



12th International LAB Meeting - Summer Session 2008
14th International Summer School

European Ph.D. on
Social Representations and Communication
At the Multimedia LAB & Research Center, Rome-Italy

Social Representations in Action and Construction
in Media and Society

"Social Representations, Collective Memory and Socially
Shared Emotions: narrative and experimental approaches"

From 26th July to 3rd August 2008
http://www.europhd.eu/html/_onda02/07/14.00.00.00.shtml

Scientific Material

European Ph.D

on Social Representations and Communication

International Lab Meeting Series 2005-2008

www.europhd.psi.uniroma1.it
www.europhd.net
www.europhd.it

Otherness in historically situated self-experiences

A case-study on how historical events affect the architecture of the self.

[ROSA, A; CASTRO, J. y BLANCO, F. (2006). Otherness in historic situated self-experiences. In L. Simao & J. Valsiner (comps.). *Otherness in question: Development of the self* (pp. 229-255). New York: InfoAge : ISBN1-59311-232-7 & 1-59311-233-5.]

Alberto Rosa (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain)
Jorge Castro (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain)
Florentino Blanco (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain)

“You may roughly divide the nations of the world as the living and the dying ... the weak states are becoming weaker and the strong states are becoming stronger ... [the] living nations will gradually encroach on the territory of the dying, and the seeds and causes of conflict among civilised nations will speedily appear”

These words of Lord Robert Cecil Salisbury, Prime Minister of Queen Victoria, were stated in a speech made on May 4th 1898 before the gathering of the Tory Primrose League at the Royal Albert Hall in London. When listening to them many thought of China, Turkey or Portugal, some Italians and French chose to take offence, but the Spaniards were certain that they were unmistakably referred to them. Three days earlier Commodore George Perry, in command of the U.S. Navy Pacific Squadron (adding together 19.362 tons and 33 heavy guns), had sunk all the Spanish Far East naval force (12.029 tons, 9 heavy guns) in the Philippines. Two months later the last nail on the coffin of Spanish imperial pride was hammered in by William Sampson's fleet at Santiago de Cuba on the eve of July 4th. His nine armoured cruisers sunk all the four armoured cruisers and three destroyers under the command of Admiral Pascual Cervera. Together the two encounters produced 912 Spanish casualties and 10 Americans (all of the latter not caused by enemy fire but because of accidents when operating their own guns). Rather than naval battles, the encounters resembled shooting drills. The Spanish Navy could not even claim a tragic but glorious defeat such as at Trafalgar. The feeling was that they had been sent to a hopeless slaughter. When five months later the Treaty of Paris brought peace, Spain was stripped of all its overseas possessions. A Spanish word changed its meaning: for decades *The Disaster* came to be synonymous with the year 98. This very same figure (98) gave its name to a generation of Spanish

intellectuals who played a major role in the building of contemporary Spanish national identity.

The consequences of this loss were mixed. Surprisingly there was no social unrest in spite of the previous activism of republican and anarchist movements. The strenuous effort of keeping hundred of thousands of conscripted troops very far away from the metropolitan territory was suddenly released. The repatriation of capital and a quick and efficient fiscal reform rescued in a few years not only the war bonds, but also all the state debts accumulated for nearly a century. Fifteen years later the navy was rebuilt and the Spanish economy, although still lagging behind their immediate European neighbours, was better than ever before. The last imperial possessions proved to have been a burden rather than a resource. But the shock had been terrible and the morale of the country had sunk deeper than the vessels of the navy.

It may be surprising that the relatively small loss of several islands came to be such a shock when seventy five years earlier a whole continent under the rule of the Spanish monarchy became independent, practically with no apparent harm to the national pride. But in the 1820s the independence of the American countries was the result of a civil war between Spaniards from the two sides of the Atlantic and, what is more important, a Spanish nation still did not exist. In contrast, the *Disaster* happened in the middle of the high tide of Western Imperialism, when Spencerian philosophy popularised the so called “Social Darwinism”, and when the very issue of what sort of nation Spain was to be (if it had to be at all) was centre of a heated debate among the Spaniards themselves.

The Spanish 19th century had not been uneventful. Apart from the involvement in the Napoleonic Wars and the Wars of American Independence, there were three civil wars between liberals and partisans of the *ancien régime*, one revolution, a change of dynasty, one republic (that lasted eleven months), a Bourbon restoration and several military *coups d'état*. What is more-- this took place within the process of transforming an ailing monarchy into a modern nation. This was a process in which the idea of “nation” appeared first as a liberal concept. It was fought against by the Church and the absolutists who defended that Catholicism and the monarchy were to be kept as the core of the legitimacy of the State. Still, it ended up being appropriated by the conservative forces. By the end of the 19th Century there was no discussion that Spain was a nation rather than merely a Catholic Monarchy, but the national identity was still very weak. There was heated discussion about what had gone wrong to make the country to fall into

such decadence, whether it was a consequence of a withdrawal from the real self of the country (whatever that was), or the failure to accept modernity. As Álvarez Junco (2001) puts it, when England pictured herself under the image of the opulent *Britannia* ruling over the waves, or France appeared in the figure of the beautiful and resolute *Marianne*, the image under which Spain was pictured was that of a *Mater Dolorosa* crying for her dead sons and abandoned in her disgrace and helplessness.

A cast of characters

There was a general feeling of pessimism, though this was not a sole consequence of the *Disaster*. Decadence was a persistent theme within the Spanish literature from the 17th century onwards, that reached its peak in the years before and after the defeat in 1898. Pessimism was widespread even among the elite. When the 1876 constitution was being drafted in Parliament and the article defining who was to be entitled to Spanish nationality was being discussed (“Spanish nationals are those born in Spain, those born from Spanish parents,...” etc.), the conservative Prime Minister Antonio Cánovas del Castillo said, as a sort of half joke, that “Spaniards are... those who can be nothing else” (Álvarez Junco, 2001, p. 573). If this was the feeling of the main political figure in Spanish politics at this time, that of those who attempted to imitate the French model of the *intellectual* was much more bitter. They were highly critical of the political system of the Restoration headed by Cánovas, and despised the whole political class. At the end of the century an avalanche of books appeared (see Table 1 for a selection of some of the best known), whose titles are eloquent. They conform a literary genre, known as *Regenerationism*, that developed at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, and their authors form a group, known as *Regenerationists*, in spite of the differences among their views.

Table 1
Books on *Regenerationism*

Title	1 st edit.	Author	Political tendency	Theoretical tendency	Professional field
<i>España tal como es</i> [<i>Spain as it is</i>]	1889	Valentí Almirall (1841-1904)	Liberal	Positivist	Politics
<i>Los desastres de la patria</i> [<i>The Diseases of the Mother Country</i>]	1890	Lucas Mallada (1841-1921)	Liberal	Positivist	Scholar
<i>Idearium español</i>	1897	Ángel Ganivet (1865-1898)	Conservative	Idealistic	Politics

[<i>Spanish Idearium</i>]					
<i>El delincuente español: Hampa</i> [<i>The Spanish Criminal: Underworld Life</i>]	1898	Rafael Salillas (1854-1923)	Liberal	Positivist	Scholar
El desastre nacional y sus causas [<i>The National Disaster and its Causes</i>]	1899	Damián Isern (1852-1914)	Conservative	Eclectic (idealist)	Politics
Las desdichas de la Patria [<i>The Misfortunes of the Mother Country</i>]	1899	Vital Fité (?)	Liberal	Eclectic (positivist)	Journalism
<i>El problema nacional</i> [<i>The National Problem</i>]	1899	R. Macías Picavea (1847-1899)	Liberal	Eclectic (positivist)	Scholar
<i>Hacia otra España</i> [<i>Towards another Spain</i>]	1899	Ramiro de Maeztu (1874-1936)	Liberal	Eclectic (positivist)	Journalism
La moral de la derrota [<i>The Moral of the Defeat</i>]	1900	Luis Morote (1862- 1913)	Liberal	Eclectic (positivist)	Journalism
<i>Reconstitución y europeización</i> [<i>Reconstitution and Europesation</i>]	1898	Joaquín Costa (1846-1911)	Liberal	Eclectic (positivist)	Scholar
<i>Crisis política de España</i> [<i>Spain's Political Crisis</i>]	1901				
<i>Oligarquía y caciquismo</i> [<i>Oligarchy and Petty Tyranny</i>]	1901				
<i>En torno al casticismo</i> [<i>About Traditionalism</i>]	1902	Miguel Unamuno (1864-1936)	Liberal	Idealist	Scholar
<i>Psicología del Pueblo Español</i> [<i>Psychology of the Spanish People</i>]	1902	Rafael Altamira (1866-1951)	Liberal	Eclectic (idealist)	Scholar

Regeneracionism books are of a mixed origin and content. Some were collections of earlier press articles and others were originally written for publication. Their authors were mainly members of the then scarce professional middle classes or university professors. Practically, none of the *Regenerationists* had connections with the political and the economical elites. Most were civil servants who supplemented their meagre wages from what they got from writing in newspapers and giving public lectures. They complained bitterly of not being taken into account by the powers in the country, proclaimed proudly their independence, and rarely got involved in real politics at this time. But all shared a sincere personal concern about their country and took its ailments personally. As Miguel de Unamuno said, “I feel the pains of Spain” [“me duele España”]. They delved in the causes of the national sickness not only in the hope of reaching a diagnosis, but because they were searching for their own identity. They were as much searching for their country’s psychology, as for their personal self within it. It is this struggle that made them an interesting case for study. Each of them got enmeshed in a web of identifications and counter-identifications which had to be navigated and

disentangled in order to figure out the identity they were looking for. They were not very successful in their attempts, since they only managed to make clearer two opposing figures (the *Two Spains*, see Juliá, 2004), that forty years later set the country ablaze in a civil war, where the two opposing views were killing each other as Francisco de Goya depicted in one of his “black” paintings one hundred and twenty years earlier.

What interests us here is not what this group achieved, but how some of them carried out their task. They were professional writers who had a considerable store of knowledge and when facing the problem that most concerned them, simultaneously produced a theory about their nation’s identity and put their own selves into play in the process. While doing so, they also set some of the foundations of the current predominant views on the history and identity of Spain. Whether their ideas were more or less valuable does not concern us here. What is the matter of our interest now is how they dealt with the public events they lived through, how they elaborated their theories, and the role otherness had in this process. And above all, how they envisioned the way in which they –and their fellow countrymen- should shape their own identities.

An agent feeling the pains of the mother country

Perhaps the most illuminating case for our purposes is that of Rafael Altamira (1866-1951) a discrete but renowned scholar and one of the many exiled intellectuals after the Civil War (1936-9). He was an outstanding jurist, historian, literary critic, professor at Madrid University, Justice at the International Court of The Hague (an institution created by the Society of Nations following a project he authored) and candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize. He authored over seventy books, among them one entitled *Psychology of the Spanish People*, published in 1902 (2nd edition 1917), the forewords of each are worth quoting:

“I wrote this book in the terrible summer of 1898 which left such a deep mark on the souls of true patriots. Between sorrowful tears and indignant rage - prompted by the ineptitude of some, the perfidy of others and the indifferent passivity of the majority -, I was filling sheets of paper, inspired not by the huge discouragement that any one would have then found justified, but by the hope, or better, by the urge that a movement would arise, as a reaction to the horrid disaster, similar to that which made the defeated Prussia of 1808 the strong and glorious Germany of today. That is why I also started then the translation of

Fichte's *Discourses*. I was not contemplating a military revenge or a renaissance of imperialism (...). What I was dreaming of was our interior regeneration, the correction of our faults, the vigorous effort that might take us from the deep national decadence, seen and felt for a long time (...).

There is no doubt that our colonial problem and that of our international affairs is dependent on other internal and deeper problems, relating to the psychology of our people, to the state of our culture, to the conception that other nations have about us, and to the conception that we have of ourselves and the social entity in which we live and belong". (Altamira, 1917/1997; pp. 53-54)

"The two enemies I fought against (...) [before] have not disappeared (...).

In the first place Hispanophobia has not totally disappeared, and even less so the ignorance about our past, our present and the conditions of our people. There are still plenty of people outside Spain under the influence of blindly accepted traditional judgments (...) there are also parties and groups of people that think as a patriotic ideal to *de-Spanish* their country, that is, to erase even the smallest trace of tradition or Spanish influence, because they consider it to be deadly harmful, as a complete expression of backwardness, tyranny or intransigence in every moment of their past and in current reality.

On the other hand, even if it is true that 1898 pessimism has been mended, it is also indubitable that it continues to be a burden in our psychology. Perhaps it is often unconfessed and one may have thought that it was defeated; but in the spiritual depths of many Spaniards' souls it keeps coercing activities, disheartening and shortening hopes. (...) [Sometimes] scepticism is allied with political passion, that makes some to reject everything that is supposed to remove the so-called traditional regimes and that instinctively hates everything that comes from those considered as enemies. (...)

However, our *practical* problem nowadays and for the future does not reside in whether or not to acknowledge the existence of a greater or lesser feeling of a Spanish national unity, but *in making an effort for it to exist* and to reinforce it increasingly, since this is something we lack and it should not be lacking." (o.c., pp. 49-510).

The purpose

These excerpts make clear not only Altamira's purposes when writing this book, but also the addressees he had in mind, and the others he was thinking of when trying to picture *the* "Psychology of the Spanish People", others that were both outside and inside the country. His purpose was the *regeneration* of the country, rejecting the pessimism about the "essential capacity of the race to adapt ourselves to modern civilization", and supporting "the hope for a better future, which, more or less consciously, carried in its bosom the belief in fundamental qualities of our spirit suitable for every progress" (o.c., p. 45). He was attempting to disentangle the fundamental elements of the identity of *the* "Spanish people" in order to put it to work for "regeneration". An endeavour that required, first to look for the existing seeds useful to his purpose, and to separate them from the weeds that were an impediment for progress. Something that could not be done without identifying the others in contrast to whom the existent "fundamental qualities" could become the resources upon which to build a national identity. Because the purpose hidden behind the label which gave the title of this book was unmistakably to develop a Spanish national identity, even if he chose to view it as the task of unveiling the psychology of the people of his country, a task that was not totally uncommon among the European social scientists of the time:

"Everywhere the hollow humanism of many internationalists – not the real humanism compatible with group differences, proclaimed by Herder -, and the petty egoisms of regions and local groups have been totally defeated. National patriotism, that before the war [1st WW] was suffering in many parts an acute crisis, has overcome it and prevailed. Every country has felt, with the grave eloquence of suffering, that it can only save itself through a strong solidarity among every one of its members, which widens the social body and gathers both mass and strength for the beatings of today and tomorrow" (o.c., p. 51)

Who were then the addressees he was talking to?, Who were the Others from whom to disentangle for *the real* self to be constructed? These are questions to be answered in due course.

From the agent to the agencies

Altamira was himself –as any social activist- a product of history and a producer of history. How he chose to present himself as an individual has to be inferred from the specific manner in which he was affected by the events of his time, the self-regulatory means he put into play, and the ways in which he chose to participate in the production of historical effects.

Altamira composed his discourse about the “national disaster” not only from his individual feelings, but also from a affectively committed collective approach. When he writes the foreword of *Psychology of the Spanish People* four years have passed after Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines were lost, and most of its content had already been published as separate articles throughout 1898 and 1899, but even so he chooses to appear before his audience with tears in his eyes. His voice transmits suffering, pain, rage and determination to act for changing the state of affairs of his country.

Tragic feelings of pain and moral rage are perhaps among the affections most difficult to fake. Suffering is taken to be something unequivocally personal, private, only possible to feel in the first person. To appear as a suffering person– besides the authenticity of the affection or the intention- is a safe rhetorical device to be listened to, to make the addressee to be receptive to the message conveyed. To some extent to show one’s emotions is to open oneself to others, to show one’s intimacy, and so facilitate an empathy that increase the rhetorical force of the diagnosis and the solutions the author presents.

The *Regenerationists’* texts pretend to be “scientific”, as their authors liked to say, but in fact they are the affectively committed answers of individuals who believe they have enough symbolic power to put their reflections on the national disaster on the market and so to be instrumental in the shaping of public opinion. Nevertheless, if we take a look at the main body of the texts, the attempt at keeping a personal distance from the events, required by the scientific ethos, is achieved in most of the cases; and also in Altamira’s book, showing himself to be a rigorous and devoted academic. The author’s feelings are systematically repressed, maintaining an impersonal tone at all times and making the force of the argument rely on reported facts (historical ones, in Altamira’s case). Forewords are the only space in which they allow themselves to be explicit on how they transit between motives and reasons, between values and facts. Forewords (perhaps with the sole exception of Unamuno’s *About Traditionalism*, that only comments on the origin of the materials gathered) appear as a rhetorical space

where the self can show the genealogy of its motives, its purposes and the way they relate to the book's task. It is within such a space that Altamira, with a subtle calculated literary ambiguity, says:

“(…) my pen logically rushed to write, before anything else, about the concept of the mother country and the need of the division in nations, in order to affirm, if this should result from the scientific analysis of historical and sociological data, our right to live” (o.c., p. 54).

These forewords appear then as a sort of transitional zone between the individual self and the impersonal and collective discourse required by the scientific ethos. Forewords attempt to specify the particular ways in which the author commits himself to a task that transcends his own life, offering himself as a sort of medium that condenses the sense (or perhaps the nonsense) of his country's tragedy, sacrificing, if necessary, his own dignity. The self might have chosen to withdraw, to leave this task to somebody else, to allow himself to be drifted by the fatality of the stream of history; but it is the love for his country – an impetuous and saviour feeling – that leads him to take his own responsibilities.

“(…) evil reached even the healthier elements of the country, the youth, on whom everybody naturally trusts. Shall we keep our arms crossed and fall into the fatalism of the belief of the *races*, and leave destiny to carry us off? I, who am among those who start to mistrust everything, would consider myself as a coward if I laid down my arms when faced with this painful struggle, full of sorrows. In spite of the sadness and deep fear that often invades my soul, I continue working, and so I believe should anyone who truly love his country” (Altamira, o. c., p. 56)

The task is so huge that it seems to point towards a collapse of the self onto the others, as if one may only aspire to a horizon of sense by taking upon oneself the collective task. The abdication of a space for personal interest is vindicated by the sense of the task of eradicating a pessimism that eventually gears itself towards egoism:

“[It is pessimism that] in the intellectual depths of many Spaniards keep coercing activities, dismaying nerves and shortening hopes. There are cases in which it has allied with the scepticism that often comes together with individual egoism and sacrifices everything on the altar of profit for a sole man”. (Altamira, o. c., p.48).

It seems clear that Altamira puts into play an affective energy that arises from a deep rejection of three basic attitudes which define the profile against whom he derives his own specificity: the pessimists, the sceptics and the egoists. He is not very specific about the names of the people he is referring to, but it is not difficult to guess. They match with a part of the political sociogram of the Ultramontanist Spain, a group who managed to derail the train of progress in Spain and ruined the progressive projects that Altamira identified with. This generic “other” against whom Altamira reacts has one foot inside and another outside Spain, and forms a rhetorical alliance that has to be attacked at its roots.

“There are still plenty of people outside Spain under the influence of blindly accepted traditional judgments. We have recently heard that some fellow countrymen of ours have been asked in a European capital city, whose name I will not mention, whether typing machines were known in Barcelona, or pianos in Madrid. There are still people who carry shotguns when coming to the Peninsula to remedy the lack of personal security that they assume to exist even in big towns. There are also parties and groups of people who think it as a patriotic ideal to *de-Spanish* their country.” (Altamira, o.c.; p. 49)

Altamira was no bigot-- nor a chauvinist. He was intellectually socialised within the Free Institute for Learning¹ (FIL), the flagship of Spanish intellectual progressive liberalism in the hinge of the 19th and 20th centuries. Related to the FIL were figures such as Ramón y Cajal, Ortega y Gasset, Salvador Dalí, Luis Buñuel and Federico García Lorca, among many others. The FIL also had as its aim to educate an elite able to produce a profound shift in the historical path of the country, and to hook it into the train of modern progress and Europe (see Blanco, 1997). These two sides of the FIL

¹ Institución Libre de Enseñanza (ILE)

mission - education as the only and true means for producing a genuine, reliable and definitive long-term change, and the idea that this task was to be carried out by a small number of agents of change – show a radical confidence in the individual, and are clearly apparent in Altamira's regenerationist program (see Asín, 1997).

The action

Education is second to nothing for Altamira. Everything that is wrong with the country comes from a shared representation of what *to be Spanish* means, a completely out-of-focus view of the future of Spain, that causes a low collective self-esteem. Political, social or economical problems are more the consequence of this distorted -or even perverse- representation rather than its cause. When Altamira writes about the “psychology of Spanish people” he is mainly referring to the logic and the historical dynamics of these representations, making the purpose of his book that of mending these distortions by resorting to historical and sociological data that seem to point towards the elimination of the motives for pessimism. As he clearly states:

“[...] my thesis and my argument unavoidably laid on an inquiry into the past and present psychological qualities of our people. I preached for overcoming our disheartment and effective decadence in many realms; I was fighting the unproductive pessimism; I was attempting to show that one of the most fertile means (shall I risk saying the only one?) is in educational reform, in strengthening and diffusing culture.

But, in order to fight against pessimism, [...], I needed first to show the lack of scientific value of the several *Psychologies* that pretended to define the Spanish soul as unappealingly incapable of civilised life, and therefore of any renaissance”. (Altamira, oc.; p. 46).

The only reasonable way to change these representations was by purposely and systematically handling the data in the proper way in order to slowly build a representation better-fitted to creating a higher collective self-esteem, a firmer identity and, in the long run, better social well-being. Education was the vehicle for change, and particularly the teaching of history. His book was intended to play a role in this endeavour since “there is no possible education without a foundation on the psychology of the subject” (op. cit.; p. 54).

Altamira's position was made possible by his choosing of (1) an affective approach to his motives for thinking (feeling "the pains" of the country), (2) the problem of Spain ("the injury"), something that can only be mended by (3) an educational reform ("the remedy"), that makes the country move towards the recovery of an almost lost self-esteem ("the healing"), and so open a future of social, cultural and economical progress ("health"). Many elements of this argument were ready for use in Altamira's intellectual milieu, including this sickness-health allegory (Castro, 2004). An allegory he exhausts in the conclusion of his foreword to the 1902 edition of his book.

However, if he managed to put to work everything he called for...

"[...] it was still to be seen whether the remedy arrived timely or it was already late; whether the good natural constitution [the psychology of the Spanish] was still strong enough to respond to the medicine and cast the sickness out of the organism. This is a question that only the future will answer" (o. c.; p. 57)

The same allegory shows a more dramatic turn in Macías Picavea's text, where reason and science appear as having a therapeutic value.

"[...] we are perfectly aware that the straight, inconsiderate and sharp words of science [...] are a pure and shocking medicine, of the sort that produce a rush, a purge, or cut and burn the flesh of the patient... I am a professor, and the reader shall see how I cut myself, how I cut all professors, and cut the educational system of the State where I live and teach... Is this so required by the scientific conclusions that, deafening myself to everything else, I am seeking here? ... Then, too bad. And whoever is found to be an abscess or pus, has to put up with being expelled and cleansed way.

Aren't we facing a deadly threat? Isn't it that we have to save a dying patient? [...] Then... It is now or never when we have to make the exception of asking and allowing science to speak with its inexorable and truthful voice in the present, as well as in past history, submitting ourselves to her sentence, learning her teachings, and redeeming ourselves in the severe doctrine of her august rulings! *Veritas liberabit vos*" (Macías Picavea, 1899/1992; pp. 34-35)

Life, History and the self: The drama lived through

The argument developed so far has not been gratuitous. Kenneth Burke (1945) was aware that there is no way human action can be described without a dramaturgical logic. No human action can be made sense of outside a grammar, a dense and recursive combinatory of cases. An ordered and credible combination of agents, actions, sceneries, purposes and agencies (the dramaturgic pentad) is a minimum condition, not only for the description of action, but also for the very existence of any significant action. Distal ('real') action and symbolic ('described') action are really the same. We may even consider that the specification of a self in a culture, vis-à-vis the world and the others, calls for shortening the distance between the action and its symbolic description. This is something that is particularly true, when one is talking about the action (writing in this case) of professional intellectuals, whose way of life lead them to construct their selves within the horizon of a progressing self-consciousness of the very conditions that make this construction possible. The self then appears as a chimera, as a belief. The realisation of this idea is a painful increase of the awareness of the relative value of each case within a particular pentadic combination. The self ends up watching itself as another case, it could not be otherwise. That is why the agential part of the self in relation to the other elements of the pentad (action, scenery, purpose and agency) has to be always subject to review.

Our purpose here is to reflect on the painful process of putting together a toolkit, which can be instrumental for the construction of the selves of a group of intellectuals, who also believe themselves to be tools for the construction of the collective identity of their country. The rest of the chapter will centre on showing some of the basic elements they contributed in the construction of a coherent collective discourse on the Spanish nation, and describing the grammar that regulated this process. We will see how the Regenerationists' discursive identification of some "others" came together with a fascinating dramatic performance of imputations of blame, or at least of a sharing of responsibilities, for the historical failure of a project of a Spanish nation. Every one of the Regenerationists thought of his own contribution as genuinely personal, but our analysis will show how they were actually merged in a collective task.

"The other" in the construction of Spanish National Identity: Polymorphic otherness.

Altamira's *Psychology of Spanish People* appeared in 1902 after the most significant titles of *Regenerationist* genre were published. This allowed him to devote

some chapters to examining the previous opinions of his colleagues and modelling an intertextual space of discussion. In this sense, Altamira's book shows us clearly the programmatic goal of the *Regeneracionists*: to design the collective identity of the Spanish people in contrast to several disquieting others. Logically, this target also tacitly involved the unravelling of the identity and activity of the *Regerationism* as a group.

The Spanish Regenerationists were themselves a group caught in an identity crisis they believed to be the crisis of the national identity of their country. They took upon themselves the task of devising a new identity that, on the one hand, had to preserve the real self of the country, and on the other, had to be able to put it on the track of the progress they sought (see Tuñón, 2000 and Tusell, 1998 for reviews). In order to do so they had to select their addressees, to draw a suitable picture of the past and present, and to choose some Others from whom to disentangle themselves. This was not an easy task. They had to negotiate the past of the nation (the historical self and other), the social structure of the country (the social self and other), the diversity within the nation (the intranational others), and place their country within the international realm (the international other). Table 2 maps the web of identity tensions the Regenerationism genre dealt with.

Table 2. Fields of identity tensions within Spanish Regenerationism.

		IDENTITY TENSIONS BEFORE THE OTHER	
		Positive: addressees (acts of identification)	Negative: against whom (acts of counter-identification)
FIELDS OF EXPERIENCE	PROFILES		
THE HISTORICAL OTHER	Empire	Nostalgia of the lost collective Golden Age.	Rejection of the obsolete structures of the <i>ancienne régime</i> .
THE SOCIAL OTHER	Elite	Proximity to the social groups capable of leading reforms.	Competition with the ruling classes.
	Masses	Confidence in the qualities and capabilities of the common people.	Uneasiness before the revolutionary potential of the lower classes. Mistrust of their ignorance and alienation.
THE INTRANATIONAL OTHER	Regions	Diversity as a potential asset of varied features of the collective.	Uneasiness before the potential claims of the regions for home rule or independence.
THE INTERNATIONAL OTHER	Nation-state	Proximity to other collectives related by history, race, culture, etc. Imitation of foreign strategies and features in order to reach modernisation.	Uneasiness before other potentially invasive national collectives. Colonial competition.
	Colonies	Desire to rule <i>savage</i> peoples in order to bring them to civilisation.	Mistrust of former colonies because of their independence or their protection by foreign powers.

All these tensions had to be negotiated in order to create a plausible national narrative identity suited to the desire of this group. Altamira was a historian and part of his attempt was to anchor the Psychology of the Spanish People on events of the country's past, creating a sort of narrative self. This required the invention of a set of suitable Others.

The “historical other”. The Regenerationist literature typically pictured the Spanish imperial past as the historical other, following the path of liberal historians of the time (see Fox, 1997, Morón, 1998, Wulff, 2003 for reviews). The Habsburg dynasty - particularly Carlos V and Philippe II, who exerted an aggressive military policy on Europe and America - and the Bourbons, from the 18th Century onwards, were

portrayed as conducting their imperial policies without taking into account the interests of the country. It was often thought that the glorification of the imperial past had the effect on the people of creating a sort of dreamy state of fascination with a glorious past that made them to be removed from the needs of the present.

However Altamira (1917/1997) pointed out that a sharp rejection of this past may be paradoxically counterproductive, since it could be the result of an uncritical acceptance of the “black legend”, invented by the enemies of the Spanish Empire (vid. García Carcel, 1992, for a historical account). If that was the case, to assume the thesis that cruelty and fanaticism were features of the Spaniards would have a deleterious effect on the self-concept of contemporary Spaniards, producing a sort of morbid identification, which may be one of the causes of the decadence. He even went as far as criticising some of his colleagues for having been carried away by this pessimism in their texts.

An alternative history had to be written. The classical protagonists of Spanish history (monarchs, ruling classes) had to be removed from the forefront, the people had to be rescued as the protagonists of the national history, and a strategic place had to be secured for the intellectual and commercial classes. Miguel de Unamuno (1895/1996) coined the term *intrahistory* (“intrahistoria”) in order to articulate a construction of the past fitted to this purpose. It was a sort of social or internal history fluctuating between the so-called dormant qualities of the race and the romantic literary genre of customs and manners, in which the common people appeared as the identity hinge between the past and the present of the national community. Most Regenerationists took for granted that, after expelling the Arabs from the Peninsula (1492) and the reign of the Catholic royals (Ferdinand and Isabella, 1479-1516), the outstanding qualities of the people were wasted in conquests and military adventures. What is more, the Spanish people, either unaware or naive, stoically suffered the errors, excesses and incompetence of their rulers.

Macías Picavea (1899/1992) and Luis Morote (1900) believed that the irresponsible direction of the Austrian and French dynasties ruling Spain (still in the throne following the Bourbon Restoration of 1875) was foreign to the real national identity: they were exemplars of the Anti-Spain. A strong man or a new class had to arise in order to remove the current remains of the *ancienne régime* and to rescue the people from their historic lethargy and put them on the path of progress. Joaquín Costa (1898-1901/1981) went as far as to identify his coetaneous intellectual classes as the

heir to those who had to leave the country because of religious or political prosecution. The history of Spain, as he saw it, had been a sort of “reverse natural selection”, since corrupt and unproductive ruling classes exploited the population, condemning the country to moral misery and decadence.

In sum, the Regenerationist projection of past history onto their present took them to perform three types of acts of identification: a) to counter-identify the national collective against the Habsburg monarchs and their Bourbon heirs; b) to identify the people as the intrahistorical other, with their mixed features of hardworking capabilities and political infantilism; and c) to present the Regenerationists as the assumed heirs to those who in the past had cultivated science and fought for freedom with the frustrated hope of making Spain to progress. This historical picture, if it managed to get stabilised in the collected memory of the Spaniards, would insure their group a key role in the future of the country. But this never happened.

The social other. These historical others are but presentist projections on the past of coetaneous others. The preferred antagonistic other were the ruling classes of the time: the politicians, industrialists and land owners of the Bourbon Restoration (1874-1923). This was a period of political equilibrium, where under a democratic façade, disguised fake election results and protected the interests of the wealthy classes, at the price of the political and economical marginalization of the broad majority of the population. A system whose workings were eloquently pictured by the title of one Joaquín Costa’s books: *Oligarchy and Petty Tyranny* (1901/1998). Lucas Mallada (1890/1989) pictured this *régime* as a state of “public immorality” and “social mess”, which he took to be a direct consequence of government corruption, political egoism and the bad moral example of the ruling classes. Costa (1898-1901/1981) and Macías Picavea (1899/1992) also extended their criticisms to the parliamentary system that they viewed as unfitting to the type of reform required.

The common people is the second Other in this game. These people, at the end of the 19th Century lived mainly in rural areas, most of them were illiterate, and some cases were also severely undernourished, a state of affairs that most of the time was borne with a stoicism that the Regenerationists admired. Altamira (1917/1997), hoped that under this stoicism the potentialities of the historical race were still hidden so that they could be awakened by the proper agencies. However, there were also some disturbing signs. In spite of the scarcity of literacy skills that could facilitate the

widespread diffusion of socialist messages, there were significant anarchist rootings in the country, that sometimes produced outburst of violence - mostly viewed as irrational and primitive reactions to abusive labour conditions (Salillas, 1896). Nevertheless, the most mentioned features of this part of the population were pauperisation, malnutrition, illiteracy and unhealthy living conditions.

This made the burden of the responsibility fall to the so-called “neutral classes” (Costa, 1898-1901/1981), i.e., those capable -because of their attitude, sensitivity and knowledge- to lead the reformation. They were the smaller businessmen, the intellectuals, scientists, and other social agents that -as the Regenerationists themselves- were ready to leave aside their personal interests to collaborate in a reformation addressed to the country as a whole. Costa again managed to provide a successful slogan for the needs of the time. “School and larder” was a motto that called for effective action in the areas of the professional expertise of Regenerationists: economics and education.

Altamira was adamant in calling on the responsibility of the enlightened elites for leading the dispossessed, and was also the one who most emphasised education as the main goal. He meant not just the reformation of the public system, but also the development of the so-called University Extension, in which university students will travel around the country carrying cultural activities for the education of the workers that he thought would be as effective as “the school and the workshop to prepare them for the social, national endeavour that needs their concourse”. (Altamira, 1917/1998; p. 183).

Education was to be the main road to nationalisation. The different social others depicted in the Regenerationists’ discourse should eventually join in the final stage of a harmonic Spanish nation state. But education was a political battleground in which the different ideological and political agents of the Restoration period were fighting to enlist the new generations². As a result, rather than closing the gap, the split between these different ‘others’ grew bigger. Their differences, now enlotted with arguments of the discourses of the new ideologies of the first decades of the 20th Century, was the feeding ground for the development of the conflicting identities of the Two Spains that fought the Civil War (1936-39).

² The conservative forces, and the Catholic Church were also very active in educational reform, although their worry was to reserve secondary education for the upper class layers of the population and maintaining the ideological monopoly of conservative Catholic ideology (see Puelles, 1980 for a review).

The intranational Other. The Regenerationists could tailor their particular historical Anti-Spain without risking their view of the nation state. It may change its shape but its integrity was not at risk. They thought the danger may come from a different quarter: the attempts to build other national entities within the Spanish territory. At the same time that the Regenerationists were struggling to make use of European nationalist ideas in order to make a modern state from the ruins left by the old Spanish Empire. There were also some Basque and Catalan writers, such as Sabino Arana or Prat de la Riba, who were attempting the same in their home regions (see Ucelay-Dacal, 2003; Juaristi, 1997). If they were to succeed the national integrity would be threatened, and Spain at the best would be a nation of nations, and in the worst a nation different to that of the Basques and the Catalans.

The construction of this particular other was particularly complex. It has to be said that all the Regenerationists were from peripheral regions of the Country. Some of them were even native speakers of their vernacular languages (e.g., Basque for Unamuno, and Catalan for Altamira). They claimed that regional peculiarities were a sign of the differences within the nation state, not only in customs and manners but also in socio-economical and moral development. However, these differences should be bridged by a common program. All the regions should

“... get together in the beautiful and great common labour of reviving the common mother country; Aragon will give its indomitable impulse, Castille its tireless endurance, Cantabria its energy, Galicia its patient laboriousness, Andalusia its tonic humour, Valencia its agility, and Catalonia and the Basque Country their guidance and leadership, since they are better equipped for this enterprise” (Macías, 1899/1992; p. 335).

Besides the regional diversity, and the possible centrifugal forces that could be unleashed, there was another disturbing other: the so-called Spanish individualism -, pointed out by Ganivet (1897/1996), Morote (1900) or Mallada (1897/1996) - which carried within it an antipathy and enmity to the neighbouring regions. The loss of the last colonies had loosened the interregional ties, providing an opportunity for some regionalist agents to design new collective identities and promote egoistical political interests. Altamira (1917/1997) was particularly concerned by this issue and, together

with Maeztu (1899/1997) and Morote (1900), warned about the dangers of historical and anthropometrical arguments geared to the promotion of regionalisms. It was here where there was another Other which could produce the braking of the nation.

When taking into account the international front, the Regenerationists realised that only a strong nationality could survive. Some of them suggested that this role could be played by the political entity created by the Catholic Kings (Ferdinand and Isabella) centred around the Kingdom of Castille. But it was only some years later when some literary authors - mainly Azorín, Machado, and the late Unamuno -, the philosopher Ortega y Gasset, and the historian Menéndez Pidal, came to idealise Castille as the central core of the country (*vid.* Moron, 1998). But this was a deviation from the original Regenerationists' idea of forging a common identity.

The international other. Western Europe was the mirror in which the Regenerationists wanted their country to be reflected. England, Germany and France were taken as the model of modernity, progress and social welfare, the summit of Western civilisation. Thus a substantial part of the reforms they posed had the goal of reaching the level of development in these countries. In addition, this general goal was intertwined with a personal biographical dimension: they admired the social acknowledgement and relevance that scientists and intellectuals enjoyed in these countries and the international projection they had. But this admiration was not blind. They took as their task to preserve what was peculiar of Spain as the cement to keep together the elements of the identity they were attempting to devise. Thus they warned as much against the temptation of dissolving the country's identity and merging with this Other in a sort of vague cosmopolitanism -under the name of humanity, socialism, fraternity, or whatever-, as against a blind imitation of imported political, administrative or educational models. They took some institutions and ideologies (self-government, democracy, liberalism, etc.) as possible useful tools for their purposes, but never beyond their applicability in the contemporary state of the country. Some aspects of the international Other were worthy to be used as a model, but never at the price of losing one's own soul in the process. That is why Altamira advocated for the creation of grants that facilitated young Spaniards to study abroad, rather than employing imported methods and professors. He recommended these grants to be awarded not too early in the students' career, and to be long enough so they could thoroughly acquire useful knowledge, but limited in time, so that an excessive adherence to foreign Otherness could be avoided.

The international Other had aspects to be admired, but it also had to be resisted. It was a dangerous competitor in the international sphere, as well as a possible threat to the national identity. This threat showed itself acutely vis-à-vis the colonial question. This was the time of the high tide of imperialism. The prestige of the main powers was played in a colonial race, justified by the Spencerian philosophy that placed on the hand of the civilized the responsibility of bringing “the primitives” to a better state. To be cast away from the colonial race was an insult to national pride. It was not only that the Spanish Pacific Archipelagos (Marian and Caroline Islands) had to be sold to Germany (1899), because of the impossibility of defending them, or that the US took advantage of the weakness after the defeat, also adding Guam and the Philippines to their bounty. It was also that Spain was left aside in the colonial distribution of Africa, with only a tiny colony in the Guinean Gulf (Equatorial Guinea). Even the Spanish interests in its immediate neighbour, Morocco -within the Spanish area of influence since the beginnings of modernity-, were threatened, first by the Germans (Tangiers crisis, 1904) and then by the French. The Algeciras Conference (1905) solved the crisis splitting the Moroccan sultanate into a French protectorate (the South with rich agricultural lands and all the main cities), and a Spanish one (the small, poor, mountainous, and bellicose Rif). However, the colonial question was not a motive of great concern to the Regenerationists, since they were advocating in favour of an internal retreat in order to put matters in order at home. It was a part of the political, ideological and economical struggles of the time, when the Spanish army was looking desperately for a war to clean their name after the 1898 defeat. The result was a long and bloody colonial war in Morocco, that eventually finished off the Bourbon Restoration régime, fed a growing Republican opposition and helped to pave the way to the Civil War (1936-39). But these events belong to the first third of the 20th Century.

Before and after the Cuban War (1898) the Regenerationists shared with the rest of Spaniards a dislike for the Anglo-Saxons, who were portrayed as materialists, egoistic and exploiters of their colonies, features that were taken to belong to Protestantism, that then acted as a sort of synonym to the Anglo-Saxon culture. In contrast, the Spanish were pictured as idealist, generous, and detached, characteristics that the most conservative regenerationism (Ganivet, 1897/1996; Isern, 1899) took as typical of the ecumenical character of Catholicism. Anglo-Saxon colonisation was considered as predatory by the Regenerationist, while the Spanish disposition towards colonisation was presented as giving concern to education, to the expansion of culture

and, therefore committed to a truly civilising enterprise. It was this view what contributed to the fact that many decades after the loss of the American empire, there was still hope that

“our language, culture, art, genius and spirit of the race, will prevail and be the *raison d’être* within the Planet of a Spain, the greatest Spain, mental and moral mother- country of eighteen nationalities, of nearly a whole continent, of a world politically separated from us, but which thinks and cherishes the same things as their Augustus mother, because when speaking, writing, laughing, singing, loving, they have to use the Castillian language” (Morote, 1900; p. 570).

This quotation is representative not just of an identity that goes beyond the borders of a particular political entity, it also concealed a concern for the survival of a wider identity. Many Regenerationists identified themselves with other Latin countries defeated at war, such as France was by Germany at Sedan (1870). What was at risk was not only the loss of colonies, but the annihilation of the Latin culture by the Anglo-Saxons. But the advocated strategy may seem naïve. Altamira (1917/1997), Morote (1900) or Unamuno (1895/1996) discredited war-mongerism as incoherent with the *Zeitgeist* of modernity. Morote even resorted to Herbert Spencer (an Anglo-Saxon) when calling for the supremacy of the rule of law, the market and science in order to counter-attack some Spanish militarist tendencies, which were pictured as belonging to a barbaric socio-historical stage already overcome.

But this naivety may be more strategic than sincere. On the one hand their linking of scientific and technological progress with success at war was not infrequent. It was a generally-agreed opinion that the Spanish Navy was sunk by American schools rather than by the guns of the US Navy. This may be the reason why the Regenerationists were concerned in leaving aside past imperial glories and performing a strategic retreat to look for the real self of the country. As Ganivet said, paraphrasing St. Augustine, “*Noli foras ire, in interiore Hispaniae habitat veritas*” (Ganivet, 1897/1996; p. 131).

It seems that Lord Salisbury’s words hit their target, in spite of the explicit protests of Maeztu (1899/1997) and Morote (1900) against them. The international Other was too strong to be opposed. The only possible tactic was to follow the ways of the law, the market, science and education, which were the only way out of their current

problems, international as well as national. This view had the added value of securing them as the only group able to lead the country into the future.

By way of conclusion: The 19th century intellectual and the construction of the modern nation state.

The Renerationists' crisis, that merged personal biographies with the national collective, rather than unusual, was typical of the 19th century intellectuals. They were placed within the identitarian crossroads where the new nation-states were being shaped. This is what makes this period a privileged landscape for the study of Otherness in historic situated self – experiences.

The nation state was the then preferred socio-political model for the social agents that attempted to get rid of the old absolutist monarchies and empires. Every social reorganisation that followed a revolutionary (or antirevolutionary) outburst resorted to theoretical contributions which putted together concepts borrowed from new disciplinary fields (*Geist*, collective psychology, race, etc.) and the emerging nationalistic ideology (nationality, state, people, etc.) developed by authors such as Fichte, Renan or Sergi³. The new disciplines provided new genealogical and ontological arguments (the history of humanity and the national histories displaced Sacred History, and divine intervention changed into the spontaneity and continuities of natural evolution), which facilitated the exploration of subjectivity, and therefore opened the floor for its manipulation. The result was the “invention” of the subject and its management (Foucault, 1966, 1975). On the other hand, the emergent nationalism claimed for a defence of the singularity and integrity of a collective self that had to face some possible others, which so appeared as counter-figures for the design of one's own collective identity. In sum, a new social model emerged, one that had to be carefully designed to manage the mismatches between specialization and homogenisation that arose within a system that favoured the free exchange of material and symbolic commodities.

³ These three authors are instrumental for mapping a quick genealogy on the role of the Other for the construction of the National. Napoleonic imperialism is the implicit Other for the Germany vindicated by Fichte (1808/1995). Renan (1882/1934) explicitly mentioned Prussian Germany pointing out the reason why this Other cannot take the place of French national self. Lord Salisbury could also occupy a place in this genealogy when he differentiated between living and dying nations, and so established an asymmetrical Other. However there is not a perception of an Other dangerous enough to put at risk the survival of one's own nation until the Italian Sergi (1900/1901) proclaimed the degeneration of Latin nations.

This makes us to believe that the nation state provided the discursive and practical laboratory where the self could take some historical-cultural depth and, at so was able to start thinking itself as an Other (see Ricoeur, 1990), or rather as a set of some possible others. This new scenery multiplied the fronts for experiencing otherness, and so making possible a fragmented subject or, as Gergen (1991) puts it, the “saturated self” that social sciences – and psychology- have been dealing with since the beginning of the 19th Century. In other words, Western modern development produced a subject in a permanent state of crisis (Blanco, 2002).

There are many fronts for Otherness and the fragmentation of the modern subject; we will focus here on three of them: the breaking of empires into nations; the braking of states into social classes; and the braking of individuals into socio-cultural roles. Each of them defined different subjective-identity alternatives as zones for experiencing life, and so have a potential for the estrangement of the individual. It is in the intersection between these three fronts, where the situated experience of Otherness we had been exploring so far – that of the 19th Century intellectual - shows its significance. They were interesting characters, their socio-cultural position placed them in a peculiar experiential position where they had to negotiate the consciousness of the interlink between their personal biography and identity with that of their collective, and consequently devise strategies to manage this connection. When dealing with these three fronts of Otherness, their particular position took them to a) produce a theory of the nation state – to which they belonged; b) to claim for the substitution of the old ruling elite for a new technocratic class – of which they were a part; and c) to assume the distribution and management of the new socio-cultural roles – that they shared. Their position in this crossroad left some traces in their identity which were as apparent in their public activities as in their private lives.

These intellectuals felt compelled to play the social role of the collective consciousness of their country, so much in the analysis and diffusion of knowledge (cognitive) as in a directive (executive) function. They felt responsible of the (performative) creation of a wide identity zone, an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983). To reach this goal with no harm to the social structure, they deployed a wide set of mediational means (Wertsch, 1991; Cole, 1996) for the interpretation of their social world, for disseminating and implementing the views they developed, and for calling to a collective identification and action in the direction they signalled. These mediational means were taken from the realms of politics and education, and their effective

diffusion should be done through the press and the publishing industry, which then were the main instruments for the creation of the “imagined community”. However, being illiterate the great mass of the population, this strategy failed. Thus, the collective self that had to be instilled, and the Others from which people had to learn to distinguished themselves, never came to be known by the public to whom these products were addressed. As happened during the Peninsular War against the French (1808-1814), the experience of Otherness was only possible before an immediate physical presence, and not just by purely symbolic means (Álvarez Junco, 2001). Spanish intellectuals had to fight with huge communication difficulties, in addition to competing with the alternative identity offered by another directive elite with a more immediate communication with the common people: the Catholic Church.

However, it is the private dimension what is our major concern here. It is in the intellectuals of this period where we find the most interesting case of identity crisis in modernity. We believe that the kaleidoscopic nature of the identity they had to negotiate, can be disentangled following Ricoeur’s (1990) dialogue between *selfhood* and *sameness*: self as identical to the others, and self as identical to itself.

When referring to self as identical to the others (*selfhood*), the great variety of possible groups of belonging has to be taken into account. The intellectual viewed himself as a member of a harmonic community, at the same time that believed he belonged to an elite, to an *intelligentsia* that claimed a leading role before two different Others: the ignorant populace, and the traditional ruling classes. But this dual adscription needed to be included within a longer trajectory spanning into the past and the future; i.e., he had to identify himself with agents of the historical past and hoped that in the future other people will continue his task. As Bruner (1990) says, narratives are the best way to decant acts of identification, to incorporate and reject the relevant Others.

When looking at the self as identical to itself (*sameness*), we can see how the intellectuals changed his actions throughout his life span. They played different socio-cultural roles and wore different persona masks in diverse circumstances. In the case of the Spanish Regenerationists we can see continuities when press articles are compiled in monographic volumes (Unamuno, Maeztu, Almirall, Altamira), or when revised editions of old books appeared (Altamira). But there were also discontinuities, when some of them rejected a part of their own production because later on in time they considered them as immature, banal or simply wrong (Maeztu, Unamuno). In the latter

cases, they did not recognised themselves in what they said before, and forced their original discourses to adapt to a new life perspective.

When these two sides of the self are taken into account, it seems clear that the 19th century intellectual is not just one more of the different social roles and functions that Adam Smith linked to the growing complexity and specialisation of modern culture. This intellectual is a character whose added value is in his pretended capability to be aware of the braking of classical subjectivity and the collapse of the individual. From his watch tower he seemed to glimpse the crossroads between the historical, the national, the social, the local, or the professional realms as arenas on which selfhood and otherness clashed in different manners. The very idea of the subject, the unified experiential self, appeared as affected by an unsolvable crisis. The impossible task they took upon themselves was that of mending the rips that the criss-cross of different Otherness had caused on the intimate, transcendental or psychological subject of the Kantian tradition.

Paradoxically, these intellectuals were the epitome of the saturated self. They volunteered to produce new foundations for subjectivity, but they were not able to unleash their own lives and identities from the enterprise they endeavoured. Their attempt could not succeed in a time when social roles and functions exponentially increased as new identity zones intersected, and so the number of professional managers of private and public identities (politicians, professionals of the health and educational services, the leisure industry, etc.) also did. In any case, the 19th Century intellectual is indubitably one of the braking points in the genealogical theorisation of Otherness.

The purpose of this chapter has been to examine how Otherness emerged in a particular historical time when other selves started to be objectified and theorised; when the estrangement before what it is not *me* began to produce hypothesis for action. This was a phenomenon with a long tradition of study in philosophy that goes as far back as Aristotle, but it was in the 19th Century, when a new existential unrest marked the appearance of the modern individual, and collective subjectivity came to the forefront. Otherness appeared in the centre of the crossroads between intersubjectivity and the encounter with the Other, and this made theorising about Other to become a culturally relevant issue. It will be in the 20th Century when G. H. Mead's and Vygotsky's psychologies – as well as Schütz's, and Berger & Luckman's phenomenological sociologies –addressed the generalised presence of the other and its interiorisation through socio-institutional strategies devised for this purpose. But there is still a long

journey ahead to map the genealogy of Otherness as a theorisation of the culturally relevant Other. A task that requires the detection of relevant dimensions of Otherness in critical moments of the past (e.g., vis-à-vis the development of nationalism) and the exploration of the transformations currently under way.

References

- Almirall, V. (1889/1983) *España tal como es*. [Spain as it is]. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Altamira, R. (1902/1997) *Psicología del pueblo español*. [Psychology of the Spanish People]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Álvarez Junco, J. (2001) *Mater Dolorosa. La idea de España en el siglo XIX*. [‘Mater Dolorosa’. The Idea of Spain in 19th century] Madrid: Taurus.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Asín, R. (1997) La psicología del pueblo español, Introducción a R. Altamira [Psychology of the Spanish People, Introduction to R. Altamira], *La Psicología del Pueblo Español*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva. pp. 17-38.
- Blanco, F. (1997) El lugar del discurso psicológico en la Institución Libre de Enseñanza: la psicología y la renovación de la conciencia nacional. [The place of the psychological discourse in the Free Institute for Learning: psychology and renovation of the national mind]. F. Blanco (ed.) *Historia de la Psicología Española. Desde una Perspectiva Socio-Institucional*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Blanco, F. (2002) *El cultivo de la mente: un ensayo teórico-crítico sobre la cultura psicológica*. [The culture of the Mind: a theoretical-critical essay about psychological culture]. Madrid: Antonio Machado.
- Bruner, J. (1990) *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Castro, J. (2004) *La Psicología del Pueblo Español. El Papel del Discurso Psicosociológico en la Construcción de la Identidad Española en torno a la Crisis del 98*. [The Psychology of the Spanish People. The Role of the Psychological Discourse in the Construction of the Spanish Identity during the Crisis of 1898]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Cole, M. (1996) *Cultural Psychology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Costa, J. (1898-1901/1981) *Reconstitución y europeización de España y otros escritos* [Reconstitution and Europesation of Spain]. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios de Administración Local.
- Costa, J. (1901/1998) *Oligarquía y caciquismo*. [Oligarchy and Petty Tyranny]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Foucault, M. (1966) *Les mots et les choses, une archéologie des sciences humaines*. París: Editions Gallimard. [Alan Sheridan (tr.) *The Order of Things, an Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1970]
- Foucault, M. (1975) *Surveiller et punir*. París: Editions Gallimard. [Alan Sheridan (tr.) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon, 1977]
- Fox, I. (1997) *La invención de España*. [The Invention of Spain] Madrid: Cátedra.

- Ganivet, A. (1897/1996) *Idearium Español*. [*Spanish Idearium*]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Fichte, J.G. (1808/1995) *Reder an de Deutsche Nation*. [*Discourses to the German Nation*]. Hamburg: Felix Meiner
- García Cárcel, R. (1992). *La leyenda negra: Historia y opinión*. [The Black Legend: History and Opinion] Madrid: Alianza.
- Gergen, K. (1991) *The Saturated Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Isern, D. (1899) *Del desastre nacional y sus causas*. [*The National Disaster and its Causes*]. Madrid: Imprenta de la viuda de M. Minerva de los Ríos.
- Juaristi, J. (1997) El bucle melancólico. Historias de nacionalistas vascos. [*The Melancholic Turn. Histories of Basque nationalists*] Madrid: Espasa.
- Juliá, S. (2004) *Historia de las dos Españas*. [*History of the Two Spains*]. Madrid: Taurus.
- Macías Picavea, R. (1899/1992) *El problema nacional*. [*The National Problem*] Madrid: Fundación Banco Exterior.
- Maeztu, R. (1899/1997) *Hacia otra España*. [*Towards another Spain*] Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Mallada, L. (1890/1989) *Los Males de la Patria*. [*The Diseases of the Mother Country*] Madrid: Fundación Banco Exterior.
- Morón, C. (1998) *El "Alma de España". Cien años de inseguridad*. [*The "Soul of Spain". A Century of Insecurity*] Madrid: Ediciones Nobel.
- Morote, L. (1900) *La moral de la derrota*. [*The Moral of the Defeat*]. Madrid: Imprenta G. Juste.
- Puelles, M. de (1980) *Educación e ideología en la España contemporánea (1867-1975)*. [*Education and Ideology in Contemporary Spain (1867-1975)*]. Barcelona: Labor.
- Renan, E. (1881/1934) *Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?*. [*What is a Nation?*]. París: R. Helleam
- Ricoeur, P. (1990) *Soi-même comme un autre*. París: Éditions du Seuil. [*Oneself as Another*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992]
- Salillas, R. (1898) *El delincuente español. Hampa (Antropología picaresca)*. [*The Spanish criminal: underworld life*]. Madrid: Imp. G. Juste.
- Sergi, G. (1900/1901) *La Decadencia de las Naciones Latinas*. [*Decadente of Latin Nations*]. Barcelona: Antonio López-Librería Española.
- Suárez, M. (eds.) (2000) *La crisis del estado liberal en la Europa del sur*. [*The crisis of the Liberal State in the South of Europe*]. Santander: Sociedad Menéndez Pelayo.
- Tuñón de Lara, M. (2000) *La España del siglo XIX*. [*Spain in XIXth Century*] Madrid: Akal.
- Tusell, J. (1998) *Historia de España en el siglo XX. I. Del 98 a la proclamación de la República*. [*History of Spain in XIXth Century. I. From 1898 to the Proclamation of the Republic*] Madrid: Taurus.
- Ucelay-Dacal, E. (2003) *El imperialismo catalán: Prat de la Riba, Cambó, D'Ors y la conquista moral de España*. [*The Catalan Imperialism: Prat de la Riba, Cambó, D'Ors and the Moral Conquest of Spain*]. Barcelona: Edhasa.
- Unamuno, M. (1895/1996) *En torno al casticismo*. [*About Traditionalism*]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Wertsch, J. (1991) *Voices of the Mind*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wulff, F. (2003) *Las esencias patrias. Historiografía e historia antigua en la construcción de la identidad española (siglos XVI-XX)*. [*The patriotic essences*.

Historiography and Ancient History in the Construction of Spanish Identity].
Barcelona: Crítica.