



INTRODUCTORY STUDY

**ENRIQUE RAMOS MUÑOZ,
THE ECONOMIST OF THE MILITARY PARTY**

PABLO CERVERA FERRI

SENIOR LECTURER OF HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT
"UNIVERSITY OF VALENCIA"







1. THE FAMILY RAMOS MUÑOZ

Aranda tried to form an unshakable enlightened military block that, in the long run, could lead the march of the country by the way of progress.
(Olaechea and Ferrer Benimeli, 1978: II -27)

We barely knew a few topics echoed in encyclopedic entries on the wanderings of the enlightened serviceman Enrique Ramos (Toro, 1729 - Madrid, 1797), the author of the first Spanish treatise that included “political economy” in its title. The new documentation presented here, located in the General Archive of Simancas (AGS) by means of the General Military Archive of Segovia, as well as some manuscript sources recently scanned, call however into question most of the biographical data assumed by historiography. The first set of evidences we will show includes several service records filled between 1776 and 1789, and a report from 1773 that summarizes his qualification and that of other officials in his Regiment.

Fields common to all records —age, country, quality and health— certify that he was born in Toro in January or February 1729 and his “noble condition”. Other sections reveal that his physical appearance was “robust” until 1783, when he was described as of “average health”, and that he remained unmarried at age sixty. These news question two basic data: his alleged origin from Alicante and his traditionally attributed birth date (1738), anticipating it nearly a decade. The *Discurso sobre economía política* (1769) no longer looks like the dissertation of a young writer and becomes that of a mature intellectual. We have to add the enigmas about Enrique Ramos’ penchant to hide behind pseudonyms and of his unknown mother’s surname.

Where do so many mistakes come from? They date at least back to the *Biographie Universelle* of Louis-Gabriel Michaud (1843: XXXV, 155) and its later expansion in the *Ensayo biográfico-bibliográfico de escritores de Ali-*



cante of Manuel Rico and Adalmiro Montero (1888: I, 179). Michaud claimed that Ramos was born in Alicante; he confused the year of death (1801), supposed he pertained to the Artillery Corps and associated him to the expedition of Algiers in 1772. Service records however show that he only took part in the war of Portugal and the site of Gibraltar, always enlisted in the Royal Guards: an event like this narrated by Michaud would never had been overlooked in such documents. Rico and Montero added an incorrect birth date (February 14, 1738) that was transcribed on a catalog sheet of the *Discurso* in the Valencian Library.¹ They deduced that he embarked to Africa on June 28, 1775 from the port of Alicante and that he was distinguished after his arrival by the Task Force Commander, famous Lt. general Alejandro O'Reilly. The parallels with life events of the poet José Cadalso (1741-1782), who was believed like Ramos' age and graduation, are deceptively obvious. Since then, outreach works like the *Enciclopedia Catalana* or the *Nueva Enciclopedia Larousse* (1981, Barcelona: Planeta, ts. I and XVI), as well as every bibliographic internet resources, reproduce these inaccuracies. And many historical studies, some of whom from me (Cervera, 2003, 2013), have assumed these iterations, although in most cases—in my defence—with reservations. I will ensure to write more thoughtfully these next pages.²

The fact that Enrique Ramos never signed with his second last name has avoided identifying his ancestors. It is however possible to locate them if we admit that he was born in Toro. The aforementioned service sheets point in that direction and several clues in *Reflexiones de Don Desiderio Bueno* (1764) question its alleged origin in Alicante. Behind that pseudonym, Ramos described “Castilla la Vieja, the country I know best” (p. 179 see note 67) and explained the evolution of wheat prices by taking Tierra de Campos as an example (p. 178). Cardenas transcribed in “Oficios enajenados: Valimientos-Hacienda (Zamora)” (1994: 236):

¹ BV: ms. 395/21 num. 1847, Anonymous (n.d.), n.p.

² In this regard, I would like to put on record the invaluable guide of Vicent Llombart Rosa, to whose memory I dedicate this work. I also thank the kindness shown for this research and the comments from Salvador Almenar Palau, Salvador Calatayud Giner, José Luis Cervera Torrejón, Joaquim Cuevas Casaña, Alexandre Mendes Cunha, Enrique Moral Sandoval, Joaquín Ocampo Suárez-Valdés, Cosimo Perrotta, Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo and Clara Sarasa Aznar. A preliminary draft of this study was presented in 9th Conference of the Iberian Association for the History of Economic Thought: Cervera, P. (2015): “La autoría del *Discurso sobre Economía Política* (1769): nuevos indicios para la reconstrucción del ideario del ‘Partido Aragonés’ o ‘Militar’”. Valencia, December 4.

12. TORO. Don Enrique Ramos was awarded by despatch of 1775 with the Title of Excise Accountant instead of Pablo Antonio Ramos, his brother, to have it for possessing the entailed estate that founded Don Jose Ramos, his father, and with the faculty to appoint a tenant. Certificate of 1776 to serve it to Miguel Vázquez de Aldana. Don Juan Antonio Marraco Huarte, new tenant by a sale document of 1783. Don Antonio Vázquez de Aldana y Ramos, Colonel and Knight of Charles III, nephew of Don Enrique Ramos, claims the property. 1797.³

PARES portal offers valuable information about these relatives that, being compared to the file entitled “Incorporation to the Crown of the Main Account of Toro”, completes a second set of evidences.⁴ Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry Antonio Vázquez de Aldana y Ramos was official archivist in the Secretary of State and in the Office of War in Indies in 1793. His brother Ignacio also received the same Civil Order of Charles III on November 12, 1789, while being Captain of the Soria Regiment. They were both exempted from bringing proofs of nobility. According to the genealogical tree annexed to witness blood purity, Antonio Vázquez was the offspring of Miguel Vázquez del Fierro and Ana Ramos Muñoz: Enrique Ramos’ sister, also from Toro. Any confusion of identities between a military man called “Enrique Ramos” and a homonymous rent accountant in Toro is discarded because of a declaration from the archivist of Simancas fortress in 5 March 5, 1781, when certifying a Real Office that sentenced:

Do know that I received a relation from Colonel Don Enrique Ramos, Captain of my Royal Guards of Spanish Infantry, that it belongs to him the property of the Accounting office of all Royal Rents in the Province of Toro, which title was drawn up in September 25, 1674 to Don Juan Zapata.⁵

We deduce from all these evidences that Enrique Ramos Muñoz was the son of José Ramos Gutiérrez, from Saldaña in Tierra de Campos (Palencia)

³ This review corresponds to the documents included in “Incorporación a la Corona de la Contaduría Principal de Rentas de la Provincia y la ciudad de Toro”. AHN: Sc. FC-Ministerio de Hacienda, sign. 4005-1, exp. 12. Zamora. The reconstruction we will offer about the inheritance of Miguel Vázquez de Aldana comes from this broad documentation and provides strong evidence that the aforementioned “Enrique Ramos” is the same subject as that of the service records.

⁴ (1794): “Expediente de pruebas del caballero de la orden de Carlos III, Antonio Vázquez de Aldana y Ramos del Hierro y Muñoz Sariñana, natural de Toro, Teniente Coronel de Infantería y Archivero de la Secretaría de Estado y del Despacho de la Guerra; caballero supernumerario”. ES.28079. AHN: 1.-2.46.1.1. Estado-Carlos III, exp. 810. See also AHN: Estado-Carlos III, exp. 440 of 1790.

⁵ “Incorporación a la Corona...”, f. 13v.

and Ignacia Muñoz Sariñana, from Toro. The parents of Don José were Miguel Ramos and Francisca Gutiérrez, also both from Saldaña. Those of Doña Ignacia were Juan Muñoz, from Tordesillas, and Isabel Sariñana, from Toro. Enrique's brothers were José Celedonio, Ana and Pablo Antonio.

Toro nobility was studied by Fernández-Prieto (1965). The Cadastre of Ensenada (1751) mentions: "*Ramos, D. José. Hijodalgo, Regidor Perpetuo, 56 años, viudo; hijos, Pablo Antonio de 27 años y Enrique de 22.- Parroquia de San Lorenzo. Folio 2v*". And also: "*Vázquez, Miguel Antonio: Hijodalgo, labrador, 28 años, casado con Ana Ramos; hijos, Antonio de 5 años e Ignacio de 2 y medio. Parroquia del Santo Sepulcro*". Note that the birth date of Enrique Ramos coincides with that indicated in the service records (1729) and that the abovementioned baptismal parish is that of San Lorenzo del Real in Toro.

The Ramos family is quite accurately portrayed. Don José Ramos Gutiérrez (Saldaña, 1695 - Toro, 1764), son of Miguel Ramos and Francisca Gutiérrez, exercised as royal rent administrator in the town of Toro when he was only eighteen years old.⁶ He had a sister, María (n. 1690), who married Agustín Díez de Castro. José wed Ignacia Muñoz, from the same locality. José Celedonio (n.d.) and Ana (1721) were first born. José Ramos aimed the office of "perpetual councilor": governing posts in Toro, a city with voting right in Cortes, were granted in perpetuity and attached to nobles and notorious hidalgos.⁷ The attribution of accounting excises and taxes — "*cientos* and other rents" and "*millones*"— was linked to the municipal council and became a significant income resource for this growing family.

This post of councilor was created in 1674 for Juan Zapata Deza y Osorio, also resident in Toro, Knight of Alcántara and Marquis of San Miguel de Gros by the sum of 40,000 *reales* in concept of "*media anata*". A part of this capital came from a loan from Gabriel Gutiérrez, who received in return the right to earn half the annual trade income. The perpetual post of councilor and the other half the income passed in 1701 to Alonso Zapata de Mercado, and in 1723 to his heir Bernardo Zapata Mercado Deza y Osorio, who sold them on October 23 to José Ramos for 37,000 *reales de vellón*.

⁶ (28-7-1713 / 22-9-1713): "Correspondencia a [Esteban Ordóñez López de Chaves, VII] marqués de Cardenosa, sobre el nombramiento del escribano Manuel Monje en el Servicio de Millones de la ciudad de Toro, de Diego Pérez Ruiz, José Ramos, administrador de rentas, Antonio Gutiérrez de Deza". AHN: Nobleza, Luque, C.366, D.730-734.

Pablo Antonio and Enrique Ramos were born in 1724 and 1729 respectively. Despite of being entitled to appoint a tenant, Don José assumed his position duties (Cuadrado, 2005: 25 and 59).⁷ He widowed before 1751. He was by then the greatest rancher of sheeps and rams in Toro, with more than 4,700 cattle heads that provided him an annual income of 13,440 *reales de vellón* for the fleece, apart from the profits for sales that he personally managed.⁸ He added to all these benefits the earnings as perpetual councillor in activity and as major excise bailiff; and also those of royal rent accountant, an employment that he shared with Nicolás Gutiérrez de Vitoria. Besides this in 1760, his wealth still climbed a step further with the aggregation of the tax accounting of “*propios*” and “*arbitrios*” to the excises.

José Celedonio, the oldest of the Ramos Muñoz brothers, is not listed in the Cadastre of Ensenada as a descendant of José and Ignacia because of he could not inherit the entailed estate: he was ordained a priest and became the abbot of Sancti Spiritus convent in Salamanca. The dates in which he participated in the Royal Academy of History activities (1758-1773) certify that he frequented Madrid. This is a reasonable clue to prove that he was older than Enrique, who began collaborating with this institution in 1776 (Maier, 2011). José Celedonio was appointed as archdeacon of Zamora's cathedral in 1773. He financed by his own means the installation of a wool factory to provide the military with clothing and blankets in 1777 (Larruga, 1795: 120). He promoted in this city the Royal Economic Society of Friends of the Country, as witnessed in a letter from the intendant Ignacio Bermúdez de Castro to the prosecutor of the Council of Castile, Pedro Rodríguez Campomanes (Enciso, 1988: 220). The Society was founded on January 9, 1778 and its statutes were authorized on October 25. He was appointed as its deputy director in the same year from June 2, under the direction of the Captain General of Castile, the Marquis of Vallesantoro (Cadiñanos, 2002: 150). The other founders were the canon Joaquín Altamirano and servicemen Vicente de Guadalfajara, Manuel de Irujo and Sebastián de Yndaburu.

This Economic Society had an odd trait: the intense participation of military men from high army ranks, who ruled it with “fatherly dirigisme” and

⁷ Toro was province from then until 1827, when the city and its jurisdiction were reincorporated to Zamora.

⁸ AGS (1.6.1752): “Ciudad de Toro. Su Partido. Nº 1. Copia de las Respuestas Generales que dieron los Nombres en dicha ciudad para la Operación de Única Contribución”: 15v, 41v, 58r y 66r. AGS_CE_RG_L 626, PARES. See the illustration p. 19.

little success. No less than twenty-four ecclesiastics and eleven servicemen appeared on the first membership list. The selection of texts on political economy in the Society's library is really striking: the main works from Moncada, Navarrete, Uztáriz, Ulloa and the Flemish mercantilist Georges de Hennin, whom the Count of Campomanes made known in *Reflexiones sobre el comercio español a Indias* (1762) and in the later *Discurso sobre la educación popular de los artesanos y su fomento*, chapter XVIII (1775).⁹ It also included the translation of *Intereses del comercio* from Jacques Accarias de Sérionne by Domingo de Marcoleta (1772-1774), which Campomanes used to refute Hennin regarding the viability of merchant companies in Spain. Finally, it featured the version made by the serviceman Carlos Lemaur (1765) of *Elementos de comercio* from Véron de Forbonnais—the best and most prolific economist of “Gournay's group”—and, of course, the *Discurso* by “Antonio Muñoz” (Enciso, 1988: 235-239). The Zamora Society also subscribed the first five volumes of José Antonio Valcárcel's *Agricultura General*, the pioneering compilation on the new agronomic method in Spain. Judging by the references in the economic works of Enrique Ramos, it is obvious that José Celedonio consulted his brother to draft a list of the readings that he considered essential. We would really need to keep this list later in mind, when outlining the preferences of the “Aragonese party” on political economy.

On January 6, 1743 Ana Ramos Muñoz married the hidalgo Miguel Antonio Vázquez de Aldana y Fierro, born in Toro in April 1723, the oldest son of Miguel Francisco Vázquez de Aldana y García (n. 1690) and Manuela Fierro y Monroy (Alonso, 1955: 300). Don Miguel—the father—was a notorious nobleman (Cuadrado, 2005: 25); the Vázquez de Aldana family had already accredited its condition of “*hidalguía*” by 1591. He was mayor of the Holy Brotherhood for the noble estate, councilor of Toro, deputy in the Guild of Heirs of Vineyards (Esteban, 2016) and owner of extensive wheat fields. In short, he was another great local potentate. Ana and Miguel Antonio had

⁹ Sancho de Moncada's *Restauración política de España* (1619) had been republished in Madrid by Zúñiga printing in 1746. *La Conservación de Monarquías* by Pedro Fernández de Navarrete (1626, Madrid: Imprenta Real) had no recent editions in 1778. Uztáriz's *Theórica y practica de comercio y de marina* (1724, Madrid: s.i.) was one of the most solidly documented trade writings to the date. Reissued in 1745 and 1757, it was the Spanish economic book translated to more languages during the 18th century; there were two English (1751 y 1752) and another French edition (1753). The *Restablecimiento de las fábricas y Comercio español* by Bernardo de Ulloa (1740, Madrid: Antonio Marín) was the most celebrated text during the reign of Ferdinand VI, also translated into French (1753). It was much less known the *Discurso de dn. Jorge de Henin, que trata de los requissitos y órde[n]e[s] que deve haver en la economía conveni[en]te de la monarquía Española para que sea perfecta* (1616), newly reprinted in 1767 (Madrid: n.p.) from the 1620th edition.

seven children: Antonio (1745), Ignacio (1748), Félix, María, Manuela, Francisca and Ángela. Antonio and Ignacio would perform brilliant military careers during the reign of Charles IV, sponsored by their uncle Enrique. Antonio ended up as Secretary with exercise of Decrees and Retired Officer of the Secretary of State and of the Universal Office of War; he retained the privilege of perpetual councilor in Toro. Ignacio entered the Army as cadet in 1766; he was appointed to the garrison in Oran and participated in the campaign of Gibraltar since 1779. Some financial complications led him to end the days in South America. Antonio's offspring will perpetuate the military tradition of the Ramos Muñoz family in Spain. His son Andrés Vázquez de Aldana will keep the post of perpetual councilor in Toro.

Pablo Antonio Ramos Muñoz (1724-1774), the third brother, was Knight of Calatrava (1743),¹⁰ collegiate of the main church of San Salvador de Oviedo at the University of Salamanca, magistrate and Crime Mayor in the Chancellery of Granada since 1761.¹¹ He studied with José Antonio Vázquez de Aldana Fierro y Monroy, sibling of his brother-in-law Miguel, who would eventually hold the position of High Court Judge in Guatemala's Royal Audience. Pablo Ramos inherited by forty (1764) the entailed estate with the accountant office, but decided to remain in his civil tenure, so that the perpetual position in the Council of Toro was in fact vacant. The other half of the post was shared by the brothers Antonio Basilio and Manuel María Gutiérrez, sons of Don Nicolás Gutiérrez de Vitoria. Miguel Vázquez de Aldana assumed the functions as accountant tenant by a warrant signed on August 22, 1766. Pablo Ramos died in 1774 and, by a judicial office dispatched on October 4, 1775, the title and the entailed state ended up in Enrique, the youngest of the family. Despite everything, the circumstances of his military career, which began in 1750 and will be examined below, led him to ratify the tenure in Miguel Vazquez on August 2, 1776.

Pablo Ramos was far more than a reference for Enrique. The pseudonym "Antonio Muñoz" corresponds to his second name and his second surname. Enrique Ramos relinquished the nickname "Desiderio Bueno" —which

¹⁰ (1743-8): "Expediente para la concesión del título de caballero de la orden de Calatrava a Pablo de Ramos Muñoz". AHN: ES.28079/1.-2.13.5.2//OM-Expedientillos, N.12065. Data about Pablo Ramos could be checked with those from Barredo Valenzuela (1954), entries 167, 168, 175, 180, 183. The date of death in Irlas (1995: 87).

¹¹ (1761/1): *Mercurio histórico y político*, Madrid: Antonio Marín, p. 211. See also De Roxas y Contreras (1768: 244).

we suppose he shared with his brother, as will be seen later— to adopt this other one. He only began signing dissertations with his true identity since 1776, just after his brother's death! Destined to become an income accountant, Pablo was necessarily trained in fiscal matters under his father's tutelage. He added his instruction as magistrate and Mayor of Crime, acquired long before Enrique took his first steps in political economy. This raises an unavoidable question: did Pablo Antonio Ramos Muñoz have something to do with the draft of the *Discurso* of "Antonio Muñoz"?

Enrique Ramos perhaps also discovered by 1771, when he intensified his literary contacts in the Fonda de San Sebastián, that "Antonio Muñoz" had also been the pseudonym of a poet, playwright and astrologer of dubious fame whose initials were J.D.T. This first "Antonio Muñoz" was the signer of *Morir viviendo en la aldea, y vivir muriendo en la Corte and Aventuras en verso y prosa del insigne poeta y su discreto compañero* (1737, 1739).¹² Both essays are still erroneously adjudged in catalogs to Enrique Ramos despite of their correct identification by Passola (2001). If these coincidences were not enough, contents and style of both texts let us know that this bad reputed author was also a soldier garrisoned in Madrid.

¹² *Morir viviendo en la aldea* was resissued in 1784, 1790 y 1805. Its expedient is in AHN: Consejos, 50634. The *Aventuras* were reedited in 1759, 1789, 1805 y 1907. This "Antonio Muñoz" also was the author of a manuscript entitled "El discreto censor en la Puente..." rejected after evaluation (1757, 50 ff., 20 cm; en AHN: Consejos, 50634) and of the "Discurso astronómico y Pronóstico general del año 1743 hasta la fin del mundo. Al meridiano de Madrid en elección de quarenta grados, ciento mas o menos..." (1742, 23 ff. 20 cm; en AHN: Consejos, 50638) also censored because of its "irreverence". Another text entitled "El cortesano, el labrador y el sacristán. Pronóstico al rebés para el año 1752" identifies "J.D.T." behind the pseudonym "Antonio Muñoz" [AHN: Consejos, 50637].

2. BATTLEFIELDS, CROP FIELDS (1762-1769)

Enrique Ramos' military career evolved in the Regiment of Royal Spanish Infantry Guards. Bourbon Army in 18th century grouped its elite troops in the so-called Royal House Corps: the Company of Halberdiers, the Corps Guards and both Regiments of Spanish and Walloon Royal Infantry Guards. Another Regiment of Royal Carabineers was aggregated in 1742. Each Regiment was partitioned into Battalions of Fusiliers and then in Companies. These of Grenadiers were the assault force in each Battalion; they led the attacks and were therefore these that took more casualties. The Royal Guards not only protected the Family and the Royal Sites, but also stood out in strategic places like Barcelona, Campo de Gibraltar or Alicante and joined the campaigns. Three Battalions were garrisoned in Madrid, Vicálvaro and Leganés. They were the seedbed of military commands for regular units and for generalship, and they carried out a constant task on tactical and technical formation for cadets, as well as on qualifying officers that would hold the highest positions in ordinary Regiments. The appointments achieved in Royal Guards had a correlation with the ranks in the regular army. When in campaign, the officer scale in this elite corps was equated with that of chieftains. For example, an appointment as Captain in a Guard Company was equivalent to the rank of a "living Infantry Colonel" when acting jointly. The rank in Grenadiers of Royal Guards was also considered a higher step than in Fusiliers.

It is noteworthy that Enrique Ramos' dedication to military service always received a "high" qualification, and that his capacity was "very high", an outstanding fact in this kind of evaluations. His professional career had to pace with the Royal Residencies, intensely in contact with courtier aristocracy. The best documented stage occurs between 1750 and 1789.¹³ He

¹³ AGS: Guardias Reales, leg. 2586: año 1773, carp. 1, f. 60; 1774, carp. 3, f. 62; 1778, carp. 4, f. 61; 1780, carp. 5, f. 57; leg. 2587: 1780, carp. 1, f. 46; 1788, carp. 7, f. 15; 1789, carp. 8, f. 16. We have compared the former information with those handwritten by Antonio de Alcedo (1772).

enlisted in August 1, 1750 when he was 21 years old; on August 10 he was a cadet in the First Regiment of the Spanish Infantry Royal Guards, under the command of the Duke of Osuna. He graduated with the rank of Ensign in the “Colonel Company” of the Battalion of Fusiliers on December 10, 1753, under the direct orders of the Marquis of Sarriá, and ascended to Grenadiers on December 20, 1755, assigned to the 6th Company.¹⁴ He was appointed as second Lieutenant in the 2nd Company of Fusiliers in March 15, 1760¹⁵ and fought as such in the campaign of Portugal during the Seven Years’ War. His new transfer to the 14th Company of Grenadiers dates from June 15, 1763, after the conflict was finished, although it seems that it did not become effective until June 28.¹⁶ Still in the same appointment, he was awarded with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in December 11, 1765 because of the wedding of the Prince of Asturias.¹⁷ He was designed as First Lieutenant of Fusiliers on December 27, 1766 and sent to the 12th Company, to finally join the 13th of Grenadiers.¹⁸ His promotion was then adjourned for a long period of thirteen years and almost five months, despite being scheduled for 1775. As it will be explained below, this career delay is related to his absence in the Algiers campaign, due to unexpected biographical circumstances.¹⁹ Briefly after returning from the first siege of Gibraltar, where he fought in the Second Regiment, he was appointed Captain of Fusiliers in the First Regiment on May 18, 1780.²⁰ He devoted himself to the military teaching in Madrid since 1784. His appointment to brigadier dates from September 19, 1789 in occasion of the enthronement of Charles IV.²¹ According to Lapeña (h. 1812: 147), he retired with this graduation and wages; it is deduced from the same source that he was replaced from the command of the 12th Company on October 18, 1792 by the Captain of Royal Guards Félix Colón de Larreategui. Some clues point that he perhaps wielded for two

¹⁴ Alcedo (1772: 48); Lapeña (h. 1812: 36 and 50).

¹⁵ Confirmed in *Mercurio histórico y político* (1760), Madrid: Imprenta Real, t. CLXII, p. 334. Alcedo (1772: 77).

¹⁶ Alcedo (1772: 46), Lapeña (h. 1812: 45).

¹⁷ *Mercurio histórico y político* (1765/10), Madrid: Imprenta Real, p. 395.

¹⁸ Alcedo (1772: 161), Lapeña (h. 1812: 42).

¹⁹ *Gazeta de Madrid* (1766), p. 424. While drawing his manuscript up (1772: 163), Alcedo supposed the appointment of Enrique Ramos to the rank of Captain, but it only became effective five years later according to his service records.

²⁰ *Mercurio histórico y político* (1780/5), Madrid: Imprenta Real, t. II, p. 83. The date could be May 19, following Lapeña (h. 1812: 157).

²¹ Published in *Gazeta de Madrid* (1789/9/22).

years since then the rank of General in the Royal Corps of Engineers.²² The promotion to Field Marshal before October 9, 1794—we assume it should happen near 1793, under Aranda’s second presidency—is only proved by indirect sources.

The Third Family Pact, signed by Louis XV and the newly crowned Charles III, dragged Spain in 1761 into the Seven Years’ War against Prussia and England (1756-1763). Enrique Ramos had his first experiences on battlefield at the end of the conflict, during the Prevention War against Portugal—the “Fantastic War”—in 1762. Combined French and Spanish forces of 40,000 men, headed by the Marquis of Sarriá, entered Portuguese territory to force Joseph I, who opted for the British side. Ramos participated as Second Lieutenant in the 2nd Company, First Regiment of Royal Guards Fusiliers in the blockade, the site and the capture of the stronghold of Almeida from August 4 to its capitulation on 25. Despite the success, the scanty Portuguese garrison barely suffered casualties and Sarriá could not avoid desertions in militia lines. The young Pedro Pablo Abarca, Count of Aranda, a veteran in Italian fields commanding the Castile Regiment, did not hesitate to dismiss him and to assume the authority for the remaining campaign. After war, Aranda was designated to the Military Junta to try those responsible for the march not reaching Lisbon. Unlike the performances of many of his superiors, these of Ramos were rewarded by the Junta by promoting him to Grenadiers in 1763. The time he served as an officer in this elite force, about seven years of his career, corroborates his outstanding value and remarkable physical conditions.

Shortly thereafter, Enrique Ramos published *Reflexiones de Don Desiderio Bueno sobre el papel intitulado: el Trigo considerado como género comerciable. De Orden Superior* (1764) and *Elogio de Don Álvaro de Bazán, primer marqués de Santa Cruz* (1765).²³ His quotation from Baron of Montesquieu in chapter I of the *Reflexiones* is well known as the first explicit reference in Spanish economic literature.²⁴ In fact, as will be pointed

²² *Diario de Alicante* (November 1, 1924: 1). His knowledge of geometry and fortification points in the same direction. However, this information comes from the unreliable biography of Rico and Montero (1888).

²³ Catalogs date the *Elogio* in 1765. Both the date and authorship are revealed by a handwritten note in the cover page’s outer margin of the copy of the National Library in Madrid.

²⁴ The pioneering interpretations on Montesquieu’s reception in Spain are these of Antonio Elorza (1970: 69-90) and Luis Díez del Corral (1973).

below, the ideology of the French philosopher is reflected in the other Ramos' texts about political economy. But we should remind that this presence is selective, centered on the first chapters of *De l'Esprit des Lois* (1748) and, to a lesser extent, on *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (1734), insofar as it specifically concerns the understanding of the body politic, the typologies of governments and luxury consumption goods, the adaptation of legal systems and the history of classical Rome.

The *Reflexiones* of 1764 are framed in the preparations of the Royal Pragmatics of July 11, 1765 to liberalize domestic wheat trade, a law designed to ensure the sale of leftovers and to discourage speculative hoarding. They must also be understood as inserted in the French debate between Physiocracy and its detractors regarding the economic legacy of Maximilien of Béthune, Duke of Sully. The superior order that reads on the cover came from prosecutor Campomanes, "Aranda's favorite" by then (Olaechea and Ferrer Benimeli, 1978: II, 73). The *Gazeta de Madrid* announced its publication on August 14, 1764.²⁵ It was also reported by the *Mercurio Histórico y Político* in the same month (1764: 385). The *Reflexiones* went on sale just seven days before Serafín Trigueros' translation of the *Dissertacion sobre el cultivo de trigos* by Mirabeau and a month preceding the edition of *Res-puesta fiscal sobre abolir la tasa y establecer el comercio de granos* by Campomanes (September 10).

But what is the point of entrusting the draft of an economic text to a young serviceman with neither literary experience nor legal qualification? We have to recall that Pablo Antonio Ramos held his position in the Chancellery of Granada since 1761 and that their father, the councilor José Ramos, had just died in 1764. Insomuch the careers of José Celedonio and Pablo were channeled, José Ramos knew long ago that it was Enrique who would eventually inherit the entailed estate, and therefore who had to acquire a proper training. His instruction for accounting and his knowledge of French language before entering the Army had much to do with his early interest in political economy. On the other hand, Enrique Ramos was not alone to assume Aranda's request. Although the *Reflexiones* were written in first person, the "Protestation" that precedes them is revealing: "We

²⁵ *Gazeta de Madrid* (1764/8/14), p. 280.

both who concur to this work, being of very different professions, have dedicated our main study to other subjects". Were there two co-authors behind the pseudonym "Desiderio Bueno"? It seems that the jurist Pablo Antonio Ramos at least contributed with his knowledge, if not with his talent as writer. Moreover, the style of the *Reflexiones* is more polished and agile than that of the subsequent *Discurso sobre economía política*. We dismiss that the collaborator was Jose Celedonio, who needed to be advised on economic matters.

The *Reflexiones* were grouped into three sections about French, British and Spanish grain policies. Arguments were inspired by the key works of Gournay's group: Lemaury's and Francisco de la Quintana's versions of *Éléments du Commerce* by Forbonnais (1754) and of *Remarques sur les avantages, & les Désavantages de la France, & de l'Angleterre par rapport au Commerce*, by Plumard de Dangeul (1754). They were supplemented with references to jurisprudence from the *Representación al Rey* by Zavala (1732) and from the Ordinances for the instruction of mayors of 1735 and 1749.

Enrique Ramos stated in chapter I his intention to examine the criticisms made against Sully's grain policy, enlightening a paper "he had translated" and which he simply referred to it as *La Police des Grains*. The agrarian economic ideology of the powerful Superintendent of Finance of Henry IV, reviled by the colbertism, was first claimed at the early 18th century by Pierre Le Pesant de Boisguilbert in *Traité sur la nature, culture, commerce et intérêt des grains* (1712 [1707]: part II, ch. VI). However, the Duke's posthumous popularity did not grow until four decades later, when his inordinately popular *Mémoires* were published by Pierre-Mathurin de *L'Écluse des Loges* (1745), while the unstoppable rising of British economy, the internal agrarian crisis and depopulation worried the French court. These memoirs were reprinted at least five times before the publication of the *Reflexiones* and even translated into English. Ten years later, Mirabeau and his master François Quesnay wangled the authority of this popular political figure to sustain free trade and an extreme agrarianism. The success of *L'Ami des Hommes* (1756) and of the article "Grains" in the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert (1757) transformed Maximilien de Béthune into a physiocratic myth. Even an excerpt from Sully's *Œconomies royales* (1638) would accompany the version of Quesnay's *Tableau économique* of 1767; the whole publication would shortly follow, by the abbot Nicolas Baudeau (1775). The defences to Minister Sully proliferated since 1763 in a calculated publicist

operation, when the French Academy announced a prize attended by biographers of irregular quality and few or even no economic knowledge—Richard Girard de Bury, Claire-Marie Mazarelli, Thérèse Willems de Saint-Vast and others—. In front of them, the writers of Gournay’s circle, more versed in commercial and treasury practices than in theoretical abstractions, endeavored to restore Sully’s figure in the wake of Boisguilbert. They did not present him as the presumed champion of free grain trade, but as a supporter of free domestic market and of strengthening agriculture for promoting other productive sectors. This alternative approach resulted in some more tempered essays such as those handwritten by Clicquot de Blervache (1764) or published by Antoine Léonard Thomas, then secretary of the Duke of Choiseul (1763a). Thomas’ defence—another primary source of the *Reflexiones*—, profusely annotated and with some profitable economic thoughts, was carefully and anonymously translated into Castilian in the same year (1763b).

Jean Sarrailh (1957: 533) hinted that the unknown author of *La police des grains*, who focused Desiderio Bueno’s critics, was Claude-Jacques Herbert, a member of Gournay’s group and an enemy of Physiocracy. He assumed that the text reviewed was the *Essai sur la police générale des grains, sur leurs prix et sur les effets de l’agriculture* (n.p., 1753; Berlin, 1755). He deduced it from the authority of Juan Sempere y Guarinos,²⁶ from that of Manuel Colmeiro’s (1861)—for whom Ramos “was not indifferent to the physiocratic school”— and from the obvious similarities in both titles. This intuition has diverted many interpretations that desired to approach Enrique Ramos to the doctrine of the *économistes*.

Nevertheless, Ramos was not a physiocrat; he was not even related to this system. “The question is not if I admire, in terms of government, composite systems; it is quite the opposite”, he said in the *Reflexiones*. “But there is an average term for success: extremes are always risky” (p. 166). Herbert’s *Essai*, that incarnates well that middle point, had already been partially translated into Spanish by Quintana in 1755. In addition, Herbert’s arguments concerning grain policy, discussed in chapter II of the *Essai*, were largely in line with those of Forbonnais and Plumard, his peers in Gournay’s entourage and primary sources of the *Reflexiones*. Plumard ack-

²⁶ (1785): vol. I, 233; (1789): vol. V, 232-234.

nowledged making a free translation of Josiah Tucker's *Brief Essay* to discuss these advantages of the British system of intervention on wheat prices that could be adopted in France.²⁷ With this in mind, it would be nonsense that Ramos referred to Herbert when he pointed out that “the author [of the analyzed essay] expressly follows a system opposite to the English one [...]. He inferred from all this that grain trade must be absolutely free to import and export, neither taxing the one nor gratifying the other” (p. 162). The real author was at a “risky extreme”.

Against all evidence, historiography has stubbornly maintained that the *Reflexiones* criticized Herbert's ideas. The *Reflexiones* are neither a translation nor an adaptation of that *Essai*, but an original text that draws upon publications of Gournay's group, with British influence, to criticize a physiocratic dissertation. Ramos brought the clues needed to recognize the anonymous French author he had translated for his private use. On page 10 of the original edition he wrote:

From the time lapse that exists (the author says in a note) from January 17 to May 21, the second Finance Council was formed, in which the King gave a place to Sully, and the edict was published in the same interim. The author needed to prove that Sully had been appointed before the Council's creation, but he did not do so. According to what he says in the same note, that Sully retired from the Council without wanting to sign its agreements, protesting they were all armed against him, it can be inferred that one of the main points of the dispute was the publication of the Edict, but that would be a sole weak conjecture if it were not strengthened by the subsequent measures that he took when ruling unopposed the Finance Ministry.

It will be a matter to locate this annotation to identify the author and the text criticized in the *Reflexiones*. It can be verified that this is the one that we reproduce (p. 32): the footnote (a) of page 5 of the *Réflexions sur la police des grains en France et en Angleterre*, published by Louis-Paul Abeille in March 1764, when he advised the *contrôleur général* of Commerce and Manufactures. The similarities with Herbert's title do not go unnoticed and easily explain so many confusions.

²⁷ 1753 [1742]: *A Brief Essay on the Advantages and Disadvantages which Respectively attend France and Great Britain, with regard to Trade. With some Proposals for Removing the Principal Disadvantages of Great Britain. In a New Method.* London: Trye.

Abeille is one of the less well-known followers of Quesnay by current historiography, probably because he retracted his economic ideas in 1769. Nevertheless, he was in his early writings one of the wisest physiocrats and the author of the best price theory of that doctrine.²⁸ He showed Sully differently from Mirabeau, as a convert from prohibitionism to convenience, whose error was his lack of faith in free grain trade, “the main principle of happiness”, regardless of the circumstances. The portrait offered by Ramos was different from that of both. The French minister understood free grain trade as a general rule and a “well-considered principle”, but also would have agreed with banishing grain exports in view of the urgency of needs for domestic consumption. A prohibition which, in the context described in the note, was otherwise unnecessary: it would have been useless to authorize in France the free extraction of wheat when production was insufficient to satisfy consumption.

Ramos’ critique to Abeille confirms our supposition: the *Reflexiones* were framed in an environment receptive to the grain policies defended in Gournay’s working entourage and faced with Physiocracy. Forbonnais would also appear himself in his *Principes et observations économiques* of 1768 in defense of a more pragmatic Sully, accusing Abeille of ignoring historical facts, just as Ramos did four years earlier. In short, the *Reflexiones* are, more than a review, a full-fledged reply even with a similar extension to that of Abeille’s *La Police des Grains*. It should be read as an anti-physiocratic text; not against the theoretical apparatus of the doctrine but against its practice, against the defense of absolute freedom in grain trade without qualifications. Desiderio Bueno still did not know Mirabeau’s *Ami des Hommes*, the most important text of physiocratic theory published in Europe at that time. He then confessed being an admirer of political economy, but without the baggage needed to discuss the *Tableaux économiques*. However, his direct knowledge of agricultural business and its legal framework—if Pablo Antonio Ramos, as we believe, participated in the preparation of the *Reflexiones*— enabled him to refute Abeille’s ambitious text. With this in mind, we must recognize the merit of Enrique Ramos as the first Spanish author in writing about Physiocracy outside from the opposition.²⁹

²⁸ Abeille, L.-P.: (1768), *Examen de l'examen du livre intitulé, Principes sur la liberté du commerce des grains. Supplément au onzième tome des Éphémérides du Citoyen*. Paris: Lacombe.

²⁹ Nipho only translated some parts of the *Ami des Hommes* in *Correo General de la Europa* (1763, vol. II trim. 2, Letters VII-X). Lluch and Argemí (1985) placed Trigueros as its introducer.

Ramos sent a newly edited copy to Nicolás de Arriquíbar when he prepared the *Reflexiones sobre el Amigo de los Hombres* (1779, letter of 1764, I.1: 29). The impression of the author from Bilbao is in all coincident referring to Physiocracy:

The one among foreigners that has spread it to a greater extent the *Friend of men in his treatise on population*: a treatise that can be said about agriculture, according to which it is the target of all his work. I cannot deny that it fills me with veneration and appreciation; as well as by the affluent force of their expressions, and by the many good principles which it contains: but whether by my short intelligence of them, or because this author wrote for France (whose constitution is very different from ours), I confess my feeling that I cannot be satisfied with some of its main opinions, and that their adoption would be detrimental to our interests. I will try to examine impartially its propositions relative to our constitution, taking what seems to me we can agree on them [...] (Arriquíbar, 1779: 41-42).

It is no coincidence that the translation by Trigueros of Mirabeau's memoir on agriculture came out of print only a week later,³⁰ prompted by Ramos and required by Arriquíbar in the hope of finishing his comments.

Moreover, the *Elogio* offers another key to unravel the biography of Enrique Ramos. It was dedicated to Don Diego de Silva y Sarmiento, son of Pedro de Silva-Bazán and grandson of Álvaro de Bazán. This young soldier served in the ranks of Prince Charles of Saxony, Spain's ally in the Seven Years' German campaign. His legs had been wounded by a grenade in early October 1761, during the siege of Wolfenbüttel. In spite of surgeons' hopes, he worsened and finally died on December 26 (Broglie and Vernier, n.d.: 507-508). The loss must have been dramatic, a sole day before the cessation of hostilities on that front. The Bazán family, we should not be surprised, were part of the most ingrained palatial nobility of Toro. The Second Lieutenant Enrique Ramos became a friend of this neighbor seven years younger. Note XI, which we reproduce in this edition, proves their relationship. Martín Fernández de Navarrete, who dealt with Ramos in Madrid (2008 [1851]: 314), was also to testify later. This friendship truncated by the war will bring Ramos to María Pilar de Silva y Sarmiento, sister of the late and future second wife of Joaquín Pignatelli, the newly appointed ambassador in Paris (1764).³¹

³⁰ V. Riquetti, Marquis of Mirabeau (1760). *Gazeta de Madrid* (1764/8/21) num. 35, p. 288.

³¹ María Pilar de Silva and Joaquín Pignatelli married in November 13, 1774.

The *Elogio* is not an economic essay but contains substantial endnotes that will be mirrored four years later in the pages of the *Discurso de economía política*. It was inspired by Jean-François Melon's *Essai Politique sur le commerce* (1734) to address the reform of sumptuary legislation and it also advanced essential notions of monetary theory: the understanding of money in its relation to production, not as an expression of wealth by itself, and the importance of its circulation in inflation.

The long time that Ramos later served as first Lieutenant of Fusiliers (1767-1780) should not be blamed for his lack of merit but for the shortage of vacancies of company command positions in Royal Guards, so coveted by the most illustrious families, supposed to rub shoulders with the Grandes at the top of the ladder. Settled in Madrid with the First Regiment garrison, Ramos would dedicate himself since 1767 to perfect his economic knowledge. Both the license application of the *Discurso* of April 6, 1769 and Juan de Aravaca's censure of April 25 initially entitled the *Discurso* as "Economy of a Body Politic".³² These documents certify that Ramos already resided in the court. According to Martín de Villanueva, who processed the proceedings, the author from Toro wanted his text to be edited with that precise label and in two volumes. In any case both titles refer to the same essay, as confirmed by the identical contents described in the review of the *Memorial Literario*.³³ The *Discurso* was printed on August 8, initialed by the pseudonym "Antonio Muñoz" and dedicated to the then President of the Council of Castile: the Count of Aranda.

³² "Dn. Antonio Muñoz residente en esta corte Sobre que se le conceda licencia para imprimir la Obra que ha compuesto titulada: Economía de un Cuerpo político", Madrid: ES28079 AHN/1.1.5. 16.7.9.1/ Consejos, 5530 (48). It is reproduced in this edition. The following review appeared in *Memorial literario* confirms the same title (1789/8), t. XCI, pp. 512-526. Madrid: Nacional, REVmicro, 132 (8). It identifies Antonio Muñoz with Enrique Ramos in the note I.

³³ *Gazeta de Madrid* (1769/8/8), p. 264.

3. INNS, SALONS AND ACADEMIES (1770-1778)

The Fonda de San Sebastián was the most active social meeting point in the enlightened Madrid. It gathered between 1771 and 1773 in an inn run by the Gippini brothers on Ángel Square, in front of the homonymous church, near the bookstores of Las Carretas Street. The Fonda was a forum for critiques against “literary vulgarity” in poetry and theater, embodied in the baroque, and in defense of the most orthodox neoclassical aesthetics. It is also said that it sometimes housed more festive evenings. It is known that it was there where José Cadalso read his draft of *Cartas Marruecas* and presented *Eruditos a la violeta* (1772), its *Suplemento* and *El buen militar a la violeta* (1790 [1773]). Nicolás Fernández de Moratín and Tomás Iriarte (1750-1781) co-starred in literary debates. Other famous parishioners were Jovellanos, Samaniego, Martín Fernández de Navarrete, Juan José López de Sedano, the canon José Guevara Vasconcelos, Ignacio López de Ayala, Luciano Comella, the botanist Casimiro Gómez Ortega, Francisco de Goya and the Valencian historians Juan Bautista Muñoz and Francisco Cerdá y Rico. A large Italian group of intellectuals also attended: Pedro Napoli-Signorelli, Juan Bautista Conti and the arabist Mariano Pizzi; perhaps Giuseppe Olivieri, Plácido Bordonni and Leonardo Capitanacci too (Aguilar, 1996: 69).

Enrique Ramos started frequenting the Fonda in 1771 accompanied by a group of military men: Cadalso and Vicente Gutiérrez de los Ríos, Manuel de Aguirre, the architect Ignazio Bernascone and Manuel de Alcázar (Franco Rubio, 2004: 60 and 67).³⁴ There have been many speculations about the likely friendship between Ramos and Cadalso. Nevertheless, this notorious

³⁴ Franco attributes in a slip to “Desiderio Ramos” a text by Manuel de Aguirre entitled “El militar ingenuo” (2004: 67). His information about the Fonda de San Sebastián procedes from Cantos Casenave, M. *et al.* (eds.) (2008: 308). We have compared it with those offered by Cotarelo (2006) and Aguilar Piñal (1996).

writer did not mention the serviceman among his twenty-three relatives in the *Memoria de los acontecimientos más particulares de mi vida* (1773).³⁵ It is evident that they met, as they attended identical circles. However, they do not seem to have any more common links. Cadalso arrived in Madrid from his Aragonese exile in December 1770 and remained there until May 8, 1773, when he moved to Salamanca. He was only a cadet of the Bourbon Cavalry Regiment in the war of Portugal and he did not even fight, if we exclude his famous duel against the Marquis of Tabuérniga. According to Durán López, “nothing recalls camaraderie and military life” in the memoirs of the young writer from Cádiz (2002: 461). His rupture in 1768 with his then-friend Aranda, whom Ramos dedicated to the *Discurso* only a year later, adds implausibility to their fellowship.

The personal histories of the other soldiers, all veterans of the Portuguese campaign, are however more similar to that of Ramos. We dismiss Aguirre, Major Sergeant of the Bourbon Cavalry Regiment and director of a Company of the Cavalry School in Ocaña: like Cadalso, he hanged around O'Reilly and left Aranda's circle to approach Floridablanca. It is most conceivable that it was Vicente Gutiérrez de los Ríos (1732-1779), a scholar in Cervantes' literacy assigned to the Royal Military College of Segovia, who introduced Ramos in this forum. Unlike the previous ones, he belonged to the generation of Ramos and was captain of artillery with rank of Lieutenant-Colonel during the site of Almeida.

However, it was Tomás de Iriarte who cultivated a closer relationship with Ramos. This young poet was the cliché of the enlightened courtier. He had moved to Madrid in 1764 and replaced his deceased uncle Juan de Iriarte in 1771 as official translator in the first Secretary of State. He was well versed in French literature and especially in Rousseau —author of another “Discourse on Political Economy”. Cotarelo (2006: 464) remembers “those three-hour conversations” that Iriarte and Ramos kept “by the naps” in their walks along Alcalá Street. After the evening in the Fonda and in order to gather literary news from the neighboring country, both friends frequented since 1773 the salon of the Countess of Montijo. The historian Coloma wrote that she was “like a mother” for the pious Doña Maria Manuela Pignatelli (1753-1816), her niece and so of the late Diego de Silva.

³⁵ Glendinning and Harrison (1979: 22).

María Manuela is a central character in the biography of Enrique Ramos. She was the daughter of the influential Joaquin Pignatelli, Count of Fuentes and Prince of Aragon, absent from the court of Madrid since he was commissioned as ambassador to Paris in 1764. He returned from France just in 1773 to be relieved by the Count of Aranda,³⁶ who would remain there with his secretary, Ignacio de Heredia, until 1786. Joaquín Pignatelli's right hand was his son-in-law the Duke of Villahermosa, exattaché of the same embassy and newly married by proxy with Manuela —Aranda himself replaced him on the wedding day. The name of Villahermosa was Juan Pablo de Aragón-Azlor y Zapata (1730-1791), descendant of the councilor of Toro Juan Zapata. Coloma (1895: 63) made an expressive portrait:

The Duke of Villahermosa was so a grand lord in the fashion of time that he did not partake of these vintage habits [...]. He spent the whole day away from his wife, devoted to his studies, to his diplomatic affairs, and to the most selected people, to which he was always very fond and cultivated with great constancy.

Ramos and Villahermosa were of the same age; they shared intellectual interests and soon became friends. When Pignatelli named Ramos and Iriarte preceptors of Maria Manuela in 1774, our protagonist entered the inner circle of Aranda's powerful family.

The date of O'Reilly's adventure in Algiers (1775) coincides with the execution of the death will of Pablo Ramos. The first biographers of Enrique Ramos had to verify his absence in the Court and unintentionally concluded that he had embarked towards Africa like Cadalso. But it is consistent that the Irish general would dispense with military commands close to Aranda, with whom he held personal disagreements from 1770. This would be a compelling reason to understand the delay in his promotion to Captain of the Spanish Royal Guards, planned for that same year (Alcedo, 1772: 163). In addition, Enrique Ramos inherited in October 1775 the post of perpetual councilor and the entailed estate in Toro, whose demands were

³⁶ Aranda was the father in law of Joaquín Pignatelli's son, and therefore, he was part of the extended family of the Princes of Aragon. His daughter María Ignacia (deceased in 1764) was married to José María Pignatelli, son of Joaquín and his first wife, María Luisa Gonzaga. These years were very hard for the Pignatelli family: María Luisa died in 1773 and José María, suffering from tuberculosis, followed her in 1774. Don Joaquín remarried in 1775 with María Pilar de Silva-Bazán y Sarmiento, Diego de Silva's sister, but hardly lived a few months longer.

hardly compatible with his career. As we have shown before, he delegated the tenancy of excise accountant to his brother-in-law Miguel Antonio Vázquez and returned to Madrid in 1776.

He published in May *Elementos ó primeros conocimientos de la enseñanza y disciplina de la Infantería*, a handbook in cameralist fashion to satisfy Aranda's pro-Prussian preferences, directed to the cadets of the Royal Guards.³⁷ Joaquín Pignatelli passed away that same month. In Aranda's absence, the Duke of Villahermosa thus became the visible head of the "Aragonese party". Since then,

The Duchess [Maria Manuela] received again at home, forming a literary gathering whose soul was Don Tomás Iriarte, and to which Ramos, Sánchez, Casalbón, García de la Huerta and others frequented, cultivating music, to which the couple was greatly affiliated, under the direction of the celebrated fabulist. (Ortí, 1896: 190).³⁸

Ramos contacted with the Royal Academy of History on March 29, 1776 and turned to visit it on May 15, 1778. We have no reliable record of coinciding with his brother José Celedonio, whose last intervention in that Academy dates from September 10, 1773. We must suppose that they effectively meet, according to that we have earlier exposed about the "militarization" of the Economic Society of Zamora and about the composition of its library. Both brothers also collaborated with donations for the numismatic collection in the institution.

The admission of Enrique Ramos as member of the Spanish Royal Academy on July 3, 1777 was due to his playwright debut with *El Guzmán*, a piece inscribed in the fashion of "national tragedies" cultivated in the Fonda and in the salon of Villahermosa.³⁹ Jovellanos described this piece of D.E.R.,

³⁷ (1776) Madrid: Josef Doblado, 326 pp., 4^o. Reviewed in *Gazeta de Madrid* num. 22 (May 28, 1776, p. 192). It is Ramos' most important study on military tactics, where he analyzes "the teaching of soldiers, how to unite them in different formations, and the divisions of them for the best and easiest government" (pp. 1-2), applying Prussian, French, English and Dutch strategic innovations. It should be noted that the draft was already up in author's mind before 1765; the master lines of this military text are portrayed with remarkable similarities in the *Elogio* (1765: 82-89, note IV).

³⁸ Ortí wrote in a footnote: "Brigadier D. Enrique Ramos, very enlightened and a real friend of Villahermosa". He also referred to Tomás Antonio Sánchez, the collaborator of Rafael Casalbón y Geli in the extended reedition of the *Biblioteca Hispana Nova* by Nicolás Antonio.

³⁹ We reproduce in p. 43 the front cover of a corrected and amended second imprint in Barcelona: J.F. Piferrer, 20 pp., 1780. On the exaltation of Guzman el Bueno with regard to Enrique Ramos,

the masked author behind those pages “so different from the previous ones”, as “the best written in our language”. Twenty years later he will retain the same admiration for Enrique Ramos’ style.⁴⁰ The composition of the Academy surely influenced the nomination. There were part of the institution De los Ríos, appointed as full member in that same year; José Bazán de Silva Pimentel, then Marquis of Santa Cruz; the noble Martín de Ulloa from Toro, son of the author of *Restauración de las fábricas en España* and Juan de Aravaca, who favorably censured the *Discurso* years ago. So was there Campomanes, who corresponded with José Celedonio Ramos and commissioned the *Reflexiones* of Don Desiderio Bueno, sat in the “Chair H”.

The affinities of First Lieutenant Ramos with Fonda’s fellows implicated him in a controversial literary mess (Rodríguez, 1987). The Royal Spanish Academy convened on March 31, 1778 its first epic poetry contest, whose prize fell to the dilettante José María Vaca de Guzmán. The second prize, to which Nicolás Moratín aspired, was won by Lorenzo María de Villarroel. The Fonda made common front and Ramos was among the friendly signatories of a protest led by Iriarte to amend such an affront.

it can be consulted Millé Giménez (1930: 391). According to Monlau (1863, vol. 3: 123) “D. Enrique Ramos, Army Brigadier, captain of the Spanish Infantry Royal Guards, was the fourth occupant of this academic chair on January 3, 1782 and was a member since July 3, 1777”.

⁴⁰ Jovellanos wrote about the *Discurso* on November 8, 1788 (1789: 40, n. 1): “I cannot miss here an essay that is enough by itself to prevent the proposition I have just posed arrogantly [The Nation begins to have Economists]. Its title is: *Discurso sobre la Economía Política. Madrid 1769. I vol. 8. En casa de Ibarra*. This writing, so excellent as little known, was then published behind the name of D. Antonio Muñoz; but his true author is one of the Literates who best honors our time, and whose name I would have illustrated this part of my speech, if I did not respect the modesty with which he tries to cover it up. But I will not hesitate to advise lovers of economic studies to read and reread it night and day, because it is one of those that contain in a few chapters great treasures of doctrine”.

4. FROM PARIS TO GIBRALTAR (1779-1782)

Floridablanca supposed that the influential Juan Pablo de Aragón-Azlor had conspired in the fall of Grimaldi, the outright enemy of the Pignatelli family. There were rumors that he had instigated the burning of the minister's house, and the King wanted him afar, so he appointed him as ambassador in Turin. That "golden exile" had to be postponed by the death of Javiera, the first-born of the Villahermosa marriage, on July 30, 1778. At the end of September Enrique Ramos left Madrid to accompany the Dukes to Italy, more as a person of trust than as the tutor of the young lady María Manuela. Authorized by Floridablanca to deviate from the route, they had to stop at Montauban for Ramos to recover from an illness that had occurred in October (Cotarelo, 2006: 451). They finally made their way to Paris in November, with full intention of spending some time there (Coloma, 1895: 351). According to Ortú (1896), it was the first time that the military man visited that city. His first impression was not the best: "Ramos is frightened", Villahermosa confessed to Iriarte in a letter of November 18; "No matter how much we talked about in Spain, we were not able to give him an idea of what this capital really is". On January 11 they were installed at the Soyecourt Hotel on Université Street, ambassador Aranda's residence. An entry in the Duke's diary shows Ramos in contact with the most selected intellectuality of the time:

January 14 [1780]. I went to see the Duke of Guînes;⁴¹ thence to the course of Natural History, whence I returned home on foot. I dressed, went to D'Egmont's house,⁴² and dine with the ambassador of Sardinia; I came back home. From there to that of M. de Castrie[s];⁴³ I came home again to seek

⁴¹ Adrien Louis de Bonnières, Duque of Guines, Choiseul's protégé.

⁴² Cassimiro Pignatelli, Count D'Egmont.

⁴³ Charles de La Croix de Castries, Jacques Necker's friend, married with Marie Louise Philippine, Duke of Guines's daughter.

Ramos, with whom I went to Mr. D'Alembert, who hosts a gathering three times a week; then to Mlle. Bagarotti's house; then to see the Duchess of Choiseul, and lately to Mme. of Villemorien's house, where I dined and stayed until two o'clock. (Coloma, 1895: 63)

At early February, Ramos also accompanied the Duke when visiting the courtier entourage of the controversial Choiseul:

I left home in the morning by carriage at eleven o'clock and went with Ramos to Saint Sulpice, where we heard the Mass in the chapel of Our Lady of Conception, which had just finished. We went from there to Val-de-Grace, where we saw only the facade, because the church was already closed. I lunched at Egmont's home, and I went afterwards to Mr. Necker's, the general accountant, where I saw milady at Saint-Severin's house, and at the door of the Dukes of Choiseul and of Praslin [...]. (Coloma, 1895: 352)⁴⁴

D'Alembert, who knew Aranda and Villahermosa by Voltaire's references; Jacques Necker, his neighbour on Sainte Anne Street and friend of Choiseul's... Even abbot Galiani, "a jester with Machiavelli's mind" as Coloma wrote, once performed as jocose confessor of Maria Manuela. There is no doubt that Enrique Ramos had the opportunity to expand his knowledge of political economy. The Duke's diaries reveal that they also met Valmont de Bomare and Sigaud de la Fond (Ortí, 1896: 196), likely when attending the course of Natural History. Both agronomists were primary sources of Valcárcel's extensive *Agricultura general*, that would rest in the shelves of the Economic Society of Zamora. A letter from Tomás Iriarte still places Ramos in Paris on May 11, 1779 (Glendinning and Harrison, 1979).⁴⁵ Iriarte, who accused right and left of the envies he woke up, questioned Villarreal's poetry in vexed manners. This letter confirms that Ramos was mentor of Doña Maria Manuela:

When he wrote to Ramos, who had gone with the Dukes to Paris, and asked him to whom he would devote his poem, whether to King David or

⁴⁴ Coloma confirms that Ramos is our main character on p. 352 n. 1: "Enrique Ramos, Brigadier of the royal armies and captain of the Royal Guards of HM, Spanish infantry. He was also an academic of the language and wrote several works, rather military than literary, reaching large fame the one untitled Elements and First knowledge of the teaching and discipline of infantry".

⁴⁵ Corroborated by Salas (1887: 24n). The original is in BN: ms. 7922. The copy of 1784 is that we have reproduced here (p. 42) and can be found in BN: sig. MSS/10460. The letter was full published in an addendum by Ortí y Brull.

to Saint Cecilia, he said to him: "I ask your worship to deal with this question with my dear disciple that, being so versed in this genre of scholarship, will not fail to give an exit as good as it suits the success of such an important election". (Ortí, 1896: 190)

But the enlightened trip was cut short on June 21 because of the siege of Gibraltar. Ramos left Villahermosa and joined his Regiment, the First, during the massing of troops. Spanish ground forces were led by Martín Álvarez de Sotomayor and composed of two battalions of both Spanish and Walloon Guards, twelve cavalry squadrons and support artillery.

The confrontation came to a standstill from October to January 18, 1780, when Admiral Rodney broke the siege and resumed fighting. We know from his service record that Enrique Ramos was still in Campo de Gibraltar on March 31, 1780, during the second Spanish offensive against the fortifications, replacing the Second Battalion's Major Sergeant. He probably watched closely to his nephew Ignacio Vázquez Ramos, who also was assigned there to the Soria Regiment. Later service records state that Ramos only fought at the campaign's beginning. The "particular talent" he demonstrated in Gibraltar earned him the promotion to Captain in May 1780 and the definitive assignment to this formation of Fusiliers. It is unlikely that he coincided in the front with the squadron commander Cadalso, who died soon by shrapnel impact in the floating battery *San Martín* (February 27, 1782).

Far from the frontline in his garrison of Madrid, Ramos unleashed his playwright talent with *Pelayo* (1780), a second patriotic tragedy that tried to please Jovellanos. Perhaps he encouraged the appointment of his friends Guevara Vasconcelos and Villahermosa in the Spanish Royal Academy. On December 4, 1781 Ramos visited the Academy of History again. On January 3, 1782, he occupied the "Chair D" as full member of the Spanish Royal Academy. His economic works were well known by then; the first quote appeared in the edition undertaken by Valentín de Foronda of the *Recreación política* by Nicolás de Arriquíbar in 1779.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Part I, Letters I and X. In this last one he did not share with Desiderio Bueno the shortage of Spanish freights (1779: 210-212). Jesús Astigarraga and José Manuel Barrenechea (1987, p. 45) have already pointed out the influence of the *Reflexiones* on the Arriquíbar's advises on free wheat trade.

5. LAST ACT (1783-1797)

In addition to Enrique Ramos' physical weakening since February 1783, mentioned in the service records, other unexpected problems arose in the management of the family entailed estate. As early as 1781, he had requested from the Royal Treasury a report on his rights as perpetual councilor, aware that he could not personally supervise the account office. According to the file of "Incorporation into the Crown of the Accountant office [...] of Toro", his brother-in-law Miguel Antonio Vázquez de Aldana had been involved in "formal neglect in the use and exercise" of his tenure and had been substituted by Pedro López de Cañedo in the business. Ramos, then Captain, was in Barcelona when he signed on April 8, 1783 the notarial document that segregated the excise accountancy in charge of his brother-in-law and, been advised by the intendant of Toro, he sold the employment to Juan Antonio Marraco Huarte, the officer of accounting "*propios*" and "*arbitrios*", who took possession in that same year on August 31.

Ramos did not meet this time with the Duchess of Villahermosa, who left Madrid for Turin on June 3 (Coloma, 1895: 498). He does not appear among his entourage: this fact confirms that he was to remain garrisoned in Barcelona, probably detached with the Royal Guards in Montjuic, in a turn that these formations orderly made every six months. Maria Manuela's trip was halted in Susa, when sudden fevers put her at risk of death. Renouncing his duties as ambassador, the Duke of Villahermosa decided to return in search of medical attention to Montpellier. Madrid was far away, so they traced a route from there to Valencia, where Villahermosa had inherited a country farm:

He then went to his estates in Valencia, where he had just inherited a new entailed one because of the death of his aunt the Marquise of Mina [...]. The travelers took twenty-three days journeying from Montpellier to Valencia, staying two of them in Barcelona. (Coloma, 1895: 498)



They perhaps met with Ramos in the Catalan capital during the return trip. After arriving in Valencia, they settled in the farm in Catarroja during the whole September. The Duke's personal diary reveals that Manuela recovered and, in October, they were all back in Madrid:

October 14 — [...] I lunched at two o'clock with Ramos and Heredia.⁴⁷ At four o'clock I went to the Spanish Academy until six o'clock; then to Campomanes' home, to speak to him of the tutelage of the Count of Fuentes,⁴⁸ and of the royal faculty to sell tied goods; I went from there to the house of the Marquise, the widow of Fontanar,⁴⁹ where I stayed until about nine o'clock, when I returned home, and I spent with the Duchess and Don Juan Pacheco the rest of the night until ten o'clock, when I entered my room, did my devotions and went to bed. (Coloma, 1895, 0.512)

This note is revealing: Ramos was an intelligent consultant on rents; he possibly advised Villahermosa to ask to Campomanes. At that time, the Duke was to have fame as protector of economic writers. A sample of it is the dedication of the translation by Victorián de Villava of Genovesi's *Lezioni* (1784).

The *Memorial Literario* newly reviewed in March 1784 (pp. 71-73) the *Elementos [...] de la Infantería* de 1776. *Elementos de Geometría* (1786) and *Instrucción para los alumnos de Artillería* (1787), published in the years prior to his promotion to Brigadier, let us suppose that Ramos hold a mentoring position in military academies since 1784. Both works, designed to teach building and defending fortifications, are the result of the experiences in Almeida and Gibraltar. He was appointed in September 1789 by "his great talent, study and application" in spite of being "a little broken in health". This employment places him second in command in the garrison of the Corps of Spanish Royal Guards at the Court (*Memorial Literario*, XLI, January: 132). The Grande from Zamora Don Carlos López Altamirano Ramos y Valmaseda was the only one to occupy a higher rank.

His identity as an economist was public and notorious by then. The multifaceted jurist Juan Sempere y Guarinos, who was promoted in the "*manteísta*" entourage of Floridablanca, unmasked the author behind the

⁴⁷ Heredia was appointed Minister of the War Council in this year.

⁴⁸ Luis Antonio Pignatelli de Aragón y Gonzaga, son of the later Don Joaquín.

⁴⁹ Brígida de Lalaing Calasanz y Abarca, relative to Aranda.



pseudonyms of Antonio Muñoz and Desiderio Bueno, but was not really careful with his review (1786).⁵⁰ Jovellanos, who undoubtedly noticed the errors in that biography, was ironic when claiming the “excellent as little known” *Discurso* (1789). In 1789 Francisco Javier Peñaranda also quoted “the Discourse on the Political Economy that was given by D. Antonio Muñoz, and has been later meant in new edition to be original of Captain D. Enrique Ramos”.⁵¹ No catalog collects such a second impression, but the review in the *Memorial Literario* on August of the same year, although it explicitly refers to the edition of 1769, points in the same direction. In fact, it is included in the journal’s “new books” section. Anyway, we have not located any physical evidence of a second edition of the *Discurso* and Peñaranda probably was confused with the contradictory information in the *Memorial*.⁵²

Villahermosa passed away at sixty on September 18, 1790 and also did Iriarte, just forty-one years old, exactly one year later. Ramos survived them. Advanced age and physical deterioration had to influence his retirement in October 18, 1792; and both prevented him from forming an active part of the operative initial command in the war against the Convention (1793-1795), at least until Aranda returned to power and required his last service. Then promoted to Field Marshal, Ramos was entrusted in October 9, 1794 the political and military interim government of Lérida.⁵³ Such a detachment is a further proof of his familiarity with Catalanian defensive forces and of the confidence that Aranda had placed in him. He barely held this post for a few months. Rico and Montero (1888) affirmed that he commanded a Regiment of royalist French troops. In the same sense, the 395/2-1847 manuscript of the Valencian Library locates him leading “a French Army

⁵⁰ Sempere misjudged the date of publication of the *Discurso de Economía Política*, attributed to 1779 (vol. IV: 134-135). That same date reappears in the entry on Adolphe Jérôme Blanqui’s *Discurso en la Historia de la economía política en Europa* translated by José Carasa in 1839 (p. 476); Blanqui was presumably based on Sempere, well-known in France.

⁵¹ (1789: 5). Italics added.

⁵² The catalographic history of the *Discurso* is chaotic and it would be risky to deny the existence of a second edition; we limit ourselves to exposing the available evidence. Higgs’s *Bibliography of Economics* (1751-1775) (1935: 264) offers two perplexing data. On one hand, it places the publishing date of a first edition in 1762, a fact that is put in question by the censorship procedure in 1769. This confusion seems to come from the reference to Antonio Muñoz in the 2nd edition of *Diccionario de Hacienda, con aplicación a España* by Jose Canga Argüelles (Madrid: Marcelino Calero, I, p. 374). It was surely an erratum, as it is verified in other Canga’s editions. On the other hand, Higgs also cited an alleged edition of 1779; he seems to have relied on Sempere’s information.

⁵³ Gay Escoda (1997: Appendix); Dedieu (1998: 495).

Corps [...] against the followers of the demagogic government”, although its anonymous author probably was also based on Rico and Montero. We cannot confirm it, despite the exhaustive analysis of the campaign by the Military Historical Service (1951). Back in Madrid, Ramos published his latest work, *El triunfo de la verdad: drama en prosa en cinco actos* (1796, in 8th), a text divided into twelve songs that we have been unable to locate, and which apparently dealt with “human weaknesses” and “the deficiencies of some civil institutions”. Sempere (1789: V, 233) hinted that this essay was already finished at least in 1789.

Its last known activity was in the Junta of Generals and Ministers of April 16, 1796 convened to reform the military constitution. After the War of Roussillon, Manuel Godoy opened a consultation on the advisability of maintaining a regular army or the Militia Corps. According to Andújar, “it was at the heart of the debate the possibility of combining militia and production, so that soldiers would be profitable for the Army but also and above all for industry, agriculture and public works” (2010: 349 and 361). The Junta should balance the defense needs with the urgency of costcutting. It consisted of four Captain Generals, fourteen Lieutenant Generals, two Field Marshals, four War Councilors and two secretaries.⁵⁴ It focused the discussion on a project about Army reforms developed by Marshal Enrique Ramos in 1791. It is an unpublished memoir on the history and the military constitution in Spain, whose predicted title was “*Re militari*” according to the manuscript. It went to be presented on June 10, 1796 to the Secretary of War Officer Gerónimo Cavallero, to forward it to the Junta. Ramos’s authorship was attested in a note on the cover by Don Félix Colón.⁵⁵ It seems stri-

⁵⁴ Captain Generals: Martín Álvarez de Sotomayor (Count of Colomera, who knew Ramos in Gibraltar), Pablo de Sangro y Merode (Prince of Castelfranco), José de Urrutia and Manuel Godoy. Lieutenant Generals: Francisco Sabatini, Vicente María de Vera de Aragón (Duque of La Roca), Manuel Moncada (Prince of Monforte), the Marquis of Las Amarillas Luis de las Casas, Pedro de Alcántara (Duque of Osuna), José de Ezpeleta, Antonio Barradas, Viscount of La Armería, Francisco Gragera, Juan Manuel Álvarez, Tomás de Morla, Juan Miguel de Vives and Gonzalo Ofarrill. Two Field Marshals: Benito Pardo Figueroa and Enrique Ramos. War Counselors: Francisco Saavedra, Antonio Jiménez Navarro and Jerónimo Enrique de Uztáriz y Tovar, Marquis of Uztáriz (intendants) and José Antonio Caballero (magistrate). Secretaries: José de Urbina and Félix Colón de Larreategui. The copy of the procedures is in the Fondo Saavedra of the Faculty of Theology of Granada, box 54. (Andújar, 1991).

⁵⁵ “This writing is from Field Marshal D. Enrique Ramos, as said by himself in the Junta of Generals and Ministers, where it was examined in Juny 10, 1796”. Eduardo Fernández San Román, who possessed the manuscript, published in *La Revista Militar* (1847: 9-16) a paper with no bibliography “Sobre la constitución militar del país”, where some fragments of the *Discurso* are recognizable about the conservation of the body politic. Cited in Barado, F. (1996: 470-471).

king that this long document does not contain but a few references to the Spanish economy. Ramos proposed the modernization of the different Armies before adopting the new system of troop recruitment by drawing back to the Prussian model, leaving artisans and farmers for nine months a year to attend to their tasks and thereby reduce spending. He also suggested the encouragement of horse breeding and its combined use in agriculture and militia. On June 8, two days before its reading, the work of the Junta was annulled by Royal Order and the manuscript was forgotten in San Román Library. It has only been cataloged correctly in recent times.

Very weakened, Enrique Ramos tested in favor of his oldest nephew, then Colonel Antonio Vázquez de Aldana y Ramos, and declared him universal heir. He aimed that Félix, the only son of Ana Ramos who resided in Toro, took over the possession of the excise accounting. The date of death is the last data in dispute. 1797 or 1801? We argued that it was in 1797, according to the *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada Europeo-Americana* (Cervera, 2003).⁵⁶ The arguments then presented are added to others. According to Monlau y Roca, “D. Enrique Ramos [...] died on January 31, 1797” (1863, vol. 3: 123). Cotarelo reproduced this information (2006: 119). The director of the Academy announced Enrique Ramos’ death in Madrid in a meeting in that same day, according to RAE’s *Book of Acts* number 17. The death had to ensue some days earlier. The claim of the nephew Antonio Vázquez in that same year to plead in the Royal Council of Finance against Juan Antonio Marraco to recover the accounting duty is the definitive proof. If his uncle were alive, what was his right to do so?

Now we can accurately date the article “Ramos” that Sempere y Guarnos presented in the Real Academy of History, which we assumed he wrote around 1796 (n.d. [1797]). It was an obituary. Of course, this “*golilla*” from Alicante brought back the veiled criticism from Jovellanos to his dis-regards in the *Ensayo de una Biblioteca española* ten years ago. He did not hesitate to point at Enrique Ramos for overvaluing nobility, more occupied in family interests than in their own mother country. He added several punctilious corrections to the *Discurso sobre economía política*, namely that meetings in Marquis of Poza’s house took place during the reign of Philip II (p. 357) and that Ramos confused Menchaca with Moncada. Nevertheless,

⁵⁶ (1923) Espasa-Calpe, vol. 49, p. 581.

Sempere subscribed to his tax proposals and especially to his treatment of contraband, by debtor of which Campomanes exposed in 1762. It seems clear that Ramos was respected, but he was not well received among the entourage of Don Jose Moñino.

The proceedings on the inheritance of Antonio Vázquez Aldana are discursive and very technical. After Enrique Ramos' death, Marraco tried to cling to the position as main accountant of "*propios*" and "*arbitrios*" in the province of Toro; and according to alleged on September 1, 1797, he also pursued to add to his privileges the excise accounting that Félix Vázquez received with procedural vices. On September 27 he requested Félix's resignation and begged the Royal Treasury to unlink his accounting duty and to incorporate it to the Crown, hoping to recover it by joining together in the same office. On October 11, Antonio Vázquez delegated to Clemente de Campos y Echeverría, a business agent of the Royal Councils, to take up his case. Antonio Basilio and Manuel María Gutiérrez, claimants of Juan Zapata's legacy and partners of the excise accounting, were involved in the trial. It was necessary to wait until 1800 for Antonio Vázquez to document that his title was qualified to perpetually maintain the property rights of inheritance, to recover his half part of the trade, to remove Marraco and to ratify his brother Félix in charge of accounting the royal rents in the province of Toro.

6. THE ECONOMIC THOUGHT OF ENRIQUE RAMOS

6.1. THE ECONOMY OF A BODY POLITIC

Enrique Ramos announced in the preface to the *Discurso* of 1769 his intention “to find the principles of the alteration of our economic system” (p. 197). Such principles emanate from political economy, a term coined in 1615 by Antoine de Montchrestien to designate the branch of natural moral philosophy that deals with understanding exchanges in the field of the law of nations and, therefore, in their relations with production, value and distribution. The military man from Toro had already specified in the *Reflexiones sobre el comercio de trigo* that:

“Matter [...] can be considered in two ways, particularly as trade or universally as the main part of politics. As trade, its only object will be interest; policy aims to increase the number, comfort and wealth of the individuals in a State”.

Ramos was aware of the distinction between commerce understood as an exchange in its scholastic sense, related to chrematistics from ethical considerations, and the science of commerce that is embedded in the sphere of politics, as “commerce in general” (p. 297 and 308), in the expression spread in Europe by Richard Cantillon. Political economy, when seen as the science of government, aims at public happiness, which subordinates legitimate self-interest to the greatness of the body politic. It is based on historical experience and includes the “theory of commerce” (p. 298) and the “police” for population (p. 206). This definition seems to follow literally Bernardo Ward’s *Proyecto económico* (1982 [1762]: 282), according to which commerce and police were grouped in the same science for managing “the economic system” to obtain “public happiness”. The theory, in obvious reference to Uztáriz’s text (1724), describes “the proportions that has the most prudent regulation of contingencies for commerce, and finally, the current

exchange prices and these of all other goods that could be purchased or sold in each country” (p. 298). It must “combine private and public interests” (p.299), concealing those of the merchants and of the sovereign. For its part, police is “the providence that maintains order in towns” (p. 224), acts against voluntary idleness from the institutions and, in a wider sense, ensures the supply for communities guaranteeing the transit of people and the traffic of goods.

The body politic is the subject of study in political economy. It represents the union of families that share territory and laws for a reciprocal interest. Following Montesquieu (1748: chaps. I.4 and II.1-3), sovereignty is the “soul” of the body politic: powers of legislating and governing are its duty.⁵⁷ It can reside in a single individual —monarchy or despotism, where force replaces reciprocity—, in a privileged class —aristocracy—, in citizens —democracy— or in a combination of them —the mixed government. Ramos emphasized both in the *Discurso* and in *Elogio*, note V (1765: 89-90) that inherited nobility privileges were connatural to monarchy. In addition, such dispensations are not bought with riches: “Nobles, not expecting to be distinguished by lavish lifestyle [...], served the State, not only without wages but at their own expense” (p. 245). Montesquieu also placed honor as a substitute for political virtue in monarchies.⁵⁸ However, he also assumed that inherited nobility corrupts: its power becomes arbitrary and transforms the government system into oligarchy; “*L’extrême corruption est lorsque les nobles deviennent héréditaires*” (1748: VIII, 5). Ramos defended a less tempered position: he valued nobility’s contribution to the stability of the body politic, and openly acknowledged the legitimacy of its hereditary nature when serving the Crown. He only warned about purchasing titles for ennoblement. Such a caution may perhaps surprise when took by a hidalgo: but from this perspective, common among military courtiers, honor in arms — even more for Royal Guards— deserved to be rewarded with the greatest distinction. The new Bourbon military man is not just a soldier, even less a mercenary. Although the notion of nationalism is not yet established, enlightened servicemen embody patriotism and identify with *Guzmanes* and *Pelayos*; and they do not only serve the sovereign in wars but also in civil life, shaping the identity of the body politic and guiding its progress. The scien-

⁵⁷ As there are many Spanish editions of *De l’esprit des lois* and for readers’ convenience, we will quote respectively each book and chapter in Roman and in Arabic numerals.

⁵⁸ “L’honneur, c’est-à-dire le préjugé de chaque personne et chaque condition, prend la place de la vertu politique [...]; il peut, joint à la force des lois, conduire au bout du gouvernement, comme la vertu même” (*De l’esprit des Lois*, 1748: III, 6).

tific knowledge imparted in their academies is much superior to those that are taught in universities. They cultivate refinement and sociability; and their literary and humanistic training—in languages, in geography, even in political economy— compete well with these of the most educated nobility. Moreover, whilst high ranks remain reserved in practice for deeprooted nobility, excellence is rewarded with promotions and social recognition. The vindication of inherited nobility prerogatives acquired in the time of Hapsburg House monarchs was already present in Campomanes' *Bosquejo de política económica española* (1750) and became distinctive of the “Aragonese party”, with a wide representation of the military elite. Nevertheless, as evinces the obituary written by Sempere, this claim was not shared at all by Floridablanca's civilian entourage. That second thesis, in defense of renewing meritocratic nobility in each generation, would finally impose itself in the late Enlightenment, with Jovellanos as its prominent advocate.⁵⁹

Ramos' stance in this matter requires further clarification. The “Aragonese party” was properly that of the noble House of Aragon, whose title belonged to the Pignatelli family, also heirs of the honor of princes of the Holy Empire. After the demises of Don Joaquín and of his son José María, both titles belonged to the Duke of Villahermosa, married to María Manuela. The current identification of the “Aragonese party” with a territory, a historical and political entity or a Society of Friends of the Country lends to confusion, although Aranda was from Huesca and the founder of the Aragonese Society, or even if the ancient Crown of Aragon was aligned with Archduke Charles in the War of the Spanish Succession. It is correct to link this party with Aranda's supporters and protégés, but cautiously: Don Pedro Abarca became its incontestable political reference between 1763 and 1773, but he was not the household head of the Pignatelli de Aragon family. Those who legitimately embodied the Aragonese party's aspirations were Joaquín Pignatelli and, since 1776, Juan Pablo de Aragón-Azlor. The decease of the latter in 1790 should be added to the causes usually attributed to the return of elderly Aranda to active politics, and also to Ramos' late public appearance in the high command of the Army.

It is well known that the expression “Aragonese party”, used widespread since Rafael Olaechea's publications, was coined in 19th century

⁵⁹ “Estorbos políticos, ó derivados de la legislación” in *Informe de Ley Agraria* (Jovellanos: 1795, ch. 6.2), “La amortización civil-Mayorazgos”, paragraphs 185-222. He questions hereditary perpetuation of entailed estates.

(Coxe, 1813). During the times of Charles III, it was called “the military party” or “the tie party”, referring to the distinctive garment of Royal Guards officers. In other terms, membership among military courtiers was characteristic on these supporters, though not exclusive. Such denominations portrayed with a pinch of irony to the low military nobility of Pignatelli’s and Aranda’s entourage —Ramos is the paradigm— as opposed to the stales and oldest aristocracy of the “traditional party” and to the plebeian “*golillas*” servicemen of the “civil party”.⁶⁰ This does not conflict with the fact that other groups subscribed to the ideology of Prince of Aragon’s supporters, particularly industrial and merchant noblemen (Lluch, 1995). From this perspective, it is easy to understand Enrique Ramos’ defense of hereditary distinctions of the military nobility and his insistence on the primacy of honor over any stipend. During the reigns of Philip V and Ferdinand VI, powerful ministers such as Patiño or Ensenada protected the privileges of the Army and the Navy. Half a century after the dynastic war, “tie-wearers” fully obeyed the Bourbon monarchy —they were not strictly “austracist”— but never sympathized with an imported political-administrative organization chart where military high officers were removed from decision-making positions. On the contrary, they claimed the restitution of a cameralist and class-structured “consensual monarchy” inspired by these of the House of Hapsburg, which preserved the *Cortes* and the historical charters, and which constrained the sovereign’s power exerted in the body politic through a militarized council. This was precisely the model of state that Aranda, a soldier with more vocation than combat experience, would suggest to Infant Charles from the embassy in Paris, or that the Marquis of Manca later claimed to Floridablanca —although both failed in their demands.

If the body politic is an analogy of the human one, it is conceivable that its goals are preservation and independence.⁶¹ To achieve them requires

⁶⁰ Historian Francisco Sánchez-Blanco has described in detail the military life in the 18th century (2007). However, I do not share his opinion regarding the entity of the military party: “with some imprecision, the team of characters or the party around the Count of Aranda has been described as ‘military’” (2007: 178), a group that he also calls the “arandista party” (2007: 127). Aranda’s economic ideologist was Ramos, a military man wearing the characteristic tie of the Royal Guards: the qualifier is very precise. On the other hand, the term “military” must be contrasted with that of “civilian” in order to acquire its full meaning, in the same way that the tie and the traditional “gola” —a cartwheel collar— symbolize antithetical political positions. In addition, for the reasons stated, it would only be admissible to speak of an “arandista party” after Villahermosa’s decease in the 1790s.

⁶¹ This analogy is reinforced in a passage of the *Elogio* that is not reproduced in this edition, where Ramos noted that money in State is “like blood in the body, which keeps communication alive between its parts” (1765, p. 69).

increasing its strength and opulence, both dependent on population size. The latter term is the same applied by Uztáriz to define a continuous increase in national wealth and was common in French literature in the 1750s and 1760s, particularly in Gabriel-Marie Butel-Dumont's and Pierre Samuel Dupont de Nemours' works. "*Opulence*" does neither belong to the discursive framework of Physiocracy nor of Gournay's circle. However, it is unusual to find this expression in English economic literature until the following decade, after Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was published (1776). Ramos presented a biased view of Spanish depopulation, contrary to the current evidence in economic history but common in that time. He denied the arbitrist plots about wars since the Reconquest and migrations, and attributed the demographic crisis to economic causes: food byproduction, demand for foreign luxury goods and special contributions. His reasoning seems to be a free version of Uztáriz's *Teórica* chapter XII (1724: 29-32), conditioned by Herbert's and Plumard de Dangeul's points of view on the consequences of sumptuary consumption.⁶² Population has a natural limit on the availability of livelihoods, represented in monetary form to circulate into the body politic: "I assume that subsistence is what matters to each vassal for eating, dressing, attending festivities, paying tithes, gabelles and tributes, all expressed in money" (p. 213).

6.2. MONEY, VALUES AND PRICES

Public happiness depends on opulence, which is the abundance of "the products of nature and industry" and of its signs. Subsistence is "the measure of population" and money is "the sign of subsistence" (p. 258). Enrique Ramos considered a serious mistake to "confuse money for true wealth" (p. 230). The Aristotelian identification of wealth with accumulation of precious metals was already discussed by the last Italian humanists, questioned by Montchrestien and dispelled by Thomas Mun in 17th century. Both political arithmetic and British protoliberals who inspired Gournay's group shared the conviction that money is a necessary convention for

⁶² On the other hand, it is much more elaborate than that of Montesquieu, who only came to establish the relationship between population, the nature of land and the requirements for cultivation (XXIII.14). He also affirmed that the most populated nations were those that combine cultivation while improving the arts, although an explanation about this matter "would lead to proportions that would require many details" (1748: XVII, 10).

exchanges between people and among nations; it is the “common measure of all appreciable things” (p. 298). But from the perspective of liberal mercantilism, real wealth lay in the accumulation of productive labor; however, there were many nuances when defining which activities were considered productive and which were not (Perrotta, 1976 and 1988). Ramos’ rejection of bullionism and his identification of opulence with creating useful occupations places him in the latter category, as a representative of the late mercantile system in the simplifying Smithian classification (1776, IV). He already pointed out in *Reflexiones* and in *Elogio*, note II that this false belief was at the origin of Spanish decadence: “The disproportion that this prodigious and sudden inflow of metals from America resulted between goods and their signs; the error of believing that money alone could make a state opulent and powerful to its sovereign, was the visible cause of the universal upheaval in the government system, and policy did not fit the smallest part to it” (p. 209). The 17th century crisis should not be imputable to wrong economic policies, but to the ignorance of the laws of political economy. He insisted in this subject in the *Discurso*’s preface, when he pointed out that the Revolution of Prices and the Hapsburg debt crisis were caused by the disproportion between signs and goods, resulting from “the free circulation of money, which its increasing mass and speed raised all prices” (p. 199).

Variations in money supply and in circulation speed thus affect the terms of trade. Alterations in the economic system derive from the disproportion between production and its monetary representation or, as will be explained below, from an excessive price margin on the cost of goods. While productive labour in agriculture, arts, commerce or navigation increase, the ratio between production and circulating capital is conserved. But if signs grow more than the goods they represent, inflation makes national goods more expensive than foreign ones, reduces domestic consumption and worsens the results of the trade balance.

The *Discurso* examines three possible reasons for disproportion: the entry of precious metals from mining, debt issues and excess demand. The first cause became a commonplace in economic literature since 17th century: Antonio Serra, Montesquieu and especially Cantillon developed it to explain the financial failure of Spanish Hapsburg Kings; and the latter comments on it were very particularly influential in French Enlightenment. Ramos relied on the Baron de la Brède (1748: XXI, 22), stating that “A state in which the increase of metals comes exclusively from the product of mines will not be opu-

lent, even though many individuals would become rich, unless the increase in signs of true wealth, widespread into the State, promotes agriculture, the navy, the arts, and commerce” (p. 235). If the nation lacks other productive activities, silver and gold will only enter the circulation as signs and will go abroad in exchange for foreign productions. Ramos grasped the essence of this idea but went so far as to describe, with Cantillon’s accuracy (1755, part II), the differential impact of a monetary expansion on the structure of prices, not to notice the changes in temporal distribution and in social sharing of profits and losses derived from inflation. The author understood on the other hand that, historically, debt issues had the same detrimental effect as entries of precious metals. However, he noted that exchange bills and bank notes enabled commercial credit by multiplying the number of signs in a way that matched the increase in productive activities. Albeit his argumentation was weak in this last matter, by obviating the relationship between issues of paper currency and trade bills with the circulation of money.

The third cause of disproportion is excess demand. Ramos presented a plain theory of value, in a similar language to that used by Gournay’s group. Agricultural goods have an “intrinsic value” or production cost determined by land fertility and by the subsistence of the farmer—a tenant—“which includes what he pays and spends on labour and composts” (p. 283). In technical terms, such intrinsic value would be expressed as the sum of a natural territorial rent—or monopoly rent—the subsistence wage fund and the advanced mass of circulating capitals.⁶³ On the other hand, the extrinsic value of subsistence—their market price—“comes from naturally or artificially existing more buyers than sellers; or more desires than goods” (p. 283). It increases “when there are more individuals that need them than that sold them” (p. 255): that is, it depends on excess demand or supply shortfalls. Ramos had not understood “just price” in an ethical sense, as agreed without intermediaries between the producer and the consumer for necessary chrematistics. His occasional use of this expression should not be interpreted as a scholastic reminiscence, but rather as an unfortunate translation. He got this in a political sense that reminds too much of Véron de Forbonnais’ “*bon prix*”, as a moderate price that minimizes the difference between extrinsic and intrinsic values—the “disproportion”—seeking “to increase first-hand sellers [to] be more things than desires” (p. 284), enhancing

⁶³ The classical concept of “differential rent” by Smith (1776: lib. I cap. XI) and Anderson (1777) did not yet exist. However, the reader would have recognized in this intuitive definition of the intrinsic value some parallels with the future Scottish theory of value based on the production costs.

supply and containing costs. Campomanes also interpreted just price in the *Respuesta Fiscal* in that same sense (1764).⁶⁴

Barter is the sole exchange made by comparing intrinsic values. In an advanced stage of civilization, “commerce, considered in its speculation, is the knowledge of the relationship between salable goods and necessities; and of the proportions between the representative value of metals and the intrinsic value of goods” (p. 298). Trade is no longer a mere swap and merchants pursue legitimate gains through sales.

Like any other commodity, money has different intrinsic and extrinsic values. The first depends on weight and law, and is expressed in coinage; the second one, on metals’ relative abundance and alternative uses. Intrinsic value is the reference for domestic exchanges and extrinsic value serves for foreign trade. Ramos expressly rejected the scholastic hypothesis of money sterility and defended the legitimacy of recovering an interest rate for commerce loans. In line with his British and French counterparts, the question was whether interest rates should be allowed to rise or, on the contrary, to intervene. Current readers will find it hard to share Ramos’s logic, which assumed a trade-off between interests and prices. We know since Wicksell’s times that this relationship is not intuitive at all. At first, it was understood that a high award would stimulate national lenders and attract foreigners; borrowing traders would bring that money into circulation and the price level would increase. But ultimately, the growing money supply would reduce lending. Thus, it was a common view that interests and prices were compensated. Nevertheless, Ramos doubted the extent to which domestic prices would vary with respect to interest rates and, therefore, how the former would affect foreign trade. He concluded that a high rate of benefits should not be the “general rule” (p. 303), although a too low one would discourage lenders and deprive industry and commerce of credit. Law should prevent usury, but it should first consider “the legitimate trade gains and the contingencies to collect loans” (p. 305). Both competition between lenders and a wider presence of private banks in business would assure a moderate interest rate without intervening.

⁶⁴ pp. 18, 44, 48, 52 and especially 81.

6.3. PRODUCTIVE AND UNPRODUCTIVE LABOUR

Population is useful when it helps to increase wealth. “States —noted Ramos— cannot achieve opulence except through goods; that is, men employed in useful jobs, who increase the sum of products and give them all value that could be added by industry” (p. 231). Productive or useful labour multiplies subsistence and therefore population. This category includes those of tenant farmers, craftsmen, sailors and merchants. It is understandable from this perspective that, when discussing law and justice, Ramos claimed the repute of merchant activity and that of “mechanical professions”, that add value to primary productions. There is no need to emphasize the differences with productive labour’s physiocratic meaning, reserved exclusively to “*fermiers*”. Quesnay’s followers considered sterile jobs in manufacturing and commerce simply to transform or exchange previously created values in agriculture.

According to Ramos, unproductive or sterile labour is the necessary one for functioning the State; civil servants and liberal professionals only imply a lesser evil to be assumed by the economic system. It is different from idleness, which does prevent growth. There are three categories of idlers: the involuntary ones —who cannot work and require not only Christian charity but also the care of the State— the volunteers or “badly entertained” ones —who must be redirected to useful occupations— and domestic service, fostered by pernicious “luxury of opinion”. Charity managed by patronage, pious works and foster care helps to defuse involuntary idleness; but it does not always satisfy the objectives of politics because they depend on private interests. Some orderly police —in its cameral sense— would redirect charity to hospitals and hospices, institutions usually run by local authorities. The latter not only offer a productive occupation to those who would otherwise remain inactive because of their physical condition or social consideration; they could also employ beggars and prisoners, more useful in these houses, factories and public works than wandering on roads or crowding prisons.

Culture plays a dual role for Ramos: it ties the body politic and reinforces productive labour. Values that ensure coexistence are learned in family, while the responsibility of training in useful occupations falls to

schools and colleges. Specialization is cultivated in universities. They were created when mathematics had hardly developed, and experimental physics was unknown, and require urgent reforms. Chairs should be provided to teach “medicine, agriculture, navigation, arts and even commerce” (p. 221). The government should protect educational institutions and promote the prestige and endowment of academies, especially these of agriculture, like those created in Europe to spread the new agronomic method.

6.4. THE FORMATION OF WEALTH

Agriculture is placed in the *Reflexiones* as the “fundamental basis of happiness” in a State (p. 157). Physiocrats were right about its importance, but their scheme could only be understood and applied as a whole. Ramos detailed his argumentation in the *Discurso*. Agriculture provides subsistence and raw materials for all activities; the other sectors depend on it, although this does not mean that it is the exclusive source of value. Agriculture occupies the most productive labour; it is “the foundation of the building”, “the only solid means of making a state opulent” (p. 248). Its surplus increases landowners’ rents, invigorates consumption by “the desire of commodities” (p. 248) and feeds to a growing population dedicated to industry and arts, commerce and navigation.

Many land plots were underused due to inadequate plantations or to practices corrupted by tradition. As we advanced, Ramos was a fervent supporter of adopting in Spain the “modern method” of New Agriculture to British example. Not surprisingly, he recommended to his brother José Celedonio to acquire the first volumes of José Antonio Valcárcel’s *Agricultura General*. Moreover, this Castilian writer, censor of Jesuit Houses’ archives in Valencia and Torrente, tried repeatedly to approach the entourage of Aranda; he corresponded with him and even dedicated him the *Instrucción sobre el cultivo del arroz al modo de otros granos* (1768). Valcárcel maintained an intense contact with the most advanced Agricultural Societies of the time (Cervera, 2003: 159-193).

Modern agronomy, key of the first Agrarian Revolution, was based on three axes. First of them was technical innovation, adapting the Norfolk method to different latitudes and climates: it proposed alternative crop rotations, new fertilizers, tree care and selecting draught animals and livestock

species. The second axe consisted on improving soils and exploiting wastelands through fiscal incentives to promote artificial grasslands, desiccations and clearing. Finally, it was grounded on institutional transformations to stimulate the sense of ownership and increase the productivity of agricultural labour. Enclosure Acts played in Britain a crucial role by allowing the fencing of leased plots: “Each individual was able to freely hedge his land field and made it more of his own” (p. 254). Ramos understood that small agrarian proprietors could also find advantages to enclose holdings if their transmission was authorized undivided and if *Mesta* stockbreeder privileges were shortened. By the other side, care for unrelated property would be enhanced by lease contracts with longer duration, favoring a “subaltern”, “continuous and privative” property by assigning the domain of use for extended terms (p. 284).

State control of low interest rates would also encourage capital accumulation in agriculture versus other more profitable investments. This idea was firmly defended by Charles Davenant and Josiah Child, whose essay was later translated into French by Vincent de Gournay. Finally, the sense of ownership would be assured in the long run by granting tenant’s freedom of cultivation: “Experience has shown that laws in this matter are useless” (p. 275). Regulations must be limited to encouraging the most suitable crops to each climate and allowing free surplus exchange between territories: “It is for the government to provide taxes and exemptions, so land plots would be applied more in accordance with the State general utility” (p. 276).

In industrial matters, Ramos sharply rejected Colbertism. Opulence would not be achieved with a favorable trade balance based on regulating royal manufactures and subsidizing luxury goods exports. In the *Discurso*, he considered industry and arts productive only when they produced necessary goods with domestic raw materials. Such activities should be encouraged only in affluent agricultural nations, in which there was a surplus of cultivators. The author appealed to the authority of Jean-François Melon (*Essai politique sur le commerce*, 1734, ch. IX), admired by Voltaire and expressly quoted in *Elogio*, note X, to discuss the productive nature of luxury industries. He observed that past comforts become present needs and deserve a similar treatment: domestic manufacturers must achieve quality at a moderate price to supply domestic consumption without being displaced by foreigners. Consistent with economic writers of his generation such as Antonio Capmany or Romá y Rosell, he only suggested timid guild reforms to ensure these goals.

Labour in factories is productive when it transforms national inputs into necessary textile goods —wool, linen and hemp— and commodities —silk and American cotton. Such productions are “factual luxury” and must be boosted with a single caution: prioritizing them would reduce agriculture labour and make subsistence more expensive. On the contrary, consumption of “luxury of opinion” always harms the body politic. It is the one favored by enriched plebeians who, imitating the style of noblemen, choose foreign fabrics because of their exoticism. This consumption encourages a zero-sum game where competitors earn whatever is lost by the State.

Parallels between the *Discurso* and *De l'Esprit des Lois* regarding luxury are recurrent. Montesquieu pointed out that exchange “makes superfluous things useful, and useful things necessary” (1748: XX, 23). Indeed, he defined factual luxury as “a solid one founded not on the refinement of vanity, but on that of true necessities” (XIX, 27) needed to preserve monarchy: it feeds commerce, maintains labour and industry, increases money circulation among social classes (VII, 3-7) and perfects the arts (XXI, 6). On the contrary, “luxury of vanity” corrupts customs (VII, 2-3).

Trade and navigation also create wealth. Ramos' arguments were based in this matter on national sources —Zavala and Uztáriz—, on the authority of Forbonnais, Herbert and Plumard, and indirectly on Tucker. In line with Aranda's and Ramón Pignatelli's projects to improve the domestic market, Ramos was unequivocal while defending internal free customs trade and the planning of new roads and canals. Nuances arise when addressing the thorny question of foreign trade, and particularly that of grain commerce. This can be direct —exports and imports— or indirect —re-exports or “saving trade”—; active or passive, as done by country nationals or foreigners. Navigation complements trade, generates productive labour and strengthens State power.

Only active foreign trade is productive when exporting surpluses of manufactured goods or agricultural commodities. Competition among money changers, access to insurance and bank credit make it easier. Trusting on growth to re-export —as Dutch government did— is not a reliable bet because its results depend on the freight costs, on the interest rate and on the uncertain formation of leftovers abroad. Ramos merely advised an active saving trade with America. In turn, wheat imports were a “necessary evil”, only admissible in years of extraordinary scarcity. The most damaging

imports are these of foreign goods, which only enrich competing manufactures.

Ramos resumed his conclusions of 1764 regarding grain trade in the “Summary to the chapter on opulence”. Food self-sufficiency is State’s primary objective. Subsistence production is stimulated by domestic consumption and by freely placing wheat surplus in markets where its domestic price is higher than in Spain. Details about British grain policy were set out in *Reflexiones* Chapter II, and it made little sense to reproduce them after the Free Trade Decree of 1765. Since 1660, the Navigation Acts enabled free extraction when the domestic price did not exceed to some extent. Since 1689, the British government established variable import tariffs to contain abundance and guarantee the profits of cultivators. Similarly, it established gratifications for grain exports in years of poor harvests to stimulate domestic production and contain famine.

Abeille extolled these measures but perverted their meaning to the extreme of suggesting the opposite system. According to this Physiocratic author, William III only authorized gratifications and taxations to attract landlords to his cause, but the success of his grain policy was due to the factual establishment of a free trade regime. Ramos dismantled this self-serving argument. Free exports did not expand English agricultural production between 1663 and 1689 due to the cultivation of less fertile fields and to the consequent increase in costs. It could not rival the cheapness of wheat, barley and rye on the European continent. Going forward in order to overcome this obstacle, English farmers improved the quality of their soils by paying more wages and accumulating capital; the result would still in higher prices during a period of transition. The success of this export policy lay in the adoption of New Agriculture. Hence is the strategic utility of the gratifications, “giving to the grains sold in foreign countries a price able to sustain concurrence” (p. 255). On the other hand, the Treasury recovered the advanced gratifications with contributions that fell on agrarian capital. Likewise, the variable import tariff prevented countries like Holland from buying cheaper wheat in other latitudes and placing it in English ports during these years of intense structural transformation.

It seems consistent that Enrique Ramos’ project to guide Spanish wheat policy was basically a proposal for sectoral modernization and market management. He based on Zavala’s authority to reject the grain tax, which

had been in force since 1699 (1732: 78-98). Campomanes appealed to the same source and similar arguments a month later, in *Respuesta Fiscal* (1764: 15 et seq.). The greatest risk to agriculture lay in the lowering of its production prices during the years of plenty, with the consequent loss of surpluses to the detriment of farmers —a situation called as “*non-valeur*” by French economists. In these cases, gratifications are useless: surplus will come out if its extraction is free. It would only be taken into consideration if domestic free trade and storage were authorized to encourage cultivating new land plots and adopting advanced techniques. It should be combined in such circumstances with reinforcing the Navy to take advantage of traffic trade. Perhaps authorizing free extraction would also require a tax to prevent shortage of domestic consumption in times of famine in Europe. On the other hand, preventing free imports is a dangerous policy to the risk of poor harvests. That is why, to avoid the prohibition, it would be essential to maintain a low intrinsic value of Spanish wheat, in order to dissuade systematic entries of foreign grains. In this sense, the adoption of New Agriculture in Spain is guessed essential.

6.5. THE FISCAL MODEL: DUTIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Enrique Ramos stressed in *Discurso's* preface the need for reviewing the principles of financing the Spanish Royal Treasury to start the recovery of its prolonged decline. The purpose of the inquiry's central chapters was to establish the nature, justice and amount of taxes for the State maintenance. An object that, incidentally, went unnoticed by its immediate critics: the extensive review in *Memorial Literario* of August 1789 obviated all details of this important part, limiting itself to enunciating the three main lines for the design of contributions.

Ramos' customs model suits with those suggested by British political arithmetic and liberal mercantilism. In broad lines and with some precautions, it pursues the trade surplus of a sub-balance of manufactured goods that exceeds the deficit of another sub-balance of foodstuffs and raw materials. The difference is an added value that generates productive labour in national industry and commerce, indirectly stimulating agriculture with a greater demand for subsistence.

Import duties should be tempered for those necessary goods of which the nation lacks; they imply a “pure rent” (p. 296) that the sovereign obtains to alleviate contributions. However, if the nation can produce them, these duties should be graduated to protect national factories, deter competition and discourage smuggling. Even so, their containment encourages innovation and avoids monopolies. High duties should only apply for manufactured imports qualified as “luxury of opinion”: “the State can forbid or overload entry duties to foreign commodities, so that they do not hinder the sale of national ones” (p. 241).

Foreign raw materials also should pay an import duty but their amount, once transformed in domestic factories, would have to be restored when exported. It is advisable to moderate export duties so that their final price would be competitive in foreign markets. The extraction of monopolized raw materials must be taxed with a very high duty.

Contributions are the other pillar of the tax system. They cover the maintenance of the Crown, security, State offices and, in general, all expenses intended to promote public happiness. Their amount is established for each province according to such expenses. They must fulfill three principles. Firstly, their amount must be the lowest and the result of fixed quota (259). Ramos denies that special contributions, such as those established at Hapsburg’s time, stimulate productivity: on the contrary, they reduce the ability to ensure subsistence. It is always better for the Royal Treasury to meet with debt an increase in spending if private banking is developed enough to lend to the Crown at a low interest rate. As showed the Catalan cadastre, some fixed quota incentives taxpayers to redouble efforts if they are certain to appropriate the fruits of labour.

Second, contributions “must be simple, to be the least” (p. 260). Following the author’s definition, a simple tax does not alter the proportion between goods and signs. Intendants were to gather information on the evolution of prices in each province, to identify variations on circulation, to calculate the amount of workers’ subsistence and to deduct the contribution quota. We understand that, regardless of the first principle, an increase in contributions resulting from the rising cost of subsistence should lower the quota: “the rate at which contributions can rise must result from the price of goods” (p. 265).

Finally, “it has to be proportionate to the circumstances of taxpayers and respective to the greatest good of the State” (p. 261). Fiscal systems with too many issues endanger the subsistence of less affluent citizens. Capitation duties, which ignore the latter situation, are particularly harmful; so are excises, levied on sales and discouraging industry. Also, the tax for “*millones*” has adverse consequences because of its cumbersome administration, like fees on necessary consumption goods and on salt. The circumstances of each taxpayer depend in essence on property and work. A tax on housing, alleviated for poor contributors, is practicable. However, complications grow when establishing taxes on farmlands and productive real estates. Ramos advised in this regard to tax the “net product” —the rent of agricultural activity— once deducted the capital advanced by the landowner for improvements, the expenses anticipated by the colonist and the subsistence (p. 260). Tenant benefits encourage productivity and must be exempted: “If the colonist, by his intelligence and activity, makes a higher product from the capital value of the land, all this increase, as it belongs to industriousness, should be free [of taxation]” (p. 264).

It is too easy to describe this last proposal as physiocratic: even more so, if interpreting capital and anticipated expenses as “*avances foncières*” and “annual advances”, and then failing to consider the monetization of calculations. However, the contribution on net product is not an “*impôt unique*” as designed by the *économistes*; it is complemented by other fiscal issues. Taxes on labour would be respective to each profession and minor in agriculture. Artisans and merchants would also become taxpayers, “but so that [...] they would not only retain a comfortable subsistence, but also the surplus [...] because of their risks and fatigues” (p. 266). Ramos finally advised to set a quota on foreign trade benefits and levies on cards and sealed paper, such the one established in Great Britain in 1765, after eliminating their State monopoly

7. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC IDEOLOGY OF THE MILITARY PARTY

Aranda sent in 1776 a letter to the director of the Aragonese Economic Society of Friends of the Country, finally inserted in its founding agreements. After a preamble and the exposition of the courses of action to overcome the obstacles of the regional economy, the leader of the military party wrote:

“Happiness in a Kingdom consists in greater population, and its increase depends on the abundance of fruits for its maintenance, and on many arts in which to employ the others that have to cultivate, consuming at the same time the crops, without whose offer workers would neither find reward for their sweat nor compensation of their expenses. [...] The real rule to enrich a Kingdom consists in attracting more money than leaves it with its productions and fabrics; and in employing preferably in industry the species provided in its soil, without appealing these foreigners more than indispensable; and without causing them to be extracted”. (Olaechea and Ferrer Benimeli, 1978: II, 150)

His views on the purpose of political economy and about the economic system’s populationist functioning were identical to those of Enrique Ramos. The biographical reconstruction leaves no room for ambiguity over the political position of the military from Toro and it also places him as the chief economist of the House of Aragon from 1773, when the Count of Campomanes distanced himself from Aranda, at least in appearance, to get closer to the rising “*manteístas*”. Apart from this, he no longer wrote economics, but he was who accompanied Villahermosa to relate to notable enlightened economists and even to visit Campomanes. His intimate bond with the Pignatelli family, the Duke and Heredia situates him in the hard core of the “tie party”. He was not a mere courtier officer; on the contrary, his career was closely linked to Aranda’s successes and misfortunes. His

rapid progression with the support of the Bazán after the war of Portugal was truncated in 1775, separated by O'Reilly of the Algiers expedition. During Floridablanca's government period, he was only promoted after being required in Gibraltar and even so was reassigned to another Regiment to be henceforth relegated to teaching in the barracks. After it, his dedication to theater and military literature does not mean that he ceased to be interested in political economy: his Parisian contacts could not influence his works by a chronological matters, but they speak for themselves of his intellectual inclinations. Perhaps, as we have hinted at, he stopped writing about economics because his ideas were no longer well received. Only at the end of his life, in his low hours, he was recovered by Aranda to attend the Catalan rearguard when war was lost. Ramos retained until death the confidence of its first protector.

Military party's identifying traits have been pointed out in past pages and it is not pertinent to recall them except in two respects. The first one is its association with the political strand of German cameralism or, more properly, with a "soft cameralism". Ernest Lluch (2000) showed that the idea of policy, the academic model and the State design of Germanic principalities subsisted in the Crown of Aragon because of its commitment to the Hapsburgs while the War of Spanish Succession. That is why it was tempting to assimilate Enrique Ramos, supposedly from Alicante, to cameralism; a historical and territorial criterion was largely defining "austracism" but, as mentioned earlier, does not accurately portray the Aragonese party. Ramos was an old Castilian, but his life was tied to the fate of the noble House of Aragon. This reflection makes necessary to conclude that political cameralism in Spanish Enlightenment was not restricted to a specific territory, but it remained associated with the branching entourage of the Pignatelli family, and particularly in a concrete Court group with extensive military representation. This does not contradict, for obvious reasons, the party of House of Aragon found greater support between the long established "austracist" nobility. Seen from this angle, it is understandable to find traces of political cameralism both in the *Elogio* and in Ramos' texts of applied science and military discipline; his admiration for the Prussian model is evident. It also explains the presence of Pedro Fernandez de Navarrete's *Conservación de las Monarquías*, dedicated to Philip III, among the lectures he recommended to the Economic Society of Zamora in 1778. In fact, it is the only title that seems out of place in the reading list at first sight. Enrique Ramos did not share with Navarrete the typically arbitrist arguments about depopula-

tion; still less his primitive bullionist definition of wealth; and their fiscal models only coincided in claiming simplicity. However, the Discourse XXX “On military awards” is a declaration of intentions on the role that the Army establishment would play in stabilizing sovereignty. It was certainly a fitting reading for a Society of such unusual features.

The second aspect has to do with economic cameralism. The *Discurso* of 1769 is not a cameralist dissertation, although some elements like tax and policy models present remarkable coincidences with those suggested in cameralist texts, particularly of Bielfeld. This is because “Germanic mecanilism” could only satisfy a part of Spanish economists’ demands. Lacking colonial markets, cameral writers barely meditated on how mines or foreign trade could fill Treasury’s coffers. They prioritized thinking on fiscal matters to simplify taxes and rationalize collection, on domestic market articulation, on finance, on how to redirect population for productive purposes and on settlement policies. We do not dare to state that Ramos was inspired in these matters by cameralist approaches that, on the other hand, he shared: any explicit citation points in this direction. In fiscal subjects specifically, Zavala’s influence is more perceptible than any other in the *Discurso*, as it would happen in Arriquíbar’s *Recreación política*. That is also the case for that of Moncada (1746 [1619]), whose reading recommended in the Society of Zamora, is recognizable in his cautions to prevent damages from excises and “millones”. The overlapping coincidence of Ramos’ contributory model with the cameralist one must be attributed to its assimilation by French authors of Gournay’s circle, and particularly by Véron de Forbonnais. These writers also dealt with two central questions in the Spanish economic debate of the first half of 1760s: the grain tax and the free trade of foreign supplies.

The most obvious influence on Ramos’ economic work is indeed that of the Gournay’s group. He confessed in the *Reflexiones* to basing his criticism on Physiocracy in Herbert and Plumard de Dangeul through, as it seems, Quintana’s partial translations of 1755. In addition, once rearranged his ideas on agriculture embodied in the texts of 1764 and 1769, it is easy to recognize the imprint of the first half of the encyclopedic article “Cultures des terres” by Forbonnais (1751), whose contents were included in *Éléments du commerce* (1754) translated by Lemaury in 1765 and in many passages of *Les finances de l’Espagne* (1755). As explained above, it is not risky either to suppose that Ramos read Butel-Dumont, whose *Historia de los*

establecimientos y comercio de las Colonias inglesas had been translated into Spanish in 1768. The proof that he continued to feel affinity for the group's ideology even in the late 1770s is his recommendation to the Society of Zamora of Marcoleta's version of *Intérêts des nations de l'Europe* by Accarias de Sérionne (1772-1774 [1766]).

As far as foreign trade is concerned, the reference to Uztáriz does not require any conjecture; the *Theórica* was the most successful work of the first half of the century in Spain. It was appreciated throughout Europe for the accuracy of its information on international trade laws. The one of Ulloa is equally justified, if we consider that it summarized the *Theórica* in its first part and that, in addition, it was translated by Plumard to French. The recommendation of reading Georges de Hennin is more striking: the almost unknown *Discurso que trata de los requisitos que deve haver en la economia de la monarquia Española* (1616) was surprisingly reprinted in 1767. This fact has to do with the attention of Campomanes (1762), for whom this Dutch politician "was a man who would have been another Colbert in Spain if he had had an able audience" (1775). Hennin proposed to Philip III the establishment of two Spanish general merchant companies to serve Baltic and Atlantic routes; nevertheless, Campomanes argued, explicitly following Accarias de Sérionne, that it could only be viable a company for Philippines. Ramos agreed with this conclusion and recognized, indirectly, to have also read the French author before it was translated by Marcoleta.⁶⁵ Why then to advise reading Hennin? The answer could lie in his cameralist proposal to repopulate Spanish wastelands with Catholic foreigners. Seen thus, it does not seem accidental that the reedition coincided with Pablo de Olavide's project in Sierra Morena.

The identification of the sources that inspired Enrique Ramos opens up several questions whose answers would need to go beyond the intentions of this preliminary study. The first concerns the debate on circulation of economic ideas in enlightened Spain; concretely the translation of the dispute between Physiocracy and Gournay's group to the national intellectual field. The Aragonese party not only played a leading role in its introduction: it monopolized it, at least in first instance, and adopted a position clearly in

⁶⁵ "I do not open a single book that deals with commerce in which I do not find that companies, even non-exclusive ones, are not only harmful in such cases..." (p. 175). In 1769 he had read more than one author who shared the opinion of Campomanes.

favor of the latter. Moreover, the order and the selection of the main economic publications —not only translations— during the decade that stretches from the end of the Seven Years' War to 1773 seems to respond to a preset and meditated plan to redefine and publicize the Post-war policy on a similar trend to that undertaken in the neighboring country between 1753 and 1758, although obviously more modest.⁶⁶ In order to explain this assertion without going into detail, we must first understand the Aragonese party as the branching environment of the Pignatelli, Villahermosa and Aranda, whose think tank was selected from the military court and the Basque “merchant and industrial nobility” based in Madrid. The other support of the party, as pointed out by Lluch, will come from trading and manufacturing bourgeoisies of territories historically linked to the House of Aragon —Catalonia, Aragon and to a lesser extent Valencia— generally related to the Commerce Juntas.

The economic ideas of Boisguilbert, Cantillon and Hume, inspirers of Gournay's group, circulated only in texts of Villarreal, Craywinkel and Simón Aragorri since mid-1750s (Astigarraga and Zabalza, 2011 and 2014). Nevertheless, the seed of this operation of “importing ideas” for the purpose of adopting them in economic policy is found in Bernardo Ward's and young Campomanes' works of the period 1750-1762, as well as in the early translations of Francisco de la Quintana. There is a notable discursive unity between the two groups of authors regarding the measures to be taken to liberalize domestic wheat trade, an issue that was urgent to address after the reform of the municipal system of seed storage of 1753. It is also the case of the American trade, which would need to be restored once the war ended. Since 1763 Campomanes had Aranda —still in the General Captaincy of the Kingdom of Valencia— and with the most than probable collaboration of Juan de Iriarte in the Secretary of State to organize a team of translators and publicists. Anglophobic reluctance after the Spanish defeat should be overcome: the English translations undertaken by the Gournay group were suitable to convey the successful economic ideas of political arithmetic and liberal mercantilism in Spain. Aranda chose this team in his military entourage, which expanded upon moving to the Court after the mutiny of Esquilache. To this estate belonged Enrique Ramos, Carlos Lemaur, Domingo de Marcoleta, Tomás Anzano and Pablo de Olavide, who had

⁶⁶ During this period, about forty original or translated works were published by Gournay's circle.

known Campomanes since 1762. Marcoleta also belonged to the Basque and Navarre merchant colony in Madrid, as Arriquíbar (Astigarraga, 2011), and no doubt there were to deal with Iriarte in the Secretariat of Interpretation of Languages. All but Ramos were linked to the Army's Accountancies or Intendance, under the direct command of the Aragonese hero. The serviceman from Toro was the one who would integrate into his inner circle.

In 1763 Nipho's "Introduction to the *Ami des Hommes*" and Thomas' version of *Éloge de Sully* were published. It would be of great interest to ascertain the authorship of this translation. Ramos' *Reflexiones* and Trigueros' *Dissertacion sobre el cultivo de trigo* were released in August 1764. Campomanes published the *Respuesta Fiscal* in September; prudently, he only quoted Spanish sources. For his part, Arriquíbar began in the same year the critical study of the *Ami des Hommes* and started corresponding Ramos. The *Discurso sobre economía política* and the *Recreación política* were drafted at the same time, although the latter text was delayed more than anticipated. It seems to have been completed in 1771, when Foronda prepared Forbonnais-Davenant's translation of the "Treaty of Political Arithmetic" to include it in the edition. Coincidences between both inquiries can only be the result of an interaction more intense than the one witnessed by the writer from Bilbao—for example, in the definition of productive work or about luxury— and of the use of common sources.

In 1765, during the crisis of subsistence, Aranda assumed the presidency of the Council of Castile; Roda became general superintendent of Grain Storage and the publicist operation was accelerated with the approval of the Pragmatic of free trade. Herbert's *Discurso sobre el gobierno de granos* and Forbonnais' *Elementos del comercio* were translated by Joseph López and Carlos Lemaur. Simultaneously, Valcárcel began writing his immense *Agricultura General*. After it, there will appear the first translations of Duhamel and Dupuy, suggesting a parallel program on the viability of New Agronomy in Spain. Casimiro Gómez Ortega, parishioner of the Fonda, would star in this procedure.

In 1767-1768 Domingo de la Torre undertook the translation of Bielfeld's *Instituciones Políticas*, Olavide published his Informe and Anzano devoted to Aranda the *Reflexiones económico-políticas*: note the similarity of the title to that of the *Discurso*, edited the following year. This Secretary of

Intendancy of the Army and Kingdom of Aragon based much of his arguments in Ramos' *Reflexiones* (Usoz, 2008). Between 1770 and 1774 there will appear translations of Butel-Dumont, Plumard, Accarias, the converted physiocrat Ange Goudar, Marcandier and Patullo, Davenant and the ex-minister of British Treasury Grenville... And suddenly, with Aranda in Paris, the program was interrupted. Ferrer Benimeli (2009) pointed out a group of "economists from the Aragonese party" that would include Pedro Normante, Ignacio Jordán de Asso and Martín de Garay. This would be, in our opinion, a second generation that shows some continuity with the previous one and that only published its best works after Aranda's return in 1790s. Normante and, we shall add, Foronda and Valcárcel wrote in the eighties... And they did not enjoy too much fortune while Floridablanca retained the power.

Ernest Lluch repeatedly asked himself who was the economist who advised Aranda. The answer is that there were many, and also organized; but the first of them, and the one who remained faithful to the party until he returned to power, was Enrique Ramos. The others most influential economists were Arriquíbar and Anzano, who built their opinions after meditating on the *Reflexiones de Don Desiderio Bueno*. The *Discurso* was the reference economic text of the Aragonese party until, a decade after its publication, it was qualitatively surpassed by Arriquíbar's *Reflexiones del Amigo de los Hombres*; but even so it maintained for his supporters, to say of Jovellanos, "great treasures of doctrine".

The other main question has to do with this interruption in 1773, which is no stranger to political change nor to the renewed impetus of the Holy Inquisition. The rise of the "civil party" brought with it a significantly different national economic literature, even in its sources. The expression of "political economy" practically disappears from titles —Normante and another military, Alcalá Galiano, were the exception. One wonders whether the "civil economy" in Floridablanca's time, focused on reveals moral philosophy and deliberately distant from political economy, should be interpreted as "the economy of the civil party" as opposed to that of the "military party". And why an author of the stature of Jovellanos would use both expressions indistinctly. But this, we insist, would require another debate.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ See Cervera Ferri, P. (2019): "Ciencia del comercio, economía política y economía civil en España (1714-1808)". *Cuadernos Dieciochistas*, vol. XX (publishing).



THE PRESENT EDITION

The works of Enrique Ramos Muñoz presented below have been ordered chronologically: the *Reflexiones de Don Desiderio Bueno* on grains (1764), a selection of end notes of the *Elogio de Don Álvaro de Bazán* (1765) with economic and biographical interest, Juan de Aravaca's censorship to the project of "Economía de un Cuerpo Político" (1769) and the *Discurso sobre economía política* (1769). The errata of this last dissertation has been eliminated and the corrections have been introduced in the original text. The syntax of the author has been respected, although it will sometimes be archaic. However, it has been necessary to update the punctuation with RAE criteria. Spelling has also been modernized and confusions between personal pronouns and object complements, redundancies of disjunctive conjunctions, and concordances of verbs and adjectives have been corrected. Grammatical modifications that substantially alter the original text have been inserted into brackets. Unnecessary capital letters have been replaced with lower case letters. The footnotes marked with an asterisk (*) are those that Enrique Ramos included in his scripts.