

UNIVERSAL MALE SUFFRAGE AND THE POLITICAL REGENERATION IN SPAIN AND FRANCE (1868-1871)¹

El sufragio universal masculino y la regeneración política en España y Francia (1868-1871)

RAFAEL ZURITA-ALDEGUER

Universidad de Alicante

rafael.zurita@ua.es

Cómo citar/Citation

Zurita-Aldeguer, R. (2019).

Universal male suffrage and the political regeneration in Spain and France (1868-1871).

Historia y Política, 42, 209-239.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.18042/hp.42.08>

(Reception: 29/03/2018; review: 29/05/2018; acceptance: 01/12/2018; publication: 13/12/2019)

Abstract

Throughout the 19th century, the establishment and the consolidation of universal male suffrage was a slow and difficult process. It was instituted in several nations where revolutions and/or wars had created a need for it. This was the case in Spain and in France where, between 1868 and 1871, a change in the political regime led to the introduction of legislative elections. In this context, universal suffrage, together with certain other rights, was considered a basic element for political regeneration. Thus, the initiatives taken by the political parties that were fighting for seats, the reaction of the media, the citizens confronted with the announcement of elections, and the attitude of the Government constituted a novel political environment.

¹ This article is part of the research project “Historia cultural de la corrupción política en España y América Latina. Siglos XIX-XX”. MINECO-FEDER (UE): HAR2015-64973-P (I+D+i).

By comparing the situation in Spain and France, this paper explores how the different political cultures—liberal, republican, legitimist—shaped the profiles of the political representatives. Elements both of continuity and change in Spanish and French politics may be detected behind the personalities of those who were standing for parliament after the respective failures of Isabel II and Napoleon III. For the purposes of this discussion we have focused on two elements: the mechanisms used to set up the candidatures, and the speeches the candidates made to win the votes of the electors. By way of reference material, I make use of historiography, contemporary newspapers and publications.

Keywords

Universal suffrage; elections; political representation; political culture.

Resumen

La implantación y consolidación del sufragio universal masculino durante el siglo XIX fue un proceso lento y difícil. Se produjo en pocos países, donde estuvo condicionado por episodios de revolución y/o de guerra. Este fue el caso de España y Francia, que experimentaron entre 1868 y 1871 un cambio de régimen político que supuso la organización de elecciones legislativas. En dicho contexto, el sufragio universal, junto con el ejercicio de otros derechos, fue considerado un elemento fundamental para la regeneración política. Así, la iniciativa de los partidos políticos que disputaron los escaños, la respuesta de la prensa y de los ciudadanos ante la convocatoria electoral y la actitud del Gobierno conformaron un renovado escenario político.

Este texto explica, desde la mirada comparada entre España y Francia, cómo las diversas culturas políticas —liberal, republicana y legitimista— caracterizaron al representante político. Así, a través de la figura del candidato a diputado, se pueden ver algunos de los elementos de continuidad y cambio en la política española y francesa tras la caída de Isabel II y de Napoleón III, respectivamente. Para ello, hemos fijado la atención en dos elementos: los mecanismos para formar las candidaturas y seleccionar a los candidatos y los discursos elaborados por aquellos para obtener el voto de los electores. Utilizamos como referencias algunos de los estudios publicados, así como la prensa y publicística coetánea.

Palabras clave

Sufragio universal; elecciones; representación política; cultura política.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION. II. UNIVERSAL MALE SUFFRAGE IN THE RUPTURES THAT LED TO DEMOCRACY. III. MECHANISMS TO CREATE CANDIDATURES. IV. SPEECHES DESIGNED TO WIN VOTES. V. CONCLUSION. *BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

I. INTRODUCTION

During the 19th century, debates about universal suffrage in Europe and the Americas were marked by deliberations about its meaning and impact on society. Against a background of political rupture, universal suffrage was also highlighted as one of the key rights in the bid to lay the foundations of a new order, or to generate, in conjunction with other rights, a more inclusive political framework². This was the case of Spain and France between 1868 and 1871, a coincidence which naturally suggests a comparison between these two countries. This article takes as a starting point an analysis of universal suffrage set against the background of policies that were seeking to break away from the past and move towards democracy following the fall of Isabel II and Napoleon III. It then goes on to explore the effect that universal suffrage had during this period on the development of electoral campaigns that were organized around the personality of an electable representative. For the purpose of this investigation I use the bibliography of both countries, along with the press and publications of the time.

In the late 18th century, supporters of the representative system believed that the election process had a dual function: on the one hand, it was expected to make an appropriate selection of the political actors and, on the other, to exert an effective control over their public interventions³. However, from the outset, an intense controversy arose between the force of number and the force of reason. The argument was over whether, in a political context, the will of the majority of citizens should prevail over the criteria of those of higher education and intelligence. Revolutionaries in America, France and Spain (Constitution of 1812), argued about the positive and negative aspects of universal male suffrage, of both the direct and indirect variety, or about the census system, which established minimum patrimonial or financial qualification. Nevertheless,

² Forner (1997) and Malamud (2000).

³ Manin (1997): 161-192.

during the first half of the 19th century, the defenders of limited suffrage gained ground, based on the economic and cultural conditions of the electors. A discourse gained the upper hand maintaining that voting was not a political right but rather a function or capacity held only by a certain type of men⁴.

In the broader context of the 1840s and 1850s France and Spain shared a common experience with regard to the theory and practice of census-based liberalism. In Spain, as in France, the development of liberal government implied complex negotiations between the local and the central government elites, and election time became a key period to measure political influence and the reality of power. For the election of the National Assembly, Spanish and French law limited the rights of suffrage on the basis of restrictive economic requirements and stringent conditions of eligibility. In these Spanish regulations a certain influence of Orleanist legislation is discernible⁵. In both countries, the circumscription of the single-member districts and the system of election boards facilitated cliental malpractices. This is not surprising given the weakness of the structures of political parties. In this area, parallels between France and Spain were significant, as the central government, through the civil governors or prefects, tried to impose their own candidates. However, the central powers did not always prevail against the influence of the local leaders. Moreover, there were cases in which two candidates competed in the same voting district. Throughout the 1840s, the electoral practices of France and Spain distanced themselves from each other, as France increased participation in its legislative and municipal elections⁶. In France, the municipal law of 1831 increased the number of electors to three million, which had as its result a gradual schooling in modern politics. Thus the introduction of Universal Suffrage in 1848 did not constitute an actual break in voting practices⁷. Although Spain did not follow the same path, from 1860 onwards, the debate over the value and meaning of voting was intensifying, as was also the case in other European and Latin American countries⁸. In fact, the disputes about the right of suffrage went even further and laid bare the implications it had for the legitimacy of representative government, for the responsibility of politicians and for the nationalization of politics⁹. By 1870 universal suffrage was firmly established in France, a fact which had its

⁴ Kahan (2003): 21-65.

⁵ Peña Guerrero (2015).

⁶ Zurita-Aldeguer (2008) and Luján (2018).

⁷ Guionnet (1997): 305-311.

⁸ De Castro (1979) and Flaquer Montequi (2007).

⁹ Bonaudo and Zurita (2010); Peña and Zurita (2016), and Sierra (2010).

influence on the process by which the same right was implanted in Spain. Thus we may read in the opinion issued by the parliamentary commission:

Universal suffrage, a term taken from modern public law, inaugurates a new period in the political history of nations. France salvages it as the only remnant left after the foundering of its liberties, and by means of it is set to reconquer all of them; The United States buy at the price of rivers of blood the rights of the negroes, and Spain, finally, entering resolutely on the path of liberty, creates the foundations for its political regeneration¹⁰.

II. UNIVERSAL MALE SUFFRAGE IN THE RUPTURES THAT LED TO DEMOCRACY

At the end of the 1860s, revolution and war determined the political development of Spain and France, and produced movements towards democracy that helped shape the political culture of that time. The Spanish revolution of 1868 brought with it the exile of the Bourbon Queen Isabel II, the introduction, for the very first time, of direct and universal male suffrage, and the announcement of elections for a constituent assembly. In such elections, the Monarchic representatives clearly outnumbered the Republicans and, as of January 1871, Spain had a new king, Amadeo I of the House of Savoy, within the framework of the democratic Constitution of 1869. In France, three processes marked the political development. The first was the defeat at Sedan in September 1870 and the capture of Napoleon III, which gave rise to the provisional proclamation of the Republic. The second occurrence was the elections of February 1871 that Bismarck demanded in order to oblige France to elect a government that would take a decision on whether to continue the war or to sign a peace treaty. Those in favour of the latter option obtained more seats. The third and final pivotal event was the *Com-mune*, whose repression by Thiers' conservative administration, followed by the partial elections of July 1871, consolidated the republican order.

The electoral history of Spain and France had run their separate course until they reached the juncture of 1868-1871. France, after the introduction of universal male suffrage in 1848, went from 240,000 voters to more than 9 million, which set in motion the process of "learning about democracy", in the words of Agulhon¹¹. This development continued after the enthronement

¹⁰ *Diario de Sesiones del Congreso de los Diputados*, 5-3-1870.

¹¹ Agulhon (1979): 305

of Napoleon III for both the electorate and the candidates, in spite of the Government's meddling through officially endorsed candidatures¹². From 1848 onwards the ballot box had become an object of political thinking as a consequence of its proliferation. The Second Empire, then, became instrumental in establishing norms which had an influence on the institutionalization of political competences and of the voting ritual. The ballot box achieved a sanctified status and the polling station helped to promote civic integration. At the same time there gradually emerged an iconography of the act of voting in the press, although, as Offerlé has noted, it is difficult to measure its real impact¹³. The opening of the regime in 1868 with laws relating to the media and the right of assembly encouraged a certain degree of liberalization, which favoured an increasing representation of the Opposition. Thus, in the elections in 1863, it obtained 32 seats (out of the 283 seats in the National Assembly) and in 1869 it reached 93, of which 30 were Republicans¹⁴. After these latter elections, Emille Acollas published a short essay, "The Simple Opinion of a Democrat", in which he contended that "although France had been immersed in counterrevolution for the past 68 years", French democracy was still alive, albeit in want of political parties organized around a programme. Acollas, with the electoral law of 1848 very much in mind, stated that every citizen should cast "a clear and free vote to choose the representatives or the "commissioners of the social body", as Jean-Jacques Rousseau would have called them. However, according to the French author, universal male suffrage had to go hand in hand with the freedom of teaching, of the press and of assembly. Without them the proposed suffrage would remain a farce, just as the system of census suffrage had been. Indeed the former was even more spurious, as it perverted a right and left society subjected to the class that was most numerous and dependent: the peasantry.

The French jurist considered it necessary to do away with the official candidature. He feared, however, that it would not prove sufficient, since "personal power was the major enemy of elections", a power which had its strongest base in the rural world, where most of the population lived¹⁵. According to the Republicans, that was where the introduction of education was most needed to "transform the masses into a people" and to form the nation of citizens that would give birth to the Republic. At the end of the 1860s, both Liberals and Republicans in France thought that politically

¹² Voilliot (2005): 155-163 and Langoueyte (1995).

¹³ Ihl (1993); Offerlé (2002b), and Villette (2013).

¹⁴ Morabito and Bourmaud (1992): 266.

¹⁵ Acollas (1869): 8-9. Source Gallica.BnF.fr

speaking, everything depended on the peasants, but that they “are not the Nation, they are merely a number!”¹⁶ As an element of improvement it would be feasible to add to education a certain degree of administrative decentralization, since, according to Ferry, the municipalities were “the citizen’s primary school”¹⁷.

However, according to Rosanvallon, after Sedan, most conservatives and certain Liberals questioned universal suffrage and used it as a scapegoat to catalyse all the anxieties that followed defeat. A criticism that had seemed dead and buried since 1848 re-emerged in its aftermath. Three major issues concerning universal suffrage were overlapping each other: the place of the elites in society and how they were selected, the nature of democracy and the form that the State should take. The war against Germany had resulted in a loss of leadership that had in turn led to a search for a “legitimate aristocracy” that could counterbalance the popular majority. Up to that moment, according to Rosanvallon, universal suffrage had existed in a contained form only. As of 1871, however, it was “free”¹⁸. And while the Liberals considered that guarantees, such as age and place of residence, were enough to enhance universal suffrage, certain conservative sectors along with the legitimists considered granting the right to vote only to the literate¹⁹. This idea reflected a paternalist view of the relationship between the people and the elites, and it understood democracy to be a mere extension of the traditional social relationships. Owing to the widespread debate within the general public and the new electoral dynamics of the first few years of the Third Republic, Huard has described this transition period as a “second birth” of universal suffrage in France²⁰.

In Spain, within the complex process of the liberal revolution the country had been experiencing from the first decades of the 19th century, the introduction of universal suffrage took place 20 years later than in France, although it did so in a very similar way, following the revolution that dethroned the Bourbon dynasty²¹. Until that moment, census suffrage had marked the electoral experience of the country. Even so, within the political culture of the Spanish Liberals, different orientations existed that drew circles of varying sizes around civil society²². Thus, while “Moderantists” sought to limit

¹⁶ D.R. (1869): 25. Source Gallica.BnF.fr

¹⁷ Gaboriaux (2010): 195.

¹⁸ Rosanvallon (2002): 281-311.

¹⁹ Brelay (1871): 5-8. Source Gallica.BnF.fr

²⁰ Huard (1990): 101-117.

²¹ Millán and Romeo (2004).

²² Romeo, M.^a C. and Sierra, M. (2014).

electoral rights to the propertied classes and professionals, the Unionists and Progressives lowered the criteria for both of these categories. The latter group distinguished itself from the others by attaching greater importance to political mobilization²³. In this context, the position of the governments on the restriction or concession of public liberties had its influence on the ideas and practices of the citizenship with regard to voting and political representation. In fact, in 1854, after the Revolution that had led to the progressive government, elections for a constituent assembly were announced and, notwithstanding the census suffrage, a lively election campaign ensued²⁴. However, after 1856, subsequent elections organized and led by Moderates and Unionists, were held with limited liberties, considerable meddling on the part of the government and very poor participation²⁵. After 1863, not only on the Republican side but also among the Monarchists opposition to the Bourbon regime was on the increase. Consensus among the political forces settled around the acceptance of universal male suffrage fortified by numerous liberties that would lend credibility to its implementation. This question had always been a key issue in the Republican ideology, and would continue to be so throughout the Revolutionary Sexennial²⁶. Some publicists with liberal views such as Gonzalo Ivars and Carlos Rubio underlined the significance of broadening the space for political participation²⁷.

The Spanish Revolution of 1868 sent Isabel II into exile in France and brought about the formation of a provisional government from which the Republicans were excluded. The new executive passed laws on the freedom of printing, assembly and association, and it also called municipal elections in December 1868. These would become a rehearsal for the Constituent Assembly since they were the very first elections in which universal male suffrage was implemented²⁸. A decree granted the right to vote to men over 25. This raised the minimum age which the revolutionaries had set at 20 for the election of the councils in many cities and which the Government now dissolved. This decision ran counter to the French policy which gave the vote to men over the age of 21. It also capped the potential votes for the Republicans, who were aware that many young people would be amongst their electorate and had made an intense mobilization effort to obtain the lowering of the

²³ Sierra (2007).

²⁴ Zurita-Aldeguer (2007).

²⁵ Araque Hontangas (2008): 491-622.

²⁶ Eiras Roel (2015) [1961]; Hennessy (2010) [1966], and Castro Alfn (1994).

²⁷ Ivars Ros (1864); Rubio (1865), and Peyrou (2008): 463-508.

²⁸ Suárez Cortina (2006): 21-28.

electoral age²⁹. At the same time, the Government emphasized the educational nature of universal suffrage. It insisted that it would make it possible to create “political traditions that ensured that the people would make sensible use of their rights and that they would get used to exercising those rights”, as the right to vote had to become “the most solemn and important act in the life of a citizen”³⁰. “Political catechisms” proliferated from then on, each with a clearly educational purpose. Gabriel Feito, for instance, pointed out in his “Republican Doctrine for the Popular Classes” that the exercise of political rights was a means to “redeem and reform the people” and that they should be given to citizens over 20 years of age. Justo Zavala dedicated his text “to instructing those electors who lack the most essential notions concerning their rights at the ballot box”, adding a warning as to what would happen if the citizens did not fully understand their rights and obligations: “They will be able to vote against the Nation’s legitimate interests, sending to parliament representatives who are enemies of liberty and opposed to the rights of the people, which would mean a veritable national suicide”. Once the Democratic Constitution of 1869 was approved, steps were taken to promote the teaching of this document. Hence, Gregorio Barragán’s *Constitutional Catechism* explained that universal suffrage was “the basis of National Sovereignty”, and defined this suffrage as: “the right of every individual to vote freely for the person whom he deems to be capable of performing the duties for which he has been elected”³¹. In the face of these positions, Carlists adamantly rejected the idea of national sovereignty, which they viewed as proof of man’s arrogance and as an act of rebellion against God’s will. Furthermore, Carlists attacked universal suffrage on the grounds that it encouraged an individualism that was alien to their community-based vision of society. Paradoxically, they did not dispute the right of the people to express its will through representative institutions, as Carlists acknowledged the people as the principal agent. The Cortes, however, ought to be limited to a merely consultative function. In the new political climate of the Revolution, all these elements helped to produce notable transformations in the Carlist movement, which gave rise to its own political culture³².

The municipal elections took place in a climate of nervousness owing to the riots that took place in Andalusia and the intense campaign of Republican

²⁹ Fuente Monge and Serrano García (2005): 9-21.

³⁰ *Gaceta de Madrid*, 10-11-1868.

³¹ Peyrou (2007): 193-221. Feito’s quote in 215; Zavala (1868): 3-4, and Barragán (1870).

³² Dupont (2017a).

propaganda in response to the provisional Government's declaration in favour of the Monarchy³³. This latter issue attracted the attention of the French Democrats who, from the pages of *La Liberté*, had criticized General Prim, the President of the Government, for not calling for a referendum that might permit the Spanish people to make their choice between a monarchy and a republic³⁴. This press reference illustrates the mutual interest Democrats and Republicans showed for each other on either side of the Pyrenees. All the while, the Spanish Republicans were influenced by the French and shared with them a common set of transnational political values³⁵.

A significant aspect of the electoral campaign was that the parties avoided local concerns in favour of the big issues of national politics. The debate was polarised between the Republic and the Monarchy, and the municipal elections in December 1868 brought about an increasing politicization. The Republicans played a prominent role due to their greater vitality, determined mainly by the novelty of their arrival on the political scene. In this sense, the Republicans disseminated their ideology in several ways: in politically sensitive places such as clubs and associations, new newspapers, the edition of leaflets and electoral manifestos, as well as in meetings, debates, gatherings and demonstrations. The results they obtained in the elections confirmed the hopes of the Republicans because, although they generally favoured the Monarchists, the former consolidated their influence on the Mediterranean coast and 21 provincial capitals chose Republicans to become their Mayors³⁶. Different local case studies have revealed the Republicans' organizational skills and mobilizing power in the cities³⁷. Deserving special mention are the mayors who were elected owing to the prestige they enjoyed within their own local communities within the context of the Revolution of 1868³⁸. After he had experienced these events in person during his visit to Spain, Elias Reclus, a friend of Spanish Republican Fernando Garrido, wrote on the 22nd of December: "If universal suffrage is not a comedy and if their decisions are to be respected, the Republican cause has just achieved a great success heralding victory"³⁹. This was, however, a wish rather than a reality because, as would be revealed shortly afterwards, the monarchic option

³³ Jaen Milla (2014).

³⁴ Alberola Fioravanti (1973): 102.

³⁵ Moisand (2015); Peyrou (2015); García Balañá (2016), and Peyrou (2017).

³⁶ Esteban Navarro (1994) and Gutiérrez and Zurita (1999).

³⁷ Arias Castañón (1996) and Penche González (2008).

³⁸ Herrán Prieto (1986) and Janué I Miret (2002): 183-220.

³⁹ Reclús (2007): 166.

enjoyed the support of the majority of Spaniards. In fact, the crisis of legitimacy that the country underwent placed not only the form of government but also the figure of the deputy at the forefront of political debate. During the reign of Isabel II, deputies had been tainted by their dependency on the Government or on local patronage networks⁴⁰. As a result of those negative influences over Parliament, after the revolution and under universal suffrage, a regeneration of the political representatives was called for. This implied that the deputy had to present a clear profile as a sign of political virtue and as a defender of a program and of certain principles.

III. MECHANISMS TO CREATE CANDIDATURES

The democratic impulse that had led to universal suffrage and to the actions undertaken in its defence in France and Spain displayed elements of continuity as well as of change with regard to the way elections were organized. In both countries two questions emerge in the political context of 1868-1871. On the one hand, the electoral method of block voting was applied. This conditioned both the way electoral lists were set up and the type of discourse used to solicit votes. On the other hand, many dignitaries had to turn themselves into professional politicians and apply new techniques to obtain a seat⁴¹.

In Spain, Sagasta, the Home Secretary (“Ministro de Gobernación”), called elections to the Constituent Assembly between 15th and 18th January 1869. The electoral campaign was marked by ample press freedom and the right to vote of men over 25. In addition, the Government played a politically relevant role clearly reflected in the decree that called the election, in which it stated that “it would remain neutral but not sceptical”. This meant that its willingness to respect all political positions did not prevent it from holding its own opinion. “Liberal institutions that are guaranteed by the solemn stability of the monarchic principle have a safer future than those under the dangerous experiment of a new form of government without historic precedent in Spain and with no examples in Europe that were worthy of imitation”⁴². Martínez Cuadrado states that the behaviour of the government in the 1869 elections was quite correct despite the atmosphere of confrontation that hung in the air between Republicans and Monarchists. Although the Executive did not wish

⁴⁰ Sierra *et al.* (2010): 411-449.

⁴¹ Phélippeau (1999) and De la Fuente (2000): 224-231.

⁴² *Gaceta de Madrid*, 12-1-1869.

to return to the methods of the regime of Isabel II, which had been marked by the interference of the civil governors, the increasing number of eligible voters (which went from 400,000 in 1865 to 3,800,000 in 1869) reduced the possibilities for exerting effective pressure. It nevertheless seems reasonable to believe that some irregularities did take place, given the speed with which the city halls prepared the new elections. In the end, the freedom of the press acted as a mechanism of control over the government. The method used to count the votes was based on the law of 1865, which, inspired by the French electoral practice, had established 82 multimember districts called “circuncripciones”⁴³. The majoritarian system of voting enabled the parties to win all the disputed seats within a particular electoral district. To become a member of parliament it was necessary to pay taxes and not to hold the post of either “gobernador civil” or “capitán general”.

Historians agree that the 1869 campaign gave rise to the greatest mobilization of any election held before the 20th century. Monarchists, Republicans and Carlists competed in many districts to obtain the support of the electorate and thereby established the bases of a new party system that would last until the end of the 19th century⁴⁴. After 1868, the new factors in the political arena were the committees, casinos and clubs, which develop into centres of popular participation and, by extension, training grounds for democracy. All the three main political currents participated in this process of politicisation. Reclús anticipated an intense struggle: “The towns with more than 6,000 inhabitants that chose a Republican majority in the local elections are also expected to choose Republicans to represent them at the Cortes, whereas the countryside was expected to return a reactionary majority”. At the same time, he made an interesting comparison between Spain and France when he stated: “Madrid is not the place that provides us with the most truthful and trustworthy impression of Spain. Unlike Paris, Madrid does not control the provinces; caught between the reactionary north and the revolutionary south, it follows Barcelona and Cadiz even more than London follows Manchester.” Neither did the French Republicans ignore the fact that in order to understand the electoral results the degree of abstention had to be taken into account:

The Spanish nation, much more apathetic than commonly believed, possesses a substantial number of people without any convictions, who take one side or another depending on the circumstances or the interests of the moment [...].

⁴³ Martínez Cuadrado (1969): 64-69.

⁴⁴ Serrano García (2001) and Villena Espinosa and Serrano García (2017).

The manifesto of the Republican Committee merely says: Vote! Vote! The great mass of the indifferent consists of ignorant people and a few sceptics; it contains many more Liberals than either reactionaries or Republicans⁴⁵.

Despite all this, it is evident that universal suffrage turned the election or designation of candidates into one of the key moments of the electoral process. The Republican Party's lack of a central organization stopped it from setting up national candidates despite the great prestige of many of their members⁴⁶. That is why they instructed the presidents of the provincial committees to create electoral boards, and it was these boards, elected by universal suffrage, that nominated the candidates. This happened in Cadiz, Jerez, Madrid, Valencia and Barcelona, while in Valladolid the candidates were appointed by acclamation of the party members⁴⁷. In these districts, meetings, press editorials and electoral catechisms formed the central pillars of the Republicans' activities. National leaders such as Castelar, Orense and Garrido visited different parts of the peninsula to support the candidates and to give speeches together with them. That was a clear instance of the process of nationalization that was taking place in politics. Furthermore, the candidates pledged in their speeches to defend the programme that their followers had approved or, in some cases, the guidelines that had been issued by the committees, with a clear reference to the imperative mandate. There is no doubt that the Spanish Republican Party was aware of the need to mobilise the electorate, since they believed it would be possible to gain a good number of seats in block vote districts by an open-list vote.

The political mobilization of the Monarchists was somewhat less forceful. They confined their pre-electoral activities to press editorials, a few manifestos and candidate lists. The Madrid committee divided Spain into seven regions. These were assigned to the national leaders who had electoral committees set up in the provincial and district capitals⁴⁸. Although their mindset was evidently still fettered by the political uses of census suffrage and political patronage, the overt Government support for the Monarchists was a guarantee for their success, especially in those areas of Spain that would normally vote for the powers that be. Barcelona and Vizcaya were the exception to the rule as their fervent desire to compete, irrespective of the strength of

⁴⁵ Reclús (2007): 204-216.

⁴⁶ *La Discusión*, 27-11-1868 and 1-1-1869.

⁴⁷ Bahamonde Magro (1976): 641-642; Monlleó (1996): 218, and Marcos del Olmo (1985): 231.

⁴⁸ *La Época*, 8-1-1869.

their opponent, led to a certain level of mobilisation. In Barcelona, the Monarchists adopted the Republican method of first choosing the electoral committees of the district, which in turn would designate a provincial committee that nominated the candidates. In addition, the supporters of the Monarchy called on all the neighbourhoods in the city for the purpose of delivering speeches. In Vizcaya, where the Carlists and liberals were in the majority, the latter group, which was more democratic than the liberals in Barcelona, elected their candidates in an assembly meeting⁴⁹. Merchants and industrialists in Madrid participated with a list of their own after organizing something akin to a primary election. The press proclaimed that it was a model to be followed and lauded the commitment of the candidates. It went on to emphasize the significance of the imperative mandate, so deeply rooted in all the political cultures that understood the fundamental relationship between the deputy and his voters⁵⁰:

This procedure is the one we have recommended on several occasions to the electors as we believe it is preferable to an *a priori* creation of candidatures. In the meeting at the Price Circus we thought we were in an English election. The Price Circus was really a husting at which the main candidates make personal formal commitments to the voters, and we believe it is an example that merits imitation. We also advise all the supporters to demand from the candidates a formal pledge to present themselves before those who elected them at the end of their term in office to explain how they have used their mandate⁵¹.

As far as Carlism was concerned, around 1868 a number of factors, according to J. Canals, had prompted the creation of a new “counter-revolutionary amalgam” that was based on the organization of the neo-Catholics from the years prior to the Revolution, the anti-clerical policy of the Government, the disappearance of the moderates from the political arena, and the reorganization of the Carlist movement in exile, which had close links to French Legitimists and had elected Carlos VII as their new pretender. Under the cover of the freedom of the press, headlines favourable to this political movement multiplied. At the same time, the Spanish Catholic Association was created, whose aim was to foster “catholic unity in Spain” and “the freedom of the Catholic Church”. In November 1868, the electoral commission appointed by Don Carlos created the basis for the candidature of the

⁴⁹ Janué i Miret (2002): 298 and Urquijo (1994): 279-280.

⁵⁰ Sierra *et al.* (2010): 475-476.

⁵¹ *El Imparcial*, 8-1-1869.

Comunión Católico-Monárquica. In a manifesto directed at the Carlist voters, the commission insisted upon the importance of making the most of this favourable climate. In the cities, Catholic and Carlist centres were set up. Committees of wise men, which were extremely active in the Basque Country, Navarra and Catalonia, prepared the candidatures for the elections to the Cortes and promoted a hierarchical process of politicisation from the top down⁵².

Once the elections had taken place, the victory of the Monarchist coalition was overwhelming: 236 were Monarchists, 85 Republicans and 20 Carlists⁵³. Much research remains to be done at a local level into these first Spanish elections under universal suffrage, but it seems evident that in 1869, patronage practices coexisted with others that were more participatory and independent, both with regard to the way voting lists were created and the political representatives were chosen.

Meanwhile in France, the formation of the “Government of National Defence” and the provisional proclamation of the Republic on the 4th of September 1870, was evidence of the critical situation the country found itself in. In the words used by the Executive, the Republic was the most appropriate system to “save the endangered homeland”, thereby resurrecting the myth of 1792. Initially, the Government decided to remain in Paris, and although it later moved to Bordeaux, it resorted to universal suffrage to give the regime lasting legitimacy and strength⁵⁴. The birth of the Third Republic was more the result of the Second Empire’s demise than the maturation of Republicanism. It emerged initially with a character that was more formal than real, akin to the compromise of 1848 between the *Orléanists* and universal suffrage. The first months of its existence were marked by the war against Prussia and in support of the Commune. However, following the special elections of July 1871, the Third Republic ended the period of political instability and gained greater legitimacy. Until the elections in 1877, France went through a time of trials and new legislation which, according to Charle, constituted a definite transition from the “République des Ducs” to the “République des Républicains”⁵⁵.

With a country partially occupied by German troops, the elections on the 8th of February 1871 were a struggle between two positions: the moderate supporters of Thiers, who demanded the signing of a peace treaty, and the

⁵² Canal (2000): 120; De la Fuente (2001), and Toledano (2011): 45-53.

⁵³ Martínez Cuadrado (1969): 82-83.

⁵⁴ Mayeur (1984): 13-22.

⁵⁵ Charle (1991): 141-340.

followers of Gambetta, who campaigned for “national defence”, as they still had not abandoned their hope of facing down the Prussian army. The former emphasized the concept of law and order, with its evident counter-revolutionary connotation, in the face of those who were shouting “Vive la République!”: “Those who want war to the bitter end will vote for a Jacobin list that [...] wants to get every last man killed and every last *écu* spent. Those who want an honourable peace, vote for a list of peace”⁵⁶. The elections followed the electoral law of 1849, which established male suffrage above the age of 21 and the use of closed lists in departmental districts. The number of seats was also increased to make the deputies more representative. In this way, the French Assembly went from 292 elected deputies in 1869 to 768. To get a seat, it was necessary to obtain a relative majority in the first round and to receive a number of votes equal to 1/8th of the registered voters. With reference to the conditions needed to become a deputy, and as evidence of the new morality of the Republic, Gambetta proclaimed the ineligibility of those who had held public posts during the Empire or had been designated “official candidates”. He did, however, allow prefects and deputy prefects to be elected as deputies outside the departments in which they had held their posts⁵⁷.

French public opinion split into four main political currents. The Bonapartist Party had remained in the public positions that their leaders had held, but after Sedan, they lost a considerable part of their influence. The Republican Party on the other hand, once established in the Government of a centralized country like France, gained in strength. Their campaign against the Empire they had led during the previous years had turned out to be justified by the military defeat. The party included some of the most outstanding intellectuals of the time. However, the Republicans were badly organized in the rural areas, which made up most of the country, and in addition to that, they suffered as a result of the campaign that the Monarchists were launching against them. The monarchists identified them with the heirs of The Terror and with the social upheaval of the 1848 Revolution. The supporters of the Monarchy, finally, were divided into Legitimists and Orléanists. The former group had scant support among the masses and they were more successful in obtaining votes than their election campaign may have warranted. They did not look upon themselves as members of an actual party, and people voted for them mainly because of their attitude towards the war, their social position and their defence of law and order: “To be a legitimist is to believe in the principle of authority: first and foremost, the divine authority that has laid down

⁵⁶ Mayeur (1973): 9-11.

⁵⁷ Rudelle (1982): 13-22.

the fundamental conditions of every human society, and then the authority of national law, the work of time and of Providence”⁵⁸. The Orléanists on the other hand, found a good number of voters among the different sectors of the bourgeoisie; they were liberals who kept their distance from the clergy and they believed in the possibility of restoring a moderate republic that was opposed to dictatorship and in favour of an immediate peace. On that account, as soon as elections were called, they created committees and organized meetings in many departments⁵⁹. Finally, we should not forget the campaign launched by the Church and championed by clergymen such as the Bishop of Orléans, who, in a letter, talked about “the duty of honest people” in the elections, admonishing them to vote for candidates who would defend the interests of the Catholic religion and who favoured a new relationship between Church and State⁶⁰.

The term “electoral campaign”, by no means free of military connotations, had already been used in 1869 and obtained its character from the participation of the press, the activity of the committees and the organization of meetings with the candidates⁶¹. However, in February 1871 hardly any campaigning took place, despite the political pluralism that had been announced. France was living under dramatic circumstances, partly because no postal communication was possible with the 43 departments occupied by the Prussians. Even so, for the previous two months they had been publishing leaflets in which they insisted on the necessity to vote in order to determine the shape of the new regime. For example, Marcère emphasized in a “letter to voters” that not only had they to choose the deputies for the constituent Assembly, but they also had to tell them what to do, in a clear effort to uphold the imperative mandate. Furthermore, he based France’s needs on four pillars: order, liberty, stability and greatness; an order that was associated with progress and was compatible with freedom. Marcère concluded that the French had been made citizens by the 1789 Revolution, but that they would not really acquire their political rights until they used them in complete liberty. The Republican author considered this government the most advanced to date and in accord with the principle of national sovereignty⁶². Trouessart expressed himself in a short essay along similar lines:

⁵⁸ Benezet (1871): 14.

⁵⁹ Locke (1968): 351-358.

⁶⁰ L’Évequ  d’Orl ans (1871) and Gadille (1967): 214-228.

⁶¹ Berstein et Winock (2002): 174-175.

⁶² Marc re (1870).

The Republic is the only government whose form is capable of adapting itself to the forces of progress and of shielding itself against revolutions, guaranteeing the respect for national sovereignty, free and continued use of universal suffrage and the establishment of a government of the majority which is subject to the periodic enactment of universal suffrage, to the control of publicity and to the responsibility of their temporary mandate⁶³.

The topic that was on everyone's mind, however, was that of "peace or war" as established in article 2 of the armistice. Only in Paris manifestos were published, since in most voting districts committees were set up to create the lists. Thus, only in very few cases the election of the candidates was based on deliberation, and the differences between Republicans and Conservatives would be derived from the candidates' background. Among the former there were survivors of the 1848-49 Assemblies while the younger representatives had been in the party under the Empire. The conservative lists, on the other hand, were made up from veteran Monarchist notables, bourgeois Liberals and some soldiers who had distinguished themselves during the war. The war-mongering proclamations were countered by candidates brandishing the slogan "Lists of Peace"⁶⁴. The Conservatives scored a great success, although the Republicans won in the big cities and the East, the South-East and the departments of the Valley of the Rhône. For a total of 753 seats, 645 deputies were elected (the difference resulting from candidates running for more than one seat). 400 of them entered the Assembly under the Monarchist label, 20 as Bonapartists, while the moderates and the radicals of the Republican Union won 200 seats⁶⁵.

On the 2nd of July, however, the French were called to the polling stations once again, as it was necessary to fill the 114 seats that had been left vacant due to multiple candidatures and resignations. In practice, this meant that more than half the country had to go to the polls—elections took place in 47 departments—. In Paris, the campaign was marked by the experience of the Commune⁶⁶. With the *Communards* massacred or in prison, public assemblies forbidden and left-wing newspapers suppressed, the editors of the press presented their own candidatures, as they had done in 1863. The *Union Parisienne de la Presse* enjoyed the biggest support, with the backing of 21 conservative newspapers. One of the most prominent of these was *La Liberté*,

⁶³ Trouessart (1871): 45-46.

⁶⁴ Goguel (1954): 55-76.

⁶⁵ Hanotaux (1925-1926): 28-40.

⁶⁶ Merriman (2017).

whose fundamental goal was “the diffusion of voices devoted to the cause of law and order and to safeguard the present without jeopardizing the future”⁶⁷. The opposite position was held by the *Union Republicaine de la Presse*, which was led by *Le National* and backed by six other newspapers that advocated the consolidation of the Republic as an “essential instrument for maintaining order and liberty”. In their communiqué, these newspapers announced that they had united in order to “persuade readers in Paris and in other departments only to vote for principled and moderate men associated with the former convictions or who have been won back by the Republic, whose character is a guarantee against the aspirations or ventures of royalists or Bonapartists as well as against the return of the madness and the crimes of the Commune”⁶⁸.

These were the general principles defended in the Manifesto of the moderate Republican left. *Le Temps* expressed itself in a similar vein, albeit in its role as organ of the electoral committee of the “Rive Gauche” of the Seine. This newspaper sympathized with the moderate Republicans and little by little was gaining a position of relevance within the press. Lastly, the radical Republicans closed ranks around the new “Ligue des droits de Paris”, founded on the 5th of April in an attempt to reconcile the Commune and the Government. In the departments, the struggle was frequently split between two lists: Royalists and Conservatives on the one hand, who defended “society and religion”, and the Republicans on the other, who backed the Executive led by Thiers⁶⁹.

The electoral campaign turned out to be more dynamic than the previous one. Just as had happened in Spain, the political context had changed after the defeat of the Monarchy, which was made evident by the massive production of written material. Newspapers with a diversity of tendencies abounded, not to mention essays, leaflets, catechisms and publications sponsored by different political institutions⁷⁰. The Republican committees became genuine assemblies where, whether by secret ballot or general acclaim, they selected the candidates of every district. Although the electoral law made no reference to the candidate, 1871 saw the revival of a representative practice that had flourished in France and in Italy in 1848–49 and that was an integral part of Republican political culture. Some of the committees developed a programme to which the candidates had to subscribe or, alternatively, they had

⁶⁷ *La Liberté*, 28-6-1871.

⁶⁸ *Le National*, 23-6-1871.

⁶⁹ Seignobos (1921): 282-283, 322-323.

⁷⁰ Halevy (1930): 33-41, 274-276.

to lay out their principles in a manifesto in which they declared what positions they intended to adopt in case they won a seat in the National Assembly⁷¹.

In the end, the Republicans won in 39 departments, obtaining 99 seats, while the Monarchists were left with 12 seats and the Bonapartists with only three. The Commune had clearly had its effect on the elections with varying implications. The Conservatives insisted on identifying the revolutionary upsurge with the Republican extreme left, which held the majority in Paris. Even so, the radicals had obtained some 30 seats in the South-East and South of France. At the same time, the Commune had not damaged the Republican idea, since its repression had demonstrated that the Republic was able to maintain order. After the 2nd of July elections, the Assembly was dominated by a strong conservative group, which highlighted the absence of the two main losers: the Socialists and the Bonapartists⁷².

IV. SPEECHES DESIGNED TO WIN VOTES

The introduction of universal male suffrage in Spain and in France created a new political market that was not based solely on social relationships and patronage as had been the case during the days of census suffrage. The candidates established an autonomous relation with the voters through the promises of electoral programmes which were contingent on success at the polls⁷³. In the case of Spain, the clubs and other sites of social and political activity, which had emerged in the time around the Revolution of 1868, became pivotal in the electoral campaigns. The lay and philo-democratic discourse gained strength in some progressive salons, even in rural Castille. Through these spaces of socialization, Monarchical organizations partially compensated for their lack of political structure⁷⁴. In this respect, the Republican cause had the upper hand as its social practices encouraged a high degree of political participation⁷⁵. These circumstances led to a political struggle for the vote that prompted a number of candidates to present their ideas as representatives of the people. The manifestos and professions of political faith, thus, came to reflect an aspect of contemporary political culture, and through the speeches they gave rise to we may

⁷¹ Goguel (1954): 10-118; Fruci (2004, 2005).

⁷² Morabito and Bourmaud (1992): 283-289.

⁷³ Garrigou (1992): 236-240 and Garrigou (2002): 90-108.

⁷⁴ Serrano García (2006) and Higuera Castañeda (2007).

⁷⁵ Morales Muñoz (2002) and Gutiérrez (2001).

get a picture of the idea of representation that motivated Spanish and French politicians.

The Republicans in Madrid, for instance, addressed a manifesto to the voters in which they made a comparison between the Monarchy and the Republic, only to find that democracy was exclusive to the latter. The Monarchy, on the other hand, was in their view reprehensible and responsible for the death of a group of “martyrs”, such as Lacy, Riego and Torrijos, who had been fighting for liberty. The text underscored that with the Republic the “great principle of national sovereignty” would be established and all the individual rights would be recognized⁷⁶. The Republicans also presented their election proposals elsewhere in Spain, but in a different format. The election committee in Logroño, for example, urged voters not to fear the Republic and to “open their eyes of discernment”, since only the “monarchs and the generals with their personal ambitions” had been the cause of the “country’s disasters”. The Republic, on the other hand, with its respect for the rights of the people, was presented as the “government of the free and the upright”⁷⁷. The Federalists in Girona put forward the same argument, appealing to the moral value of the latter form of government⁷⁸. In Seville, the electoral committee demanded from the candidates a formal oath as a clear testimony to their acceptance of the imperative mandate:

PRESIDENT.— Do you promise to vote in favour of our political Constitution under a Federal Republic?

CANDIDATE.— Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT.— Do you promise to vote in favour of all individual rights?

CANDIDATE.— Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT.— Do you promise to vote for freedom of worship and the separation of Church and State?

CANDIDATE.— Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT.— Do you promise to vote for the abolition of slavery, conscription and the death penalty?

CANDIDATE.— Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT.— Do you promise to vote for and defend the reforms and principles achieved by the Revolution if they were to come under debate again, such as universal suffrage, freedom of education, etc.?⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Pérez Roldán (2001): 251-258, 414-422.

⁷⁷ *La Discusión*, 6-1-1869.

⁷⁸ Clara (1986): 242.

⁷⁹ *La Discusión*, 6-1-1869.

In other cases, rather than a profession of faith, the Republicans repeated the “biographical” model used by the liberals, in which the candidate’s life and achievements were sufficient guarantee for his credentials and capacity, his opinions and his political actions⁸⁰. This was the case with a list presented in the province of Zaragoza:

Patricio Lozano, a veteran in the service of the Liberal Cause, always ready to defend the interests of the people, his own master, never held office, and a native of Daroca; Joaquin Catalina, persecuted since 1923 for his work in defence of liberty; imprisoned on several occasions, exiled on others and has lost a considerable part of his considerable patrimony in the political struggle; never held office, a native of Calatayud; Mariano Garcia, a constant defender of liberal ideas, a rich landowner, never held office, and a native of Almunia⁸¹.

As we can see, they all shared similar profiles with regard to their commitment to the defence of “liberty”, their condition as natives of the area they sought to represent and, finally, their independence from previous governments, since none of them had held a position in the public sector before. This point touches on one of the issues to which most time was dedicated in parliamentary debates on political representation: the question of whether a Member of Parliament could or could not be, at the same time, a public servant with a government salary⁸².

The limited campaign of the Monarchists is explained, moreover, by the Liberals’ lack of enthusiasm for public meetings. This was made evident in Madrid, where they published a manifesto with the list of their candidates the day before the elections. The list consisted of leaders of the revolution and members of the government: Prim, Becerra, Serrano, Rivero, Ruiz Zorrilla, Topete y Sagasta. They insisted that the “consolidation of liberty” was at stake and encouraged the voters to go to the polls, as that was the best way of showing their gratitude towards “those who had started the revolutionary movement”. In disregard of the Republicans, the Monarchist leaders set themselves up as the guarantors of the new electoral right: “Voters: don’t let it be said that the first time you avail yourselves of universal suffrage in a general election you forgot about the men who played their part in securing that right for you. Ingratitude is unbecoming of a free people”⁸³. In other cases, as happened in Girona, the

⁸⁰ Rousellier (1999): 81-90.

⁸¹ *La Discusión*, 12-1-1869.

⁸² Sierra, Peña and Zurita (2010): 475-499.

⁸³ *El Imparcial*, 14-1-1869.

Monarchic rhetoric attempted to mitigate the consequences of universal suffrage. For that purpose they underscored in the candidates' biographies their political aptitude, omitting the electoral programme or the defence of specific interests: "When designating each of these candidates, we focused on their liberal past, on the firmness of their convictions, their independence and their patriotism [...]"⁸⁴. The Monarchists of Alicante, on their part, stressed the importance of drafting a Constitution that would guarantee the heredity model of government. That would be, in their view, the only way of securing the liberties and unity of Spain in the face of the threat of dissolution that the Republicans were posing to the country. In Valladolid, moreover, the question of how much importance should be given to religion in the future Constitution gave rise to an intense debate between Monarchists and Republicans⁸⁵.

As far as the Carlist candidates were concerned, they always drew attention to the central element in their political agenda: "A united Catholic and Monarchic Spain, personified in a Spanish prince"⁸⁶. In the districts of Navarre and the Basque Country, moreover, the following could be read: "Here is what our vote must mean: God and *Fueros*, but God above everything." Some neo-Catholic candidates presented themselves with a short life history emphasizing the fact that, when they were Members of Parliament in 1865, they had protested against the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy⁸⁷. In support of these candidates some bishops joined the electoral campaign with their ecclesiastical bulletins, as did the Bishop of Osma, Laguera, who proclaimed: "Our religious unity is in grave danger. To the polls, then, to vote for candidates that will defend it in Congress"⁸⁸. As Dupont has explained, the political discourse of Carlism after the Revolution of 1868 underscored the "democratic" notes by invoking the concepts of popular will and public liberties. Thus, the manifesto of the candidature for Madrid, for example, proclaimed: "Complete freedom for the one true Church of God; wide freedom of our villages to administer themselves in accordance with their laws and customs"⁸⁹. Such were the messages they popularised by means of iconographic propaganda and leaflets containing the contributions of don Carlos to the political debate⁹⁰.

⁸⁴ Clará (1974): 55-57.

⁸⁵ Marcos del Olmo (1985): 233-242 and Giner Lillo (2017).

⁸⁶ *La Esperanza*, 16-1-1869.

⁸⁷ Urquijo (1992): 236-249; Canal (2000): 160.

⁸⁸ De la Fuente (2001): 139.

⁸⁹ *La Esperanza*, 12-1-1869.

⁹⁰ Dupont (2017b).

In France, as had already happened during the elections of 1848, the messages emitted by the candidates during the campaign of 1871 were a faithful reflection of the different ways political representation and public interest was understood⁹¹. Those messages could reach their voters by means of leaflets handed out in the streets, through the press, at election campaign banquets, or in private gatherings and meetings. Many candidates had electoral assistants who could, if necessary, deliver copies of the political agenda or declarations of intent to the voters' doorstep⁹². The Monarchists, after their victory in February, felt in the ascendant again, and as a result they did not consider it necessary to make definite statements. At best they would underscore their affinity with the Conservative cause and their adherence to Thiers' politics. Thus, for instance, Le Berquier, a candidate for the Seine department, proposed to "remedy our disasters, restore order, and with order, liberty." He added that as a Parisian and a person who was famous for his publications, he was anxious to see the reconstruction of Paris, and he pledged to put forward appropriate measures in the Assembly. Morin, the Mayor of Nanterre, with the backing of the 71 municipalities of the Seine, expressed himself in a similar vein: "I am one of you [...] and I will vigorously support every measure that promises to shore up the country's economy and material prosperity"⁹³.

The Legitimist tendency, on the other hand, in view of what had happened in the *Commune*, felt reinforced in their position, and there were archbishops such as the one from Rennes who intervened in support of the candidates that would guarantee the preservation of "the religious principles". Accordingly he supported the electoral list endorsed by the Count of Chambord⁹⁴. The Republicans, on the other hand, mindful of their defeat in February, strove to proclaim their convictions with vigour and with arguments. Scherer, the Editor in Chief of *Le Temps* who had been put forward by the liberal-democratic committee of Seine and Oise, declared: "The Republic is the most reliable regime because in it the people governs itself"; at the same time, the Republic represented "order, stability and the end of the Revolution." Scherer also offered a way to overcome the major setbacks France had suffered as a result of ignorance: "A secular and truly modern education promoting a new spirit throughout the country"⁹⁵. Other candidates brought with them their experience in a variety of fields: Pothier, for example, an Alsatian military

⁹¹ Déloye (1999): 231-254.

⁹² Offerlé (2002a): 82-91.

⁹³ *Journal des Débats*, 1-7-1871 and 2-7-1871.

⁹⁴ Gadille (1967): 226.

⁹⁵ *Le Temps*, 26-6-1871 and 28-6-1871.

officer with contacts in the arms industry, described himself as “an enemy of all excess and a defender of order and progress”; Lasteyrie highlighted his position as a Member of Parliament in 1848 and 1849 and declared that, after the invasion and the civil war, France needed “a break”, while rejecting “Monarchic intrigues and the criminal plotting of Anarchism.” Some candidates, however, opposed the profession of political faith. Villiaume, from Paris, considered that as far as he was concerned, such a declaration was “superfluous”, since he was renowned for his speeches and his history books devoted to “the triumph of good order and the true principles of humanity and of the Republic.” The candidates of the Republican Union of the Press expressed themselves in a similar vein. The historian Louis Blanc, who had become a member of the National Assembly in February, stressed the importance of voting to defend the Republic, which, according to him, had already passed through all three phases on its ascent to power: it had been denounced as a utopia, debated as an idea, and, finally, acknowledged as a fact which, moreover, he equated with universal suffrage: “A Republic which has the sovereignty of the people as a principle, the perfected form of universal suffrage as a law, the right to investigate as a tool and order with liberty as its goal”⁹⁶. Note should finally be taken of the publication of manifestos aimed at workers, who had a tendency of staying away from the polls, the objective being to encourage them to vote: “Comrades, no talk of abstention!! The right to vote is one of the finest conquests of our great Revolution of 1789 [...]. Support the men who know your interests and can defend them in the National Assembly. What are we going to gain from revolutions? NOTHING. What are we going to gain if order and the Republic prevail? EVERYTHING”⁹⁷.

Clearly, the French candidates, regardless of their political affiliation, were very conscious of the key events in their history. These were presented through the dialectical relationship of revolution and order, and the practice of universal suffrage was presented as a decisive element in the consolidation of the representative system of government.

V. CONCLUSION

A comparative analysis between Spain and France reveals the different connections that existed between their respective processes of politicization. The most obvious parallelism lies in the fact that, in both countries, great

⁹⁶ *Le National*, 24-6-1871.

⁹⁷ *Le Siècle*, 30-6-1871.

significance was attributed to universal male suffrage in the reconstruction of the political scene. However, there also existed a shared conviction that an extended right to vote was not enough to establish a democratic system. Clear evidence of this was provided by the French experience during the Second Empire. It was only in its more open closing stages that the opposition could enter the political arena. The fall of the Bourbon dynasty and of the House of Bonaparte, together with the liberties granted by the provisional governments, gave rise to a new political scenario marked by ideological pluralism and by mechanisms that helped promote a higher degree of participation in the public sphere. As opposition forces in the time of the fallen regimes, Republicans and Legitimists in both countries had been mutually influential. Along with the Liberal Monarchists, they used the same mechanisms of political socialization and electoral competition once elections were called: the press, political clubs, meetings, and propaganda. The new political environment opened the doors to the struggle for parliamentary seats. The creation of electoral lists and the presentation of manifestos or professions of political faith were the clearest evidence for the candidates' eagerness to capture the vote of the electorate.

Public discourses both in France and Spain exhibited significant common traits: some candidates decided not to include any kind of declaration of intent, believing that their own personal trajectories spoke for themselves; others, on the contrary, opted for the explicit defence of principles such as "order", "religion", "monarchy", or "the republic"; many invoked the imperative mandate to the voters in their own constituency.

Moreover, the appeal to the national mandate and to the party leaders became more firmly rooted, at the same time as the national dignitaries were gradually converted or replaced by professional politicians. The political circumstances analysed in this study bear witness to the process of nationalization that took place in the politics of France and Spain, although further in-depth research needs to be done into specific local conditions in order to understand more fully how the practices of universal suffrage influenced the development of political culture during the final third of the 19th century.

(Translation by Peter Lauber)

Bibliography

- Acollas, E. (1869). *Les élections en 1869. Simple opinion d'un démocrate*. Paris: Librairie Pagnerre.
- Agulhon, M. (1979). *La République au village*. Paris: Seuil.

- Alberola Fioravanti, M. V. (1973). *La Revolución de 1868 y la prensa francesa*. Madrid: Editora Nacional.
- Araque Hontangas, N. (2008). *Las elecciones en el reinado de Isabel II: la Cámara Baja*. Madrid: Congreso de los Diputados.
- Arias Castañón, E. (1996). El republicanismo federal: organización de partidos y alternativas de revolución política en el Sexenio Democrático (Sevilla, 1868-1874). *Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, 7, 11-66.
- Bahamonde Magro, Á. (1976). Contribución al estudio del fraude electoral en un distrito urbano: las elecciones de 1869 en Madrid. *Hispania*, 174, 639-658.
- Barragán, G. (1870). *Catecismo Constitucional, o sea, explicación del Código de 1869, puesto al alcance de los niños*. Valladolid: Imprenta de La Conciliación.
- Benezet, E. (1871). *Les mensonges et la vérité. À propos des prochaines élections*. Toulouse: Bureaux de L'Echo de la province.
- Berstein, S. and Winock, M. (dirs.) (2002). *L'invention de la démocratie, 1789-1914*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bonaudo, M. and Zurita, R. (2010). Les débats parlementaires autour du suffrage universel dans la construction de la représentation politique en Espagne et en Argentine: vers une analyse comparée (1860-1870). *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 30 (2), 163-174.
- Brelay, E. (1871). *Réforme électorale. Notes. Offertes aux rédacteurs de la loi*. Paris: E. Levaillant.
- Canal, J. (2000). *El carlismo*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Castro Alfn, D. (1994). Las primeras etapas del republicanismo en España. In N. Townson (ed.). *El republicanismo en España (1830-1977)* (pp. 33-58). Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Charle, Ch. (1991). *Histoire sociale de la France au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Seuil.
- Clara, J. (1974). *Las elecciones del 1869 a Girona*. Barcelona: Dalmau.
- (1986). *El federalisme a les comarques gironines (1868-1874)*. Girona: Diputació.
- De Castro, C. (1979). *La Revolución Liberal y los municipios españoles*. Madrid: Alianza Universidad.
- De la Fuente Monge, G. (2000). *Los revolucionarios de 1868. Elites y poder en la España liberal*. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- (2001). El enfrentamiento entre clericales y revolucionarios en torno a 1869. *Ayer*, 44, 126-150.
- Déloye, Y. (1999). Se présenter pour représenter. Enquête sur les professions de foi électorales de 1848. In M. Offerlé (dir.) *La profession politique XIXe-XXe siècles* (pp. 231-254). Paris: Belin.
- D. R. (1869). *Les paysans et le suffrage universel: études sociales et politiques*. Paris: Chez Tous Les Librairies.
- Dupont, A. (2017a). Una politización paradójica. Carlismo, democracia e implicación popular durante el Sexenio Democrático. *Investigaciones Históricas. Época Moderna y Contemporánea*, 37, 40-68.
- (2017b). ¿Resolver la cuestión por la fuerza de los votos? La tentación democrática del carlismo. In D. González Madrid, M. Ortiz Heras y J. S. Pérez Garzón (eds.). *La Historia, lost in translation? Actas del XIII Congreso de la Asociación de Historia Contemporánea* (pp. 1001-1012). Cuenca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

- Eiras Roel, A. (2015) [1961]. *El Partido Demócrata español, 1849-1868*. Madrid: Ediciones 19.
- Esteban Navarro, M. Á. (1994). De la esperanza a la frustración, 1868-1873. In N. Townson (ed.). *El republicanismo en España (1830-1977)* (pp. 87-112). Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- L'Évêquë d'Orléans (1871). *Lettre sur les prochaines elections*. Paris: Charles Douniol.
- Flaquer Montequi, R. (2007). Ciudadanía civil y ciudadanía política en el siglo XIX. El sufragio. In M. Pérez Ledesma (ed.). *De súbditos a ciudadanos. Una historia de la ciudadanía en España* (pp. 59-102). Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Forner, S. (coord.) (1997). *Democracia, elecciones y modernización en Europa. Siglos XIX y XX*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Frucci, G. L. (2004). L'abito della festa dei candidati. Professioni di fede, lettere e programmi elettorali in Italia (e Francia) nel 1848-49. *Quaderni Storici*, 117, 647-672.
- (2005). *Il fuoco sacro della Concordia e della Fratellanza*. Candidati e comitati elettorali nel primo voto a suffragio universale in Francia e in Italia (1848-1849). In F. Venturino (cur.). *Elezioni e personalizzazione della politica* (pp. 19-46). Roma: Aracne.
- Fuente Monge, G. de la and Serrano García, R. (2005) *La Revolución gloriosa: un ensayo de regeneración nacional (1868-1874): antología de textos*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Gaboriaux, Ch. (2010). *La République en quête de citoyens. Les républicains français face au bonapartisme rural (1848-1880)*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Politiques.
- Gadille, J. (1967). *La Pensée et l'action politiques des évêques français au début de la IIIe République, 1870-1873*, 2 vols. Paris: Hachette.
- García Balañà, A. (2016). Bajo la sombra de la Comuna: sindicalismo y republicanismo en la Barcelona de 1871. *Historia Contemporánea*, 53, 491-520.
- Garrigou, A. (1992). *Le vote et la vertu. Comment les Français sont devenus électeurs*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- Garrigou, A. (2002). *Histoire sociale du suffrage universel en France, 1848-2000*. Paris: Seuil.
- Giner Lillo, V. (2017). Los discursos políticos en las elecciones a Cortes Constituyentes. Alicante, 1869. In D. González, M. Ortiz Heras and J. S. Pérez Garzón (coords.). *La Historia, Lost in translation?* (pp. 1023-1035). Cuenca: Universidad Castilla-La Mancha.
- Goguel, F. (1954). *Comment la France est devenue républicaine*. Paris: Armand Collin.
- Guionnet, Ch. (1997). *L'apprentissage de la politique modern. Les élections municipales sous la monarchie de juillet*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Gutiérrez, R. A. (2001). Sociabilidad política, propaganda y cultura tras la revolución de 1868: Los clubes republicanos en el Sexenio Democrático. *Ayer*, 44, 151-174.
- Gutiérrez, R. A. and Zurita, R. (1999). Canvi polític i mobilització electoral en la revolució del 1868.
- Halevy, D. (1930). *La fin des notables*. Paris: Bernard Grasset.
- Hanotaux, G. (1925-1926). *Histoire de la fondation de l'IIIe République*. 4 vols. Paris: Plon.
- Hennessy, C. (2010) [1966]. *La República Federal en España. Pi y Margall y el movimiento republicano federal, 1868-1874*. Madrid: Los Libros de la Catarata.
- Herrán Prieto, J. (1986). *La Gloriosa en Cádiz: de la revolución de 1868 a la Constitución de 1869*. Cádiz: Fundación Municipal de Cultura.
- Higuera Castañeda, E. (2007). Radicales y Federales: el ejemplo de Cuenca en el proceso democratizador de 1869-1873. *Hispania Nova: Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, 12.

- Disponible en: <https://e-revistas.uc3m.es/index.php/HISPNOV/article/view/1876/885> (10-9-2018).
- Huard, R. (1990). *Le suffrage universel en France, 1848-1946*. Paris: Aubier.
- Ihl, O. (1993). L'urne electoral. Formes et usages d'une technique de vote. *Revue française de science politique*, 43 (1), 30-60.
- Ivars Ros, G. (1864). *Necesidad de que se unan los partidos avanzados, siquiera sea para que entre el progresista en el poder*. Madrid: Imprenta de Pedro Montero.
- Jaén Milla, S. (2014). La modernización de la política republicana durante el Sexenio Democrático (1868-1874): el modelo jiennense. *Alcores*, 18, 139-161.
- Janué i Miret, M. (2002). *Els polítics en temps de revolució. La vida política en Barcelona durant el Sexenni revolucionari*. Barcelona: Eumo.
- Kahan, A. S. (2003). *Liberalism in nineteenth-century Europe: the political culture of limited suffrage*. New York: Palgrave.
- Lagoueyte, P. (1995). Candidature officielle. In J. Tulard (dir.). *Dictionnaire du Second Empire* (pp. 226-228). Paris: Fayard.
- Locke, R. R. (1968). A New look at Conservative preparations for the French elections of 1871. *French Historical Studies*, 5 (3), 351-358.
- Luján, O. (2018). *Ni tan apáticos ni tan subordinados. La politización electoral en la Década Moderada (1843-1854). El caso de los distritos catalanes*. Lleida: Milenio.
- Malamud, C. (coord.) (2000). *Legitimidad, representación y alternancia en España y América Latina: las reformas electorales*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Manin, B. (1997). *The principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcère, F. de (1870). *Lettre aux électeurs à l'occasion des élections pour la constituante*. Douai: Imp. Mme. Veuve Ceret-Carpentier.
- Marcos del Olmo, C. (1985). Las elecciones legislativas de 1869 en la provincia de Valladolid. *Investigaciones Históricas*, 5, 215-252.
- Martínez Cuadrado, M. (1969). *Elecciones y partidos políticos de España (1868-1931)*. 2 vols. Madrid: Taurus.
- Mayeur, J. M. (1973). *Les débuts de l'IIIe République, 1871-1898*. Paris: Seuil.
- (1984). *La vie politique sous la Troisième République*. Paris: Seuil.
- Merriman, J. (2017). *Masacre. Vida y muerte en La Comuna de París de 1871*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Millán, J. and Romeo, M. C. (2004). Was the liberal revolution important to modern Spain? Political cultures and citizenship in Spanish history. *Social History*, 29 (3), 284-300.
- Moisand, J. (2015). Les exilés de la «République universelle». Français et Espagnols en révolution (1868-1878). In J. Moisand, D. Diaz, R. Sánchez Villar and J. L. Simal (dirs.). *Exils entre les deux mondes: migrations et espaces politiques atlantiques au XIXe siècle* (pp. 161-188). Mordelles: Les Perséides.
- Monlleó, R. (1996). *La Gloriosa en Valencia (1864-1869)*. Valencia: Alfons el Magnànim.
- Morabito, M. and Bourmaud, D. (1992). *Histoire constitutionnelle et politique de la France (1789-1958)*. Paris: Montchrestien.
- Morales Muñoz, M. (2002). Cultura política y sociabilidad en la democracia republicana. In R. Serrano (ed.). *España, 1868-1874: nuevos enfoques sobre el Sexenio* (pp. 211-234). Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León.

- Offerlé, M. (2002a). *Un homme, une voix? Histoire du suffrage universel*. Paris: Gallimard.
- (2002b). Voter en images. Pour une iconographie du suffrage universel. In M. Pertué (dir.), *Suffrage, citoyenneté et révolutions, 1789-1848* (pp. 99-167). Paris: Société des études robespierristes.
- Penche González, J. (2008). Republicanismo y republicanos en Bilbao. *Historia Contemporánea*, 37, 441-468.
- Peña Guerrero, M. A. (2015). Mais cette souveraineté qu'est-elle devenue? La influencia del orleanismo en la legislación electoral de la España liberal. In J. A. Caballero López, J. M. Delgado Iadarreta and R. Viguera Ruiz (coords.), *El debate constitucional en el siglo XIX: ideología, oratoria y opinión pública* (pp. 87-114). Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- Peña Guerrero, M. A. and Zurita, R. (2016). The Peruvian native and the conception of liberal citizenship in the Latin American context. In M. Sierra (ed.) *Enemies Within. Cultural Hierarchies and Liberal Political Models in the Hispanic World* (pp. 7-40). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.
- Pérez Roldán, C. (2001). *El Partido Republicano Federal español (1868-1874)*. Madrid: Endymion.
- Peyrou, F. (2007). Demócratas y republicanos: la movilización por la ciudadanía universal. In M. Pérez Ledesma (ed.), *De súbditos a ciudadanos. Una historia de la ciudadanía en España* (pp. 193-221). Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Peyrou, F. (2008). *Tribunos del pueblo. Demócratas y republicanos durante el reinado de Isabel II*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- (2015). Exilios, viajes y la emergencia de una cultura política transnacional democrática en las décadas centrales del siglo XIX. In J. Moisand, D. Diaz, R. Sánchez Villar and J. L. Simal (dirs.)
- Peyrou, F. (2017). Los republicanos españoles y “los otros”. Impacto e influencia de los modelos republicanos foráneos, 1840-1874. *Revista de Estudios Políticos*, 175, 331-356.
- Phélippeau, É. (1999). La fin de notables revisitée. In M. Offerlé (dir.), *La profession politique XIXe-XXe siècles* (pp. 69-92). Paris: Belin.
- Reclus, E. (2007). *Impresiones de un viaje por España en tiempos de la revolución*. Logroño: Pepitas de calabaza.
- Romeo, M.^a C. and Sierra, M. (coords.) (2014). *La España liberal 1833-1874* (vol. II). En *Historia de las culturas políticas en España y América Latina*. Madrid: Marcial Pons; Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.
- Rosavallon, P. (2002). *Le Sacre du citoyen: histoire du suffrage universel en France*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Rousellier, N. (1999). La culture politique libérale. In S. Berstein (ed.) *Les cultures politiques en France* (pp. 69-112). Paris: Seuil.
- Rubio, C. (1865). *Progresistas y Demócratas. Cómo y para qué se han unido. ¿Pueden constituir una sola comunión en el futuro?* Madrid: Imprenta de La Iberia.
- Rudelle, O. (1982). *La République absolue, 1870-1889*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Seignobos, Ch. (1921). *L'établissement de la Troisième République*. Paris: Hachette.
- Serrano García, R. (2001). La historiografía en torno al Sexenio 1868-1874: entre el fulgor del centenario y el despliegue de lo local. *Ayer*, 44, 11-32.

- (2006). El progresismo laico y filodemocrático del Sexenio (1868-1874). In M. Suárez Cortina (coord.). *La redención del pueblo: la cultura progresista en la España liberal* (pp. 347-370). Santander: Universidad de Cantabria.
- Sierra, M. (2007). Electores y ciudadanos en los proyectos políticos del liberalismo moderado y progresista. In M. Pérez Ledesma (ed.). *De súbditos a ciudadanos. Una historia de la ciudadanía en España* (pp. 103-133). Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- (2010). The profession of deputy. The idea of political representation in liberal Spain. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 30 (1), 31-40.
- Sierra, M., Peña, M. A. and Zurita, R. (2010). *Elegidos y elegibles. La representación parlamentaria en la cultura del liberalismo*. Madrid: Marcial Pons.
- Suárez Cortina, M. (2006). *La España Liberal (1868-1917). Política y sociedad*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Toledano, L. (2011). *Entre el sermón i el trabuc. El carlisme catalá contra la revolució setembrina (1868-1872)*. Lleida: Pagés.
- Trouessart, É. (1871). *Le suffrage universel est-il au-dessus de la République?* Angers: Imprimerie de J. T. Dumont.
- Urquijo, J. R. (1992). Las elecciones a Cortes constituyentes de 1869 en Bizkaia. *Cuadernos de sección. Historia y Geografía*, 19, 237-256.
- Urquijo, M. (1994). *Liberales y carlistas. Revolución y Fueros Vascos en el preludeo de la última guerra carlista*. Leioa: Universidad del País Vasco.
- Villena Espinosa, R. y Serrano García, R. (2017). Introducción al taller Cercanías de una conmemoración: el 150.º aniversario de la Revolución Gloriosa, 1868-2018. In D. González Madrid, M. Ortiz Heras and J. S. Pérez Garzón (coords.). *La Historia, Lost in translation?* (pp. 967-974). Cuenca: Universidad Castilla-La Mancha.
- Villette, V. (2013). *Apprendre à voter sous la IIe République: le suffrage de masse dans le département de la Seine (1848-1851)*. Paris: Les Indes Savants.
- Voilliot, Ch. (2005). *La candidature officielle. Une pratique d'État de la Restauration à la Troisième République*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Zavala, J. M. (1868) *Catecismo electoral con las nociones más imprescindibles para ejercer debidamente el sufragio universal*. Madrid: Imprenta de los Ferrocarriles.
- Zurita-Aldeguer, R. (2007). Intérprete y portavoz. La figura del diputado en las elecciones de 1854 en España. *Spagna Contemporanea*, 32, 53-71.
- (2008). Candidatos aceptados, apoyados, impuestos. El Gobierno ante las elites locales en la España liberal. In R. Zurita and R. Camurri (eds.). *Las elites en España e Italia (1850-1922)* (pp. 145-165). Valencia: Universitat de València.