberal doctrine (*A History of Argentine Political Thought*, Stanford, 1968, p.65)

⁷ By political modernity we understand the principle of people’s sovereignty, political equality, elections as the expression of people’s will, and the individual as the main category of social organization. See P. Rosanvallon, *Le sacre du citoyen. Histoire du suffrage universel en France*, Paris, 1992, p.42.

⁸ F. Morelli, “Entre ancien et nouveau régime. L’histoire politique hispano-américaine du XIXe siècle”, *Annales HSS*, 4, 2004, p.780.

⁹ The concept of Hispanic Revolutions belongs to F.-X. Guerra and refers to the revolution as a single process of the Hispanic world because since 1808 there was a permanent overlap and reciprocal causality between the events on the Peninsula and on the America colonies. (F.-X. Guerra, “La desintegración de la Monarquía hispánica: Revolución de Independencia”, in A. Annino, L. Castro Leiva et F.-X. Guerra (eds.), *De los Imperios a las Naciones. Iberoamérica*, Zaragoza, 1994, p.195).

¹⁰ Between 1810 and 1812 there were six revolutionary governments in *Rio de la Plata*: The First Governing committee (*Primera Junta*, Mai-December, 1810), the Big Governing committee (*Junta Grande*, January-September 1811), the Conservative committee (*Junta Conservadora*, September-November 1811), the First

Triumvirate (*Primer Triunvirato*, September 1811-October 1812) and the *Second Triumvirate* (*Segundo Triunvirato*, October 1812-January 1814).

¹¹ The assumption that Latin-American 19th century represents a “hybrid” model it is particularly noticeable in the writings of F.-X. Guerra. See, for example, *Modernidad e independencias. Ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispanoamericanas*, México, 1993.

¹² E. Hobsbawm notes: “Concepts, of course, are not part of free-floating philosophical discourse, but socially, historically and locally rooted and must be explained in terms of these realities” (*Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality*, Cambridge, 1990, p.9). It should be noticed however that the relationship between the ideas, the concepts and the context is not simple to determine and is extremely difficult to identify the social belonging of and individual or an idea as J.G.A. Pocock had noted (*Politics, Language, and Time. Essays on Political Thought and History*, Chicago, 1989, p.105). We believe that the concepts that we analyze for *Rio de la Plata* revolution were in a crisis of political language and it is precisely through their unfixed meaning and their ambiguities that we seek to analyze the revolution. See P. Rosanvallon, *Pour une histoire conceptuelle du politique*, Paris, 2003.

¹³ The *Junta* of Seville had declared in 1809 that the American territories were not colonies but an “essential part” of the monarchy. At the same time it established an unequal representation for the American deputies. This contradictory decision have strengthen an anti-Spaniard feeling in the creoles and consolidated “an unanimous opinion that the Americans possessed the same rights as the Spaniards to decide upon their own destiny, once the sovereign had disappeared” (J.L. Romero, op.cit., p.68)

¹⁴ The *Cabildo* was the town council and represented the city’s inhabitants. In 1810 there were 65,000 inhabitants in Buenos Aires city. The *Cabildo abierto* was an exceptional town council enlarged to other qualified inhabitants. The *vecino* (neighbour) was the inhabitant who had “a house and household in a village” and contributed “to its taxes and distributions” (*Diccionario de Autoridades* [1726-1739], Madrid, 1990, v.3, p.428). Hence, the *vecino* was the resident of a community who had a privileged situation in the kingdom as well as a collective representation within a particular territory.

¹⁵ *Gaceta de Buenos Aires*, November 13, 1810. We will refer to this publication as *GBA*.

¹⁶ The Spanish Courts of Cadiz enacted the 1812 Constitution which was accepted in almost all the American territories except on *Rio de la Plata*, Venezuela and part of Nueva Granada.

¹⁷ *GBA*, November 10, 1810. Naturally, the *Primera Junta* was a revolutionary government because its authority had not been delegated to it by the king nor his delegates but by the people of Buenos Aires.

¹⁸ *El Censor*, February 25, 1812.

¹⁹ *Mártir, o Libre*, May 25, 1812.

²⁰ T. Paine, *The Rights of Man*, Part II, in *Thomas Paine: Political Writings*, Cambridge, 1989, p.167, 168.

²¹ Rousseau, *Du Contrat Social*, in *Œuvres Complètes*, Paris, “Bibl. de la Pléiade”, 1964, v. III, book II, chap.VI, p. 379, 380.

²² Montesquieu, *De l’esprit des lois*, Paris, “Bibl. de la Pléiade”, 1951, p.239 (author’s original italics).

²³ The leaders of *Rio de la Plata* revolution read, for example, the writings of Plato, Aristote, Tacite, Polybe, Tite Live, Cicero, Puffendorf, Condillac, Mably, Montesquieu, Voltaire, D’Aguesseau, Raynal, Rousseau, Bentham, Burke, Paine, the *Federalist* and Jovellanos. Some 18th century books circulated between the urban elite although there had been a royal law which prohibited the essays of the French Enlightenment writers (see R.R. Caillet-Bois, *Ensayo sobre el Río de la Plata y la revolución francesa*, 1929, p.27). Leaflets, pamphlets and political press were as important as books for the circulation of ideas.

²⁴ See *The Federalist* No.10, A. Hamilton, J. Madison and J. Jay, *The Federalist*, Cambridge, 2003, p.44.

²⁵ Rousseau, op.cit, p.380. “To be legitimate, the Government must not be confused with the Sovereign, but be its minister: Then monarchy itself is a republic”, notes Rousseau in his footnote on this chapter.

²⁶ Montesquieu, op.cit., book V, chap. XIX, p.304.

²⁷ For example, see D. Roldán, “La cuestión de la representación en el origen de la política moderna. Una perspectiva comparada (1770-1830)”, in H. Sabato y A. Lettieri (eds.), *La vida política en la Argentina del siglo XIX. Armas, votos y voces*, Buenos Aires, 2003, p.37.

²⁸ A. Annino, “Soberanías en lucha”, in A. Annino, L. Castro Leiva and F.-X. Guerra, *De los Imperios a las Naciones. Iberoamérica*, Zaragoza, 1994, p.250. For Annino the peoples reinvented the corporate order during the crisis of the Spanish monarchy giving local bases to the future republican States.

²⁹ Gregorio Funes (1749-1829) was born in Cordoba. He studied canonical law in Spain and when he returned he integrated the Cordoba Cathedral. He was candidate to represent the *Rio de la Plata* Viceroyalty at the time of the *Junta* of Seville, which was dissolved before the American deputies arrived to Spain. During revolution, he

integrated the first governments in Buenos Aires, the Assembly of 1813 that produced a Constitution which has never been applied, and the Tucuman Congress which declared formal independence in 1816. He also wrote in *La Gaceta de Buenos Aires* and was dean of Cordoba University. In 1823 he represented Colombia in Buenos Aires by order of Venezuelan revolutionary Simon Bolívar. Lastly, Bolívar appointed him at the cathedral of La Paz.

³⁰ *GBA*, August 2, 1810 and October 2, 1810.

³¹ *GBA*, November 13, 1810. Mariano Moreno (1778-1811) was born in Buenos Aires and studied law at the University of Chuquisaca (in Peru Viceroyalty). Before revolution, he worked for the *Cabildo* and the Royal Audience (Justice Tribunal) of Buenos Aires and fought against the Spanish monopoly defending a commercial openness with England for the landowners and farmers. He was the first secretary of the *Primera Junta* and represented revolution's radical faction. He founded the official newspaper *Gaceta de Buenos Aires* and the first public library. He also translated Rousseau's *Du Contrat Social* but eliminated the passages about religion since, he explained, Rousseau "had the misfortune to rant and rave (...) in these matters". By the end of 1810 he resigned from the *Primera Junta* because he was against the majority who sought to enlarge the government with provincial deputies.

³² *GBA*, August 2, 1810.

³³ This was a Jujuy's request to the government. Cited in J.C. Chiaramonte, "Ciudadanía, soberanía y representación en la génesis del Estado argentino. 1810-1852", in H. Sábato (dir.), *Ciudadanía política y formación de las naciones. Perspectivas históricas de América Latina*, Buenos Aires, 1999, p. 98.

³⁴ In the Spanish culture the "politic" was conceived as "the good government of the city" (Bobadilla, *Política de corregidores y señores de Vasallar en tiempo de Paz y de Guerra*, [1640], Madrid, 1697).

³⁵ See *Diccionario de Autoridades*, op.cit. and Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o Española*, [1611], Barcelona, 1993.

³⁶ A. Lempérière stresses that the word republic "was never threatened by suspect connotations, even after the fall of French monarchy in 1792" ("República y publicidad en el Antiguo Régimen", in F.-X. Guerra et A. Lempérière (et al), *Los espacios públicos en Iberoamérica. Ambigüedades y problemas. Siglos XVIII-XIX*, México, 1998, p.55. For the idea of republic as *res publica* in the Spanish monarchy see from the same author, *Entre Dieu et le roi, la République. Mexico, XVIIe-XIXe siècles*, Paris, 2004 and J.-F. Schaub, "El pasado republicano del espacio público", in F.-X. Guerra and A. Lempérière (eds.), op.cit.

³⁷ Machiavelli, *Discours sur la première décade de Tite-Live*, Paris, 2004, book I, chap. V, p.73.

³⁸ Montesquieu, op.cit., book IV, chap. V, p.160.

³⁹ Rousseau, "Des loix", in *Fragments politiques*, op.cit., p.492. Rousseau continues saying: "because in this last case I obey to someone else will but obeying the Law I only obey to the public will".

⁴⁰ Q. Skinner, *Visions of politics*, v.2, Cambridge, 2002, p.199, 380, 382.

⁴¹ For the distinction between republican theory and democratic participation, see P. Pettit, *Republicanism. Una teoría sobre la libertad y el gobierno*, Barcelona, 1999; M. Viroli, *Republicanism*, New York, 2002 and J. Coleman "El concepto de república. Continuidad mítica y continuidad real", in *Res publica*, 15, 2005. See also Q. Skinner, "The republican ideal of political liberty" in G. Bock, Q. Skinner and M. Viroli, *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, Cambridge, 1990. For Skinner the neo-roman theory of free states is not in a strict sense republican because, as he shows with the English revolution, there are for some writers a compatibility of their theory of liberty with regulated forms of monarchical government (Q. Skinner, *Liberty before liberalism*, Cambridge, 2003, p.22, 55). On republican tradition as a theory of democratic participation see B. Manin, *Principes du gouvernement représentatif*, Paris, 1996.

⁴² *GBA*, February 7, 1812. Bernardo de Monteagudo (1789-1825): was born in Tucumán. He studied law at Chuquisaca University and worked as a lawyer of the *Real Audiencia* in Peru. During revolution he represented a radical version of Moreno's legacy. He wrote in *La Gaceta de Buenos Aires* and founded the newspaper *Mártir O Libre*. He also organised the Patriotic Society in 1811 and Lautaro's Logia in 1812 (a Masonic secret association) with José de San Martín (the Argentinean independence hero) to "educate the people" and promote independence. He participated in different governments, wrote Chile's independent act and was diplomatic agent of Bolívar.

⁴³ *Mártir, o Libre*, April 27, 1812.

⁴⁴ *GBA*, 14 June, 1810 and November 1, 1810. Moreno based his argument on Rousseau's formula: "Let us agree, then, that force does not make right, and that one is only obliged to obey legitimate powers" (*Du Contrat Social*, op.cit., book I, chap. III, p.355).

⁴⁵ *Gaceta de Montevideo*, December 4, 1810.

-
- ⁴⁶ *GBA*, November 6 and 15, 1810. For this idea of *vacatio legis* see E. Palti, *Acerca de los lenguajes políticos en el siglo XIX latinoamericano. Sus nudos conceptuales*, México, 2006.
- ⁴⁷ *GBA*, November 6, 1810.
- ⁴⁸ *GBA*, November 20, 1810.
- ⁴⁹ “Oración Inaugural de la Sociedad Patriótica”, January 1, 1812.
- ⁵⁰ “Estatuto Provisional del Superior Gobierno de las Provincias Unidas del Rio de la Plata a nombre del Sr. Fernando VI”, November 22, 1811.
- ⁵¹ “Inaugural manifiesto de ‘El redactor de la Asamblea’ del año XIII”, in A. Sampay, *Las Constituciones de la Argentina (1810-1972)*, Buenos Aires, 1975, p.124.
- ⁵² *GBA*, November 20, 1811.
- ⁵³ *El Censor*, February 11, 1812.
- ⁵⁴ *GBA*, January 10, 1812. As Furet wrote, we could think that a nation means the foundation of a society through language. See F. Furet, *Penser la Revolution Française*, Paris, 1999, p.52.
- ⁵⁵ *GBA*, January 3, 1811.
- ⁵⁶ Funes, *Bosquejo de nuestra revolución. Desde el 25 de mayo de 1810 hasta la apertura del Congreso Nacional, el 25 de marzo de 1816*, Córdoba, 1961, p.22.
- ⁵⁷ *GBA*, November 6, 1810.
- ⁵⁸ “Oración Inaugural de la Sociedad Patriótica”, January 1, 1812. The Patriotic Society was an association created by Monteagudo to “promote the knowledge” and “support people majesty”. This association was organized like the *Jacobines* clubs of the French revolution.
- ⁵⁹ *GBA*, November 10, 1810 and December 27, 1811.
- ⁶⁰ Montesquieu said: “So far as luxury is established in a republic, so far does the spirit turn to the interest of the individual” (*L’esprit des lois*, op.cit., book VII, chap. II, p. 227).
- ⁶¹ *GBA*, January 10, 1812.
- ⁶² Funes, *Plan de estudios para la Universidad Mayor de Córdoba*, in *Biblioteca de Mayo*, op.cit., p.1576.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, p.1559, 1560, 1581, 1585.
- ⁶⁴ *El Censor*, January 21, 1812. (author’s original bold letters)
- ⁶⁵ See X. Gil, “Republican Politics in Early modern Spain: The Castilian and Catalano-Aragonese Traditions”, in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, Cambridge, 2002, vol. 1.
- ⁶⁶ The quotations are from the definitions of “Constitution”, “República literaria”, “Patricio” and “Ciudadano” of the *Diccionario de Autoridades*, op.cit., v.1, 2, p. 536, 586, 165, 364.
- ⁶⁷ G. Escolano, *Década primera de la historia de Valencia [1610-11]*, cited in X. Gil, op.cit., p.272.
- ⁶⁸ J.A. Maravall, *Antiguos y modernos. Visión de la historia e idea de progreso hasta el Renacimiento*, Madrid, 1998, p.530.
- ⁶⁹ T. Halperín Donghi, *Revolución y guerra. Formación de una élite dirigente en la Argentina criolla*, Buenos Aires, 1994, p. 131.
- ⁷⁰ *Martir, o Libre*, May 11, 1812.
- ⁷¹ *GBA*, November 20, 1810
- ⁷² S. Bolívar, “Discurso de Angostura”, February 15, 1819. Bolívar would try to disseminate his project of American unity in Rio of Plata through Monteagudo and Funes.
- ⁷³ *GBA*, February 7, 1812.
- ⁷⁴ M. Belgrano, “Informe sobre el establecimiento de una monarquía (1816)”, in J.L. Romero and L. A. Romero, *Pensamiento político de la emancipación*, Caracas, 1977, v.II, p.210.