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ABSTRACT

Although he was most famous for his books of fiction and philosophy, 20th century Spanish public intellectual Miguel de Unamuno also wrote a large body of newspaper articles in which he critiqued politics and society during his lifetime. Unamuno lived during a polarized time in Spanish history, and he witnessed many political and social conflicts, including the Third Carlist War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, a military dictatorship, the Second Spanish Republic, Franco’s military coup, and the Spanish Civil War. In the midst of this atmosphere of conflict and polarization, Unamuno used the medium of the newspaper to diagnose Spain’s problem and to present possible solutions. This project examines the rhetorical style that Unamuno developed in response to his political context, as he examined Spanish society and the various political regimes in Spain.

As he defined the problem, Unamuno characterized it as one of ideology, excess rationalism, and inauthenticity. To solve this problem, Unamuno approached it in two ways. First, he acted as what he called an “idea-breaker,” or as one who assumes an attitude of skepticism and uses individual thought to break down ideas and dogma. Second, he created a unified collective consciousness in Spain through what he called intrahistory, or the history that occurs beneath the level of written history. Intrahistory comprises the everyday bonds between people, and Unamuno used this to build a community and a collective consciousness in the people of Spain. He did this through his use of language, descriptions of the physical environment, deep bonds of personal relationships, legends, and spiritual authenticity.
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``What’s gained in breadth is lost in intensity.’ That was his motto. Paparrigópulos knew that a highly specialized article or solid monograph could contain an entire philosophy’’ (Unamuno 2017, 119-123).

In the middle of his well-known novel, Fog (Niebla), Miguel de Unamuno introduces the reader to an ancillary character named Antolín S. Paparrigópulos. Seemingly insignificant, the character is described in five pages of the novel, and a main character visits him for advice in only three pages of action. Yet, the description of Paparrigópulos reflects characteristics similar to how the author Unamuno characterized himself. Like Paparrigópulos, the character of his creation, Unamuno also understood that articles could contain an entire philosophy. As indicated by the phrase, “what’s gained in breadth is lost in intensity,” both Unamuno and Paparrigópulos agreed on the importance of highly specialized articles and their ability to convey significant themes and philosophies. Although best known for longer works of fiction and philosophy, Unamuno also published more than 3,000 newspaper articles during his career as a public intellectual. Between the beginning of his production in the 1880s and his death in 1936, Unamuno turned to the newspaper to express his views on the various political and social crises and events in Spain. In these sometimes short and “seemingly insignificant articles” Unamuno, like Paparrigópulos, conveyed his own sharpness, good sense, historical intuition, and critical acuity.

---

1 Fog is translated by Elena Barcia.
It can be argued that when Unamuno refers to Paparrigópulos in his novel, he is describing his own work as a writer of newspaper articles. This dissertation is a study of how Unamuno utilized the genre of the newspaper article to make political critiques and shape a Spanish community, offering us a new model of the public intellectual. Paparrigópulos provides us with a symbol of Unamuno’s function and motivation, and simultaneously gives us a way to transition from his work as a novelist to his work as a public intellectual. This chapter provides a general introduction to this study, an overview of the method employed, and a brief literature review detailing how scholars have already approached Unamuno’s work.

In Unamuno’s description of Paparrigópulos, we can see further similarities between the author and the external character he describes. Unamuno writes that Paparrigópulos is “what you’d call a scholar, a young man who was going to bring glory to his country by shedding light on its most neglected achievements,” something that Unamuno, too, attempted to do through his body of articles (Unamuno 2017, 119). In his work as a public intellectual, Unamuno’s mission was to examine neglected achievements and to improve Spain. As Paparrigópulos “didn’t want to strike a discordant note to make himself heard, but to use his carefully disciplined voice to strengthen the beautiful, truly national, purebred symphony,” Unamuno had the same mission (Unamuno 2017, 119). His aim was never self-publication, but always to improve and strengthen Spain as a country and community. Moreover, in Fog, Unamuno describes how Paparrigópulos “thought in pure Castilian, with no trace of horrid northern mists… pure, clean Castilian” (Unamuno 2017, 120). Similarly, Unamuno hailed from northern Spain, but he also refused to speak with the “trace of horrid northern mists,” meaning he did not speak the Basque language. Indeed, it is well-known that Unamuno did not support regional languages as he believed they created divisions within Spain, and therefore, he always spoke Castilian Spanish.
It is not strange that one of Unamuno’s characters would be designed in his likeness. In the beginning of his 1927 book, *How to Make a Novel (Cómo se hace una novela)*, he writes, “Yes, every novel, every work of fiction, every poem, when it is alive, is autobiographic. Every fictional being, every poetic character that an author creates forms part of the author. And if an author puts into a man of flesh and bone into a poem, it is only after the author has made the character part of herself” (Unamuno 2005b, 184-5).

Once we understand that the character of Paparrigópulos, is a symbol that refers to Unamuno, we can better understand Unamuno’s method in his articles as he conveys the soul of the people, makes specific rhetorical and linguistic choices, selects events to respond to rhetorically, and uses specific and living examples to provide sociopolitical critique. First, Unamuno tells us that Paparrigópulos’s “thoughts were solid and deep, suffused with the soul of the people who nurtured him and to whom he also owed his spirit” (Unamuno 2017, 120). Moreover, “Paparrigópulos dedicated the powerful forces of his mind to researching the private lives of our people – a work as solid as it was selfless – aspiring to nothing less than reviving our past, his great-grandparents’ era, for our citizens” (Unamuno 2017, 121). In his articles, Unamuno always retains the primary focus on the soul, the depth, and the private lives of the Spanish people, attempting to create a consciousness based on Spain’s past for them in order to unite the community. Second, Unamuno, like Paparrigópulos, places importance on his linguistic and rhetorical choices in his articles. The character Paparrigópulos believed that the form of great works allowed them to “live on through the ages, [so] he labored over the language he was going to use in all his works as painstakingly as did the most wonderful Renaissance artists” (Unamuno 2017, 120). Similarly, Unamuno believed his articles could become great works that would capture the soul of the Spanish people, and so, in his work, he made very deliberate linguistic and rhetorical
choices. Third, Unamuno shows the reader of Fog that Paparrigópulos “idolized his beloved Spain … this Spain that would provide him with material for all the works that would grant him his future fame” (Unamuno 2017, 121). Thus, Unamuno’s articles, like Paparrigópulos’s work, offer rhetorical responses to a selection of events from Spain’s social and political situation. In forming these rhetorical responses, the authors Paparrigópulos and Unamuno both select and highlight certain events for readers. In Paparrigópulos’s “eyes, every event, no matter how insignificant, had precious value” (Unamuno 2017, 121). Unamuno agreed with this, as he often used newspaper writings to respond to events, even seemingly insignificant ones. Finally, the author Unamuno and Paparrigópulos have “critical acuity” in common, as both of their “best qualities shone when applied to concrete, living things, not to abstractions and pure theory…. Every essay was a course in inductive logic, a monumental work” (Unamuno 2017, 122). Indeed, Unamuno’s articles provide a critical lens with which to understand abstract theory and philosophy through examining the concrete, specific, lived experiences of the Spanish people. Like his description of Paparrigópulos, Unamuno “knew that we have to learn to see the universe in a drop of water, that a paleontologist can reconstruct an entire animal from a single bone” (Unamuno 2017, 121).

Unamuno’s life in Spain, from his birth in 1864 until his death in 1936, was punctuated by political and social crises and regime changes that impacted his work. When he was nine years old, in 1873, the First Republic of Spain was proclaimed, and the country proceeded through a series of very short and unsuccessful democratic governments. By the following year, the monarchy was restored. At the same time, during his youth in northern Spain, Unamuno lived through the Third Carlist War, the last in a series of civil wars fought over the Spanish throne. In 1898 Spain was embroiled in the Spanish-American War in which they lost the colonies of Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, bringing about the end of the Spanish empire and an
ensuing identity crisis. Early 20th century Spain was a time of general unrest, as “[b]etween 1902 and 1923 there were a record thirty-four governments, making any consistent effort of reform an impossibility” (Carr 2001, 235). Contributing to the problem was a weakened Spanish monarchy, as Alfonso XIII became king in 1906 and had difficulty “finding a strong ministry” (Carr 2001, 235). Although Spain was not directly involved in World War I, it affected the Spanish political situation. While Spain officially took a position of neutrality that benefited Germany, many people disagreed with this position, including Unamuno. By the end of World War I in 1918, Spain was “in a state of crisis…. Anarchy and hierarchy, egotism and formalism, pseudo-culture and hatred of ideas, and above everything a mortifying monotony and uniformity” (Barea, 18). Because of this state of crisis, Spain fell under the military dictatorship of Primo de Rivera between 1923 and 1930. Following this, the Second Republic of Spain was instituted in 1931. This led once again to heightened political tension, and by 1936 conflicts between Republicans and Nationalists turned into the Spanish Civil War. Unamuno died later this same year, but the war carried on until 1939.

In the midst of this tumultuous and vacillating political and economic situation, Unamuno and other Spanish intellectuals felt compelled to address these crises. William D. Phillips, Jr. and Carla Rahn Phillips argue that “Spain’s intellectual elite saw a deep breach between the attitude of the government and the needs of the country as a whole” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 235). Responding to this context, Unamuno turned to the newspaper to express his opinions about the Spanish government and society. In this dissertation I argue that Unamuno utilized the medium of the newspaper article to respond to the crisis of political polarization and, in doing so, became an influential public intellectual. To understand the nuances of his creative response, I examine his political newspaper articles to see how the newspaper allowed him to confront political crises and
create a Spanish consciousness. Thus, this dissertation captures the rhetorical voice he employed in his articles as he confronted the political and social exigencies of his time.

Unamuno is one of the most important public intellectuals of the twentieth century, and his insights and methods remain unique and valuable contributions to public life. Jan E. Evans refers to him as “Spain’s most distinguished man of letters during the twentieth century” (Evans 2013a, 1). Because of his fearless critique of the Spanish government and his defense of the Spanish collective consciousness, Unamuno is considered “one of the heroic intellectuals of our century” (Lacy 1967, 8). Not only heroic, he was also a courageous, “vehement, even vociferous critic of his time, he did not mind calling bread, bread, and wine, wine; he fought without rest” (Iturbide 2010, 212). In addition to waging political battles, Unamuno was also a “great thinker, intellectual, polyglot, philologist, scholar, and above all, a prolific writer that cultivated all literary genres” (Iturbide 2010, 213). Indeed, Unamuno was one of the rare writers who embodies “the qualities, the mood or the ambitions of their peoples so forcibly that they achieve an extraordinary influence, a symbolic greatness” and he became “the acknowledged incarnation of the spirit of his people” (Barea 1952, 7). This dissertation examines how Unamuno uses his articles to respond to the Spanish political situation, to understand and embody the spirit of the Spanish people, and to improve and unite this spirit through his unique style of public intellectualism.

Unamuno’s career as a public intellectual spanned more than fifty years and many genres, but scholars have largely neglected his political writings found in newspapers and magazines. For most of his life he served as a professor and rector of the University of Salamanca. He wrote poems, essays, and plays but is most renowned as a writer of novels, including Tía Tula (Aunt Tula), Niebla (Fog), Abel Sánchez, Amor y Pedagogía (Love and Pedagogy), Tres novelas ejemplares y un prólogo (Three Exemplary Novels and a Prologue), and San Manuel Bueno,
Martír (*Saint Manuel the Good, Martyr*). Internationally, he is well-known for his philosophical essay, *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida (The Tragic Sense of Life)*, a meditation on life, death, and faith. G.D. Robertson explains that Unamuno’s political commentary has been neglected by scholars, as he “enjoys far greater recognition among Hispanists as a writer of novels, essay, poetry and drama than for his activities as a commentator on, and participant in, the political realities of Spain” (Robertson 2010, xi). Robertson argues that the lack of analysis of his articles “is a lamentable state of affairs that pays scant attention to the fact that Unamuno wrote thousands of articles on political issues for the Spanish, Spanish-American and European press” (Robertson 2010, xi). These articles, which have barely been studied or translated, comprise a huge portion of his life’s work. Upon further examination, they are not just the repetition of his writings that appear elsewhere in other genres. Rather, in the articles he hones his ideas, confronts the political situation of his time, reveals things about himself and the nature of Spain, and gives us lasting tools to confront our own crises.

While historical and biographical studies sometimes mention his journalistic work, these studies do not rhetorically analyze the texts of Unamuno’s articles to show how, in the midst of national crisis, he used the genre of the newspaper article to lash out against the political and social structures of the time. Despite the fact that he is well-known and widely studied both in Spain and around the world, Unamuno is not renowned as a rhetor, or as one who produced discourse in the moment to confront the immediate challenges or crises of his time. And yet, Unamuno is responsible for a large corpus of newspaper articles that are direct and immediate responses to his situation.

Unamuno’s newspaper articles allowed him to be politically engaged and to make interventions in Spanish political life without serving as a professional politician. His articles “can
be examined with more rigor if they are considered more as political action than as information or advocacy of a political position” (Valdés 1990, 491). It is important to remember that, beyond advocating for a political stance, the articles are meant to bring about political action and a change in the consciousness on the people of Spain. During his life, on several occasions, he “had the opportunity to exercise a public role in the direction of his country; and in each instance he refused the openly political protagonism, finding refuge in transcendental meditations” (Fox 1988, 256).

Through his articles he remained connected with the public and able to impact Spain’s political situation better than he could as a professional politician. His serious work in the newspaper demonstrates the importance he placed on the role of the writer-intellectual in society and on the power of the press as a way to engage the public and intervene in political affairs. Indeed, his “journalism was never a waste of time or a distraction from more profound literary things, but it responds to a serious awareness of what the mission of the writer should be and the conviction that journalism is a powerful vehicle between himself and the public” (González Martínez 1984, 11). Rather than distracting from his work as a philosopher or novelist, his writing in the newspaper was vital, both to his development as a writer and to his mission to impact Spanish society.

In my analysis of these articles, I answer key questions about the political and social problems Unamuno confronted, about how the press both exacerbated these problems and helped to solve them, and about how Unamuno combatted the problem of ideology. These questions include: What political and societal problems did Unamuno confront? How did the medium of the newspaper become part of his process of formulating a rhetorical response, providing criticism, and functioning as a public intellectual? What rhetorical strategies did Unamuno employ to confront the crises of his time? Where does rhetoric fit into this model of public intellectualism? How can we use Unamuno’s strategies today?
Method

In this dissertation I analyze the articles from all periods of Unamuno’s life to examine the key rhetorical strategies he employed as a public intellectual responding to political events in Spain. The research for this project is archival-based, and the material comes from a selection of the more than 3,000 newspaper articles spanning his lifetime, collected and stored by the Unamuno House-Museum and Archive in Salamanca. Barbara Biesecker writes that the archive is not just a place of discovery, but also a historical, political, sacred space of preservation, interpretation, and commemoration and collective invention (Biesecker 2006, 124). Rather than being a site of singular discovery, it is a scene of doubled invention. She writes that “Scholars of persuasive speech have not yet begun robustly to engage the entailments of the archive’s irreducible undecidability even though we are uniquely positioned to do so” (Biesecker 2006, 130). According to the Spanish newspaper *El Mundo*, Unamuno’s archive provides “an essential key to understanding the multiple facets of the Bilbaoan writer” (2012). The archive contains 6,000 books and more than 25,000 of Unamuno’s letters, notes, articles, manuscripts, drafts, and newspapers. During the summers of 2016 and 2017, I researched in his archive and in the General Archive of the Spanish Civil War in Salamanca, that also has a collection of books, articles, and files pertaining to Unamuno. As part of the project, I read and translate the articles from Spanish to English.

I interpret Unamuno’s articles through the literature on the functions of the press, through a rhetorical approach to intellectual history, and through Kenneth Burke’s language of the rhetorical symbol. In this study, the primary task was to read and translate Unamuno’s articles and trace his rhetorical strategies. To understand how his life and circumstances influenced his work, I read Unamuno’s biographies, including the preeminent ones written by Jean Claude Rabaté and
Colette Rabaté, María Zambrano, and Julián Marías. Once I became familiar with Unamuno’s articles and personal history, I performed a detailed analysis of the different rhetorical strategies he employs and the political problems he responds to. Although my analysis focuses on his newspaper articles, his other works of poetry, fiction, and philosophy serve as a backdrop and a frame by which to understand the articles and his writing process.

In Spain, Unamuno’s fame has only grown since his death, and, although he is widely known in the Spanish-speaking world, this reputation has not translated. Scholars have suggested that we must remedy “the almost complete innocence of Unamuno’s work on the part of English and American philosophers and theologians, for whom Unamuno occupies a shadowy place indeed in the history of human thought concerning those matters in which they claim special interest” (Lacy 1967, 7). This can be attributed to the fact that Unamuno “had the misfortune of writing in a language ordinarily outside the ken of our philosophers and theologians” (Lacy 1967, 7). Many of Unamuno’s works, including his articles, have not been translated, and “until the day, hopefully not too far distant, when a standard English translation is available for all his major writings… Unamuno will doubtlessly remain neglected by many who might otherwise find him a congenial spirit and a seminal thinker” (Lacy 1967, 8). Thus, in translating his articles into English, this project aids in the vision of spreading Unamuno’s thought to a wider audience.

**Literature Review**

Beyond Unamuno’s significance in the political sphere, his works have made contributions to literary culture. First, scholars argue that Unamuno’s fiction has influenced literature and thought around the world. Federico de Onís argues that “Unamuno was one of the principle creators and precursors of many streams of thinking that have dominated literature and thought
around the world” (de Onís 1961, 20). Some of these streams of thought include philosophical literature, realism, and a psychological style of writing. Unamuno’s narrative style influenced the history of the novel in Spain, as his novels “exerted an incalculable impact on modern Spanish fiction, from the vanguard novel of the 1920s right down to our own time” (Longhurst 2014, 1). Indeed, Unamuno’s novel Fog has been called “one of the greatest novels ever written in the Spanish language” (Ardila 2011, 135). In fact, it “still sells profitably one hundred years after its first appearance and has become the second or third most studied novel in Spanish literature (after Don Quixote and possibly Lazarillo de Tormes)” (Longhurst 2014, 1). Unamuno’s narrative style shaped many thinkers and writers both in and out of Spain, including famed Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges. Upon Unamuno’s death, Borges wrote, “I understand that Unamuno is the foremost writer of our language. His bodily death is not his death; his presence – argumentative, garrulous, tormented, sometimes intolerable – is with us” (Borges 1990, 82). In addition to writers of fiction, Unamuno’s work also impacted the thought of French mystic and theologian Simone Weil and Spanish philosophers María Zambrano and José Ortega y Gasset, among others.

Second, in terms of his fiction, scholars have argued that Unamuno provides a new type of aesthetic that uses literature to explore philosophical themes and confront reality. Unamuno “formulates and develops a highly original aesthetic to confront contemporary reality… Upon analyzing the aesthetic development of Unamuno’s novel, we see how a narrative art of radical originality emerges, closely tied to the exigencies of the historic moment” (Diez 1976, 9). Although his fiction may not explicitly refer to his political context, it functioned as a response to and a reflection of those realities. Ricardo Diez writes that Unamuno’s novels offered a social criticism “of the disarray and final collapse of a formerly stable organization whose values had been founded upon a patriarchally oriented community” (Diez 1976, 156).
In confronting reality, Unamuno’s fiction uses a unique and innovative style of writing to directly and explicitly struggle with the human problems of his lifetime. Indeed, he created “a narrative technique of singular originality…. Unamuno was the first to conscientiously utilize the novel as a vehicle of philosophical exploration, something that erudition frequently attributes to Sartre” (Diez 1976, 272). He was among the first writers to use genre of the novel to express philosophical ideas and to confront political realities, and his narratives are not merely art for art’s sake and are “never purely narrative” (Burns 2009, 5). In fact, some scholars argue that his novels are more philosophical than fictional (Quiroz Pizarro 2015, Blas González 2007, Marías 1976). Deron Boyles describes how “philosophical elements are often embedded in the text – sometimes deeply and sometimes superficially” (Boyles 2016, 628). Likewise, Julia Biggane connects Unamuno’s prose and his philosophy, writing that “the travails of Unamuno’s protagonists are consonant with his reflections on the human condition as laid out in his most famous essay, *Tragic Sense of Life*” (Biggane 2013, 2). As he “imagines the possibility of exploring concepts and ideological positions” in literature he amplifies “a sense of literature that becomes much more than fictional and aesthetic scenes” (Quiroz Pizarro 2015, 261). In Unamuno’s fiction, he “communicate[s] his experience and philosophical reflections; through literature he expresses his questions and concepts, utilizing in a masterful way the lives of ‘fictitious’ characters that ask questions, fight, feel, believe, reason, and live – above all, that live” (Escobar V. 2013, 519). His protagonists, philosophy incarnate, embody his philosophical reflections and act as vehicles through which he explores ideas on being and reality. In short, scholars have examined how Unamuno’s fiction employs “the voices of literature, but interpreting human and philosophical problems” (Quiroz Pizarro 2015, 266).
Finally, beyond influencing other authors and using the novel as a vehicle for addressing philosophical and social questions, scholars have examined how Unamuno disregarded conventional style, composing the novel in an original and innovative way. In his earlier novels Unamuno seems “dominated by the traditional convention of the novel,” but later he “throws off all pretense at conformity and launches into the production of the unorthodox nívolas”2 (Livingstone 1941, 445). His nívolas uniquely and “radically limit the descriptions of the setting or the physical aspect of characters,” and “the major part of the work consists of dialogues and monologues” (King 1967, 224). In this new style, Unamuno’s novels take “the guiding principle of the nonreality of the material world” and “eliminate all externals, particularly settings and character descriptions,” focusing, instead, on the characters, their realities, and their ideals (Livingstone 1941, 445, Candau 2014). For the most part, his novels could be set in any Spanish city and his characters are general representations of universal types. Arturo Barea writes that Unamuno’s novels need “no scenery or description, only characters who lived their lives according to their spiritual laws” (Barea 1952, 39-40). Unamuno adopts “the attitude that excessive description can detract from narrative” and the ideas embodied in narrative, so he relegates landscape description to his travel writings, articles, and essays about Spain (Strzeszewski 2006, 5). Moreover, in terms of literary technique, Unamuno “experiments with narrative techniques of psychoanalytical origin” such as “the many forms of presenting the flow of consciousness: the interior monologue, the soliloquy, [and] the state of drowsiness” (Diez 1976, 272). J.A.G. Ardila writes that Fog “introduced a number of narrative techniques that would subsequently become the trademark of other authors: it precedes the work of Dorothy Richardson, Marcel Proust, and James
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2 Nívola is a neologism devised by Unamuno “to describe stories in which the characters and the author would often reflect on themselves, their roles, and the ideas expressed within the pages of the work in both tragic and comic senses” (Boyles 2016, 627). Moreover, the nívola should be a tragicomedy, “confusing the reader by treating comic events with total seriousness and viceversa” (King 1967, 224).
Joyce in the use of stream of consciousness, and it includes a lengthy and dramatic interview between the main character and Unamuno the author, predating Pirandello’s similar interplay between reality and fiction” (Ardila 2011, 136). For instance, in *Fog*, Unamuno is a character in the novel, and he interacts with the main character, Augusto, as his creator. As he writes himself into the text, as the author communicating with his character, Unamuno plays with the boundary between fiction and reality. Here we see “the full significance of his disregard for more conventional standards of novel-writing…. [H]e created another reality by ‘realizing himself’ in imagined beings who had a life of their own, yet were part of himself” (Barea 1952, 39). Similarly, in *Love and Pedagogy* (1902), Unamuno breaks “a long tradition of descriptive fiction writing. Prior to *LAP*, the instances of fictional characters that are aware that they exist in the literary work go back to William Shakespeare, Miguel de Cervantes and Søren Kierkegaard, but Unamuno twists the point to include the author’s own self” (Boyles 2016, 627). This is one instance of Unamuno’s “fictionalization of the ‘real’ and the ‘realization’ of fiction’s essential reality” (Gómez 2007, 45).

In his philosophical work, Unamuno did not create a systematic program, but scholars have studied his numerous contributions to philosophy and theology. First, Unamuno, although not always included in anthologies of existentialism, gives us a poetic, if not systematic, philosophy of existentialism. Unamuno “does not understand the desire to systematize and place the universe, the world, and life on a grid” (Onieva 1964, 38). The very structure of his thought is unsystematic, as he “embraces paradox and contradiction antithetical to systematic philosophy” (Boyles 2016, 619). William Barrett’s *Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy* lists Unamuno as one of the two modern Spanish figures to contribute to existential philosophy; “Unamuno, a poet first and last, wrote one of the most moving and genuine philosophic books of the whole [existentialist] movement” (Barrett 1990, 16). Although he expresses philosophical themes in all genres of his
writing, he writes three great works of pure philosophical thought, *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*³ *(Our Lord Don Quixote: The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho)*, *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida en los hombres y en los pueblos*⁴ *(The Tragic Sense of Life)*, and *La agonía del cristianismo*⁵ *(The Agony of Christianity)*. Most of his contributions to existentialism come from his essay *The Tragic Sense of Life*, but many of the same ideas and themes appear in his novels, articles, and essays. As a philosopher focusing on the tragic nature of human life, death, and mortality, Unamuno “unites …the linguistic concerns…of anglo-American philosophy with the more material and existential concerns of many of our religious thinkers” (Lacy 1967, 8). In his philosophical writings, Unamuno struggles with topics such as “God, reason, doubt, faith, and immortality” which were “almost the only philosophical issues that Unamuno want[s] to write about” (Davis 2013, ix). Unamuno “makes the whole question of religion hinge on the individual’s desire for an eternal happiness – that and nothing less” (Barrett 1990, 176). Like Kierkegaard, Unamuno believed that Christianity had lost its essence, and he must work to “recuperate authentic Christianity” among the people (Aguiar Baixauli 2014, 88). His focus on questions of God, faith, and immortality also make his work relevant to theological conversations.

Second, in the field of philosophy, Unamuno provides us with a new perspective on doubt, describing it as a positive element in both faith and philosophy. Unamuno inquires into the role of suffering and doubt in faith, arguing that doubt is essential to true faith. Furthermore, for Unamuno, it is enough to have the desire to believe, while not actually believing (Evans 2013a). While some thinkers have written of the negative attributes of doubt, Unamuno views doubt as beneficial, and even necessary to faith. In Unamuno’s estimation, when we subject “everything to doubt, we

---

³ 1914
⁴ 1912
⁵ Written in 1924, but published in 1930.
change ourselves as human beings; we create a mode of being from which there is no escape. Once formed as a doubting subject, one cannot simply dispense with fresh doubts as they arise. Once developed, a doubting consciousness prods us whether we want it to or not; it will not leave us alone” (Roberts 2015, 1201). Unamuno turns doubt on its head, distinguishing “between methodical doubt, as portrayed by Descartes, and passionate doubt – the ‘eternal conflict between reason and feeling, between science and life, between the logical and the biotic’” (Unamuno, 1972, 120). The former is a kind of theoretical game; the latter is crucial in defining us as human beings” (Roberts 2015, 1202). In Unamuno’s thought, “doubt and despair were central elements of what he referred to as the ‘tragic sense of life’…. Unamuno made it clear, however, that doubt need not be destructive; indeed, it is through uncertainty that hope arises and is given substance and significance” (Roberts 2015, 1199). Often likened to Kierkegaard in terms of philosophical themes and beliefs, scholars have also compared Unamuno to thinkers such as Henri Bergson, Mircea Eliade, Heraclitus, Wilhelm von Humboldt, William James, Blaise Pascal, Søren Kierkegaard, Gabriel Marcel, José Ortega y Gasset, George Santayana, Friedrich Schleiermacher, and Arthur Schopenhauer.6

In his works of literature and philosophy, Unamuno utilizes different stylistic devices and tropes, but most studies focus on the aesthetic, and not the rhetorical nature, of his work. For Unamuno, language is significant, as “the living, but corrigible, speech of the man of flesh and bone” (Lacy 1967, 8). Thus, he consciously plays with language and is “very much aware of his own tendency to think in terms of reversals, antitheses, and binary oppositions,” using chiasmus to “[overcome] the pure temporal linearity of language by making it refer back to previous
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moments in its onward flow” (Olson 2003, 1). Unamuno’s texts abound with many instances of “chiastic reversibility… of things normally regarded as contraries: spirit and matter, action and contemplation, inwardness and outwardness… the identity of pure being and pure nothingness” (Olson 2003, 4). Indeed, Unamuno’s contradictions, paradoxes, and reversals attract readers, breaking old patterns of thought. Scholars have looked at his use of chiasmus and paradox in his novels, but not in his journalistic work (Olson 2003, Boyles 2016). Moreover, scholars have studied Unamuno’s use of multiple voices and dialogue in his novels, applying Bakhtinian concepts of polyphony, dialogic, and indirect communication. The use of these rhetorical devices “allows characters to have counterpoints, conflicts and ideological alliances. The novel acquires multiple perspectives, instead of maintaining only one perspective of the author” (Gardeazábal Bravo 2014, 174). Although Unamuno uses these devices in his articles, scholars have only looked at them in his novels, neglecting to examine how they function as a political and rhetorical response to his situation.

In addition to studying his fiction and philosophy, scholars have looked at Unamuno’s poetry to discover his contributions to language and its relationship to sentiment. Although he has “some 2,500 poems to his name” and “is one of the most prolific of Spanish poets,” his poetry has been neglected in favor of his fiction (Longhurst 2015a, 56). Unamuno “regarded himself as a poet above all else and, as he made clear on several occasions, valued his poetry far more than the rest of his work” (Longhurst 2015a, 57). Through his poetry he explores the “fundamental question about the power of language to appropriate our sentiments,” writing about the distinction between words and feelings (Longhurst 2015a, 58). Unamuno’s poetry asks, “does the sentiment exist before the words (i.e. does it belong to the poet qua person), or does it come to exist through the poetic structure or cadence (i.e. is it a property of the poetic device)” (Longhurst 2015a, 58).
Longhurst argues that “in seeing language as driving the poet rather than the other way round, Unamuno is adopting a quite radical position for his time” (Longhurst 2015a, 65).

Although Unamuno was not a politician by trade, he concerned himself with politics, and scholars have studied his contributions to political thought. Unamuno’s “public presence was constant, but he denied being a politician…. [He] contributes to the evolution of the behavior of the liberal intellectual. This happens to be from an agitator of ideas to a ‘maître a penser’ (guru) and from journalist to opponent of the regime” (Aubert 2003, 213). While not a politician, Unamuno maintained “constant and often intimate correspondence with the principal political figures of the day,” and he “strove to convince politicians at the highest level of the need to make the central government democratic and effective” (Robertson 2010, 23). Instead of becoming a politician, he used his position as an intellectual to impact politics. Unamuno’s “actions were not those of a politician in the usual sense of the term,” and instead, “he assumed the role of civic guide to the Spanish people with pride” (Pascual Mezquita 2003, 16). Indeed, he had a different aim, and his “politics were different: far from whatever gubernatorial ambition, he aimed to recuperate the most authentic meaning of the concept of republic or at least, the one that he felt was implicit, that is, the most proper and etymological sense, which he incorporated in his own civil-liberal vision of the sociopolitical and of history” (Pascual Mezquita 2003, 28).

As for Unamuno’s newspaper articles, some scholars have studied their historical context, but have neglected their rhetorical significance. Robertson provides a summary of Unamuno’s journalistic work, but he does not analyze the articles from a rhetorical standpoint. Robertson writes that “throughout his life, Unamuno dedicated a great deal of his considerable journalistic and creative talent to denouncing the failings of the political system, the maladies – both general and specific – of Spanish society and to pointing the way to possible solutions” (Robertson 2010,
Few studies focus on his political interventions in the newspaper, and no studies examine how he used the genre of the press and the form of the newspaper article to make these political interventions. Unamuno fought against all of the regimes, and was “criticized, dismissed, disgraced, condemned to jail, deported, voluntarily exiled, celebrated, honored, decorated, insulted, placed under house arrest,” and “was always, in his fight for liberty, a provoker and agitator, a sharp shooter, and finally, a dissenter. And where better to find this evolution than in the reading of his journalistic work” (Aubert 2003, 233). Thus, this dissertation fills a gap in the literature about Unamuno and sheds light on his unique way of providing a rhetorical response to a situation of political polarization.

While the work of some public intellectuals may be too embedded in their immediate contexts, Unamuno’s writing speaks to us today, and we may continue to draw upon his ideas. In his articles, he identifies the problems facing Spain during his time. Instead of providing a systematic approach to this problem, he attacks the symptoms of the problem, which he understands as human frailty, arrogance, and faith in reason and progress. These symptoms are manifest in attempts to control the environment, to wipe away the subtleties of the world, and to reduce the world to a maxim or ideological program, all still relevant today. Unamuno leaves us with a vague, yet inspiring, solution of a community united by intrahistory. This dissertation captures Unamuno’s rhetorical voice in his newspaper articles as he identifies the problem, the symptoms, and the possible solutions. In a public speech he made in 1903, Unamuno said, “Spain needs a new civil war, but truly civil, not with firearms or blades, but with weapons of burning words, which are the sword of the spirit” (Unamuno 1971b, 166). This dissertation examines how Unamuno uses these “weapons of burning words” to constitute the problem and propose a solution for Spanish society during his life.
CHAPTER II
UNAMUNO’S OVIPAROUS GROWTH AS A WRITER

The experience of writing in the newspaper constituted Unamuno as a certain type of writer, facilitating his development of new attitudes and styles. Examining the history of Spain through his eyes helps us to understand the connection between his life as a public intellectual and the political developments in Spain at the time. To see how he addressed the exigences of his time, we must keep in mind the peripheral events that surrounded Unamuno’s work, including other political and social issues of the time. Because Unamuno’s development was connected with his writing in the genre of the newspaper, it is necessary to understand the scope of his relationship with the newspaper. Thus, this chapter begins by looking at Unamuno’s development as a writer formulating responses to events, then provides a brief history of the press in Spain, and finally examines the events of Unamuno’s life and his relationship to the press and pivotal events in Spanish history. In presenting Unamuno’s biography, we must look not only at his thought and writings, but also at the broader circumstances in his life to which his writings respond. Spanish philosopher María Zambrano writes that “not all people have a biography,” but someone like Unamuno, a “man of action, war, politics, has one to the highest degree” and “the biography of a philosopher is integrated in his thought” (Zambrano 2003, 31-2). His biography and his rhetorical situation are significant to his work, and as we view the biographical events of Unamuno’s life, we must take into consideration the events both in Spain and in his personal life that impacted his thought.

This approach is particularly suitable to Unamuno because of the method of invention he used in writing his articles, which was a method very much tied to action and events. As he wrote
of various ways to generate ideas and texts, Unamuno used the metaphor of oviparous and viviparous birth. In a biological sense, an oviparous birth occurs when an egg develops and hatches external to the parent’s body, while a viviparous birth refers to a live birth after the offspring has fully developed inside of the parent’s body. Translating this to the realm of textual invention, Unamuno explains that viviparous authors incubate their ideas internally while oviparous writers develop their works externally, gradually, and piece by piece. In a 1902 article called “Oviparous Author,” Unamuno presents a detailed explanation of this textual birth process. He begins by explaining the viviparous method, saying, some writers produce an ovule of an idea, a sprout, and once, somehow or another, it is fertilized, they begin to turn it over and over in the mind, to develop it, extend it, diversify it and add all kinds of developments to it. It is a gestation. The major theme of a novel or an event of character occurs to one who spends a month or two or six or a year or more turning the future novel over and over in fantasy. And when the author has everything well imagined and composed, they take a sheet of paper, number it, and begin to write their novel, starting with the first line and then continuing until it is entirely finished. This is a viviparous writer, who gestates their work in their mind and gives live birth, that is to say entire and true and in its almost definitive form (“Oviparous Author” 1902).

For Unamuno, most of the work in this viviparous process is internal, and the work is fully developed when the author finally sits down to write it. An idea about a character, event, or theme occurs to a viviparous author, who then ponders that idea internally, over time. After the plot of the work plays out entirely in the mind of the author, the author can write it down, line by line. This is viviparous because the work is fully formulated and developed internally, and then born on the page as a viable and self-sustainable being that does not need parental care.
On the other hand, Unamuno explains that “[o]thers of us proceed in another very different way” from the viviparous style; this is the oviparous style, which is Unamuno’s preferred method of writing and invention. This means that he thought and wrote without a plan or telos, and instead allowed his ideas to develop externally and organically, through notes on paper. In one early article from 1893, Unamuno describes this process as being grounded in a veritable physical movement of wandering along a path rather than reflecting on meanings in one’s mind: “Reader, pardon me if my pen, although guided by my hand, appears to be guided by my feet. That is to say, that instead of being a real and flat road of uninterrupted discourse, I lose myself on the paths and sidewalks of the mountain” (Unamuno 1893a). In “Oviparous Author,” Unamuno continues to describe his oviparous style, providing an example from his own experience and telling a story of an idea that occurred to him during his time in Madrid:

Years ago, when I was in Madrid, the idea occurred to me to write a story about the events of the death of a person I had heard about in the Carlist camp. I wrote it on a sheet of paper, and there I noted, in telegraphic style, some traits of the character of the subject in question. From time to time I added details, peculiarities, and observations that had occurred to me. Around this foundation, I composed a story, and I continued adding, substituting, and altering details. Once the story was written, it occurred to me to turn it into a short novel, to expand the characters, to broaden their action, and to develop the historic environment in which the narrated argument unfolded. I dedicated a folder to each character and began to study them and attribute facts and phrases to them. At the same time, I started to study the last civil Carlist war in my Basque country, and above all, the bombardment of Bilbao, of which I was a witness. And I continued filling pages and accumulating facts, some psychological, some historic, and putting them into the unrefined story. When the materials
accumulated for the story were many, so many they impeded my work, I started to organize them and the story grew. In the same way an embryo grows with materials that the blood brings from outside. As this story grew, the labor of accumulation continued and another assimilation occurred, and like that, through a series of accumulations and assimilations of material, I came to write my novel *Peace in War* (Unamuno 1902c).

In this tale, he describes one instance of his oviparous process, detailing the collection of ideas and notes and the development of work over time. He began with short jotted notes on the traits of the characters, and continued to develop on different pieces of paper, in separate folders, piece by piece, over time. Additionally, he did not have a destination for the piece when he began writing. While, at first, he thought of it as a short story, it eventually transformed into a novel. He refers to this type of writing as oviparous because the development occurs externally and in pieces, as an accumulation of bits and pieces gathered from practice, experience, and discovery. To be sure, not even an oviparous writer can do without reflection. He writes that, “oviparism has its degrees, because even the author who uses papers and notes, who incubates most of their work externally, cannot be exempted from internal labor” (Unamuno 1902c). Yet for him, the internal labor always comes about as a response to events, as a process of meaning-creation brought about by threading together objects, events, actions, and people into a common situation.

Because his oviparous writing functioned as a response to a situation, at times he would publish articles before he felt they were fully formed, as the situation necessitated. In 1918 he explains this further, as he responds to the immediate situation of World War I. In an article titled “Idealist Conception of History” he explains his initial desire to write down observations about war and save them, in order to "prepare later in calm, during a time of peace, an organized and systematized work" that he would call *Civilization and Culture* (Unamuno 1918c). However, he
worries that this may never come to fruition, as he questions, what if later “we do not have a chance
to complete this work because another war calls us? And what if death surprises us before?... We
have decided, thus, to continue publishing our notes, as they come to us, with the inevitable
repetitions and the no less inevitable disorder, and later these notes will aid us in making our
organic and systematic work” (Unamuno 1918c). Thus, his development as an oviparous author
was crucial to his production of articles, and his articles became part of his larger production and
the development of longer works as an oviparous author. We can see in this instance that Unamuno
understood the value in a timely rhetorical response.

Just as Kenneth Burke wrote that symbols could be generative, Unamuno’s writing process
often began with a seed or a sprout of an idea and grew from there. Sometimes these sprouts came
from childhood memories imprinted on his mind years before or from recent political events that
he felt compelled to address. As an introspective child who spent a great deal of time in his father’s
library and in a religious household, Unamuno had an abundance of intellectual and religious
themes to incorporate into his writings. The seeds from his childhood that germinate and resurface
throughout his body of work include themes such as religion, death, and the Carlist Wars. Indeed,
his childhood played an important role in his writing, as his “first ten years take on central
importance in his mature thought. The imaginative return to this childhood is one of the crucial
themes in his later writing” (Lacy 1967, 24). The traumas from his childhood existed as dormant
seeds in his mind that would later be activated to germinate in his works.

In addition to his childhood memories, political and social events or conflicts served as
catalysts for his ideas, as something in his external environment provoked his mind. Unamuno’s
articles were “frequently born of an external or internal incitement” that “generates a phrase, which
generates a paragraph, which generates an article” (González Martínez 1984, 51). Often, he would
invent one clever phrase or paradox and then develop an entire article around that. In response to external incitement, Unamuno’s articles followed two different schemata. While in the first schema, the article presented a reasoned, compact argument on a topic, in the second, the article provided a critique of another author’s article, beginning with a few paragraphs of that article to establish context before Unamuno proceeded to make his counterargument. In response to an internal incitement, or a mood or emotion agitating him, Unamuno asked a question of the reader or posed a rhetorical question and responded to it (González Martínez 1984, 53). Vicente González Martínez argues that Unamuno wrote two different types of articles: in the first, he “defends some political and social principles that he considers basic to whatever people,” while in the second, his argument is critical and satirical of social life, institutions, and leaders (González Martínez 1984, 53).

Because Unamuno often did not have a predetermined plan for his ideas, his oviparous process spanned years and crossed genres. An introspective person, Unamuno considered a certain theme or topic over a period of many years, and it transformed as it traveled from his mind to his notebooks, into daily conversations or public lectures, through the pages of the newspaper, and finally, into longer works such as novels or works of philosophy. Throughout his life, the same themes resurfaced in his work, in different stages of development. Much of Unamuno’s thinking process occurred, not when he was sitting in his study behind his desk, but while walking and dialoguing, while lying in bed reading and writing, and through the act of speaking in public or writing articles.

Often, one of the first steps in his oviparous process was walking outdoors. Because of his weak constitution, Unamuno began to take regular walks for exercise, but he grew to love this habit, especially walking outside of the city. During his daily walks, he reflected on nature, life,
and philosophy. This habit later became an instrumental practice in his process of thought and invention. Sometimes he walked alone, but occasionally he would invite friends or students to accompany him. He did not expect his walking companions to speak, but to listen to him, and his friends knew that Unamuno would speak and not expect a response. They also understood that “Unamuno would write even when he was speaking. Whoever spoke with him knew that their conversations would be in an article the next day” (Madruga-Méndez 2005, 10). One companion, José María de Cossío, who was later exiled in France with Unamuno, wrote about this aspect of Unamuno’s inventive process. He recounted a time when he asked Unamuno, “‘how can you walk for three hours with a man who is absolutely mute?’” to which Unamuno answered, “‘For me the interlocutor is like the wall for the pelota player. He is useful in that I can throw the ball to him, have it be returned, and I can hit it back again’” (Cossío 1964, 9). Furthermore, after pondering an idea during walks and through thought and speech, Unamuno would then sometimes give public lectures or speeches. It was well-known that speaking was an integral part of his process of invention. In his early career, he often spoke about social or political issues in a club in Bilbao called El Sitio. Local periodicals often published his speeches the following day, and the themes from the speeches often resurfaced later in his writings.

---

7 Pelota is a popular ball game in the Basque Provinces. It is similar to racquetball, but played by using the hands instead of a racquet to hit the ball against a wall and return it.
8 El Sitio, started in 1875, was “a civil society supporting the search for the maintenance of constitutional principles by those who had fought against Carlistism in 1874” (Unamuno 1891). After the Third Carlist War, many of the citizens of Bilbao had helped the liberal cause and fought against the Carlists. El Sitio was a club that was formed around these ideas as “a tribune of truly free thought, in which all ideologies and political and philosophical approaches have been allowed – not sustained by totalitarianism or violence, but the forum has been characterized by tolerance, democratic discrepancy, the correction of forms, true dialogue and free conscience” (Gomez Molleda 1980). In 1891, Unamuno wrote an article about El Sitio called “From the Tree of Freedom to the Palace of Freedom, or the Little Wine Room” in which he wrote about Bilbao’s past and the beginnings of El Sitio in the shade of an important cultural tree. He explained that “those first heroic days of the club were enchanting” as he equates it to the Israelites walking through the desert, where they grew up telling stories, on the way to the Promised Land” (Unamuno 1891). In the same way, he wrote, “‘El Sitio’ brought people through the village because of its alliance with the liberal ideal” (Unamuno 1891).
Once he had reflected on an idea and spoken about it, he quickly wrote his thoughts for newspaper articles when the moment demanded it, publishing in a short amount of time. He often used writing in the press as one step in his oviparous process, to experiment with themes and expand his initial thoughts on issues. His newspaper articles became an important part of his writing process, and it was an exercise that he could quickly complete in a matter of a few days. More than acting as a vehicle to quickly spread his ideas to the public, the genre of the newspaper article provided an exercise that Unamuno used to hone and develop his thoughts. The themes and concepts introduced in his articles often resurfaced in later writings in other genres. Unamuno’s journalistic pieces became an important part of his process, as he often later narrativized the theoretical ideas and themes from the articles into his novels’ plots and characters.

After he explored themes in newspaper articles, they would often reappear in longer, creative writings such as novels, essays, or philosophical works. His ideas were “subsequently expanded in more substantial” works (Longhurst 2014, 2). For instance, we can see how the symbol of bees developed throughout his body of works. He originally used bees in an article published in 1921, and it later became a resource for a novel. In the article, he explains how female worker bees pass on the art of survival, work, construction of the honeycomb, and the spiritual tradition of the hive, although they do not reproduce. Rather, they transmit this knowledge culturally, not genetically, and he equates this to the figure of the childless aunt, the guardian and transmitter of the Spanish culture and tradition, in the beehive of Spanish society. Like the childless worker bee, the aunt passes on a spiritual inheritance, if not a carnal one. He writes that in “a hive there is the queen, the female, the mother, the one who lays the eggs and assures the material, carnal continuity of the swarm… and there are the worker bees, sterile females, who make honey and wax and sting. And the spiritual tradition of the hive is transmitted from bee to bee, from aunt
to aunt, from worker to worker and not because of carnal inheritance” (Unamuno 1921d). In Tía Tula, his book published later the same year, he writes this theme into narrative form, and a dialogue between two of the characters employs the same metaphor of the bees for the Spanish aunt:

R: ‘Tell me, little sister, haven’t you ever thought of being part of a honeycomb, of entering a beehive…?’

M: ‘It’s possible to make honey and beeswax while remaining part of the world…’

R: ‘And to sting…’

M: ‘And to sting – exactly!’

R: ‘Ah, yes, and you intend to be an aunt, like Aunt Tula’ (Unamuno 2013, 238-9).

Both the article and the novel utilize the trope of the beehive in relation to femininity, sisterhood, and the inheritance of culture in Spain, but the novel narrativizes the philosophical ideas seen in the article. In the book, Tula is a childless, single woman who does not give birth, but plays a maternal role in her family, raising her sister’s children and passing the “spiritual tradition” through generations. Unamuno compares this type of woman in Spanish society to the worker bee in a hive, someone instrumental in transferring culture to younger generations. Both pieces discuss the importance of sisterhood through the analogy of bees, queens and drones. His exploration of the theme in the process of article writing prepares him to delve into his reflections in novelistic form.

In order to provide a broad narrative background to understand his oviparous method of writing, the rest of this chapter will outline the context of the Spanish press in which he wrote and then provide a biographical account of Unamuno’s life that situates his development alongside the history of Spain. The goal is to show how Unamuno’s development as a writer took on a distinctly
rhetorical character insofar as he used the art of writing to respond to contemporary events and to create symbols that could interpret them and move people to judgment and action. Unamuno was keenly sensitive to his political and cultural environment, and he relied on the stimulation of that environment to generate new meanings and perspectives. His rhetorical engagement with events thus helped provide material from which he could draw in crafting more reflective works of art or philosophy.

The History of the Spanish Press

The press with which Unamuno became involved had a long history in Spain. After the arrival of the printing press in 1470, the “press” that developed from it helped catalyze the process by which Spain transformed from a loose constellation of kingdoms into a modern nation. The portable printing press aided the unification of Spain under King Ferdinand and Queen Isabel, as the press “followed the victorious armies… as they moved south in 1492 against the Moors at Granada” (Schulte 1968, 68). A traveling press spread stories of the Christian reconquest of Spain and of Columbus’s expeditions in the New World. By the 1500s, Spanish printers began to publish stories and news accounts in one volume, constituting “the origins of modern journalism in Spain” (Schulte 1968, 69-70). Throughout the 1500s, the press provided a way to distribute pertinent information and news about current events. Although authors printed short articles about different events and episodes, the first attempt at publishing an actual newspaper in Spain occurred in Barcelona in 1640 (Varela Hervías 1960, xxvii). This newspaper was a collection of tales about interesting events imported from different countries, and after the publication of this periodical, many others began to imitate its form to gain readers.
Because of the increase in the number of publications, the demand for information began to grow, and so did the press. The press strived for accuracy and speed, and it began to implement a variety of typefaces in order to attract readers (Schulte 1968, 85). By the 1750s the newspaper became more accessible to greater numbers of people as literacy rates increased, the cost of the newspaper decreased\(^9\), and the language of the press followed the vernacular style (Schulte 1968, 95). In Spain, newspapers transformed into more regular daily publications. By 1758, *Diario Noticioso* of Madrid became the first daily newspaper in Spain, and the second in Europe, only after London’s *Daily Courant* (Schulte 1968, 94). In the wake of *Diario Noticioso*’s success, publications began to surface around Spain, in cities such as Barcelona and Valencia. At the time, newspapers needed licenses to operate; in order to get a license, the newspaper’s official purpose had to be committed to increasing commerce in Spain. Over time, the popularity and freedom of the press waxed and waned, but by 1870, during Unamuno’s childhood, there were 500 newspapers in Spain (Schulte 1968, 213). In 1888 *El Noticiero Universal* became “the first attempt in the nation’s history to achieve a broad-based mass circulation by reducing subscription rates to a minimum and making it possible for low income groups to subscribe on a fortnightly basis” (Schulte 1968, 214).

From the beginnings of the press, there was a connection between political events and the press’s response. Scholars have described the “clear relationship between the epochs of political tension and the beginning or development of the national press” (Varela Hervías 1960, xxviii). Initially, for instance, although in Spain it was “welcomed as a means of spreading knowledge,” the press soon became a vehicle of propaganda and control by the Catholic church. By the 1600s, the press began to introduce “elements of opinion or judgment or used their sheets as vehicles for

---

\(^9\) The cost of the newspaper decreased to less than one U.S. dollar cent per issue.
political or personal attacks, or for praising persons of position to help them – characteristics which appear again and again in the Spanish press of later years” (Schulte 1968, 72). Early newspapers in Spain were commonly censored by the Church and local priests. By the 1760s, however, the Spanish press assumed a new function, and it was used as a form of popular education, which led to another boom in sales and subscriptions (Schulte 1968, 99). For this reason, many periodicals arose at the end of the 1700s in Spain. However, the French Revolution had scared monarchs across Europe into thinking that revolutionary fervor would spread through the press. As the press grew and political landscapes across Europe changed, there was “an increasing official alertness to the press’s potential as a channel for, or originator of, ideas hostile to the ruling powers” (Schulte 1968, 115). Thus, in the 1790s the Spanish king, fearing revolts, limited the number of Spanish newspapers to two. By the early 1800s, government controls loosened in Spain, and new papers came into being, creating a more competitive environment in which periodicals were able to become increasingly extreme. In the 1820s a new constitution passed in Spain, allowing a boom in periodicals. Most of these presses had short lifespans, averaging about thirteen weeks (Schulte 1968, 137). Periodicals attacked the Church, the monarchy, the liberal government and the constitution (Schulte 1968, 139). For instance, one critic wrote in a newspaper in 1864 that the language of the press was one “of royalty, philosophers, scholars, statesmen, political infighters, and literate guttersnipes. Its role has been that of public mouthpiece for the nation’s rulers or political podium for narrow, partisan interests. It has been the weapon of those grasping for power and a tool for consolidating power once it was gained” (Schulte 1968, 3). Not long after this, the king took control of the situation and voided the constitution, and the monarchy attempted to control and regulate the press. Lastly, as it grew throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries,

---

10 We will see that Unamuno complains about this trait of the press in his articles during the 19th century.
readers were attracted by stories of conflicts in North Africa, Cuba, and the 1898 war with the United States. During this time, “El Imparcial’s circulation rose to 120,000. Other newspapers benefited similarly” (Schulte 1968, 215). Because of increased sales, the nature of the press changed, as “businessmen, rather than politicians, began assuming control of the fortunes of the larger newspapers” (Schulte 1968, 215). Freedom of the Spanish press shifted with the change of governments and it was common for authors to criticize the government in the press. This is the landscape in which Unamuno began his career.

The Formation of the Unamunian Spirit (1864-1876)

Unamuno was born in September of 1864 in Bilbao, a port city nestled in the lush mountains of Basque Country in northern Spain and grew up in a religious family with five brothers and sisters. On the afternoon of his late September birth, on the feast of Saint Michael (San Miguel), he was baptized with the name Miguel in his neighborhood church. Of the appropriateness of this name, he later wrote that “being called Miguel, by way of providence, obliged me to make a sword of my pen and to enter the pandemonium to fight” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 20). Growing up, his family lived in a flat above his uncle’s chocolate shop. His father was a baker in Bilbao, but he also involved himself in local politics. When Miguel was four, his father was elected to the city council of Bilbao. Both his name and his father’s example of political involvement inspired Unamuno from an early age to step into the political fray.

During Miguel’s childhood, deaths in his family made a lasting impression on his life and thought. When Miguel was only six years old in 1870, his father died. His mother, a widow at the young age of 30, raised her children with help from Miguel’s grandmother and uncle. Tragedy struck the household again the following year when Miguel’s infant sister died. After these deaths,
his family life became more austere and religious, a theme that resurfaces throughout his body of writing. As a child, he accompanied his mother and grandmother to daily mass, and in later reflections he described his family life as puritanical and without demonstrations of affection. Although emotionally austere, the family did participate in the religious festivals and celebrations typical of Spanish towns.

Although his father’s death meant that he was not physically present for much of Miguel’s childhood, he left behind a large library with books on all subjects, including poetry, history, science, politics, and art that influenced Miguel’s love of literature. The library included around five hundred books that his father had collected in his travels, mostly from Mexico. As a small, weak, and melancholy child, Miguel spent a great deal of time among these books and was nourished by and raised on them. When he felt frustrated or unsettled, he would seek refuge among the books. And so, at an early age Miguel developed a “fondness for books and for Latin America, whose literature began to create in him a lasting fascination” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 36). Although his memories of his father remained vague, cloudy, and mostly informed by his portraits on the walls of the house, Miguel was always impacted by the memory of his father’s library.

As a schoolboy, Miguel spent a great deal of time in solitude, daydreaming and observing others, but from a young age he also enjoyed storytelling. Because he was weaker than other children, he often did not play games with his peers, and so he involved himself with other creative hobbies. He became a paper-folding aficionado, and, for the rest of his life, spent time making little origami birds. It was common to see him sitting in cafes, folding napkins or little pieces of paper into life-like figures. Indeed, he coins a term for this art, calling it “cocotology” (“cocotología”) in one of his article essays, “Notes for a treatise on cocotology.” By calling it cocotology, he presents the art of paper folding as a technê to be studied and perfected.
paper folding, he also learned drawing and painting from an artist who lived in his building. He would continue pen and ink drawings throughout adulthood. In addition to the visual arts, among friends he was known for telling little stories based on things he had read. Even as a child, he captivated audiences as a fantastic and whimsical storyteller, a talent that would only grow as he did.

Young Unamuno was shaped by ideological and political disputes in Spain during his childhood, the overarching one a conflict between liberals and traditionalists. Indeed, “nineteenth century Spain was a caldron [sic] of conflicting ideologies, all making absolute claims” (Lacy 1967, 20). While liberalism of the left was seen as a sin against conservatism and religion, any religious talk was thought to be linked with clericalism and anti-liberalism. Although this ideological conflict played out repeatedly throughout Unamuno’s life, when he was young it manifested in the Carlist Wars. When Unamuno was born, Isabel II reigned, but her queenship was contested by a group called the Carlists who supported her uncle Carlos, a pretender to the throne. The Carlist revolts led to the 1868 exile and 1870 abdication of the queen, in what is known as the Glorious Revolution. At this time, the Spanish parliament instated a new family dynasty, and an outsider, Amadeo of Savoy, was appointed king. However, Amadeo I’s rule faced problems gaining support from the start, as the Carlists still preferred their candidate for the throne.

War was another event in his childhood that formed his spirit, and he would live the rest of his life protesting all war. When Unamuno was eight years old in 1872, the Third Carlist War began between the Carlists and Amadeo, lasting four years. In 1873, during the middle of the war,

\[\text{11 In 1833 when King Ferdinand VII of Spain died, he did not have a male heir, and, according to Spanish law, his brother Carlos would assume the throne. However, before his death, Ferdinand had ratified a decree stating that his daughter could succeed him. Thus, upon the death of the king, Isabel II became monarch, but because she was only three years old, her mother, Maria Cristina, served as queen regent. As a result of this, Carlos’ supporters, calling themselves Carlists, rebelled, sparking several wars during the 19th century. The First Carlist War lasted from 1833-1839, driving “the wedge still deeper between traditional and liberal Spain” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 214).}\]
King Amadeo abdicated the throne for several reasons, including the Carlist conflict, revolts in the Spanish colony of Cuba, and other political disputes. Upon his abdication, the First Spanish Republic replaced the monarchy. However, the Republic only lasted one year because of continued political turmoil and disagreements. During this year of Republic, several presidents unsuccessfully tried to restore order, but by 1875, when the Republic’s failure was clear, the Spanish monarchy was restored to the son of Isabel II, Alfonso XII. At last, a king’s rule was able to bring relative stability to Spain, and Alfonso was able to put an end to the Carlist revolts.

As a child, Unamuno was aware of the presence of a war only when he had to stay inside or school was canceled because of bombardments, but the events remained with him throughout his life and appeared in his later writings. One of his earliest memories was of shells exploding next to his house during the 1874 siege of Bilbao, when Carlists tried to take the city. Despite the threat of danger, Miguel particularly loved the excitement and the interruption of routine. During these moments, he was able to hide away in the house and play quietly with his cousin. They worked together to create an imaginary world of little folded paper birds, a world that, mimicking the human world, had names, currency, armies, births, deaths, and laws. Years later, when he was 24 years old, he philosophically reflected on this bird world in an article called “The Story of Some Little Paper Birds.” Indeed, “Unamuno’s first ten years take on central importance in his mature thought. The imaginative return to this childhood is one of the crucial themes in his later writing” (Lacy 1967, 24). When he was 33, he returned again to these childhood memories in his articles and in Peace in War, his novel about the Carlist Wars.

Because his grandmother preferred him over her other grandchildren, she paid for Miguel to attend El Instituto Vizcaíno, a prestigious school in Bilbao, where he developed his lifelong love of knowledge and philosophy. At the institute he learned subjects such as geometry, trigonometry,
logic, rhetoric, poetics, and Latin and Spanish grammar. It was here that he read his first book on political theory, *Nationalities* by Francisco Pi y Margall, which would continue to influence his political thought and encourage him to be politically active. As a student, he continued to read at a furious pace, consuming more and more books. However, because of his physical weakness, doctors instructed him to spend time exercising outdoors. During this period, he started to take walks for his health, but he soon realized that they also aided his thought process. In addition, during this time he honed his artistic talents, as he continued paper folding and became renowned for his pen and ink caricatures of professors at the institute. In moments away from school, he would spend time relaxing with friends in the Plaza Nueva, one of his favorite places for fellowship in Bilbao.12.

**Development and First Manifestations of Public Intellectualism (1877-1890)**

Following the end of the Carlist Wars and while Miguel was still at the Institute, political events in Spain began to prompt a public response from Unamuno. Because the Basque Provinces had supported Carlos in the Carlist War, the Spanish monarchy abolished some rights previously enjoyed by the Basque people in 1876 when Unamuno was 12 years old. As residents of the Basque Provinces, Unamuno and his family were impacted by these laws, so he felt “a sense of calling to become an active participant in Spanish public life, not as a party politician but as a critic and guide” (Robertson 2010, 13). This sense of calling led him to write articles in newspapers and
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12 The plaza holds a distinctly important place in Spanish life as a center of civic, social, and commercial life. Most cities have one main plaza and several smaller ones geographically scattered throughout town. The plaza serves as not only a place of commercial activity, but also as a place of social meeting and gathering. It is typically a flat open terrace, surrounded by buildings on all sides. Often, the town hall is one of the adjacent buildings, and restaurants, cafes, and bars with outdoor seating line the plaza. Plazas frequently feature art installments, public exhibits, and performances. Socially, the plaza is a bustling social site people sit in or stroll through in the evenings in order to be seen.
magazines. Additionally, the repression of Basque culture impassioned Unamuno about political issues, and in response, at the young age of 12, he wrote “an anonymous letter of protest to King Alfonso XII – the first manifestation of ‘the arouser of Spain’” (Burns 2009). Shockingly, this letter contained death threats addressed to “His Majesty the King Alfonso XII” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 41). After mailing the letter, though, he grew terrified of the possible repercussions of sending death threats to the king.

During this period of his early manifestations of public intellectualism, he first took to the newspapers to make a political impact. His newspaper writings never presented news, but views and opinions. His first forays into political writing were inspired by his early life during the Carlist War, the exile of Queen Isabel II, and the fall of the Bourbon monarchy in Spain. When he was only 15 years old, Miguel published his first newspaper article, called “Union Constitutes Strength” in El Noticiero Bilbaino (Unamuno 1879). In this article he writes about the axiom found on Belgian money, “Union constitutes strength” explaining the importance of union and unity. As he examines why this is not the case in Spain, he provides an answer, saying that “passions are the obstacle. In people, and therefore in the people, two contrary and contradictory elements exist, two principles that are constantly fighting, repelling and rejecting each other, and both tend to direct human actions. This fight is between the passions and reason” (Unamuno 1879). Even at a young age, Unamuno perceived the underlying tensions and polarization in the people of Spain. His first article displays the themes and methods that would become important in his future body of work. In this article, we see him examining Spain’s circumstances, desiring unity in the country, diagnosing the reason for disunity, and offering a potential solution. In this case, he explains the problem as a struggle between passion and reason and an excess of hatred and pride.
During 1880, the year Miguel turned 16 years old, he faced several new challenges. His grandmother died, he graduated from El Instituto, and he left Basque Country for the first time to study at the Central University of Madrid. Saying goodbye to his family, he boarded a train to the capital. Although academically prepared for his studies, he was overwhelmed by the scale of the city and the mass of people he encountered there. Used to being surrounded by a large family in his childhood home, Miguel lived alone for the first time in a small, dark, and dingy room. He profoundly felt the isolation of being alone in a big city. To cope with his loneliness, he frequented cafes to surround himself with people. In those public spaces, however, he felt “a profound deception, because no one listened to the others and the conversations were futile” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 48). He greatly missed passing hours in the Plaza Nueva with his fellow citizens of Bilbao, entering into conversations and debates. He found Madrid “an artificial capital, a city lacking vitality because of the enormous presence of bureaucracy, the very opposite of his native Bilbao, mercantile and dynamic” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 49). In his writings, he noted some of the many contrasts between the two cities, including differences in the people, the climate, the landscape, the architecture, the culture, and the very moods characterizing the cities. To enrich himself and find fellowship, he would often go to the Ateneo in the afternoons to hear lectures and debates. While in Madrid, Bilbao and the Basque Provinces remained on his mind and in his heart. He ultimately wrote his doctoral thesis about the “Problems of the Origins and Pre-History of the Basque People.”

Because of the difficulties he faced in Madrid, most Unamuno scholars “refer to this period as that in which Unamuno lost his faith” (Lacy 1967, 35). During his first year of school, Miguel continued to attend Mass in Madrid. His mother worried that studying philosophy would turn him away from the Church, and she begged him to continue reading religious works. Indeed, he was
exposed to different philosophies. By his second year of studies, he began to contemplate religion in light of positivism and dialectic philosophy. After a year, he stopped attending mass and began to question Catholic dogma, such as the concepts of heaven and hell. Because his mind was preoccupied with these questions and he felt unhappy and lonely in his surroundings, he suffered bouts of insomnia. After this period of questions and doubts, his faith was restored, but a new and mature faith that he described as pure and separate from religious dogma.

While he faced personal difficulties in Madrid, Unamuno’s thought was influenced by a new group of intellectuals there called the “Generation of 1868.” This group’s writings and thoughts were influenced by the failed ideals of the Glorious Revolution of 1868 and the events following it, such as the exile of Isabel II, the installation of Amadeo I as monarch, the failure of the Spanish monarchy, and the First Spanish Republic of 1873. The movement included authors such as José María de Pereda, Benito Pérez Galdós, Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, Emilia Pardo Bazán, and Armando Palacio Valdés, authors who comprised a literary generation that desired “the renewal of Spain after the fall of the monarchy” (Burns 2009, 3). The writings of the Generation of 1868 were characterized by realism, progressivism, defense of the modernization of Spain, and a critique of conservatism. Being exposed to these authors and trends sharpened Unamuno’s political thoughts on Spain’s future, its need for renewal, and how to achieve this aim.

In 1884, at the age of 20, Unamuno finished his doctorate in Philosophy and Letters, left Madrid, and returned to Bilbao, where he began to assume his role as an “agitator of spirits” in Spanish newspapers. While he looked for a university position, he often published in periodicals for extra income, but increased political turmoil made him willing to enter into conflicts in the newspaper. By the end of the 1880s, he “exerted himself as an official chronicler and he wrote for Bilbao periodicals” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 80). Some of his articles dealt with themes of Basque
issues, customs, folklore, festivals, daily life, pelota games, and celebrations. Others took a stance on social issues or observations of political life, explaining his dissatisfaction with the polarized party system in Spain. During this time, he published many articles in a socialist periodical, *La Lucha de Clases*, and for several magazines and periodicals across Spain, like *Revista Ibero Americana*, and *La España Moderna*. Between 1886 and 1889 he wrote a series of articles about Basque life and language published in periodicals such as *El Norte, El Noticiero Bilbaino, Bilbao Ilustrado*, and *La Revista de Vizcaya*. In 1888 and 1889 he added the publication *El Nervión* to his collaborations. In addition to original articles, he also published translations of philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt from German to Spanish in the magazine *Euskal Herria*. Not only did he write his opinions in the newspaper, but he also gave speeches in the local club El Sitio, a liberal gathering place in Bilbao. His political articles during this time can be divided into articles about socialism and anarchism and articles critical of the monarchy.

His articles in this early period expressed threads of socialist and anarchist thought, a response to the situation and exigences of class struggle in northern Spain. An industrial steel boom in Bilbao had led to exaggerated class and social divisions, influencing his socialist thought. For this reason, he was aligned with the socialist periodical *La Lucha de Clases*. However, because he “was not doctrinaire in his acceptance of Marxism… he quickly fell out of favor” with some editors of socialist periodicals (Evans 2013a, 14). Throughout his career, Unamuno would never be doctrinaire in his acceptance of anything, and he would constantly question and critique all ideas and dogma. Not just interested in socialism, in 1887 and 1888 he expressed anarchist ideas in his writings. For Unamuno, this interest mostly came from the belief of the freedom of the individual conscience. In his work, shades of anarchism were seen “in the ‘opposition’ that he establishes
‘between society and the state’ in relation to ‘property’” (Rivero Gómez 2005, 173). Throughout his life he describes himself as being a spiritual anarchist, more than a political anarchist.

From an early age, Unamuno publicly criticized the institution of the monarchy. When King Alfonso XII died unexpectedly in 1885 at the age of 28, it caused a wave of political upheaval that Unamuno addressed in his articles. Although the king’s infant son Alfonso XIII succeeded him as monarch, his widow María Cristina served as queen regent until Alfonso came of age in 1902. Despite the fact that Unamuno had sent death threats to Alfonso XII, he did not feel any sense of relief when the king died. With the passage of time he had realized that the monarch’s death would not improve the Spanish political landscape because the institution would abide. As a proponent of liberal values, Unamuno observed that in María Cristina’s regency after Alfonso XII’s death, liberalism “had been thwarted by oligarchic and plutocratic forces and that, as a consequence, the political system had ceased to function as a means to achieve progress and social improvement” (Robertson 1996, iii). In his 1886 article series called “Evolution and Revolution,” Unamuno writes of the king’s death and how it would not end the institution of the monarchy, explaining that the “monarchy is not what it was, and although the old ideal dies, the monarchy continues living, not as it was, but as another thing. In every nation there are invariable elements that have reached the height of their aspirations…. To believe that these elements are transformable is to believe that an ox can fly; in these elements there is no evolution” (Unamuno 1886). He denied the possibility of evolution of the Spanish monarchy, arguing that it was so deeply entrenched in Spanish society and culture that even the death of the king would not change it. Although the monarchy was no longer what it had previously been in the wake of the king’s death, as an institution it lived on. In Unamuno’s eyes the elements of the monarchy were not able to transform or evolve. Rather, the only way for these elements to evolve would be through a more
serious form of revolution. Unamuno went on to critique the institution of the monarchy throughout his lifetime.

In his first article of this period, Unamuno published using a pseudonym, as he would continue to do intermittently for years. He published his first article under the pseudonym “X,” and the newspaper introduced him by saying, “Today we offer our readers a new and valuable work of a writer who modestly hides himself behind an X, and we do it with the utmost pleasure since this article is an eloquent justification of unionism that constitutes the social political creed of *El Noticiero Bilbaino*.” Similarly, between 1894 and 1897 he did not sign his socialist articles in *La Lucha de Clases*, instead publishing anonymously or under pseudonyms such as “I, Myself” (*Yo Mismo*), “Your Friend” (*Tu Amigo*), “Manu Ausari,” or simply with the letters “X” or “M”. He did this to avoid being associated with radical ideas, as he took “into account the false ideas that many people, including his own mother, believed of socialism and socialists,” deciding “not to sign his writings so as to avoid dangerous misunderstandings” (Ereño Altuna 2005, 99).

In addition to his work as a journalist, Unamuno tutored and taught classes at high schools in Bilbao, which provided more material for his articles. As a teacher, he became critical of the education system, especially what he deemed ineffective pedagogical methods. He later wrote of this frustration with the educational system. For example, in an article from 1900 called “Textbooks,” he writes that bad teachers corrupt education, and that, “[w]e can only call teacher those who communicate to us something more than knowledge and intelligence, pouring their souls into it. A teacher communicates enthusiasm for knowledge and inquiry above all…A teacher is a living person, not a walking library. Human, it is all human!” (Unamuno 1900q). Here, Unamuno showed the importance of the teacher as an individual human in the educational system, making students question ideas rather than blindly accepting them. Although textbooks were one
problem, more importance should be placed on the individual human professors, with their warmth, spiritual action, communicating enthusiasm for knowledge and inquiry. Teachers should communicate the humanity and soul of education, the living word and knowledge, not just cold words in a textbook.

Finding His Voice in Salamanca (1891-1897)

Unamuno’s situation became more stable when he obtained an appointment at the University of Salamanca in the field of Greek Language and Literature in 1891. Once he secured a position, he was able to marry his long-time sweetheart Concepción “Concha” Lizárraga, and together they moved to Salamanca, a city in western Spain, very different from Bilbao in terms of its climate, landscape, culture, and history. For Unamuno, however, it “represented a golden mean between the tedious provincialism of the Biscayan port and the tiring over-stimulation of Madrid, whose intellectual pace left little time for reflection and quiet growth” (Lacy 1967, 67). In Salamanca, Unamuno lived a simple life. His son later remembered that Miguel enjoyed a life free of excess, avoiding meat for health reasons and never drinking or smoking. Instead he spent leisure time playing solitaire, drawing, and making folded paper birds. (Unamuno y Lizárraga 1966, 183). He lived with his wife and children in a house next door to the university, and his home office was full of large wooden bookshelves, a center table, and an iron balcony overlooking the street. Although he slept a great deal, he did so without curtains on the windows, so he would wake up when the sun rose, and he would lie in bed to read and write. After a nine o’clock breakfast, while reading the daily paper El Imparcial, he would drink hot chocolate before teaching class. Once done teaching for the day, he took a walk between three and five o’clock, as he enjoyed being alone and thinking outdoors. The historic city was small enough to walk, and he could easily cross
the river Tormes into more natural surroundings. Moreover, he often departed the city for the
Gredos mountain range, a place he loved to visit so he could sit on the hills and think. Indeed, the
magic of Salamanca and its surrounding landscapes became an influential part of Miguel’s life and
work. Many afternoons and evenings he liked to sit in the Plaza Mayor and discuss issues or hold tertulias. In the plaza he often frequented Café Novelty, the oldest café in Salamanca.

Although his professional position and home life were secure, lingering struggles with
religion and philosophy combined with political and personal crises to internally torment
Unamuno. His daughter was born in 1897, but in March of 1897, he faced a deep spiritual and
existential crisis, caused by a confluence of events, including his meditations on religion, his
experiences with the deaths of loved ones, and the illness and eventual death of his fourth child,
born the previous year. Paralyzed by this internal crisis, Unamuno reportedly sat for three days,
staring at a wall in a convent in Salamanca. Scholars agree that this became “the most important
single event in Unamuno’s life” (Lacy 1967, 77). In some ways, it seems as though this crisis
became a catalyst for his productivity, as he published most of his major works of fiction, poetry,
essay, and philosophy after this point. These themes of philosophy and religious crisis became
important in Unamuno’s articles and other works.

As a result of this spiritual crisis, he turned away from socialism and grasped the spirituality
of his youth, forcing himself to believe and to focus on the problem of religion and religious
language. Through this experience he discovered the “tragic sense of life,” a concept that would
imbue many of his articles and other works of this period. After the crisis, Unamuno again felt a
deep sense of loneliness and lived “in a state of radical dichotomy: Christian and Agnostic;
traditionalist and progressive; dead to ‘the stage’ but still seeking fame and fortune as a writer”
(Burns 2009, 9). From this point forward, his life, work, and thought would be full of contradiction
and existentialism. During the year of the crisis he wrote his first great work of fiction, *Peace in War*, about his childhood and life in Bilbao during the Third Carlist War.

In Salamanca, Unamuno’s new professorship stimulated his energies as a teacher and as a writer. On October 2, 1891, he taught his first university class there, and as a professor he became known as a non-conformist. He had a different style of teaching, and his students were surprised to see that he did not stand on a platform to lecture and that he kept the windows open during class. Unamuno wanted the university to be more rigorous, and he believed that professors should encourage students to think on their own. In addition to his duties as a professor, he translated many works between 1893 and 1900, publishing some of these in different magazines and periodicals, including *La Lucha de Clases* and *Revista Internacional*. He devoted time during this period to reading “the works of Herbert Spencer, Thomas Carlyle, Ernest Renan, Hippolyte Taine, Henry George” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 146). Increasingly, he felt more deeply called to be an “agitator of spirits” engaged in public life through the newspaper, and “he felt part of a generation come to ‘stir and agitate the conscience’ of the people” (Ruiz Manjón 2003, 277). Thus, Unamuno’s newspaper work increased during his early years in Salamanca, and his newspaper articles of the time focused on the “search for the image of a Spain that would rise triumphantly above petty divisions and nationalistic manoeuvres, vindicating its human heritage and, incidentally, giving him a spiritual home” (Barea 1952, 14).

However, Unamuno was careful to distance himself from very radical socialist dogma, and he remained relatively quiet in Salamanca’s press so as not to attract attention that would threaten his university position. He wrote one pro-Cuban independence article called “True Charity” in the student magazine in Salamanca, *El Estudiante de Salamanca*. Additionally, he continued to write for publications in Bilbao and added new collaborations in Madrid. Although *La Lucha de clases*
gained readers over time, Unamuno worried about losing his university position if he became labeled as an outspoken socialist newspaper doctrinaire. For this reason, he strategically began to distance himself from the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE, Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party) and did not publish any articles in La Lucha de Clases between April and August of 1895.

During this period, he began to write articles for periodicals such as La Libertad, La Democracia, El Nervión, El Fomento, El Eco de Bilbao, and Ciencia Social. In September of 1891 he published his first explicitly political critical article in the newspaper La Libertad, titled “Republican Propaganda.” La Libertad was a paper affiliated with the Krausist movement, and in this article he described different possible forms of government and critiqued the monarchy. During 1891 he continued to use pseudonyms, publishing articles in La Libertad under the pseudonym “Unusquisque.” Unamuno became so involved in writing for La Libertad that he served as interim director of the paper for a short time. In 1892 he wrote a series of six articles published in La Democracia of Salamanca about socialism under the series title “The Socialist Movement.” In 1893 he wrote articles in El Nervión, exposing corruption, and using the pseudonym “Exoristo.” Under this pseudonym he also wrote responses to another intellectual in La República, a centralist Republican paper. In 1893 he also wrote for El Fomento, a conservative periodical, publishing five articles. These articles he signed as “A.S.G.” or “R.M.C.,” and “[u]nder these initials, Unamuno answers in a joke form some traditionalist Salamancans, denouncing the Jewish danger in Spain” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 124). The series was called “The Antisemitic League of Salamanca.” Also during 1893 he began writing pieces about social thought and critiques of neo-feudal Spanish society for El Eco de Bilbao. During this time, he wrote on topics
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13 Krausism is a philosophical movement named after German philosopher Karl Krause. It became popular in Spain and Latin America after 1870.
such as Spanish youth, the division of labor, public office, and criticism of the press and the monarchy. He also wrote a series of articles critical of the press in the 1890s, published in Madrid’s *La Justicia*. By 1894 he had a disagreement with the editor of *El Nervión* and he began to focus, instead, on other outlets for his work (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 148). In 1896 he started to write for *Ciencia Social*, a monthly anarchist magazine from Barcelona, writing about human dignity, intellectual Spanish youth “in which he insists in the general ignorance that Spanish people have of their language, beliefs, psychology and customs” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 174). He wrote articles about “The Crisis of Patriotism” and “Civilization and Culture” where he declared the need to free culture from civilization. However, after an anarchist bombing, *Ciencia Social* was suspended.

Although he distanced himself from the socialist party and dogma, especially after 1895, he would continue to write openly about socialism and worker struggles. In an article from 1894, he wrote of his conviction “of the truth, the high justice, and the profound goodness of socialism,” but that, despite this, he continued “far from the working people, limiting my projects to serve them from afar, translating socialist works and preaching in a serene and scientific form in bourgeois periodicals” (Unamuno 1894a). In this article, he explained that he was prepared to take “the final step, having thought it over well and matured for a long time. It is not enough to keep yourself in a cold and distant region, apart from the burning struggles, but it is necessary to descend into the arena” (Unamuno 1894a). It was at this time that he decided to enter the political struggle, and he defined socialism as something true, just, and good for society. His conclusions on this question came from his observations of how members of the bourgeoisie treated members of the working class and his own background of studying economic questions. Unamuno reflected here that he identified as a socialist, but felt removed from the workers struggle.
At this juncture Unamuno realized that he must descend into the arena of the newspaper to fight certain political battles against the various regimes of Spain. He continued to do this for the rest of his career. During this period in his articles, he continued to tackle socialist issues and concerns. For instance, six years later, in a 1900 article called “Regionalism and Socialism” he wrote that the ties among workers were stronger than national ties, saying, “there are more common interests and feelings between the workers of different nations and regions than among the working mass and the capitalist class of the same nation or region. The Catalonian worker has a greater brotherhood with the worker from Malaga than with the Catalonian owner” (Unamuno 1900n). Here Unamuno argued that the regionalist sentiments or nationalist sentiments associated with autonomous regions in Spain were one form of distraction for and opposition to the socialist party. He identified the periodical La Lucha de Clases as one of the defenders of socialism that worked to protect the working class and expose corruption in the government. As Unamuno investigated the ties between the working class and the solidarity that existed between them, he found that these relationships crossed national boundaries and were stronger than ties of national citizenship.

The Spanish-American War and the Creation of a Generation (1898-1913)

The following year, in 1898, Spain entered into the Spanish-American War, a conflict that would change the course of Spain’s future and change the economic situation in Spain. As a result of the economic impact, newspapers were no longer inclined to pay for articles. In the midst of a Cuban rebellion against Spanish rule, the United States became “the protector of an oppressed Cuba and accused Spain of brutality beyond measure” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 228). The United States military joined the fight and defeated Spain, and with the loss of the war came the
loss of most of Spain’s colonies, including Puerto Rico, Guam, Cuba, and the Philippines. The golden age of the Spanish empire was over; it was reduced to a few small colonies in Africa. For this reason, in Spain the war is known simply as “The Disaster,” as it signaled the end of empire and a coming crisis of national identity. The loss was “a tremendous blow to [Spain’s] national self-image” and after the war, “national humiliation” led to “self-examination” as people wondered why, “when other Europeans were building empires, had Spain lost hers?” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 229); (Carr 2001, 224). In the wake of the conflict, the Spanish “elite of all political stripes felt an urgent need to reform Spain and bring the country up-to-date within the European context” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 229). Thus, there were many discussions on how to regenerate and revitalize Spain, and Unamuno became an important voice in these discussions.

This conflict would define Unamuno as part of the Generation of 1898. The group was born out of the anxieties of war and the shifting identity of Spain as it coped with the loss of its empire. This collection of literary figures were nurtured “in an atmosphere of pessimism and heart-searching” (Starkie 1976, xi). As these artists matured, the Generation of 1898 began “brilliantly in literature under the guidance of Unamuno and other young writers whose minds were concentrated on the idea of rebirth after the Disaster” (Starkie 1976, xiii). The Generation of 1898 has been described as a “movement of soul-searching,” characterized by works that portray a pessimistic attitude, a critical tone, and a search for the regeneration of Spain and the recuperation of a sense of national identity (Burns 2009, 7). This group of writers and thinkers also “constituted the first group of intellectuals to assume a clear conscience of their guiding role in the political and social vanguard” (Fox 1988, 234). As a more senior member of the group, Unamuno influenced others who would go on to become leading public intellectuals and authors, including Pío Baroja, Ramiro de Maeztu, and Ramón del Valle-Inclán.
During this period, and especially after 1900, Unamuno wrote more actively in various publications, providing his argument for how Spain should recover after the disaster. He collaborated with papers such as La Estafeta, El Imparcial of Madrid, El Norte de Castilla, Vida Nueva of Madrid, Las Noticias of Barcelona, and El Correo of Valencia, while continuing to write for La Lucha de Clases. He had an agreement to share the front page of Las Noticias of Barcelona in three articles per month, receiving 20 pesetas for each article. At the same time, he began to write in El Imparcial of Madrid and La Ilustración Española y Americana. In Las Noticias he wrote articles critical of the Spanish social situation, discussing the issues of idleness, social relationships in Spain, and problems with the monarchy, and in El Correo he discussed freedom and political critiques. In Vida Nueva he wrote more political articles, noting his observations about war, politicist superstition, and Spanish culture. Not only newspapers, but he began to write in magazines. About this work, he wrote, “you may say that in a magazine my articles will not have an impact. It is not my fault. There is not a daily circulation that would allow me to publish anything like that” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 255). The magazine at times gave him more freedom and less censorship than did the more careful daily newspapers. He began to collaborate in Arte Joven, a magazine under artistic direction of Pablo Picasso. After 1905, intellectuals became more involved in public manifestations, something in that influenced Unamuno’s mode of response. Due to his busy teaching and writing schedule, in 1906 he limited his newspaper work mostly to La España Moderna, El Imparcial, and La Nación in Buenos Aires. Publishing in the newspapers secured an additional 2,880 pesetas per year for his family. By 1907, he wrote that his financial situation was resolved largely because of his publications in foreign newspapers, including La Nación and Caras y Caretas in Argentina and El Diario Ilustrado in Chile. These papers had, in Unamuno’s own words, “freed me, thank God, from the Spanish press. There they pay triple and
they thank you quintuple” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 272). Foreign collaborations were also satisfying, more than financially, but also intellectually, as “he could write more freely for attentive and respectable readers” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 273). In 1908 he wrote two articles about the separatist situation in Catalonia in an anti-Catalanist paper El Mundo. Early segments of his book The Tragic Sense of Life were published in 1911 in the magazine La España Moderna.

He also continued to praise socialism in some of his articles. As he observed people leaving the countryside around Salamanca because of low salaries, Unamuno returned to the socialist themes and the agrarian question of his earlier articles. He writes in Ciencia Social an article called “The Crisis of Patriotism” where we see him discussing these themes. He continues in this vein in articles such as “La crisis actual del patriotismo espanol” and “La patria y el ejercito.” About these articles he wrote in a letter, “There has not been written in Spain anything more decisive, more resolved, more frank, and why shouldn’t I say it, more valiant than these two articles… It is my J’accuse” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 255). In these and other articles he writes out against wealthy landowners and agrarian corruption.

In the wake of the Spanish-American War, Unamuno began to write about war, expressing anti-war sentiments, and recalling the Carlist War of his childhood. This anti-war approach was a direct response to the problem of the Spanish-American War, but it also took into account his subjectivity as a rhetor and his own childhood and experiences with war. In 1899 in an article called “The Rifle and the Plow” he writes about the term "civilized war" explaining that “the most monstrous obstacle to progress” was “civilized war, or at least that is what it is called. It is an escape valve to animality, whose purification is the work of progress…. Corroboration of the atavistic instincts of our original savageness and horror at work, are the principle pedagogical effects of the last war on those of our countrymen, that had the misfortune to be brought to it as
lambs to slaughter” (Unamuno 1899f). This anti-war attitude, accompanied by a desire for social unity in Spain, would be markers of his work in years to come.

After the war, Unamuno continued to write about a path to Spain’s regeneration, explaining the importance of the past culture and traditions and tempering this with the idea of Europeanization and progress. While some intellectuals wrote articles in a more pessimistic tone, saying that Spain was sad, Unamuno disagreed, claiming that it was full of opportunity and possibility. While scholars and intellectuals debated whether to turn outward and Europeanize or turn inward to traditional Spanish values, he viewed liberalism as a way to achieve regeneration in Spain. Although he also defended Europeanization, he believed that “intellectuals of liberal socialist tendencies between 1909-1912” were too extreme in their project of Europeanization which “blinded them with respect to the spiritual values of Spanish culture” (Fox 1988, 243). Thus, as in most things, he believed in a more moderate version of Europeanization. As they debated how to approach Spain’s regeneration, Unamuno wrote in an 1899 article that Spain should look at the example of Japan wanting to Europeanize “see that it is impossible to bring the advancements and techniques of modern science without bringing the soul of modern science against which people here boldly fight” (Unamuno 1897c). In 1900, after the war, he wrote a series of articles about the meaning and future of the nation and patriotism, and the struggle between tradition and progress. In one of these articles, “Tradition and Progress” he wrote, “it is good that we turn our gaze to our past, to our Spain, but it is so that we can better walk to our future” (Unamuno 1900t). He continued in 1901, explaining how Spain should orient itself after the crisis, writing, “When the migrating bird wants to orient itself, first it flies up, up very high, and from that height it lays out its view, and flies off like an arrow. In Spain we are all very low to orient ourselves; we must
first go up, and go up a great deal. Help us then to all go up so that we can orient ourselves” (Unamuno 1901).

In addition to these political issues, Unamuno wrote about his travels and the Spanish landscape during this time. It was common for university professors to visit other cities and rural sites and write about their trips and the traditional cultures they encountered. Unamuno took visits like this during this time period, going to places like Guernica and a rural area of Spain called Las Hurdes. In 1913 he published five articles in Los Lunes de El Imparcial about his impressions of his trip to Las Hurdes. He was attracted by the different landscapes of Spain and the language and psychology of the people. After the disaster of the war of 1898, there was an “intellectual movement to turn back to the landscape and folkloric religious traditions” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 192).

In addition to his travels, he had a great deal of work to do in Salamanca aside from teaching and writing articles. A group of friends and colleagues met regularly in his office to learn English. He worked on poetry and books, publishing Memorias de niñez y mocedad (Memories of Childhood and Youth). By the early 1900s, Unamuno became a very successful and prolific writer, professor, and intellectual. In 1901, he had been appointed the Rector of the University of Salamanca, and in 1902 he published another novel, Amor y pedagogía (Love and Pedagogy). As poetry was his first literary love, Unamuno shifted to writing more in this genre, publishing books of poetry in 1907 and 1911. In 1912 he published his most famous work of philosophy, Tratado del amor de dios (Treaty on the Love of God, later renamed The Tragic Sense of Life).
World War I, Neutrality, and Destitution (1914-1922)

Although things remained politically stagnant in Spain with little progress toward reform, the 1914 beginning of World War I marked a new era in global and Spanish politics that Unamuno confronted in the newspaper. When the Spanish monarchy took an official position of neutrality, Unamuno disagreed because for him, “the war offered… the possibility of transforming a society that was seen as frozen” (Fox 1988, 246-7). While neutrality allowed Spain to profit from the war, it ultimately benefited Germany. However, in Unamuno’s eyes, worse than neutrality, the Spanish monarchy unofficially supported Germany. More generally, World War I had deeper implications for Unamuno as it exemplified “the fight of popular democracy against the imperialism of the materialist interpretation of history” (González Martínez 1984, 18). His growing concern with political and social issues after 1914 was “a reflection of the increasingly precarious social and political situation in Spain” (Robertson 2010, 8). Because of his critiques and disagreements with the monarchy, he had “problems with censorship on various occasions” but “he considered himself to still have full freedom of expression” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 368).

In addition to expressing his opinions about World War I, Unamuno’s articles also directly criticized King Alfonso XIII, who ruled from 1902 until 1931. During his reign, Unamuno wrote hundreds of articles critical of him. Beyond Alfonso’s stance on the war, Unamuno disliked “the irresponsible meddling of Alfonso in national and international matters,” and suspected that he “had been secretly negotiating with Austria and Germany and banking on the victory of the Central Powers” (Montezuma de Carvalho 1990, 38). This provoked “Unamuno into making direct attacks on the King and Queen Mother in his articles; thus carrying the battle to the very heart of the regime. From this time forward we find constant references, frequently in very strong terms to the king in which Unamuno left in no doubt his opinion that Alfonso had become an obstacle to
political progress in Spain” (Montezuma de Carvalho 1990, 38). Thus, in this era we note an increase in his article production as Unamuno attacked the monarchy. For instance, in 1918, Unamuno wrote an article called “What is it to Reign?” in España magazine, explaining that Alfonso XIII was a monarch without an “archy” or one “without power, like a fictitious sovereign” (Unamuno 1918g). One year later he wrote “Order and the Monarchy,” in which he began to rethink the shift from a monarchy to a republic and what that would look like. In “The Irresponsibility of Power,” he argued for the disappearance of the party of the monarchy as it “confuses patriotism with interested loyalty” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 424). As Unamuno lashed out increasingly against the king, he faced more and more problems with censorship. Unamuno’s biographers Colette and Jean-Claude Rabaté found that during this period “[h]e intensifies his collaborations with articles of social and political critique… and he feels satisfied that he contributes more effectively than any deputy of the legislative process of his country” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 346).

Opposing the king, Unamuno took a strongly anti-Germanic stance, and continued to criticize the policy of neutrality in the newspapers, instead favoring support of the Allies (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 359). He often took to the paper to disagree with the king’s stance on the war and the pro-Germanic position of “neutrality.” However, it was difficult to publish this type of article in Spain, and he found that “it was easier to write in Italian, Argentine, English, or even Catalanian periodicals, because those from Madrid, like ABC and El Correo Español largely favored Germany” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 349). During this period, he began writing for a magazine created by José Ortega y Gasset, España, Semanario de la Vida Nacional, a pro-Allied periodical for intellectuals. This magazine began around the theme of war, but quickly evolved beyond that. In addition, starting in 1914 he wrote for El Día and El Liberal, both Madrid
periodicals, and for *El Mercantil Valenciano*, a Republican periodical with moderate to leftist tendencies. Unamuno was a prolific writer of articles of this time, not of news, but of views, and he found himself at the vanguard of liberalism. With the end of the war in 1918 “ends an intense period of his activity in the press: not only did Unamuno multiply his articles – some 600 in four years –, but he also amplified the number of his collaborating periodicals” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 389). After this intense production, Unamuno was “exhausted by writing so many ‘fleeting’ articles, of overseeing political realities day by day, week to week, of protesting against this and that, and of judging the regime” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 391). Throughout this period, Unamuno refined his method of social and political critique in periodicals. Rabaté and Rabaté describe that *El País* wrote about Unamuno’s method on May 28 of 1917, saying, “Unamuno each time appears better to us. He has methodized himself, the fire of his conviction has burned and clarified all confusions in his mind, contradictions… All his discourse is a portent” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 370). By 1917, he was censored by the government, but he collaborated with *El Imparcial, Nuevo Mundo, El Mercantil Valenciano*, and *La Nación* in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

1914 was a year of personal change as well, as Unamuno was dismissed from his position as Rector of the University of Salamanca. Although an official reason was never given, many suspect his dismissal was due to his public criticism of Spanish neutrality, his support for the Allies, his criticism of landowners and support of land reform, and his criticism of Alfonso XIII (Evans 2013a, 23). Others hypothesize that there were darker forces at work and that he “was the victim of cynical maneuverings by political cliques in Madrid that were vying to manipulate university representation in the senate” (Robertson 2010, 30). Whatever the case, once removed from his position as Rector, his criticism of the Spanish government in the newspapers became more direct and caustic. In fact, after his dismissal, Unamuno turned aggressive, and his personal
war began in 1914, when he went on the offensive against Alfonso in his political articles (Aubert 2003). Although this “had gotten Unamuno fired from his position, it did not deter him from continuing to fight for the Allied cause or any other liberal cause” (Evans 2013a, 23).

However, Unamuno’s assaults on the king and the monarchy had further repercussions, and by September of 1920 he found himself on trial for “crimes of the press.” For his trial, he traveled to Valencia, and he wrote about the trip in *El Mercantil Valenciano* in an article called “From West to East.” The charges brought against him were a result of three of his articles published in 1918 and 1919 in the periodical *El Mercantil Valenciano*, including “The Archduke of Spain”, “Irresponsibilities”, and “The King’s Loneliness.” Reporting on his trial, the headline of the September 17, 1920 issue of *El Mercantil Valenciano* read “‘Don Miguel de Unamuno condemned’, accompanied by details of the verdict that inform the reader that the court placed Unamuno on trial on three counts of ‘…alleged crimes of insulting Alfonso” (Robertson 2010, 43). As a result of the publication of these articles, Unamuno was fined and sentenced to 16 years in prison and a one-thousand-peseta fine, a sentence he never completed, thanks to his friends and his own prestige as a public figure. As evidenced by this trial, Unamuno preferred to serve time in jail “rather than retract his comments regarding King Alfonso and the Queen Mother although he was probably confident that the government would not dare to put him in prison” (Robertson 2010, 13).

Unamuno courageously continued to write articles even though he risked punishment for his attacks on the king. Some conservative periodicals, such as *El Pueblo Vasco* denounced him in an attempt to separate themselves from him. By 1921 his articles were more censored, and many
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14 Accounts of this are found in Robertson (Robertson 2010, 43) and Evans (Evans 2013a, 24). Article titles are: “El archiducado de España,” “Irresponsabilidades,” and “La soledad del rey.”

15 Translations found in Robertson are Robertson’s.
were either heavily edited or disallowed. Due to a lack of freedom, he stopped writing in *Nuevo Mundo*. During summer vacation of 1921, he wrote many articles, submitting 31 to publications like *El Mercantil Valenciano, El Liberal*, and periodicals in Argentina and Chile. He became increasingly ferocious, seemingly unfazed by his brush with the law. By the end of 1921, even *La Nación* of Buenos Aires censored some of his articles. On April 5, 1922, Unamuno had a private meeting with Alfonso XIII for two hours. The same day he published an article in *El Mercantil Valenciano* called “The Wisdom of the Crown” again discussing the irresponsibility of the king.

Although much of his attention was devoted to the king, Unamuno attacked the whole of Spanish political life in his articles. After the war, the precarity of the Spanish situation did not improve as continued economic problems led to labor strikes and political turmoil. In 1920 there were 1,316 strikes, resulting in street violence and many deaths (Schulte 1968, 223). These exigences caused Unamuno to continue to take up his pen. Indeed, during and after the war “Unamuno wrote at least three articles a week for the Spanish and foreign press” (Robertson 2010, 36). After the war, he addressed the government’s inability to resolve crises and to define policy in terms of labor (Robertson 2010, 83-84). Perhaps more importantly for him, one of his “constant laments was the absence in Spain of a real entrepreneurial middle class capable of transforming the economic and social life of the country” (Robertson 2010, 71). For this reason, through his articles Unamuno attempts to unite a class of Spanish people that could transform the country.

**Dictatorship in Spain and Unamuno’s Exile (1923-1930)**

While Unamuno disliked the king, he understood that if the monarchy toppled, the alternatives could be worse, a sentiment that would later prove to be true. In 1923, Spain saw what the alternative to the monarchy would look like, as the king supported the military dictatorship of
General Miguel Primo de Rivera. Although Unamuno had always disapproved of Alfonso XIII, his articles became even more critical when the king handed power to Primo de Rivera. The king agreed to form a military dictatorship to attempt to restore order, and Primo de Rivera published “a manifesto that could be considered a coup d’état similar to others of the 19th century” (Madruga Méndez 2005, 26). This was a common occurrence in Europe at the time, as “insecure, faction-ridden democracies collapsed into authoritarianism and dictatorship all over central and eastern Europe, between 1923 and 1926” (Carr 2001, 236). Indeed, Primo de Rivera’s “takeover followed the precedent of Benito Mussolini’s ‘march on Rome’ in October of 1922, which had left King Victor Emmanuel II on the throne of Italy” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 241).

Yet even in this tumultuous period, Unamuno pressed on. 1923 began as a very productive year in periodicals for Unamuno, “as abundant as ever” and he published “as in the previous year, between 14 and 20 articles per month in Spain and the Americas” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 436). Unamuno wrote letters to the paper Nosotros in Argentina and Le Quotidien in 1923 detailing why he opposed Primo de Rivera’s rule, and these two letters led Primo de Rivera to take steps to silence Unamuno. Although this period became influential in the development of his future works, “as a result of the imposition of strict censorship by the regime in Spain, Unamuno was unable to publish articles in the national press that reflected frankly his views on the current situation of the country” (Robertson 2010, 139). However, his continued criticism of the government in the newspaper only created greater personal problems for him. Despite the fact that Primo de Rivera attempted to censor detractors, Unamuno did “not tone down the intensity of his public disapproval of the new regime” (Robertson 2010, 132). Many followed suit as most intellectuals, “including members of university faculties and their students, disapproved of the regime on principle, inspired by the philosopher and novelist Miguel de Unamuno” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 243). However,
Primo de Rivera was popular with many people as he was supported by the military and some intellectuals. Unamuno attacked not only Primo de Rivera, but also his policies of censorship, in articles such as “Nothing of a National Party” and “We Must Lift Censorship.” Some newspapers feared the repercussions of publishing Unamuno’s work, and the director of El Liberal wrote to Unamuno, asking him to send articles without “even the slightest reference to H.M. the King.… If I publish one of your articles mentioning the playboy of the whisky bottle and the roulette wheel … the authorities are round in a flash to confiscate the print run” (Robertson 2010, 104). Censorship of Unamuno occurred not only in the press, but “should be seen in the context of a long list of official obstacles to his work as a public speaker and journalist, such as censorship of his articles and the refusal to grant authorisation for his public speeches” and travel for conferences (Robertson 2010, 104).

Unamuno’s attacks on the king and Primo de Rivera intensified until the situation reached a breaking point. One morning in February of 1924, he was in Salamanca’s Plaza Mayor and he saw a commotion, when another professor there informed him that he was being sent into exile, which “took him by surprise, but he continued his walk without making the slightest commentary” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 435). After this, he returned home to tell his family, and the papers reported it the next day. España newspaper “set the announcement of his exile in black, funereal type, usually reserved for obituaries. The message was clear. Once again the death knell had sounded for intellectual freedom” (Schulte 1968, 226). La Gaceta published notice of his exile on February 21, 1924. The next day, after teaching his morning class, he took the two o’clock train to Madrid. As he left, “in the station in Salamanca the platforms were full of people from all social classes who had come to say goodbye to the professor” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 455). After kissing his family goodbye, he boarded the train with some close friends and colleagues who
accompanied him to Madrid. Through the window as he said goodbye, he imparted “words of thanks and affection, and above all, he exhorted each one to cultivate their own intelligence” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 455). Once in Madrid, he took a car to Cádiz and a boat to Fuerteventura in the Canary Islands. With this exile, he was “dismissed and banished at the whim of the Dictator, without a hearing or due process of law” (Robertson 2010, 136). As he departed from the Spanish mainland for the island, he proclaimed, “I will return to bring you freedom!” At the beginning of his exile, Unamuno mistakenly believed that the dictatorship would not last long, and that he would soon be able to return to Spain. Students organized protests against the dictatorship in the wake of his exile.

While in exile he continued writing, but he was censored in the Spanish press, so he renewed his devotion to poetry and creative writing. For the most part, he stopped publishing articles in Spain “because he was not prepared to have his work censored by ‘illiterate soldiers who are degraded and debased by military discipline and who hate nothing more than intelligence’” (Robertson 2010, 146). Presses that defended Unamuno, like El Socialista, were censored by the government. Because of this heavy censorship, he sent more of his political articles to countries outside of Spain. He grew increasingly annoyed by the censorship and threw himself into other hobbies. In 1924, he published a book of poetry called Rhymes from an Unknown Poet (Rimas de un poeta desconocido) and Teresa, a poetic novel. In addition to writing, he also read three books that he brought with him: a Greek version of the New Testament, Dante’s Divine Comedy, and the poetry of Leopardi. In addition to these scholarly activities, he received visitors, took walks on the beach, rode camels, held tertulias by the sea, and “[s]ome days he would go out to fish with his friends on the island. They would fish for whatever they could; he, according to what he said, would fish for metaphors, to place the net of his meditations in the ocean” (Esplá
While there, he also “during his walks and sea trips, forged ideas and thoughts that would form the basis of the essays, poems and articles that he published during the following years” (Robertson 2010, 138).

After one year of living in exile in Fuerteventura, he dramatically escaped and went to Paris in 1925, where he once again became involved in public life. A team of people from the Parisian newspaper *Le Quotidien* rescued him, documenting his exile and escape in the paper. The head of the paper “felt that the rescue of a distinguished republican intellectual would be of interest to the paper’s more serious supporters and that the direct collaboration of Unamuno in Paris would lend weight to the paper’s position as a strong voice of international republicanism” (Ouimette 1977, 76). Every night Unamuno would wait on the beach between 10:30 p.m. and midnight for the boat. The Spanish government caught wind of the escape plot and granted amnesty to Unamuno, in order to make the plan “appear foolish and extravagant” (Ouimette 1977, 77). Because of this, Unamuno decided to remain in voluntary exile until Primo de Rivera left power. The escape plot was “intentionally spectacular, for Unamuno’s exile was given perspective only by creating and appealing to an informed public, and throughout the six years that it lasted, most actions were planned to sustain interest and attract as much international attention as possible” (Ouimette 1977, 72).

Upon finding himself in Paris, Unamuno quickly became involved with French intellectual circles and continued his publications in periodicals. He “attracted the attention – or, perhaps, curiosity – of the French intelligentsia. He was a novelty and his political actions had earned him an almost mythical status” (Robertson 2010, 144). During his exile he wrote articles in French paper *Le Quotidien* “in an attempt to bring to life for French readers the injustices he perceived in Spanish politics as well as the personal unworthiness of Primo de Rivera” (Ouimette 1977, 81).
Moreover, in France, he continued to be involved in Spanish affairs, and “he quickly entered into the polemics of what was happening in Spain through writing for [the French newspaper] Le Quotidien, and Primo de Rivera actually responded to his criticism in the same paper, but the French newspaper was banned in Spain” (Evans 2013a, 24). Unamuno and Primo de Rivera exchanged messages in Le Quotidien. In 1923 Unamuno first published a letter in the newspaper describing his concerns with the Spanish political situation, “which was specifically aimed at provoking a public international reaction beyond the relatively confined limits of Unamuno’s usual Spanish-speaking audience” (Ouimette 1977, 75). In 1924 Unamuno wrote another article expressing his anger with Primo de Rivera, who responded with an open letter to the newspaper on August 14. On August 26, “Primo’s letter and Unamuno’s response were published on the front page with photographs of the two men” (Ouimette 1977, 81). As a result of these exchanges and its cooperation with Unamuno, Le Quotidien was banned in Spain. In addition to Le Quotidien, he continued writing for the Argentine magazine Caras y Caretas. At this time the university suspended his employment and salary, so he had renewed economic difficulties and the articles helped.

After one year of living in a hotel in Paris, he moved to Hendaye, a small French town on the Spanish border, so that he could be closer to Spain. There he worked with other intellectual exiles including Blasco Ibáñez, Carlos Esplá, and Eduardo Ortega y Gasset, in the launching of the antidictatorial periodical, España con Honra…. Unamuno’s letters and articles in España con Honra and later Hojas Libres… circulated widely in Spain and America and were a profound embarrassment for the Dictatorship” (Robertson 2010, 145). In addition to Le Quotidien and España con Honra, he wrote in Les Nouvelles Littéraires and sent ten essays to the Argentine magazine Caras y Caretas and eight essays to Madrid’s Nuevo Mundo. By 1925 he claimed he
would stop publishing in Spain during the dictatorship, but continued writing in the Argentine press. In 1926 he sent two articles to La Voz de Guipúzcoa in San Sebastian, publishing them under the pseudonym Augusto Pérez Niebla.\footnote{16 Augusto Pérez is the main character in Unamuno’s novel named Niebla (Fog).} In one of these, the article “The Bad Child, Brutality and Unintelligence,” Unamuno attacked Primo de Rivera without explicitly naming him. In 1927 he resumed his journalistic writing against Primo de Rivera in España con Honra. While in Hendaye, he started the periodical Hojas Libres in 1927 with Eduardo Ortega y Gasset,\footnote{17 Eduardo was the brother of José Ortega y Gasset.} one of the only ways he could still fight the dictator. Unamuno regularly contributed to the periodical with several aims: to condemn and embarrass the dictator and monarch, to show the problems in Spain and lack of support for Primo de Rivera, show the political reality despite censorship, and to ridicule and mock major political figures (Robertson 2010, 159). As could be expected, the Spanish government attempted to stop the periodical from leaving Spain in order to preserve the country’s international reputation. Unamuno continued working on Hojas Libres until 1929 when the government prohibited the paper, detained Ortega y Gasset, and forced him to move away from the border. Even from a distance, Unamuno continued to be a thorn in the side of the Spanish government, as the “exiled Unamuno became the symbol of the revolt of the intellectuals” against Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship (Carr 2001, 242). In September of 1928 he began to write for Monde magazine, a magazine for leftist intellectuals around the world.

Because of censorship and his decreased contributions to periodicals, he worked on poetry and other literary endeavors. He wrote poetry outside of Spain about the experience of exile, publishing a book of poems in 1925 called From Fuerteventura to Paris, and he sent some very short sonnets to España con Honra. In Paris he wrote 35 sonnets about life in Paris. Later, in 1928,
near the end of his exile, he published a book of poetry called *Ballads of Exile*, the last poetry book he published during his lifetime. In addition to being involved in public life, in Paris he also completed the book-length essay, *Agony of Christianity* and the book *How to Make a Novel*. In the conclusion to *Agony of Christianity*, he referenced his exile, saying, “I write this conclusion outside my native country, Spain, which is torn by the most shameful and stupid tyranny, a tyranny of military imbecility – far from my home, my family, … and in my heart burns this civil and religious struggle. The agony of my native country in its death-throes has awakened within my soul the agony of Christianity” (Unamuno, 171).

Some have asked whether Primo de Rivera truly understood his actions in exiling the famous intellectual of Spain. Surely “he did not suspect who Unamuno was and what he represented inside and outside of Spain” (Esplá 1961, 120). Others believed that Primo de Rivera “was clearly unaware of the moral authority that Unamuno possessed and of the threat that Unamuno in exile and as a figurehead to the opposition posed to the standing of his regime” (Robertson 2010, 137). In either case, Unamuno’s exile turned him into “a symbol of the spiritual fight for freedom among the intellectuals of the world” (Barea 1952, 53). His exile raised a storm of indignation in the world” and people as far as the Americas and France protested (Esplá 1961, 120). In addition to protests in other countries, people in Madrid and throughout Spain also protested Unamuno’s exile. Additionally, Unamuno’s exile led intellectuals in Spain to protest Primo de Rivera’s government, and it pushed many toward Republican affiliations.

Although Unamuno was eventually pardoned and allowed legally to return to Spain, he remained in voluntary exile, refusing to return until Primo de Rivera was deposed. However, because of his refusal to be silent, it was a dangerous time for Unamuno, and his “personal safety  
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18 One book of his poetry was published posthumously in 1953, *Songbook*. 
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continued to be a significant issue” (Robertson 2010, 147). Just as Unamuno persisted in his attacks on Primo de Rivera, Primo de Rivera did not cease in “his efforts to rid himself [of] the Unamuno ‘problem’” and he attempted to force Unamuno back to Spain so he could control him (Robertson 2010, 153). But Unamuno refused to be silent in Spain; he preferred to have a political voice, even if it meant staying separated from his beloved homeland and his family. When Primo de Rivera’s attempts to force Unamuno proved futile, “the Dictatorship began to employ underhand tactics to besmirch Unamuno’s name in an attempt to convince the French authorities to deport him” (Robertson 2010, 154).

**Return to Salamanca and the Second Spanish Republic (1931-1935)**

Primo de Rivera stepped down in 1930, which meant that at last Unamuno could freely return to Spain and resume his position in Salamanca. Although Unamuno always staunchly opposed Primo de Rivera, Primo’s legacy was more complicated for Spain’s political future. While he had destroyed both the Liberal and Conservative parties in favor of a one-party system, “radical groupings both to the left and to the right grew stronger and more resolute during the dictatorship” leaving “Spanish political life more polarized than ever” (Phillips and Rahn Phillips 2015, 244). Upon his return, Unamuno was hailed as a Spanish hero and figure of resistance. He “represented for some the most high figure of Spanish politics against the dictatorship and the monarchy” (Fox 1988, 252) and the “flag and symbol of republicanism” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 7). To Unamuno’s dismay, Alfonso XIII remained in power after Primo de Rivera’s departure, but on April 14, 1931 the Second Spanish Republic was proclaimed. Finally, the people of Spain felt optimistic, but the deep polarization from the era of Primo de Rivera continued. Power transferred back and forth between parties, and the military, business owners, and the Church were nervous about the reforms
promised by the Republic. Because they felt threatened by impending reforms, the right wanted to entirely ruin the Republic. Thus, polarization grew, and the extreme movements of the leftist anarchists and the rightist Falangists gained strength.

Although on the surface it appeared that he would support the Republic, in practice he criticized the political parties and the Republican government in the press. By 1933 he began “to feel that extreme republican fervor was outstripping his moderate views” (Burns 2009, 20). As the party grew more radical in the polarized political landscape, he realized he could no longer be involved. He continued to grow apart from Republicans and officially declared himself against the Republic, even speaking out against the government in the press. Because of his dissatisfaction, during this period, “Unamuno did not stop combatting the myth of ‘The Republic’, eagerly fed by Azaña and other political leaders, a myth that gnawed on the civil feelings of ‘eternal Spain,’ the ‘Spain of forever,’ the Spain that was above the different contingent forms of government” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 120). Unamuno even went so far as to tell a reporter who published his statement in *El Adelanto* in June of 1936 that President “[Manuel] Azaña should commit suicide as a patriotic act” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 674). The Republican government had a serious problem with Unamuno’s statements, and on August 22, 1936, they decreed that Unamuno should once again be removed from his position as rector of the university. Moreover, the government removed his name from streets and replaced it with the name of Simón Bolívar.

Many have questioned why Unamuno turned against the Republic. Scholars identify for four main reasons that Unamuno changed his mind about the Republic: 1) he wanted to unite Spain both geographically and linguistically, and he opposed autonomous regions or official bilingualism in Spain; 2) he feared the agnosticism of the Republic and the government’s turning away from the Church, which he identified as a way to culturally unite the Spanish people; 3) he distrusted
political parties and political dogma, believing that these things did not form a “national consciousness”; 4) finally, he did not agree that the Republic should be revolutionary or associated with “a Marxist formulation of the international class struggle instead of a historic conception of the Spanish nation” (Fox 1988, 253). The overarching problem was that Unamuno was bothered that “the Republic had become a dogma” (Aubert 2003, 229). When a journalist questioned how he could side with the military and “abandon a Republic that [he] helped create,” Unamuno responded, it “is not a fight against the liberal Republic, but a fight for civilization. What Madrid represents now is not socialism or democracy, or even communism” (Blanco Prieto 2009, 17). In 1932, Unamuno gave a speech expressing his “disillusion, his loss of confidence in the republican values, and even a deep pain” caused by the Republic (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 602). He was upset because of the terrible acts committed by the Republic or in its name, such as the burning of convents and its censorship of some periodicals. It was difficult for him to come to terms that it was not the “Republic of which he had dreamed,” and “he did not want to be an accomplice to the injustices committed” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 604).

As he settled back into life in Salamanca, Unamuno felt this polarization and again took to the newspaper to discuss the political climate in Spain. After 1930 we witness a productive period in which he wrote many articles and speeches attacking political figures and policies. With the institution of the Republic, Unamuno returned to writing articles, something he had not begun since his return to Spain because of censorship issues. However, in May of 1931 he wrote three articles in *El Sol* as part of the series, “The Promise of Spain.” He continued writing for *El Sol*, and between April of 1931 and November of 1932 he published 120 articles. However, as things progressed and the Republic became more extreme, he broke with *El Sol* because of its ties to Prime Minister of the Republic, Manuel Azaña, a figure Unamuno detested. When he broke with
El Sol, he shifted his focus to a different periodical, Ahora. Ahora was one of the periodicals with greatest distribution during the time of the Republic, and it attracted many well-known authors of his generation such as Ramiro Maeztu, Pío Baroja, and Ramón Valle-Inclán (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 604). In his articles in Ahora he critiqued the Republic’s iterations of liberalism and the concept of civil war, saying that a civil war does not go with the principles of liberalism. He also wrote a series of articles called “Cartas al amigo” to “clarify his conception of politics” and he explained his preference for “a monarchical republic, without a king, like the French bourgeois republic” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 613). During this time, he stopped collaborating with most other periodicals and magazines so he would dedicate his time writing articles for Ahora, as he found it to be “a true tribune and a pulpit from which to influence his compatriots” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 633). In 1934 he published a series of 7 articles in Ahora called “Actual Reflections” that examined the various revolutionary attitudes, arguing that revolution and reaction are concave and convex sides of the same surface. In 1935 he critiqued the political tendency of orienting toward spectacle and wrote another series of articles about censorship. In this phase, it cost him time and effort to write about the themes the periodical wanted, and he was interviewed by other periodicals, which also consumed a good deal of his time. At his advanced age, “the mental and emotional effort of writing commentaries in Ahora was exhausting for him” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 656). However, he retained the same process from his youth, as “in a small book he noted phrases, turns, aphorisms” that help him in the composition of his essays (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 656).

These years of political upheaval were also years of personal strife for Unamuno as he reached an advanced age and faced illnesses of his own and of loved ones. His brother, wife, and daughter died between 1931 and 1934, and he also faced his own health problems. Despite being
in bed for ten days with an attack of rheumatoid arthritis he continued writing articles for Ahora. However, he was also reinstated as rector of the university in 1931, the same year that he was one of the nominees for the Nobel Prize. In 1931 he published San Manuel Bueno, Mártir, one of his most famous novels, and in 1932 he published some works of theater.

**Civil War and Unamuno’s Legacy (1936)**

This polarization and anxiety culminated in July of 1936, when General Francisco Franco led the nationalist forces in a military rebellion against the Second Spanish Republic. What Franco initially thought would be a quick overthrow of the government turned into a lengthy and bloody civil war, pitting Catholic Nationalist insurgents against the liberal Republicans. The war divided Spain, tearing families apart and creating an atmosphere of terror.

As Spain found itself embroiled in an intensifying civil war, Unamuno struggled to decide which side to support. He had already turned against the Republic. More problematic than this, Unamuno completely reversed his position, declaring his support Franco and the nationalists in their fight against the Republic by June of 1936. Many people wonder how Unamuno could support the Nationalists, since “the stereotypical and profusely diffused image of ‘Unamuno, man of the left’ (republican, liberal, democrat, anticlerical, and antimilitarist) does not align – or aligns badly – with the adhesion to a military uprising, supported, as is known, by the crème de la crème of authoritarianism, monarchism, and clericalism” (de Azaola 1990, 191). However, when Unamuno declared his support for Franco, it was “not because he shared the ideas of the fascists among them, but because he hoped that the movement would save Spain from the mass rule which was his nightmare, and revive the ‘living tradition’” (Barea 1952, 56). As always, his primary goal was to save and improve Spain. Indeed, he desired Spain to remain a united, Catholic nation, as opposed
to autonomous, agnostic, revolutionary regions formulated through class struggle (Fox 1988, 253). Additionally, Unamuno had never liked dogma, and “it bothered Unamuno that the Republic had become a dogma” (Aubert 2003, 229). Once, he explained his change in position, saying, “I am not on the right or the left. I have not changed; it is the regime of Madrid that has changed” (Salcedo and Unamuno, 408). In speaking with Greek author Nikos Kazantzakis, Unamuno explained his position, saying, he followed the military because “They are the only ones that will bring us order…. No, I haven’t turned into a rightist. Don’t pay attention to what people say. I haven’t betrayed the cause of freedom… for now, it is totally essential that order is restored. But whatever day I will get up – soon – I will throw myself into the fight for freedom, I alone. I am not a fascist or a bolshevist. I am solitary, a loner” (Kazantzakis 1963, 191-2). He described the shifts in the political landscape and the increased polarization, lamenting how Spain, not himself, had changed position.

But Unamuno’s support of the militant Nationalists did not last long, as he soon realized that neither side offered a good solution to Spain’s problems and that both sides committed violent atrocities contributing to an atmosphere of death. Upon realizing this, he published articles condemning the practices of both the Republicans and the Nationalists. Even at the age of 72, Unamuno “retained the strong energy of a warrior that has taken part in countless battles, without impairing his value or deteriorating his strength” (Iturbide 2010). Indeed, by the end of his life, discontent with all parties and all facets of Spanish political life, he “lashed out against everything and everyone; he injured others and they injured him, he silenced many voices, but they never silenced his” (Iturbide 2010, 212). During this time he wrote “article after article of acute, often unpopular and often cantankerous criticism, directed against every sort of slogan, Right or Left, against Marxism, against urban mass movements, and against the new generation of
“Europeanisers” (Barea 1952, 56). In April he wrote six articles discussing Spain’s political situation in which he expressed his “fear of the violence and barbarism invading his country” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 664). He explained that counterrevolutionary barbarism is not more or less barbaric than barbarism, but it is the same. As the situation intensified, he continued writing and, in the two weeks before the July uprising, he sent four articles to Ahora. In August of 1936, the well-known poet, Federico García Lorca was executed by Franco’s forces, something that greatly saddened Unamuno. Moreover, he received many letters from the spouses of victims, and all of this took an emotional toll on him (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 681). Thus, by midsummer, when Spain was embroiled in civil war, he could no longer summon the strength to write articles.

In October of 1936, in the midst of the violence and death of the Spanish Civil War, the University of Salamanca held a celebration of Hispanic heritage. Unamuno presided over the ceremony, but was not slated to give a speech. He opened the ceremony with some brief words, and he sat on the platform next to Franco’s wife, Carmen Polo, to watch the rest of the festivities. The room was full of high-ranking professors, the bishop of Salamanca, and other important political and military figures, and audio of the ceremony was transmitted in the main plaza of Salamanca and throughout the city. As the speeches continued in the vein of nationalism and militarism, the atmosphere became increasingly tense, and Unamuno, looking disgusted, began to write notes on the back of a card. Finally, he rose to his feet, and began to speak, criticizing the fascist cause, while outraged soldiers raised their guns and their voices, chanting for “death to the intelligentsia! Long live death!” Undeterred, Unamuno responded, “this is the temple of intelligence and I am its high priest…. You will conquer because you have brute force, but you
will not convince. To convince you need what you lack, reason and right in the fight.” With this, soldiers swarmed Unamuno, who was escorted to safety by Carmen Polo. That evening he went out into the casino in town, where people insulted him, calling him “Red! Traitor!” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 684). Some wanted to arrest him, and Franco even wanted to kill him, but instead they placed him under house arrest, where he lived as an enemy to both sides for the next ten weeks, until his death on December 31, 1936.

This event formed the basis for a myth that has lived on in history and legend as the face of resistance. Recently, historians have debated the veracity of these events and the exact words that Unamuno spoke. El País writes that “It is impossible to reconstruct the words of Unamuno because, although the ceremony was transmitted on the radio, the rector spoke without a microphone” (Del Molino 2018a). Historian Severiano Delgado writes that the story has been dramatized and exaggerated over the years, beginning with a fictionalized story contained in Unamuno’s Last Lecture by Luis Portillo. Although Unamuno’s speech is an invention, “it is sustained by what Portillo knew of his character… and it was things he had said in some form or another in other places” (Del Molino 2018a). Historians read this literary text and popularized the narrative, considering “Portillo’s story as official narration” (Del Molino 2018a). One of his biographers, Jean-Claude Colette says that, “we only have the 40 words that Unamuno wrote on a card while the others spoke. Yes, it is a more or less fictitious story and we could spend our lives debating what he did or did not say, but the spirit and the idea remain, and the myth it created is very important, because it dramatizes the confrontation between a republican memory and a Francoist” (Del Molino 2018b). It is true not only that Unamuno was at this event and was escorted
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19 Scholars have disputed as to how exactly these events occurred, since they were censored out of newspaper accounts, but several different scholars have reconstructed them.
out but also that the story remains significant as part of the lore surrounding the events of the Spanish Civil War.

Walking through the streets of Salamanca, you can hardly avoid hearing about Unamuno or seeing his image. In addition to the Unamuno Café, and the Café Niebla Bar, named after one of Unamuno’s novels, there is a statue of Unamuno in a plaza in town. Moreover, the Plaza Mayor of Salamanca is adorned with medallions of notable historical figures, and the bust of Unamuno can be found on one. Beyond visual representations of him, there is a legend, often told, about Unamuno. The legend tells of the confrontation with the fascists at the University of Salamanca. Although some dispute the truth of the reported events, the legend surrounding Unamuno has lived on, and in Salamanca one can often hear the phrase repeated “Venceréis, pero no convenceréis,” or “You will conquer, but you will not convince.” Indeed, these events helped to solidify his legendary status in Spain. Spanish newspaper El País writes that in that moment, “the Basque intellectual was freed of his support of the coup, and like that was converted into a symbol of democracy against dictatorship, civilization against barbarism, and good against evil…. His words are part of Spanish mythology, a gospel of civic courage before that which one could only applaud with reverence” (Del Molino 2018a).

Between July of 1936 when the coup began and Unamuno’s death in December of 1936, he actively spoke out against the government. During this period he “gave 15 interviews, wrote seven private letters, one open letter, composed fourteen poems, gave two speeches, wrote a manifesto of reflections about the civil war, signed a University message and wrote some notes about the revolution and Spanish civil war” (Blanco Prieto 2009, 14). Upon his death, Unamuno was preparing notes for a manuscript about the Spanish Civil War, called The Tragic Resentment of Life. He passed away before he completed this manuscript, but his notes from it were published.
In 1991. In these notes it is clear that Unamuno does not “want to choose a side, and he does not see a future for intellectuals in Spain. He chooses a sort of interior exile. He is convinced that the war is a crime against the spirit and that anti-intellectualism has been generalized” (Aubert 2003, 233). Even until his death, Unamuno worked tirelessly to improve Spain. It may be said that he predicted his own mission in one of his articles from 1900, “The Pond” in which he writes about nature and the landscape. He writes of a “poor, free bird that crosses the sky singing of freedom and the open air and the light and fell wounded, and drowned in the pond. Will it be resuscitated?” (Unamuno 1900m). Unamuno, in the end would be the poor, free bird crossing the sky and singing of freedom for Spain and her people.
Unlike other studies that focus on Unamuno’s works of philosophy and fiction, this project focuses exclusively on his journalistic writings. These writings appeared in the periodical press between the years 1879 and 1936, beginning when he was fifteen years old and lasting until his death. Throughout his life, Unamuno took his role as a social commentator very seriously, writing these articles and giving speeches on the political and social problems in Spain. His more than 3,000 articles appeared in a wide variety of publications, including periodicals such as La Justicia, La Lucha de Clases, El Sol, El Liberal, and Nuevo Mundo. In these articles he employed a different skillset than he did in his novels, plays, poems, and philosophical essays, as he intended the articles for a different audience and purpose. His articles showcase a variety of different types of writing, including the epistle, short story, fictional interview, landscape description, and historical analysis. While his literary and philosophical works targeted more erudite and academic readers, his newspaper articles were aimed at reaching all levels of Spanish society in order to have a social impact. In the articles he addressed people in every social strata of Spanish society, including everyone from the king to people living in the streets. This project answers questions about how Unamuno used the genre of the press to target these different audiences, the methods he used to expose social problems and unite the people of Spain, and how his journalistic writings served as a source of invention and experimentation.

To address these questions, this project adopts a rhetorical approach to the interpretation and criticism of Unamuno’s journalistic writings. Looking at these articles through a rhetorical lens demonstrates how they functioned in their context as a response to the specific Spanish
political and social situation during Unamuno’s lifetime. As an outspoken intellectual during an extremely polarized period of Spanish history, Unamuno was uniquely positioned to respond to these events as a rhetor, which is to say a rhetorical actor who seeks to shape contemporary events and guide public judgment through the construction of persuasive discourse. In his response, Unamuno utilized the genre of the press to simultaneously diagnose Spain’s problem and to urge people to form a more authentic community. As examples of rhetorical artifacts, Unamuno’s newspaper articles warrant a rhetorical approach because rhetoric dissects the various stylistic elements used in the artifact, while also understanding the artifact’s relationship with the audience and the socio-political context. A rhetorical approach also examines the various motives at play and specific choices of language and rhetorical devices and their functions when employed in a specific context.

Because Unamuno’s articles addressed specific political and social situations during a period of crisis, it is important to examine his work from a rhetorical standpoint to see how it both responds to and reflects the reality of the Spanish situation. For instance, in many of Unamuno’s articles he coins new terms and concepts, contributing to the history of ideas. He invents terms such as *intrahistory*, *informationery*, *reporterism*, and *factology*, among others. In addition to introducing new concepts and words, Unamuno’s articles also give us new ways to consider important historical events, as he provides different perspectives on the Spanish-American War, World War I, and the Spanish Civil War from his public intellectual point of view. Rather than the traditional view of Spanish history, we see his critique of the Spanish political system and the monarchy. For example, in 1900, two years after the Spanish-American War, he wrote an article called “Nation and Homeland,” in which he explains that “[w]ar and protectionism are two foundations of the nation, a bourgeois institution, and they keep people oppressed and suffocate
true patriotism, that of the social groups of the community of spirit”(Unamuno 1900k). In this quote, Unamuno acknowledges that Spain is navigating the streams of two prominent political ideas of the time: war and protectionism, and he critiques them both. Although he recognizes that war and protectionism can be useful in founding nations, on the other hand, they oppress and do not inspire true feelings of patriotism. Looking at this time period through a rhetorical analysis of Unamuno’s articles provides a new perspective on the important lines of thought in Spain during his time. It also speaks to the cultural relationships of power, including the idea of political oppression of some classes. Moreover, this method allows us to see Unamuno’s method of explaining these relationships. This rhetorical perspective allows for new ways to think about history, public intellectuals, and power relationships during Unamuno’s time.

Thus, this dissertation’s rhetorical approach to Unamuno’s newspaper articles differs from other approaches to his work that are largely biographical, historical, literary, and philosophical. Interpreting Unamuno as a rhetorical figure will lead us to new perspectives on his work. We will be able to observe 1) how he composed rhetorical responses and used stylistic devices, modes of persuasion, figures, and tropes; 2) how he addressed his rhetorical situation and responded to it, considering exigence, audience, and constraints; 3) how the text can provide new meaning when separated from its context and understood in new readings; and finally, 4) how he used language in a time of division to create identification and consubstantiality. Unamuno’s newspaper articles employ various stylistic elements and modes of persuasion, they exist as responses to situations, they can teach us things independent of those situations, and they worked to create identification and consubstantiality in the people of Spain. Although Unamuno addressed his specific context, his rhetorical strategies may be extrapolated to other times and places, providing us ways to respond to similar situations.
The Press: Shaping Culture, Public Opinion, and Community

As this dissertation focuses exclusively on Unamuno’s newspaper articles published in the periodical press, it is important to understand the nature of journalism as a unique genre of writing. Looking at the scholarship of Michael Schudson, Marshall McLuhan, Walter Lippmann, Benedict Anderson, Jürgen Habermas, James Carey, and Randall Sumpter on journalism, the sociology of news, and cultural studies provides a unique perspective on Unamuno’s work that helps us understand his articles as shaping culture, forming public opinion on events, and creating community. Unamuno used his press writings to initiate public conversations and create a unified culture, functioning in a different way than his novels and works of philosophy did. In his articles, Unamuno recognizes this power of the press to create public opinion or public consciousness, as he calls it: “the public consciousness is something more than the sum or mere mix of individual consciousness, it is a chemical combination of them” (Unamuno 1896a). Unamuno realized that the press played a role in creating this public consciousness and forming people into groups. Likewise, in his own articles, Unamuno used the medium of the press to provide a clear opinion for people to either assent or refuse. He provided opinions for people on such topics as the Spanish-American War, Europeanization, the Spanish language, the education system, religion, economic questions, autonomous regions in Spain, the king, the military dictator, World War I, the Spanish Republic, and the military coup of 1936. Once he formulated these opinions, his readers only had to choose whether or not to accept them. This section explores the role that the press plays in modern society so that we can better understand how Unamuno adapted his writing to fit the needs of his audience and the institution.

The most important aspect of journalism is its connection to events. Newspapers not only report events, but the choices and language reflected in the press shape culture and the world, as
Schudson writes, “journalists not only report reality but also create it” (Schudson 2011, xiv). While journalists report on events grounded in reality, “through the process of selecting, highlighting, framing, shading, and shaping what they report, they create an impression that real people – readers and viewers – take to be real and to which they respond in their lives” (Schudson 2011, xiv). Authors and editors have a great deal of agency to “depict the world according to their own ideas. They do not simply transcribe a set of transparent events” (Schudson 2011, 10). Rather, the press is composed of specific, designed representations of events. Lippmann agrees that “[e]very newspaper… is the result of a whole series of selections as to what items shall be printed, in what position they shall be printed, how much space each shall occupy, what emphasis each shall have” (Lippmann 1922, 223). Indeed, the press is a series of choices, and has never been “a mirror of reality,” but “a representation of the world, and all representations are selective” (Schudson 2011, 26). In the representation of the press, the inclusion of some things implies the exclusion of others. As it includes and excludes, the press announces to audiences which things are important in the space of public appearances. Press writers frame messages and transform events into news, as “a declaration… that an event is noteworthy. It announces to audiences that a topic deserves public attention” (Schudson 2011, 23).

In this way, Unamuno can be seen as a shaper of events and also as a rhetorical actor who provided his own preferred perspective on their interpretation. His response shaped the Spanish situation as he provided new opinions for the public to discuss. This rhetorical character of journalism is emphasized by Schudson, who advocates for a rhetorical consideration of journalistic work. Schudson argues that one way to define news is “to emphasize its textuality, to take it as a rhetorical form or set of rhetorical forms, a discursive structure, or a cultural genre within a larger literary and representational culture” (Schudson 2011, 5-6). Lippmann agrees on the rhetorical
function of news. As authors interpret events and create images of the world for readers, they fashion the public’s emotions and opinions about these events. Writing about the creation of public opinion, Lippmann explains that journalists inspire feelings about events through creating mental images, as the “only feeling that anyone can have about an event he does not experience is the feeling aroused by his mental image of that event” (Lippmann 1922, 9). These feelings created by mental images lead to the formation and crystallization of public opinion. Public opinion is bound in emotion and often created by symbols that are planted “by another human being whom we recognize as authoritative” (Lippmann 1922, 142). Unamuno was one such authoritative human being. Unamuno’s articles to show how, in the midst of national crisis and decadence, he used the genre of the newspaper article to lash out against the political and social structures of the time. Through the genre of the newspaper Unamuno offered a direct and immediate response to political events in a way that he could not with other genres, such as poetry or novels.

But journalism for Unamuno was more than simply shaping events and advocating positions; it was also about creating and sustaining conversations. This approach to journalism is captured by Carey, who writes that “[f]or the public to form, urban life had to develop sufficiently for strangers to be regularly thrown into contact with one another and there had to be newspapers and pamphlets to provide a common focus of discussion and conversation. The public, then, was a society of conversationalists” (Stryker Munson and Warren 1997, 237). By placing short stories about a variety of topics adjacent to each other, the press begins many different conversations on one page, and provides topics of conversation for people in public. Schudson agrees that “[w]hen the media offer the public an item of news… they bring it to a common public forum where it can be known to and discussed by a general audience.” (Schudson 2011, 21). As people read the newspaper on trains or in cafes, it provides them with items to discuss. Similarly, Charles Taylor
explains that “newspapers circulated among the educated public” and “were widely read and often discussed in face-to-face gatherings, in drawing rooms, coffeehouses, salons,” and other places (Taylor 2004, 84). Carey explains that the press “reflected and animated public conversation and argument, furnished material to be discussed, clarified, and interpreted, information in the narrow sense” (Stryker Munson and Warren 1997, 238). Thus, the press supplies public conversations with topics, opinions, materials, and events.

Unamuno often aided this conversational function of the press in several ways, beginning and contributing to conversations on many topics in Spanish political and social life. Indeed, many articles begin in a conversational style, addressing an issue, and then speaking casually and conversationally about it. Other times, Unamuno presents his articles as a dialogue, mimicking the conversational form of the press and interrogating two different points of view. In one article he creates a fictional dialogue about elections with a character called “Mr. Candid,” saying, “I am a victim, dear friend, of a vicious cycle, the cycle is that the pain of my vote is lost, I cannot help but give it to one of the candidates, and, on the other hand, I don’t want to vote for any of them!” (Unamuno 1892a). Through dialogic form he teases out two arguments, thus providing a conversation starter for people in the public sphere. Finally, he also used the press as a way to continue civic conversations with other authors responding about one topic, over several days or in different periodicals. Sometimes he wrote articles in response to other authors’ articles, and more authors would respond, continuing the conversation over time and in various periodicals. The press served as a way to begin dialogues with other authors or political figures, as writers published articles, responses, and open letters in the newspaper as a public forum.

Similarly, Unamuno clearly saw the conversation of journalism as a means to creating community. For, as an initiator of public conversation, the press also creates communities,
connecting people through common experiences. Jürgen Habermas argues that the development of the periodical press aided in the creation of the public sphere and the development of social bonds in communities. He writes that in the 1700s the public sphere was created in coffee houses and salons, and it later was “held together through the medium of the press” (Habermas 1991, 51). Similarly, Benedict Anderson writes that the newspaper was a cultural artifact that created an “imagined political community” and helped national consciousness to form (Anderson 2006, 6). For Anderson, the newspaper allowed people to imagine other unknown members of the community living similar lives and picking up their newspapers while eating breakfast, drinking coffee, or riding the train. This imagining aided in the development of a national consciousness. Likewise, Charles Taylor writes of the similar concept of the social imaginary that occurs as “ordinary people ‘imagine’ their social surroundings” through “images, stories, and legends” and then share it with “large groups of people” leading to “a widely shared sense of legitimacy” (Taylor 2004, 23). Oftentimes this social imaginary occurs through the medium of the newspaper, as the newspaper can collectivize people into a nation and imprint them with a homogeneous narrative about their identity. As one who wanted to create a national consciousness to unite the people of Spain, Unamuno used this function of the newspaper to try and forge a community. For instance, in his 1896 article called “The Fourth Estate” he writes that “[t]he periodical press should be the most genuine and adequate organ of social relation of a people, the organ of its conscience, collective reflection, whose function is to bring to light” (Unamuno 1896a). In this instance we can see that Unamuno recognizes the power of the press to collectivize people, and uses it to create social relationships between people in Spain, urging them toward collective reflection and the formation of a group consciousness.
What facilitated this conversation was the uniquely mosaic form of the press, very different from the experience of reading a single text by a single author. As the press juxtaposes different topics, events, themes, and literary styles, it takes the form of a mosaic, increasing participation and community formation. McLuhan writes that “news magazines are preeminently mosaic in form, offering not windows on the world like the old picture magazines, but presenting corporate images of society in action” (McLuhan 1994, 204). As they portray different political decisions, crimes, puzzles, and sporting events, newspapers show the multiple threads of action occurring in a society. Moreover, he explains that “the newspaper, from its beginnings, has tended, not to the book form, but to the mosaic or participational form” (McLuhan 1994, 210). The mosaic form “commands deep participation,” as it requires readers to decide which parts to read and in what order, as opposed to a linearly organized book by one author about one subject (McLuhan 1994, 211). In this way, “the mosaic of the press manages to effect a complex many-leveled function of group-awareness and participation such as the book has never been able to perform” (McLuhan 1994, 216). As it requires participation, it also inspires group conversations, creating community. It is important to remember the mosaic and participative form of the newspaper when considering Unamuno’s articles, because they existed in this format, which aids in the conversational nature of the press and its function as a creator of community.

Carey’s work also uses a distinction between the ritual and transmission view of communication which captures Unamuno’s approach to the press, not as a conveyor of mere information, but as a means of creating and sustaining cultural richness and continuity. Carey defines the transmission view as “the transmission of signals or messages over distance for the purpose of control” (Carey 1992, 15). This transmission view is the more traditional and common view of communication, and in the press it occurred with the speed up of information technology,
and “the desire to increase the speed and effect of messages” (Carey 1992, 15). From the transmission perspective “communication is a process whereby messages are transmitted and distributed in space for the control of distance and people,” and it thus links the transmission of information with power (Carey 1992, 15). In the transmission view, the press becomes “an instrument for disseminating news and knowledge” and for holding power (Carey 1992, 20). In contradistinction, the “ritual view conceives communication as a process through which a shared culture is created, modified, and transformed” (Carey 1992, 43). It points “not toward the extension of messages in space but toward the maintenance of society in time; not the act of imparting information but the representation of shared beliefs” (Carey 1992, 18). While the transmission view imparts information, the ritual view of communication intends to form social bonds and establish a base of culture. Ritual communication is “the construction and maintenance of an ordered, meaningful cultural world” (Carey 1992, 18-9). Carey likens ritual communication to “the sacred ceremony that draws persons together in fellowship and commonality” (Carey 1992, 18). From the standpoint of the ritual view, the intent of communication is “not to alter attitudes or change minds but to represent an underlying order of things, not to perform functions but to manifest an ongoing and fragile social process” (Carey 1992, 19). Rather than the communication of facts, the ritual view is a conversation of culture. In this view, the power of the media lies in its contribution as “cultural actors, that is, as producers and messengers of meanings, symbols, and messages” (Schudson 2011, 17).

Considering the ritual view of communication in conjunction with the function of the press as a creator of community, we can understand how the press becomes important to the cultural formation in the community. From this vantage point, “reading a newspaper” becomes not about “sending or gaining information” but is more similar to “attending a mass, a situation in which
nothing new is learned but in which a particular view of the world is portrayed and confirmed” (Carey 1992, 20). The press provides us with cultural unity and a specific view of the world. Carey explains that “[n]ews reading, and writing, is a ritual act and moreover a dramatic one. What is arrayed before the reader is not pure information but a portrayal of the contending forces in the world” (Carey 1992, 20). Dramatically, it brings the world to life for readers, making them part of a vibrant and living community. In the ritual view “news is not information but drama. It does not describe the world but portrays an arena of dramatic forces and action” (Carey 1992, 21). This is similar to John Dewey’s position, as explained by Carey, that “[t]he purpose of news is not to represent and inform but to signal, tell a story, and activate inquiry. Inquiry, in turn, is not something other than conversation and discussion but a more systematic version of it” (Carey 1992, 82). Newspapers, beyond just informing and interpreting events, should create culture and stimulate inquiry and conversation. Schudson explains a similar phenomenon to the ritual view, but calling it the “narrative view of journalism,” a view that “sees news as part of a process of producing collective meanings rather than as a process of transmitting information. It emphasizes the social rather than the mechanical feature of the news process” (Schudson 2011, 186-7).

Thinking of Unamuno’s work in the press we must remember the function of the press as a ritual creator of culture, as he often relied upon this function.

In his articles, Unamuno critiques the transmission function of the news, while he embraces the ritual function and attempts to use the press for this purpose. Critiquing the transmission function, he describes the press as a “factory system” and explains how the press presents an excess of information and facts, written by unskilled writers in the format of a canned journalistic story. In the 1896 article called “Informationery and Reporterism” he writes that in an era of transmission and information overload, “the truth is that one becomes dizzy before the alluvium of unorganized
and what is worse, un-organizable, minutiae” (Unamuno 1896b). The press presents too many facts that overwhelm, oppress, and isolate people. On the contrary, Unamuno realizes that the press has potential beyond the transmission of facts, and he believes it should be used to form a collective cultural consciousness for the people of Spain, strengthening the community and the nation. In another article about the press from 1896 called “The Press and Culture” he expresses this potentiality of the press to perform a ritual function, saying, “That the press does much between us for the national culture, it is indubitable, and no less indubitable, that it could do more” (Unamuno 1896f). Through his creative newspaper articles that rely on national symbols and rituals, he uses the press for this ritual function.

What also attracted Unamuno about the modern press was that it nonetheless allowed him to experiment with and integrate stylistic elements that he drew from the genres of poetry, the novel, and the essay. As Schudson explains, while news at times assumes “a set of literary forms,” it is sometimes “predictable and formulaic as the unfolding of a mystery novel, a romance, or a limerick” and at other times “complex” (Schudson 2011, 178). McLuhan, too, observes the similarities between the forms of literature and the press, writing that “[b]oth book and newspaper are confessional in character, creating the effect of inside story by their mere form, regardless of content” (McLuhan 1994, 205). In addition to the similar confessional styles and forms, the newspaper also utilizes many types of literary genres, as journalists sometimes write stories “to soothe and sometimes to enliven, sometimes to honor and commemorate, and sometimes to embolden and impassion” (Schudson 2011, 176). All genres of “news stories are stories, but some are more storylike than others. Some of them remind us of the novel, the joke, the campfire story, gossip, the moral caution” (Schudson 2011, 186). In fact, in the 19th century, news and fiction continued to grow together, and “had become so much alike that they could not be distinguished
from one another” (Sumpter 2018, 23). Sumpter explains how “[t]he narrative text generated by news interviews was like the dialogue and description in a play. The ‘color’ used to enliven an interview with an important public figure was much like that used to develop characters in a novel or short story” (Sumpter 2018, 37). Due to this stylistic overlap, writing in the press required some of the same skills that being a literary writer required, and “the fact that some successful journalists were also successful short-story and novel writers indicated that the two narrative forms shared at least a few rungs on the same career ladders” (Sumpter 2018, 37). Historically, in both Spain and the United States, journalism was often considered a stepping stone to a different type of literary career (Sumpter 2018, 13).

Unamuno at times uses different types of literary genres in his press articles, and he often incorporates a variety of genres into his articles, such as elements of dialogue, philosophy, descriptions of nature, and short story. For example, in 1897 he begins an article with a short story about a man who loved sleeping, which allows him to segue into a discussion about sleepwalkers and progress in society. He writes that the man "would wake up late, get dressed, wash himself and eat lunch calmly, read the newspaper, examine a catalog, look lovingly at his books, touch them, move them around, leaf through some, and just like that, the time to eat would arrive again. Then to the café… a slow walk, the gradual invasion of sleep, a meager dinner, and early to bed” (Unamuno 1897b). In another article he writes a short story about two men who routinely meet in a coffee shop to discuss ideas, issues, and themes such as justice and charity, but know nothing about each other’s day-to-day lives or habits.

Nonetheless, the genre of journalism requires a unique approach and even a lifestyle that differs from the novelist or the philosopher. Sumpter writes that the necessity to define the news, although difficult, “established the occupation’s apartness from other jobs, particularly the text-
based work of playwrights, poets, and novelists” (Sumpter 2018, 36). News was set apart from literature as writing that provided a timely response for a large community of readers. McLuhan describes novels as more private and providing “a ‘point of view’” while “[t]he press is a group confessional form that provides communal participation” (McLuhan 1994, 204). Moreover, definitions of news did not focus on words such as “editor” or “reporter,” but on the words “audience” and “reader.” Thus, we might think of the newspaper as a more audience-centered genre. The tone of newspaper writing and journalistic style was impacted, according to McLuhan, by the speed-up of news and information and the introduction of new technologies. With the advent of the telegraph and its introduction into information movement, the journalistic style became shorter and choppier, and McLuhan describes the “equitone” style of the press as “maintaining a single level of tone and attitude to the reader throughout the entire composition” (McLuhan 1994, 206). The press also employed a different type of language than novels, using the everyday language of the people, and calling it “newspaper language.” Many believed that using “plain English was the quickest way to reach the largest audience.” (Sumpter 2018, 50).

Unamuno, as an author of novels, poetry, and philosophy, incorporates these styles into his press writing, but his articles in the newspaper differ from his work in other genres. First, he calls attention to the language of the press, believing that “the true and living Castilian, the common and current language, that of the average educated person, is the language of the press” (Unamuno 1896f). The press should use “words spouting with the life that comes from the street” (Unamuno 1896f). He also considers the newspaper press as a place for words to form and a place to experiment with language, as he writes that “it gives the right of citizenship to language, phrases, and vocabulary” (Unamuno 1896f). Indeed, Unamuno also practices this as he often coins new terms in the newspaper, words like informationery, factology, reporterism, and intrahistory. He
sees the language of the press as living, changing, and dynamic, and he believes that it should speak to the people. As such, he uses the language of literature to get people interested in topics, and then turns to provide a more political or philosophical explication.

Using an approach that takes theories of journalism into consideration differs from other approaches to his work because it can shed light on the different ways in which he uses the press to define events, create public consciousness, and shape culture through the conversational and mosaic nature of the press and also through the transmission view of communication. Scholars have not previously attended to how Unamuno utilized the medium of the press to form an immediate response to the socio-political situations in Spain. By using these theories of journalism in our analysis of Unamuno’s articles, we are able to see how he critiques the notion of the press as representative of the transmission view of communication; how he utilizes the press as demonstrative of the ritual view of communication as he believes it to be a place to shape culture, form public opinion, and develop the people of Spain into a community; and how he makes different stylistic and linguistic choices to access the conversational nature of the press, thus aiding in his construction of a meaningful cultural world.

A Rhetorical Approach to Intellectual History

In addition to focusing on how the context of the modern press influenced his journalistic writings, this dissertation also looks at these writings rhetorically, drawing from theories of rhetoric to provide new perspectives on Unamuno’s work. Some of the theories that will enhance our rhetorical reading of Unamuno include classical scholars such as Aristotle, but also more contemporary rhetoricians like Herbert Wichelns, Lloyd Bitzer, Richard Vatz, Barbara Biesecker, Nathan Crick, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Matthew May, Dilip Gaonkar, and Kenneth
Burke. Taking the work of these scholars together will provide us with a theoretical rhetorical perspective and a vocabulary with which to describe the various stylistic and rhetorical devices Unamuno uses; the importance of the broadly defined situation, the rhetor’s subjectivity, and the establishment of a relationship between rhetor and audience as elements that impact a rhetor’s choices in the text; the significance of considering the language of events; the usefulness of thinking about the text in itself and removed from the situation; and the use of identification to reach an audience.

Aristotle offers the most classical definition of rhetoric that would have been familiar to Unamuno. Rhetoric for him represents “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle 1984, 24). The means of producing persuasion are the three “proofs” of ethos, pathos, and logos. Thus, to examine a rhetorical text in an Aristotelian sense would be to look at the character of the speaker or author (ethos), the use of emotion (pathos), and the use of various types of logical argument structures (logos). Additionally, an Aristotelian analysis takes into consideration the different stylistic and rhetorical devices employed, including tropes, figures, enthymemes, and metaphors. For Aristotle, style must be clear, appropriate, proper, and unambiguous, and one must consider style at the various levels of words, phrases, and sentences. As a professor of the classics, and one well-versed in the Greek language and tradition, Unamuno would have been familiar with Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric, and indeed, he often wrote about rhetoric and rhetorical concepts. For instance, in an 1889 article called “About Oratory,” he writes that “the word oratory, which is Latin… is translated to the Greek rhetoric and to the Spanish habladuría,” demonstrating his familiarity with rhetorical history. In other articles he discusses rhetorical theory, such as in a 1918 article when he writes, “Rhetoric can be, like so many other things, good or bad. What fools, cowards, and powerless people call rhetoric is the
language of passion. Bad rhetoric is learned in manuals; it is one that coldly mimics the inflamed accents of passion” (Unamuno 1918b). Unamuno understands the Spanish problem of propaganda and polarization is a problem of rhetoric, and he thus aims to educate people about rhetoric and how to produce it. Unamuno often uses devices, especially paradox and chiasmus, to express his ideas in the newspaper. With our knowledge of his treatment of rhetoric and his educational background in the subject, we can see Unamuno intentionally using language and rhetorical devices in his newspaper articles as he addresses the people of Spain.

This Aristotelian definition of rhetoric is significant when looking at Unamuno’s articles because the two thinkers appear to have the same understanding of rhetoric. As he responds to his situation and his context, Unamuno effectively spots the available means of persuasion, and utilizes a combination of ethos, pathos, and logos to reach the people of Spain. Most people in Spain at the time knew of him and his work because he was a renowned professor and public intellectual. However, in the event that people did not know his work, the newspapers sometimes introduced him. For instance, in 1911, the periodical Publicidad announced an article of his, describing him as “[r]ich of ideas, frugal in thought, always in constant disagreement with life, but always loyal in his constant fighting…. This is Mr. Miguel de Unamuno, old friend of readers of La Publicidad, a rich spirit. The most interesting and discussed figure of Spanish intellectualism today” (Unamuno 1911a). Usually, Unamuno’s ethos was already established, but early in his career sometimes the paper provided a description of his credentials. In addition to ethos, Unamuno utilized pathos in the way he passionately spoke about the issues plaguing Spain. Writing about the king in 1918, he said “Be quiet! Be quiet! Be quiet! Because releasing…those phrases that he releases, insults the country in its days of agony. Be quiet!” (Unamuno 1918b). He
often used pathos in this way, emphasizing problems and playing on emotions to convince the monarch and the people of Spain to change.

Although Aristotle is known as the father of rhetoric, his methods have been critiqued and adapted over the years. For many years, scholars relied exclusively on an Aristotelian approach to rhetorical texts, translating his insight and methods into a more modern context, until Edwin Black published his well-known critique of neo-Aristotelianism. Stephen Lucas writes that Black “provided a comprehensive indictment” of neo-Aristotelianism, finding that neo-Aristotelianism focuses too much on logic and rationality, promotes “a restricted and artificial understanding of historical context that [does] not permit the critic’s vision to extend beyond proximate circumstances;… and circumscribe[s] the assessment of effects to a discourse’s impact on its immediate audience” (Lucas 2007, 513). Moving forward into Unamuno’s work, we should bear in mind the importance of both examining the discourse in a rich historical context and considering the effects of a discourse beyond its immediate audience. Despite Black’s and others’ critiques of neo-Aristotelianism, Aristotle’s foundations of rhetoric still offer an important lens for viewing rhetorical works such as Unamuno’s.

Not only taking an Aristotelian standpoint, this dissertation also examines Unamuno’s writings using 20th century rhetorical theory that grows out of the language of the rhetorical situation, in which scholars begin to consider rhetoric not simply as an analysis of style, but as the pragmatic art of using language specifically to respond to certain situations. In 1925, Herbert Wichelns argues in “The Literary Criticism of Oratory” that rhetoric is situational, as “it is bound up with the things of the moment; its occasion, its terms, its background” (Wichelns 2000, 4). Rhetoric depends on its context and situation, and a rhetorical evaluation must take these things into consideration. For Wichelns, while literary critics assess the beauty, wisdom, and truth of a
text, rhetorical critics distinguish themselves from this method by examining the persuasive effect a text has in its specific context. Rather than being concerned with the permanence or beauty of a work, a rhetorical critic should examine the artifact’s effect on an audience. As such, a rhetorical analysis should assess the situation and events that called forth a work of rhetoric, looking at a rhetorical work as “partly an art, partly a power of making history, and occasionally a branch of literature. Style is less considered for its own sake than for its effect in a given situation” (Wichelns 2000, 21). In this moment, scholars begin to differentiate literary texts from historically significant literary and artistic rhetorical texts, and Wichelns posits a new function of the orator – to influence people in a concrete situation. Likewise, we can think of Unamuno’s articles from both a literary and rhetorical perspective, as situational texts that speak out of a certain context and to specific occasions. Thus, it is fitting to consider Aristotelian stylistic devices and how Unamuno uses them to speak to a certain situation.

More well-known is Lloyd Bitzer’s later work on the concept of the rhetorical situation, in which he explains that rhetorical works arise as responses to certain situations, composed of audience, exigences, and constraints. In 1968 Bitzer explains that “[a] work is rhetorical because it is a response to a situation of a certain kind” and it “functions ultimately to produce action or change in the world” (Bitzer 1968, 3-4). A rhetorical work is called into being by a certain situation or context and it functions as a catalyst for change in this situation. As in Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric, for Bitzer, a rhetorical text also sees the available means of persuasion in a situation and then works to produce action. Applying the concept of the rhetorical situation to Unamuno’s articles, we can think of them as a response to the different political situations he experienced during his life, and they were meant to produce action and change in Spanish politics and society. Generally, Unamuno wrote critiques of the problem of dogma that he understood as coming from
different forms of authority in Spanish society, namely, the Catholic Church, the political regime of the monarchy, and the educational system. As he relentlessly critiqued the king, Unamuno once said that his aim was not to destroy the monarchy, but to rescue it “from the error of its ways and to goad Alfonso [XIII] into a reconsideration of his role” (Robertson 2010, 48-9). He hoped to use his rhetorical articles to persuade the monarch to change his action. For Bitzer, rhetoric alters reality “not by the direct application of energy to objects, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action” (Bitzer 1968, 4). By creating discourse that impacted the reality of the Spanish political situation, he hoped also to change people’s actions and interactions. As Unamuno’s articles function as fitting responses to his situation, we may say that they are, indeed, pieces of rhetorical discourse. Utilizing Bitzer’s definition of rhetoric as a pragmatic tool for the creation of action changes the way we view Unamuno’s work, allowing us to see it as arising from and addressing the Spanish socio-political situation.

Bitzer’s work also provides us with a rhetorical vocabulary of audience, exigences, and constraints so that we can better understand Unamuno’s articles and the rhetorical situations from which they arise. As Bitzer defines the rhetorical situation as “persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence” we can understand the important components of the rhetorical situation (Bitzer 1968, 6). Through this definition, Bitzer brings the terms exigence, audience, and constraints into the foreground of rhetorical analysis. Exigence, for Bitzer, “is an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be” and should be a problem that can be modified by discourse
As a modification of an exigence can only occur by “influencing the decision and action of persons who function as mediators of change…it follows that rhetoric always requires an audience” (Bitzer 1968, 7). The rhetorical situation asks us to consider the audience and their role in the work of rhetoric. However, this rhetorical audience “consists only of those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change” (Bitzer 1968, 8). In addition to exigences and audiences, a situation also includes constraints, or “persons, events, objects, and relations which … have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence” (Bitzer 1968, 8). For Bitzer, the exigences, audience, and the constraints comprise the situation that determines the rhetoric that responds to the situation.

Applying the rhetorical situation to Unamuno’s work helps us to understand the various exigences, audiences, and constraints that helped to fashion his responses to situations. His newspaper articles directly address a variety of exigences in Spanish politics and society, including a polarized Spanish nation, international political conflicts like the Spanish-American War and World War I, and changes in political regimes including the shift from monarchy to military dictatorship to Republic to military coup and civil war. As he writes about these problems in the newspaper, his audience includes all people in Spain, from the lowest members of society to the king. Additionally, he writes in many different types of periodicals, including conservative, liberal, and socialist newspapers and magazines, addressing many different types of audiences. As newspapers and education became more widespread, more people in Spain read his ideas, and even when people did not read articles firsthand, they could hear others discussing them in the plaza or in cafes. Because his newspaper articles targeted all segments of Spanish society, he tailors his language to reflect the living language from the streets and coins many new words, experimenting linguistically. This is a different approach than he takes in his novels and works of philosophy.
where he writes with more erudite language for educated audiences. As he dealt with these exigences and exposed them for wide audiences, Unamuno also faced some constraints. The most significant constraint for him was the censoring of the press, as in different time periods and political regimes there were varying levels of censorship. In addition to this were people’s attitudes and the legal constraints he faced for his writings. For instance, he faced backlash, and at various points he was deposed from his university position, put on trial, and exiled for his articles. However, while most would consider these things constraints, he did not. He was unafraid and refused to soften his critique because of the threat of a prison sentence or exile.

Although Bitzer’s perspective has been important in rhetorical theory, in “The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation,” Richard Vatz disagrees with Bitzer’s conception that the situation calls rhetoric into being, arguing, instead, that rhetoric creates, constitutes, and refines situations. For Vatz, the meaning of events comes “from the rhetoric surrounding” them and thus, “meaning resides in events” (Vatz 1973, 159, 155). The rhetor, rather than the situation, controls the response, in Vatz’s estimation. However, if we consider that Bitzer’s argument is not that meaning resides in events, but that events provide the impetus for an act of rhetoric, we can reconcile the positions of Bitzer and Vatz. We can do this by considering that rhetoric can be called into existence by events, but also that a situation’s meaning is constituted by the rhetorical act responding to it, including the choices and interpretations of the rhetor. Rhetoric, thus, can be both a “creation of reality” and a “reflector of reality” (Vatz 1973, 158).

Both the perspectives of Bitzer and Vatz are useful when considering Unamuno’s articles. Bitzer shows us how to analyze a situation’s exigence, audience, and constraints and the role they play in shaping the rhetoric that responds to the situation, while Vatz shows us that the rhetoric employed in a situation, in turn, shapes that situation. Unamuno’s articles both derive from a
situation of political crisis and polarization, and they reflect the important issues and create meaning around these situations for the people of Spain. While the situation plays a role in their necessity, as a rhetor he also uniquely responds to it in a way that no one else can. For instance, after the Spanish-American War, he often writes about war and the problem of Spain’s identity crisis after the loss of its colonies. In 1900 he writes a clear response to this situation, critiquing protectionism’s role in the war and saying, “Protectionism maintained our colonies under a true economic feudalism; they were the base of a powerful industrial and mercantile monopoly…Protectionism is what brought actual war” (Unamuno 1900k). However, although his words provided a clear response to a situation, they were uniquely his and they shaped people’s opinions of the situation, as he was an influential figure in Spain.

Entering into the debate on the rhetorical situation, Barbara A. Biesecker argues for a new interpretation that focuses on reframing rhetoric as a process that creates identities and relationships rather than a process aimed at influencing people. Approaching the rhetorical situation from the vantage point of Jacques Derrida’s concept of *différance* deconstruction allows us to see it as “an event structured not by a logic of influence but by a logic of articulation” (Biesecker 1989, 126). Thus, the rhetorical situation, for Biesecker, becomes not about the influence the rhetor commands over the audience, but should focus on the articulation of the rhetoric as something that establishes social relationships. As interpreted through *différance*, Biesecker sees the rhetorical situation “neither as an event that merely induces audiences to act one way or another nor as an incident that, in representing the interests of a particular collectivity, merely wrestles the probable within the realm of the actualizable” (Biesecker 1989, 126). Instead, the rhetorical situation is “an event that makes possible the production of identities and social relations” and within that schema, rhetoric becomes a process that aids in the “discursive
production of audiences” (Biesecker 1989, 126). This interpretation is useful as Unamuno’s articles aim to create identities and social relationships for the Spanish people.

Other scholars have expanded Bitzer’s theory, arguing that in an assessment of the rhetorical situation we must consider a broader scene that includes more than just the rhetoric at hand. For instance, Kirt Wilson argues that we must consider the entire “discursive field” out of which the rhetorical act arises. Wilson defines the discursive field as the “larger context of symbolic exchanges and the rhetorical culture that gives them particular meanings” including a variety of texts in an entire field, including different types of cultural expressions such as songs, pamphlets, and other artifacts of popular cultural (Wilson 2005, 306). According to Wilson, in order to understand the full significance of the rhetorical artifact, we must consider the broader cultural landscape and other contemporary rhetorical acts. Thus, it is important to examine the thick cultural and discursive context behind Unamuno’s articles. For this reason, I refer to other authors and cultural artifacts that made up his discursive field and surely impacted Unamuno’s work and opinions.

Considering the entire field of discourse and rhetorical practices taking place around an event, we must also keep in mind other peripheral events that bear upon the rhetorical situation. Vatz argues that “there is a choice of events to communicate. The world is not a plot of discrete events. The world is a scene of inexhaustible events” (Vatz 1973, 155). As such, this scene of inexhaustible events should be properly interrogated and understood, and rhetors must select which events to represent and how to represent them. Because a situation or context is comprised of an infinite number of events, “one never runs out of context. One never runs out of facts to describe a situation” (Vatz 1973, 155). In the face of the vastness of events, salience aids a rhetor in choosing the relevant facts to represent. Vatz believes that “meaning is not discovered in situations
but *created* by rhetors” (Vatz 1973, 155). In Unamuno’s articles, he chooses events that he deems significant in order to begin conversations.

Once we select which events to represent in our discourse, rhetoric provides a way of making sense of these events. Nathan Crick writes that rhetoric “responds to disruptive events that reveal gaps in our habits, laws, beliefs and relationships by creating and publicizing a discourse that gives a new meaning to situations, audiences, beliefs, and actions” (Crick 2014, 254). Rhetoric such as Unamuno’s articles can provide a new perspective on events, showing us problems through discourse that would have otherwise gone unnoticed. The way we frame events and the language we use “focuses, centers, and forms events so as to make them express qualities they did not possess before, but which are nonetheless actual components of those events” (Crick 2014, 263). Rhetoric has the power of transforming events and giving them new meaning. Although “situations begin as events… we do not yet have a ‘situation’ until, through an act of communication, we link these events together and turn them into an object capable of being defined and investigated” (Crick 2014, 267). For Crick, “a rhetorical situation takes on an identifiable and communicable character only after being constituted through language that evokes character” (Crick 2014, 268).

In other words, the character of the rhetorical situation is formed through language, in the transaction between rhetoric and events. Thus, Unamuno’s articles show us a new kind of transaction between rhetoric and the events, providing a new perspective on the events and crises leading up to the Spanish Civil War.

Other scholars similarly argue that the event establishes new relationships between things, people, and discourse, unleashing new potentials. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari argue that as the event “creates a new existence, it produces a new subjectivity (new relations with the body, with time, sexuality, the immediate surroundings, with culture, work)” (Deleuze and Guattari
For Deleuze and Guattari, creativity is needed to conceive of new responses to the demands of events. Unamuno’s creative rhetorical response to the demands of events during his lifetime opened possibility for the people and the future of Spain. Similarly, Matthew May writes that “events do not release their full potential in their historical actualization- that there persists unspent potential in an event that can not so much be signified but rather affirmed in the concrete act of repetition and difference (in this case, through writing)” (May 2013, 3). Creative discourse and rhetoric can help to expose the unspent potential in events, a potential that can then be translated into other contexts and situations.

While the context and the situation surrounding discourse are important, we must not forget the importance intrinsic to the text itself. In “The Oratorical Text: The Enigma of the Arrival” Dilip Gaonkar traces rhetoric and the study of the text, arguing that throughout the history of rhetoric, the text has resisted critical inquiry. For Gaonkar, rhetoric is polysemous, meaning that it can be interpreted in many different ways depending on the audience and the context. Gaonkar writes that “a polysemous text is such that it can be read competitively and even oppositionally by different audiences… Hence, the text is potentially open to alternative readings, and privileged cultural texts can become sites of intense ideological struggle over meaning” (Gaonkar 1989, 271). Removing the text from its context and interpreting it as a timeless text can shed new light on the text and its rhetorical functions. Likewise, “textual criticism can bring to light the possibility of unsettling the ideologically fixed and taken for granted meanings of such texts by recourse to the notion of polysemy” (Gaonkar 1989, 272). By taking a polysemous view of the text we can remove any fixed notions about it, leaving an imaginative space for new creative interpretations. This polysemous view aligns with Unamuno’s thought, as he disliked anything ideologically fixed, and he promoted inquiry, creativity, and new interpretations. The notion of polysemy provides a new
way of examining texts, by remaining open to the innumerable potential readings inherent in texts. When removed from its situation and context, the text takes on new interpretations and importance. After we understand the text in its own situation, we can look for its general importance.

Continuing this focus on the text, some scholars have argued for the importance of the text as separate from its context, a perspective that can illuminate a rhetorical analysis in new ways. Cesare Casarino presents the notion of philopoesis, a rethinking of literary criticism that extends Gaonkar’s idea of the polysemous text. As philopoesis looks at the untimely and the unthought in a text, it understands that each reading of a text reveals something new. Thus, a philopoetic approach encourages us to return to historical texts to seek new potential outside of its rhetorical situation. In the traditional view, while poetry was considered timeless, rhetorical texts were “held to be of limited and transient interest, and the issues of polemic resolve themselves or grow old and die, the passionate immediacies of one generation becoming the quaint antiquities of the next” (Black 1978, 58). From this perspective, rhetorical discourse creates only fleeting interest insofar as it is tied to the time and situation. On the other hand, a philopoetic reading is concerned not with the text’s response to a situation, but with the “untimely” elements of the text, acknowledging a new plane of potential in a new reading of the text. Different from the approach of the rhetorical situation, a philopoetic reading rejects the judgment of a text’s influence or effectiveness based on its response to a situation. Philopoetic rhetorical criticism enhances the contribution of discourse to the history of ideas, by releasing the text from the stifling constraints of context and illuminating new possibilities. Unamuno, at times, employs a philopoetic method, especially when he discusses Don Quixote, rereading and rewriting the story and looking for the untimely elements and the potential of the text when applied to his context.
Considering Unamuno’s articles from a philopoetic standpoint, we can look for potential in his work when we re-read it in different contexts and as part of different conversations. Philopoesis looks for interventions that texts make in the political and philosophical. We can remove Unamuno’s articles from their original contexts, placing them in a scholarly conversation about political and philosophical theory. Unamuno’s work can be understood in a broader political and philosophical conversation with thinkers such as Jose Ortega y Gasset, Arthur Schopenhauer, Søren Kierkegaard, Georg Hegel, Herbert Spencer, Hannah Arendt, and William James. Through philopoesis we can read for the interventions Unamuno makes into the political landscape, not only during his time, but continuing to today. Unamuno’s work can be translated to address our current political climate, speaking to issues of polarization and community. Philopoesis, as a method, allows texts to continue to reveal truths to us, as speech events are openings to the possible in thought, theory, practice, ontology, and politics.

Scholars agree that it is important to look for the link between public address and political thought, a perspective that sheds new light on Unamuno’s articles. James Aune argues that “a Restoration of the close connection between public address and Western political philosophy may provide a better grounding for our work than current alternatives seem to do” (Aune 1989, 44). Seeking the interference between public discourse and political theory can give new perspectives to discourse. Aune agrees that rhetorical critics should abandon “our commitment to the game-based notion of effect and strategy and … our commitment to drama and text-based symbolic interactionism, and instead view public address documents for what they really are: concrete instances of political judgment, embodiments of political philosophy” (Aune 1989, 49). Aune perceives the political potential in a public address document, and proposes criticism, not on the basis of effectiveness or style, but on such political potential. Looking at Unamuno’s articles as
instances of political theory can help inform the way we view and respond to political polarization, how we embody public intellectualism, and how we work to strengthen community.

The field of rhetorical criticism therefore offers a new perspective on rhetorical texts that differs from literary approaches and provides a good starting point to enter into Unamuno’s articles. In Ernest Wrage’s “Public Address: A Studying in Social and Intellectual History,” he argues that by taking a rhetorical approach to texts, scholars can make important contributions to social and intellectual history. Although, as Wrage writes, scholars in the disciplines of “philosophy, history, and literature are traditionally accredited as the official custodians and interpreters of intellectual history,” he believes that scholars of “public address may contribute in substantial ways to the history of ideas” (Wrage 1947, 453). Thus, studying texts like Unamuno’s newspaper articles can provide valuable contributions to social and intellectual history. As Wrage argues that “popular opinions, beliefs, [and] constellations of attitudes” are important to social and intellectual history, in Unamuno’s articles, we can locate the ideas, values, and beliefs of 20th century Spain (Wrage 1947, 452). Moreover, these contributions to intellectual history are not limited to the country of Spain, but also in the more general history of ideas and responses to political crisis across the globe. With this argument in mind, Wrage calls for the recovery of public address scholarship that would present “an organized body of literature which places speeches and speaking in proper relationship to the history of ideas” (Wrage 1947, 457). In light of Wrage’s study, approaching Unamuno’s articles from a rhetorical perspective can make new and innovative contributions to the history of ideas.

While rhetorical analysis of Unamuno’s articles can contribute to developments in intellectual history and to a better understanding of history, this type of study also has the power to shape history. Thomas Rosteck argues that the study of rhetoric needs to take “a perspective
that would understand both that rhetorical discourse represents the shared meanings of a particular society in history and that such discourse is itself a cultural practice that shapes history” (Rosteck 1999, 229). This can occur through revitalizing the notion of culture that would form a bridge between text and context. For Rosteck, rhetoricians must examine the “cultural rhetorical perspective” in which we reconsider the relationship of the text to the cultural context to understand how representations of culture are social documents dealing with questions of power. This type of work should place the popular, cultural, and historical into relationship.

In sum, rhetoric provides a way to interpret intellectual figures like Unamuno as actors within the drama of rhetorical history. David Zarefsky argues in “Four Senses of Rhetorical History” that we should look at rhetorical discourse as a “force in history” and as something that “alters an ongoing social conversation” (Zarefsky 1998, 29). This is similar to Wrage’s argument of rhetorical studies as significant to the history of ideas. As Zarefsky asserts, historical-rhetorical scholarship can enhance understanding of rhetorical events and can further the discipline of rhetoric as something that can give new insight into history. Studying history by analyzing the rhetorical production of the era can bring to light “significant aspects about those events that other perspectives miss” (Zarefsky 1998, 30). For instance, a rhetorical perspective can provide new insight not gained from a historical, philosophical, or political perspective. Zarefsky argues that rhetorical scholars should examine history because it can teach us “how people defined the situation, what led them to seek to justify themselves or to persuade others, what storehouse of social knowledge they drew upon for their premises, what themes and styles they produced in their messages, [and] how their processes of identification and confrontation succeeded or failed” (Zarefsky 1998, 32). By examining Unamuno’s articles from a rhetorical vantage point, this study sheds light on the period of Spanish history leading up to the Spanish Civil War. A rhetorical
analysis of Unamuno’s articles shows how he defined the situation of polarization in 20th century Spain, the themes and styles he utilized to fight this polarization and establish community ties, and the type of social knowledge he drew upon to make these arguments to his audience. Once these questions are addressed through a rhetorical analysis, they can be translated into other contexts and used to formulate new responses to similar situations.

The Rhetorical Symbol

The work of Kenneth Burke is particularly useful in interpreting intellectual and literary figures like Unamuno because Burke provides a way of rhetorically interpreting their use of symbols and tropes. One of the interesting things that is unique to Unamuno is his use of imagery and style which is important to how he constitutes rhetorical symbols in his newspaper articles. Burke’s rhetorical perspective of the four master tropes and his grammatical and rhetorical interpretations of a symbol and its functions can help us to hone in on how Unamuno makes sense of events and sets things in tension. Unamuno understands the importance of style, writing that “[i]ntimacy of style, my way of seeing reality, the character of my metaphors, the turn that it gives to my thought will correspond always to the specialty of my expression… Style reveals the tonality of our impressions, our temperament” (Unamuno 1900e). As Unamuno indicates that his style and his use of rhetorical devices reveal something about his work, using Burke’s theoretical perspective on this can shed light on Unamuno’s rhetorical expressions.

The basis for Burke’s rhetorical interpretation is grounded in his notion of identification and consubstantiality. As Burke describes, humans create identification and division through the language we use to explain and define things. Identification occurs when parties believe that “their interests are joined,” and they feel “consubstantial,” as unique entities that share the same
substance. Burke relates identification with persuasion, saying that “a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications; his act of persuasion may be for the purpose of causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker’s interests and the speaker draws on identification of interests to establish rapport between himself and his audience” (Burke 1969, 46). As identification is created, people begin to feel consubstantial, or having “common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, [and] attitudes” (Burke 1969, 21). Using the language of motives and identification, we can see how in our responses to situations we create these forms of identification. Identification, for Burke, is only needed because of division, as if people “were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity” (Burke 1969, 22). Symbols and tropes that have rhetorical significance in so far as they create forms of identification that usually form the basis for collective action and judgment. Rather than looking at them as merely stylistic innovations, Burke looks at all poetic creations as laying the foundations for rhetorical action in particular events.

A “symbol” for Burke is what he calls a verbal parallel to a pattern of experience, which is to say a condensed formula that describes how a specific type of figure adapts a pattern of action in response to a recurrent and recognizable situation. A symbol is made up of three components, universal experiences, modes of experience, and patterns of experience. In describing the symbols components, I explain it through the example of the symbol of Don Quixote, often used by Unamuno. For Burke, universal experiences are “[t]he various kinds of moods, feelings, emotions, perceptions, sensations, and attitudes” that all people “are capable of experiencing” (Burke 1953, 149). Don Quixote’s character experiences the universal feelings of anger, frustration, loss, and triumph, emotions common to all. While these universal experiences are things that all humans feel, modes of experience “arise out of a relationship between the organism and its environment”
and are the more specific contexts in which specific universal experiences arise (Burke 1989, 107). For instance, Don Quixote experiences his emotions as a poor and slightly insane landowner in early 17th century Spain. Finally, patterns of experience, then, are the responses, adaptations, and “adjustments of the organism” to deal with its environment and to these universal experiences and modes of experience (Burke 1953, 150). Don Quixote thus responds to the changes in his environment by treating the modern world as if it were the world described in fantastic novels of chivalry in order to slay dragons and feel like a hero. A symbol like Don Quixote is therefore “the verbal parallel to a pattern of experience” insofar as his name calls to mind a specific form of adjustment humans have made to his mode of experience and its accompanying universal experience (Burke 1953, 152). Thus, a symbol can be rhetorical when it is called upon later to interpret something in contemporary experience and, therefore, to guide our own judgment. That is why a symbol is “most overwhelming in its effect when the artist’s and the reader’s patterns of experience closely coincide” (Burke 1989, 110). Humans constantly create symbols in order to understand new complexities in life, which is why when “the emphasis of society has changed, new symbols are demanded to formulate new complexities, and the symbols of the past become less appealing” (Burke 1953, 59).

Symbols also have an impact on future invention. Burke argues that the symbol can have such an effect on the author that it becomes a generating principle for future innovation. This means that after the author translates the pattern of experience into a symbol, “the symbol becomes a guiding principle in itself” (Burke 1953, 156). Thus, the symbol takes on a life of its own, helping to generate more symbols, as “symbols within symbols will arise, many of these secondary symbols with no direct bearing upon the pattern of experience behind the key symbol” (Burke 1989, 113). It removes itself from the pattern of experience and even “brings up problems extrinsic
to the pattern of experience behind it” (Burke 1989, 113). As it illuminates new problems and new patterns of experience, “the symbol is a generating principle which entails a selection of different subtilizations and ramifications” (Burke 1989, 113). Consequently, once an author creates a symbol, the symbol takes on a life of its own and becomes a generating principle throughout his or her work. Locating these symbols in a writer like Unamuno helps us understand how a symbol which may have been rhetorical in its origin, by responding to a specific set of events, can then create possibilities for invention in other genres of writing, literary, poetic, or philosophical.

A rhetorical reading of symbols requires a Burkean approach that not only examines the functions and appeals of symbols, but also how the symbol relates to other events, fits into a text, and constitutes a situation in a certain way. A rhetorical reading of a symbol looks at how we can use the symbol from the text to make sense of other things and situations external to the text. In this type of reading, the symbol works rhetorically to orient an audience faced with a specific problem, helping to orient us to a certain scene external to the work. While a rhetorical reading “deals with the possibilities of classification in this particular aspect; it considers the ways in which individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another” (Burke 1989, 181). It is because of this property that Burke has described literature as “equipment for living,” as literary symbols can aid us in understanding other scenes of life (Burke 1973, 253). Symbols, for Burke, are one of the defining features of human life, and they serve various functions in discourse. Burke defined humans as “the symbol-using (symbol making, symbol-misusing) animal,” explaining that humans create reality, communicate, and persuade through systems of symbols (Burke 1963, 507). Symbols are abstractions that bring clarity and allow ideas to spread, among other functions. As understood by Nathan Crick and Jeremy Engels, symbol is “more than just a glittering generality or a sign of something else,” but
rather, “a symbol is a diagnosis” (Crick and Engels 2012, 275). For Crick and Engels, “The reappearance of a once-forgotten symbol indicates that people have drawn an analogy between present complexities and those of the past and have called forth the same pattern of experience in response” (Crick and Engels 2012, 275). In these moments, symbols become a way to converse about culture, and they are bound with many attitudes and emotions.

We can examine Unamuno’s use of symbols in a rhetorical reading to see how he calls upon symbols to speak to other situations. In one article called “Sorority: Angels and Bees” he uses the symbol of Antigone from the Greek play by Sophocles, beginning by writing, “Let us return to read the tragedy of Sophocles, Antigone,” indicating that he understood the rhetorical power of the symbol as being able to speak to other contexts, and he pulls the character Antigone into his present context. Antigone, for Unamuno, is an anarchist, as she defies the law of the king (Unamuno 1921d). However, Unamuno believes she is both courageous and correct because she disregarded an unjust law so that she could bury her brother. Thus, Unamuno positions her as “the eternal model of fraternal piety and feminine anarchism” and the “priestess of the religion of the home, the keeper of family tradition… of religious domesticity or domestic religiosity, and in its name she rose up against tyrannical civility or civil tyranny” (Unamuno 1921d). Threading this symbol throughout the article written in 1921, several years after World War I, Unamuno helps us to understand the political situation in Spain as one that needed more individual care and courage and less war and injustice. The re-appearance of the ancient symbol of Antigone indicates that there is an analogy between the present complexity of war and judgment of anarchy with previous complexities, and that there is a similar pattern of experience at work. Unamuno’s work can benefit from this type of rhetorical reading, as he uses symbols often and they have a life outside of the text, speaking to different political contexts.
When reading Unamuno’s journalistic writings through a Burkean lens, one is looking for how he uses symbols to constitute certain types of rhetorical situations, thereby creating the possibility for common understanding and collective action. A symbol, thus, is a way of reacting to events rhetorically and translating them into a unified meaning. For Burke, a symbol has numerous types of functions, but four of them stand out for being useful in interpreting Unamuno’s work. First, a symbol can interpret experience. In a rhetorical situation marked by confusion and uncertainty a symbol can function to give it order and meaning. Second, a symbol can force acceptance of things we had previously denied. This function can only occur when there is a preexisting undesirable or threatening aspect of a situation that many have refused to acknowledge in the hope that it will just go away. Third, a symbol can reveal future possibilities that “correct” imperfections in the present. Especially when faced with an undesirable situation in the present, an audience naturally wants to be offered a destination that will get it out of that situation. Finally, a symbol can emancipate certain types of action. When our moral codes seem to prevent desirable action and license undesirable actions, symbols have the unique power to invert our moral codes, thus making the better into the worse and the worse into the better.

An interpretation symbol can help us to interpret or understand a more complex situation, something that Unamuno does in his articles. Burke explains that a symbol can “give simplicity and order to an otherwise unclarified complexity. It provides a terminology of thoughts, actions, emotions, attitudes, for codifying a pattern of experience” (Burke 1953, 154). As a sort of metaphor, a symbol can make us understand something or provide a new perspective on something. Unamuno uses symbols to help clarify complex things. For instance, he often uses the well-known symbol of Don Quixote to help the people of Spain understand their own history, writing, “in the light of the Quixote, we can see our history… Spain, the historic and chivalrous
Spain, like Don Quixote, has to be reborn” (Unamuno 1898c). By explaining the history of Spain and Spain’s need for regeneration in light of the symbol of Don Quixote, people in Spain could understand their situation as analogous to that faced by Don Quixote. This allows them to make sense of events that might otherwise appear to them as chaotic and confused.

An acceptance symbol encourages the acceptance of a situation that we would not accept previously, as a “symbol can enable us to admit, for instance, the existence of a certain danger which we had emotionally denied” (Burke 1989, 111). Whereas previously we may have believed a situation was not dangerous, the symbol can warn us. Depending on the symbol, it can encourage our acceptance in different ways. Burke describes how a “humorous symbol enables us to admit the situation by belittling it; a satirical symbol enables us to admit the situation by permitting us to feel aloof from it; a tragic symbol enables us to admit the situation by making us feel the dignity of being in such a situation; the comic symbol enables us to admit the situation by making us feel our power to surmount it” (Burke 1989, 111). By changing our attitude toward the situation through the symbol, we might come to accept a situation that we previously did not. Unamuno often uses humorous symbols when talking about the king, helping people to accept situations. In 1888 he does this in an article called “Story of Some Little Paper Birds.” In this article he explains how, during his childhood, he created paper birds with his cousin, and played with them, creating armies and a political state of birds. The paper birds become symbols of Spain, and one of them even represents the king, as he writes, “The first historic king was a wax doll imitating a monkey, with his arms and legs mobile by some strings,” identifying the king as a sort of puppet. Later, he explains that the successor of this king was “Amadeo I, made with the head of King Amadeo cropped from a stamp. He did not do anything remarkable.” By humorously representing the
monarchy and king Amadeo through the symbol of paper birds, he can encourage his audience to accept the situation by belittling it.

A corrective symbol compensates for the deficiencies of our current situation by presenting us with an ideal situation that possesses all of the desirable qualities that we currently lack, no matter how fantastic or impossible that situation might be. A corrective symbol can thus either engage in pure fantasy or, more practically, help us to see the contrast between the reality of the situation and the symbol. For instance, Burke tells us that “a dull life in the city arouses a compensatory interest in symbols depicting a brilliant life in the city” (Burke 1953, 155). In the disparity between the situation and the symbol, we see the corrective property of the symbol. For instance, the chivalric fantasy of Don Quixote operated as a corrective symbol for the character, compensating in his fantasy for the deficiencies of 17th century Spain. Similarly, the Golden age of Spain during its empire often served as a corrective symbol for those of Unamuno generation who saw the final collapse of that empire.

An emancipation symbol is arguably the most explicitly political and radical of the functions of a symbol in so far as it actually rationalizes and guides action in a revolutionary way. An emancipation symbol requires “an adjustment which certain of his moral values prohibit” (Burke 1953, 155). By reframing the dilemma through a symbolic shift, the reader is freed from things that would have been prohibited by ethical values. In this situation, “if some kind of conduct is, by our code of values, called wicked, absurd, low-caste, wasteful, etc., and if the situation in which we are placed requires this reprehensible kind of conduct,” an effective symbol will manipulate our other values to make “such conduct seem virtuous, discerning, refined, accurate, etc.” (Burke 1953, 156). Considering the symbol as emancipator “involves fundamentally a mere shifting of terms in this way: leisure for indolence, foolhardiness for bravery, thrift for miserliness,
improvidence for generosity” (Burke 1953, 156). As we shift terms and definitions of values, we can more easily justify our actions, and are freed from the restraints of our old moral code. An emancipatory symbol transforms something that was once demonized and embraces it. Unamuno does this around the concept of anarchy, which had a negative connotation in Spain at the time because of its association with labor strikes and street violence. He writes that there is anarchy at each level of government, not only within anarchist groups. While people express shock at violent anarchist movements, they do not notice the gradual and systemic problems within the government. He explains this as “it is useless to repress the symptoms of a sickness, but you must combat it at its root, because a cut tumor resurges again with grave complications when there is an internal cause, a vice in their constitution” (Unamuno 1893c). By using the symbol of physical illness to emancipate the concept of anarchy, he makes people understand that anarchist groups are not the problem, but the anarchy in the government causes all evil, thus removing the demonization from anarchism as typically expressed.

Another useful set of terms that Burke provides for reading the work of intellectuals like Unamuno is found in his reinterpretation of the four master tropes from a rhetorical perspective. For Burke, the four master tropes are not only important because of the depth they provide to a text, but because they each embody a certain set of practical attitudes towards experience that have analogues in ethics and politics. In his explanations of symbols, Burke writes about what he calls the four master tropes, including metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony. Although each of them refers in poetics to certain figures and tropes, they also have what he calls “realistic” applications. As he writes, “for metaphor we could substitute perspective; for metonymy we could substitute reduction; for synecdoche we could substitute representation; for irony we could substitute dialectic” (Burke 1941, 247). Each of these substitutions represents an entire set of
attitudes that we adopt when we use these tropes and take them seriously as rhetorical suggestions for interpreting experience. Applying these to Unamuno’s articles can give us insight into how he makes sense of and provides new perspectives on the political crisis of his time.

Metaphor is a concept defined by Burke as examining something from a different perspective or through a new lens. He writes, “Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else. It brings out the thisness of a that, or the thatness of a this” (Burke 1941, 421-2). Furthermore, considering “A from the point of view of B is, of course, to use B as a perspective upon A” (Burke 1941, 422). Applied to words, using metaphor is to extend “the use of a term by taking it from the context in which it was habitually used and applying it to another” (Burke 1984, 119). Burke believes that we can gain a new perspective by applying terms from one realm to another. Burke calls this “perspective by incongruity,” as it is the establishment of new “perspectives by a constant juxtaposing of incongruous words” (Burke 1984, 119). For instance, using words from the medical field to describe emotions can make us understand emotions in a new and more concrete way, more exact “than by using the ordinary intellectual method of substituting abstractions reached by analysis” (Burke 1984, 126). In metaphor “we substitute for the fact to be described some quite different fact which is only connected with it by a more or less remote analogy” (Burke 1984, 126). To see “something in terms of something else involves the ‘carrying-over’ of a term from one realm into another, a process that necessarily involves varying degrees of incongruity in that no two realms are never identical” (Burke 1941, 423). In sum, Burke sees metaphor as a way of creating a unique perspective on an event in order to disclose one particular property or quality that stands out as significant. Metaphor does not pretend to be comprehensive; it argues that by looking at an event as if it were something else, we can gain an essential insight into that thing through creative imagination.
In his articles, Unamuno is always thinking in metaphors and giving new perspectives on events and society. To describe the problem of idleness in Spain, he uses language about a child studying, providing a new perspective on laziness (“Idleness and Impotence” 1900). When he writes about intellectuals arguing about who was the first to formulate phrases, he uses the language of a diamond necklace, providing a new perspective on intellectualism to make these discussions seem ridiculous. In the article he writes a fake argument, giving perspective to the types of arguments that take place among the erudite, saying, “‘I, I was the one who first removed the diamond from the earth, who first took it out of the mine.’ True, you extracted the raw diamond from the mine, an opaque piece of stone, but was it you who worked to refine it? Was it you who placed it in a necklace? And having placed it in the necklace, are you the beauty who wears it to give it its perfect shine?” (Unamuno 1900i). In this way, Unamuno gives perspective to people who argue about taking credit for making up phrases, mocking them through this new perspective.

The second trope, metonymy, Burke presents to us as reduction. Metonymy, a type of metaphor, “convey[s] some incorporeal or intangible state in terms of the corporeal or tangible.” It is the “reduction of some higher or more complex realm of being to the terms of a lower or less complex realm of being” (Burke 1941, 4). Metonymy is a reduction, however, not because it simply condenses something complex into something which is small, which is a function of all tropes; rather, metonymy reduces ideas to things, spirit to material, the abstract to the concrete. A simply case of metonymy, for instance, occurs when Unamuno describes the abstract process of writing as if it were a “pen.” He says, “I do not use any weapons other than my pen and my tongue” (Unamuno 1919c). However, understood as a set of attitudes, metonymy represents the attitude of materialism that is intolerant of spiritual abstraction and ideals and seeks to reduce everything to
mere material. For instance, Unamuno constantly lashes out against the materialism of the modern world, criticizing it for its reduction of everything spiritual to dogmatic formulas.

Synecdoche thus differs from metonymy because it does not seek to reduce everything to material basis, but rather seeks to represent the macrocosm through the microcosm. Burke writes of it as a “part for the whole, whole for the part, container for the contained, sign for the thing signified, material for the thing made…. cause for effect, effect for cause, genus for species, species for genus, etc.” (Burke 1941, 426). He provides the example of a macrocosm and microcosm, as a microcosm is a part of a whole. In the ideal synecdoche, “the individual is treated as a replica of the universe” (Burke 1941, 427). The perfect synecdoche is thus a miniature map, a responsible political representative, or a sample of some material. One thus understands the whole by a detailed analysis and criticism of the part in which many of the key relationships are embodied. Synecdoche thus has a more democratic and pragmatic character whereas metonymy tends to be associated with economic or philosophical materialism. For instance, for Unamuno, the individual represents a microcosm of the whole of Spanish society. When he presents us with the little civilization of paper birds, Unamuno is giving us a metonymy of Spanish civilization. He explains the development of their political society, and it parallels the formation of human society, as he writes, “The nations were growing, and each day new birds appeared to thicken the armies and the excess of wrong brought the remedy” (Unamuno 1888). The birds formed armies, developed medicinal strategies, married, had children and died, as a metonymy or microcosm of greater Spanish society.

Finally, irony for Burke is the most rhetorically powerful of the tropes because it includes all of the others in dialectic, which is to say it arises in the dramatic interplay of perspectives and the above terms. Irony as a poetic figure, such as in simple sarcasm, thus represents dialectic
because it always includes two voices, the A and the not-A, simultaneously. As such, it resists any singular interpretation because it always comes with a competing voice that says the opposite. For Burke, when taken realistically, irony thus invites us to bring as many voices together and see them as cooperating in a shared conversation. Burke writes that “[i]rony arises when one tries, by the interaction of terms upon one another, to produce a development which uses all the terms” or, in other words, it provides a “perspective of perspectives” (Burke 1941, 432). The political implications here are that we cannot really know the truth of anything until we have embraced all of the many perspectives. Consequently, from the standpoint of irony, “none of the participating ‘sub-perspectives’ can be treated as either precisely right or precisely wrong. They are all voices, or personalities, or positions, integrally affecting one another. When the dialectic is properly formed, they are the number of characters needed to produce the total development” (Burke 1941, 432). Whereas in a kind of romantic irony, we can sarcastically ridicule the other while maintaining safety in our own perspective, and in a “true irony, humble irony, is based upon a sense of fundamental kinship with the enemy, as one needs him, is indebted to him, is not merely outside him as an observer but contains him within, being consubstantial with him” (Burke 1989, 257-8). Irony thus invites all of the other master tropes into a collective dialectic as perspectives clash on perspectives in a constant interplay and conversation.

As interpreted through Burke’s definition, we can observe irony at play in Unamuno’s articles, as they include all of the tropes and provide an interplay of perspectives. In many of his articles we can hear two voices. At times, he provides two literal voices, in a dialogue, so that he can examine multiple points of view from different perspectives. In this way, he can show one side of an issue, and then provide a competing voice saying the opposite. By using a dialogue and presenting people in a shared conversation, we can understand a variety of perspectives on the
matter. For instance, the article above “Elections and Convictions,” presents two different perspectives on the role of elections in citizenship. Likewise, the article, “The Gossips” from 1889 provides a dialogue of two men who met daily at a café to converse, and in presenting the dialogue of the two men, Unamuno writes, “I will not reproduce here those monologues as they were produced. I prefer to expose their pure melody” (Unamuno 1889b). Rather than reproducing word for word, he describes the tone of irony or the multiple voices. In 1921’s “Sorority: Angels and Bees,” he describes a dialogue from the Greek drama Oedipus in order to present a symbol for the reader and to present different perspectives and opinions that arise in the dialogue. Unamuno’s goal in his articles is to bring many voices together in order to uncover the truth or the best path for Spanish society.

Lastly, Burke provides a distinction between ideology and myth that is useful in approaching Unamuno’s work. Like Unamuno, Burke was skeptical of ideology, which for him violates the kind of “true irony” based on a dialectical perspective. Burke thus argues that we do not just use words, but they can also use us, oftentimes through the form of demagoguery and ideology. He writes, “‘ideology’ is like a god coming down to earth, where it will inhabit a place pervaded by its presence. An ‘ideology’ is like a spirit taking up its abode in a body: it makes that body hop around in certain ways; and that same body would have hopped around in different ways had a different ideology happened to inhabit it” (Burke 1963). Moreover, “[i]deology, like rhetoric, gravitates to the side of ideas (the term originally referred to systems of ideas considered in themselves without reference to external factors)” (Burke 1989, 303). Ideology, as defined by Burke, is similar to Unamuno’s conception of ideology, a preoccupation with ideas. In contradistinction, myth gravitates not toward ideas, but “gravitates to the side of image” (Burke 1989, 303). Burke explains how to align “the political (or ideological) with the nonpolitical (or
mythic),” saying that we must either “treat them simply as mutually exclusive, so that we could turn to the poetic myth only by turning from the political ideology” or “treat the mythic as the nonpolitical ground of the political, not as antithetical to it, but as the ‘prepolitical’ source out of which it is to be derived” (Burke 1989, 310). This is exactly what Unamuno’s work focuses on, as his focus is turning people from the mindset of political ideology to one of poetic myth. He does this by treating the mythic and poetic as the nonpolitical or prepolitical ground of the political. This is how Burke describes the “‘ideal myth’ of today: a vision that transcended the political, yet that had political attitudes interwoven with it” (Burke 1989, 310). In his articles, Unamuno fashions this ideal myth, something that uses political attitudes in its quest to transcend the political.

By using symbols in different ways and by employing the four master tropes, Unamuno is able to offer a new perspective on and interpretation of events. Using Burke’s method of the rhetorical interpretation of symbols will help us gain a new understanding of Unamuno’s articles. The way Burke explains style and symbols can illuminate Unamuno’s relationship with his environment and it provides a new lens on the stylistic way in which Unamuno works to provide a new perspective for the people of Spain. We can think of the public intellectual like Unamuno as fashioning a persona or ethos through a creative act. Within the mosaic form of the newspaper and through the conversational press, Unamuno created his sense of the “I,” made himself a symbol, and made the individual representative of collective problems.
CHAPTER IV
THE CHALLENGE OF SPAIN’S DOCTRINAL TENDENCY

As we have seen, the most pressing problem in Spain during Unamuno’s life was the problem of political polarization. He had observed this problem in his childhood during the Third Carlist War and the disagreements surrounding the question of who should be monarch. After this, he witnessed increasing polarization in the wake of the Spanish-American War of 1898, when people debated how to proceed after the loss of the Spanish colonies. In 1914, World War I forced the people of Spain to consider whether to remain neutral or choose a side to support. Throughout these conflicts, the Spanish political system reflected this polarization, as “between 1902 and 1923 there were a record thirty-four governments, making any consistent effort of reform an impossibility” (Carr 2001, 235). By 1923, Primo de Rivera’s military dictatorship abolished political parties in favor of one party, which, in trying to transcend divisions, led to a deeper sense of polarization as people clung to their extreme beliefs more fervently. After Primo de Rivera left power, the Spain declared the Second Republic in 1931, which led many on the right to feel that the Republic was an attack on the Catholic Church. Increasing tension, disagreements, and violence finally culminated in 1936 with a military coup to overthrow the government, resulting in a gruesome three-year civil war in Spain between the Republican government and the Nationalist rebels.

Throughout his life, Unamuno spoke out against the problem of polarization, and he worked to rid Spanish society of division. For instance, in the wake of the Spanish-American War he tried to find ways to unite and regenerate Spain. Additionally, he wrote against all types of regional separatist movements, including those in both Catalonia and the Basque Country. He
would not support anything that caused division in Spanish society, even linguistic division, as he also wrote against the use of regional languages in Spain. In an 1895 article he cautioned people to “watch closely each patriotic and exclusivist movement, all that tends to divide people” (Unamuno 1885a). Given this quotation from his early career, we can understand why he would stand against political regimes he viewed as exclusivist, dogmatic, and divisive, including the monarchy, the military dictatorship, the Republic, and later the military coup.

As Unamuno approaches this problem of polarization in Spanish social and political life, he diagnoses it as a problem fomented by the press. Although he critiques the press, he also uses the medium of the newspaper to identify the various figures and tensions in Spanish life, reframing the problem in his own way. Through the genre of the newspaper, he demonstrates how the problem manifests itself in different ways in Spanish society. This chapter examines Unamuno’s critique of the polarization in Spanish society. First, I analyze how he understood the press as exacerbating this problem. Second, I explore how he defined the problem through the medium of the press. I do this by analyzing his critique of the press, which he described, in his own terms, as a “journalistic machine”, with “doctrinal tendencies,” and linguistically “rancid.” After this analysis of how he viewed the press, I go on to examine how he explained different manifestations of the problems of Spanish society through the medium of the press. These are problems of ideology, rationalism, and inauthenticity, and they manifested in the political, educational, and religious spheres. Through the press, he is able to reframe these problems as problems of ideas, information, and communication that could be fixed by shifts in rhetoric and community. Having examined how Unamuno framed the problem in this chapter, the chapter that follows looks at how he proposes to fix the problem defined here.
Unamuno’s Critique of the Press

Although Unamuno perceived the press as a vehicle by which he could be politically active and rhetorically respond to events, he also identified some of the negative aspects of the press. In a series of articles that he wrote between 1896 and 1900 and in some later articles, Unamuno critiques the nature of the Spanish periodical press, identifying several major flaws with it, including that it is a “journalistic machine,” has “doctrinal tendencies,” and is linguistically “rancid.” He published this series of articles in 1896 in the Madrid periodical La Justicia. The titles of the article include “The Fourth Estate”, “Informationery and Reporterism”, “Politicist Superstition”, “Politicist Superstition: Again”, “The Journalistic Business”, “The Press and Culture”, and “The Press and The Environment.” In the same vein, in 1899 he writes another article in Barcelona’s Las Noticias called “The Press and Language.” Later he refers to the press in other articles, but these initial pieces lay the framework and set up his system of beliefs about the press and the role it plays in the socio-political problems in Spain. Throughout this article series, Unamuno critiques what James Carey calls the transmission view of communication in the press, or the understanding of the press as purveyor of facts and information. As he does this, Unamuno invents new terms that we can use to describe the problems of the press and shows us that the press in the transmission view becomes a journalistic machine, has doctrinal tendencies, and is linguistically rancid.

The Press as Journalistic Machine

Unamuno critiques the press as a “journalistic machine,” saying that it has become overly mechanized as it now comprises part of the “factory system.” As part of the factory system, the press operates under the principles of big business, a development in the history of the press that
Unamuno perceives as negative. Historically speaking, the development of the Spanish press under the factory system follows a similar trajectory as the American press. As in the United States, Spain’s economy was industrializing, and the expansion of business swallowed and subsumed the business of the newspaper as well. In his article “The Fourth Estate,” Unamuno writes that “it is necessary to add the gradual invasion and application to journalism what the English call factory system [sic]” (Unamuno 1896a). The factory system is not a process that the press goes through; it is a system that invades and actively takes over the press. As this occurs, Unamuno describes that the press passes from a “manufacturing to an industrial period; it converts from a workshop into a factory” (Unamuno 1898b). He uses the metaphor of the workshop and the factory to explain the transformation of the press into a journalistic machine, thereby providing a new perspective on the nature of the press. Threading this idea of the press as “factory system” through this series of articles makes it an extended metaphor, providing a new perspective on the press and allowing people to understand the press as a business. Moreover, this metaphor is an instance of metonymy as it presents a way to explain the intangible through the tangible. The tangible example of the workshop and the factory helps to explain the intangible concept of the “journalistic machine.” In a workshop, specialized workers see a product from inception to finish, while in a factory, unskilled workers have one task in an assembly line. For Unamuno, the root of the problem of the press is its economic problem, or the way that it, like a factory, segments work, becomes mechanized, and devalues journalists in order to make greater profits. This attitude indicates his belief that the problem with the press as factory system drives other problems in the press, as he writes that “the base of the evils of our press is the economic base” (Unamuno 1896b).

As the factory system takes over the press and it becomes part of the industrial market, the press begins to discard specialists in favor of unskilled workers. When he refers to unskilled
workers, Unamuno means those authors in the press who lack special training or techniques, who write formulaic and sensationalized stories, and who report facts without discriminating or interpreting them for readers. In the previous times of the manufacturing period, or in a workshop environment where smaller presses thrived, Unamuno explains, “there are workers who are differentiated, each one cultivating their own specialty” while, after the transformation, “in the factory the same instrument completes different tasks, reducing the worker to care for their machines” (Unamuno 1898b). Once the new factory system takes over the press, humans are only needed for their ability to keep the machine moving, and not for their special knowledge. Part of this problem originated from a lack of education in the standards of journalism, as “benign editors with plenty of time to teach beginners the nuances of the sensational human-interest story did not exist. Universities did not offer degrees in journalism, although some taught a few classes in news work. Few ‘how to do journalism’ books” existed (Sumpter 2018, 17). In the previous times of the manufacturing press, or, as Unamuno describes it, the workshop environment, specialists, journalists, and skilled writers are initially valued. However, once transformed under the factory system, specialists are no longer necessary. Skilled writers are no longer needed to interpret and connect facts for the reader. Rather, the worker only has to be able to fit into the machine and make sure the machine continues to run.

The introduction of unskilled writers into the press results in the removal of the human element from periodicals, as the press replaces skilled human writers with what Unamuno calls a “journalistic machine.” The transformation of the press into a machine makes skilled laborers unnecessary, and “in this business scenario, laborers were easy to replace” (Sumpter 2018). But as the journalistic machine removes the human touch from the press, laborers are replaced by machines and unskilled workers, further mechanizing it. Moreover, the introduction of the
unskilled author into the newspaper’s landscape devalues the skilled writer, as in the factory system, “under the fabrication process, the newspaper machine nulls the worker that works for it, the press gains importance and influence, and the journalist loses prestige” (Unamuno 1896g). As the unskilled newspaper writer follows simple formulas and writes canned stories, the skilled journalist loses significance and is reduced to a cog in the journalistic machine. In this environment, anyone can fulfill the role of newspaper writer, even those without special skills or knowledge, as long as they maintain the journalistic machine. The supplanting of the skilled journalist by the journalistic machine manifests in the press as seen in the following scenario described by Unamuno: “the lively and prying boy, good sleuth of all types of sensational news, expels the delicate observer that knows how to see the facts in relief and give them connection and life. The journalistic machine overcomes man and depresses him” (Unamuno 1896c). In this article, he identifies the scenario in which the reporter-sleuth, a provider of sensationalized facts and information, becomes the unskilled worker of the press, overtaking the traditional periodical writer, one who is not a reporter of news, but who writes views, and has the training and technique to make delicate observations and conclusions about facts, tying them together and connecting them to the life of the people. By using the term “in relief” to describe facts, Unamuno brings a term from the world of art into the realm of journalism, providing a metaphor or a new perspective that shows how facts are unique and cannot be produced by machines, but should be handcrafted in a workshop environment by a skilled journalist who understands the art of journalism and the nuances of different types of facts and information. Often, these unskilled writers present caricatures and sensationalized versions of events and small crimes, treating all facts equally, and not seeing them in relief. As part of the transformation to the factory system, the journalistic machine overcomes the human aspect of writing. Again, Unamuno describes the loss of
personalization and the decrease in specialization, saying, “once industrialized, the press tends to be converted into a potent machine in which everything is made to the mold. No longer is material forged by hand, but it is melted in molds. For the news there is one, another for the backgrounds, etc.” (Unamuno 1898b). The industrialized, journalistic machine relies on molds, mechanization, and segmentation to keep the machine alive, and it values the unskilled writer who uses molds and formulas over the skilled writer who thinks and writes uniquely and creatively.

For Unamuno, removing skilled writers from the newspaper and replacing them with unskilled writers makes the news cheaper, but simultaneously lessens its quality. He uses the metaphor of the difference between margarine and cow’s butter to provide a new perspective for people to understand the difference between skilled and unskilled writers, as he claims that the introduction of unskilled writers “tends to cheapen the product, even at the expense of the quality, because the consumer can demand little and prefers margarine to cow’s butter, if that is cheaper” (Unamuno 1898b). The metaphor of margarine and butter is one that everyone understands, and it helps him to explain the reduction in quality of the press as the journalistic machine takes over. When given the preference, consumers choose cheaper periodicals, and the employment of unskilled writers in the journalistic machine costs less than employing skilled writers. Unamuno critiques unskilled writers of the press, and he sees their employment as a direct result of the factory system being imposed in periodicals. Moreover, he argues that there is a correlation between the employment of unskilled writers and the decline of the press as a place to interrogate ideas. Instead of interrogating ideas, the press of unskilled writers inundates people with an overwhelming amount of excessive and extraneous facts. Writers in the factory system indiscriminately report all facts, without interpretations and without any air of subtlety. Of the quality of information in the journalistic machine, Unamuno writes, “I get much more true information from *El Globo*,
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presented quietly and modestly, than from our bullying colossals mounted by the system of fabrication (factory system) in which the human is voided before the machine” (Unamuno 1896b). He indicates that before the takeover by the journalistic machine, the quality of news and information was higher in periodicals.

As the press becomes factory-like and mechanized, it transforms into a business enterprise, in which only larger businesses and presses can survive. For Unamuno, this transformation to the factory system and the mechanization of the press has the unfortunate effect of damaging smaller presses and removing them from the market. During his career as a writer of articles, he witnesses firsthand the smaller party newspapers disappearing and dying because of their inability to compete with larger presses, or the “bullying colossals” as Unamuno refers to them. For example, in the Spain of his early career, he read and wrote for numerous small periodicals representing many various parties and perspectives. For example, there were socialist papers such as *La Lucha de Clases* which Unamuno contributed to and more conservative periodicals such as *El Fomento*. Additionally, there were small regional papers such as *El Pueblo Vasco* that dealt with issues of Basque life and politics. Unamuno describes the process by which “the small domestic industries, the party newspapers, languish and disappear with their undoubtable advantages, even unsubstituted, and the journalistic business succeeds them, assembled by the factory system” (Unamuno 1896c). While he equates party newspapers to small domestic industries, he describes larger presses as part of “the journalistic business” that operates under the principles of the factory system. As evidenced here, Unamuno understands the advantage of smaller presses and party newspapers, periodicals that provide a greater input of voices into the public sphere of debate. In his estimation, small, free presses help to keep thought free and serve an educative and edifying function as they can teach people to question dogma and authority.
Subsuming smaller presses, the journalistic machine becomes a larger, more polarized, powerful, and totalizing system, something Unamuno identifies as a problem. By simply naming one of his articles “The Fourth Estate” he identifies the power of the press.\(^\text{20}\) He writes, “The evils of our fourth estate, the educative together with the legislative, executive, and judicial, are evils: some of the environment, many of the spirit of caste, but mostly of the economic state” (Unamuno 1896a). Thus, the fourth estate, the press, is an evil that is produced by the environment, the spirit of race, and the economic structure of the press. As it is a totalizing system, people may be agitated and unhappy, but Unamuno sees little possibility for reform; when people speak out against the press, little happens. He writes, “of the last rumpus that was raised because of the press’s action, hardly anything has remained. It was the wake of the keel in the sea and not of the plow on land” (Unamuno 1896a). Unlike the plow on land, which makes a lasting impact on the earth’s surface, the wake of a boat disappears from view shortly after they arise, having little effect on the system. Using the vocabulary of Kenneth Burke, we can say that Unamuno uses the symbols of the plow and the boat as symbols of acceptance. He shows something that people may have previously denied and makes it easier for them to accept, as he equates uprisings against the press with the wake of a boat whose trace vanishes as it passes. This is in contrast to the lasting impact and lines cut by the plow upon the earth. He combines this symbol of the boat with that of the hydra to emphasize its state of paralysis: “the agitation, besides, is of little effect on our people, like the hydra stirs and shakes its body without ceasing, continually creating tentacles, but, stuck, it does

\(^{20}\) Unamuno calls it “El Cuarto Poder” which directly translates to “The Fourth Power.” “The fourth estate” is the more common term in English, but other European languages, including Spanish, commonly use the term the fourth power. The fourth estate is the indirect power and ability of the press to frame political issues. It is fourth after the clergy, nobility, and commoners but also refers to the powers of government such as legislative, executive, judiciary, and journalistic. See Edmund Burke, Thomas Carlyle, and Oscar Wilde’s 1891 “The Soul of Man Under Socialism.” Unamuno had read Wilde and was influenced by these ideas.
not move from its rock” (Unamuno 1896a). At least the boat is moving; the hydra just waves its tentacles but remains stuck in the same place.

A greater consequence of the mechanization of the press, the implementation of unskilled writers, and the devaluing of skilled writers is that this process makes journalists forget their power. While the periodical as an enterprise gains fame, money, and even political influence, it becomes a powerful figure, and it removes all influence and voice from individual journalists. Unamuno, though, recognizes the power of the press and its authors, saying that “journalists, who are made small before the machine, have not acquired full consciousness of their power, of the power of the fourth estate, and so they lower their own weapons” (Unamuno 1896g). This power resides, in Unamuno’s opinion, within the educative function of the press and is wielded by the pen of the skilled writer. He finds it

sad that the press, the advanced army of the coming industrial age…does not have the valor or wildness to put the pen against the sword. And…why must one be more noble; the claw of the lion or the beak of the eagle, the cunning of the fox or the color of the cuttlefish? Nature has given each species its own weapons; they are noble or ignoble according to the ends they are directed (Unamuno 1896g).

The press has the power to fight against the militarization of the government. Utilizing the rhetorical device of metonymy, he equates the pen as a weapon that can effectively combat the sword—if only it is wielded correctly. Not only here, but in other articles he also refers to the pen as a weapon. For instance, in a 1919 article he writes, “I do not use any weapons other than my pen and my tongue” (Unamuno 1919c). In 1900 he writes that books, too, are like swords, saying, “books are swords that can have perfect edges and forms, or they can be totally jagged: all consists in who wields it and how they wield it. If one is a good combatant, they will make marvels with a
jagged sword, using it as a saw” (Unamuno 1900q). Through metonymy we can understand the power inherent in books and writing, by reducing them to a tangible weapon. In the article above, Unamuno extends this weapon metaphor to create the symbol of the press as an “advanced army.” In Burkean terms, the press as an “army” functions as a corrective symbol, exposing the deficiencies in the press’s lack of courage and encouraging it to correct imperfections to live up to its future potential. But in “The Prestige of the Press” above, Unamuno combines the use of metonymy with the metaphor of different animals’ natural defenses to demonstrate how writing can be a defensive weapon as effective as military arms. In an era of industrialization of the press, the journalist does not realize their power as an agent of the press to combat the authority of the government and military. Unamuno hopes to inspire writers to take their potential seriously and take up their pens to form the army of the coming age, one that can equally fight the brutality of militarism and the adherence to dogma. However, beyond skill, this journalistic army also needs what he refers to as “wildness” or “valor,” by which he means courage, something that he perceives as lacking in the press. He perceives this problem throughout his career, as in 1921 he writes about the cowardice of the press, saying, “The Spanish press is not the most restrained, but the most cowardly. It does not dare to denounce anything, and if it does, they denounce it for denouncing, and the abuse denounced by it continues” (Unamuno 1921b).

*The Doctrinal Tendency of the Press*

In addition to the press being overly mechanized and removing skilled workers that can courageously write in the press, Unamuno argues that the newspaper contributes to problems of dogma, doctrine, and ideology in Spain. The press contributes to the problem of dogma by acting as an authority and spreading what he terms “conventional lies.” Unamuno describes this problem,
writing that the “racket of our culture is reflected, as in all literature, in the press, and the press also reflects a false rationality that renders enlightened all kinds of conventional lies” (Unamuno 1896a). As the press reflects our culture to us, it also reflects conventional lies, hidden behind a mask of rationality and enlightened facts, making dogma appear to be true and justified. By “conventional lies” Unamuno means lies that are widely held to be true or generally-accepted, as “conventional” is used as it is in the phrase “conventional wisdom.” Unamuno uses the phrase “conventional lies” several times in different descriptions of the press, saying that the press “has contributed, and contributes more than a little, worshiping at the altar of conventional lies, maintaining, until it decides to attack, the most unbearable doctrinaire or the prestige of political fraud” (Unamuno 1896d). By using the language of religion to explain the press, including words such as worshiping and altar, Unamuno creates a metaphor, providing a new perspective on the press. As he equates the press to a religion or cult, we understand the press’s power over people in a new way, and we realize the value that the press places on these “conventional lies.” Through this metaphor, Unamuno exposes the way that the press supports and controls the way people see dogma and doctrinaires, as he indicates the nature of the press’s power. In this way, the language of religion becomes a corrective symbol, in Burkean language, as Unamuno exposes the future possibility to correct the deficiencies of the press. Again, Unamuno refers to the “conventional lies” of the press when he writes, “The real truth is heard many times from the lips of those who never allow it to leave their pens, because in privacy they do not believe it, because they are convinced of the conventional lie” (Unamuno 1896e). Although many would refuse to write the real truth in the press, they may say it, but they do not believe it, because the mechanistic press convinces everyone of the conventional lie. Thus, the press upholds these agreed upon falsehoods and doctrines. In his 1897 article “Pistis and Not Gnosis!” Unamuno describes the press as “the
press that weaves and cooks up plots of lies and the insincerity in which we live” (Unamuno 1897a). Thus, we see the press as a site of power that creates a climate of lies and insincerity, promoting and spreading lies, dogma, and false authority. Unamuno explains that there is “part of the press, that is not the people, nor does it represent them, nor does it direct them, but instead it tricks and exploits them” (Unamuno 1911b). By promoting conventional lies and controlling dogma, the press has a great deal of power to exploit the people.

For Unamuno, the spreading of dogma and ideology through the press occurs, not only through the conventional lie, but also in the way that the press and its unskilled writers editorialize and interpret facts. He writes of the art of finding the balance between indiscriminately providing too many facts and editing a smaller selection of appropriate facts. Likewise, the press must strike a balance between imparting facts for the reader’s use and spreading dogma for the reader’s acceptance. Ten years after his original series on the press, Unamuno writes, “I take a newspaper for the copious information, for the richness and exactitude of its news, for the facts that it supplies, but I am irritated by the teachings that these same facts and news want to impart. And perhaps the director of the newspaper does not consider that the newspaper is read despite its doctrinal tendency and not because of it” (Unamuno 1906b). Although he appreciates the press for the quick information, facts, and news it can convey, Unamuno disapproves of the way it uses these facts in service of spreading doctrine and ideology. This doctrinal tendency is something Unamuno perceives as dangerous, as the press serves as a leading authority of the people. For Unamuno, the press should not purvey doctrines and dogma; rather, it should provide observations and should skeptically interrogate and question dogma and teach people to do the same. The doctrinal tendency of the press is something that Unamuno finds extraordinarily problematic, as it uses the medium of the journalistic machine to shape Spanish society and community. He writes that the
press “does not ordinarily falsify facts, although it can at times present them in such a way that brings the reader to form the conclusion that the author wants them to form” (Unamuno 1906b).

Here, Unamuno defines the doctrinal tendency, as authors present pre-formed conclusions for readers, providing them with an easily digested form of a political dogma, and removing some of the participatory aspect from the press. Unamuno dislikes this doctrinal tendency of the paper to present conclusions and one-sided perspectives for readers, instead of simply presenting information, many perspectives, and skeptically questioning facts. He acknowledges the tendency described by Walter Lippman for the press to create public opinion. However, in time, the opinions presented by the press and the journalistic machine can effectively turn the press against itself.

Much like the way he critiques the dogmatic nature of the press, Unamuno understands the problem of political rhetoric in the press as a problem of factology (*hechología*) and informationery (*informacionería*), terms he coins to discuss the way in which journalists write about facts in the press. In an article reminiscent of early iterations of Marshall McLuhan’s work on communication technologies, Unamuno defines factology through the examples of the instant photograph and shorthand. He argues that “few good things have produced more harm at the moment than the instant photograph and shorthand; they have made the most deplorable factology advance, that of information, not only unarticulated, but inarticulable” (Unamuno 1896b). Along with the press, instant photographs and shorthand are two mediums that create this environment of factology, defined by Unamuno as the state of communicating an excess of unorganized and unorganizable information. As we look at the composition of the word factology, we can break it down into the root “fact” and the suffix “-ology,” meaning “the study of.” We can thus interpret factology as the study of facts, or the branch of knowledge concerning facts, specifically as portrayed in the press. When the mechanized press loses skilled writers, the journalistic machine dumps a plethora of
unorganized facts about all kinds of events on readers. We begin to study facts and how to communicate them more rapidly. He provides the example of the instant photograph and shorthand because these are two communication technologies that make people want information faster, even at the expense of quality and precision. Considering the example of instant photography, Unamuno was most likely referring to the time prior to instant photography, when most portraits were captured in a daguerreotype. A daguerreotype was a very detailed, beautiful, and artistic process of creating a photograph on a sheet of metal. This process took longer in terms of exposure and development, and required a certain level of skill and technique, but was the main method of capturing an image until the late 1800s. As instant photography supplanted the daguerreotype, skilled artists were no longer needed, but only someone who could work the camera machine. Moreover, with the advent of instant photography, much of the detail and intricacy of a daguerreotype was lost. In the second example of shorthand as a style of notetaking, the advent of shorthand in the 1800s allowed people to write everything at a rapid pace. This meant that people no longer needed to select which facts to write down, as everything could be written quickly in an abbreviated form, at the expense of quality and detail. The inception of the technologies of the instant photograph and shorthand changed the way audiences receive information, preparing them for more information at a lower quality and a quicker speed.

Translating this to the newspaper press, these technologies created a mindset in audiences that led to periodical press that functions as an informationery. His word informationery (informacionería) combines the root “information” with the suffix “-ery”, meaning an actual location where a certain activity takes place. Thus, “informationery” refers to a place where information does something or something happens to information. For Unamuno, the press

---

21 "-ería" in Spanish.
becomes an *informationery*, a place where information is stored, but in the form of a warehouse stocked with piles of facts and not as a small artisan shop with unique and subtle observations. The *informationery* of the press inundates people with facts. Unamuno argues that one could find out about what was happening in the world better when there were no telegraphs or reporters because today…you cannot see the forest for the trees. And the truth is that one becomes dizzy when faced with the flood of unorganized (and worse, unorganizable) minutiae. Journalists must have an intelligent and sensible editor, in charge of creating a weekly, bimonthly, or even monthly summary of the movement of interior and exterior politics (Unamuno 1896b).

Indeed, before the telegraph and the reporter ushered in the *informationery* through the new speeds of information technology, it was easier to understand the world. During the era of *factology*, people are overloaded with information and unorganized and unimportant minutiae. Surrounded by an inundation of endless and trivial information, it is difficult to get a clear picture of what is important. In “The Fourth Estate” Unamuno writes that in the press, “information hardly informs anything, is reduced to neighborhood gossip, and in this way, it stops being educative information, passing from the fruit of curiosity, to un-educative information, to non-information” (Unamuno 1896a). Although the press is overladen with information, “it hardly informs us of anything. And because almost no one is truly in-formed, almost no one finds out” (Unamuno 1896a). To fix this problem of information overload in the press, Unamuno believes that periodicals need editors that can monitor, pare down, and summarize information for audiences. In other words, an editor should have rhetorical agency and should make selections that are fitting for the rhetorical situation. These terms, *factology* and *informationery*, fall under the realm of what Unamuno coins as *reporterism*. *Reporterism*, with the suffix “-ism” that denotes an action, practice, or philosophy,
refers to the various practices of reporters. By this, he means the practices of those unskilled sleuth writers who inundate readers of the press with facts. \textit{Reporterism} is more than just reporting the news. Rather, it has a role in both \textit{factology} and \textit{informationery}. Through the practices employed by \textit{reporterism}, the press becomes an \textit{informationery} where information is stored, and we can study facts and their dispersal in the press as \textit{factology}.

For Unamuno, this quality of the press to overload readers with information translates to negative consequences on political life in Spain. As the press creates audiences ripe for receiving copious amounts of information, the press also transforms audiences into groups that listen to authority and crave dogma. Unamuno uses a metaphor, comparing politics with sports, and describing how the press has turned politics into a sport, or something that requires both “natural talent” and honed skills. He writes of this idea of “natural talents” in politicians, describing how in Spain, the press does not promote the most educated politicians, but rather, those with “natural talents,” and idea that Unamuno finds ridiculous. He describes how in promoting politicians with “natural talents,” the press plays a role in “political fraud, by which all more or less empty doctrines are supported, like an old, blind man is supported by a street urchin guide… In this way politics has been converted into a sport, into the running of the bulls or a game of pelota” (Unamuno 1896d). Unamuno perceives that the press helps unqualified and fraudulent politicians who lack intelligence and training and who support empty doctrines. Here he uses the metaphor of an old blind man being led by a street urchin to provide perspective on the ridiculous nature of this system of the press supporting the natural talents of politicians. While the old man can neither sustain himself, nor see where he is going, the street urchin can barely support the man, nor does the child want to. Unamuno uses this comparison as a symbol of interpretation, providing an everyday perspective that anyone in Spain would understand, giving meaning to confusion and providing
simplicity to an unclarified complexity, to use the language of Burke. Unamuno continues to write in 1900 about the dangers of natural talents, saying “we must distrust greatly those natural talents without cultivation, of those who have had occasion, methods, and time to cultivate them and have not done it. The best proof of aptitude for something is the fondness for it” (Unamuno 1900g). Thus, he argues that natural talent is not enough, but it is necessary to have both natural talent and the desire to work and hone skills, as he summarizes, “only natural talent combined with study can produce fruit” (Unamuno 1900g). Unamuno believes in the grave importance of encouraging Spaniards to value skill and learning. This, for Unamuno, is one of the most serious issues of the press in relation to politics. As the press sustains fraudulent, talentless politicians and a climate of dogma and information, the press turns politics into a sport, a competition, into a game that must be won to support what he describes as “Spanish arrogance.” Beyond the negative political consequences, this has detrimental effects on the press and on the greater society. He writes that “the press here is too closed, it lives its own life too much, it tries to nourish itself too much with its own blood” (Unamuno 1896g). As it goes on nourishing itself with its own blood, feeding on itself, it becomes part of the journalistic machine, and it loses its potential as a medium to critique the social or political situation.

The Press as Linguistically Rancid

Unamuno believed that language usage was one of the main problems plaguing the Spanish situation, and that this problem was reflected in and perpetuated by the periodical press. In his estimation, the problem is that the press does not reflect what he refers to as the “living language.” In 1899 he writes about this issue of language and the press, saying,
one of the things that we must work on in Spain to be able to enter fully into the culture of the new people is language. We must mobilize the hieratic rigidity of the old Spanish language; we must give it flexibility and greater richness; we must take advantage of its potential energies making them actual…. As our lives are complicated, the language with which we reflect on it also must be complicated. New institutions, new inventions and utensils, new ideas demand new words, as a new way to conceive of life demands a new tone and new orientation in language (Unamuno 1899e).

By using the word “hieratic,” Unamuno refers to the type of script writing that was employed in religious, literary, educational, and formal administrative texts in ancient Egypt. He uses this metaphor to demonstrate the formality, rigidity, and antiquity of the Spanish language as he sees it being used in the newspaper. Instead of using an outdated and inflexible language that does not reflect reality, the Spanish language, and especially the language of the press must be richer and more dynamic and should reflect the everyday lived experience of the Spanish people. If life is complicated, so, too, must be the language of the press. He finds that the press “is quicker to adopt pedantic terms with rancid flavor, than words spouting with life that come from the street” (Unamuno 1896f). Here, he uses vocabulary associated with food, “rancid flavor” applied to the realm of language, to make a living metaphor for people. This example of metonymy makes the problem come to life for the people, reducing the intangible problem of language to a more tangibly understood problem of flavor. Unamuno argues for the creation of new tones, words, and phrases, and new ways of using language, believing that the press should be a site where the transformation of language takes place. For this reason, Unamuno plays with language and coins many new words and phrases in his periodical publications, like the words discussed above, including factology, reporterism, politicist superstition, conventional lies, and informationery, among others we will
explore later, such as *altereutrality* and *intrahistory*. He notices others using the press in the same way, as he writes, “the daily press is where I have first read phrases like ‘to solution’ a problem or ‘to influenciate’ in a matter” (Unamuno 1899e). As he writes of this language creation, he describes it as a necessity to actualize the potential energies of language, in a nod to Aristotle’s theory of motion.

For Unamuno, the press should serve as a location to store and collect the living language; it should express the living language or the common tongue of the people. He writes, “I do not believe that there is an institution besides the press that is designed more purposefully to collect the living language, that is forming day after day, in streets and plazas and in cafes and casinos and fields, in incessant labor, along with the language already made and consecrated, cultivated by archaeologists and purists and archived in grammars and dictionaries” (Unamuno 1899e). As a fleeting communication technology that is re-published every day, the newspaper lives its life in the streets, as it is sold, carried around town, read in cafes and trains, and discussed by people at all levels of society. Analogous to Carey’s ritual view of communication, Unamuno sees newspapers as living sites where language comes alive and words and phrases can be born. He understands that language from the streets can enter into the press, and, likewise, language from the press can enter the streets. Thus, the press should function as a more authentic arena of lived language than dictionaries that are slower to change and adopt neologisms and turns of phrases. Unamuno writes that the “‘common tongue’ is what, for us, average Castilian Spanish represents, language that is formed in the bosom of the public, in cafes and tertulias, the living language. To reflect on it is and should be the endeavor of the press” (Unamuno 1899e). Thus, the press has a duty to reflect on the language it uses and the language of the people, as it collects and stores language. The language reflected in the press should feel alive, and “the newspaper should appear
to be written in the street, among the crashing of carriages, the voices of street peddlers, and of comings and goings of the passers-by, in the loose and even sloppy language of those who use it. Fruitful neglect of such a language!” (Unamuno 1899e). Contrary to what many scholars believe, Unamuno argues that the neglect and misuse of words and language can, in the press, be fruitful, inventive, and productive. He further says that he supports “this corruption of language” in the newspaper (Unamuno 1899e). Moreover, the newspaper is a text, like a dictionary, from which one can learn the language of the people. He describes how “each time a foreigner has asked me the best texts by which to learn Spanish, if it was not an erudite who wanted to learn the classics but was for life or philological study, I have recommended that they read newspapers” (Unamuno 1899e). Unamuno perceives the newspaper as a location that reflects the cultural life and the spirit of the people through its flexible use of everyday language.

The problem of the language of the newspaper not reflecting the reality of Spanish life extends to the problem of the press as a vehicle for propaganda and sensationalism, another problem that Unamuno perceives throughout his career. He believes that one of the major issues plaguing Spain is the problem of propaganda, and that this can be fixed through a purification of the rhetoric used in the newspaper and by political leaders. Thus, we see Unamuno addressing the concepts of propaganda and rhetoric throughout his body of articles. When he speaks of rhetoric, he explains that there has been a misunderstanding of the nature of rhetoric: “Rhetoric can be, like so many other things, good or bad. What fools, cowards, and powerless people call rhetoric is the language of passion. Bad rhetoric is what is learned in manuals; it is one that mimics, coldly, the inflamed accents of passion. The execrable is not rhetoric; the execrable are commonplaces, traditional topics, set phrases when they are not turned on and a breath of passion renews them” (Unamuno 1918b). According to Unamuno, bad rhetoric comes from manuals, from the practice
of strategies without belief, practice that attempts to mimic feeling without having a basis for this feeling. He believes it is detrimental to rely on these commonplaces and set phrases without sentiment behind them. What he calls “execrating rhetoric” is another thing, but it is not, in fact, rhetoric. Neither is rhetoric speaking solely with the “language of passion.” Instead, it involves “a breath of passion” in combination with thought and the knowledge of rhetorical strategies. Unamuno attempts to reinvigorate our understanding of rhetoric in the way he uses it in his newspaper articles, by showing us directly how to marry the breath of passion with the knowledge of rhetorical strategies and techniques of persuasion. Additionally, in the same article he says that bad rhetoric is rhetoric that inspires fear, “What horrible rhetoric is that which inspires fear! …And it is even called goodwill and good faith – and this is what bad rhetoric is – that which is not will nor faith, nor good nor bad” (Unamuno 1918b). This recalls Aristotle’s definition of ethos that involves the component of goodwill. Bad rhetoric lacks goodwill and faith and any component of good, but falsely inspires fear in people. Unamuno sees this kind of rhetoric being replicated and spread through the language of the press and politicians.

He sees the example of “execrating rhetoric” and the misuses of rhetoric occurring in the government by many of the political leaders, including the king. He writes this commentary article in 1918, in the midst of his grand attacks on the monarchy, and shortly before he was put on trial for crimes against the press and for speaking out against the king. In the same article, he goes on to explain how governmental agents and “professional politicians” misuse rhetoric, saying, those commonplaces, those traditional topics, those set phrases make up the miserable language of the professional politicians, professional politicians that are found at the head of the government in days of tragedy…. A country that tolerates its leader, a leader who is, in appearance, like a phonograph that the releases to the air the most trite commonplaces,
the most miserable old topics, the most grayed set phrases, is a country that does not have an alternative solution…. For God’s sake be quiet! Be quiet! Be quiet! Because to release – not to say, to release – those phrases that he lets out is to insult the country in its days of agony. Be quiet! (Unamuno 1918b).

He uses the metaphor of a phonograph to explain how the king’s rhetoric works, repetitive, rote, and throwing sound into the void. This phonograph becomes a symbol of acceptance in a Burkean interpretation, helping us to accept an undesirable situation that we previously denied. The equation of the king’s rhetoric with the technology of the phonograph helps the people of Spain to understand and accept the gravity of the situation. Rather than thinking and speaking, the king is a machine who plays and releases sounds that others want to hear.

One of the main problems for Unamuno is how the newspaper discusses politics, and this is related to the adherence to reporterism and the cultivation of the press as an informationery. To describe this, Unamuno coins the term “politicist superstition,” and he explains how, in the press, “politickism is applied to science, art, literature, and what not?” Politickism takes over all topics, and everything is explained in terms of the political. For Unamuno, the way the newspaper writes about politics is “the true root of all harm…. One of the gravest public infirmities that we suffer, an infirmity that the press cultivates instead of curing… is the politicist superstition” (Unamuno 1896b). Thus, the treatment of politics by the press leads to what Unamuno terms politicist superstition. The suffix “-ist” turns the word into someone who supports a doctrine or movement and then holding superstitions about it. The press foments these types of superstitions that come as a result of holding politics as ideologies and dogma.
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Although he critiques the press throughout his career, he also uses it as he turns to the medium of the newspaper to define and expose socio-political problems for the people of Spain. As he creates and defines facts and events in his articles, he demonstrates how the press can redefine problems for audiences and constitute the audience as agents and actors. He creates this kind of feeling through his method of reframing the problem and using a certain style to describe the problems.

Spain’s Exigences: Ideology, Rationalism, and Inauthenticity

Although he critiques the press and the transmission view of the press, Unamuno goes on to try and improve the press by becoming part of it and shaping himself as a writer of articles. Unamuno acknowledges that the press has systemic problems, but he also recognizes its inherent power; it is a vehicle by which he responds to certain events and characterizes the problems plaguing Spain. In this section, I use a rhetorical lens that examines metaphor, metonymy synecdoche, irony, and the functions of symbols to look at some of the strategies he employs in the press as he diagnoses specific problems in Spanish society. Through an analysis of his process of characterizing problems we can understand his diagnosis of the problem in Spain during his lifetime, a problem of ideology, rationalism, and inauthenticity. Unamuno uses the medium of the press to draw attention to these issues that he perceives as the major problems creating political and social polarization in Spain during his lifetime. In a 1902 open letter to Spanish journalist Francisco Grandmontagne that he publishes in an article called “The Religious Question,” Unamuno explains his diagnosis of Spain’s problems. He organizes the problems by linking them to each other and says, “I present them to you concretized in Spain but with universal characteristics. You already know that I do not think that the universal and eternal can be seen live
unless concretized in the local and temporal” (Unamuno 1902d). Here we see the importance of presenting local and concrete examples, which becomes a vital part of his method of defining the problem. Thus, Unamuno, himself, here provides the justification for looking at the local and temporal manifestations of the universal and eternal characteristics and problems.

*Ideology: Ideocracy, Common Sense, and the Tyranny of Ideas*

Unamuno often diagnoses Spain’s problem as a problem of individuals following ideology, dogma, and what he describes as the tyranny of ideas. He writes in 1900 that “ideas do not mean what it is believed. Ideas are nothing more than a vehicle, vehicle of spirit; those that are the most false are overflowing with life. That is and will be my constant predication against the tyranny of ideas. Life more than logic, faith more than dogma, spirit more than idea” (Unamuno 1900q). He perceives ideas as empty vehicles that persuade by a false sense of spirit and life. Moreover, ideas are tyrannical and powerful, as they can form people into groups, and control their actions. He constitutes the problem as one of logic, dogma, and idea, and explains that instead of being controlled by these things, the people of Spain need to look to the individual life, the true faith, and the spirit behind ideas. In 1899 he publishes an article in Venezuela, in which he describes the problem in Spain, that the people “do not understand free faith, free of dogma, holy tolerance. Everything corrodes the tyranny of pseudo-ideas” (Unamuno 1899d). He continues in this vein a year later, asking, “[W]hat shall we do with an ideocratic people, in which faith signifies intellectual adhesion to dogma, adhesion to routine, and not abandoning trust in a person?” (Unamuno 1900q). When he explains the nature of the tyranny of ideas, and the importance of fighting against it, he writes,
It is the highest, the most noble, the most regenerated campaign that there is to undertake: the campaign against the tyranny of ideas, the base and foundation of the tyranny of men. We must repeat at all hours and in all tones that there are not good or bad ideas; to speak of good or bad ideas is like speaking of blue sounds or hexagonal flavors. We must repeat without rest that the good or bad sprouts from the man who adopts ideas, and not that ideas make him good or bad, that one idea can serve to educate both the executioner and the victim; we must be masters to ideas and not slaves… ideas are not the end of man, man is the end of ideas” (Unamuno 1900a).

The tyranny of ideas exercised through the press is the foundation of the tyranny of government. He uses the metaphor of a blue sound or a hexagonal flavor to show the preposterous nature of the claim that ideas can be good or bad. This use of sound and flavor, the senses of hearing and taste, is a form of metonym, explaining the intangible of ideas through the tangible senses. Rather than ideas being good or bad, Unamuno believes that it is the attitude that people take toward the ideas, and the way we critically examine them or blindly accept them. Instead of accepting ideas from the press, books, education, or religion, people should skeptically interrogate ideas. People must own ideas, rather than becoming slaves to them. Ideas can serve different ends, depending on who uses them, and Unamuno uses the symbols of the slave and the master and the executioner and the victim as a symbol of emancipation, in Burke’s language. Unamuno emancipates us from the traditional way of viewing ideas as good or bad, and wants to transform the way we view ideas through employing these symbols. He uses this symbol to reframe our moral values surrounding ideas, showing us that ideas are not good or bad, but humans are.

Further, to enter into this debate about ideas as expressed in the article, Unamuno starts with a story about Strauss. He explains how some people in Spain refuse to dance to waltzes by
Johann Strauss because a different Strauss, David Friedrich, wrote a controversial book about religion called *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Unamuno uses this irony to point out the ridiculous nature of this belief in “bad” ideas, and to expose that the people of Spain have an “inquisitorial spirit.” By inquisitorial he does not mean an inquisitive or questioning spirit, but instead he refers to a prosecutorial spirit of intolerance, as in the Spanish Inquisition. As the Inquisition of the 1400s was established to maintain the supremacy of Catholic dogma, he describes a similar inquisitorial spirit in the people of Spain that maintains the supremacy of political and religious dogma. In this sort of environment, the tyranny of ideas will reign. The symbol of the Inquisition is thus used as a corrective symbol, one all Spanish people would be familiar with, to force them to accept the dangerous reality of fearing ideas and extinguishing them without consideration. He writes of this inquisitorial spirit again in 1902 in the article “The Two Regionalisms” identifying one of the worst “national defects” as “the inquisitorial spirit of barbaric intolerance” (Unamuno 1902e). He finds this intolerance and inquisitorial spirit to be a problem throughout Spain, writing that, “in this, in intolerant dogmatism and the petulance of believing ourselves to be in possession of the true notion of public things, in this there is perfect unity among the diverse peoples that form the Spanish nation” (Unamuno). He describes dogmatism and intolerance as problems that indiscriminately plague the entire nation of Spain.

The problem of dogmatism begins as a problem of the individual. Unamuno questions the focus on ideas, writing, “‘What ideas do you profess?’ Not what ideas do you profess, no, but, 'How are you, how do you live?' The way in which one lives gives truth to his ideas, and not the ideas truth to his life. Disgraced the one who needs ideas on which to base their life!” (Unamuno 1906a). Rather than speaking in ideas, we must understand the essence of others, how they live, and how they live their ideas. Unamuno critiques the individual personal tendency for Spanish
people to label themselves with one dogma and then to criticize all who oppose it. This is the foundation of one of the biggest problems with Spanish society for him, as he writes, this “bothers me most in Spain; the persistence of many to pigeonhole ourselves and to label all others (liberals, conservatives, Carlists, socialists, libertarians, Catholics, freethinkers, etc.), and the sad habit of treating those who do not think the same way as mules and fools or as ignorant hypocrites” (Unamuno 1900p). He disagrees with the use of dogmatic labels and the divisions they create, and he finds fault with the way people fall into dogma without thinking for themselves. Indeed, individuals “put this and that in their mouths and only a few are limited to prudently and sincerely speaking in their own name” (Unamuno 1900p). This tendency toward stubbornness and closed-mindedness and lack of prudent and individual thought are what he diagnoses as the main problem plaguing Spain. In one article Unamuno says there are “more elevated, more living, and more fecund things than doctrines, dogmas, ideas, principles, and all that springs forth from the head… Poor spirits that think that ideas move the world!” (Unamuno 1892a). Rather, it is the living aspect, or the spirit behind the ideas that moves the world. Here Unamuno expresses the belief here that the living individual should not be able to be “formulated in analyzable propositions.” Instead, the human individual is unique and complex and irreducible to dogma. Again, he refers to people who believe that ideas move the world in 1889 when he writes, “nothing comes of formulable ideals, and they find in the ultimate depths a profound reason, a living sentiment, the same perhaps that produces wars. Ideas move the world, it is said, and it is forgotten that there is something that moves ideas that is not an idea” (Unamuno 1889c). He says, there is something beyond ideas, and refers to it as something found in the ultimate depths that is “profound reason” or a “living sentiment” and a feeling that lies behind or under ideas. Unamuno believes that it is essential to access this feeling in order to understand ideas.
The individual tendency to follow ideology and dogma leads to the collective and tangible problems of the creation of “professional politicians” and political polarization. Unamuno says that “there is no one more removed from reality, from true reality” than the “professional politician” who he defines as “one who estimates that elections are the supreme political function: an electioneer; one who subordinates everything to winning and increasing votes; one for whom their ideas are a method to achieve power, and power a way to hold and make friends” (Unamuno 1914). Unamuno writes these words when he is frustrated with the Spanish government: after he loses his position at the University of Salamanca, he begins to speak out against the king because of the king’s stance on World War I. Professional politicians, rather than educating the people or wanting to improve society, only care about personal gains. For this reason, they focus exclusively on elections and winning votes so that they can have power and status. This type of professional politician created through reporterism and the press as informationery has a negative impact, spawning political polarization, unrest, and a lack of political reform in Spain. In his articles, Unamuno inquires into this polarization that he understands as a result of ideocratic thinking. From an early point, Unamuno develops the phrase “the ones and the others”23, using it to explain the atmosphere of polarization in Spain, especially when he perceives two opposing groups but disagrees with both of them. For instance, he writes about this in 1921, saying, “the ones and the others, those of a terrorist band and those of a repressor band, appear disposed to compete in stupidities. Although, at times, stupidities end bloodily” (Unamuno 1921a). Unamuno continues to use this phrase of “the ones and the others” until the end of his life, especially during the beginnings of the Spanish Civil War and the conflict between Franco’s Nationalists and the
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Republican government. By this point he was disgusted with both sides, and he believed they were both guilty of similar atrocities masquerading under opposing doctrines.

Although a problem rooted in the individual, the political polarization created by the obsession with dogma and ideology becomes a type of collective madness, insanity, or dementia. Unamuno coins the term *dementality*\(^\text{24}\) to explain what he means by being out of the mind. As mentality means a way of thinking or a capacity for intelligent thought, and the prefix “de-” implies a negation of this, he uses the word *dementality* to explain a lack of mentality, a lack of capacity for intelligent thought, and even a denial of thought. For Unamuno, the lack of thought and the attraction to dogma appears to be a type of “collective madness” that is overtaking Spain. He writes of the concept of vesania, or insanity, saying, “A wind of vesania appears to have been unleashed on Spain, a vesania incubated for some time, a vesania that was exacerbated in 1898” (Unamuno 1921e). In Unamuno’s opinion, this madness or *dementality* began in 1898, with the disastrous defeat of Spain in the Spanish-American War. Later, in 1921, he questions, “What if this were not more than a collective madness of persecutory mania?” describing this mood as a “collective madness” or mania, and explaining it as “troglodytic neurosis” (Unamuno 1921f). Thus, he sees the problem of dogma as a collective problem, but also as a sort of mental illness in Spain that has affected everyone. During the time of the Republic and the Spanish Civil War he strengthens his belief that a mental problem is plaguing Spain. Although the press is supposed to foster a “collective awareness, whose function is to bring to light the subconscious richness of a people” it has not done more than create, instead, a “collective madness” (Unamuno 1896a).

As people blindly follow ideas, ideology, and dogma, Unamuno argues that the government shifts to an ideocracy, a government based on abstract ideas and ideologies. To define ideocracy

---

\(^{24}\) “*Dementalidad*” in Spanish.
he again uses the phrase “tyranny of ideas,” which he uses often to explain how ideas reign in Spain. Some of his articles form a “campaign against ideocracy – the tyranny of ideas” (Unamuno 1900d). He explains the power behind an ideocracy, saying, “ideocracy prevails because it has so few ideas, because the fewer ideas, the more tyrannical they are” (Unamuno 1900d). Thus, we see that the power of the ideocracy is that it chooses a few ideas and uses them powerfully. In 1900 he writes an article against ideocracy, in which he writes, “of all tyrannies, the most hateful for me is the tyranny of ideas; there is no cracy that I detest more than ideocracy, that brings with it such a forced sequel, ideophobia, the persecution of some ideas in the name of other ideas” (Unamuno 1906a). The problem with ideocracy, for Unamuno, is that ideas have totalitarian power over the people and government of Spain. Worse, ideocracy brings ideophobia, a fear of new ideas and thoughts that, in turn, leads to the persecution of ideas. This is linked to his idea of “persecutory mania” and the “inquisitorial spirit” that he perceives in the dogmatic people of Spain. He goes on, explaining that “where ideocracy rules there will never be true freedom, but freedom before the law, which is the idea enthroned, the same for all, the logical faculty of being able to do or not do something” (Unamuno 1906a). The law is the legitimacy and codification of the idea, and the application of it to everyone without determining individual cases. Rather than giving true freedom, it gives only as much freedom as the idea allows. In another article months later, he refers to this earlier article on ideocracy, explaining that maybe it is not about ideas, but about concepts or interests. He writes,

I know that my essay ‘Ideocracy’ and, in general, everything I have written against the tyranny of ideas, has caused strangeness in some and scandal in others. Perhaps they should accuse me of not having defined well what I mean by idea …. Perhaps it would have been better to call them concepts. Because it is that, what we call a concept, the type of
formulable, definable, logically constructed intellect, that is subjected to schemas to become a transmissible mental product, that I believe is dangerous when we turn it into an idol (Unamuno 1900d).

In this clarification of ideas, we see that it is not so much the idea or the concept that is dangerous, but the danger is in the method of formulating it, defining it, placing it in a schema or motto so that it is something transmittable to a group, and then treating it as an idol.

Unamuno often uses the symbol of the Pharisee to bring a new perspective to the problem of dogma. Pharisees, from Biblical times, were a Jewish sect with very strict interpretations of the law, who thought dogmatically and followed ideology. Because of their dogmatism and adherence to the law, the Pharisees often appear in the New Testament in opposition to Jesus and are portrayed as hypocritical and self-righteous. Thus, in a Catholic country like Spain, the symbol “Pharisee” would be easily understood as having an insulting connotation and would provide a new perspective to people about dogmatic thinking. Throughout his articles, Unamuno describes the dogmatic people of Spain, calling them Pharisees to equate them to people who do not think individually and authentically, but follow a group. In Burke’s terminology, we can understand this use of the Pharisee as a corrective symbol, since it presents a contrast in the reality of a situation, so as to highlight the future possibility of correcting the imperfections of the problem. We first see him use this metaphor in 1899, as he compares “patriots” persecuting people to the persecution of Jesus by the Pharisees (Unamuno 1899b). Later, in 1921, he writes about “Pharisees of the patria (homeland)” saying, “Pharisees, race of vipers! Those Pharisees of the patria (homeland), are full of fear for the future, because they are men without faith. They ask for a dictatorship and tomorrow they will ask for the freedom of Barrabas or the head of John the Baptist” (Unamuno 1921c). He sees the people of Spain as people without true faith, but relying only on ideas and dogma. Because
of the reliance on dogma and the lack of free thought, people follow the masses, asking for whatever is popular, and not what is right. To demonstrate this and follow the symbol, Unamuno uses the contemporary examples of dictatorship and the Biblical examples of Barrabas’s freedom, and John the Baptist’s head, intertwining the historic with the present. This extended metaphor provides a new perspective on patriotism for the people of Spain, equating patriots to Pharisees and equating the Spanish dictatorship to freeing the criminal Barrabas or to killing John the Baptist. Unamuno writes about “Pharisaic patriotism,” and he continues to use this Biblical symbol throughout his life, as he returns to it in the 1930s responding to the exigence of the impending Spanish Civil War.

Although ideology is a political problem for Unamuno, it is an attitude and a perspective that he describes as “common sense” that bleeds into other areas of life. Thus, the problem of dogma is tied to the collective, as people blindly follow ideas and disregard individual thought, developing “common sense.” When Unamuno writes of common sense, he does not mean it as something that everyone understands to be true. Rather, he holds that common sense is the sort of sense that we develop as a group. It is the tendency for people to follow group thought or thought handed down by an authority, rather than asserting their own individual and authentic ideas. He thus redefines the concept of common sense, saying, “common sense is the most common, is that of the majority, and is one of the fonts of the most errors…. Common sense judges with common ways of knowing and attending to common facts” (Unamuno 1900c). Instead of asserting individual perspectives and looking for uncommon or original facts, people fall into the trap of groupthink, resulting in errors and bad decisions. For Unamuno, the “majority does not possess more than dead, crystallized truth, that transform into automatic habit. I always prefer paradoxes to the truths called common sense” (Unamuno 1900c). When our communal habits are created
from crystallized, dead truths that the majority believes, this becomes a problem for the entire society, but by playing with language and inquiring into ideas, we can avoid common sense. Against the notion of common sense, he poses the concept of the individual sense, arguing for its importance to society, as he writes, “each person is valuable because of their own sense; common sense does not make them more than an individual in the herd” (Unamuno 1900c). Thus, Unamuno wants to encourage people to nourish their own individual voices and not to follow common sense. He concludes by saying, “I hate common sense with all my soul, because instead of maintaining its own ground, it invades that which is forbidden,” invading the minds of others and persuading them to follow it (Unamuno 1900c).

This notion of “common sense” has broader implications for Spanish society, as it makes people more inclined to follow dogma and authority and the opinions of others, without taking their own individual sense into consideration. Unamuno lashes out against dogma and Spanish society’s tendency to follow political, religious, and military dogma. Throughout his life, he often calls those who blindly follow dogma “troglodytes,” using the corrective symbol of a prehistoric, old-fashioned person, or a cave-dweller in order to show the possibility and the necessity to correct imperfections. He writes, “There is nothing easier than being dogmatic in the way that our troglodytes are. Their dogmatic propositions, strictly about nothing…are purely verbal propositions without precise and clear conceptual content…. Dogma exempts one from thinking and wants to impose it on others so that others will not make you think” (Unamuno 1918f). This article was published in 1918, when Unamuno was seriously campaigning against the monarch and the institution of the monarchy. During this time, he often uses the word “troglodyte” and he explains that he originally “put this epithet in circulation to designate our Germanophiles” during World War I (Unamuno 1918d). However, later, he uses it to describe anyone who does not think.
Here he demonstrates for us that dogma is something easy, empty of content, composed of verbal propositions and attractive slogans, but that does not require logic or sound ideas. Rather, dogma is about words without content and bad rhetoric. For Unamuno, dogmatism is an easy path that removes the necessity to think and provides people with simple political dogma. He sees this play out in many governmental shifts in Spain, both before this moment and after, as the monarch, the military dictator, the Republic, and finally, Franco’s coup all relied on dogmatic approaches and language.

Unamuno believes that adherence to ideology plays a role in war propaganda and the problem of war, something he often wrote against. In 1898 he explains how ambiguous and empty concepts are used dogmatically and tyrannically to make people fight, writing, “war is, for most people, in its essence, a historical mystery. The use of undefined concepts such as ‘national honor,’ ‘prestige of the patria,’ and others, tests the not very clear vision of the process of war” (Unamuno 1898a). War is something unclear, mysterious, not understood, and not able to be understood, as the reasons people fight are based on undefined and hazy concepts. Indeed, Unamuno cannot think of a legitimate reason or concept to make people give up their lives in war. He perceives politicians and the press using dogmatic terms and propaganda, often linked with the idea of patriotism, to persuade people to fight. Unamuno, a pacifist, often writes about the preposterous idea of a civil war, saying that no war is civilized or civil, and instead he inverts the term, calling all war uncivil and uncivilized. In one of his very early works, from 1893, he explains his dislike for all programs, theories, and dogma that unify people to fight wars, writing that “the motto God, Country, and King25 unites thousands of volunteers, joins infinite and diverse yearnings, collects thousands of rivers of feeling under its supreme vagueness, and brings death and heroism to the masses”

---
25 “Dios, Patria y Rey”
(Unamuno 1893b). It is the supreme vagueness of the motto that makes it so effective in its ability to join people with diverse interests, desires, and feelings. Indeed, we see this occurring during the Spanish Civil War, especially on the left, where Republicans, socialists, and communists joined together under one motto, but with many purposes. Ultimately, this supreme vagueness and lack of clarity of words led to disagreements over the purpose of the Republic and the war and the eventual loss of the war.

One instance of using propaganda and dogma to encourage people to fight, occurs in Spain in the use of Christian propaganda in service of war. Throughout his life, Unamuno very much disapproves of this paradoxical militaristic use of religion, saying:

[T]o carry the cross with the sword is the most anti-Christian thing one can do. There is no greater blasphemy than to represent the cross by the sword. It is pure paganism to bless the flags that guide soldiers to combat, pure paganism to build altars to killers of men. They defend and excuse the war and look for all kinds of justifications, but covering it with a religious cloak is the most monstrous blasphemy (Unamuno 1900o).

Unamuno finds fault with the combination and use of the symbols of the cross and the sword to ask people to fight. In Spain, however, this is common. For example, the cross of St. James Matamoros, often represented in the city of Santiago de Compostela, is a cross made out of two swords. St. James, himself, commonly known as the “Moor slayer,” was a saint who was believed to have aided the Christian reconquest of Spain from the Muslim Moors. Unamuno finds this type of symbol and this use of dogma in direct conflict with the true principles of Christianity. Using the symbol of the sword and cross is, to employ Burkean terms, a symbol of emancipation, or one that is able to shift the moral code, by turning things normally perceived as bad into good things. Placing the cross with the sword has the effect of reframing and transforming our moral values,
making war and murder somehow seem “holy” and “just.” This article by Unamuno comes in the wake of the Spanish-American War of 1898, as he investigates the different motives used by the government to get people to fight. He sees dogma as one way of doing this. Not only political dogma, but also through religious dogma, conveyed through propaganda. Unamuno inverts and exposes the illogical propaganda, showing that war is not a Christian thing, but it is murder, paganism, and blasphemy. In this article, “Religion and Patria,” Unamuno specifically refers to Spanish missionaries, as he is responding to the situation of Spanish missionaries in the Philippines converting people. However, as Unamuno ventures into this topic, he goes back in history to the 1400s, writing about the reconquest of Spain from the Moors by the Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabel, as they worked to unite Spain into a country of Catholic kingdoms. Much like how he uses the symbol of the cross and the sword, Unamuno converts Ferdinand and Isabel into a symbol of acceptance. As he shows how the Reconquest was an original example of mixing patria and religion, he calls attention to things people have denied, forcing them to accept the undesirable side of the reconquest, that it was not, in fact, Christian to violently expel Muslims from Spain. He explains that “the Christian thing would have been to not expel the Moors by force” (Unamuno 1900). Through the use of the emancipation and the acceptance symbols, Unamuno exposes the ridiculous nature of combining Christianity with war and violence, and shows how religion has been used in service of reframing moral values around war. He writes of these nonsensical values, saying, “I hate the sword, I detest the military spirit with all my soul and what gentlemen call honor disgusts me” (Unamuno 1900).

The reliance on political propaganda to rationalize war in service of militarism is a problem that Unamuno also identifies. In 1893 he writes an article called “Second of May,” which was the day of commemoration of the Spanish defeat of the French occupation by Napoleon on May 2,
1808. He takes advantage of this occasion to philosophize about war and the motivation for people to fight, saying,

Many ask themselves why they fight, why they kill? And they await reasons. Reasons! The poor product of mental industry, of the machine of brains that is contained in whichever bottle from the drugstore of logic. Reasons and programs restrain, before they drive action. There is no tale of a martyr who has allowed himself to be killed for testifying the truth of a mathematical theorem. Instead, people face death in the vigor of youth and the fullness of life for a legend, for a principle darkly glimpsed, for a vague and floating shadow that is painted at a distance from the serene blue of the sky, for echoes of a voice that we do not know, for dark impulses that are gathered to give form to a motto that blows on the wind (Unamuno 1893b).

Unamuno employs beautiful imagery here to imply here that there are no reasons that are strong enough to justify killing. It is not about science and logic, but about legends, shadowy mottos, and foggy principles that come from an authority, which he describes as an echo of an unfamiliar voice. He uses the metaphor of the drugstore or pharmacy of logic to give new perspective to this idea of reasons. Because we exist in a rational world, we want reasons for everything, and we want to be able to go to the drugstore of logic to purchase our reasons that come tidily in a bottle and ready for consumption. At this drugstore of logic, one can purchase whichever reasons and rationality one might need to justify something. However, for this reason, rationality and programs are empty of feeling, so they do not drive pure emotional action. He uses the symbol of a martyr, as we all understand that martyrs die for convictions and things they believe in, and not for theorems, science, and rationality. But what are the things that will impel people to go into war, to kill, and to die during the youth of their lives? He says it is for principles of which we only have a shadowy...
understanding, but these things are covered up by mottos, legends, a painted blue sky, and more attractive things to cover up the dark truths of death in war and the real lack of reasons and rationality.

He positions the idea of war propaganda as part of a dichotomy with true patriotism, and he describes war propaganda as relying on a false notion of patriotism and false mottos. He writes, “War and protectionism are two foundations of the nation, bourgeois institution, that keep people oppressed and suffocate true patriotism, that of the social groups of the community of spirit” (Unamuno 1900k). In one article from 1918 in which he describes bad rhetoric, he explains that bad rhetoric inspires fear and says “do not invoke patriotism. In order to be patriotic, it is not enough to want to be patriotic” (Unamuno 1918b). The following year, in 1919, he writes that the king’s party “confuses patriotism with loyalty” and that “because I do not carry a pistol in my pocket, therefore, my patriotism must be doubted” (Unamuno 1919c). Rather, Unamuno understands true patriotism as a revolutionary and critical act of speech against the government, as “patriotism, true patriotism, demands us to make gubernatorial action difficult, to stop popular passions and aggravate social conflicts. The cure can only come through aggravation. And no worthy and patriotic citizen should make the work of the government easy” (Unamuno 1919b). Unamuno explains the dichotomous nature of patriotism, saying that “it is undoubtable that patriotism has two roots: one sentimental and another intellective. There is the sentimental homeland, that we embrace, whose origin does not extend beyond our sentiment, and there is the intellective or historic homeland that we are taught to love in school with tales more or less true. They are the two poles of complex patriotic feeling” (Unamuno 1905a). War propaganda and so-called bad rhetoric can easily tap into these feelings of patriotism.
One of the problems that Unamuno addresses in the newspaper is the problem of rationalism in science and education, a problem linked to dogma and the mentality of following ideas and authority in politics, science, and education. Unamuno often laments the status of education and science in Spain, saying that people conceive of them dogmatically and take all education as authority. In 1905, he writes that people “abound who do not know how to conceive of science except dogmatically, and it is not rare to hear phrases like this: ‘about this matter, science has already spoken,’ or better yet, ‘science has not yet given the final word on this.’… Often we conceive of science as something made, definitive, unappealable, and if once it tricks us because we do not know how to use it, we retire all of our confidence” (Unamuno 1905b). The danger in conceiving science in this way is that it shuts down all opportunity for other interpretations, understandings, or possibilities. When science and rationality are believed to have the final word and the final authority, science becomes law or a closed book that we cannot question. Shutting down critical inquiry in such a way is a principle that goes against the very nature and purpose of science. Linked to this is the problem that, as people view science as an infallible authority, they not only stop questioning, but they stop wanting to understand the processes behind the science. Ironically, a scientific education makes people uninterested in doing science. The appearance of science as an authority makes people accept conclusions from external sources, removing their need to learn how to think or do science for themselves. This is dangerous as it can lead to the end of actual scientific progress. In this stagnant environment, who continues to keep science alive? For Unamuno, this problem of science as an authority comes about because of “the lack of scientific education” that makes people lose time “in dissertating about the ancient to the modern way of seeing things” rather than “studying embryology of the plant in its soil and
with its details” (Unamuno 1889c). Rather than looking at scientific processes and experimenting with ways to use science to improve life, people focus on other topics and external views of science. For Unamuno, only by improving the education system and focusing on scientific education can we cure this problem. By teaching students to investigate, do experiments, follow the scientific method, and to question the authority of science can we solve this social problem.

Conceiving of science in this way is linked to the concept above of common sense, as it is something that becomes a popular trend that people blindly follow. Writing about common sense in 1900, Unamuno explains that “because of blind faith in authority, most of our students believe it is the sun that turns around the earth, because common sense tells them one thing, and they do not know how to prove the contrary. Because of faith in authority we accept more than a few scientific affirmations, even paradoxical ones, tied to what common sense teaches us” (Unamuno 1900c). Here he explains how people without a critical scientific education who witness the sun rising and setting come to believe that the sun is moving around the earth. People are no longer concerned with understanding the methods of science because of their faith in common sense and educational authorities.

Thus, as the remedy for common sense and scientific dogmatism, he proposes the “individual sense” and individual intelligence for a scientific or philosophical life. Unamuno proposes that “the first thing to do upon entering the sanctuary of science is to tie up common sense, and I would even dare to say that it is better to leave it at the door, because in that sanctuary it has as much to do as dogs have to do in mass. There intelligence and the individual sense work; but not common” (Unamuno 1900c). He argues that although common sense plays a role in the world, its role should be relegated to the everyday, and not to the philosophical or scientific realms, as he writes, “common sense is good, excellent, un-substitutable; but it is for common life, for the
business of everyday life” (Unamuno 1900c). When common sense is “elevated to the criteria of philosophical truth” it is problematic, as it “makes doctrinaires and dogmatics” (Unamuno 1900c).

Similarly, Unamuno speaks against what he calls the “plague of eruditism,” something related to this problem of education, rationality, and the authority of science. He makes up the term “eruditism,” using the suffix -ism to describe when erudition turns into a dogmatic -ism. He writes, “Plague of eruditism! When shall we be free of it! Because erudition is a form of haranguery, as I plan to demonstrate… It is less difficult to cite, to extract, to compile. It is much easier to be a channel than a spring. Plague of eruditism!” (Unamuno 1900i). He coins the term haranguery, from the word harangue, to explain aggressively and critically speaking. Additionally, he uses the symbol of water in channels and springs to describe the plague of eruditism, saying that it is easier to be a channel, or one who does not innovate, but quotes and combines the work of others into non-original work. By a spring, he refers to an original and unique source of water found in nature that bubbles up from underground, as contrasted with a channel that joins two larger bodies of water. Using this metaphor provides an easily understood perspective about erudition and the problems with academia.

At the same time, in 1900, he describes academic work with the metaphor of building a tower with a scaffolding around it. Here, he makes the same point as he does with the metaphor of the spring and the channel. In the metaphor of the scaffolding, he focuses on the importance of keeping the scaffolding in case the tower falls so that the next tower will be rebuilt more easily. In this way he provides a new perspective on scholarly works in Spain, critiquing those who just quote other works without drawing new conclusions. He asks, “Haven’t you read those poor writers who do not dare to take a step without holding on to the authority of so and so?... There are books in which only a third of each page is by the author and the rest is scaffolding” (Unamuno
1900h). Unamuno concludes that eruditism is problematic because it places the so-called “wise” above those who actually think, as he writes, “disgraced is the country in which the wise drown the thinkers, and the erudites obscure the clairvoyants” (Unamuno 1900h).

Unamuno also sees a problem in the connection between rhetoric and science and the way we speak about science. In 1889 he writes that “science cannot have oratory beyond that of the font of truth…. Science does not need rhetorical trinkets nor dialectical bells. All charlatans become excited when they say that heat and movement are convertible” (Unamuno 1889a). For Unamuno, science does not require the trappings of rhetoric, propaganda, or dogmatic mottos. Rather, science speaks for itself and is exciting and innovative enough in itself, by virtue of the information it conveys. However, for Unamuno, one of the dangers in scientific communication is its way of communicating and cataloguing facts. In studying science, we want to put everything in order, and “the end of science … is to catalogue the universe, with the secret purpose of returning it to God in order, in logical order” (Unamuno 1906c). In the scientific realm this is fine, but Unamuno reminds us that it is not possible to do this with unique and individual humans. He explains, “when I affirm something, I affirm it for myself, and I, like you, reader, like all of us, we are free, purely free. Neither you nor I can prove ourselves logically, and woe to us if we could! Then we would not be men, but formulas. And a formula, above all a logical formula, is one of the most horrendous things that can be” (Unamuno 1906c). Here he proclaims the importance of the individual and individual thought, and not only having individual thoughts, but in communicating those thoughts to others. We communicate our unique selves, and our humanity is not able to be reduced to formulas that represent other unique individuals. For Unamuno, the imposition of dogma and dogmatic education turns people into formulas.
The turning away from a scientific education has other serious consequences for Spanish life, such as forming people who do not question or examine their surroundings. Again, he explains the problem with formulas and dogmatic education, as he writes, “in everything we stumble on the very serious consequences of our dogmatic education. They have taught us to rely on formulas, some of which are pretended to be expression of truth revealed and undebatable, and on those formulas that they have given us, without us doing the work to get to them” (Unamuno 1905b). Because this education has formed students who rely on formulas, it has consequences in all other areas of life. This education creates people who fall back on set thought and empty aphorisms provided by authorities, rather than thinking and discovering truths for themselves. These formulas may be a type of misinformation, pretending to show the truth. In addition to making people misinformed, the reliance on formulas creates a lazy body of people, who trust authority rather than examine, inquire, and investigate. He goes on, explaining that “our dogmatic education is at fault; that which has taught us to rest in dogmas, formulas, principles, and aphorisms and not to form them from our own convictions and beliefs” (Unamuno 1905b). The more serious consequence is that

this education infiltrates everything, and brings its pernicious influence to everything. It has maintained and corroborated our mental laziness, and has taught us to rest in distant experience, and not even in this, but in distant affirmation. Science is no theology revealed; science is subject to continuous revision and to continuous progress; science hardly gives any final word…What must be done is to test and experiment without rest, and not to tire of testing and experimenting (Unamuno 1905b).

This problem is linked to the trait of “mental laziness” that he often describes in conjunction with the problems of Spanish education, as a reliance on formulas and authority leads to an attitude of
laziness in students. For Unamuno, the worst part is that not only do people not understand how to do science, but they do not even understand why they should do it. He calls this authority a type of “distant experience” or “distant affirmation,” and he argues that people must bring science closer, testing and experimenting for themselves. In this dogmatic education, ethos is the only standard of truth. As long as one has authority or credibility as established by science, their conclusions are accepted. Thus, Unamuno encourages people to discard this education by ethos and to rely more upon an education by logos and direct experience. Unamuno sees this manifesting in many different arenas, as he witnesses people believing anything said by a priest, a scientist, a teacher, a politician, or anyone else with the credentials of authority.

Indeed, this dogmatic education creates people who are ready to accept dogma in other realms of life, such as religious and political. This attitude fostered through the education system manifests in different places in Spanish life, as “this fatal education persists, although it changes its object. One who does not profess religious dogmas professes scientific ones. And people accustomed to hearing and giving consent to the priest without examining his teaching because he says he speaks in the name of God, hear the expert presenting a theory of agriculture as a priest of science” (Unamuno 1905b). He goes so far as to call it a “fatal education” as it has potentially lethal consequences. There are many similarities for him between the dogma of education and the dogma of religion, in that they both rely on authority and “distant affirmation.” Here he provides us with an example of the ramifications that dogmatic education has. It creates people who not only listen to scientists and educational authorities, but who also listen to priests and religious authorities. Unamuno encourages people to move toward a re-examination of ethos when we hear dogmatic rhetoric. Who is the person speaking, what are their qualifications, how did they arrive at such conclusions, what are the risks of believing these conclusions, and what might be some
problems with these conclusions? In conjunction with the re-examination of ethos, there should be an orientation toward logos and a focus on the technical development of skills or an understanding of scientific processes.

In addition to these problems, the dogmatic scientific education also has negative implications for Spanish political life and for the life of the individual. This occurs as people think of people as formulas and think in terms of “humans” instead of the individual human. Unamuno writes that “legislators, imbued in a science in which the universal is almost everything and the individual almost nothing, only see abstractions and instead of making laws for man they made them for the man (the homo sapiens of Linnaeus) measuring all with the same yardstick and asking, rightly, that lawyers study the individual before applying an abstract solution” (Unamuno 1889c). Thus, he perceives the problem of a dogmatic education infiltrating the government and the legislative process. He indicates the problem with the dogmatic education that makes us see humans, not as individuals, but as formulas and abstractions of a human. We see this manifesting as the denial of humanity.

Additionally, as it contributes to a denial of individual humanity, scientific education has more religious and spiritual implications, leading into our next section. In 1902, Unamuno writes of science’s double purpose, saying that, “science has a double value, one practical, to better human material wellbeing, dealing with the economy, and another to elevate the spirit, dealing with religion” (Unamuno 1902d). Beyond only improving human material life through material inventions and innovations, science has a responsibility to improve the human soul and spirit. He describes this as the religious value of science. A dogmatic scientific education completely negates this function of science to improve the spirit of inquiry in the human.
Inauthenticity: Interior Life, Spiritual Poverty, and Gnosis

Spiritual inauthenticity, described by Unamuno as “spiritual poverty,” is an individual, religious, and existential problem, with collective implications. The problem of spiritual inauthenticity is one of the overarching problems in Spain, as identified by Unamuno in his articles. In a 1919 article he describes it as the “avaricious spiritual poverty in Spain” (Unamuno 1919a). This spiritual poverty comes about because the people of Spain “do not understand free faith, free of dogma, holy tolerance” and they are “hardened by a secular dogmatism, where the Catholic spirit, formal schematic exterior logic, has drowned the Christian spirit, has drowned free faith” (Unamuno 1899d). In this article he contrasts holy tolerance, non-dogmatic faith, and the Christian spirit with what he describes as secular dogmatism, or a type of dogmatism that uses the phrases of Catholicism and the Catholic spirit, but empties them of their spiritual authenticity, following formal logic. He describes this authentic spirit also as an “interior spiritual life” saying, if Spanish authors “show so little of their intimate spiritual life, it is because they do not have it; almost all our life is exterior life” (Unamuno 1900f). He contrasts the exterior life with the spiritual life, arguing that many in Spain do not have interior spirit lives. In another article he refers to this lack of spiritual authenticity and interior spiritual life as “spiritual poverty” (Unamuno 1902e). Unamuno explains that the people of Spain have, instead, a “lamentable spirituality; it creates the most unscientific and irreligious people that I know” (Unamuno 1899d). Thus, he links the problem of spiritual authenticity to the problems of science and education.

Unamuno contrasts the original spiritual authenticity found in the early Church with the spiritual inauthenticity that he finds in the dogmatic Catholicism of his era. In one article from 1897 called “Pistis and No Gnosis!” he explains the difference between the Greek terms pistis and gnosis, using the history of Christianity to explain this question. He contrasts the view of faith in
the early Church with the developments of the modern Church, one he sees as dogmatic and lacking true faith and authenticity. Unamuno finds that in the early Church, the original followers of Jesus “felt swollen of true faith… that is called *pistis*, faith, or trust, religious faith and not theological, pure faith and still free of dogmas. They lived a life of faith; they lived for hope in the future; they lived, waiting for the kingdom of eternal life. Each one gave to their hope the imaginative or intellectual form that they best pictured” (Unamuno 1897a). The early followers had a pure faith that was removed from dogma or theology. Additionally, this was an individualized notion, not imposed on people or conveyed through mottos or slogans. He contrasts this idea of “true faith” or *pistis* with the idea of *gnosis*, or, “knowledge, the belief, and not faith; doctrine, and not hope…. Faith became attached to the intellect… religious practices were converted into philosophical theoretical principles, religion revealed in metaphysics. Sects, schools, dissidences, and finally dogmas were born” (Unamuno 1897a). Thus, we can identify *gnosis* with a sense of a loss of spiritual authenticity. As ideas crystallized and solidified, the true faith gradually became more attached to knowledge doctrine, and the intellect. Once Unamuno creates this framework, he uses it to diagnose Spain’s problem, saying, “in Spain? Here there is no *pistis*, there is nothing more than *gnosis*, and *gnosis* is rickety and poor; there is no faith, there is nothing more than creeds” (Unamuno 1897a). His aim is to change this, and to renew in people a sense of *pistis*, as ideally, people will have “*Pistis*, the true living faith” that gives a “tone of profound unity to that rich palpitating variety of future diverse beliefs” (Unamuno 1897a). Opposing dogma, he proposes the concept of a “tone of profound unity,” a term he uses to refer to a way to acknowledge diverse beliefs without overriding them and subsuming them with dogma, as, for Unamuno, dogma kills faith.
As in the realms of religion and politics, people follow too much the collective common sense, ignoring their own authentic spirit. To describe this, he uses the metaphors of goats and people walking along paths. He explains that when the earth was empty of paths and roads, people began to walk and paths were created, but once paths are worn by the group, many continue to follow the paths that have already been created, rather than finding their own path. Similarly, “[g]oats, guided by their instincts to find the easiest way up traced their own goat paths… A goat could be wrong or could follow an extravagant whim or be distracted from the path by an attractive bush. But the collective work is infallible. This is why people say vox populi, vox Dei” (Unamuno 1893a). This tendency to follow vox populi, common sense, or authority, prevents us from finding paths that may be more efficient, more aesthetic, safer, or generally better. Unamuno argues against taking these paths, in favor of finding independent and new paths.

The background for his study of spiritual authenticity takes place in, and we can see it unfolding, through the drama of the newspaper, but it also unfolds in his philosophical work and his novels. It is also something that he describes in his preeminent philosophical work The Tragic Sense of Life, in which he deals with spiritual authenticity and the importance of love and faith above rationality. His beliefs on this topic of spiritual inauthenticity culminate in his final novel, San Manuel Bueno, Mártir, published in his later life in 1931. This book deals with themes of spiritual inauthenticity and the nature of the people of Spain, as it centers around a Spanish priest, Manuel, revered by people as a model of Christianity, good faith, and good works. Indeed, the people of his village consider him a saint. However, as the book progresses, the reader learns that Manuel does not believe in Christianity, but he views Catholicism as socially important, as a way for people to exist in community. Some have read the symbols in the book of the mountain and the lake as symbols for superficial faith and true and profound faith, respectively.
Although this is an individual problem, it has consequences and implications for the greater society, as spiritual authority is translated to the political realm. In 1918 he explains in an article called “Church and Homeland” his negative opinion on the dogma of the infallibility of the pope. As a result of this dogma of infallibility, people believe that it extends to the dogma of the political infallibility of the sovereign; the "military spirit prescribes that one cannot debate the legitimacy of a war” (Unamuno 1918a). Because the Catholic Church is so culturally important in Spain, it is problematic that spirituality and religion have become dogmatic. He writes that “Troglodytic dogmatism is a case of Roman Catholic apostolic dogma,” and he goes on to explain “the marvelous fabrication of dogmatic creed of the Roman Church, its dogmatic theology, with its system of counterbalanced contradictions” (Unamuno 1918f).

He sees this spiritual inauthenticity playing out, not only in religion, but also in society. He sees it manifesting in people as he writes in 1896, “we are like an inveterate bachelor that neither dives into the depths of his soul nor opens his eyes to what surrounds him, contenting himself with pondering his bookish prejudices and to see everything through crude formulas in block letters” (Unamuno 1896a). In this description, full of metaphor, he indicates that the Spanish people are stubborn and unlikely to change their habits, and therefore unlikely to want to investigate their souls or their consciousness. Rather than examining and making connections and inquiries into themselves and their surroundings, he argues that the people of Spain have been lulled into a sense of security through the authority of books and the press, authority of block letters and formulas. He uses metaphors here to explain the danger of the spiritual inauthenticity for the Spanish people, calling the people of Spain an “inveterate bachelor.” Moreover, the use of the term “diving into the depths” calls to mind the example of the lake and a profound body of water to bring a new understanding and a new perspective to spiritual authenticity.
Although Unamuno harshly critiques the problems that he sees in the press, he also understands the importance and the power of the medium of the press. Thus, he uses it as part of his writing process, as a medium to respond rhetorically to political events in Spain, and as a method to create a Spanish community and consciousness. While he observes the power and potentialities of the Spanish press, he is aware of its drawbacks, namely finding it mechanized, dogmatic, and problematic linguistically. But, as always, Unamuno critiques it in order to improve it, and he hopes for a better future for a more fruitful press in Spain. He writes that although “the press does much among us for national culture,” it is “no less indisputable that it could do more” (Unamuno 1896f). He holds an ideal in his mind, and does not tire his criticism until it reaches that ideal. In 1896 he writes optimistically, “What a beautiful day on which a diamond is worth less than a juicy bunch of grapes!... We await the day in which the social press sprouts, a really informative press, when news diamonds are not worth more than news fruit” (Unamuno 1896c). News diamonds are the flashy pieces of information, as opposed to news fruit that can nourish readers and provide them with something of more substantial value. As Unamuno demonstrates the ideal way to use the press, he critiques the major problems in Spain, namely the problems of ideology, rationalism, and inauthenticity. In the next chapter we examine how Unamuno proposes to solve these problems through his newspaper articles.
CHAPTER V
UNAMUNO AS IDEA-BREAKER

For some time past I have not written a single line of art or philosophy. I have to write articles of battle. Who knows – perhaps those articles will in the end become more permanent than all the rest! The Gospels were written for an occasion, and the Epistles of Saint Paul were really newspaper articles. I do not know when I shall rest; perhaps never26 (Starkie 1976, xxxiv)

In this letter to Walter Starkie written in 1921, Unamuno identifies the importance of the Spanish press to his own work in addressing the problems and the situation in Spain during his life. Throughout his career, Unamuno felt called by his situation to write what he refers to above as “articles of battle,” articles that fought against the various political problems he diagnosed in Spain. During Unamuno's lifetime, the overarching problem was one of political polarization, and he defined this polarization in a nuanced way, using a variety of symbols, rhetorical devices, and neologisms to reframe the problem. As seen in the previous chapter, Unamuno identifies these as problems of ideology, rationalism, and inauthenticity, that he sees manifesting in various ways in Spanish society, especially in the arenas of politics and militarism, scientific education, and religion and spirituality. Defining these problems as the major exigences of his time, Unamuno uses the medium of the newspaper to create in the people of Spain a common understanding of their shared situation. While he sees the press as playing a role in the exacerbation of these problems, he also perceives that the press can provide a way for him to constitute, communicate, and combat these problems. Thus, for part of his career, he focuses mostly on the press, setting
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26 Unamuno wrote this in a letter to Walter Starkie, and it is translated in Starkie.
aside his love of art and philosophy in order to write these articles of battle as a direct rhetorical response to the tumultuous events of Spanish history.

Having examined the problems that Unamuno addresses and the way in which he constitutes them in the previous chapter, this chapter looks at what he proposes to replace ideology and dogma in the Spanish mind. In this chapter I closely read Unamuno’s articles to see how he conceives of the solution to the problem that he has defined. Although Unamuno was never a systematic thinker and he opposed programs, in his articles we can find some solutions and alternatives that he suggests to combat the problem of ideology. Rather than proposing or supporting a dogmatic program and persuading his readers to follow it, he instead exposes the problems of dogmatic thought, and he tries to unite people into a community. When asked for his “program” he responds, “Here is my program, and I give it to you here, readers of this column, so that in successive ones you do not believe the cause of my arbitrarities is to deceive you. I want to give you the only thing that is mine, something of my spirit; I do not aspire to inform you of anything” (Unamuno 1906c). His desire is not to inform, deceive, propagandize or persuade of any dogma. Unlike the standard newspaper that inundates readers with information, he hopes to impart some of his spirit to his readers, teaching them how to approach texts through his mood and his method. As we analyze his articles, we can observe that his overall method is to break down ideas skeptically and to re-form individuals into a unified, ideal community or a collective spirit that is based on the bonds between people. As he works to create what he considers this “authentic” spirit of the Spanish people, he employs different strategies covered in this chapter.

Although Unamuno’s articles respond to his immediate rhetorical situation and context, in the quote above he also expresses the hope that his articles will have a more permanent life outside of the immediate situation, resonating with Cesare Casarino’s concept of philopoeis. Describing
himself as one called to use the press to respond to his situation, Unamuno demonstrates the rhetorical nature of the press as a medium that is useful in providing an immediate response to exigences. Although his articles are a direct response to his situation and are rooted in the political and social context of his era, they can also be applied to and re-read in other contexts. In the quote above, he indicates this quality of the importance and the potential permanence of the daily press, explaining that some Biblical texts that began as mere letters and articles later became more permanent works that could also speak to different contexts. Here we see Unamuno using the analogy of the Biblical text to stress the lasting importance of the rhetorical text and the genre of the epistle or newspaper article. Rhetorical texts, although they directly speak to their immediate circumstances, also live beyond those circumstances and can speak to other times and places. Thus, it is important to reconsider Unamuno’s newspaper texts to see what clarity they might offer to other parallel situations and contexts. Throughout his life, Unamuno and the press have a lengthy and multi-faceted relationship; even as he critiques it, he believes it to be an effective vehicle for social change. From an early point in his career, the periodical press becomes an integral part of his writing process and also a place for him to respond quickly to the social and political exigences of the moment. Thus, this chapter examines the unique way in which Unamuno uses the medium of the newspaper to respond to various events in the Spanish social and political situation.

As he directly confronts events in the press, he also constitutes the people of Spain in a certain way, formulates unique responses, and develops a new style of responding to the political exigences in Spanish life. In his unique approach he invents new symbols and perspectives that he tailors to the situation but that remain lasting styles of response and ways of thinking that can universally be applied in similar situations. Although he responds in particular ways to specific events, Unamuno creates patterns that are useful for us today in formulating responses to analogous
situations. He encounters these events through the medium of the press, and he speaks to the public so as to provide them with symbols with which to understand these ideas in new ways. His response to events and crises is not political, but philosophical. In an article from 1886, he describes his method, saying, “I do not do politics, I make historical philosophical considerations; I do not say what should be, I say what usually is” (Unamuno 1886). As a public intellectual in the newspaper, Unamuno’s aim is not only to break down the ideas, ideologies, and dogma that tyrannically control the people of Spain, but also to unite people and create a Spanish community, spirit, or consciousness. I argue that Unamuno does this: 1) by being an idea-breaker, which entails assuming an attitude of skepticism and promoting the individual sense; and 2) by creating a collective consciousness for the people of Spain through his notion of intrahistory, which he expresses through language, descriptions of the physical environment, explanations of personal relationships, the use of myths and legends, and discussions of spiritual authenticity and youthfulness.

“**Idea-Breaker**: Skepticism and Individual Sense

Understanding at least one aspect of Spain’s problem as a problem of ideas, Unamuno approaches it as what he describes as an “idea-breaker.” After explaining what he perceives as the problem of the “tyranny of ideas” and “ideocracy” in an article from 1906, he defines his method for combatting the problem of ideas and dogma that he perceives in Spain. He claims to “hate all labels,” but “the most bearable for me is that of ideoclast, or idea-breaker. And how do I propose to break them? By making them mine, and using them…. I aspire to enrich myself from each idea. After I remove the juice, I spit the pulp from my mouth. I crush them and get rid of them. I want to be their owner, not their slave!” (Unamuno 1906a). As an idea-breaker, he removes the juice or
the information from the idea, analyzes it, and discards the remaining “pulp,” or excess words, dogmatic phrases, or ideological slogans. He defines the term idea-breaker as one who combats the problem of polarizing ideas by dissecting, interrogating, thinking deeply about them so as to reframe them for the people of Spain. An idea-breaker should work for authenticity of thought and spirit, as opposed to being blinded by partisan political, religious, or scientific dogma.

We repeatedly see Unamuno serving as an idea-breaker in many different situations during his career. In 1913, he writes about the ideology of anarchism, describing the paradox in the different ways people treat anarchist and military attacks. He explains the paradox in the way people believe that “logic rules their reasoning when they become indignant about anarchist attacks. They execute anarchists, but they defend war as a noble thing and worthy of praise and military glory” (Unamuno 1913). By using this paradoxical logic, he subverts the standard moral values surrounding the dogma of militarism and anarchism, portraying militarism as negative and equally as bad as anarchism. Indeed, he “cannot understand how the homicides committed by” famous Spanish politicians “are less criminal” (Unamuno 1913). Admittedly, this is not a popular position, which he acknowledges, saying, “I am aware that this proposition scandalizes and upsets many people, and they declare that whoever says this is dangerous or crazy, although they condemn, as I do, all homicide” (Unamuno 1913). Unamuno takes this unpopular perspective and presents a new voice to the argument surrounding anarchism and militarism. This is an example of Burkean irony in which two voices, the A and not-A are in conversation with each other. In this section, I begin by looking at the different ways in which Unamuno faces the exigences of his time as an idea-breaker, and I analyze how he addresses and constitutes these specific problems through strategies he employs in his articles. I look at Unamuno’s method of idea-breaking in two parts: skepticism and the individual sense.
Skepticism

After Unamuno defines the problem of dogma, ideas, and ideology, as an idea-breaker he approaches this problem with an attitude of skepticism. Because he defines the problem as one of people blindly following dogma and authority, Unamuno proposes to look at all dogma, whether political, religious, or scientific, with the mind of a skeptic. Unamuno defines the skeptic as one “who inquires and investigates, conscious that for each problem that is solved, three or four new ones arise; conscious of the relativity of all thought, that all error is subjective. The opposite of skeptic is the dogmatic” (Unamuno 1900d). Thus, the skeptic does more than doubt ideas; the skeptic thinks, researches, questions, and investigates, looking for new possibilities and issues. The skeptic also realizes that thought is relative and subjective, and that there are many different perspectives. The skeptic approaches questions and problems with a mind of intellectual curiosity and inquiry. While the dogmatic is a slave to ideas, the skeptic actively works to be free from their hold and to question the logic behind the dogma that enslaves. Of his choice of the word skeptic, Unamuno writes about “the skeptic voice in its etymological and philosophical sense, because skeptic does not mean one who doubts, but one who investigates or researches, as opposed to one who asserts and thinks that they have found. There are those who scrutinize a problem and there are those who give us a formula, verified or not, as solution to it” (Unamuno). Again, here he indicates that the choice of the word “skeptic” points to one who does more than just doubt. Moreover, he proposes a distinction between the two positions or approaches to problems: one scrutinizes a problem, while the other presents a formulaic solution. Here, we can observe Unamuno explaining his own practices in the press, as he never presents a positive solution; instead, he skeptically critiques and denies the superiority of all different political regimes, figures, and parties. For Unamuno, the skeptic cannot provide a formula, a solution, or a system. Rather,
the skeptic must scrutinize the problem through actively investigating, researching, and questioning.

As a professor of the classics, it makes sense that Unamuno’s attitude of skepticism is related to its Greek origins. Scholars agree that Unamuno’s brand of skepticism “grows out of Hellenic skepticism” (Cope 2009, 473). Brian J. Cope defines the theory of skepticism as “an intellectual position that denies the possibility of epistemological certainty,” and similarly, we see Unamuno’s articles reflect a denial of certainty (Cope 2009, 473). Richard Popkin writes of the history of Academic skepticism that developed from Plato’s Academy, beginning with Socrates’ dictum, “All I know is that I know nothing” and developing into assertions that “nothing could be known” (Popkin 2003, xvii). Much like Unamuno’s purpose, the Greek skeptics desired “to show, by a group of arguments and dialectical puzzles, that the dogmatic philosopher (i.e., the philosopher who asserted that he knew some truth about the real nature of things) could not know with absolute certainty the propositions he said he knew” (Popkin 2003, xvii). Unamuno has a similar aim, using arguments and dialectical puzzles to expose the falseness behind dogma, or at least to demonstrate that the truth could not be known. Thus, the Academic skeptic, much like Unamuno, hoped “to demonstrate the complete relativism of truth, …to discredit the claims of dogmatic philosophers by formulating positions that show the opposite stances to also be true; in turn, since the dogmatic philosopher loses confidence in the certainty of her propositions, the suspension of judgment ensues” (Cope 2009, 473-4). Taking this perspective, and in an attempt to demonstrate truth’s relativism, the skeptic does not try to persuade of any one position, but hopes for a mere suspension of judgment. Indeed, “skepticism’s very name underscores what it most values: detached inquiry” (Cope 2009, 475). Skepticism desires to inquire into questions and problems, but from a detached perspective that does not choose one or the other.
Skepticism, then, becomes a mood and an attitude, and Unamuno uses it as a lens through which to interpret and give meaning to events. He often takes a perspective that nothing can be known absolutely, but only ironically; consequently, he presents in his articles different arguments and dialectical puzzles. He rarely promotes any doctrine, dogma, or idea, but promotes the inquiry into all of them through competing perspectives. He is skeptical of many ideas and political figures, and he questions them, with the intent to improve Spain. Thus, many of his works that we see in the press showcase an attitude of skepticism, an attitude that he also highlights in his longer philosophical work *The Tragic Sense of Life*. As we see Unamuno using the principle of skepticism, we often see him denying any certainty of the good, preferring, instead, to critique what he finds problematic in order to improve. He, himself, does not persuade or promote ideas. As he explains, “I do not try to convince anyone of anything; strictly, and despite false appearances, I have never done so. If one of my arbitrary affirmations … corroborates with your opinion or makes you form an opinion, I am compensated” (Unamuno 1906c). In highlighting these problems, as part of his skeptical point of view, Unamuno believes that all dogma and all sides must be exposed and explained in the public sphere, but not necessarily debated. For instance, he writes, “only sectarians propose public debates, that are the most useless things” (Unamuno 1900r). He believes debate is useless because people are disagreeing and arguing into the void; they are not fully listening, understanding, or inquiring into other positions. Sectarians propose these debates so as to create further division through argumentation. Instead of debating, Unamuno wants us to simply clarify our own thoughts and positions without the need to assert superiority over others. In his writings on debate, he further says that it “does not serve for anything fruitful; to lose time and patience. He who debates much, thinks little. Expose your doctrines or beliefs, but do not debate them. Let the others expose theirs so everyone can hear and compare and judge
them. Let them fight in your spirit, without bringing it to fight at the public plaza” (Unamuno 1900r). Thus, he proposes an open public sphere where people explain and compare beliefs, but do not put ideas into an agonistic struggle. Doctrinal struggles should occur be engaged within the individual’s own consciousness, where people can make their own decisions.

It is this focus on the internal and the individual that exposes Unamuno’s link between skepticism and vitalism. Cope writes that because “Unamuno’s outlook revolves not around concepts and premises, but rather ‘the man of flesh and bone,’ skepticism, as a lived philosophy, clearly holds a unique appeal for him” (Cope 2009, 482). Unamuno often stresses the central importance of the human and many times uses the phrase the “man of flesh and bone.” His work often anchors on the human, the living being, and rationalism, instead of on philosophical systems, formulas, and rationalism. Focusing on vitalism and the person of flesh and bone, Unamuno often demonstrates skepticism as he looks into the dogma and propaganda that promote war. For example, he writes of the need for people to assume the skeptical attitude when examining the propaganda and slogans of war: “There is harm in not seeing in our civil wars more than abstract ideals; this refers to the clash of religious convictions, those political opinions, another way to trick people, comfortable explanations” (Unamuno 1889c). When there are disagreements and wars, for Unamuno, it is important to see them as only abstract ideals that use religious or political dogma as ways to deceive by providing easy explanations or motivation to encourage people to fight. He goes on to say that in writing history, partiality must be cast aside, as “scientific work demands that the historian see the ideal of himself as a man without homeland or party, or temperament. The love of truth and of studying, at the same time supplements and gives colorful robustness to the story” (Unamuno 1889c). This skeptical attitude must be employed even in the writing of
history, as he explains the importance to not follow biases, but to love truth and studying. This will provide enough color for the story, making partiality unnecessary.

In addition to being a skeptical writer of history and interpreter of facts and events, it is also important to be skeptical of all types of dogma so that we do not become slave to ideas. Indeed, we must separate ourselves from the control of dogma and arguments, and investigate the ideas behind them: “It is necessary to move away from the fields where people fight in this way and study Christianity and anarchism and everything you can with quiet and love, and find the snippet of truth in all doctrines, no matter how falsely they are presented to us, and the elements of falsehood as true as they sound, and to search without rest to discover the living ground” (Unamuno 1900p). Moreover, people should look for the truth in all that seems false, and, conversely, look for the false in all that seems true. Unamuno uses the term “living ground” as something that we can seek behind and under dogma, something we can find and understand, something alive, with a pulse, that is not formulaic. Similarly, he writes again of living ideas, saying that one “of the most useful endeavors is to repeat at each moment the principles and maxims that the purely wise forget. Otherwise, they pass through spirits as a cold idea, without taking flesh, flesh that pulsates and suffers when it is wounded” (Unamuno 1893c). When people repeat maxims, the words become empty and lose their significance and their living quality.

Not only does skepticism imply approaching ideas with a questioning mind, but it also implies adopting a revolutionary attitude and teaching others to develop these habits. As a public intellectual, Unamuno espouses what he calls the “revolutionary attitude.” Linked to the notion of skepticism, Unamuno believes that intellectuals must encourage a revolutionary attitude in the people. Cope explains that “the theoretical and practical axes of skepticism rest, respectively on the idea of active and passive resistance to fixed beliefs and dogmatic claims to truth” (Cope 2009).
Thus, skepticism entails the notion that there must be some kind of resistance, active and passive, to dogma in the process of denying it. Unamuno, as he confronts the different monarchs, political leaders, and policies of Spain, agrees with the idea that there must be resistance or revolution, and he often writes about the importance of revolution. At the end of a scathing article against the king, he writes, “We have written this with the greatest calm and contentment. And we are convinced that to serve the order of justice, there is no other attitude in Spain today than the revolutionary attitude” (Unamuno 1919b). For Unamuno, skepticism entails applying a revolutionary attitude to all ideas and situations, which is as important as a physical revolution. By encouraging habits of skepticism and the revolutionary attitude in the people, intellectuals can help society to become more just.

_Individual Sense_

For Unamuno, a second problem related to the problem of ideas is the problem of common sense, something that he proposes to solve through the idea of the individual sense, which is to say the use of individual thought of philosophy. Thus, although common sense is a collective problem formed through our relationships with others, he proposes a solution grounded in the philosophical corrective: “One of the deepest functions of philosophy consists of emancipating us of common sense. Philosophy that appeals to common sense is nothing more than systematized prejudices” (Unamuno 1900c). “Common sense philosophy” is thus an oxymoron as philosophy deals with thought that is uncommon. In contrast to and opposing common sense, he asserts the idea of the individual sense. In his book _Contra esto y aquello_27, a collection of his essays, he contrasts “common sense” with what he calls the “individual sense” or the “own sense.” For him, “each
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27 Against This and That
person is valuable because of their own sense” while common sense makes people part of a herd (Unamuno 1900c). Individual sense gives us value and sets us apart from this herd mentality. He says, “if that is the collective, the common, this is or begins by being the individual, the own. Paradox is the most genuine product of the own sense. And it is, therefore, the most effective element of progress” (Unamuno 1912, 98). Individual sense often produces paradoxes that may appear to contradict the common sense, but that should be investigated, as this type of thought can lead to real progress. In this way, the “whole history of human thought could be reduced to the conflict between common and individual sense, between truism and paradox, between practical instinct and speculative reason” (Unamuno 1912, 98).

Much like common sense, practical people do not follow the voice of the collective, but they follow theories and formulas and value those over their own individual sense. Unamuno writes of the individual sense in the “practical man,” and he explains the difference between practice and theory. Practical men “obey a theory, but fragmentary, unconscious… they are the men that call themselves of the middle ground and should be called of the routine, that do not regress or advance, but stagnate” (Unamuno 1887). When he says practical, in his sense of the word, he means that they practice, but do not theorize, which is to say that they act, but do not think. These practical people practice their routines, and they do not progress: “The practical man (in the sense I refer) disdains thought; if he can live without thinking, why would he take advantage of thought?... For them life is a business, beliefs a credit, death bankruptcy, the spirit an untanned leather bag, full of liability” (Unamuno 1887). He uses a sort of paradoxical logic to reverse the traditional meaning of the word “practical,” employing it, instead, to denote people who practice without thought. Moreover, he uses the financial metaphor of business, credit, bankruptcy, and liability as a type of metonymy to make the intangible tangible.
Unamuno, in his articles, often enjoins people to develop and follow their own individual senses. He uses Biblical allusion to explain how the “road to hell, they say, is a wide and comfortable road, not for where it goes, but because it is traveled by crowds of cars and vehicles, while the way that leads to heaven is a humble path, full of thistles because of the neglect of this path that climbs the holy mountain” (Unamuno 1893a). The crowds of cars and vehicles that he describes can be likened to the idea of common sense, while the neglected path is the path of the individual sense. Unamuno called the people who were most likely to follow the wide and comfortable road of dogma and common sense, “spiritually lazy.” In 1910, Unamuno writes about people who follow dogma, saying that “the people of spiritual laziness… tend toward dogmatism, whether or not they know it or want it, proposing it or not. The spiritual laziness flees from the critical or skeptical position” (Unamuno 1910, 7). People who follow dogma are spiritually lazy, have a spirit of laziness, that wants to follow authority and dogma because it is the easiest path, easier than having to think and inquire.

Once the individual sense is developed, it must be communicated to the group so that we can put many different opinions in conversation: “I do not like to read authors who say the same things that I think… and whose writings corroborate with my own opinions. For a trip like this I do not need saddlebags. On the contrary, I like to read those who affirm the things I believe are most absurd and who refute and combat my points of view” (Unamuno 1887). He believes in the importance of putting many different perspectives in conversation, but common sense often inhibits this process. To achieve this diversity of perspectives, Unamuno focuses on the individual and the concrete, thinking in terms of the individual person instead of on collective opinion. By focusing on individuals and individual development, Unamuno can transform the collective through the individual. In a letter to a friend, Unamuno once wrote, that “human society should be
based around the individual particular human, around the concrete personality and not the abstract” (Rabaté and Rabaté 2009, 83). Thus, people must communicate these individual senses to the rest of society.

As an advocate of vitalism, Unamuno believes in the primacy of the individual and their humanity: “I take from those around me, not their ideas, but the heat with which they sustain themselves, heat of humanity” (Unamuno 1906c). Here we see that Unamuno is not interested in trying to persuade anyone to accept dogma. Rather, he writes,

I am interested in you, known or unknown reader. I am interested in you, but your ideas, your thoughts, your opinions, do not interest me a bit. You interest me, and it hurts me that you make yourself the slave of your ideas, of what you call your ideas, that are not yours. Every day I become more interested in emotions and humans; every day I become less interested in ideas and things (Unamuno 1906c).

Here he expresses the idea that the individual is supreme, that it is more important than their ideas and their program. He often writes of this as the “heat of humanity” and he places this heat and the living individual human with their emotions in a dichotomy with ideas, thoughts, and opinions.

Unamuno proposes the idea of “altereutrality” as a way of becoming free of ideology. Altereutrality is a neologism that Unamuno coins and he defines as something different from neutrality. It is a position in the center, not favoring one pole. It takes the -eutral from neutral, not taking a side in an argument, and the prefix “alter” which means “other.” As he declares himself to be “altereutral,” he aims to “balance both poles, without eluding the simultaneous criticism of both parts” (Blanco Prieto 2009, 29). This position of altereutrality aims to unite in tension and neither separate nor dissolve. Unamuno is interested in the ironic space that lies at the tension between two poles. Indeed, he himself consists of tension, and this tension is represented in his
thought, “between his ‘belief’ and his ‘knowing’, or between his desire to believe and his inability
to do so. He is, at the same time, the one and the other, the one who believes and the one who does
not, the one who grieves and the one who is calm, the one who hopes and the one who despairs”
(Aranguren 1961, 246). Neutrality is not one or the other, but it is being in the middle of two extremes without declaring yourself for one or the other. On the other hand, Unamuno, in Ahora, explains that “alterneutralidad” comes from altereuter, meaning one and the other and defined as “the position of being in the middle, in the center, uniting and not separating.” This term comes about because Unamuno craves “a synthesis of the two Spains in his own conflict-ridden mind” (Barea 1952, 11). Pascual Mezquita writes of this as the “Unamunian dialectic” which “consists of the simultaneous affirmation of contrary alternatives, without possible conciliation” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 107).

Unamuno’s thought in this way relates to Erich Fromm’s idea of paradoxical logic. He defines it as something opposing Aristotelian logic, and it “assumes that A and non-A do not exclude each other as predicates of X” (Fromm 1956, 73). This type of logic has ties to the dialectical thought of Hegel and Marx, two thinkers that Unamuno studied. Indeed, Unamuno often writes about the thought of both of these authors in his writings. For instance, one example comes in 1900, when Unamuno writes about Hegelian logic: “Nihil novum sub sole, nothing new under the sun! That can also be converted easily into its contrary, which is identified with perfect Hegelian logic: omne novum sub sole! All is new under the sun! Is there nothing older than the daily exit into the sun? Always the same sun! Not under the sun, nor over the sun is there anything new, nor is it new the same sun” (Unamuno 1900i). In an example of dialectical logic or paradoxical logic, Unamuno reverses the old adage. Rather than using Aristotelian logic to persuade readers, he employs a variety of tactics. First, he does not argue for any side, but he
attempts to expose the dogma or the contradiction of many ideas. He does this through the notion of the intrahistoric and by presenting things in short stories, dialogues, and different formats, instead of by presenting a logical argument.

**Building a Collective Spirit Through the Rhetoric of Intrahistory**

After breaking down ideas skeptically and through promoting the use of the individual sense, Unamuno must find a way to unite the people of Spain into what he calls a collective consciousness or communal spirit. From his earliest writings, he maintains a focus on the importance of what he calls the “collective spirit” (Unamuno). He writes in 1900 about the reception of one of his novels into this collective spirit, saying, “I made a book; I put years of my life into it, the flower of my youth, the fruit of my experience, the best of my soul… It will continue living and will be young forever. It will continue its path, after the necessary gestation in the collective spirit” (Unamuno 1900b). Thus, he implies that literary works and rhetorical texts all become part of the collective spirit, interacting with and impacting it. It was always part of his mission to unite Spain, and we see this when he cautions in 1903 that "If in Spain a collective consciousness is not formed of our role in the life of the actual people will end in Spain's disappearance” (Unamuno 1903a). Thus, he sees the creation of a unified consciousness as a vital and existential problem in Spain’s future. Throughout his body of articles, we can see him use different words and phrases for this collective spirit, including “harmonic unity”, “collective nimbus”, “eternal tradition”, “national tradition”, and “collective ideal.” Unamuno identifies the need to “to extract a national tradition, more or less long and more or less formed, a collective ideal” (Unamuno 1912, 235). Although there may be different ways of creating this consciousness or spirit of the people, Unamuno does it through his notion of the intrahistoric. As I look at his
concept of the intrahistoric, I examine five components of how he uses it: language, physical environment, personal relationships, myths and legends, and spiritual authenticity.

Unamuno’s vision of the future differs from a utopia and is not a utopic vision of the future: “Utopias! Bear in mind that in a utopia, any representation of the future, even the most absurd, …implies that the present state of affairs must be eternalized and perpetuated, with slight variations at most” (Unamuno 1894b). As a utopia presents a version of the future and then must try and attain that and only that, it loses all sense of progress and improvement. But Unamuno refuses to go down this path of stagnant utopias; he does not present a plan, program, or blueprint for a utopia. Rather, he elects to provide for us a negation of dogma and politics. Instead of giving us a plan for the future, he tells us what not to do; he breaks down any of the utopic dogmas lurking in society and uses strategic undercurrents to create and amplify the collective spirit. For Unamuno, the specific political program or regime a nation follows is secondary to the mood or collective unity of the nation.

Unamuno often writes about the problem of the lack of collective consciousness in Spanish society. In his estimation, the people of Spain have “no interior life,” which has “inconveniences, above all, for the most intimate of the culture. It is a harmful modesty” (Unamuno 1900f). The lack of interior life means that people do not think but follow the authority of dogma and common sense. Unfortunately, for Unamuno, “this brings another evil, and that is that we live in our social relations a regime of lies. Two people can call each other friends, be familiar with each other over years and years and die without having known each other” (Unamuno 1900f). He presents a tale of how this plays out in the article “The Gossips.” Here, he tells a short story about two men who meet regularly at a café, but know nothing of the other’s interior lives: “Don Francisco was single, retired, lived alone with one daughter and a greyhound that he brought to the café to give leftover
sugar cubes. Don Pedro was a widower, retired with one married daughter who lived separately because of the son-in-law. They did not know more” (Unamuno 1889b). These two men meet at the café, but they never speak of the everyday, nor do they speak in a regular conversational style. Rather, they “went to the café to vent in dialogued monologues, drowsy at the lullaby of conversations of news and information” (Unamuno 1889b). When one died, the other continued going to the café and “continued his monologue. The echo of his soul had been put out, who was he? Where did he come from? How did he live? He did not know or attempt to know. He remained alone and did not know his loneliness” (Unamuno 1889b). In this article, Unamuno establishes for us the lack of connection between the people of Spain, resulting in empty or hollow relationships and little sense of community.

In his quest to form a collective spirit of Spain, Unamuno understands the need for a perfected rhetorical practice that calls individuals to improve so that the collective also improves. Unamuno sees the connection between the individual and the collective consciousness as crucial to this process. He explains that “the public consciousness is something more than a sum or mere mix of individual consciousness, it is a chemical combination of them” (Unamuno 1896a). It is for this reason that Unamuno begins with the individual. By changing and improving the individual, he can eventually change or impact the collective or the public. Unamuno wants to create a collective consciousness, but not a collective mass of people who blindly follow common sense. Rather, he wants a collective of individuals who have their own individual sense: “Union is useful, convenient, and necessary in everything, for everything. Without union there is nothing…. The annihilation of a single one of the parts would affect the whole, as the disunity of one single of its innumerable parts that constitute its nature, would affect the whole union; then this union is extremely transcendental” (Unamuno 1879). By using the metaphor of a chemical reaction,
Unamuno suggests that each individual is important to the chemical makeup of the collective consciousness and focuses on the simultaneous development of the individual and the collective.

Unamuno works toward improving the collective consciousness of Spain through something that he called “intrahistory,” a neologism he coins in the 1890s. The use of the suffix “intra-” indicates that it is something inside of, or something internal, so intrahistory means the internal history, or the history masked within Spain. A preeminent Unamunian scholar, Julián Marias, writes that “Unamuno had founded his interpretation of collective human reality and of the people on an idea not sufficiently elaborated that he loved: what was sometimes called ‘eternal tradition’ and other times with deepest depth, ‘intrahistory’” (Marias 1961, 152). Intrahistory is the history and the bonds between people, created through everyday life, stories, rituals, and interactions that occur beneath the level of official history.

Unamuno believes intrahistory supplants ideology as a unifying factor of the people of Spain, and it can be communicated to people in order to unite them into the collective consciousness. For Unamuno, standard “history is produced in dialectic and agonic relationship” through events, wars, and conflicts (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 26). On the other hand, intrahistory is the unconscious, interior, deep history or subhistory of anonymous people “whose work passes unnoticed by exterior history. Intrahistory is manifested through the hero, who does not do more than pick up and transmit the spirit of the people, the spirit that constitutes the authentic historic reality” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 28-9). It is something that accesses a different mode than history that is written in books; it takes place beneath the layer of written history. While written and recorded history is quantifiable, recordable, and narrated, intrahistory is unconsciously lived by the collective people, and is living and impossible to delimit. Intrahistory shows us that the living history of a people is made of people and their stories, not facts, dates, and battle statistics. Unlike
recorded history, intrahistory is not bound by time, but marked by timelessness (Fiddian 1974, 788). The factors that compose the intrahistoric happen outside of time, and apart from any sense of chronological order or cause and effect.

Intrahistory does not appear in the record of officially written history; it is the history that happens daily, in and among anonymous people. Not only difficult to narrate, it is also largely unperceived. It is the quiet history that is lived unconsciously by the people and becomes, for Unamuno, the glue that holds a people together. It is “a living, spiritual, popular reality… something diffuse, impossible to delimit exactly, …the intimate reality of the silent life of the people, the reality upon which the character, tradition, and history of the people are founded. Although it is a part of constant daily life, it passes unperceived, for the most part. It does not deal with mathematical formulas or a thing already done or definitely finished” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 35). As something constantly evolving and apart from formulas, it is something that directly opposes rationalism and the authority of dogma. Never completed or dead, intrahistory can be considered the “‘living tradition’ or the continuous refreshing of the authentically historic past in the deep life of the people” (Mezquita 1993 38).

Unamuno coins the term intrahistoric, and we see it appear in some of his earlier essays, beginning at least by 1895, as it surfaces in essays he publishes in La España Moderna in 1895. Later, in another essay he explains how in writing his first novel in 1897, he “attempted to show something of the intra-history of my people. Interlaced with the tale of the uprising and the bombardment of Bilbao – of which I was witness as much as a little boy can be … I wanted to express what I had seen of the intimate life of the people that manifested in those events” (Unamuno). As defined here, this novel reflects the concept of intra-history, the feeling of the intimate life of the people, intertwined with the events of the war told from a historic point of view.
In this way, Unamuno contrasts the idea of intra-history with traditional history and the standard way of providing a story of war. While a traditional history of war exposes the plot points and important events of struggle and dialectic that comprise a situation, Unamuno, in an intra-history wants to capture the underlying intimate life and spirit of the people, or the history that is not captured by a mere history of events.

Unamuno indicates that there is a deep intrahistory in all societies; it is not temporally or geographically bound to Spain of that epoch. He writes that we can look to the example of “Shakespeare [who] penetrates the Roman intrahistory and soul with Hamlet, incarnation of such deep humanity” (Unamuno 2005a, 228). The use of the term “eternal tradition” implies that intrahistory also exists outside of chronological time, and not only out of spatial boundaries. When he writes of “the present historic moment” this also indicates “that there is another moment that is not” present or not historic (Unamuno 1958, 184). And thus, the intrahistoric refers to the a-historic, the nontemporal. Rather, intrahistory is the substance of history, as its sediment…the unconscious of history…. The waves of history, with their whispers and foam that reverberates in the sun, roll on a continuous, deep sea, immensely more deep than the foam that undulates on a silent sea whose deepest depths the sun never reaches. Everything the newspapers tell daily, all history of the ‘present historic moment’ is nothing but the surface of the sea, a surface that is frozen and crystallizes in books and registers, and once crystallized that way, a hard layer…. The newspapers say nothing of the silent lives of the millions of people without history who, at all hours of the day and in all countries of the globe, arise at the orders of the sun and go to their fields to continue the dark and silent daily and eternal labor…. That intra-historic, silent, and continuous life, like the same bottom of the sea, is the substance of progress,
true tradition, eternal tradition, not that false tradition that can be found interred in books and papers and monuments and stone (Unamuno, 185).

Intrahistory is the leftover sediment of history, something that is unconscious, that is unseen and unknown.

The idea of intrahistory and the soul of the people is often associated with words expressing depth. Likewise, Unamuno defines the idea of the intrahistoric, using metaphors of roots and the depth of the sea. In an 1899 periodical he writes, “two tasks, convergent tasks, are imposed on us: to deepen our collective spirit, to arrive at its roots, to intraSpanicize ourselves, and to open ourselves to the exterior world, to the European environment… By the roots the people must be linked, not by their hearts; by their intrahistoric roots, not by their historic hearts” (Unamuno 1899c). Thus, there is a need to deepen what he describes as the collective spirit, using the metaphor of roots that connect, give life, and extend into the depths of the ground. In the language of Burke, the metaphor of roots makes the concept of the intrahistoric much more accessible to the people of Spain. Unamuno sees himself as the guardian of intra-history, combatting myths and legends that he perceives as inaccurate, and proponing those that were beneficial and true. In his own words, he defines it as an “eternal tradition,” or the unconscious, substance, sediment. He uses the metaphor of the sea to convey what he means by intrahistory. The sea here, in the language of Burke, functions as a metonymy to make the intangible concept of the intrahistoric something that is more easily understood. He describes a history that comes in waves, that is presented in the surface level information in the press, the historic moment, information that crystallizes in books, that loses its living quality. On the other hand, there is an immense and unknown depth to the sea, to the people, to the intrahistory, that is found under the surface, near the depths of the sea.
Intrahistory, as a concept and word, appears in many of Unamuno’s articles as he establishes what should take ideology’s place in Spain; he also uses it rhetorically throughout his writings in order to create a feeling of unity among the Spanish people. He often refers to intrahistory indirectly by writing about “the life of a people” and he says, “when one studies the life of a people, it is necessary to know scientifically the theater of events, the country, the climate, its influence, and later, who is the actor, his physical and spiritual constitution, temperament and character; additionally, the method, the people who surround him and their actions. Here, the sea and the mountain, the dominant temperament of the people, their education, their way of understanding religion and life, their genuine literature; all are the obligated elements to reconstitute the synthesis” (Unamuno 1889c). Here, he explains the important qualities to consider in intrahistory, including where it occurs, how the natural landscape, the moods of the people, how they understand literature, education, religion, and life. From this explanation, we can understand how all of these things come into play in looking for the intrahistorical in a people.

Although sometimes we see Unamuno explicitly define the concept of intrahistory, at other times, we merely feel a tone of the intrahistoric because of the themes he uses. For instance, in 1905 he writes an article about the prevalence of mendicancy in Spain, but he describes it as “ingrained into the subsoil of patriotic life, under the historical cloak” (Unamuno 1905d). It is this reflection of the ideas of the subsoil and under the historical cloak that access a mood of intrahistory. He uses everyday words from the realm of geology (subsoil) and clothing (cloak) to express a metaphor and to make the intangible concept of intrahistory something people can understand. As it falls under the historical cloak, it is concealed or something difficult to see. Thus, we can see that even when Unamuno does not explicitly refer to intrahistory, it is something underlying in his work.
The intrahistoric can reveal to us things about the political nature of a people, and it can also be a way to guide and modify a people. In one article, he writes, when we study individuals “we try to determine… individual character and temperament so as to guide and modify it; it is the same in a people, to determine its character. Historic events are symptoms of a collective character, and the reason to live under a regime is not found precisely in past facts but in the character of the people and its way of being that those facts are manifested” (Unamuno 1889c). An intrahistorical analysis can show us the character of a people so that we can guide and modify it, improving the collective community, which was one of Unamuno’s goals. Moreover, an intrahistorical analysis of a people will help us to understand the political life and motives of a people. In one article he questions the future of Spain, asking, “is everything dead? No, the future of the Spanish society waits inside of our historic society, in the intra-history, in the unknown people, and will not emerge as powerful until it is awakened by gusts or gales of the European environment” in the midst of discussions about Europeanizing (Unamuno, 298). Thus, Unamuno sees the intrahistory as something powerful and important that must be awoken for the health and future of the nation. Moreover, it is in the idea of the intrahistoric where wars and other political disputes can be understood and resolved in new ways. For Unamuno, the uselessness “of war, the manifestation of the barbarism represented by one brother killing another brother can only be overcome through a superior synthesis, and for Unamuno, history cannot offer that, but only intrahistory. It is in intrahistory where the contradictions between liberal and carlist, peace and war are resolved” (Cortina 2003).

We can examine Unamuno’s concept of intrahistory as he writes about it as a rhetoric of intrahistory, as opposed to the idea of the rhetorical situation or the rhetoric of events. While the rhetorical situation looks at the response to events, and the rhetoric of events looks at the
transaction between rhetoric and events, the rhetoric of intrahistory looks at a situation, focusing on the symbols and moods and attitudes that people develop in response to this situation. In some of his articles, Unamuno explicitly discusses the concept of intrahistory, and the symbols of intrahistory also appear in his articles. These intrahistoric symbols include the “depth of the sea, nature, the ‘unconscious’ people, the mother, childhood, interiority, silence, legend, etc.” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 81). Unamuno represents the intrahistoric in many ways throughout his writing and in his articles. When he writes of language, the physical environment, personal relationships, cultural myths and legends, spiritual authenticity, Unamuno refers to the intrahistoric. Now let us proceed to examine these categories.

Language

Language is the way in which we communicate our intrahistory; it forms part of the intrahistory that unites people in a community with a collective consciousness. It is the way that we share our intrahistory, our habits, our daily lives and emotions, and how we communicate our stories of being in community. Thus, language plays a part in intrahistory because it is the way in which we associate with each other and the way we develop bonds between each other. In 1895 Unamuno writes: “What makes the continuity of a people is not so much the historical tradition of a literature as the intra-historic tradition of a language” (Unamuno). Here, we see Unamuno argue that the continuity and the development of community does not occur through the shared literary tradition, but rather through a shared intrahistorical tradition of language. Intrahistory is “in some ways, the vindication of the artistic as vehicle of an essence that can only be captured in language. That is to say, ‘intrahistory’ is a new way of excluding (official) ‘history’ from the artistic possibility of representing the spirit of the people” (Saba 2014, 40). Thus, intrahistory looks at art
and language as ways of representing people and a nation, and these things take on new importance in an intrahistorical framework.

Because he believes that language is an important part of constituting a community, Unamuno does not agree with autonomous regions of Spain using their own regional languages, as he sees this as something that creates division. He often writes against the use of the Catalonian and Basque languages and always uses Castilian Spanish. He explains in 1899, "We must work to make national Castilian Spanish an international Spanish, so that it remains a sacred deposit of old memories" (Unamuno 1899a). Thus, he argues for Castilian being the national and international language, not only for reasons of communication facilitation in national matters, but as a site of memory, a “sacred deposit” of memories, as a site of intra-history, and as a way to hold people together through shared experiences. In one article published in English in The New York Times in 1931, he writes about the formation of the Second Spanish Republic’s constitution. After describing many problems with the Republic and its constitution, he says, “Bilingualism in institutions of learning will give rise to a sort of civil war with Catalonia” (Unamuno 1931). Thus, he sees bilingualism as destroying unity and collective consciousness.

In addition to using a common language of Castilian Spanish, Unamuno believes that language use must also be authentic in interactions with others. In 1892, condemns those who choose to “speak for speaking’s sake, to chat in vain, to be lost in idle conversations, is to speak for all those who must immediately satisfy a desire, the liberation of a necessity, the filling of an emptiness, the satisfying of a major or minor pain finally, because pain is above all desire. Idle words, all that do not settle business” (Unamuno 1892b). When he questions poetry and music then, he writes that those are “expressions of pain… of what pain has to do with life, of the will to live that pulsates under pain” (Unamuno 1892b). To be truly authentic of language, Spain must
reform rhetoric and stop using propaganda. According to Marías, for Unamuno, “what Spain needs is exactly the same thing the world needs: rhetoric. Rhetoric has been substituted in almost all parts by propaganda. Rhetoric is the art and technique of collectively steering people without profaning, like poetry, it is the art of dealing with them… individually” (Marías 1961, 155). Thus, rhetoric and improved communication can help fix the problem of propaganda and division, bringing people together and forming a collective consciousness.

The type of language used in certain writings can capture something of the intrahistorical. Unamuno provides an example of this as in the literature of Enrique Taine. He says that in Taine’s writings, “a climate is felt, the cold fog of England goes down on the pages, one can see how people live and the facts of the living people pulsate on dead pages. It is a beautiful study of what they call in Germany volkerpsychologie, psychology of the people” (Unamuno 1889c). Thus, the language of literature and the press should be living, and should be something readers can feel and experience. Language should make the intrahistoric come alive, allowing readers to understand people’s lives and psychologies. In order to purify terms and rhetoric, he argues that we must reframe the way we talk about some things. He provides an example as he argues for the redefinition of the hero based on the Greek origins of the term. He says, “The day will come, we might say, in which it is clearly seen that most heroes are pacifists… and not bellicose; the hero is one who knows how to win and to endure and to suffer, and not how to resist evil. Then people will reconsider their military glory, that did nothing more than hold them back in the march of progress” (Unamuno 1900s). By redefining the term hero as one capacity of enduring suffering, he hopes to change the way people think about war and people’s attitudes to war. He questions why “the concept of heroism has sprouted from the military concept, tied to the barbarity of humanity, and that the hero, in general, is a soldier… The day will come, we may say, in which it
is clearly seen that most heroes are pacifists, those that would be called children of God, and not the bellicose” (Unamuno 1900s).

Language, not only published in literature and the press, but also in oratory, must transform so that it can convey the intrahistoric and reflect the living language. In 1889, Unamuno writes that “oratory is the art of speaking to others in public…. The distinguished speaker must be from a different cut than other speakers. If she says what all others say, she is a singer in the chorus; if he expresses what no one else thinks, his song may be beautiful, but as a melody of Beethoven on an uncultured audience. He must be more common than the common people” (Unamuno 1889a). Thus, to make an impact, orators need to speak in the common language of the people. He describes the importance of improving our rhetoric so as to make it come alive, as part of the intrahistoric: “I studied a rhetoric that advises that when you want to say death swallows everyone, you should say that “the pallid scythe of death harvests the same way in the straw hut of the poor as in the marble palace of the opulent”” (Unamuno 1889a). This expressive language comes to life for the people, expressing the intrahistoric behind language. In another instance of this living and expressive language, he writes that there “is no oratory more expressive than that of the loved to their beloved during the night, quiet and unapplauded; or the terrible oratory collected by the pillows, enveloped in tears, of the defeated in the fight for life; or the plethoric improvisations of an eternal suitor to whichever destiny at the café table” (Unamuno 1889a). He describes the genuine and authentic language usage and oratory, that is contrasted with propaganda and other types of language that conceal dogma, such as sacred oratory.

Opposed to this living language, Unamuno describes the idea of “sacred oratory” as language that conceals dogma and ideas. Sacred oratory “is concerned more with the formula than life. They do not realize that what it is lacking is heat and that it is not electric light that heats
more” (Unamuno 1889a). Sacred oratory encompasses dead language and propaganda, is concerned with formulas, and needs the heat of life, not of empty science and the electric light of authority and propaganda. He says that speech can be an “apparatus to hypnotize the public. It begins quietly, it grows, it surrounds, it strikes, everything that everyone does and nothing that one does” (Unamuno 1889a). Thus, oratory and propaganda can become something that plays into common sense and creating a collective mass. He looks at the transformation of “epic oratory that manifested outdoors, and died with the epoch in which the rhapsodes sang. Being shut up in a locked enclosure, it shrinks, it is condensed, and it dwindles. Oratory, the poetic form and the base, is called to disappear in its traditional form” (Unamuno 1889a). He relates the origins of oratory, oratory that began as the rhapsodes entertained by singing the tales of epic heroes around the fire. However, when encapsulated by formulas and trapped inside in stifling and cold speeches, this epic oratory shrank and disappeared as a poetic art. Unfortunately, he writes, oratory is disappearing because people no longer want to hear it as a free and living art; they want formulas, propaganda, and hypnosis.

As part of how he views the intrahistoric and living language, Unamuno transforms language, inventing new words and neologisms in order to express the living spirit of the people. In many articles, he proposes new words to convey things for which there are not words. He writes of the Greek Sophoclean heroine, Antigone, as a model of “fraternal piety and feminine anarchism… Fraternal? No: we must invent another word that does not exist in Spanish. Fraternal and fraternity come from frater, hermano, brother, and Antigone was soror, hermana, sister. And it would make sense to speak of sorority and of sororal, of a feminine brotherhood” (Unamuno 1921d). He writes about how femininity, or sisterhood, is needed in politics, and that it would improve civilization since “the barbarism of wars is because our civilization is predominantly
masculine. Virility has drowned humanity” (Unamuno 1921d). Thus, he always proposes new words and terms for things that he observes but for which he cannot find words.

Physical Environment

Intrahistory also involves the physical environment, including both the landscape and the built environment, which is an expression of the people and with which all people can identify. Some have written about how intrahistory is “embodied in the people and physical environment of its pueblos” (Strzeszewski 2006, 1). Often this comes from descriptions of both the built environment and the natural landscape, and Unamuno provides many descriptions of both of these in his articles. These descriptions and the understanding of the Spanish landscape were things that were part of people’s daily lives, things they could depend on everyone understanding in common. There is a notion of depth to the idea of intrahistory the comes out in the descriptions of nature, often playing out in the idea of the height of mountains and the depth of bodies of water. The depth signifies the deep bonds between the people. It is the deeper history that falls beneath the level of written history. As explained by F.W. Fiddian, “intrahistory is directed inwards to infinite depths” (Fiddian 1974, 788).

In many articles Unamuno writes of the Spanish landscape, and while his novels often do not portray details about the setting or the landscape, his articles do. His novels speak more of the general, and deal with broad themes and philosophical ideas. On the other hand, his articles show specific individual instances of these themes and ideas playing out. Thus, the descriptions of the landscape become important, as the people of Spain read them in the newspaper, can imagine this, and then feel connected through intrahistoric descriptions of the landscape—the people’s unique modes of experience. In 1885, Unamuno writes the article “Guernica: Memories of a Short Trip”
in which he describes the landscape he observed during his trip to the city in northern Spain. He wrote this at the age of twenty-one years, as he often traveled to Guernica during that time to visit his fiancée who lived there. In the text, he says that “I have already said that I appreciate nature (and also art) for the impression that it produces” (Unamuno 1885b). He references a deeper emotion, feeling, or impression that it produces in people, something beneath the surface. He continues, writing that upon his arrival at ten o’clock in the morning, “the sky was blue and the countryside green, two very good omens. From the car I watched the landscapes parading by, and in this way, they appeared to be alive. How many trees passed! I don’t know how to appreciate nature more than by the impression that it produces in me” (Unamuno 1885b). Again, we see him here describing the impression that nature produces, as an internal, deep universal experience. Unamuno believes that this kind of depth experience can connect people who all feel it. A few years later he writes again about the importance of the landscape, saying that “[t]he landscape is a type of music, of easy and deep music” (Unamuno 1900j). Yet again we see him use this idea of depth like the depth of intrahistory to refer to the landscape. Music, too, is something cultural that ties people together through a depth experience, so Unamuno uses this metaphor to show this function of uniting people through the landscape. His articles, Unamuno often writes about travels to different places in Spain, especially to the Sierra of Gredos, the hills outside of Salamanca where he enjoyed sitting, walking, relaxing, and thinking. Moreover, he explains the importance of the Spanish landscape outside of the city, and the importance of walking in the landscape and being connected to the land: “Urbanism is one of the great evils that our Spanish society suffers. For something is observed that is lacking in Spanish literature it is the sense of nature, of the landscape. The Spanish poet sings of man; rarely of nature” (Unamuno 1900j). He critiques the fact that many
in Spain neglect or do not appreciate the landscape and nature, as he finds that one way to unite people.

*Childhood Relationships and Family Bonds*

Unamuno often writes of the nostalgia of childhood, including various themes of childhood and tales of his own childhood in his articles. The most notable tale from his childhood in his articles is his description of the story of his little paper birds. Throughout his life, Unamuno was known to be a paper folder, and he often made little paper birds as a hobby. He started creating these little birds as a child, and he would play with them with his cousin, as they began a little society of paper birds. As he reflects on this later in life, the birds become an allegory for human society. He says, in the beginning the birds “lived in a savage state, without police or hierarchical order, without anyone having a name, position, or fixed residence” (Unamuno 1888). Unamuno and his cousin were the gods of this bird society, as the birds were created “by spontaneous generation, out of the prime material of blank paper, formed by my hands and the hands of my cousin, their creators” (Unamuno 1888). The birds “sprouted from the material when I called them to life, they lived at my whims, and when mad, still childish, I threw them to forgetfulness, they were as resigned as they had been when they came to life” (Unamuno 1888).

The birds for Unamuno present an allegory for life, the creator, childhood, and the development of society: “In those first times of the golden age… all came from the same paper and the same hands. The individual still had not sprouted from the mass, that was pure objectivism, in philosophical terms” (Unamuno 1888). As he became more involved in the bird society, he describes the developments that occurred: militarism was born as armies formed and wars took place, heroes and kings surfaced, he wrote history books to collect and archive the news of the
birds, cities formed and birds fought over them. He describes his own relationship and childhood feelings of nostalgia for the birds: “A rainy afternoon makes a beautiful afternoon for fighting” (Unamuno 1888). He here captures the intrahistoric nature of childhood, the things that occur without anyone noticing, under the level of history: “I believe in my duty to commemorate this memory to those who were my childhood companions. Who can swear that in those inanimate little papers, inert and cold, there was not a shadow of conscience? Not I, who has never been a paper bird” (Unamuno 1888). For Unamuno, it is important to remember those intrahistoric memories of childhood that hold much more significance when later we reflect upon them and share our experiences with others. Indeed, in the collective act of sharing experience there are many relationships that sustain intrahistory. He writes that “a village can be considered a large family that has its traditions, its home, its children by birth or affinity or adoption, its intimate spirit” (Unamuno 1893d). This intimate spirit is what he means of when he writes of the collective spirit and the notion of intrahistory. It includes the relationships, not only of blood and birth, but also of affinity and social relationships.

One relationship Unamuno often writes about is the relationship and the importance of the childless aunt in Spanish society. He writes about this theme in one article, and in his book Aunt Tula. He finds that the aunt plays an important role in intrahistory and in Spanish society. Although the childless aunt does not have children, she is one who guards the “spiritual tradition” and passes it down through generations. In “Sorority: Angels and Bees” he writes,

In a hive there is the queen, the female, the mother, the one that lays the eggs and assures the material, carnal continuity of the swarm. There are the drones, the males, that fertilize and do not work, and there are the worker bees, sterile females, that make honey and wax and sting. And the spiritual tradition of the hive is transmitted from bee to bee, from aunt
to aunt, from worker to worker and not because of carnal inheritance. How does the worker bee inherit its art of constructing the honeycomb? It cannot have received it by carnal inheritance, because the queen who gives them life has never worked, nor have those queens before her. Neither their mother, grandmother, great grandmother, nor any of their progenitors worked or knew how to make honeycombs, and neither did the drones. … Antigone was the priestess of the religion of the home, the keeper of family tradition. She was the keeper of religious domesticity or domestic religiosity (Unamuno 1921d).

In this article he directly compares the carnal continuity, or biologically continuing the society, with the idea of spiritual continuity or passing down a spiritual inheritance to continue the spirit of the society. He uses the metaphor of the beehive to explain how each bee or person has a role, and how important it is to teach the spiritual tradition of the hive. This metaphor can show us how bees learn to build honeycombs, although the builders do not bear children. All children are born of ones who do not work. Thus, the spiritual tradition of the beehive is one that is learned and passed on, and is not something that is genetically inherited. As such, Unamuno should be able to isolate and understand how this spiritual tradition develops. Similarly, he uses the symbol of Antigone as a symbol of interpretation to give meaning to confusion, and to show how we keep the spiritual tradition alive.

Myths and Legends

In Unamuno’s work, the creation of myth becomes important, and Unamuno becomes a creative and prophetic storyteller. The creative is important, as it enables a depth experience, and mythology and legend can also unite people in shared experiences and histories. Miguel Enguídanos explains that Unamuno is a type of historian-prophet: “The Unamunian historian-
prophet is, thus, the creator of myths. Don Miguel must ‘make myths’ and make the author himself a myth” (Enguídanos 1961, 260-1). Not only does he create myths, but, in so doing, he makes himself into a myth. When speaking to Kazantzakis before his death in 1936, Unamuno reportedly said, “The people need myth, deception, fraud. These things support you in life. Look, I wrote a book, the last one, about this terrible theme. Here you have it! San Manuel Bueno, Martir” (Voutsa 2007). In San Manuel, as explained in the previous chapter, Unamuno writes of a village priest who promotes Catholicism and a life of faith to the people, but who does not believe. However, as Unamuno states here, he believes that myth and cultural religion are things that support people through the difficulties of life. Thus, Unamuno believes that myth can unite people into a community. He writes of things like cultural religion and myth and he forms symbols for the people of Spain. Unamuno creatively uses many myths and legends to demonstrate the intrahistorical and to use it to form a community and a collective spirit. Unamuno’s method is to not present a detailed program or plan of mythology or religion, but to evoke feelings, attitudes, and moods. He writes, “In these notes much is missing, without a doubt, but I only aspire to evoke memories by suggestion, not to present complete scenes” (“Ancient Times – V” 1891).

Unamuno is not the first person to use myth in order to unite people or to create community. Leroy G. Dorsey argues that presidents and other modern figures have utilized, revised, and recast various myths in order to redefine the American people (Dorsey 1995). The stories of myth “can help to reconcile individual inconsistencies in a culture’s ideology” and, that “[m]yths, then, constitute an essential community-building force. They bridge differences and promote commonality among human beings by framing their everyday reality in an almost mystical way” (Dorsey 1995, 3). Beyond building community, myths continue to be important, as they “represent an integral part of a community’s existence” and help to make “the chaotic and complex dynamic
of human life understandable” (Dorsey and Harlow 2003, 62). Myths have the power to “fuel a
nation’s imagination with wonder about itself” and “these stories become the touchstones for
human behavior within a community and the criteria for meaning in that community’s existence”
(Dorsey and Harlow 2003, 62). Moreover, the characters of myth are “mythic beings of a stalwart
nature, in particular, serve as role models with which listeners can identify and emulate” (Dorsey
1995, 4). Joseph Campbell writes that the “prime function of mythology” is “to supply the symbols
that carry the human spirit forward” (Campbell 2008, 7). Myths do this by utilizing a “universe,
the protagonist, and the narrative” thus providing us a shared place that we all understand, a
protagonist with whom we identify (Dorsey and Harlow 2003, 62).

Thus, we can see that the language people use becomes very important to the community
building function, and that intrahistory and community creation are bound in the language people
share. As Pascual Mezquita understands it, “legends incarnate the values of intrahistoric
interiority; legend, in this sense, shares something mythological that…has been incorporated into
language and the spirit of a people” (Pascual Mezquita 1993, 107). One of the ways these
languages are formed is through community legends and myths that people have understood and
learned over time. One example is Unamuno’s writing about the beginnings of the club El Sitio,
in which he tells the story about the beginnings of a tavern in Bilbao where people told their stories.
Unamuno writes about the old days, the time of war, the tree of liberty, and the tavern called El
Sitio in the shade of the tree. He turns these symbols into a myth: "Primitive times have an exquisite
enchantment, and those first and heroic days of the club were enchanting.” As he describes the
beginning of this club, he employs a Biblical mythological symbol, saying that, El Sitio was
founded by people sitting around telling their stories, like the Israelites wandering in the desert,
telling their oral history: “The Israelites walked through the desert to the promised land. They
raised their stores, they camped beneath the immense sky, and they continued without leaving a footprint on the ground that they left.” As he describes the mythology of this lifestyle, he compares it to the beginning of El Sitio, saying, “Like this ‘El Sitio’ has brought in its migrations through the village” (Unamuno 1891).

In Unamuno’s work, one legend that he commonly uses to unite the people of Spain is the legend of Don Quixote. *Don Quixote*, written by Miguel de Cervantes in the 1600s, is the most influential and renowned Spanish novel of all time. It follows the adventures of elderly gentleman Alonso Quijano, who reads many chivalric romances and becomes Don Quixote, a knight-errant. Unamuno turns Don Quixote into a legend and symbol, relying on him as something all Spanish people know about. Not only did Unamuno write a book about Don Quixote, but he also includes him in many of his articles, and often utilizes the figure and symbol of Don Quixote. In the article “Death to Don Quixote!” of 1898, he goes over the history and some points from Cervantes’s *Don Quixote*, and then he compares Don Quixote to Spain. He writes that don Quixote, “the poor gentleman from la Mancha, once he had lost his mind, went into the countryside to conquer empires” (Unamuno 1898c). We can already see the parallel Unamuno is establishing, as he writes in the wake of the Spanish-American War, and Spain’s loss of her colonies. Unamuno goes on to write about how the Knight of the White Moon defeats don Quixote, and “thus, our wandering gentleman took the road to his village” to take a year’s rest as was ordered by the knight. Upon his arrival home, he fell ill, but when he recovered from the fever, he was fully sane, no longer Don Quixote, but Alonso Quijano once more. Unamuno writes that “And so the gentleman Don Quixote died, with exemplary death, the historic, in order to be reborn before the judgment of God as the honorable gentleman Alonso Quijano, the eternal” (Unamuno 1898c). Thus, he demonstrates that
Spain should cast aside the madness and the disaster of the Spanish-American War, and should be reborn anew as Alonso Quijano.

He uses this tale of Don Quixote as a corrective symbol of Spain. Although it is pure fantasy, he shows us the future possibility to correct the imperfections in Spain. In a Burkean sense, the symbol of Don Quixote takes on a new life outside of the original text and in a new context. He writes, “the Quixote is worth more for Spain than its dying colonial empire. In the light of the Quixote, we can see our history” (Unamuno 1898c). When illuminated by the symbol of Don Quixote, Spain’s history and trajectory take new shape and new understanding: “The strange and temporal madness of Don Quixote, was perhaps a disorder of the eternal goodness of Alonso Quijano, but was perhaps an explosion of the arrogance of the imposed spirit. He believed himself to be a minister of God on earth and arm that executed his justice” (Unamuno 1898c). While Spain is eternally good, like Alonso, he identifies the arrogance and temporary madness of the Quixote, and that inflicted Spain in the previous years. He concludes: “Spain, the historic and chivalrous Spain, like Don Quixote, has to be reborn in the eternal gentleman Alonso the Good, in the Spanish people, who live under history, ignoring history for the most part. The Spanish nation, – the nation, not the people – ground and broken, has to heal, as its hero was healed, to die. Yes, to die as a nation and to live as a people” (Unamuno 1898c). Here we see Unamuno pointing, again, to the notion of intrahistory, as he identifies the people of Spain under history and ignorant of history. Unamuno also points to his mission to heal the nation of Spain and to form them into a collective consciousness.
Youthfulness, Spiritual Authenticity, and Spiritual Anarchism

Finally, Unamuno perceives youthfulness, spiritual authenticity, and spiritual anarchism as part of intrahistory that can unite people under a collective spirit. This is affiliated with religion and the idea of dogma and authority taking over religion. He describes this as living faith, faith that is pure and alive and not marred by dogma and ideology, and he explains this by saying, “Ah! Taking ourselves away from the lethal tyranny of ideas, we would live by faith, by true faith, by living faith!” (Unamuno 1906a). Thus, spiritual authenticity requires what Unamuno refers to as “living faith” or true faith, that which he refers to as “pistis, faith, or trust, religious faith not theological” (Unamuno 1897a). In one article he writes a dialogue in which he describes, through one of the characters, what faith is: “The most living faith is that whose object is not formulated in analyzable propositions. Not by programs, by empty mottos are they allowed to kill people. And it is that motto, that floats on the wind like a flag, conceals dark aspirations and keeps them below the spirit of the people, those living currents that flow powerfully beneath the formulas of charlatans” (Unamuno 1892a). Living faith is something that cannot be rationalized or put into formulas and empty mottos. Unamuno, through his work, hopes to inspire in the people of Spain a true faith. At the end of Unamuno’s life and in the throes of the Spanish Civil War, he tells author Nikos Kazantzakis of his hopelessness, and the way people are violently killing each other. He says, “Do you think all of this happens because the Spaniards have faith? ... all these things are happening because the Spaniards don’t believe in anything. Nothing… They are desesperados. No other language in the world has this word. Because no other nation except Spain has what it stands for. Desesperado means the man who knows perfectly well that he has nothing to hold on to; who believes in nothing; and ... he is governed by savage rage” (Kazantzakis 1963, 174). In this
moment he expresses his belief that the people of Spain lack faith and hope, which translates, for Unamuno, into rage.

The lack of this true faith or spiritual authenticity is one of the things that divides people, and is one of the worst problems he identifies in society. It is necessary to try to solve this problem through finding a sense of spiritual authenticity. He writes: “One of the greatest scourges of Spain, in my understanding, is the lack of religious consciousness…. Nevertheless, that religious consciousness that is today the luxury of an insignificant minority could be, with time, the treasure of the whole people…. That fight that is begun, should be, before all and above all the fight of sincerity against the lie” (Unamuno 1906d). As Unamuno writes of the conventional lie and the enslavement of the people under the conventional lie, he also writes about the importance of countering this with sincerity or a type of religious authenticity.

Unamuno believes that Catholicism can be a unifying factor among people, but it must be a deep religion, a spiritually authentic Catholicism, and not a Catholicism that is overrun with dogma. Through his articles he hopes to inspire a true faith or true spirituality. Unamuno shows us how we must free religion from theology and from the dogma of Catholicism. Deep religion is related to intrahistory insofar as it reflects the depth of religion as something that is part of one’s spirit and something that impacts all other spheres of life. It does not take place in the church or in the profession of dogma. Rather, “religion should not be a separate sphere…but a sphere that encompasses all others, a sap that circulates through all. Religion is doing everything religiously … and prayer must be eating, drinking, spending time, and writing, and even sleeping. It is not mystic, that is an intellectual thing of pagan origin, but action, evangelic life; we must keep working and not discover God by thinking; by the cordial stairway, not the rational” (Unamuno 1902d). He redefines religion as a new way of life, and he redefines prayer, not as words, but
through all of the actions that we perform daily as we go through life. Moreover, we discover God through action and not through thought.

He finds it problematic that in his time, people fuse religion with dogma, but he believes in the importance of uniting science and religion, gospel and culture: “The great modern work is the fusion of the scientific and religious spirits, to unite the gospel and culture, not making of them absurd dogmas and affirmations of theoretical order that repugnate with reason, not making of the culture something that only deals with comfort and material wellbeing” (Unamuno 1902a). Thus both science and religion should be balanced, and both are important socially. We should not allow dogma, theory and reason, to overrun either field. Just as it is important to free religion from theology and the doctrines of the Church, it is important to free science from materialism: “At the same time that we free religion from theology, let us free science of materialism” (Unamuno 1902a).

In terms of the individual, the individual must be authentic to the self. He writes, “I do not want to be a man of convictions, a convicted man is, that is to say, defeated…. I can say that I am much more anarchist than most of those who call themselves that, because I do not want to submit myself even to that interior authority that enslaves the I of tomorrow and the I of yesterday” (Unamuno 1903b). In order to be authentic to the self, this requires what Unamuno calls “moral bravery.” He writes, “We need bravery, it is moral bravery that is lacking in Spain. That kind of bravery does not consist in confronting dangers that are commonly confronted, like harm to the body, loss of fortune, or the impairment of honor; but something that is feared more” (Unamuno 1905b). The models he provides for this type of spiritual authenticity is Antigone, who, as described previously, contradicts the law of her tyrannical uncle and buries her brother “incurring the wrath of the tyrant and the punishment for her disobedience” (Unamuno 1921d). However,
because she defies an unjust law to do what is right and pious, “Antigone remains as the eternal model of fraternal piety and feminine anarchism”— but then he proposes the word “sororal” piety.

Authenticity of ideas and thought that come from the “I” and the individual sense is another component of this spiritual authenticity. He writes in 1903, “As I receive [ideas] with sincerity, I want to with sincerity leave them, when they do not correspond to my thought. I do not resist new ideas” (Unamuno 1903b). He indicates here that it is important to take an attitude of sincerity toward ideas, to not be enslaved to them, but to also remain open to them. Similar to this, he believes that it is important to remain what he describes as a “spiritual anarchist” and he writes, “I can say that I am much more anarchist than most of those who call themselves that, because I do not want to submit myself even to that interior authority that enslaves the I of tomorrow and the I of yesterday” (Unamuno 1903b). He describes himself as a spiritual anarchist, who defies even any internal sense of authority. The individual must be authentic to the self because the authorities cannot be trusted, something that has political consequences and implications. Unamuno writes that “the authority in Spain is absolutely irresponsible” and thus, it is even more important to be spiritually authentic and possess moral bravery (Unamuno 1918e).

Unamuno likens spiritual anarchism to the idea of taking a youthful approach and often writes about this distinction between youthful spirits and old spirits, arguing for the benefits of a youthful attitude. It was known that Unamuno loved children and he was always very whimsical and imaginative. In his older age he loved his grandchildren. He models this ideal of a youthful civilization after that of the Greeks, and he quotes Solon who writes about the childlike society of the Greeks. In 1900 he titles one of his articles “One Must Become Childlike,” and he writes the story of a narrator who walks outside of his house and sees a child making a pirouette: “And I, who felt some crazy urge to make a pirouette, had to contain myself, because they see me as a
formal and grave person, and I cannot be a child nor make pirouettes when I feel like it. That is against my precedents. We cannot be children; this is our disgrace, that of Spaniards above all” (Unamuno 1900l). He writes this in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War when he sees the Spanish people seriously upset over the “disaster” of the loss of Spanish identity and colonies. He realizes it is the tendency for Spanish people to take things seriously that causes problems in Spanish politics, and he believes that a turn to a more childlike attitude could improve society and politics, reduce polarization, and connect people.

For Unamuno, a childlike or youthful society is one in which people feel the heights and depths of emotions, where people are sincere toward attitudes, but not serious, and people question ideas. He clarifies what he means by this, as he writes that we should become like playful children, children who are not ashamed to suddenly make, without an apparent motive, a pirouette in public; children who laugh while crying, as the sun shines through the rain. Whoever does not know how to laugh and play is disgraced, to laugh freely and happily with the soul, without proposing to correct anything, without a satirical moralizing end. He who does not know how to laugh, also does not know how to cry with his whole soul. Our solemn gravity betrays a true moral disease, a dryness of the heart, a sad ossification of the conscience, a lack of tenderness in the end. The frank and free laugh, that of the soul that breathes happiness freely, the laugh without purpose, when have you heard it? Instead of hearing daily this lamentable question that is: ‘what is the purpose of that?’ Well, it has no purpose besides to play, to play as children (Unamuno 1900l).

Indeed, the non-childlike attitude in Spain leads to the collective problems and political and social madness that he has described before, as he writes, “The lack of infantilism is a symptom of senility and degeneration” (Unamuno 1900l). He believes that people do not tend to conserve a childlike
attitude in Spain “not because the desire to do so is drowned, but because of lack of health of spirit: they suffer from moral sclerosis, their tenderness has been drowned” (Unamuno 1900l). He writes that in Spain, “Here, the youth do not appear young, because they do not hope for anything; they live in the slavery of the past, not in the freedom of the future…. They apply labels and they pray whatever creed and they accept one of the saints; almost all are reactionaries… That is to say there is no youth as such” (Unamuno 1897a). However, Unamuno promises to “make a vow to conserve a perpetual youthfulness, and in freedom, as I have explained to you” (Unamuno 1901). The idea of youthfulness is tied up in how people view the future and the past. People who fear the future are not youthful, but those who see the future as hopeful have a youthful attitude. He views this fear of the future as a problem with political implications, as in 1921 he explains that “the principal characteristic of political life – above all political – today in our Spain, is the fear of the future” (Unamuno 1921c). Opposing this, youth is “the age of the true faith, of creative enthusiasm” (Unamuno 1897a). The problem is that “the fear of the past prevents [people] from loving the future in the present, and hoping for it; they do not see in today more than the inheritance of yesterday and not the heritage of tomorrow” (Unamuno 1897a). He compares this attitude of the youth in Spain to other countries, saying that “in other European countries, a great part of the youth marches facing the future, in search of the future kingdom of man, it stagnates here in pettiness, stupid actuality, or politicism” (Unamuno 1897a).

As Unamuno approaches the problem of his rhetorical situation, he approaches it with a dual solution that involves breaking down ideas and creating a collective spirit. Through his articles, we see him approach the problem of authority and dogma in Spain as an “idea-breaker,” one who breaks down ideas, exposing them and revealing the ideas behind words. As an idea-breaker, Unamuno approaches these ideas with the attitude of philosophical skepticism.
Additionally, he encourages us to leave aside common sense, in favor of developing our own individual senses. He also enjoins us to be, like him, spiritual anarchists, being individual and authentic of spirit.

In addition to being an idea-breaker, he also wants to unite people into a collective consciousness with an eternal tradition and a unified spirit. He does this through his notion of the “intrahistoric,” which is how he describes the bonds uniting people in a society, that occurs at the level of everyday people in mundane interactions and rituals as we go about our daily business. The intrahistoric is what holds a society together, and he rhetorically uses different intrahistoric concepts in order to bolster a notion of collective consciousness. The intrahistoric concepts that he employs in his articles include the use of common language, a familiar physical environment including the built environment and the natural landscape, interpersonal relationships and childhood nostalgia, myths and legends common in Spain, and the notion of spiritual authenticity and youthfulness. By employing these different concepts, he hopes to bring the people of Spain into a fuller community that shares a common spirit and consciousness and reduces its polarization. We can find his ideal of this collective unity summarized in his article about the origami birds of his childhood: “Men of flesh should take as a model, not only ants and bees, but also those villages of paper, free and obedient, always happy, resigned to life and death, pious toward their creator, and all animated by the same idea, the same will, and the same end” (Unamuno 1888). It is Unamuno’s hope that through the rhetoric of intrahistory, he can create a community of people who are happy, free and obedient, and share common ideas.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

The Legacy of the Unamunian Public Intellectual

The way Unamuno engaged with the periodical press during his life provides us with a model of an “Unamunian” public intellectual as one who utilizes the conversational and ritual functions of the press to break ideas and to creatively use the intrahistoric to create a collective consciousness. Not only does he enact these methods, but through the newspaper he also teaches them to his audience, showing them how to approach questions of dogma by also being skeptical idea-breakers and to use the intrahistoric to nourish relationships. It is fitting that Unamuno, one of the first people to use the word “intellectual” as a noun, also exemplifies a new model of the intellectual. He writes about it in 1905, saying, “Who of us that write for the public, has not used, not only once, but many times, in these times the noun intellectual? Who has not talked of intellectuals, distinguishing with such a name a variety of men by opposition to other varieties?” (Unamuno 1905e). He begins to use this word to distinguish a specific type of intellectual from other types of thinkers.

The concept of the intellectual changed in the 19th and 20th century as a new type of intellectual developed, a public intellectual. The role of the intellectual transformed during Unamuno’s life as intellectuals became more specialized public intellectuals, and began to see the importance of entering into public life and debates. At the end of the 19th century, “we find a ‘class’ of intellectuals that is not defined only by its way of thinking or by the mere fact of being writers or scientists, but also by its critical attitude or by its withdrawal from the dominant social political structure” (Fox 1988, 234). Intellectuals at this time ventured out of the university and into the
public forum: “Rather than just providing ideas or reflections, as had been the case in the diversified intellectual market of the nineteenth century, the role of the new specialized intellectual included intervening in the broader debate of society” (Moreda Rodriguez 2016, 154). These intellectuals were “the first to adapt their strategies to the new society of the masses were anti-bourgeois authors like Unamuno” (Storm 2002, 155). During his lifetime, the new intellectuals broke away from being part of “the political and cultural elite of the country as the preceding generation had been…. They consciously broke with existing society, and adopted new strategies to influence the course of the new mass-society that was slowly coming into being” (Storm 2002, 157). As part of this transformation, intellectuals participated less “in the same social organization and more toward compromise as interpreter inside of a cultural system whose meanings were principally symbolic” (Fox 1988, 233-4). Rather than being part of the system, the new intellectual became an interpreter of the system. During Unamuno’s lifetime “[i]ntellectuals became omni-present in political life outside the centres of power”; faced with “governments that opted to throw a veil over problems or eschew rather than resolve them, intellectuals constituted a coherent minority within the enlightened groups of society” (Robertson 2010, 2). Thus, being a new public intellectual involved more than simply being an elite speaking to other elites; it involved speaking to the masses, publishing views in the popular press, and creating enduring ideas to change public life over time. Unamuno falls into this category of the new public intellectual that develops at that time, but he also provides a new way of embodying this public intellectual.

By analyzing Unamuno’s rhetorical style in his articles, we can rethink the methods of the public intellectual. Crick defines public intellectuals as “those who react to the problems of their sociohistorical situation by creating enduring works that broadly influence cultural habits and institutional practices during their lifetimes” (Crick 2006, 131-2). Thus, public intellectuals are
rhetorical actors, responding to situations and also impacting future rhetorical work. It is fitting to
examine Unamuno’s articles rhetorically, as they functioned as reactions to the immediate
problems of his time. Moreover, these articles are enduring works through which he desired to
influence the cultural habits of the people, create a Spanish consciousness, and change institutional
and governmental practices. Put another way, public intellectuals “respond to their philosophical
situation by producing a work that conceptualizes and provides direction for solving longstanding
and pervasive problems and are then successful in helping change the habits and practices of a
public” (Crick 2006, 138). Unamuno, himself, writes about the importance of inspiring habits and
thought in the people: “The orator finishes his discourse… ‘What has he said?’ No, not what has
he said; but “what has he made me think?” (Unamuno 1889a). Ideology is less important than
making people think. Unamuno was such a public intellectual, but beyond this, he was an “agitator
of spirits” and an ideoclast who abandoned ideology and took courageous action to confront
political systems and defend the sanctity of the intellect. As Unamuno critiques ideology and
dogma, he shows us that rhetoric of public intellectualism and community building can be free of
ideological intent. Indeed, it can be enough to examine ideas with the intent to free rhetoric from
ideology.

In his articles, Unamuno explains why intellectuals have a duty to enter into public life as
he perceives it. He writes that when one becomes known throughout Spain, people expect that
person to perform duties of a public intellectual: “As soon as one achieves a bit of notoriety as a
public figure, they seem obligated to respond to all sorts of questions about public things, and in
fact they are, since our culture is so varied in its composing parts, it is so homogeneous and lazy”
(Unamuno 1903a). He agrees with this notion, and understands that it is the duty of a well-known
figure to provide opinions for the people. Because there is so much diversity of opinion and
laziness of thought, the people need someone to provide perspective and opinions or things for
them to discuss.

Intellectuals have a duty to function as public intellectuals. In one article, he writes, “From
this agora or modern forum – such is the press – I use my voice with the only right of a Spanish
citizen, and there I write what appears to me to be the case” (Unamuno 1903a). He describes the
press as an agora or a modern forum, using the metaphor of the Greek agora or the Roman forum,
both of which were central locations in classical life, a gathering place. It was not only a
marketplace for goods, but also for ideas, and was a site of political life and public speech. The
press becomes the new agora and the forum. Through this metaphor he shows his belief that the
press is a central location for political life and public dialogue. Within this new agora, the writer
must provide his own opinion on events as he sees them. Unlike some intellectuals who try to
provide their own dogma or program, Unamuno is an interpreter for the people, as he dissects
ideas, looking for what is hidden behind them. He writes in 1905, “What I want to note here, is
that of each 20 times that intellectuals are spoken of, 19 of them are about mere littérateurs, of
authors of poetry, dramas, or novels.... Some of us believe, I do not know upon what foundation,
that intellectualism is not determined by the genre of labor to which a person is dedicated, but in
the way of executing it” (Unamuno 1905e). Here, he indicates that intellectualism is a method and
procedure, not a topic or genre. Often, in Unamuno’s view, people misinterpret the idea of the
intellectual and what the intellectual should do. An author of literature is not necessarily an
intellectual, but can be. An intellectual can come from any genre, but intellectual status is defined
by a method and how intellectualism is embodied. However, Unamuno provides a disclaimer to
his theory of the intellectual, saying, “I am not, surely, the Spanish professor who dares to say
what the mission of the professoriate should be in modern society. The only society that I know
anything about is Spanish, and I do not know if we can call it modern. Thus, I am limited to write about what the mission of the professoriate should be in Spanish society today” (Unamuno 1905c). He argues that the university and the professoriate should play a role in Spanish society, as “the university is a piece of the social mechanism. There one learns sciences, arts and humanities, obeying the law of the division of work. A chemist, a physicist, an entomologist, a Hellenist, a physiologist, etc., finish their mission teaching, respectively, chemistry, physics, entomology, Greek, physiology, etc.” (Unamuno 1905c). As a university trains people who become part of society, professors have a responsibility to the greater society and the community, to serve as public intellectuals.

The work of the Spanish professoriate should not be limited to the docent work of the Chair, but it must be extended to an educative labor surrounding the people. Educative more than instructive in the strict sense. More than vulgarizing the sciences, arts and knowledge through courses of university extension – which commonly results, it must be confessed, in a failure – or by other analogous methods, they must form in the people habits of seriousness and work and feelings of sincerity and patriotism. The professoriate should be, if it were as it should be, the priest of the patriotic religion, of the religion of patriotism (Unamuno 1905c).

Thus, not only in practice, but also in his theoretical writings, we can see Unamuno’s belief that intellectuals and professors should educate, not merely instruct, the people in society. They should do more than bring courses and instructive information to the people; they must educate the people on different types of habits, including changing their attitude to one of seriousness and sincerity and orienting them toward work and patriotism. Indeed, he uses the symbol of the priest to show
people the role a professor should play in society— one who cares for and spreads the religion of patriotism, encouraging positive habits in the people.

In his articles throughout his career, we can observe Unamuno embodying this type of skeptical public intellectual who teaches people how to question authority and dogma. Let us examine one instance of this, as he combats the king and the principle of authority. He approaches the subject of the duty of authority courageously, critiquing the monarchical authority in Spain, and paradoxically saying that authority “should obey more than it orders” (Unamuno 1919b). He explains a hypothetical example of arbitrary authority, and how people should respond to this, saying,

if an arbitrary authority ordered poor people, who could not afford shoes, to walk in the streets, by the river, in the mud and dust, stepping on stones and pebbles, and ordered wealthy people, with shoes, to walk on the sidewalks, and, if they, the poor people without shoes, accept the unfair proclamation – which would be the law – this way of walking would constitute order, but also an injustice. And if the poor would revolt against it and step up onto the sidewalks, disturbing the privileged or perhaps throwing or pushing them off of the sidewalk to the river, authority, to maintain its principle – the principle of authority, font of order – it would send out its agents, its mastiffs, to take action against the rebels. And later, the people of order … would applaud the unjust authority. And if you told them that the poor were right, they would answer you: ‘That may be, but that is not the way to create change; they must know how to ask!’ They must know how to ask!... They must know how to ask! He who limits himself to asking for justice, he who does not risk taking it himself, whatever the case may be, is in trouble now! (Unamuno 1919b).
He provides us with a hypothetical example of an authority that acts arbitrarily, creating unjust and arbitrary laws. Once he sets up this scenario, he explains that following arbitrary laws as such is orderly, but unjust. In doing this, he teaches his audience to be skeptical of authority, and he shows the possibility that authority may be arbitrary and unjust. People must inquire into dogma and authority and decide what is just and act accordingly for justice, rather than asking for it. And so, he says, the authorities will do anything it takes to maintain the principles of authority and order, by force or whatever means. The so-called “people of order” care nothing for the justness or unjustness of laws, but they care only for order. As such, “people of order” do not believe in revolts and revolutions against authority, but in asking properly for justice, something Unamuno finds ridiculous and ineffective. He exposes the idea of asking for justice as something ridiculous. He continues, extrapolating this “arbitrary” example to his present scenario of living under what he deems an incompetent king and monarchy:

Each time that a conflict surges – and that is every day – between the victims of inveterate injustices and the despotic government of His Majesty, people say: “They should first change their approach, and then we will see.” But those that protest should not change their approach to do it the “right” way. And besides, if the rebel is in the right, they must give it to him, no matter how he asks for it (Unamuno 1919b).

In this section, we see Unamuno courageously relate the prior hypothetical description to the real situation in Spain and the authority of the monarchy. By showing the ridiculous scenario in the first hypothetical situation, he hopes to show that the authority in Spain is exactly the same type of arbitrary and despotic authority, concerned only with order and not with justice or humanity. In confronting conflicts between the people of Spain who want justice and the king, who is “despotic” and unjust, and concerned with order, Unamuno critiques the response that the people living under
authority should ask for justice in different ways, believing that you should not have to ask for justice. This was one article of many of his that spoke out against what he calls the “principle of authority,” either the authority of political, religious, or scientific dogma, as “Unamuno’s public life is a long personal fight against public authority. From this point of view, he achieved his goal. It is in the civic preaching and in the ideological conflict where he found himself at ease, because he preferred polemics and confrontation” (Aubert 2003, 231). Finally, Unamuno concludes this article by saying,

when the Government of His Majesty tells us that we must facilitate action and not aggravate conflicts, we should respond that no, that patriotism, true patriotism, demands that we make gubernatorial action difficult, to crimp popular passions and aggravate social conflicts. The cure can only come through aggravation. And no worthy and patriotic citizen should make the work of the government easy (Unamuno 1919b).

He provides here a paradox. As most believe that patriotism is following authority and making things easy, Unamuno presents the opposite point of view, redefining patriotism and saying that true patriotism involves questioning the government and authority and that we make it difficult for authority. Only by questioning authority and providing more perspectives can we improve society and make it more just. Through the way he explains this, he also orients people to approach authority with an attitude of skepticism and aggravation. By employing the symbol of the patriot, he makes it a symbol of emancipation, changing the way they morally view their responsibility as citizens. It reframes moral values and subverts the audience’s moral code, turning blind patriotism and following authority into a negative, and making aggravation and active skepticism and resistance a true act of patriotism.
Scholarly Contributions

Unamuno stepped into his role as a writer of newspaper views at a young age, as he desired to make social and political commentary. He continued to make interventions in the political press throughout his life, using different creative styles and revolutionizing the genre of newspaper writing. From the perspective of journalism and the press, addressing Unamuno’s newspaper articles can teach us about how Unamuno used the functions of the press such as shaping culture, forming public opinion, and creating community. Rather than simply providing information on facts and events, as do many other writers in the press, Unamuno treated the press as a site to constitute, explain, and respond to events in Spanish political and social life. In addition to this, the press also provided him with a way to create a community in Spain. As he uses the press as a way to communicate his notion of the intrahistoric, Unamuno uses the medium of the press and its function as conversational, mosaic, shaper of public consciousness, and community builder. Although he critiques the press and its function as part of the transmission view of communication, as one that simply conveys information, he also sees the potential in the press to function as part of the ritual view of communication, as something that binds a community and sustains cultural richness. Thus, the ritual function of the press works well with Unamuno’s mission to create a collective consciousness or a collective spirit through the notion of the intrahistoric. Although the press can be an agent of division that creates political polarization, he also sees the potential in the press as a place to nourish the intrahistoric current of the people in Spain. He does this through language, descriptions of the physical environment and the Spanish landscape, descriptions of personal relationships, tales of myths and legends, and spiritual authenticity. This works because of the conversational and mosaic natures of the press, and its portable nature, it inspired public conversations. Observing his methods of using the medium of the press, we understand how
Unamuno uses the ritual view of communication as it functions in the press and analyze his various stylistic and linguistic choices to see how he accesses the conversational nature of the press as he creates a cultural consciousness through intrahistoric rhetoric. This can lead to new insight into how to use the media as a site of public intellectualism.

Because journalism is inherently rhetorical, it is fitting to apply a theoretical rhetorical lens to Unamuno’s work, which provides a vocabulary for us to understand Unamuno’s articles in relation to the context and the rhetorical situation. As intellectuals and newspaper writers like Unamuno respond to their rhetorical situations, we observe them addressing the exigences of the time, managing constraints, and targeting specific audiences. Through this perspective, we see Unamuno and the public intellectual as both a creator and reflector of reality, as he chose exigences to which he would respond, but also shaped people’s views of reality. Looking at Unamuno’s articles in their rhetorical situation, we can understand how he developed the attitude of a skeptic toward all forms of dogma, denying any knowledge of the truth. Addressing Unamuno’s articles from a rhetorical standpoint takes into account how public intellectuals can contribute to the history of ideas and political theory by denying and questioning existing ideas and dogma. This perspective allows us to take both a vocabulary and method from Unamuno’s unique style of response to political polarization, while also keeping in mind the cultural and political power relationships at play in such situations.

Finally, adopting an approach to Unamuno’s articles that takes the rhetorical symbol into consideration shows how Unamuno develops his skeptical attitude and creates a collective consciousness through the use of devices such as symbols and the tropes of metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony. The creation of a collective consciousness also requires Unamuno to establish a foundation of identification and consubstantiality through the intrahistoric rhetoric that
he creates. Moreover, Unamuno models a new way for intellectuals to engage with their situations, and his skeptical attitude enlightens the situations and events of Spanish history for us in a new way. Examining Unamuno’s methods of breaking ideas and creating community, we realize that his method and strategies provide lasting contributions, more than the specific information he provides in the text. As a public intellectual, Unamuno wanted to “to break molds and to create new possibilities. Thus, the most important thing here is not the information or the vehemence, although there is enough, but the strategy of provocation and the framework of his approach” (Valdés 1990). It is this framework that can be applied in other rhetorical situations.

As a public intellectual, Unamuno wanted to release Spain from the grip of authority and dogma. He sees the problem in his rhetorical situation as a three-part problem. The first part is the problem of political ideology that has become an ideocracy, as many people have lost their individual sense and now follow the common sense. He observes this becoming an environment in which the tyranny of ideas dominates all thought. The second problem is that rationalism has taken over and exerts authority over people through what Unamuno calls the “plague of eruditism” and scientific education. Finally, the third part of the problem is a problem of inauthenticity, that he diagnoses as coming from an environment of spiritual poverty and a lack of interior life. Once the problem is diagnosed, Unamuno takes a unique approach to solving it. First, he approaches it as an idea-breaker, with an attitude of skepticism and a focus on the individual sense. Second, he focuses on what he calls intrahistory, as a way to unite the people of Spain and form a collective consciousness. Intrahistory, or the history of the everyday people, the history that occurs beneath the surface of history, keeps people united in a community, and has several components that we can identify in his articles. These include language, the physical environment and landscape, interpersonal relationships, myths and legends, and spiritual authenticity. Generally speaking, the
Unamunian public intellectual serves as an agitator of spirits, approaching all ideas with an attitude of skepticism, and speaking intrahistorically to form a community based on authenticity.

In Spain today, Unamuno is well-known as a courageous public intellectual who fearlessly confronted politicians and governmental regimes during his lifetime. In Salamanca, many traces of his presence remain, including his former house, which has been converted into the Unamuno House-Museum and Archive. The house is furnished much like it was when he lived there, with his books, bed, desk, and other relics on display. The archive is located in the uppermost level, and it houses many books and articles by and about Unamuno. Around the city, cafes bear his name and one of the medallions bordering Salamanca’s Plaza Mayor depicts his image. A life-sized statue of Unamuno watches over a small plaza next to the house where he died in 1936. At the University of Salamanca, one of the oldest universities in Europe, a classroom is named in his honor. His legacy remains, not only Salamanca, but also in his birth city of Bilbao. A plaque sits above the door of his childhood home, and his sculpted bust watches over the city in the Plaza Miguel de Unamuno. Additionally, several of his novels have been translated into films.

Unamuno remains well known in Spain and around the world as one of the most important public intellectuals of the 20th century, and many have written about his legacy and described society’s need for an Unamuno today. Spain has not seen another figure comparable to him, and he is a singular figure in Spanish, and even world, history. Marías writes: “The intellectual of the last twenty-five years has not been able to do what Unamuno did…. There has never been the equivalent or anything similar; he has not had imitators” (Marías 1961, 152). More recently, on December 29, 2017, the Spanish newspaper El País published an article arguing that “Spanish society today needs a don Miguel that, as the Unamuno of yesterday cried ‘Neither Maura! Nor Romanones!’, would today proclaim ‘Not Rajoy! Neither Sánchez, Iglesias, nor Rivera!’ ... Spain
urgently needs an agitator of consciences that would remove the flat and depressed perception of the reality that afflicts us” (Mota 2017). Not only Spain, but countries around the world urgently need an agitator of consciences such as Unamuno. He earned this reputation as an influential public intellectual by tapping into and giving voice to the consciousness of the Spanish people. Barea writes:

From time to time, people arise who embody the qualities, the mood or the ambitions of their peoples so forcibly that they achieve an extraordinary influence, a symbolic greatness, which belong to their persons rather than to their achievements. We have known some such people in our time, nearly all of them in the political sphere. It is a much rarer thing for a writer to become the acknowledged incarnation of the spirit of his people…. This is, I think, the case with the Spaniard Miguel de Unamuno (Barea 1952, 7).

Unamuno understood and embodied the spirit of the Spanish people, and attempted to improve and unite this spirit. Indeed, Unamuno did acquire a symbolic greatness and he incarnated and became the incarnation of the spirit of the people. He had and continues to have an effect on Spanish consciousness. Enguídanos questions, wasn’t Unamuno “the clearest prophet that the Spanish people had in this century? What have we done with the myths created by him? What have we done with our history? What are we going to do in an uncertain tomorrow? Will we hear the voice of our great historian? Who, in our days… has put truth in his work to see so prophetically the history of Spain?” (Enguidanos 1961, 260-1). And for those who question the efficacy of Unamuno’s writings, scholars have argued that, while their influence on the immediate rhetorical situation cannot be determined, they have had an impact in the years following. Valdés writes, “In immediate terms of political efficacy, it is impossible to make an estimation, but in the long term it has undoubtedly been a factor of major importance in the maintenance of a political
consciousness during decades of severe restrictions in the political activity of the Spanish people” (Valdés 1990, 498).

Indeed, while the work of some public intellectuals may be too embedded in their immediate contexts, Unamuno’s work continues to speak to us, and we may continue to draw from his ideas. Although articles of public intellectualism speak to their specific situations, the polysemous nature of texts allows them to be re-read in different contexts. Applying these readings to other contexts, they can shed light on analogous situations and they can also teach us strategies and methods for responding to the crises of our own time. In his articles, Unamuno identifies the problem of Spain as a problem of ideology. Instead of providing a clear, systematic approach to this problem, he attacks the symptom of the problem, which he understands as laziness of thought and faith in authority and reason. These symptoms are manifest in the tendency to attempt to control the environment, to wipe away the subtleties of the world, and to reduce the world to a maxim or ideological program. Unamuno leaves us with a vague, yet inspiring, solution of a community united by true faith, intrahistory, and authenticity. Today, we live in a world that is divided by political polarization, ruled by dogma and authority and, which lacks a sense of a collective consciousness. In the present we can approach texts from an Unamunian perspective. Although the medium may have changed, the styles of communication and rhetorical goals remain important, making Unamuno and his rhetorical contributions significant in today’s political environment. This study can serve as a point of departure for other studies, leading us to develop new methods of public intellectualism. One study would look at different types of public intellectuals and their different rhetorical strategies and methods for engaging the public. Another study looks at the Spanish Civil War and the reactions of liberal public intellectuals, including people like Unamuno, María Zambrano, and Manuel Azaña. Yet another study would look at
responses to similar moments of polarization as employed in other geographical areas, perhaps comparing them to the Unamunian response.

Let us return, now, to the novel *Fog*, so as to end on the same thread with which we began. Once more, we assume that the character Antolín Paparrigópulos, designed and written by Unamuno, himself, symbolizes Unamuno, and in the novel, Unamuno writes,

If only Providence would provide Spain with more Antolín Sánchez Paparrigópuloses. With their help, we could take possession of our traditional riches and reap profitable returns with them. Paparrigópulos aspired, and aspires – he’s still living and continues to prepare his works – to dig into the soil with his critical plow, even if only a half-inch deeper than those who preceded him in the field (Unamuno 2017, 123).

Thus, Unamuno, like Paparrigópulos, digs into the soil of Spanish life with his critical plow, showing us similar ways to do the same in our own place and time. Let us, like Unamuno and his character Paparrigópulos, take up our own weapons of burning words, in order to skeptically question ideology, rationalism, and inauthenticity, and to create a collective consciousness through the rhetoric of intrahistory.
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