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ABSTRACT

This study analysed the reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao in the Basque nationalist newspapers Egin and Diario Vasco. I was looking at differences/similarities between the newspapers, and at how argumentation changed over time (1997/1998), drawing upon content analysis, discourse analysis of the ideological themes in the reporting and an in-depth analysis of two editorials, one in Spanish and one in Basque. The content analysis confirmed that economy and Basque culture/identity were highly controversial themes; and that in 1998 the museum became more accepted. An analysis of rhetorical strategies e.g. quantification rhetoric for economic predictions; vagueness/evasiveness to portray the Basques' reception of modern architecture/art, permitted the examination of intragroup/intergroup models of interaction, strategies and underlying ideological dilemmas (Billig et al, 1988). After the inauguration, Diario Vasco claimed that the museum was concerned with Basque modern art, while Egin maintained a cautious distance. The in-depth comparative analysis of political rhetoric in two Egin's editorials, reporting similar events in Basque or Spanish, confirmed that the use of these different languages involves different construction of the readership; and different strategies to convey communality between writer/reader. In the Basque language editorial, communality was cautiously constructed until an assertive we Basques stressed search of unity, differentiation, and sovereignty: conflict/differences between Basques were omitted, backgrounded or ironized, while differences with the Spanish foregrounded. In the Spanish editorial, an impersonal third person tone avoided using the rhetoric of we. Specific Basques were blamed for the repression of Basque secessionism. A dramatic tone suggested subtle criticism against ETA, yet implying that it was reasonable to include ETA among the human victims. The explicit nation state's deixis in the Spanish editorial implied Spain was the nation state. In the Basque context the nation state's deixis was ambiguous: we Basques might be used to address Basques beyond French-Spanish boundaries, suggesting a long-term representation/project that imagined Basqueness beyond its present-day administrative division or actual political influence. The implications of such fine detail differences were discussed.

Key words: Guggenheim Bilbao Museum, ideological discourse analysis, political rhetoric, ideological dilemmas, Basque language, Basque nationalist press, artistic/cultural policymaking, Basque history.
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Chapter one

Introduction

Bilbao is at present-day considered a prototypical case of urban regeneration and many studies have pointed out that the implantation of a symbol of international and cosmopolitan avant-garde like the Guggenheim Bilbao, and specially the spectacular building designed by the architect Frank Gehry, triggered what has been depicted, not without some irony, as the “Miracle of Bilbao” (Herbert Muschamp, “The Miracle in Bilbao”, New York Times Magazine, September 7, 1997, pp. 54-59). In the early 1990’s both sides in the partnership, the Guggenheim Museum of New York and the city of Bilbao were going through very serious, respectively, financial and industrial crises; and from the beginning the Guggenheim Bilbao was perceived as a highly risky enterprise. In the domain of the social sciences, the topic has drawn the attention mainly of anthropologists and historians. They have generally depicted the Guggenheim Bilbao project in the line of the narrative of literature on globalization. Subsequently, the Guggenheim Bilbao has been described as an instance of the contemporary trend towards gradual cultural homogenization that reinforces the dependency of the periphery in relation to a center that controls the dissemination of hegemonic discourses on politics, culture and economy (Van Der Bly, 2005).

Occasionally discourse analysts have studied this contemporary trend of the discursive creation of “World-Cities’, like Hong Kong (Flowerdew, 2004), which local policymakers’ discourses built up as centres of high technology, tourism, trade, banking finance, avant-garde artistic expression, etc., of which the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum (GBM) seems to constitute a typical case. Yet, these phenomena have seldom been studied from a social psychological perspective.

At the same time, it is well-known that the Guggenheim Bilbao was inaugurated at the heart of a city in which the Basque nationalist Party was founded; and the Basque Country was a place that had been for decades reported in the international mass media mainly because of ETA militias’ sometimes spectacular bomb attacks, killings, etc. From abroad, it has been observed that in the Guggenheim Bilbao can be found a complex narrative in which aspects of regional identity, political symbolism and international tourism overlap (Jarzombek, 2001, p. 18).
It can be noted that two aspects of the negotiation to set up a Guggenheim Museum in the Basque autonomous region's financial/industrial capital put Bilbao, if not necessarily in the map of international tourism, at least in the spotlight of the international media. First, that the Guggenheim Museum Corporation opened a new museum in a particular place where one of the most active European stateless combined autonomist and secessionist nationalisms was very influential. Second, that the ruling autonomist nationalists were the main promoters of the very expensive project that would be, largely, financed by Basque taxpayers.

A survey of the Basque nationalist press shows how before the Guggenheim Bilbao's inauguration the Basque nationalist daily press reported the museum’s planning and opening drawing upon specific economic and cultural predictions; and how the choice of selectively quoting diverse policymakers’ utterances, and the rhetoric embedded in such utterances, reflected different positions on the debate. The aim is to study this particular conjuncture in which significant discursive shifts took place involving economic and cultural predictions and arguments on the Guggenheim Bilbao. Overall, the newspapers’ reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao involved rhetoric deployed by policymakers to depict and sell the Guggenheim Bilbao as a success and a legitimate project; and of the alternative counter-discourse that the museum would be a failure, and that would have a negative cultural impact. Drawing upon a three-level content and qualitative analysis I looked at underlying ideological dilemmas in the Basque newspapers’ reporting of the debate over the GBM, and at how discourses, positions and meanings changed over time. Special consideration was given to the nationalist newspapers’ and agents/participants’ strategies to tackle the difficulty to address to differently perceived audiences in a general context shaped by international modernity, heteroglossia and ideological dilemmas. Particularly, a fine-grain qualitative analysis of political rhetoric that compared two Egin’s editorials’, respective, use of Basque and Spanish to refer to the same events confirmed that different languages constituted different rhetorical contexts. It also permitted to verify that diverse strategies to construct the necessary communality between the newspaper and its imagined readership were framed by different representations of what it is to be Basque; who are included/excluded from such Basqueness; and where it is located the boundary between us and the others. In addition, it will be pointed out that discursive change and the museum’s gradual acceptance was facilitated by a wider specific political conjuncture of rapprochement of Basque nationalist parties, and positive Basque economic growth rates in the late 1990’s. It is necessary to stress that the author of this thesis has tried to reflexively be aware of the effect of his own
biography, place, and constructed representations of self and others for the theoretical and methodological choices; and of how all this has shaped his own relatively distant, but ideologically positioned, understanding and analysis of discourses and rhetoric involving the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum’s debate. My own standpoint is favourable to Basque identity assertiveness, which I view as potentially expressing a minority ethnic/national group’s search of autonomy and as an alternative to the dominant ideological tradition of nation states. I acknowledge the importance of the nation state and nationalist ideology in the shaping of the main Basque nationalist political parties, and in the modern Basque politics that put forward projects of Basque secessionism or autonomy adopting available models of nationalist ideology. However, at present day I do not see myself as partisan of either model of Basque nationalism. My position is that Basque nationalist parties are only the tip of the iceberg of Basque identity and politics. Therefore, I decided to focus also e.g. on examples of Basque associativism that could be unrelated to Basque nationalism, and which I consider pivotal to understand how the ongoing revival of Basque identity, language and culture, was achieved without a Basque modern state.

Even if my thesis describes how throughout 1997 and 1998 the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao gradually cooled off, and this is reflected in the Basque nationalist press’ reporting, still in 1999 I experienced a personal episode of conflict related to the debate. It happened as a result of my own position as someone who went to visit the Guggenheim Bilbao, and did not criticize it, but instead described positively some aspects of it. For many years I have been reflecting on that event, and my interest to understand the debate grew steadily as I started to seek information on the topic mainly in the Basque press. Looking at the reporting of ideologically differently positioned Basque nationalist press I wanted to detect the work of ideology and power in the clash of a variety of discourses. For such undertaking it was necessary to chronologically review how nationalist ideology spread mainly in Europe and how it was adapted to the Basque context and used by specific groups for their particular purposes. Drawing upon the insights of different literature on Basque history and nationalism, and the methodological and theoretical tools of discourse analysis, I aimed at examining the often implicit and taken for granted rules which prescribe what can be ‘said’ and ‘thought’ about the Guggenheim Bilbao’s economic and cultural repercussions for the Basques; and regarding the description of how the Basques relate with/view symbols of modern high culture like the Guggenheim Museum. In addition, I examined pragmatic narratives on the Guggenheim Bilbao that involved diverse versions on themes such as
Basque identity/culture, economy, modernity, and Basque identity rhetoric to examine and interpret the gradual process of dissemination, normalization and naturalization of the policymakers' version that the Guggenheim museum would have positive repercussions for the Basque economy, culture and avant-garde artists.

A main research question was whether the use of the discourse analysis tool-kit would throw light on the abovementioned discursive change in the Basque nationalist press. I expected it would permit to follow up the process of turning the Guggenheim Bilbao a less controversial issue, and to show how this change was achieved through a length negotiation between the relatively opposed ideologies of traditional Basque nationalism and left-wing Basque nationalism, under the implicit influence of the culture of Basque associativism and widespread common-sense assumptions or lived ideologies on Basque identity.

In addition, another question that this thesis wanted to address is how the presence of diverse and potentially contradictory views of Basqueness reflects on different types of more or less explicit types of we in the reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao debate. Further, I aimed at pointing out that this implicit variability in the Basque nationalist press' reporting of we discourses can be interpreted as provoked by conflicting views among Basque nationalists on the Basque identity's degree of separateness from the Spanish and French nation state naturalized ideologies. In that sense, a main concern of this thesis was to examine in the Basque press how diverse ideologically positioned agents discursively negotiated the Guggenheim Bilbao debate and its implications as an economic and avant-garde project for the Basque people. Such agents represented specific groups and political projects with uneven resources and power; and with diverse intragroup and intergroup interaction models. Their discursive acts were shaped by context-bound pragmatic choices informed by short, medium and long-term strategies and goals to achieve their differently imagined/projected Basque country. In the flow of discursive exchange and clash between diverse ideological constructions they contributed to reproduce or change the social status quo.
Overview of chapters

Chapter two provides a critical review of the literature on nationalist and ethnic/cultural movements, situated mainly in Europe, to answer to the question of why the Guggenheim Bilbao became a political issue. This chapter analyses the genesis of nationalist ideologies and their evolution from the eighteenth century era of Revolutions until present-day banal nation state and ethnic/cultural nationalisms. The chapter is structured as to compare both wider/general patterns of the dissemination of nationalist ideologies and their effect on the particular southern and northern Basque contexts; and thus its approach can be described as both sociological and historical. This chapter also focuses on the rapport between Basque associativism and cultural revivalism; and reviews the history and present-day evolution of Basque secessionist and autonomist movements. Finally, it provides a chronology of Basque modern painting/sculpture and discusses why the Guggenheim Bilbao became a highly controversial and politicized issue.

Chapter three reviews the main theoretical tenets and approaches adopted in the thesis. It presents diverse discourse analytic approaches to the use of language for political rhetoric; and emphasizes common grounds and differences between discursive psychology, critical discourse analysis and dialogical social psychology. It reviews the discourse analysts’ stress on language and thought as action oriented, and of discourse as construction of versions that can be challenged and need to be protected. However, it is pointed out that something that distinguishes the different ways to make discourse analysis is the different emphasis put on the context to explain events, agents and actions. This chapter also introduces the main theoretical and empirical background for the analytic chapters. It examines how discourse analysis can be used to study texts and news reports, and stresses the importance of looking at the workings of ideology in texts in the light of the broader socio-historical context. Therefore, the main characteristics of a dialogical psychology are outlined. It is suggested that the study of the ideological function of stereotypes regarding national or ethnic identity, and of the ideological dilemmas that are typical of modern relatively democratic/pluralistic societies, requires a combined approach that draws upon different insights of the ideological discourse analysis (IDA) and also from other social sciences.

Chapter four describes the content analysis procedure and the qualitative data used in this thesis.
A brief introduction outlines why the two Basque nationalist newspapers were chosen, the main hypotheses and the reasons why a classical content analysis was used to identify themes and agents/participants mentioned in the analysed newspapers. The chapters’ first section provides a quantitative overview of the corpus on which the comparative analysis of the newspapers was based. It describes the general list of types and numbers of news data from *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* in 1997 and 1998. In the second and third sections the general themes, such as economy, Basque identity/culture, politics, modernity/international culture, among others, are listed and described; as well as agents/participants who were mentioned or quoted in the Basque newspapers.

**Chapter five** presents the content analysis of the data in tables of frequencies and percentages focusing on general changes between the years 1997 and 1998. In the first section some general frequencies of the two newspapers are compared that provide orientation as to in which year the Guggenheim Bilbao was more mentioned and which themes were more reported on each newspaper. The second section provides an overview of changes on favourable, neutral and unfavourable references found in each newspaper, separately, comparing the years 1997 and 1998. The third section displays the results of the comparative analysis between the newspapers’ reporting’s favourable, neutral and unfavourable connotations, over the same period, also both in general and in relation to specific themes. Section five presents the results of the comparative analysis of themes and their favourable/neutral/unfavourable connotations reported in *Egin*’s Basque and Spanish language samples, and the differences over the two compared periods. Finally, the sixth section describes the results of the comparative analysis of who were mentioned or quoted, in which newspapers, and in which language, in 1997, as talking about a Guggenheim Bilbao related specific theme. First, this chapter served to confirm that there were significant general differences between the newspapers, with important shifts over the years 1997 and 1998, a process that is thoroughly analysed in chapter 6. Second, the content analysis highlighted that there were also significant differences within the same newspapers’ reporting of themes in Basque and in Spanish; and that some specific themes were more relevant for the Basque language readership: this is a question that required a fine-grain qualitative discourse analysis that is reported in Chapter 7.

**Chapter six** analyses how the discourses and rhetoric of diverse policymakers and Basque culture representatives were reported in the Basque daily press, and which was each newspaper's
underlying position and strategy behind the selective choice of quoting or describing others' opinions, while omitting other voices and versions. The first two sections analyse specific rhetoric used in the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao before the museum's opening, when the main argumentative clashes involved economic and cultural predictions. The third and fourth sections propose, respectively, a comparative qualitative discursive analysis of the Basque newspapers' strategies to deal with the rhetoric of the Guggenheim success, and the rhetoric of reconciliation between the Basque culture and the museum, which reflects an extreme discursive shift between the two periods on focus.

Chapter seven describes the comparative analysis of two editorials published in Egin that covered the same events of a frustrated bomb attack by ETA that caused a Basque policeman's death, and the forthcoming Spanish king and queen's visit to Bilbao to inaugurate the Guggenheim Museum. One of the editorials was written in Basque and the other in Spanish. Their discourses and rhetoric to suggest communality with the imagined audiences is framed by different representations/versions of what divides us and them, and reflects different implicit views on the Basques' rapport with the Spanish state. In sum, an in-depth qualitative analysis of political discourses and rhetoric was drawn upon to highlight the implications of the more/less explicit use of the personal pronoun we, and the presence/absence of the implicit Spanish state's deixis in descriptions of the events and active/passive agents.

Chapter eight draws together some of the empirical threads of the study of discourses and rhetoric that underpinned the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao, and its evolution over the analysed conjuncture; and proposes an interpretation of why the Guggenheim Bilbao ceased to be a very controversial and politicized issue. Finally, it comments on the benefits of combining content analysis, qualitative in-depth discourse analysis of particular texts, and the analysis of a bigger representative sample of texts to examine how meanings spread and change over time in the flow of argumentation.
Chapter two

The Guggenheim Bilbao and the Basque nationalisms:  
A political question

2.0. Introduction

This chapter aims at clarifying why the Guggenheim Bilbao became a highly politicized question in the Basque Country. In the modern international system of nation states, politics typically involves debate, negotiation and argumentative clashes between political parties, trade unions and individuals that represent different and often opposed interests and projects that they try to fulfil in the narrow realm of the nation state. Further, politics involves questions of power and freedom that are often unevenly distributed between majority and minority groups. What it is commonly known as Euskal Herria (the Basque Country) encompasses nearly 20,000 square kilometres: a cultural area in which part of the population speaks, or spoke, Euskera; and it includes territories that far from being united in a single political institution, are actually divided in three different parts, between two nation states: France and Spain. In the south, Navarre and the Comunidad Autónoma Vasca (CAV) are two distinct autonomous communities of Spain. In the northern Basque country there are three Basque provinces, but instead of forming a department on their own, the Basque provinces and the non-Basque territory of Béarn constitute the Department of Pyrénees Atlantiques. The administrative centre or préfecture of this département is Pau, which is not in the Basque Country either, since it is the capital of Béarn. The Guggenheim Bilbao project meant that the place chosen to place a symbol of international culture was Bilbao (the capital of Bizkaia), which was the biggest metropolitan area of the Comunidad Autónoma Vasca (CAV). Bilbao is also the city where moderate Basque nationalism was born and initially disseminated, far before it became the most voted party in the CAV from the 1980’s onwards. The Spanish Constitution of 1978 defines the CAV, as an autonomous territory which is part of Spain, and the influence of Spanish political parties is significant in the Basque elections. Nevertheless, the main promoters of the Guggenheim Bilbao project were the PNV policymakers; and thus the PNV is nowadays viewed by some as a bourgeois and modernizing
Basque nationalism that has challenged the established semi-federal nation state of Spain.

The Guggenheim Bilbao was opened in the site of one of the hottest stateless nationalist movements in Europe; which until then was more often reported in the international mass media as a region where the paramilitary guerrilla pro-Basque-secession group ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna/Basque homeland and freedom) was created and perpetrated terrorist attacks. One of the PNV policymakers' goals seemed to be to show that other important events were taking place in the Basque Country apart from ETA's activities. Nevertheless, the political context of conflicts/negotiations over questions such as the Basque national identity's assertion arose doubts about what would be the place of Basque cultural identity in the Guggenheim Bilbao (Guasch & Zulaika, 2005).

A main question that scholars have tried to answer was whether eventually local actors managed to indigenize the museum (McNeill, 2000), or whether the global had suffocated the local as many analysts pointed out (Guasch, 2005; Zulaika, 1997; 2005). This is why the Guggenheim Bilbao was depicted as a franchise or satellite museum of a galaxy McGuggenheim in the era of blockbuster exhibits (Zulaika, 2005, p. 167) that represented the Americanization of local culture. It is consensually agreed that the Basques took a high risk with an ambitious undertaking that would be funded by Basque taxpayers' money, but many observers have highlighted that the Basques' investment eventually turned out to be profitable and fulfilled the goals of Bilbao's urban development through the boom of the local service industry, boosted by the arrival of international tourists (Haacke, 2005, p. 118). This thesis aims at understanding how Basque social groups' and also nationalists' necessity to assert their power and freedom and to showcase it to the world transformed the Guggenheim Bilbao project. I shall also try to comprehend how the Basque nationalism became one of the hottest contemporary European stateless national movements. Therefore, this chapter proposes to make a survey of the emergence, transformations and implications of nationalist ideas mainly in the wider European context and in the Basque Country, including Navarre and the French Basque provinces.
2.1. The concept of nation: its historical evolution and dissemination

2.1.1. How modern is the concept of nation?

Two prestigious and influential intellectuals such as Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm have followed a main trend in the social sciences of claiming that the idea of ‘a nation’ is a modern creation. Both emphasised that a ‘nation’ is not a primary social entity, and that it has to be understood as part of a machinery or social engineering endeavour that emerged in the period of the nineteenth century’s liberal nation constructing project. Ernest Gellner (1983) defined nationalism as based on the principle that the national and political unity should be congruent, a conception which both Gellner and Hobsbawm stressed it was a novelty in the nineteenth century. A logical conclusion of this conception was the assumption that nationalism precedes nations.

Michael Billig (1995, p. 10) also adhered to the idea that nationalism was a modern idea at least in the sense that it provided previously unknown ways of imagining and talking about the world. In Banal Nationalism he dedicated a chapter to show how social-psychological theories were wrong to depict nationalism as a form of identity among others;

Nationalism is more than this: it is a way of thinking or ideological consciousness. In this consciousness, nations, national identities and national homelands appear as ‘natural’. Most crucially, the ‘world of nations’ is represented as a ‘natural’, moral order. This imagining of ‘us’, ‘them’, homelands and so on must be habitual or unimaginatively accomplished; yet, it also provides a complex way of talking about the world. Nationalism is not an inward-looking ideology, like the pre-modern ethnocentric outlook. It is an international ideology with its own discourses of hegemony. Thus, US presidents, in defending their own national interests, can claim to speak for universal interests, or for the whole world order. The voice of nationalism can employ ‘the syntax of hegemony’, which claims an ‘identity of identities’ (Billig, 1995, p. 10).

A main question that has often been addressed is how old are nations: Eric Hobsbawm (1992) suggested that, instead, the point to be addressed should be when the nation as a concept started
to be defined as we know it at present-day. He provided examples from modern nation states like Spain (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 14/15) that often were thought to be the oldest existing nation states; and demonstrated that the incorporation of the term nation to National Dictionaries arrived much later than it is commonly assumed;

The modern sense of the world is no older than the eighteenth century, give or take the odd predecessor (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 3).

Hobsbawm (1992) also pointed out that both objective and subjective criteria have often been deployed in order to define what it is a nation, and that the two ways are misleading. He proposed not to adopt an aprioristic definition of the nation.

The problem of which criteria to adopt has hindered efforts to date the nation. The question of when did nations appear has been haunting the study of nationalism, and particularly scholars such as Anthony D. Smith (2002). Among the elements that should be bore in mind to properly tackle the question of dating the nation, Smith (2002) underscored the symbolic and the institutional. He proposed that nations existed even before nation construction processes became a generalized mass phenomenon.

Scholars such as Smith (1982; 2002) and Connor (1994) partially adhered to the modernist thesis, but tended to criticize some aspects of this dominant paradigm. One of the modernist thesis’ main apostles was probably Gellner (1983); and there are two main pillars that support the modernist paradigm thesis that dates the ‘nation’ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The first is based on historical evidence that nationalism as a doctrine only became dominant in Europe and the Americas in the early nineteenth century. Second, is the assumption that nations and nationalism are mass phenomena and thus require mass mobilization in contexts in which nation states have reached a level of democratization and generalization of franchise. In other words, it is implied that the masses’ psychological aspects like beliefs, sentiments and attachment to the state, or nation, are important because ordinary people and common sense will determine the ‘nation’, as Connor (1994) postulates, or that an elite will educate and turn the masses self-conscious citizens of a nation that did not exist before (Gellner, 1983).
From a social constructionist viewpoint, Benedict Anderson saw nations as "imagined communities" (Anderson, 1983); and his insights have influenced much work on nationalism; as for instance the work of Hobsbawm (1992) and Billig (1995). This idea of nations as "imagined communities" adheres to the thesis that nations are modern creations related to enlightenment, rationalist secularism, and radical changes brought by technological innovation; and that it involved a process of social construction, although emphasis is put on the subjective aspects of imagining a community as a nation:

It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (Anderson, 1983, p. 6).

For Anderson (1983) nationalism is not based on objective criteria: a nation has to be imagined; but for Billig this idea that a nation is based on a subjective act of imagination is an oversimplification;

As will be suggested, there is a grain of truth in this 'subjective' way of conceiving nationhood. Nevertheless, it is an oversimplification. Psychological identity, on its own, is not the driving force of history, pushing nation-states into their present shapes. National identities are forms of social life, rather than internal psychological states; as such, they are ideological creations, caught up in the historical processes of nationhood (Billig, 1995, p. 24).

Technology innovations such as print permitted the flourishing in Europe of the novel and the newspaper in the eighteenth century (Anderson, 1983). He saw the print of newspapers and novels in the vernacular languages as a factor that was not isolated from the incipient capitalist form of production and social interaction, and from the existing cultural and linguistic diversity. All these elements rather influenced each other and provoked the spread of multiple ways of imagining the community or the nation;

Speakers of the huge variety of Frenches (...) became capable of comprehending one another via print and paper. In the process, they gradually became aware of the hundreds of thousands, even millions of people in their particular language-field, and at the same time that only those hundreds of thousands, or millions, so belonged. These fellow readers, to whom they were connected through print, formed, in their secular, particular, visible invisibility, the embryo of the nationally imagined community (Anderson, 1983, p.
In addition, Anderson (1983) argued that print-capitalism provided a new fixity to language and that the fact that seventeenth century texts are available to read in museums or libraries reinforced the perception that the nation was ancient, which is an essential ingredient of the subjective experience of the nation.

Benedict Anderson, like e.g. Hobsbawm (1992) and Kedourie (1966), was indeed very aware that the French Revolution had aimed at abolishing the Ancient Regime and at creating a new world that was assumed would impose enlightenment and rationalist secularism and leave the religious vision of fatalism, darkness and ignorance behind. The French Revolution was fought against the ancient conceptions of time, and the concept of nation provided the nation states with a sense of being the result of an immemorial past, and of having a limitless future;

Anderson argues that the nation is to be imagined as a unique entity in terms of time and space. It is imagined as a community stretching through time, with its own past and own future destiny: it is imagined across space, embracing the inhabitants of a particular territory. The temporal dimension ensures that all nations maintain a sense of their own history, which is no one else's (Billig, 1995, p. 70).

It is well documented the fact that the emergence of national states and the construction of national myths and stories have been two parallel processes (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). In the 1880’s Ernest Renan (1990) pointed out that the national construction of a tradition and a history involves also forgetting past historical events related to the use of violence to achieve religious and cultural unity and homogeneity. On his analysis of present-day nation states’ unnoticed nationalism, which he described as banal nationalism, Billig pointed out to the importance of this everyday process of simultaneously forgetting and remembering as the base of the construction and naturalization of national histories and myths:

Renan implied that intellectuals are involved in the creation of amnesia. Historians creatively remember ideologically convenient facts of the past, while overlooking what is discomfiting. Today, social scientists frequently forget the national present. The banal episodes, in which nationhood is mindlessly and countlessy flagged, tend to be ignored by sociologists. They, too, have failed to notice the flag in the forecourt. Thus, Renan's insight can be expanded: historians might forget their nation's past, whilst social scientists
can forget its present reproduction (Billig, 1995, p. 38).

Extreme modernist positions were represented e.g. by Ernest Gellner. As an alternative to these, the sociologist Smith (2002) emphasised the necessity to distinguish between ancient nations and the modern concept of nation as mass phenomena or 'mass nation', the latter being a concept that scholars such as Connor and Gellner embraced. Anthony D. Smith (2002) recognized that most nations are modern, but he was sure that not all of them. Therefore, he proposed to distinguish the two concepts of nation in both chronological and sociological terms. According to Smith a main difference between ancient and modern nations is that in the ancient nations only small parts of the population were deemed to be citizens and to have equal rights. By contrast, in modern nations all citizens are theoretically deemed to be equal, although the principle does not necessarily apply in practice. In other words, unlike in modern nations, in ancient nations culture was not standardized and public and did not belong to the community; culture was often segmented by class (Breuilly, 1993; Smith 2002, p. 66).

The argument that Smith (2002) wanted to put forward is that the French Revolution proposed a modern concept of nation, which as an ideology would since then compete with an already existing popular concept of nation that was explicitly rooted in ethnic links and based on a shared feeling of community and cultural distinctiveness. This ancient concept of nation would frequently be hidden underneath the rhetoric of the nation state and its abstract depiction of the nation; but later would gradually resurface through the influence of romanticist and historical renewal movements.

In this sense, Smith's stance can be considered to come closer to primordialists' such as anthropologist Armstrong (1982) who, like Smith, argued that in ancient times can be found strongly rooted ethnic communities that were aware of their distinctiveness, and that could be termed 'nations'. For perennialists and primordialists (Armstrong, 1982; Hastings, 1997), "nations antedated nationalism, and the concept of 'the nation' provided the basis for the ideology of nationalism" (Smith, 2002, p. 60). Further Smith (2002) adhered to the perennialist thesis that several ancient 'nations' already existed in a world in which different homologous communities recognized each other and interacted as nations. John Armstrong (1982) argued that several nations such as France and Spain became aware of their religious, ethnic, or imperial distinctiveness and created powerful myths of origins centuries before the advent of the formal
theory of nationalism. In addition, he pointed out that diverse myths brought to development of different styles and degrees of organization, centralization and bureaucratization; and thus to very different models of nation state.

2.1.2. The repressive use of the discourse of 'the nation'

In the previous subsection it has been pointed out that one of the main reasons why 'the nation' has been considered a modern concept is that it has risen in the wake of the late eighteenth century's revolutionary praxis. In this subsection it will be highlighted that the French Revolution and the American Revolution were both equally important; and that each of them conveyed qualitatively different projects of nation building with significant implications and consequences for the current representations of what a nation state stands for; and for diverse views on which means should be used to achieve national self-determination.

Eric Hobsbawm (1992) proposed that the best way to understand the nature of 'the nation' is to examine how the modern concept of nation was used in political and social discourse since the Age of Revolution and from the 1830's onwards, when the same word tended to simultaneously be drawn upon to mean different things;

The primary meaning of 'nation', and the most frequently ventilated in the literature, was political. It equated 'the people' and the state in the manner of the American and French Revolutions, an equation which is familiar in such phrases as 'the nation-state', the 'United Nations', or the rhetoric of late-twentieth-century presidents. Early political discourse in the USA preferred to speak of 'the people', 'the union', 'the confederation', 'our common-land', 'the public', 'public welfare' or 'the community' in order to avoid the centralizing and unitary implications of the term 'nation' against the rights of the federal states. For it was, or certainly soon became, part of the concept of the nation in the era of the Revolutions that it should be, in the French phrase, 'one and indivisible'. The 'nation' so considered, was the body of citizens whose collective sovereignty constituted them a state which was their political expression. For, whatever else a nation was, the element of citizenship and mass participation or choice was never absent from it (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 18/19).

Although contemporaries of the French Revolution, such as Condorcet, believed that the French Revolution would have never taken place if it did not have already witnessed the advent of the
American Revolution in the previous decade: the fact is that French intellectuals and political philosophers like Rousseau and Montesquieu had written elaborated political theories that would soon seduce scholars of several generations. Therefore, a myth was born mainly among European thinkers that the real and most influential Revolution was the one that took place in France; and the American Revolution tended to be put down as an event of comparatively minor importance (Arendt, 2004). A key difference between the French and the American Revolutions that Arendt underlined was the very different economic and political contexts to depart from. Hannah Arendt (2004) argued that the French Revolution had inherited an absolutist tradition; and that the Revolution turned 'the people' into the recipient of absolute power and authority, By putting the people in the place of absolute monarchy, and thus above a constitution or free agreement between different parts, the French revolutionaries made the mistake of reversing the ancient regime's system without altering a basic absolutist conception of power and politics. Robespierre and his partisans spread the dangerous idea that violence and terror would be instrumental to tackle the urgent "social question" of mass poverty and deprivation. Arendt (2004) insightfully underscored that the French revolutionaries did not want to know that the Revolution could only work in contexts of relative wealth in which the basic needs were quite covered and other sources of happiness could be duly valued such as freedom of speech and opinion, individual initiative, among others. The impact of the French Revolution's experience as an event made out of acts of violence, in which freedom was viewed as intrinsically linked to acts of destruction to achieve liberation, is a model that would later be partially borrowed by many national liberation movements, such as the famous case of the Soviet Revolution or even the Basque secessionist movements' paramilitary wing's (ETA's) acts of terrorism.

Further, the French revolutionaries adopted Rousseau's idea that "the nation" should represent the sovereign and absolute 'common will' of 'the people', and that the general will should prevail over any particular/individual will; and thus they proposed the government of the 'public opinion'. Arendt (2004) warned that there is a total lack of compatibility between the government of a unanimous 'public opinion' and the freedom of opinion. When the government of the 'public opinion' aims at turning all the opinions identical, and individual opinions are looked at with suspicion; it threatens and thwarts the expression of the ones who dare to oppose the reified tyranny of 'the people'.

In a similar line, Hobsbawm (1992) highlighted how much this abstract concept of territorial
nationalism that embodied the citizen's collective sovereignty, was linked to the idea of popular self-determination:

The equation nation = state = people, undoubtedly linked nation to territory, since structure and definition of states were now essentially territorial. It also implied a multiplicity of nation states so constituted, and this was indeed a necessary consequence of popular self-determination (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 19).

However, the idea of popular self-determination surfaced in the middle of much violence and repression perpetrated against ‘the people’ and the associations that they had created to express and support their plea for liberation. The Jacobin instrument of the centralist state actually served to the purpose of taking the power away from “the people” it claimed to represent; whereas drawing upon the discourse of the collective and general will that should prevail over the allegedly petty and selfish individual or group interests (Arendt, 2004). Therefore, all the revolutionary societies that the people’s and the groups’ own initiative had created in different provinces and territories of France were persecuted, eliminated or assimilated to the Jacobin centralizing machine. In the name of the revolution and the ‘general will’ the Jacobins imposed the monopoly of governmental power against the federal model and its divisions of powers.

As we shall see both the French and American Revolutions faced the urgent need of an absolute or divine legislation that would place the legislator outside and above his own laws (Arendt, 2004). The French revolutionaries placed ‘the people’s general will’ in the place of the absolute monarch; and the Americans managed to find a formula to avoid the oppressive absolutist tradition that European nations unwittingly reproduced. What really prevented the American Revolution from reproducing the European tradition was that when pilgrims arrived to the American soil they found a land full of material resources; and thus people managed to create their own ‘political civil bodies’ emancipated from the burden of European oppressive traditions (Tocqueville, 2006; Arendt, 2004). Unlike in France, where new constitutions were often written and soon discarded throughout the nineteenth century, which aggravated the post-revolutionary governments’ pervasive instability, in America the constitution’s authority and legitimacy was guaranteed by the very act of its foundation and was aimed to last. This foundation had been accompanied by the implicit idea that the same constitution could be constantly amended and improved; and that it was pointless to write a new constitution out of scratch whenever parts of it
were criticized by some, because the constitution represented God’s rationality and only God, not human beings or nature like in France, were above it (Arendt, 2004). To sum it up, the authority of the American constitution was underpinned by its capacity of being augmented/improved/implemented. At the time, both endeavours of founding something new with the idea of maintaining and actualizing it, were considered relevant and compatible. Thus, unlike the French revolution, the American Revolution was not perceived as an explosion of an irreversible movement of nature as typically biological and physical changes are conceived of (Arendt, 2004). Neither did the American Revolution aim at destroying the ancient regime to put ‘the people’ in the place of the absolute king (Arendt, 2004) as did happen in the French Revolution that placed ‘the people’s’ authority above the constitutions.

In contrast with the centralizing model that the Jacobin victory imposed in France, in the North American lands of abundance the fight against poverty and privileges was not perceived to be an urgent necessity at all. Hannah Arendt (2004) wrote that the real worth of America has not been political freedom or unrestricted “private initiative”, which she aptly argued, has begot mass poverty and lack of felicity in countries which did not have the same natural wealth that America had. For Arendt (2004) the real wealth of America has been the actual political freedom of speech and thought; of association and meeting, which Americans have generally enjoyed; despite their lack of elaborate theories to account for their original political praxis and philosophy. This weakness, stressed Arendt (2004), is what, in the long run, provoked that although what the Americans did was indeed a relatively successful Revolution it fall into obscurity and oblivion. Nevertheless, Arendt (2004) also suggested that the American Revolution had an impact on the “public spirit” that had been positively invaded by values that survived in the private realm, such as individual well being and civil liberties, which Arendt (2004) thought were part of the first political values of Revolution. She highly appreciated such values described as values of a Revolution that had been based on debate and negotiation within ‘public civil bodies’; and thus in principles such as the ethics of respecting the individual right to have different opinions and views.

That said, Arendt (2004) stressed that what made a difference was also that in North America the model of ‘felicity’ was underpinned by moderate government and by the adoption of Montesquieu’s principle of separation between executive, judicial and legislative powers, combined with a Federal and decentralized model of state (Tocqueville, 2006). The fathers of the
American Revolution aimed at avoiding what Arendt (2004) described as the typical instability of a form of government based on the sovereignty of the people's will which in praxis tends to be deprived from a basic spirit of public and individual freedom. In sum, North Americans created a mix form of government that was mainly concerned with turning the constitution something steady and enduring that can be reformed and implemented; that permits the expression of different opinions and interests within the system; and that serves to control possible excesses and arbitrariness of power (Tocqueville, 2006; Arendt, 2004). By contrast, in France the concept of the modern nation that developed within the Age of Revolution was imposed in the name of the 'general will' of a nation-people with common interests against the privileges of the ancien régime's ruling classes: the aristocracy and clergy. Within such conception ethnic differences were considered less relevant, and the spoken language, and ethnicity, were not taken as a criterion of nationality. As Hobsbawm noted, whether Gascons or Alsatians continued or not speaking their own languages and dialects did not in principle change or affect their status as members of the French people or nation, "even if for most Jacobins a Frenchman who did not speak French was suspect, and that in practice the ethnolinguistic criterion of nationality was often accepted" (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 21). In other words, familiarity and acquisition of the French language would soon become a pre-condition to access the condition of the French modern citizenship;

The French insistence on linguistic uniformity since the Revolution has indeed been marked, and at the time it was quite exceptional. (...) But the point to note is, that in theory it was not the native use of the French language that made a person French – how could it when the Revolution itself spent so much of its time proving how few people in France actually used it? – but the willingness to acquire this, among the other liberties, laws and common characteristics of the free people of France. In a sense acquiring French was one of the conditions of full French citizenship (and therefore nationality) as acquiring English became for American citizenship (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 21).

Eric Hobsbawm (1992) emphasized that French language in France had traditionally been just a functional administrative tool that served to unify statewide communication since the ordinance of Villers-Cotterets in 1539. The revolutionary regime would follow this historical model, and would turn the French language into a revolutionary device for bringing the truths of liberty, science and progress to all, ensuring the permanence of citizen equality and preventing of ancien régime hierarchy, as
it was for the Jacobins.” (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 103).

It was an obvious contradiction in French revolutionary ideology that claimed to represent a universal idea of nation and a universal language, but in practise imposed the particular language of a particular ethnic group to the whole. Billig (1995, p. 87/88) observed that as with any other kind of nationalism, French revolutionary nationalism included the contrary themes, which would soon become source of contradiction and would affect the evolution of nationalism. More specifically, in a territory characterized by huge cultural and linguistic diversity, a particular part of the French people used universalistic discourse in order to create a cultural unity in the territory and to impose it to the whole. That is, one part became the voice of the whole, a situation that Billig conceptualized as the use of the syntax of hegemony. The outcome of it would be that a dominant group would claim the right to represent France as a whole, drawing upon a universal discourse in order to exert the nation state's power (Lyotard, 1984). Therefore, other ways of being national and languages other than official French would be repressed, forgotten or ignored within France.

2.1.3. The concept of ‘the nation’ in the heyday of European capitalist development: the threshold principle’s praxis.

In 1815 Napoleon was defeated and in the Congress of Vienna the major victorious countries decided the rules that would determine political relations, boundaries and trade within Europe for the rest of the century and beyond (Hinsley, 1986). Anthony Giddens (1990) pointed out that this treaty assumed, for the first time, a principle that nowadays still determines global political order: state sovereignty is based on a mutual recognition among states that are similar in the sense that they are all similarly sovereign and each govern their respective communities. Thus, Billig (1995) saw here the outset of the international system of sovereign nations/states:

The Congress heralded not merely the era of the sovereign nation state, but that of the international system, in which each state officially recognizes the internal sovereignty of its neighbours (Billig, 1995, p. 83).

Hobsbawm (1992) analysed the reasons of the nineteenth century’s liberal bourgeoisie’s adhesion
to the territorial concept of nation and highlighted that at that epoch the world’s economy was rather international than cosmopolitan, and based on the colonialist expansion of some specific European nation states. In that sense, German economists were influenced by the ideas of Friedrich List, and they formulated the liberal concept of the nation. A main characteristic of this theory was the belief that a nation should have a size big enough to be considered viable as an economic unit. Like many contemporary others, the apostle of the ‘principle of nationality’, Giuseppe Mazzini was deeply influenced by the German economist ideas and supported what has been described by Hobsbawm (1992, p. 32/33) as the principle of the threshold.

Another consequence of the economist ideas’ influence in the liberal conceptualization of what it was a nation, and which territory and people were entitled to claim an independent nation state, was the view of national movements as expansion and unification. That is, liberal ideologues such as the economist John Stuart Mill assumed that smaller nationalities should merge with a bigger nation, or to constitute a bigger unit with another territory. Consequently, the acceptance of the criteria that an independent nation should be viable as a nation was informed by the implicit presupposition that the small languages and nationalities did not deserve to have an independent future, and thus should remain subordinate to the ‘real’ nations. By the second half of the nineteenth century, not only liberals, but also thinkers, like Engels, who were not hostile to the idea of national liberation assumed that the small nationalities did not have any future as independent nations (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 35). According to the liberal bourgeoisie’s view that differentiated between ‘real’ nations and nationalities, the French and Spanish Basque territories were doomed to remain regions of bigger nation states; and their culture and language a mere folkloric curiosity or, even worse, a fossil. This representation of Basques as collective victims of the laws of progress did not in principle imply any hostility against the Basque language and traditions, although these were thought deemed to gradually disappear. Nevertheless, explicit attempts to abolish smaller cultures and languages were rare in Europe until the end of the twentieth century with the exception of France (Hobsbawm, 1992). In practical terms there were three main criteria that qualified a nationality to become a ‘real’ nation according to the liberal bourgeois ideology:

1) The first one was the association of the candidate nationality with a state that whether existed at that moment, or had existed over a historically long and recent period. Even if the cultural, linguistic and institutional differences between the people and Kingdoms of Castile and Aragon were obvious, the existence of a Spanish state was equally noticeable. Accordingly, the other
Europeans and foreigners in general saw Spain identified with an existing state and tended to take for granted that the only people who lived in Spain were those belonging to a same people and state: the Spanish. Even at present-day the tendency to overlook the existing cultural and linguistic variety within the Spanish state and to represent Spain as a whole that is uniform remains pervasive in Europe and elsewhere. This is partially due to the nineteenth century liberal criteria of what constitutes a ‘real’ nation, which it was assumed the Spanish nation's characteristics did perfectly fit. (2) Another requirement candidates to become a ‘real’ nation could meet was to have had an ancient cultural elite who had developed a vernacular written literary language deployed for national administrative purposes. This is a condition that Italy and Germany, which until the nineteenth century were formed by many scattered little kingdoms, and did not form any centralized German or Italian political unity, could fulfil. (3) The criterion of the capacity for conquest sounds politically incorrect nowadays. Nevertheless, it can be related to the influence of Darwinist evolutionism ideas. The nationalities that had been able to conquer other territories and impose their rules and laws to other groups deserved to become a ‘real’ nation, because it was assumed the capacity for conquest proved that they had succeeded to evolve as social species.

It has been often overlooked the fact that the liberal debates that revolved around the ‘principle of nationality’ were discussed among diplomats, a milieu to which Giuseppe Mazzoni and other ideologues were linked. That is, direct political participation was reserved to the ruling groups and classes. This situation would start to change from 1880 onwards when the right to vote gradually started to generalize to the masses and the political phenomena of nationalism would become a central feature of what has been defined as the era of the democratization and mass politics in Europe.

2.1.4. The situation of the Basque Provinces in France and Spain in the 19th century

The southern Basques' old laws and rights, known as _fueros_, which had been successfully negotiated and renewed with the Castilian (and later Spanish) monarchy since the Middle Ages until the 19th century, had granted some economic rewards and relative cultural and administrative autonomy to the Basques. Since 1200 Gipuzkoa, Bizkaia, and Alaba were
territories officially annexed to the Kingdom of Castile, and owed loyalty to this kingdom's king/queen. These three Basque provinces had previously been part of the Kingdom of Navarre, and for a few decades, in the eleventh century, all the Basque Country (including the northern Basque provinces, which nowadays are part of France) constituted a single political unity under the rule of the king of Navarre. The latter kingdom would be, along with Castile, one of the main protagonists of the Reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula from Muslims. Its southern part would remain an independent political entity until the 1510's, when it was eventually conquered by Castile that had started its own proto-nation building (the Spanish nation) campaign: they expelled/converted Jewish and Muslims in order to achieve religious uniformity in the Iberian Peninsula. Cultural and linguistic uniformity was not thought to be necessary, and the Habsburgs, the Austrian dynasty that ruled Spain until the beginning of the eighteenth century, granted a high degree of autonomy to the kingdoms and territories they annexed. A.W. Orridge (1982, p. 54/55) highlighted that both Spain and the Habsburg possessions in Eastern Europe were in the fringes of the Christian Europe and the border with Islam. Therefore, the Habsburg empire maintained a decentralized political organization; granted some rights and privileges to Hungarians, Catalans, Aragonese, Basques, etc.; and avoided conflicts with them. For centuries, the Basques' collaboration was thought to be necessary by the expansionist Castilian Kingdom to protect the border from French and English incursions. In exchange of the three (Gipuzkoa, Araba and Biscay) Basque provinces' loyalty and military support, the Castilian monarchs made an oath to respect the Basque *fueros*. Thus equally relevant for the examination of the Basque autonomist movement is a structural precondition Orridge (1982) underscored: the survival of some independent institutional life in the territory that is separate from the nation state;

Well-known examples are the Scottish legal and educational systems and the Basque *fueros*, but regionally distinctive institutions of this sort were widespread in some areas of Europe until well into the nineteenth century. Institutional distinctiveness of this sort carries it both a degree of consciousness of separate identity and some sort of organizational framework and thus is highly suitable as a basis of community (Orridge, 1982, p. 49).

Both the Navarrese and the Castilian kingdoms were aware of the Basque Provinces' strategic location and since the twelfth century strategically situated walled villas had been constructed in the Basque Country, when the road to Santiago that crossed the Basque Provinces and Navarre was in vogue. Such walled villas would soon become urban centres populated by French, Gascon, and Spanish speakers who enjoyed economic and political privileges granted by the crown and who contributed to diversify local commerce and economic growth, while the
countryside would remain the realm of the Basque speaking native people. If the walled villas were under the crown’s jurisdiction, the rural areas “remained under the jurisdiction of provincial Juntas Generales (General Assemblies) and the municipal councils that ensured a measure of popular participation” (Shafir, 1994, p. 89). In sum, from the early Middle Ages the Basque Country was populated by, broadly speaking, two diverse economic and cultural groups who nevertheless were very much linked since the Basque economy depended on that interaction between the urban and the rural (Heiberg, 1989; Shafir, 1994).

In the golden period of Spain’s expansionism as a big overseas colonial empire the Basque ruling classes benefited from Castilian commerce with either its overseas and European colonies. Basques played an important role in the Spanish colonization of American territories such as México, Venezuela, Perú, Colombia, Argentina, Chile, while in contrast Aragon, and its allied territories, such as Catalonia and Valencia, were not allowed to take part in the Spanish overseas undertakings. Another interesting conclusion Orridge (1982) reached was that while mainly agrarian states such as France, Prussia and Sweden tended to centralize their system as the only solution in order to enforce coercive tax-gathering machinery to finance their wars, Spain could find a solution to avoid enforcement taxation and pressure of centralization;

Paradoxically, but not inconsistently, Habsburg Spain was partially released from this pressure during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries because of its control of American gold and silver. This reinforced the lack of concern of the monarchy for administrative control outside Castile (Orridge, 1982, p. 55).

The Spanish crown granted the status of *hidalgo* to all inhabitants of Bizkaia (in 1526) and Gipuzkoa (in 1610). This strategy of collective recognition that the Basques were not mixed with groups considered racially and religiously impure, and thus persecuted by the Spanish inquisition (Poliakov, 1974), contributed to the Basques’ loyalty to the Spanish crown. Further, the local establishment would tend to adhere to the influential neighbouring Castilian culture and its national ideology and myths, and even if the *fueros* made Basque conscription to the Spanish army something that the Basques could control and limit, the residents of the Basque provinces “pledged to defend the region without compensation” (Shafir, 1994, p. 89). At that time there was no contradiction between being Basque and Spanish, and Basques tended rather to collaborate with than to confront the Spanish state. The Basque *fueros* exempted the Basques from paying tariffs to the Spanish crown, and the Basque provinces enjoyed a lower taxation (which could not be imposed, but requested and negotiated by the Castilian king/queen) than the rest of the
territories allied to the Spanish empire. Until the nineteenth century there would be maintained a customs system (a duty-free zone) in the borders between Castile and the Basque Provinces that permitted the Basques to charge a tax to the goods that circulated between the two territories. The main beneficiaries of this situation were the local elite of rural notables (known as jauntxoak); the owners of lands rented to tenant farmers, and also of mills and iron foundries. Therefore, jauntxoak could exert a crucial influence upon the local and provincial institutions in which the fueros and political life developed.

Spain’s decline as an empire had already started by the end of the sixteenth century, in terms of the gradual emancipation of its European possessions. At the outset of the seventeenth century, religious wars and persecutions by the Counter-Reformation reaction against different kinds of Protestantism, and the repression of popular culture, through accusations of witchcraft, reached a peak in Navarre and the Basque Country, either side of the Pyrenees. Although the decline of the Spanish overseas empire occurred on a relatively slower path than the lost of the Spanish annexed territories in Europe, eventually throughout the nineteenth century Spain lost most of its overseas colonies. Thus the end of the Spanish colonial period, and the beginning of the ancien régime’s destruction were parallel historical events. In a period of less than fifty years, in the 1830’s and the 1870’s, two wars were fought in Spain that shattered the relatively stable social system that had prevailed until then. The traditionalist forces (among then the local Basque elite of jauntxoak) that opposed the Spanish state’s centralization trends were defeated in both wars (Shafir, 1994). In 1876 the ancient Basque fueros were officially abolished and the Basque urban elite was delighted to know that the customs would be removed from the border between Spain and the Basque provinces, and would be relocated in the border between France and Spain. However, a single legacy of the fueros was maintained: Navarre, Araba, Gipuzkoa, and Bizkaia, would keep the right to asses and control their own taxes, and to negotiate with Spain the payment of taxes for services provided by the central state (like control of borders, e.g.), amounting to a little more than half the proportionate tax the rest of Spanish provinces paid to the government in Madrid. These local levying of taxes known as conciertos económicos would be eventually abolished in 1939, when Franco declared the provinces of Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa traitorous to Spain, but were maintained in Navarre and Araba where the Carlist majority had supported Francoism.

A brief discussion of the situation in Iparralde (the northern part), which is the name generally
used in euskera for the French Basque Country, is necessary. The aftermath of the French Revolution left the material and linguistic reality largely unchanged. Nevertheless, although the main way of life, habits and traditions of Basque speaking peasants and fishermen were not altered, yet the French revolution suppressed the Basque fors or liberties and laws. By reinforcing the Basque Country's dependency on stances of power that were located outside the Basque Country the Revolution destroyed a highly participatory Basque political culture (Jacob, 1994; Totoricagüena, 2004). James E. Jacob (1994) suggested that the French Revolution's act to abolish the Basque fors, by relegating them to the past history and to the Basque collective memory, was the harbinger of plans that were going to be implemented only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century: the cultural assimilation of the Basques to the French nation state and its symbols and mythologies.

As the Basque case exemplifies, the liberal bourgeois nation states applied a centralized formula of nation invented after the French Revolution: the modern state (Arendt, 2004; Hobsbawm, 1992). The modern state functioned as a territorially defined supreme national agency that had the monopoly of the use of violence and control over its territory and people. The development of transportation facilitated a more steady contact between the citizen and the state and even the most remote parts of the country started to be aware that there was a centre and that they lived on the fringes of the nation. In most Europe the expansion of the nation states' centralization politics abolished the pre-existent examples of federalism. For instance, in Spain two wars were fought throughout the nineteenth century between liberals and federalists. These were wars between supporters of the new model of modern nation, and those who wanted to maintain the federal structure of the Spanish Kingdom, which granted the maintenance of significant political and economic privileges known as fueros in the Basque Country. The traditional Basque ruling classes were defeated and this would provoke a sense of deprivation and humiliation in the sectors that had benefited from the traditional social and economic structure, and the next generation would see the birth of the Basque nationalist movement.
2.2. Nationalism as a mass phenomenon: the 20th century

2.2.1. Studying nationalism as a top-down and bottom-up phenomenon

A common question of debate among scholars who have studied nationalism has been whether nationalism is an elite phenomenon that is spread through a top-down process in which ideas are thought by a selected few, and eventually reach the mass of ordinary people; or if it is a bottom-up process in which more than the written ideas, what really counts and should be studied is how ordinary people think about their national identity and contribute to turn nationalism a mass phenomenon.

On his introduction to *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Hobsbawm (1992) agreed with Ernest Gellner's view that nations are a construction of nation states; and that the latter typically invent myths and traditions that tell stories about a very ancient existence of the nation. Nevertheless, the latter also suggested that social scientist have often tended to overlook that the 'national question' is a dual phenomenon, because it is not constructed only from above and by the intelligentsia or policymakers, but it is also influenced and determined by ordinary people's actions and thought. Repeatedly, Hobsbawm (1992) warned against the tendency among social scientists to focus on official national propaganda, and other material, which is generally written by intellectual elite. He warns that these data can be misleading to understand nationalism, since official ideologies do not reflect what was going on in ordinary people's and militants' minds. The historian refers to the masses who in Europe were overwhelmingly illiterate until the nineteenth century, but started to increasingly influence nation states' national politics, even to a large extent with the democratization of politics. He stressed that two aspects that would determine the raising of a different concept of nationality have been largely overlooked: 1) that a national identification does not exclude other types of identifications; 2) that not only national identification but also the meaning associated to it can change over time.

In the postwar period, much theoretical work aiming at studying linguistic and ethnic nationalist movements has mostly focused on the role played by local cultural elite or intelligentsia (Gellner,
1983; Smith, 1982); on official discourses or documents (Conversi, 1997; Arendt, 2004), and the spread of ideas (Greenfeld, 1992). Walker Connor (1994) reputedly criticized a general elitist trend in post-war studies of ethnonationalism. Connor addressed his critique to two main aspects: 1) he referred to the prevailing attitude among postwar scholars to consider that ethnonationalist movements were decaying and disappearing. 2) Connor wanted also to warn against the general trend to study social and political movements only through elite and leadership, as if these were the single key to understand such processes. That said, it can be noted that the author of this thesis intends to adopt a non-elitist approach to the study of nationalism, and in the theoretical chapter an account is provided of why the rhetorical and discursive analysis might be a good fit to harmoniously combine top down and bottom up approaches.

Daniele Conversi (2002) sums up well Connor’s stance that a nation and a nationalist movement have first to exist as a ‘subjective’ experience of nationhood among ordinary people;

In Connor, subjectivism is the upshot of common political experiences and shared feelings, not merely of an élite’s vision. Such a subjective feeling can be brought about by longue durée processes in which institutions such as the state, the army, the Church and mass education are involved, but it cannot be treated as the invention of arbitrary attempts by nation-builders, especially if the latter clash with a deeply established sense of ethnic continuity (Conversi, 2002, p. 12).

That is, Hobsbawm and Connor saw the nation and the spread of nationalism as dual phenomena that are influenced both by elite and intellectual ideologies, and by ordinary people’s ‘subjective experience’. Particularly, Connor (1990) emphasised the importance of the ‘subjective’ experience of nationhood that has to spread and reach the larger social body. In other words, in order to exist a nation has first to be experienced and felt by ordinary people through everyday praxis, and it cannot be just imposed by an elite or raise in the minds of intellectuals.

2.2.2. The modernization paradigm theories

The spread of nationalist movements has often been attributed to modernization, industrialization and urbanization processes, and also to the dissemination of mass media and communications by influential and prominent social scientists (Deutsch, 1953/1966; Connor, 1972; Gellner, 1983; Breuilly, 1985). Among those who adhered to the modernism paradigm as a main explanation for the rise of nationalist movements, Gellner (1983) is the theorist who pointed out that
industrialization, which he labelled as an elite or top-down phenomenon provoked nationalism. Further, he emphasised that at the heart of nationalism lies the question of the expected congruence between the ethnic people and the nation. That is, nationalism assumes there will be congruence between the ethnic nation and the political power, and that the state will tend to find or to artificially create this ideal coherence; and in order to maintain its legitimacy, in the changing context of industrialization, the modern state will have to create a highly standardized culture. According to Gellner (1983), the creation and imposition of a standardized language is crucial in this process of maintenance of the state’s legitimacy and its effort to turn the nation and the political power congruent. In addition, this process of industrialization as a factor that enhances cultural standardization and homogenization would contribute to boost both chauvinist and counter-state nationalism.

Although Connor (1978; 1994) also adhered to the modernist paradigm, for him it was not industrialization that provoked the rise of many nationalist movements. Walker Connor (1994) argued that the main factors that propelled nationalism in the period in which the liberal nation state model was consolidated, were conscript education and conscript armies that aimed at educating the citizen into state patriotism; but also at reinforcing current ethnic identities. In this sense, as Conversi (2002) has noted, Connor’s position follows the pattern of what are known as conflictual modernization theories. That is, Connor considered that by multiplying contacts between different cultures, identities and languages, modernity could provoke intergroup conflicts that would make groups more aware of their ethnic and linguistic distinctiveness; albeit Connor’s position was the opposite of the influential melting-pot modernization theories spread e.g. by Karl Deutsch (1953/1966), who thought that modernization meant assimilation of smaller languages and ethnic groups into bigger dominant cultural/ethnic entities. All this process happened in a context of technical and economic development that enhanced the possibilities of the nation state exerting direct control over its citizens within the ascribed territory. It was partially the consequence of a broader process of modernization that implied standardization and homogenization of its citizens by means of a written language (Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1992). In order to be effective mass education should be made in a vernacular language; and in multinational states it implied that only a vernacular (in Europe traditionally the dominant ethnic groups’ tongue) would be selected. The process of modernization also multiplied diffusion of economic, technological and political discourses through new mass media technologies such as radio, film and television and it made necessary the creation of a mass spoken communication to
maintain the nation state's political and social cohesion. In most occasions, all this implied the choice of a single vernacular to become the language to educate the masses into loyalty and state patriotism, but it also turned the rising of counter-nationalism not only possible but also more likely to happen (Hobsbawm, 1992).

2.2.3. The building up of civic nationalism

In the following subsections the insights of different research on nationalism will serve to buttress the thesis that the Basque Nationalist Party's (PNV) foundation by Sabino Arana in 1895 was not an isolated event. On the contrary, it followed the general trend of a democratization of politics, which was reflected in the growing extension of franchise, mainly in parts of Europe and North America. This electoralization of the modern nation states boosted the creation of new political parties, and since then the political parties that had represented the interests of the ruling class would have to compete in the political arena to secure the lower classes' political loyalty. This period of democratization/electoralization of politics spans from the end of the nineteenth century to World War I, and also saw the outset of the public school system that aimed at generalizing literacy and identification of the citizen with the nation state. Passive identification of citizens with their modern nation states was expected based on the idea that institutionalization and routine interaction between the state and its citizens, through public education system, etc, would enhance patriotism (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 86). The more and more states that based their legitimacy on the principle of popular sovereignty, inspired by French Revolution were urged to create a civic religion that was patriotism. This civic nationalism was necessary in states that tended to generalize franchise and literacy first to men, and later to women; and thus did expectantly wait its citizens' votes. The risk that a part of the citizenry would support political parties other than the traditionally identified with the liberal bourgeoisie increased when socialist and diverse nationalist parties appeared in the political arena. It provoked what has been described as the problem of the threat to the nation state's social and political cohesion, an argument that since then has been often uttered against secessionist movements.

On the other hand, the democratization of politics, which followed the French Revolution's principle that the state represented sovereign people or citizens, was implemented in a context in
which there was a huge gap between the ruling classes and the very subaltern workers’ position.

Eric Hobsbawm (1992) highlighted that in the period from 1880 to 1914, the democratization of politics triggered the mobilization of popular nationalism by most European nation states, in a period of imperial expansion and huge international and intercontinental migration movements. Popular nationalism was more explicitly based on common-sense racist assumptions about the existence of superior races and cultures than the liberal civic nationalist model. However, the necessity to secure the ordinary people’s loyalty pushed many nation states to merge their civic nationalist rhetoric with non-state patriotism as part of a new effort to educate the masses into state patriotism. This construction and imposition of state patriotism through the mass education system was part of the nation state's strategy to tackle and eliminate the potential risks of alternative nationalist movements within the same nation state's realm. It was the outset of what has been known as e.g. French chauvinism, and Spanish, English, or German conservative national movements;

The merger of state patriotism with non-state nationalism was politically risky since the criteria of the one were comprehensive e.g. all citizens of the French Republic – whereas the criteria of the other were exclusive – e.g. only those citizens of the French Republic speaking the French language and, in extreme cases, blonde and long-headed (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 93).

French Revolution’s stance that it had been fought for a universal principle such as the rights of the man made even contemporary scholars (Kedourie, 1966) believe that it was the national expression of the universal enlightenment aspirations. But as Billig (1995, p. 87/88) highlighted;

"We" the French, linguistically and rhetorically, coincide with ‘we’, the whole of humanity. Some analysts have claimed that the combination of universalism and particularism was so contradictory that it was bound to collapse. Thus, nationalism moved towards the right, as the universal was rejected in favour of the particular (Dumont, 1992) (Billig, 1995, p. 88).

In France, right-wing nationalism (Dumont, 1992) was expressed in the Dreyfuss affair, long before World War I. It was this merger between the identification with the state and the identification with one (ethnic) nation what provoked the incorporation of popular nationalism into state patriotism. In this sense, it can be reminded that underneath the nation as an imagined community lies a myth of horizontal comradeship (Anderson, 1983);
it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings (Anderson, 1983, p. 7).

In that historical period state patriotism had to compete with two new enemies that had also surfaced thanks to the democratization of politics. What has commonly been labelled as nationalism is the rise, in the same historical conjuncture, of two new types of mass political parties. On the one side, the secessionist and pro-autonomy movements. On the other, the emergence of populist and chauvinist patriotic movements that mobilized the established nation state’s patriotism. Eric Hobsbawm (1992) pointed out that the term nationalism was coined to describe chauvinist, imperialist and xenophobic political movements to which the lesser-middle strata nationalism had moved in France and later in Italy. These strata had been previously linked to the nation state’s civic patriotism or nationalism, but by the 1870’s especially in France, had adhered to the radical right. Hobsbawm (1992) wanted to make the point that at the outset of World War I, in 1914, the nation state’s civic nationalism had merged with popular nationalism and tried to neutralize and to turn useful both the ethnic and racist sentiments. The nation states attempted to incorporate patriotic right wing chauvinist nationalist sentiments and also to control and neutralize linguistic minority nationalism; and thus adhered to the principle of a state a nation. This is the reason why Gellner (1983, p. 1) defined nationalism as “primarily a principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent”, a definition that would be also accepted by different writers like Breuilly and Hobsbawm.

John Breuilly (1993) described poignantly how middle classes have been increasingly influential in political mobilization in modern nation states drawing upon populist discourses in the period when civic and popular nationalism merged. For Breuilly (1993, p. 34) democratic populist nationalist discourses were deployed by the middle classes as a strategy to obtain the adhesion of a working class that was often divided between different loyalties.

In turn, Hannah Arendt (2004) stressed that the present-day political parties inherited the political model of the French centralized nation state; and were born within the bases left behind by the many political fractions that fought each other during and after the French Revolution. These
political fractions had their origin in the only and centralized revolutionary Assembly that survived after the Jacobins destroyed the many other popular assemblies. Paradoxically, the Jacobin-fashioned assemblies, which with their fanaticism and loose ambitions typified what Arendt (2004, p. 341) defined as the "dictatorship of the single party", would eventually become the ground for the birth of the Continental European system of parties. Therefore, the main features of the modern political parties are not flattering: oligarchic structure and lack of internal democracy etc, that turns the European nation state's political parties prone to adopt totalitarian practices (Arendt, 2004, p. 371).

As it is typical of the widespread trend between social scientists who addressed the issue of ethnic nationalism, Connor (1994) pointed out that the rhetoric of Hitler, Mao-Tse-Tung, and Bismarck was based on this mythical idea of common blood and ancestry in which ethnonationalism feeds its irrational force. Thus he suggested that civic patriotism is reasonable and that nationalism tends to be dangerous and uncontrollable. The explanation of the ambiguous relation between nation and state within consolidate European nation states is a question that has been source of much debate and confusion; and it will be helpful to examine other theories, like for example those that drew upon the concept of ethnonationalism. Anthony D. Smith (2002) noted that the dichotomy between 'ethnic' and 'civic' nationalism that scholars as Connor (1994) proposed is nowadays fashionable, but might be misleading. The latter wanted to criticize the communication theorists' views, e.g. Deutsch (1953/1966), based on the modernist assumption that 'nation building' meant cultural homogenization, through processes of social mobilization and mass communication that provoked assimilation of smaller cultures and languages by bigger ones. That is, Connor (1994) considered that this model of 'nation building' as a top-down process was erroneous: apart from omitting the crucial aspect of ethnicity, it simplified the phenomena of nations and nationalism by describing them as processes provoked exclusively by the actions of the dominant nation states. As Smith (2002) argued, the formula Connor found to attack the modernist vision of 'nation building' was to create the term ethnonationalism which stressed that deeply rooted in the nation is the psychological sense of ethnicity that resists assimilation by nation states. In other words, the nation would be supported by the belief that its members are related by ancestry and common ethnic bounds; a myth which would be missing from the feeling of loyalty to a state, which he defined as rational civic patriotism. Consequently, nationalism was seen by Connor (1994) as an irrational and subjective belief of being part of a nation, and based on myths of a common ancestry. By contrast, he considered that what has been
labelled as ‘civic’ nationalism was actually just patriotism: a rational loyalty and love of the territorial state by its citizens.

More recently social psychologist Daniel Bar-Tal (1993) reproduced this distinction between civic patriotism and chauvinism. He made a distinction between patriotism as a positive force that brings stability and a sense of identity to the ‘ingroup’, and both chauvinism and nationalism that he considered irrational and potentially negative forces. Nevertheless, after examining arguments of several authors who followed the formula of distinguishing between civic patriotism and nationalism, Billig was sceptical and pointed out that it was actually very difficult to distinguish these “allegedly very different states of mind” (Billig, 1995, p. 57). The following sentence can serve to sum up Billig’s conclusion on this issue, which the author of this thesis also considers a wiser stance:

The claim that nationalism and patriotism are psychologically distinct needs to be backed by evidence about different states of mind or underlying motivations. Often the force of the claim is stronger than the empirical data cited in support (Billig, 1995, p. 57).

In turn, Billig (1995) noted that cultural, linguistic and ethnic nationalism has been commonly presented as the only and quintessential kind of “hot nationalism”, practically implying that by contrast nation states’ 'reasonable' civic patriotism is not nationalism. It served to preclude the pervasively overlooked phenomena of banal nationalism. That is, while nation states routinely exerted their actual nationalist praxis, which tended to pass unnoticed as something natural, peripheral stateless nationalist movements have been associated with cultural backwardness and radical/unreasonable stances. For instance, it became commonplace to interpret the rising of ethnic autonomist and separatism as a reaction against modernization, urbanization and industrialization processes, assuming that both the nineteenth century and the late twentieth century cultural nationalist movements were triggered out by a similar reaction against modernization. This kind of interpretation that typically distinguished between urban, Western European, civic and modern nationalisms, and rural mystical forms of defensive response to modernization was found e.g. in Kohn (1946), and also influenced Gellner (1983). In addition, the latter authors believed that cultural nationalism could provoke larger isolation and a kind of recession in an agrarian society.
2.2.4. The dissemination of linguistic nationalism across Europe

In practical terms, linguistic nationalism tends to refer to the language of public education and official use. It was a statistician of the Habsburgs' Austro-Hungarian Empire who in the late 1860's published two articles arguing "that language was the only adequate indicator of nationality" (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 99), and he exerted much influence over the German speaking intellectuality and nationalists.

The relation and the gap that exists between popular and high culture has been a topic of debate since the nineteenth century. As Gramsci defined it, popular culture was the unofficial culture of the subordinate classes; and at the end of the eighteenth century, and the first decades of the nineteenth century, the romanticist and nationalist movements recuperated the popular culture in Europe. The sixteenth century is considered the golden age of popular culture (Burke, 1978). It was a moment when the aristocracy and clergy participated in the carnival and other popular celebrations such as, for example, bullfights. It was a period in which the greatest writers like Rabelais and Cervantes were inspired by popular culture. As a consequence of religious wars between Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation the popular culture came to be considered as containing elements of Paganism and immorality. Protestantism tried to substitute carnival by the pedagogy of the word; the teaching and learning of the Bible in the vernacular languages. That is why in the sixteenth century many Protestant Bibles were translated to vernacular languages, and a significant parcel of the population learnt to read and write in Protestant countries, while levels of illiteracy remained higher in Catholic countries, where Bibles continued to be written in Latin. Instead of the individual learning of the Bible, the Catholic Church drew upon the pedagogy of the image and used plastic arts to propagate religion. By the eighteenth century, as an effect of religious repression against popular culture, and the Reformation and Counter-Reformation processes, the gap between popular and high culture was consolidated. The aristocracy's, and later the upper bourgeoisie's, refined way of life was assumed to be the exact opposite of the popular classes' culture, which was represented as "vulgar". In this sense, throughout the period known as the Illustration it was reproduced this idea of the popular culture as representing backwardness and superstition. Eventually, in Europe, the end of the eighteenth century brought the French revolution's break with the ancient regime,
and also the outset in Germany of the Romanticist movement that would reach its peak in the first half of the nineteenth century. Romanticism boosted nationalism and tended to exaggerate the positive aspects of popular culture: its purity, originality, quality, and its exoticism (Furió, 2000).

The use of linguistic and cultural criteria in order to form a new nation was a nineteenth century innovation that first surfaced in the German speaking Europe. It is well documented that in the long run Romanticism would inspire cultural nationalist movements and the twentieth century's 'ethnic revival' (Smith, 1979; 1982). Hroch (1985) and Hobsbawn (1992) were right to stress that it is a mistake to consider Romanticism a political and nationalist movement: it was a purely folkloric, literary and cultural movement that did not have repercussion on the popular masses, and did not aim at political agitation like national ideology so often does. Further, Hobsbawn (1992, p. 57/58) pointed out that the idea of language being the central feature of national identity is a "myth" and an ideological construction of nationalists inspired by Herder and the Romanticist movement. Nevertheless, the Herderian idea of the language spoken by a culturally distinct community would influence how the community was imagined (Anderson, 1983) by ordinary people, and also indirectly the modern definition of nationality;

Language in the Herderian sense of language spoken by the *Volk* was therefore plainly not a central element in the formation of proto-nationalism directly, though it was not necessarily irrelevant to it. However, indirectly it was to become central to the modern definition of nationality, and therefore also to the popular perception of it. For where an elite literary or administrative language exists, however small the number of its actual users, it can become an important element of proto-national cohesion (Hobsbawn, 1992, p. 59).

In turn, Billig (1995, p. 15) pointed out how nation states and their national languages have been naturalized and nationalist ideologies have made them appear as 'natural', 'common sense', and inevitable (Eagleton, 1991). He warned that one of the most pervasive 'myths' of nationalism is that language is taken to be the core element and the main trigger of nationalism (Edwards, 1991; Billig, 1995, p. 14). So Billig (1995, p. 14) highlighted that scholars such as Connor (1978) often assumed that multinational nation states in which different languages are spoken would tend to develop separatist nationalist movements. Further, he points out that this assumption was already present in the romanticist ideas, and, as Hobsbawn (1992) suggests, that they had great influence in the later conceptualization of the modern nation;
This way of thinking is not new. In the eighteenth century, Herder and Fichte were declaring that the basis of the nation, and indeed its genius, lay in its language (Billig, 1995, p. 14).

For Hobsbawm (1992) Romanticism was a populist cultural revival movement, in the sense that it was created by German intellectual elite who had an idealized view of peasantry and its particularities, such as language and folk culture. A reason this historian puts forward to explain why linguistic and ethnic nationalism did not become dominant earlier is the lack of influential pseudo-scientific theories linking nations and genetic descent until quite late in the nineteenth century. In addition, Hobsbawm (1992) stressed that the international situation brought about massive immigration movements of peoples; and that the academic elaboration of a general theory of races, which influenced social sciences and common-sense representations, would give opportunity to locals to express hostility towards foreigners. Under the pressure of modernization, urbanization and industrialization processes that provoked massive movements of populations, traditional groups started to feel threatened and sought new formulas to protect their way of life and to imagine or invent a community or nationality for themselves. Ultimately, Hobsbawm (1992) noted that the main factors that propitiated the background in which linguistic and ethnic nationalism started to spread were political democratization and the existence of a nation state that was able to influence and mobilize its citizens. Yet, it was a context in which the dominant ideology fostered by nation states in their policies regarding minority nationalities within their territories was still the liberal 'threshold principle'. Darwinism applied to the social, economic and political realm now reinforced this principle that denied the access to the club of modern nations to the smaller nationalities. Thus linguistic nationalism implied the defence of declining rural languages, spoken by peasants who were often willing to abandon them and to learn the dominant 'modern' nation states' language;

Essentially the situation was not different where the linguistic issue was the defence of a declining idiom – often one which, like Basque and Welsh, was virtually on the point of extinction in the new industrial-urban centres of the country. Certainly defence of the old language signified defence of an entire society's old ways and traditions against the subversions of modernity: hence the support which such movements as Bretons, Flemings, Basques and others received from the Roman Catholic clergy. To this extent they were not simply middle-class movements. (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 120/121).

At the time peripheral nationalism was still considered a minor problem by nation states which main strategy would be to draw upon the diverse nationalist sentiments to hinder the advance of
what was perceived as the main threat: the spread of the new proletarian socialism, which was based on an internationalist ideology.

The end of World War I, in 1918, was marked by some spectacular changes: the collapse of the big Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires, the Russian Revolution, and the birth of many new small states in Europe. The allies' liberal governments preferred to negotiate with the United States' president Thomas Woodrow Wilson than with the Bolsheviks, and accepted his 'principle of nationality'. It proposed that the territory of a nation state and the linguistic and nationality borders should fit one another. The Treaty of Versailles permitted the creation of many new nation states in Europe. The Wilsonian principle also assumed that the members of a nationality identify with the territorial state. This peace settlement based on the Wilsonian 'principle of nationalities' permitted to temporarily alleviate tensions between different nation states and smaller nationalities. Nevertheless, it was in fact impracticable given that in many cases it was practically impossible to make coincide nationality and language borders with the nation states' boundaries. As Hobsbawm (1992, p. 132/133) noted, a consequence of efforts to enforce the Wilsonian principle of nationalities, and to create a linguistically and ethnically homogeneous population, would be mass expulsion and even extermination of minorities who remained within the nation state's territory. In parallel to President Wilson's 'principle of nationality', Lenin also drew upon the right of self-determination to consolidate centralized state's power in Russia. The application of the principle of nationality over national groups and republics of the former Russian-empire was a path-breaking historical experience, which contributed to spread internationally the idea of national self-determination. Daniele Conversi (2002) highlighted that until the late 1980's most scholars assumed that Lenin's formula of granting a high degree of formal autonomy, as well as a nominal right of self-determination, to the nations that constituted the Soviet empire, had worked quite well and had solved the national question. One of the few discordant voices was Connor (1984) who claimed that not only the right of self-determination was never implemented in practice in the Soviet Union, but that the local elite and the potentially nationalist intelligentsia were repressed or plainly eliminated. One of Connor's investigation's most striking conclusions was that the communist state did not succeed in eradicating nationalist proclivities. However, it can be noted that Lenin's application of a nominal national self-determination to several nationalities within the Soviet Union served at least to popularize the concept of self-determination, especially when in the postwar period it became associated with the idea of a people colonized by an imperialist power (Mayo, 1974).
At the end of the 1970's, and throughout the 1980's, Smith (1979; 1982; 1986) had already claimed that European stateless nationalism was experiencing a renewal. Although he acknowledged that many stateless movements were merely autonomist, Smith (1982) also underscored that the contemporary bids for separatism in Western Europe were examples of ethnic separatist movements based on a perceived cultural discrimination. In the same article he proposed that distinction between outright secessionist and pro-autonomy movements can often be ambiguous and misleading:

'Secession' and irredentist' movements are not only forms of nationalism. There are also movements of 'renewal'. While secession emphasizes autonomy and individuality, and irredentism cohesion and individuality, renewal movements seek cohesion through autonomy. In each case it is their ethnic situation which determines their direction and particular emphasis. All three subtypes are varieties of 'ethnic' nationalisms. The secession movement wants to extract the selected entity from the larger unit; the irredentist movement wants to unite all members of the ethnic group into a single territory entity; while the renewal movement operates on behalf of a formally independent unit which lacks a sentiment of solidarity, which it attempts to instil (...) (Smith, 1982, p. 18).

A main question that sociologist Anthony D. Smith (1982) formulated was why does ethnic consciousness very often take political form. He proposed to examine the social background of stateless ethnic nationalisms focusing on cultural and political factors, and highlighted that the ethnic character of most nationalist separatism was linked to the phenomena of the intelligentsia's politicization. For Smith (1982) apart from historicism, inspired by the Romanticism's recovery of languages and folk tradition, the reawakening of a broader intelligentsia has also been a necessary factor. These permitted a previously existing ethnic revival to assume political form by attracting local intelligentsia in contexts marked by the decadence of the nineteenth centuries' colonial nation state empires, which failed to supply attractive enough posts to their educated professionals. The importance of the old empires' decadence as a trigger element for stateless minority nationalism was also underscored by Orridge (1982), among others. It was considered a particularly important factor in cases like Spain in which the central state was perceived as relatively weak and less developed than the industrialized parts of Catalonia and the Basque Country.

John Hutchinson (1987; 1994) who analysed the effect of cultural revivalism movements in different nations that made the transition from mainly rural societies to industrialization, argued that present-day cultural nationalism is a political movement that works as a moral regeneration force and tends to rescue minority nationalities from inertia, propelling them towards modernity,
because current cultural nationalist movements aim at combining the virtues of tradition and modernization, maintaining a touch with their cultural heritage. For Hutchinson (1987; 1994) very often cultural nationalists influence mainly educated people and fail to have the same impact over the population they claim to represent, and it is then when the local intelligentsia is tempted to adopt state-oriented strategies. In turn, Smith (1979, p. 182) was more sceptical and emphasised cultural nationalism's engagement in state-oriented actions, such as linguistic and economic planning, that involve a reproduction of the bureaucratic machine. He defined that phenomenon as a bureaucratic circle, and by that is meant that the same movements that opposed the modern nation states' rational bureaucratization will inevitably get involved in it once they get hold of or create a nation state apparatus.

2.2.5- The Euskera’s revival as a result of Basque associativism

In the previous subsection the German Romanticism's main features were outlined. Now it will be examined how this cultural revivalist movement influenced Basque nationalism.

The first well documented efforts to create a Basque language literature can be dated back to 1545, when in Basse-Navarre (Iparralde) it was published a small book in Basque language: *lingua Vasconum primitiae*, signed by Roman Catholic father Bernat Dechepare. However, the first very important book published in Basque language would arrive some years later in the same northern Basque province when the Basque Calvinists translated to the Basque language, not only the New Testament, but also all the books written by Calvin (Olaizola, 1993). In the Basse-Navarre the protestant priest Joannes de Lizarraga completed his translation of the Calvinist bible written in a very elaborate Basque language in which he combined three Basque dialects. The majority of the Basques did not speak or understand a language other than the Basque, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries most Protestant worship was performed in Basque. The first Basque Bible was funded by the Queen Jeanne III d’Albret who aimed at spreading the Calvinist faith in the northern Navarre's Basque population. The Basque Calvinist Bible was first published in 1571, and it is considered one of the milestones of Basque literature for the quality of its Basque language (Olaizola, 1993, p. 175). Jeanne III d’Albret (1528-1572), the queen of Navarre and Bearn, had converted to Calvinism, as did most citizens of the province of Bearn, a
few decades after the southern Navarra’s conquest by the Castilian army. It has to be noted that
she was the daughter of Marguerite of Angouleme. Among other prominent personalities who
sought refuge in Navarre and Beam, and that Marguerite protected, were Calvin himself
(Stauffer, 1985), in 1534, and the polemic writer François Rabelais whom she much admired
(Bajtin, 1987). This is the reason why in his book on Rabelais Bakhtin mentioned “the humanist
club of Marguerite de Angouleme and the movement of the early Reformation leaders (…)”
(Bakhtin, 1984, p. 138). She did not just protect famous Protestants, but she even wrote and
published works in which she took a stance favourable to Protestantism (Olaizola, 1993;
Prestwich, 1985). The kingdom had to face a steady pressure from its French neighbours to
abandon the Calvinist faith, and after Jeanne III d’Albret died (1572), her son was crowned king
of Navarre, known as Henry III of Navarre. This Protestant Kingdom in Navarre and Beam was
short-lived though, due mainly to the strong Counter-Reformation reaction in France and in
Spain; and because the king of Navarre would soon become (1589) the king of France,
contributing thus to reassess the process of French centralized model of nation building. In 1593
Henry IV of France, and III of Navarre, definitely abjured his faith and converted to Roman
Catholicism. Unfortunately, even the king of France could not prevent the religious repression
and encroachment of Protestantism in France, and by the time he was killed by a Jesuit, in 1610,
the Calvinists were once again enduring persecutions in the Kingdom of Navarre and Beam and
elsewhere in France (Olaizola, 1993). Consequently, until the nineteenth century most Basque
language publications consisted of Roman Catholic religious books; and the Basque language
missed the chance to consolidate a high level literary form of Basque (Anderson, 1983); with the
consequence of the language’s loss of prestige, and its perception as linked to popular culture
only. Although in the eighteenth century over half of the population spoke Euskera in the
southern part of the Basque Country, and the percentage of Basque speakers was even higher in
the three northern Basque provinces, by the end of the nineteenth century the Bourbon dynasty’s,
and the French Jacobin states’, centralizing policies gradually established the spread of literacy
through primary schools. Since education was provided uniquely in Spanish or French the
proportion of Basque speakers started to decrease on a faster pace (Heiberg, 1989). It was
precisely in the nineteenth century when linguists influenced by Romanticism discovered the
Basque language’s uniqueness in Europe; they were attracted by the Basque culture’s perceived
exoticism, and originality. The Basque hinterland has usually been considered the preserve of the
Pre-Indo-European Basque language, whereas even in the rural villages, the Basque language has
coeexisted for centuries with the French and Spanish languages in a situation of diglossia¹

¹“In a classic article Ferguson (1959) describes it as the uneven coexistence of two languages, or varieties of
(Fishman, 1967; Conversi, 1997). A high variety form of written and standardized Spanish or Castilian language, or French, has traditionally been used in the public domains, and formal situations. Well into the twentieth century there was still a significant part of the Basque rural population who did not speak Spanish or French fluently, and oral Basque was used in a wider range of situations than merely the private life realm (Shafir, 1994). Nevertheless, what characterized Basque language most was its lack of social prestige. The evolution of the Basque language has followed a pattern that is not unlike other minority languages. Joshua Fishman (1972) has highlighted that most Western European stateless languages have entered in a dramatic process of recession, which is mainly the result of official monolingual policies enforced by nation states that only protect their majority’s language. A consequence of this situation of diglossia is that the southern Basque intellectual elite has often been monolingual Spanish. The gap between the cultural revivalists of Navarre and Vizcaya and the Basque popular culture was enormous after the Second Carlist War, and the Basque cultural revival that was due to take place from 1877 onwards did not have much impact on the Basque society as a whole (Conversi, 1997), despite the presence of important figures such as e.g. Arturo Campión (1854-1937) who left works of great value for Navarrese historiography and ethnography.

Revivalists’ attempts to build up the Basque language and identity as a full-fledged modern nationality failed, but soon the Basques and their language would become an anthropological topic and curiosity of European scholarship. This happened in a context in which racial theories and studies were in vogue in the continent, and the existence of human races was considered a scientific reality. The very influential pioneer of the scientific study of the Basque race was the Basque anthropologist Telesforo de Aranzadi (1860-1945) who dedicated much of his research to the measurement of Basque skulls. Aranzadi believed that his scientifically grounded work was a watershed in comparison with the previous Basque studies, which he did not consider as being “pure science”. He is considered the father and founder of Basque anthropology, and his most outstanding disciple was father José Miguel de Barandiarán. Both of them were active participants in an important cultural movement that took place in a period in which the PNV had obtained its first significant electoral triumphs in Bizkaia.

In 1918 a group of Basque politicians, scholars, professionals and businessmen, influenced by positivism, and believing that knowledge and study of sciences could boost social change in the language, within a single community. The high variety is used in public and formal domains; it has a written and standardized form, and is normally associated with high status. The low variety is spoken in informal situations, for instance, within the family, among friends et al., and it normally has little prestige.” (Conversi, 1997, p. 168)
Basque Country, organized a congress in the town of Oñate to create a Basque Studies Society (Urla 1988). They were based on Enlightenment ideas and wanted to save the Basque language and culture from the manipulation of nationalism, and from amateurish studies. One of the most interesting participants was the philologist Julio de Urquijo (1871-1950). He was the director of the most international journal of Basque studies, wherein elaborate articles on many aspects of Basque cultural manifestations were published that revitalised and gave some cosmopolitan aura to Basque studies between 1907 and 1936. Conversi (1997) has pointed out that it is unlikely that this Congress would ever happen without the previous PNV’s political triumphs. Nevertheless, the participants and creators of Eusko Ikaskuntza (Basque Studies) claimed to have a non-partisan and non-confessional policy, although they stated to be respectful and aware of the country’s religious character, and not to be aspiring to a Basque independent state. An important step of this Congress was to create the Basque Language Academy (known as Euskaltzaindia), which aimed at turning the Basque a language with social prestige, by creating a proper grammar, syntax and lexicon. This undertaking that is typical of what Hroch (1985) described as phase 1: a movement that is only cultural, would unfortunately be paralyzed after the Spanish civil war, and the Basque language would not recover its literary character until the 1960’s, when Koldo Mitxelena and other linguists managed to create what is known as Euskera Batua, the literacy and high level Basque language. One of Eusko Ikaskuntza’s main projects was to create a Basque university, but they would soon be accused of mingling culture with politics. During Primo de Rivera’s monarchic dictatorship, the Liga Monárquica (Monarchical League) rejected the project of creating a Basque University, and instead they proposed a Spanish university for the Basque Country. The famous writer Miguel de Unamuno, a well-known partisan of Basque acculturation and assimilation, applauded the latter proposal. Unamuno’s discourses reproduced the familiar stereotype of the Basques as illiterate and rude peasants, and his argument was that the Basques should give up their native identity and join what he perceived as the cosmopolitan Spanish culture. This representation of the Basque farmer was common among the Bilbao’s industrial and financial pro-Spanish elite; and especially during the Francoist regime’s repression against all things Basque this stereotype was spread into other social groups. In sum, it was pervasively used to dissuade the Basques from undertaking any attempt to maintain and manifest positive and constructive views/actions regarding Basque identity and language;

This class, in creating standards and models of behavior, presented “all things Basque” (behavioral forms, dress, language, style, and the like) as bad taste, provincial, rustic (the term casero, literally “farmer” or “farmlike”, came to be used in reference to Basque
culture, implying the ordinary or unrefined), and, ultimately, lacking elegance. Unfortunately, there is not research on this subject. Nor has there been any sociological investigation of the interesting social changes in the bourgeois sectors after Franco’s death (Pérez-Agote, 2006, p. 64).

The Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship’s repressive measures against any literary manifestation of Basque culture made in 1924 the Diputación of Biscay to withdraw the subsidy until then granted to the Sociedad de Estudios Vascos. In the same year, the use of Basque language was banned from journals and newspapers in Biscay. On the whole, between 1918 and 1936 just five Basque congresses were organized, and only during the Republican period the Basque Studies Society could resume a normal activity, until it was banned by the Francoist regime.

Also a collaborator of Eusko Ikaskuntza, José Miguel de Barandiarán (1890-1991) was able to found in his seminar of Vitoria, the “Sociedad de Eusko Folklore” (The Society of Basque Folklore) in 1921. Barandiarán, who only learnt Spanish once he entered the seminar, wanted to gather, preserve and comprehend the Basque culture and he reputedly saved many myths, song and manifestations of popular culture from oblivion. While Barandiarán was working to preserve the native Basque cultures, Aranzadi was concerned with “pure races” (Zulaika, 1996), but none of them questioned an idea that was common sense at the time: that there was a Basque race (Azcona, 1984). It is significant that the two key ethnographers of Basque oral culture were both priests: Barandiarán and Manuel de Lekuona. Whether in France or in Spain, for most low-income youngster from Basque rural areas the Catholic Church’s convents had traditionally been the only available place where they could have a higher level formation. Joseba Zulaika (1988, p. 106) noted that one of Barandiarán’s main contributions was the use of Basque folklore and mythologies, which he interpreted as the remembrances of the “ancient Basque religion”, to assert the Basque national identity. A main political achievement of the first Basque anthropologists was that they reinforced the view that the Basques had inhabited the territory named after them since Neolithic times (Zulaika, 1996); and this happened in a context in which the Basque Country did not have the modern institutions that a consolidated nation state provides to construct and legitimize their myths. The general Franco’s supporters considered Barandiarán a secessionist and he was exiled. He would remain though in a little town in the French Basque Country, near the border with Spain, from where he would eventually return in 1954. Although he had still to work without any secular institutional support, all the Basque nationalist groups unanimously received Barandiarán as a great figure of the Basque studies. However, Barandiarán
still represented a period in which Basque anthropology sought refuge in what could be described as a prehistoric out-of-time site, in which the idea of Basqueness was constructed as a trans-historic essential identity. Thus, some cultural patterns were assumed to be permanent and the anthropologists did overlook the influence of diverse historical events, and context, in the transformation of Basque identity. In turn, Julio Caro Baroja was the first anthropologist and ethnologist who was not a priest: he put his analysis of Basque folklore and popular culture into a historical context, avoiding essentialism. Barandiarán, Lekuona, and Caro Baroja, unlike Aranzadi, developed most of their carriers without any academic institutionalization, given the lack of social sciences faculties in the few existing private and elitist Catholic universities (Mees, 2003). It can be noted that the Public University of Bilbao was opened in 1968: at that time the only university was the Jesuit-run private University of Deusto in which there was not any social or human sciences faculty. Only after Franco’s death was a public university system created in the Basque Country (Mees, 2003; Pérez-Agote, 2006). Despite all this, and the political repression of the Basque nationalism’s diverse manifestations, Basque anthropologists managed to create influential discourses on Basque culture and identity.

Drawing upon Anderson’s (1983) insights, it can be argued that thanks to the work of Basque anthropologists, the Basque community could be brought to exist through a work of imagining it, in the sense that the process of imagining triggers out a process of constructing a reality out of an idea like e.g. a common language, ancestry or mythologies. For Hobsbawm, Hroch and Anderson, in a later phase, recreated or reinvented language, customs, traditions would also serve to enhance the popular feeling of ethnic distinctiveness. That is, a group of intellectuals would try to turn the raw ethnic material into a standardized and modern tool of communication in order to spread nationalism and to turn it into a political movement.

In the last decade of Franco’s dictatorship, a more positive representation of the Basque identity and language started to gradually disseminate into wider parcels of the population. A new Basque cultural revivalism would take place in the 1960’s and early 1970’s, stimulated by all the clandestine political mobilization of diverse nationalist groups. Pérez-Agote (2006, p. 79) stressed that during the Francoist regime’s last decades neither PNV, nor ETA, were sites where ideological reproduction took place. For him, the key ideological reproduction realms were the traditional forms of social control exerted through socialization with family, friendship networks, leisure activities in a Basque Country that he viewed still functioning very much as a traditional
society due to the uneven impact of industrialization and urbanization;

The key difficulty in studying development and change within Basque nationalist consciousness stems from one characteristic: its main reproduction mechanisms were not directed, in the period under examination, by political or intellectual leaders (Pérez-Agote, 2006, p. 77).

Particularly, Basque culture’s popular manifestations were benefited by this new revival: music, oral poetry that served as a base for songs, bertsolarism, and rural sports. Parallel, to these ‘street’ manifestations of Basque culture, a very important work of diffusion of the Basque language and culture was being made by a net of ikastolas that started their work of providing primary and later secondary education. In the 1940’s and 1950’s, Franco’s dictatorship had prohibited all explicit manifestations of Basque culture, and the non-Christian Basque names could not be used for baptism or in graveyards up to 1976; everything Basque was strongly repressed at least until 1968 (Sullivan, 1988). The Basques had to choose whether to join the Spanish language public school system, or to take part in a community action to pass the seriously threatened Basque language to the new generations. In that conjuncture some parents had the original initiative to create a network of clandestine schools to provide their children primary and secondary schooling in Basque language. The fundraising was carried out by parents village by village and it represented a high point of a community action (Conversi, 1997, p. 104). The first ikastolak, after the civil war, were created in the southern Basque Country in the 1960’s, and in the northern provinces in the 1970’s. Only after the regime operated a partial ‘cultural openness’, in the late 1960’s, could the ikastolak continue (now openly) their work of providing primary and secondary schooling integrally in Basque, but indeed out of the public school system. Although, as Tocqueville (2006) had noted, civil associations in a country where the political association is prohibited tend to fail, a survey of statistic data (Mateos, 2000) shows that the ikastolak were a highly significant success. If in 1960 there were only 60 irakasleak (teachers), in 1976 there were 30,000: the number of ikastolak, and of children studying in these private schools had increased spectacularly (Mateos, 2000). At that time, most parents who backed and funded the ikastolak were from Basque nationalist milieus, and born in the Basque Country. Even if at the outset the figures of middle-class parents predominated, children coming from less wealthy backgrounds were the recipients of discounts and grants that permitted them to join the ikastolak. The cases of immigrant parents were very rare (Mateos, 2000). This suggests

---

2 Troubadour
3 In France the use of Basque names in official documents is not permitted to the present-day (2006)
that the *ikastolak* movement is an original example of Basque civil intellectual and moral associativism (Tocqueville, 2006). It was a well-succeeded attempt at setting up a free association among the members of the Basque community to attend their specific social demands (Tocqueville, 2006). This example of associativism reflects that among the diverse Basque nationalist and communitarian trends existed a significant space for democratic practices; and freedom of different communities to organise themselves to express and disseminate their particular positions/interests. Therefore, the Basques exercised some democratic rights to protect their minorized culture in spite of the Francoist regime’s explicit repression, and the subsequent governments’ neglect. One of the *ikastolak* movement’s aims was to guarantee that a new generation of Basque speakers would become familiar with both the popular and literacy variations of the language. In the meantime the members of *Euskaltzaindia* (the Basque Academy), from both sides of the French-Spanish border, made a crucial step by setting up the bases of the *euskera batua*, a standardized form of Basque language. After much controversy, this elaborated hybrid of the different Basque dialects was proposed as an all-purposes high level variety of Basque. Thus, literature written in Basque language started to grow at least in number of publications, although it was not until the 1980’s when some authors like the novelist Bernardo Atxaga would obtain a wider editorial repercussion.

When a cultural elite starts to imagine the community as a nation they can try to spread the standardized version of a given language to make it coincide with the imagined national territory, even if it did not materialize yet into a state (Hobsbawm, 1992). It would be necessary to wait until the Basque statute of autonomy was enforced in the 1980’s, to witness the beginning of the transformation of the until then spontaneous and not institutionalized Basque culture manifestations into a unitary high culture (Conversi, 1997, p. 160). By then, for the first time in its history, the Basque Country had recently inaugurated a Basque public university, where the study and research on fields such as Arts, Social Sciences, and Human Sciences could have an institutional support; and, finally, the centenary private University of Deusto also opened its own social sciences sections. The times of isolated and individual heroic researches about the Basque popular culture and plastic arts seemed to be finally over, and a Basque nation was finally being constructed that could show to the world its own unitary ‘high culture’. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the “normalization” of Basque language in Basque universities is still far from being achieved; and most of the courses have continued to be offered in the Spanish language only (Mees, 2003). Although in the 1990’s the Basque Autonomous Community (CAV) has
successfully implemented the teaching of Basque in primary and secondary schooling, yet the Basque language's presence in many other domains is still scarce. Catalonia and the CAV have been described as the Autonomous Communities of Spain in which more provisions concerning the preservation and implementation of the use of the local language have been written (Poggeschi, 2001, p. 88); and although the term minority is not used in the Spanish Constitution to refer to the local languages the Basque remains a minority language in its own territory. In that sense, it is significant that when, in 1993, the CAV’s government and the ikastolak tried to negotiate the transition of these schools to the Basque system of public schools, most of the ikastolak decided to remain private schools. The negotiations were surrounded by much controversy, although in theory the public school system provided all the warrants that schooling in Basque language would be maintained and even implemented. The PNV’s failure to attract the ikastolak to the public school system was considered one the most traumatic post-Francoism divisions between Basque nationalists (Mateos, 2000). The negotiations involved 114 ikastolak (encompassing 70,000 students). 56% (64% of students) voted in favour to remain in the private network; 36% (25% of students) decided to join the public system; and 8% (11% of students) of ikastolak that also opted for the public system were (as it is common in ikastolak) organized as cooperatives and needed two thirds of favourable votes to enforce their decision. It provoked painful processes that were eventually solved in courts.

It can be argued that the long running efforts by a literate elite to create a standardized variety of written and spoken Basque have relatively succeeded in obtaining the Basque governments' support in the southern Basque provinces. From the 1980’s onwards the euskera batua, the high variety of Basque, which aims at enhancing and recovering the Basque language’s social prestige, has obtained significant mass support. The Unión del Pueblo Navarro (UPN) and its allies have been target of much criticism by Basque nationalism for what the latter depicted as policies of neglect and marginalization of the Basque language spoken in Navarre. Nevertheless, in his article on linguistic rights in Spain, Poggeschi (2001) depicted in a less pessimistic light the situation of the Basque language in Navarre, where the Linguistic Law of this Comunidad Foral arose a big controversy drawing a linguistic map of Navarre: according to the number of Basque speakers, three different territorial categories were created, namely the Basque-zone, the mixed-zone and the non-Basque zone. Unlike in the southern Basque Country, in Iparralde the Basque is not officially recognized as the local language. Even in the southern Basque Country, the Basque language is relatively discriminated in relation to the Spanish language. While the Spanish
constitution stresses that all the Basques must know the Spanish language, the Basque language's learning is not compulsory for the inhabitants of the Basque Country. Overall, the situation of inequality between the Spanish language's and the Basque language's prestige and use in the public domain still remains at present-day. In addition, it is not clear if the official language revitalization efforts have increased the use of Euskera in informal contexts (Echeverría, 2003).

A significant consensus among many authors is that cultural and linguistic nationalism that aims at turning languages, like the Basque, into all-purpose languages at all levels (Hobsbawm, 1996), in order to insert them in the schooling system as the basis of national education and culture, more than educational matters involves a political assertion and fight for power in the name of the minority group. By implementing the use of the Basque language at schools and other public domains, the Basques can declare themselves a national group, and this is a particular political statement that evokes a specific ideological history of entitlements and rights (Billig, 2001). The difficulty found by the Basque Autonomous Government's policies' to stir up the use of Basque language by Basque citizens seems to contradict the common assumption that the Basque is one of the hottest stateless nationalisms in Europe. Nevertheless, it is likely that instead it would be good to think that to have a distinct language is not necessarily the most important factor that triggers stateless secessionist nationalism.

In sum, this section highlighted that the Basque communitarian and associativist action is a highly significant and complex feature of the Basque nationalist movements. In other words, this Basque communitarian associativism does not necessarily share, and even suit, the PNV's and the secessionist Basque nationalisms' (ETA and Herri Batasuna) nation construction projects that are based on European conceptions of nation state.

2.2.6. The history of the Partido Nacionalista Vasco

Sabino Arana had founded a Basque nationalist organization in 1895, and set up the ideological philosophy of what would become the Partido Nacionalista Vasco/Eusko Alderdi Jertzailea (PNV/EAJ). The man that invented most of the key 'aesthetic' symbols of Basque nationalism (Conversi, 1997) was a child of his time. As it is common in peripheral nationalist movements (Smith, 1982; Orridge, 1982), this movement was born in a moment in which Spain had lost one
after the other most of its overseas colonies. Its declining position as an imperialist country also threatened Spain’s internal legitimacy, and in an effort to secure the control of its peninsular territories the Spanish liberal forces started a process of centralization of their political and economic system. The Bourbon restoration tried to enforce a French Jacobin centralized model of state in Spain (Hobsbawm, 1992). Moreover, the PNV was founded in a context of uneven industrial and financial development of the Basque Provinces, which mainly concentrated around Biscay’s capital, Bilbao, and later in parts of the province of Gipuzkoa. This process of modernization, urbanization and industrialization was perceived as a threat for the traditional Basque life style, and also as a factor that begot the decadence of the Basque rural ruling classes formed by landowners. Thus, the foundation of the PNV has been defined as the result of a strong anti-capitalist and anti-liberal sentiment against the very uneven industrialization and modernization of Basque economy that enhanced the centuries-old contrast between urban and rural areas within the Basque territory (Shafir, 1994).

It has been pointed out how Basque nationalism was born when the traditional local rights and laws were abolished after a war with the central state; and how this conjuncture created great discontent in the local population. A main phenomenon that contrasted with the traditional rural economy of the ancient regime was the quick process of industrialization of Bilbao, which started in the 1860’s, was then concentrated around the river Nervion, and based on mining ore and steel production activities. It has been noted that the Basque industry development was begot by foreign demand (mainly English) of his low-phosphorous iron ore (Shafir, 1994). Since the mines were located near the coast and the port of Bilbao, its extraction costs were relatively low; and by the end of the nineteenth century Bilbao was exporting more than 5 million tons of iron. Even after the fueros’ derogation the iron mines continued under Basque ownership; Basque entrepreneurs were able to reinvest part of the profits, and developed diverse related industries such as steel and metallurgy, shipbuilding, chemicals, railways, banking and insurance. A Basque oligarchy who often depended on military contacts with the Spanish government (especially in the case of ship and steel production sectors) controlled mining, industry, and banking. By 1908, one third of Spain’s investment capital was linked to Basque industry and banking (Diez Medrano, 1995). The Basque urban upper sector was an integral part of the Spanish establishment and government, as Heiberg (1989) noted, and the Basque financial and intellectual elites were profoundly influenced by Spanish culture.

The industrialization process in Vizcaya was uneven and highly concentrated in some areas near
Bilbao. It provoked a great rural exodus from the Basque hinterland, while also attracted many immigrant workers mainly from Castile and León. The number of Spanish immigrants arriving to Bilbao quickly multiplied and reached a peak in the 1890’s. Bilbao’s industrial sectors’ economic growth continued to attract many workers to the city, many of whom endured appalling conditions of work and life. An important portion of the Bilbao’s industry’s proletariat was formed by immigrants with a strong Castilian national consciousness and a higher educational level than the Basque proletariat. Thus immigrants were less likely to assimilate to the local Basque culture, which did not enjoy much prestige. Eventually, the immigrant workers created their own socialist political party (PSOE) and trade union (UGT) (Linz, 1967). In that period and context were born the Socialist Party and the Basque Nationalist Party in Bilbao that would soon become the two main political forces in Basque politics, and would determine the development of Basque nationalism in the following decades.

Sabino Arana’s conception of the Basque nation was picked up from the German Romantic tradition known as Volkgeist, which stressed the existence of a national community that is more important than the individual who arrives later and has to integrate to the community. This national community is assumed to have distinctive features such as race, language, government and laws, character and customs, and historical personality, which are thought to be particular to each community. His detractors have often dismissed Sabino Arana as a racist because he claimed that the Basque race was superior to the Spanish and French races; and he considered intermarriage between Basques and make/os (non Basques) to be a plague, and a threat to the survival of the Basque people. Actually, Arana’s emphasis on the importance of Basque race has to be understood within a context in which current academic theories about the Basques were indirectly supporting the idea of the Basque people’s uniqueness. In the nineteenth century linguists discovered and scientifically proved that Euskera was not an Indo-European language. At the time, language used to be linked to race in academic theories. Thus the confirmation of Euskera’s radical distinctiveness in relation to Latin, Germanic and other Indo-European languages was interpreted by many scholars as proving that the Basque race was also different. Nevertheless, by the time Sabino Arana founded the Basque Nationalist Party, the Basque language was in decline and most urban Basques did not speak this language. The knowledge of Basque was particularly rare among the first PNV members who lived in Spanish speaking milieus. In need of a symbol his community could relate with, Arana chose race as the main defining element of the Basque nation, while the Basque language remained an important ingredient, but secondary in relation to race (Corcuera, 1979). In practical terms, Arana assumed
that race could serve to mobilize all the Basques, while the Basque language was considered something remote for many Basques who lived in the cities and identified it with rural life only.

Sabino Arana's emphasis on the necessity of creating an independent Basque Country was a defensive reaction to what he perceived to be an invasion of huge contingents of Spanish immigrants; and a reaction against a capitalism perceived as a threat against the Basque way of life and interests. Arana assumed that these immigrants could destroy the local culture and traditions, especially now when the Basques had lost their traditional political autonomy and institutions that had protected them from the central power's excesses. In sum, rather contradictorily Basque nationalism started as an urban phenomenon, while defending an ideology based on values and views of the world that represented the interests of the rural notables who had been defeated by the new urban bourgeoisie. Paradoxically, the PNV represented the adaptation of antimodem discourses to a nationalist language in order to face a new context of rapid changes, but most Basque speaking rural areas continued to be ideologically more influenced by Carlism. This is the case of the territories of Navarra and Alava that would remain predominantly Carlist until they started their respective industrialization processes in the 1960s. Most of Gipuzkoa also remained under the spell of Carlist ideology until the 1930's. The historian Fusi Aizpurua (1984) pointed out that a situation of political pluralism characterized Basque politics in the period between 1900/1936. Gipuzkoa's model of industrialization was very different from Bizkaia's. Gipuzkoa's economic growth was based on many small local industries; and not on a big financial and industrial centre like Bilbao. Actually, the capital of Gipuzkoa, San Sebastián-Donostia, famous in the Belle-Époque for its Casinos (that competed with Biarritz, in the Basque French coast) and for being the city where the Spanish aristocracy used to spend their holidays, remained relatively detached from the industrialization process, which instead developed in multiple small and medium size towns. Thus, the first industrialization wave did not provoke a rural exodus in Gipuzkoa: it did not attract many immigrant workers, neither did it radically shake the traditional way of life of Basque workers like happened in Bilbao; and there even the Basque language continued to be spoken by the majority of the population. In sum, Pérez-Agote (2006) aptly noted that there were two bourgeois models in the Spanish Basque Country:

Prior to the civil war, two general political models for shaping the Spanish market contended for the attention of the Basque industrial bourgeoisie. One was supported by the vast majority of Bilbao's great industrial and financial high bourgeoisie. It was opposed to Basque nationalism and therefore supportive of Franco's revolt. It also
attempted to create a unitary Spanish bourgeoisie (through financial and matrimonial alliances), together with a strongly centralized and standardizing state. The other bourgeois sector sought to forge a political alliance between an autonomous Basque territory and the central state. As such, it attempted to establish, within the Basque Country itself, a cross-class coalition (including the creation of Basque nationalist labor unions in league with the bosses) through nationalist ideology. This latter model was supported by the less economically powerful industrial bourgeoisie (upper middle class) of Gipuzkoa and Bizkaia, as well as the odd prominent member of the industrial elite (Pérez-Agote, 2006, p. 61).

Tensions between the party's secessionist and anti-Spanish ideology, and his praxis of conciliation/reconciliation with the central power were already underpinning the PNV's first electoral successes in the 1898's provincial elections, when Arana got a seat in Biscay's provincial assembly. The latter achievement was possible thanks to the support he got from the shipping magnate Ramón de la Sota who consolidated a small pro-capitalist wing within the PNV. Ramón de la Sota was at that time literally the only Bilbao's industrialist who supported Sabino Arana's party, while Bilbao's oligarchy remained opposed to a movement seen as contrary to their project of economic integration with the Spanish state (Zabala 1980).

World War I (1914-1918) was a golden period for the Basque Spanish shipping, mining and weapons manufacture industry. The Basque region's industrial growth benefited enormously from the fact that Spain remained neutral in a war in which most European countries would sooner or later get involved. It has often been overlooked that the PNV was one of the earliest Christian Democratic parties created in Europe (Clark, 1979; Conversi, 1997). The influence of Catholicism in the PNV is reflected in the symbolic choice to celebrate the Aberri Eguna (the Day of the Basque Mother Country) yearly on the Resurrection Sunday, during Easter; tradition that has remained unchanged. For instance, in 1910 the Basque nationalist movement adopted a more Catholic-oriented name, Comunión Nacionalista Vasca (CNV, Basque Nationalist Communion). One year later, they created a trade union that soon would become relatively influential among railway workers, and that aimed at dividing “Basque-surnamed workers from the immigrants organized in the socialist UGT (...)” (Shafir, 1994, p. 99). In 1933 this trade union would change his name to Eusko Langile Alkartasuna - Solidaridad de Trabajadores Vascos (ELA-STV). The PNV obtained its first major electoral success in 1917, although its influence was still limited to Biscay. At the end of the First World War, fear of workers' organizations and communism affected politics in the Basque Country and Europe in general (Hobsbawm, 1992). In the years that followed several splits would take place within the Basque Nationalist Party. Different scholars (Zirakzadeh 1991; Espinosa 1993) have pointed out the importance of the fact
that a branch separated from the more bourgeois majority Basque nationalist movement. The leading figure of this anti-capitalist minority in the CNV was Eli Gallastegi (1892-1974), also known by his nickname Gudari (Basque Warrior). The latter adopted the historical label of PNV to name a new Basque nationalist party he created. His movement's more left-wing and working-class orientation would later transform into a more articulated ideology, eventually serving as inspiration for the 1960's Marxist Basque nationalists who conceived of themselves as Gudari, or Basque warriors. It has to be stressed that in this period the PNV's influence in the southern Basque Country was very uneven, and that it did have a very weak impact in Iparralde. Apparently Sabino Arana's theories did not influence at all the French Basque clergy's cultural elites who played a key role in the organisation of most cultural activities related to the expression of a Basque culture that survived in predominantly rural/traditional environment. Historians (Jacob, 1994) have pointed out that at the outset of the twentieth century, the French centralizing state's policymakers had started to notice the failure of their policies to assimilate the Basques. That is, compulsive schooling exclusively in French language and values, was not succeeding in turning the Basques less attached to their local language, moods, “superstitions”, and Catholicism.

In the southern Basque Country, with the fall of Primo de Rivera's dictatorship in 1930, the Basque nationalism's two branches made peace and united again in a single party, retrieving the acronym of PNV. Meanwhile, the main anti-monarchist parties had gathered in San Sebastián to set up the basis for the new government. In that meeting, from which the PNV was absent, the Catalan nationalists, and the Basque and Catalan republicans agreed to create a plan of regional autonomy for the Spanish state (Granja 1986). In the rural areas, where an overwhelming majority were Basque speakers, the PNV acted as a minority political force struggling to disseminate its ideology among a generally indifferent Basque audience (Hobsbawm, 1992). Yet it was somehow the beginning of the Basque national movement's second phase in which nationalist ideas were pronounced by a political intelligentsia without succeeding to mobilize the masses (Hroch, 1985). In the 1931's municipal elections the PNV ran a slate with Carlists. To make this coalition with Carlists feasible, the PNV had to moderate its discourse of separatism, and to emphasise the centrality of race and Catholicism as the essential identity features of Basqueness; and a more left-wing fringe group separated from the PNV to create their own secular and republican party. The coalition between the PNV and the Carlists brought an important electoral success, but soon divergences would arise between the two parties, when the republican state's secularism clashed with Carlist fundamentalist religious ideology. The fate of
Carlists' extremely conservative political stance would be to gradually ally with the Spanish fascist right wing, during and after the Spanish Civil War. In the 1933's parliamentary elections the PNV would obtain its biggest electoral triumph ever (Payne, 1975), and the proposed statute of autonomy for the three Basque provinces was approved by 84% of the voters (Granja, 1986), with an amazing turnover of 87% (Payne, 1975). Navarre, which was controlled by a Carlist majority, had rejected the autonomy statute draft. In the meantime, a right-wing coalition known as CEDA had an electoral triumph in Madrid and this political force cancelled the approved Basque statute of autonomy. Between 1930 and 1936 three different autonomy statutes were proposed for the Basque Country and only the last one was accepted and enforced by Madrid (Castells, 1976). A main difficulty to negotiate with Madrid was also related to what the central state perceived as anti-republicanism from Araba and Navarre. In addition, two PNV demands that were considered unacceptable by the republic, and delayed the eventual enforcement of the Basque statute of autonomy, were “the right for direct relations between Euskadi and the Vatican and the limitation of the political and civil rights of Castilian immigrants through a restrictive naturalization process” (Shafir, 1994, p. 101). Finally, the PNV politicians dropped their more conservative demands and the Basque statute of autonomy was approved in October 1936, three months after Franco's uprising. The Carlist forces of Navarre and Araba joined the general Franco's side, and this provoked a split with the other Basque provinces, but Gipuzkoa would gradually be captured by the Spanish nationalists troops shortly afterwards. The Basque autonomy would last nine months until Bilbao was captured by the Spanish ‘nationalists’ in June 1937, and remained mainly a phenomenon of Biscay. Probably, the most famous episode of the Basque autonomy’s resistance in the republican period was the slaughter of hundreds of people in the town of Gernika (Bizkaia), in April 1937, perpetrated by German airplanes of the Condor Legion. Picasso painted his famous “Guernica” inspired by this event that had international impact in a context in which the European democracies were trying to find a way to avoid a war with the Nazis. The Basque government had enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy during those nine months, and even Basque passports and money had been issued. In June 1937 the Spanish ‘nationalist’ troops took Bilbao and immediately suppressed all the political parties, putting an end to the Basque self-rule by declaring Biscay and Gipuzkoa traitorous provinces. Many Spanish republicans sought refuge in French soil, once the Republic of Spain was definitely defeated by the Francoist army. A huge number of Spanish and Basque republican refugees arrived in Iparralde in the aftermath of the Spanish civil war and met a relatively heady Basque ethnic cultural revival movement. This Basque cultural expression was mainly supported
by some key figures of the Basque French clergy's intelligentsia; it permitted the emergence of the first secular Basque nationalists in France (Jacob, 1994). Throughout the 1930's, this new generation of Basque nationalists sat up the way for new leading figures in the movement, like e.g. Marc Legasse; and to the discourse of Basque self-determination. The creation of a specific Basque department or territory in France would soon become a main goal of Basque nationalism as a preliminary step towards Basque autonomy in France. This project was drawn up and presented in the postwar years by Marc Legasse; but his political party got very modest results in local elections.

2.2.7. The Basque secessionist and autonomist movements’ evolution

The first years after the Spanish extremist right-wing nationalists won the civil war were characterised by violent repression against Basque culture, and those who had supported the republican government (Pérez-Agote, 2006). It is still uncertain the number of the innumerable people who were executed by the regime accused of promoting ‘separatism’. This situation of horror provoked a Basque Diaspora in many countries (Totoricagüiena, 2004). According to Legarreta (1985) between 100,000 and 150,000 people sought exile abroad. Eventually, after years of international isolation, in the early 1950’s, the new Cold War context facilitated the Spanish authoritarian regime’s transition towards some international recognition: in 1951 Spain was accepted as a member of the World Health Organisation; in 1952 in the UNESCO, and in 1955, in the United Nations. At the same time, Spain also managed to sign a bilateral treaty with the United States and the Vatican, both in 1953. In the next years, several USA’s NATO military bases would be set up in Spanish territory. Meanwhile, in the 1950’s western democracies were more concerned to fight communism, and did not support the Basque government in exile. The PNV government in exile would gradually lose the hope of a near return to the southern Basque Country. In Spain, the clandestine PNV articulated its ideas of nation and culture in a very discreet and conservative way, focusing on traditional folkloric manifestation and trying not to arouse the attention of the repressive regime (Bruni, 1993). However, in the 1950’s second half, a new generation of young Basque university students who idealized Basque nationalism and wanted to shake what they considered their predecessors’ lack of activity (Pérez-Agote, 1984), was going to confront the old PNV generation. This radical minority was known as Ekin (to act).

Daniele Conversi (1997) underlined some key reasons to explain why the Basque nationalist
movement took a Leftist turn in the late 1950's, when the Basque Nationalist Party ceased to be represented as the only legitimate movement of Basque nationalism; and ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna – Basque Land and Freedom) was born, in 1959 (Conversi, 1997): the American betrayal, the arrival of immigrants in a second wave of modernization that started in the late 1950's, and the ideological diffusion of Leftist ideas and French existentialism⁴. The sensation of American betrayal among Basque nationalists was a result of the collaboration that had existed between the latter and the USA before the Cold War period and the expectancies this created among the Basques in exile. The second element is related to the beginning of a new period of economic growth and industrialization that this time would affect not only Bizkaia, but also Gipuzkoa, and in some degree Navarre and Araba. This new urbanization and industrialization boom would attract large contingents of immigrants in the 1960's. The third element noted by Conversi is that Leftist ideology and movements were spreading and very influential in the Europe of the 1960’s, and that these ideas were often born in the neighbour France. First, ETA rekindled some Aranist myths. The main Aranist discourses that ETA re-appropriated were the idea of Basque primitive independence, the Basques’ social justice and egalitarianism, the Basques as freedom-loving and democratic people, and last but not least, the Spanish state as the main enemy and accountable for the Basques’ oppression. ETA’s principles, which proclaimed the group a “Revolutionary Basque movement for National Liberation”, in a First Assembly held in exile in 1962, would also be influenced by Marxism and Third World liberation ideologies. Federico Krutwig’s (1921-98) book Vasconia (1963) is considered by many “the key text of contemporary Basque nationalism” (Conversi, 1997, p. 93). This book was very controversial, among other reasons, because the author’s stance was openly against Catholicism and proposed Basque paganism as an alternative to the Basque cultural inertia. Nevertheless, the book was immediately accepted by ETA as a source of reference that would orient the groups’ praxis. ETA did maintain though some general principles of Christian ethics, and although the group adopted an explicit Marxist and Trostkyist influence many people formed in Catholic seminars continued to join ETA throughout the 1960’s. In turn, Pérez-Agote (2006, p. 103) accounted for why part of the Catholic Church played a significant role in the preservation of Basque culture: the Catholic seminars were the only place where Basque literacy was cultivated, and the Francoist repression of Basque culture forced the Basque cultural nationalists to seek refuge in churches.

In Vasconia the idea of race was replaced by the concept of ethnus, described as formed by

language and culture. Thus, Krutwig was the first nationalist to have chosen language as a main element of Basque identity. It has been pointed out (Conversi, 1997) that the Marxist and Trotskyist ideology influenced the book in the sense that great importance was given to praxis and action: the action of learning and using the Basque language, the personal engagement in Basque nationalist mobilization, the fight against the Spanish oppressive state. In this sense, Jauregui (1981) noted that this emphasis on action found in Krugwig should be also understood as the influence of Ernest Renan’s concept of the nation as ‘a daily plebiscite’.

In the 1960’s race had become impracticable as a mobilization slogan with the new huge contingents of immigrants arriving in the Basque Country, and religion was loosing ground in a changing urban society that tended towards secularization. Daniele Conversi (1997) noted that ETA’s new pragmatic strategy followed Lenin’s idea of “what can be done (in a given context)”. ETA attempted at attracting immigrants to the Basque liberation movement. To mobilize immigrants against the oppressive Spanish state it was necessary to adopt a civic definition of Basque identity (Linz, 1985). Ultimately, left-wing Basque nationalists promised the immigrants that if they joined the Basque movement and had a Basque patriot’s praxis they could be accepted as Basques by the Basque “moral community” (Conversi, 1997). A factor that facilitated the gradual integration of the new wave of Spanish immigrants was that they came mainly from the most deprived areas of Andalusia and Extremadura, thus did not have a very strong attachment to the core Spanish identity; and that their level of literacy was lower than that enjoyed by the Castilian immigrants who had arrived at the beginning of the twentieth century. All this made the new immigrants more available to assimilation (Linz, 1985). Moreover, in the last years of Francoism, and over the period of political transition to a democratic regime, ETA enjoyed much popularity beyond the Basque nationalist ranks. At that epoch ETA’s activities represented a daring challenge against the Francoist regime. Deeds such as the killing of a famous general, Carrero Blanco, in 1973, who had been appointed to succeed Franco as the head of the regime, contributed to build up a positive image of ETA like a group who opposed a dictatorship that perpetrated systematic tortures and repressed any manifestation of dissent. This conjuncture favoured the organization of a common democratic platform between socialists, communists, Basque nationalists and other banned political groups to unite forces to fight for a democratic transition after Franco’s death.

On the other hand, Gershon Shafir (1994) has pointed out that all the Basque nationalist movements, whether left-wing, centre or conservative had to adapt their ideology to new contexts
and demands and avoid further internal splinters. This author singled out two main dilemmas that affected all the Basque nationalist parties in a process that he broadly described as the adaptation of a nationalism that initially rejected modernity, but later increasingly reconsidered its positions and selectively adopted modern ideas. For instance, Shafir argued that clarity was never a common element of Basque nationalism. With the democratization and decentralization of the Spanish state the PNV had to face the dilemma of self-determination versus autonomy. It happened in a context in which as the leading protagonist of the autonomist project the party could not longer be explicitly supporting a secessionist project, but neither could rule out or oppose demands for Basque self-determination and to betray its past positions. Another main source of potential contradiction and dilemma that the same author highlighted was the Basque nationalism's shift from anti-immigrant belligerence, due to an ethnic definition of Basqueness, to the currently spreading civic definition of Basqueness. Although the Basque Liberation Movement abandoned Sabino Arana's racial and exclusive definition of Basqueness, ETA's attitude in relation to immigrants has been characterized by vagueness and lack of definition. This is due partly because in the last years of the Francoist regime immigrants were seen as reproducing Spanish culture and imperialism, and later as voting for Spanish parties in the Basque Autonomous Communities' elections. According to Sullivan (1988) ETA would never solve the dilemma of what attitude to take in relation to immigrants, although its socialist wing offered them the possibility to be considered Basques if they supported Basque aspirations. Overall, the adoption of socialist ideas served to modernize a changing Basque nationalism that finally started the transition from a racial to a civic concept of Basqueness. However, it has been noted (Shafir, 1994) that only in the 1990's the civic concept of Basqueness has disseminated in larger parcels of the Basque population.

The liberation of France from the Nazis was one of the factors that propelled manifestations of French nationalism in the immediate postwar years and this functioned as an inhibitor of Basque nationalism in the northern provinces. Although the different branches of Basque nationalism had managed to avoid explicit involvement with the German occupation forces, the situation of Basque nationalism in France did not improve. The movement as a whole fell into relative oblivion and invisibility (Jacob, 1994). It was not until the 1960's when, in parallel to the first ETA guerrilla operations, the influential magazine *Embata* (in Euskera: the wind that precedes the storm) was created which reflected a higher familiarity among Basque French nationalists with Sabino Arana's theories. According to Jacob (1994), although the initial *Embata* was short-lived (1960-1974), this magazine played a key role in the definition of the Basque nationalist
movement in Iparralde, and set up the very bases of the currently ongoing debate over Basque nationalism in France. A main role Embata played was to encourage Basque nationalists to organize and propose candidates for different elections from 1967 onwards: it put northern Basque nationalism in the map of political competition. In the early 1970's Iparralde was perceived as a sanctuary where ETA members, and moderate Basque nationalists, could find shelter when Franco's regime's repression was too tight and unbearable. This situation started to change in 1973 when a Basque secessionist group started to perpetrate terrorist attacks in French soil. The name of the new guerrilla was Iparretarrak (in Euskera: those of the north), and although it never enjoyed the kind of popular support ETA had in its heyday, it would transform the political landscape of Iparralde and the interaction between the Spanish and French polices.

It has been often stressed (e.g. Díez Medrano, 1995; Mees, 2003) that in the CAV the Basque provinces of Gipuzkoa, Bizkaia, and Araba have enjoyed a higher degree of autonomy than ever in their modern history. The Spanish Constitution was approved in referendum in 1978, and the referendum on the Basque statute of autonomy in 1979. The latter permitted the implementation of a limited self-government of the Basque territories within the Spanish state, but neither referendum has been able to set up a solid political consensus between Basques. A main problem that underpinned the Basque National Liberation Movement's criticism against the new constitutional system that eventually permitted the setting up of a Basque Autonomous Community (CAV) in a more decentralized Spanish state, was that the Spanish constitution had not been approved by the majority of Basques, and thus was perceived as lacking legitimacy. Broadly speaking, the Basque left-wing secessionist groups considered the Spanish constitution that was voted in the referendum of 1978 another example of Spanish imperialist imposition. For Connor (2002, p. 27) national self-determination is a variant of popular sovereignty, and its development depends on the nation state's degree of state legitimacy. Walker Connor (2002) considered that the very existence of secessionist movements reflects that part of the population does not see the central state as legitimate, and thus some do not think it represents their nation. Ludger Mees (2003) noted that the Spanish democratic constitution won a broad consensus in the Basque Country, although this consensus was smaller in the Basque provinces of Gipuzkoa and Bizkaia than in the rest of the Spanish territories, and it would relatively weaken the constitutions' legitimacy in the eyes of an important parcel of the Basque citizenship, represented mainly by Herri Batasuna (HB). This party that has often been described as anti-system (Shafir, 1994) would maintain its influence over the Basque society. HB managed to keep its position as the second (Basque) nationalist party in number of votes for over two decades, although some have
pointed out that Herri Batasuna had been declining since the early 1990's due to the gradual privatization of politics and the isolation of what was defined as "the oppositional subculture of Basque nationalism" (Pérez-Agote, 2006, p. 189).

Paradoxically, the very same Spanish constitution that happened to be passively rejected by the Basque nationalists included the project of implementing the decentralization process of the Spanish state and the creation of the CAV. It would potentially grant a high degree of autonomy to the Basque provinces of Bizkaia, Gipuzkoa and Araba in relation to the Spanish state; and it was enthusiastically supported by the PNV. During the negotiation of the statute of autonomy with the Spanish central state the PNV negotiated the inclusion of a few clauses in its final draft, which strategically suggested that the acceptance of the Spanish constitution did not mean that they renounced to the possibility of increasing their degree of autonomy, neither a renouncement of their historical rights. Thus, "autonomy within the state could be sold as a provisional form of national freedom to which others might follow". (Mees, 2003, p. 40). The final text of that statute of autonomy that designed the outlook of the future Autonomous region of the Basque Country was agreed between the then president of Spain, Adolfo Suárez, and the PNV politician Carlos Garaikoetxea who would later become the first lehendakari (or Basque autonomous region's president), and the founder/president of the political party known as Eusko Alkartasuna (EA), in 1986. The Basque autonomous region was granted a high degree of autonomy in the realms of education, communication, taxation, and policing.

Another contentious issue in Basque politics is the problem of territorality. The fact that the seven Basque provinces are separated in two different nation states (France and Spain), and in Spain in two different autonomous communities. Navarre has been a main concern for the PNV, which traditionally wanted to turn its capital, Pamplona (the ancient capital of the Kingdom of Navarre), into the capital of a unified Basque Country. However, the traditional cleavage between Carlists and the PNV was reproduced after four decades of Francoist regime, and the pressure of traditional forces of Navarre succeeded in separating Navarre from the Basque Provinces. Nevertheless, the PNV politicians negotiated the addition of another clause in the autonomy draft to leave open the possibility of Navarre, eventually, joining the CAV (Mees, 2003). When the Basque statute of autonomy was voted for in the referendum of 1979, the recently created coalition of left-wing pro-Basque independence groups, the influential political party Herri Batasuna (HB), close to ETA-military, boycotted the referendum. Nevertheless, given that the Spanish reactionary nationalists were voting against the statute of autonomy, HB did not ask its
partisans to vote 'no'. Unlike the constitution, it cannot be argued that the Basques rejected the statute of autonomy, given that 53 per cent of the census voted 'yes' in its favour. Since 1982 Navarre has officially been a single province autonomous region. This territory has subsequently been mainly governed by a conservative political party known as Unión del Pueblo Navarro (UPN). UPN has claimed to be mainly regionalist and Navarrist, but this political party has shared with the Spanish conservative Partido Popular (PP) a strong antipathy towards Basque nationalism that they have repeatedly accused of being imperialist and expansionist in relation to Navarre. In addition, UPN has often been described as a party that draws upon the nowadays minority Carlist party's ideological inheritance (Mees, 2003). In the 1980's Navarre started its own second, and most successful, wave of industrialization and modernization process. At the time HB's presence in Navarre was already an important element of Navarrese politics, which has fuelled UPN's anti-Basque rhetoric. Meanwhile, the political presence/influence of the moderate Basque nationalism (PNV) has continued to be very scarce both in Navarre and Iparralde.

In the CAV, the historical cleavage and confrontation between Basque nationalist and Spanish banal-nationalist political parties (Billig, 1995) reached a new turning point when an internal split of the PNV caused the creation of EA. This new party, which can be described as a less conservative and more explicitly pro-Basque secessionist branch of the moderate Basque nationalism, took at the outset many votes from the PNV. The solution the PNV found to maintain a majority in the Basque parliament was to set up an agreement of collaboration with the constitutionalist Partido Socialista de Euskadi (PSE), the Basque spin-off of the Spanish Socialist Party (PSOE). This collaboration between the PSE and the PNV led to a coalition government and to an explicit commitment of the PNV to fight ETA's acts of terrorism. A main change already appointed that directly affected the development of Basque nationalism in recent years was the new willingness of the French security forces to collaborate with their Spanish counterparts in the repression of Basque terrorism in both sides of the border. This close collaboration between the two nation state's polices was facilitated when in May 1981 François Miterrand, a socialist, became the president of France: and in October 1982 Felipe González, another socialist, came to power in Spain. One of the first things Gonzalez did was to appoint José Barrionuevo the new minister of interior. Barrionuevo reviewed the antiterrorist policy and turned it much tougher;

The result was that the Socialists passed laws limiting the right of an accused to legal assistance and giving police the right to hold prisoners incomunicado – without access to
lawyers and without presenting them to a court – for up to ten days. Known in legal language as the suspension of habeas corpus, this is considered a violation of basic rights in all Western law because it gives law enforcement the liberty to commit even worse crimes. That is exactly what happened with Spain’s new antiterrorist laws. Suspects detained under these new laws were routinely beaten and tortured, and then released in a few days without ever being charged. Journalists were arrested and convicted of “insulting the Spanish government and the King.” Especially targeted was the pro-Herri Batasuna paper Egin (Kurlansky, 2000, p. 286).

Throughout the 1980’s, apart from a serious economic crises related to the obsolescence of its main industrial sectors, the Basque Country was witnessing the persistence of state violence and tortures perpetrated by the Spanish police against demonstrators and people suspected of collaboration with ETA: the number of Basque prisoners continued to raise steadily. José Barrionuevo got approved a project that according to Kurlansky (2000, p. 287) cost about 100 million USA dollars; was known as ZEN or Zona Especial del Norte; and aimed at obtaining for the Guardia Civil and the National Police the support of the Basque population in their fight against ETA. Further, the worst suspicions that ETA and HB were right to denounce that nothing had changed since Francoist dictatorship seemed to be confirmed when a terrorist group self-named Grupos Antiterroristas de Liberación (GAL) killed 25 Basques, mainly among the Basque refugees in Iparralde, between 1983-87. In the early 1990’s when the coalition between the PNV and PSE seemed to be more solid than ever, the French police started to cooperate closely with the Spanish police. Then, Iparralde definitely lost its reputation as a refuge for Basques persecuted by the Spanish police. The GAL was created in a period in which since the early 1980’s, ETA’s military tactics predominated over political pragmatism: another branch of the group, more oriented to political action and praxis, the ETA politico-militar, had negotiated the abandonment of armed fight. It was also a moment in which Herri Batasuna (HB), a political party that was very close to ETA in terms of political goals, was attracting more and more votes, and finally reached a peak of popularity in 1987. In parallel to this, in the French Basque Country the Basque nationalist forces started to discretely improve their position in the local elections under the banner of creating an exclusively Basque département or province in France (Jacob, 1994). While the campaign of Iparrretarrak would come to an end in the 1990’s, as a result of hectic collaboration between French and Spanish polices, northern Basque nationalists managed to obtain some social support by Basque left-wing groups such as Ezkerro Mugimendu Abertzalea, Euskal Batasuna, Herriaren Alde, and even from southern party Herri Batasuna in 1994 (Núñez Astrain, 1997, p. 56). The main features of Herri Batasuna’s and radical Basque nationalists’ view of the political situation have been described by Pérez-Agote (2006), as
follows;

- There is still an oppressive colonial situation of central power over Euskal Herria.
- Today Euskal Herria still requires a political solution: in general, political independence and strategic political negotiation with ETA.
- The current political institutionalization has only hindered popular political participation. The political parties are especially responsible for this. The political transition has not resolved the problems of Euskadi.
- Youth street violence is the consequence of the political and economic situation in Euskal Herria (Pérez-Agote, 2006, p. 203).

To prove and underscore the coherency and consistency of their anti-system stand Herri Batasuna acted as an organized active minority (Moscovici, 1976/1991), e.g. systematically refusing to take part in the Basque autonomous region’s institutions which legitimacy they did not accept (Núñez Astrain, 1997, p. 45). In parallel to this, the CAV government created its own Basque police force: the Erzaintza (the police force of the CAV) to fulfil the demand of liberating Euskadi from the Spanish security forces and bodies, such as the Guardia Civil, those seen with antipathy by large parcels of Basque society since the Franco regime and the transition period’s excesses. Nevertheless, it has been a matter of controversy whether the Erzaintza should be seen as a specifically Basque police corps; or should be dismissed as being merely zipaios⁵ (collaborators with the Spanish colonization), as repeatedly the left-wing radical nationalists proposed.

After a referendum in March of 1986, at the precise moment when separatist Basque nationalism was reaching its peak in terms of number of votes, Spain joined the European Union; and this event seemed to be a guarantee that Spain’s young democracy was acknowledged by the European democracies. The European idea of the European Community’s founders has traditionally been profoundly anti-nationalist, due to the identification of blatant expressions of nationalism with extreme phenomena of xenophobia, racism, and imperialist expansion like Nazi nationalism; namely with the horrors of World War II. This is one of the reasons why the possibility of a region of the European Community becoming independent of a member state has commonly been considered very remote. The European Union’s provisions have systematically ignored this idea (Lynch, 1996, p. 180). Yet, supporters of a more decentralized Europe of the regions have been able to promote their position; although the participation of European regions in the European Union’s decision-making structures is still very limited. At the outset the very

---

⁵ The term Zipaio originated from Cipayo or Sepoy. The latter was traditionally used in India to name the native troops in the British Empire’s army.
idea of the Europe of the regions was based on the assumption that, apart from nation states, Europe was made by many stateless ethnic communities (Lynch, 1996). However, soon regions that were the site of minority nationalisms ceased to be the only regions represented in the new Assembly of the Europe of the regions that had been created with them in mind, whereas the Assembly would indeed continue to be an organization that sought “to promote an increase in the powers of regional government within European decision-making”. (Lynch, 1996, p. 182). A main contribution of the Assembly of the Europe of the nations was allegedly to introduce in the Maastricht Treaty (1990) the notion of subsidiarity as a defence mechanism to protect the interests of regions when decisions were made in matters that directly concerned them (Lynch, 1996). The idea of subsidiarity was part of the philosophy that boosted the creation of a Regional Council that would serve to promote regional involvement within key decision-making moves in the European Union. All these pressures permitted the creation of a merely consultative organization named the Committee of the Regions that the Maastricht Treaty established as Committee linked to the European Commission. If the European Parliament seems to be slowly, but steadily, evolving as a supra-national institution which is gradually less determined by particular nation state pressures; the Committee of the Regions’ evolution has been depicted as quite modest (Lynch, 1996). Nevertheless, the latter Committee of the Regions has eventually permitted to the few Federal (Germany and Belgium) and semi-Federal (Spain) states’ regional ministers to vote on behalf of their members-states in the Council of Ministers. Thus, a higher and direct presence of the Basque Country in the European Union's decision-making institution has often been proposed as an alternative to Basque secessionism (Gurrutxaga Abad, 2004; Jaúregui, 1999).

Dennis Smith (1999) suggested that Brussels has become a kind of new royal court in which diplomats, lobbyists and officials put pressure to modify policies that are implemented on the behalf of large business multinationals and transnational European corporations. That is, the European Union encourages interdependence and creation of strong links between the major enterprises of its member states; and it, in turn, gives the regions the possibility of alternative sources of funding;

The European regions are being disembedded from their national states (Smith, 1999, p. 247).

In the same line, Hobsbawm (1996) pointed out that the European Community tends to implement policies that in the medium and long-term might benefit the regions of Europe more
than the established nation states. This seems to be also the opinion of the PNV policymakers who, according to an analysis of the political rhetoric they deployed in their official electoral propaganda (1987-1995), put much emphasis on discourses about the benefits of the European integration of the Basque Country; thus avoiding to mention the question of the negotiation of the political conflict with the Spanish state which, by contrast, was a favourite electoral propaganda topic of Herri Batasuna (Beldarrain-Durandegui and Souza Filho, 2005).

Ludger Mees (2003, p. 56) pointed out that the GAL was a very delicate issue in the European Union oriented Spanish politics. Therefore, it took very long (more than one decade) to verify that the GAL was an example of organized state terrorism:

During the last few years, Spanish judges have found sufficient pieces of evidence to charge the socialist Minister of the interior of that period and a number of his direct subordinates with organizing and promoting the GAL. In July 1998, the Supreme Court condemned the socialist ex-minister Barrionuevo and his former State secretary Vera to ten years' imprisonment because of their participation in the GAL activities. Only a few months after their imprisonment, and despite the protests of all Basque nationalists, both were granted a pardon by the conservative Spanish government (Mees, 2003, p. 56).

For Smith (1979, p. 165) the more democratic is the regime, the more difficult is to ignore these ethnic minorities' demands. Thus, along with Hobsbawm, among others, he associated the emergence of explicitly pro-autonomy and secessionist ethnic nationalism with the increasing democratization trends.

Between 1982 and 1996 the Socialists (PSOE) had governed Spain, and the prime minister was Felipe González. But by the middle of the 1990's their party image had badly deteriorated by factors such as corruption scandals; the GAL related investigation that pointed out to involvement of members of González's office; and the implicit failure of the anti-terrorist repressive policy. In that conjuncture ETA's acts of terrorism increased and addressed to more varied kinds of targets. Finally, in 1996 the conservative Partido Popular (PP) won the elections and José María Aznar became the new prime minister of the Spanish state. In the PNV, the most widespread opinion on the Estatuto de Autonomía was that it was dead or in regression. For the PNV, the PP and the PSOE had renounced to the concept of plurinational state, and the process of power transfer from the central to the Basque Autonomous region's institutions was thwarted by the increasingly difficult negotiations between the political parties. (Gurrutxaga Abad, 2004). Further, the PNV's hegemony was being put at stake by PP that reached its apogee at the ballot
boxes in the 1996's elections to the Spanish parliament: in the Basque Country the PP obtained 18.63 per cent of the votes (Mees, 2003, p. 118), his best figures ever. It should be noted that at the time the Spanish economy was performing better than other EU economies, but that the CAV's development of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was in 1996 similar to the Spanish average. However, in the last years of the twentieth century the Basque economy's ranking changed and started to grow faster than a Spanish economy that was then one of the most dynamic economies of the EU. When in 1998 a ceasefire was declared by ETA the Basque economy reached its peak, and was “growing nearly two points more than the Spanish economy.” (Mees, 2003, p. 85) In the summer of 1997, even the moderate nationalists were the recipients of Spanish mainstream media's strategy of criminalizing all Basque nationalists as if they were accountable for ETA's assassination of a young PP councillor (Batista Viladrich, 2004). All this has provoked an extreme polarization of the Basque-Spanish political arena, and the failure of the diverse attempts at setting up an agenda for the political negotiation of the conflict (Segura Mas, 2004).

Between 1985 and 1998 the coalition between the socialists and the PNV had been the axis of the CAV's politics (Mees, 2003), what had enhanced the distance and polarization between moderate and secessionist Basque nationalists. One of the first signs that the political conjuncture was starting to change were the secret contacts held by HB and PNV in December 1997. The promoters of the “third space”, which should serve as a meeting place of citizens dissatisfied with Basque society's bipolarization, were mainly social movements and not yet political parties (Mees, 2003, p. 121). The main promoters were the nationalist and left-wing trade union Eusko Langileen Alkartasuna (ELA), the Union of Basque Peasants (EHNE), the peace movement ELKARRI, the HB-allied trade union Langile Abertzaleen Batzordeak (LAB), and a group of politicians and intellectuals (Mees, 2003). Their explicitly acknowledged goals were: 1) to create a new majority that was favourable to Basque self-determination as an alternative to armed struggle; 2) the de-escalating of tension/conflict through dialogue; 3) the breaking of the stalemate between the 'democrats' and the 'violent people' (Mees, 2003, p. 124/125). The Basque nationalist political parties only joined the pan-nationalist entente proposal in March 1998. First, the CAV's president presented what it was known as “the Ardanza document”; and Herri Batasuna proposed a gathering of all Basque nationalists to discuss the possible application of Northern Ireland's peace process in the Basque Country. Second, as a result of the pan-nationalist rapprochement, the PSE broke its coalition government with the PNV on June 30, 1998. Then, a new Basque nationalist majority was formed with the support of Izquierda Unida
(IU) to the detriment of PP and PSE (Segura Mas, 2004). Finally, on September 12, 1998, PNV, EA, HB, IU, the trade unions ELA and LAB, and diverse nationalist associations, signed the Lizarra Garazi statement. This agreement proposed a global negotiation of the political conflict that respected the plurality of Basque society without limitations. It aimed at setting up a Basque realm of decision in which the citizens of Euskal Herria (not only the CAV) would have the last word on their future (Segura Mas, 2004). Four days later (September 16, 1998) ETA announced a unilateral and indefinite truce.

It is significant that the closure of the newspaper Egin, ordered by the Spanish supreme court, did not prevent ETA from declaring a ceasefire. Egin (that literally means to do) had started to be published on September 29, 1977, and at the outset it was funded through popular subscription. Although Egin did not belong to any holding or larger industrial group, at the time it was closed down, accused of collaboration with ETA, it was the third most sold newspaper in the southern Basque Country. By far, the most read newspapers in the CAV were El Correo Español-El Pueblo Vasco (in Bizkaia) and El Diario Vasco (in Gipuzkoa), both of them of Christian and Social Democrat orientation. In 1998 Egin sold 52,311 copies per day and had 106,000 readers (Etxezaharreta, 2001, p. 27). Egin has been described as an anti-system newspaper that served as a platform for the left-wing nationalism to denounce delicate subjects such as e.g. political torture against Basque prisoners, and involvement of high-profile members of the Ertzaintza with drugdealers. In addition, ETA’s communiqués were generally sent to, and published by, Egin. In turn, El Correo and Diario Vasco represent the Basque pro-autonomist project. For instance, in Diario Vasco prevails a political position that is not sympathetic to the left-wing Basque nationalism. This newspapers’ journalists’ and the PNV politicians’ interests often coincide to the extent that the PNV’s main headquarters, like Sabino Etxea, are places where the Diario Vasco’s journalists’ comments/opinions on Basque politics find a supportive audience (Batista Viladrich, 2004). The sudden closure of the newspaper and radio Egin was reported in Diario Vasco, and this newspapers’ editorials criticized the decision by noting that penal responsibility can be only individual and that the accusation of collaboration with terrorism should not apply to the newspaper as a whole (Etxezaharreta, 2001, p. 57). Subsequently, for several months the Basque secessionist movement published daily a small-size newspaper that consisted of half a dozen pages: Gara. Only by January 1999, popular subscription permitted the gathering of 1,1000 million pesetas to create a new full-fledged newspaper. This newspaper that still continues to be published is also known as Gara.
In terms of ballot box, the third-way's popularity brought benefits mainly to Herri Batasuna that in October 1998's Basque Parliament's elections obtained 17.9% of the votes, and 14 deputy seats (Segura Mas, 2004). Although the PNV lost many votes, overall the Basque nationalism's third-way to boost a peace process in the Basque Country did allow the nationalists to obtain a majority position in the Basque Parliament. Subsequently, the PP's main strategy would be focused on the undermining of the “peace-process”. The agreement that brought together Herri Batasuna, PNV, EA and IU was target of an aggressive campaign of criminalization of all things Basque (Segura Mas, 2004) that continued after ETA's announcement that the ceasefire was over, in December 1999. In the 2001's elections to the Basque Parliament the PNV obtained its best electoral results in the history of post-Francoist Spain. Meanwhile, HB was represented as being very close to ETA, and the political party lost 7 out of 14 deputies (Mees, 2003). Significantly, in July 2001 groups such as Aralar, Batzarre and Zutik abandoned HB. In September Aralar created its own political party: still left-wing secessionist, but against ETA's use of violence (Segura Mas, 2004).

To conclude, it can be noted that the Guggenheim Museum was opened in a political conjuncture in which two main Basque trade unions, diverse associations, and representatives of all the Basque nationalist parties (including the PNV and Herri Batasuna) started to work out a 'third way', aiming at propelling a peace process in the Basque Country (Mees, 2003; Zallo, 2001). On October 19, 1997, one day after the death of a Basque autonomous region's policeman as a result of a clash between Basque policemen and ETA militias, after a frustrated bomb attack against the Guggenheim Bilbao, the trade unions LAB and ELA called for a meeting in Guernica to find a negotiated outcome for the political conflict in the Basque Country. The erzaina Agirre was a member of the ELA trade union (Mees, 2003, p. 123). According to Raento and Watson (2000) that meeting was highly significant, and these authors consider that the event in which even Herri Batasuna held a moment of silence for the erzaina who died in the Guggenheim Bilbao clash marked a shift towards rapprochement between the different Basque nationalist parties.

2.2.8. The Basque modern art and the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum

To examine the evolution of artistic creation in the Spanish part of the Basque Country, it will be followed Anna Maria Guasch's (1985) criterion for differentiating three main periods in the
Basque artistic creation.

1) Some sociologists have stressed that the creation of a system of art galleries, and the introduction of an organised art market, liberated plastic artists from the ancien régime's system based on guilds and schools; and that those galleries of art were created by the bourgeoisie, and not by the aristocracy or the working class (Furió, 2000, p. 139). By the end of the nineteenth century so many impressionist high quality paintings circulated in Paris that there were not enough places to exhibit and sell them. The academic system's ways of exhibition were limited, and the art dealer Paul Durand-Ruel (1831-1922) obtained the support of bankers to create the first art gallery in Paris in the 1870's to show the works of the impressionist artists. Durand-Ruel's undertaking would eventually succeed at internationally launching the impressionists in an exhibition that took place in New York in 1886. This system of art galleries, based on private initiative, would later spread worldwide; and nowadays still remains one of the main bases of the contemporary market of art. A key factor that explains why this contemporary art gallery system was so successful is that the work of art provides the bourgeoisie the chance to make an economic inversion, and to posses an object that enhances his social prestige (Furió, 2000, p. 284). Unlike in the much more cosmopolitan Barcelona, there were not many art galleries in Bilbao, and even less in the other Basque capitals. At the time, what characterized all Basque painters was that they were formed in prestigious centres and schools of art in Madrid, Rome and Paris; their style was deeply influenced by what has been described as Mediterranean pictorial traditions. The end of the nineteenth century was also characterized by the Basque bourgeoisie's refusal to support an art related to Basque nationalism, and their lack of interest for the new avant-garde plastic trends. Nevertheless, by the beginning of the twentieth century socialism and Basque nationalism stood out as the two main political ideologies in the Basque Country, and this would have a decisive impact in most artistic undertakings throughout the century and at least until the 1990's. Although Sabino Arana and the Partido Nacionalista Vasco stressed Basque race's beauty and Basque traditional values (Guasch, 1985, p. 47), they apparently did not bother to create a Basque nationalist aesthetics. None of the painters who followed the PNV were able to create a style different from the Spanish artistic model. The artistic environment was quite unfavourable to the development of contemporary avant-garde artistic expression in the Basque Country. A main problem was the Basque oligarchy's lack of interest in avant-garde artistic expression, a situation that would remain unchanged until the end of the twentieth century (Guasch, 1985). Some interesting artistic creations came from Basque painters who were
ideologically closer to socialism than to Basque nationalism. Two important artists of that period were Aurelio de Arteta (1879-1940) and Julián de Tellaetxe (1884-1960). Both painters were able to portray signs of Basque ethnicity and working class identity, and thus they tried to overcome the PNV artists' style, which Guasch (1985) described as bourgeois folklorist. These two painters benefited from a change of regime from a monarchy, actually controlled in the 1920's by Primo de Rivera's dictatorship, to a First Republic, in 1930. The kind of compromise these artists proposed between Basque nationalism and socialism was already possible during the Second Republic, since the 1933's plebiscite had been highly favourable to Basque nationalism.

A very important undertaking in this period would be the creation of the main museums of art in the Basque Country. The Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao was inaugurated in a period of great economic growth of Biscay's industry. According to Arostegui Barbier (1972), from the beginning, the museum had to tackle two main problems: the too small size of the building where it was opened and the fact that most of its collection was formed by old paintings. It contradicted Bilbao's presumed vocation of being a capital with a contemporary art museum. Nevertheless, Bilbao's atmosphere was favourable to modern painting and an ambitious exhibition, the "Harmony Show" of Biscay, was inaugurated, in 1919, dedicated to modern art artists from Spain and from abroad. When eventually the Museo de Arte Moderno opened its doors in Bilbao in October 1924, its collection of modern art was enriched, among other sources, with the funds of paintings that had been acquired in the "Harmony Show". Later, in the 1920's and 1930's the Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao would also become interested in the acquisition of contemporary Basque art, and would seek to follow up the new Basque artists' evolution. By the time of the Second Republic (1931) onwards it had gathered a big collection of contemporary Basque art, but many of the people in charge of the museum had to seek refuge abroad once Bilbao was occupied by the Francoist troops in 1937. Consequently, part of the collection of the Museo de Arte Moderno was expatriated. The two museums remained closed until the end of the civil war, and part of the Museo de Bellas Artes' collection was scattered. Finally, the problem of space was sorted out in 1945 when a new museum also named Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao was opened in the same site where it still remains, near the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum. The collections of the two former museums were gathered in this museum, which was the biggest and most famous of the city until the Guggenheim Bilbao was opened in 1997 (Viar, 2005).

2) Until the 1940's the two main artistic trends had been the folklorist nationalism, and the

---

6 The first "Harmony Show" had taken place in the USA six years earlier.
realism, which was concerned with social and cultural reality. Most of the painters that represented the latter movement had to go on exile or had died. Thus, in the first decade of Francoist repression Basque painting was mostly based on the imitation of Basque and Spanish impressionism of the beginning of the century. On the whole, the contemporary international trends such as abstraction, cubism, constructivism, and informalism did not reach the southern Basque Country’s postwar artistic environment. Another structural problem that affected negatively the Basque artists’ production was the small number of art galleries in the Basque Country, and the lack of investment of most of them in avant-garde artistic expressions. Until the 1970’s most art galleries in the Basque Country were oriented to supply traditional folklorist and impressionist figurative painting to a bourgeoisie who tended to ignore international and Basque trends towards abstractionism. In the late 1950’s, the relative internationalization of the Basque arts would come from the work of sculptors like Eduardo Chillida and Jorge Oteiza, while painters such as Ibarrola and Basterretxea did not gain the same level of recognition. The peak of their respective international recognition arrived when Oteiza won the Great Prize of Sculpture in the prestigious IV Bienal de São Paulo (Brazil), and when Chillida was awarded the Great Prize of Sculpture in the Bienal of Venice. In the Basque country, Jorge Oteiza, Eduardo Chillida, Agustín Ibarrola, and Nestor Basterretxea had been involved since 1951 in the ambitious project to renew the Franciscan basilica of Aranzazu. This project was complicated by ideological conflicts between the Catholic hierarchy’s conceptions of religious art, and the experimental abstractionism of its sculptors and painters. Jorge Oteiza’s finished sculptures of apostles, and Ibarrola and Basterretxea’s projected murals, shocked the Catholic hierarchy’s common sense, and the artists were accused of being Atheist. One event that also marred the project was the death (1954) of its main promoter: father Lete. This situation encouraged the more conservative branch of the Franciscans to destroy the murals created for the basilica by Ibarrola and Basterretxea, whose symbolism the priests considered to go against Christian-Catholic values. In addition, although Oteiza’s sculptures were not destroyed, he was not allowed to resume and complete his project for the basilica until the late 1960’s. In the meantime, Oteiza managed to survive thanks to private sponsors, like the industrialist from Navarre Félix Huarte. The latter protected him during the difficult period in which the artist focused on the preparation of the exhibition in the Biennial of Sao Paulo. Four decades later, Oteiza would be able to set up in Alzuza (Navarre) a Foundation to protect and spread his work thanks to the collaboration of another member of the same industrialists family: Juan Huarte, who had sponsored many other Oteiza’s projects since the early 1960’s. Although it had been a rather unpleasant and even traumatic experience for most of the artists involved, many consider (Guasch, 1985) the works on
the basilica of Aranzazu a trigger of the unexpected revival of Basque artistic expression. It can be argued that these artists created an atmosphere favourable to geometric abstraction, of constructivism, of analysis of space that was linked to contemporary international avant-garde trends. In addition, Jorge Oteiza published in 1962 his *Quosque tamdum* a book in which he proposed the necessity to understand the essential definition of Basque arts and exposed his theory that the Basques had a heritage of artistic and existential abstractionism (Guasch, 1985; Guasch, 2005). In the 1960’s one of Oteiza’s main concerns was the justification of the artist’s function for the society. The sculptor believed that he had reached the zero level of abstraction in the relation between space and emptiness. Further, he argued that the Basques had achieved in the Neolithic age a similar level of abstraction. For Oteiza, the cromlech-statue represented the total fulfilment of the prehistoric artistic abstractionist research, which cannot be found in other European prehistoric art manifestations (Guasch, 1985). Oteiza argued that the Basque cromlech was the shelter of the spirit, a place of reflection and awareness of the inner-self and the transcendental. According to the artists’ version, the Basque cromlech-statue should be considered the culmination of a process of extreme plastic abstraction, and research on the elimination of the space. As the prehistoric Basques who were not anymore afraid of open and empty spaces and death, Oteiza also thought he had already elaborated a new sensitivity for life; and took the decision to stop creating. Since then, Oteiza’s new mission would be to take care of the Basque society’s necessities by enhancing awareness of the Basque soul’s existential reality. Oteiza assumed that contemporary Basques had a dual Latin and Basque identity: the Basques had two souls, two histories, and two cultures that were alive. The Latin culture had been incorporated later, but only a comprehension of the Basques’ Neolithic culture could reveal the intimate style of the Basque culture related to their hidden mental structure. For instance, Plazaola (1978) considered that throughout history there have been two main artistic trends of figuration and abstraction. This art critic argued that the Basques have shown, since their origins, their preference for symbolism and abstraction, and have tended to avoid figurative plastic expressions; some cultures and people are predisposed to images, as for example Greek and Latin cultures, and other cultures (like the Basque) are predisposed to symbolism and abstraction. Plazaola stated that this preference for a symbolic expression is more common among Oriental ethnic groups who are characterized whether by a nomadic way or life, or by a transcendental religion. Oteiza had tried to create a Basque School of artists in the Basque Country since he returned in 1947, after ten years of exile in South America. He considered that all the previous Basque painters’ plastic expression had always been influenced by the Greek and Latin pictorial models, and that they should not be seen as really Basque artists. Oteiza based this argument on
the assumption that the Basque painters had always been very distant from what he defines as the Basque ancestral tradition. That is, the Basque culture’s non-Western and non-Latin tradition.

In the early 1960’s southern Basque Country a few main plastic abstractionism trends can be found that correspond to the profiles of the four artists who had been involved in the basilica of Aranzazu project. The Basque social realism was represented among others by Agustin Ibarrola, who committed to his Communist affiliation created paintings that reflected his interest in a research of space, geometrical abstraction, and constructivism, although always related to his main concern to reflect in the essence of Basqueness. Eduardo Chillida’s sculpture seemed to be characterized by Basque nationalist views and privileged interaction with the European artistic milieu. Many thought him to represent the prototypical Basque artist who reflected essential features of a Basque art. Néstor Basterretxea can be considered close to Basque traditional nationalism, and his painting focused on Basque traditions and mythologies. Finally, while Oteiza’s many efforts to create a Movement of the Basque School were unsuccessful, in the long-term he ended up having much influence over new generations of Basque artists (Zulaika, 1997).

Although throughout the twentieth century’s first half Bilbao maintained its role of cultural protagonist, the influence in Gipuzkoa of a new plastic trend known as informalism would change this situation at the end of the 1950s. The term informalism has got strictly plastic implications, in the sense that it refers to the plastic form, independent of any topic or symbol tackled by the artist. That is, informalism is a plastic choice and concern, which is not necessarily related to the Basque social or political context. Under a common interest to explore the plastic possibilities of informalism some artists from Gipuzkoa would eventually create the influential group Gaur (Today). They drew on Oteiza’s theories that the abstract is one of the pervasive characteristics of the Basque character. As the art critic Arnau Puig (quoted in Guasch, 1985) pointed out, these artists considered informalism to be the more appropriate contemporary plastic trend for a possible aesthetic of the Basque, and to liberate Basque arts from the already established and traditional artistic models.

3) The Mid-1960’s have been described as a period of associationism among Basque artists. This associationism was in practice reflected in the creation of many artistic groups who tried to set up common aesthetics and cultural projects to boost a cultural atmosphere that was widely recognized as of absolute artistic void. It was a crucial moment in which several artists decided it
was time to join forces and to create a genuinely Basque avant-garde plastic art. Donald Drew Egbert (1969/1981) stressed that the question of an avant-garde art only surfaced in a context of social radicalism, and that these conditions were not given in Europe until the French Revolution. It is only then that the new system, known as democracy, with its system of political parties, its political and religious liberties, and civil rights started to spread to other countries. In addition, avant-garde art projects have historically been associated with an elite of creators. In a context of political radicalization, best reflected by the separatist organization ETA, two main groups of artists were concerned with creating avant-garde plastic work that would convey the essence of the Basque art. They were the promoters of diverse cultural events that gathered painters and sculptors with representative artists of the Basque popular culture, and with writers. Their aim was to increase the ordinary Basque people’s awareness about the Basque reality. An influential group was Estampa Popular, and one of his main figures was Agustín Ibarrola. He was inspired by the legacy of painters like Arteta and Tellaetxe who had highlighted the Basque working classes’ strength and beauty. Ibarrola, and other communist militants or sympathizer artists developed a social realism style. Since the early 1950’s Jorge Oteiza had been claiming the necessity of a Movimiento de la Escuela Vasca (Movement of the Basque School). Eventually, the ‘resurrection’ of the Basque school happened in 1966, when in each Basque province a group of the Basque school was created. The artists’ goal was to create a Basque artistic community without imposing any aesthetic, quality, or category boundaries or criteria (Guasch, 1985). The Basque school created the group Gaur (Today), in Gipuzkoa, the group Emen (Here), in Biscay, and the group Orain (Now) in Araba. The group Gaur, in Gipuzkoa, was formed by some of the most prestigious figures of the Basque avant-garde in that period: Amable Arias, Ruiz Balerdi, Basterretxea, J. Antonio Sistiaga, and Jose Luis Zumeta represented the painting; and Oteiza, Chillida, and Remigio Mendiburu were the sculptors. The group Gaur has been described as exclusive and elitist (Guasch, 1985): allegedly they were more concerned with a professional recognition of the individual figures than with their manifested goal to set up the bases for an aesthetic uniformity of Basque arts. By contrast the group Emen (Here) has been described as more open and less selective. The group Orain (Now), from Araba, had a main interest: to catch up with the newest trends of international avant-garde and to maintain a high level of aesthetic experimentation combined with a deep knowledge of the Basque popular aesthetic tradition. This group selected artists whom they considered representative of contemporary international avant-garde trends, and their project was the opposite of what the basic principles of the Basque School had uphold. All these internal contradictions resulted in confrontation. Specially, the conflict between the group Orain and, on the one hand, the artists who represented the social realism and,
on the other hand, the artists who created a more traditional art provoked the end of the Basque school of artists. The fourth Basque school that was planned for Navarre, and that with the name of Danok (Everybody) was going to gather in a big exhibition works of arts of the four Basque provinces in Spain, was never founded. After one year since their creation, the other three Basque Schools saw how their members parted company and this ambitious project that attempted to create a Basque artistic community was over. A main positive consequence of this frustrated project was that for the first time the idea that the Basque Country needed to have a more dynamic and experimental cultural project started to have some social impact. It was the outset of a new period in which contemporary and high level Basque art, which was also engaged in the search of the Basque essence, would start to arise some interest.

At the end of the 1970’s it was clear that the groups of artists who claimed the necessity of creating an art which was specifically Basque were still influenced by three main ideologies and philosophies (Guasch, 1985). Their theories and aesthetics were based on Jorge Oteiza’s philosophy, and politically they were close to the left-wing aberzalismo\(^7\), although in some cases they could be influenced by a traditional Basque nationalism. In the 1970’s a new generation of Basque artists appeared who refused the idea of viewing avant-garde as an exclusively plastic phenomenon. There are some differences between the regions; in Gipuzkoa artists were very influenced by their geographical environment and Basque traditions: while sculptors like Chillida and Mendiburu were at the peak of their creativity, painters such as Goenaga, Ameztoy, Zuriarrain, and Nagel created naturalistic figurative and very intellectualized works. In Biscay, there were a large variety of abstract and realist plastic expressions. Overall, in the Basque Country, the expressionist abstraction proposed a local variation of this international plastic trend that was based on the American quick-painting model; and what it is known as analytical abstraction. The latter followed a constructivist pattern that had already influenced earlier generations of Basque artists such as Aurelio Arteta and Jorge Oteiza; and can be related to the contemporary American hard minimal abstraction art. Among the artists who created their painting within the guidelines of critical realism, Andrés Nagel has been described as the one who was more liberated from Basque roots, and able to catch up with the newest international trends. His expressive and original work was rather an exception in a context in which Basque artists had to find individually information about the new international plastic currents (Guasch, 1985). In a decade of important political transformations in the Spanish state, most art galleries still gave priority to a folkloric art; and art reviews were scarce and very conservative (Guasch,

\(^7\) Basque nationalism
Until the 1980’s the lack of a previous policy and adequate infrastructure to support and institutionalize the creation of arts also conditioned the lack of an atmosphere that would be more stimulating for plastic experimentation in the Basque Country. Since the end of the Spanish civil war the Escuela de Artes y Oficios de Bilbao, also known as the Escuela de Achuri, which enjoyed much prestige at the beginning of the twentieth century, and had provided teachers like the renowned artists Arteta and Tellaetxe, had remained closed down. Thus for a very long period there was not an official institution where Basque artists could get a formal plastic formation in the Basque Country. This conjuncture only changed when, in May 1969, was opened the Escuela Superior de Bellas Artes de Bilbao. However, throughout the 1970’s the Escuela Superior de Bellas Artes de Bilbao did not satisfy the necessities and aspirations of a Basque art. Most of its teachers and all its directors used to be from Catalonia, given that there were not many Basque artists with a higher education degree in arts. The institution was repeatedly accused of being pro-Catalonia and pro-Spain. Only the decentralization of the Spanish state’s education system permitted the Basque autonomy’s policymakers to introduce and consolidate throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s diverse schools of architects and plastic arts, even at the level of public university. In the same period, the plastic art created in Euskal Herria has incorporated the main international trends and styles; and the contemporary Basque arts hardly differentiate from the art produced in the rest of Europe (Fernández, 2003). The new Basque art movements and groups are not as influential and outstanding as were the previous ones. The present-day atmosphere can be described as more heterogeneous, and the Basque artists develop their creations and act more individually. That is, they are less influenced by the big ideological trends of the 1960’s, whereas for the first time the Basque businessmen and the political classes as a whole seem to have decided to support contemporary arts. In the 1990’s they made a risky bet on the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum. Apart from the famous Guggenheim Bilbao, the development of the Basque and Navarrese autonomies has allowed its respective local government policymakers to open ambitious and lavish contemporary art centres and museums in different capitals and towns of the Basque Country: the Artium of Vitoria-Gasteiz, the Chillida-Leku, dedicated to exhibit the work of Eduardo Chillida, in Hernani, and the Fundación Jorge Oteiza in a village, in Navarre. It seems that the Basque government policymakers and entrepreneurs finally believe that the Basque bourgeoisie and middle classes can be interested in consuming art, and that high art is an attraction addressed not only to an illustrated elite.

Throughout the 1980’s, Bilbao’s traditional industrial sectors of iron, steel and shipbuilding closed down or started a process of reorganization. In the 1980’s and 1990’s about 180 thousand
jobs disappeared in the Basque Autonomous Community. However, in the early 1990’s the Basque economic figures had turned out to be more optimistic and indicated that the economic crisis would soon be left behind (Mees, 2003). The agreement between Thomas Krens, representing the Salomon Guggenheim Foundation of New York, and Bilbao’s officials was signed in December 1991. In the years 1992 and 1993 the Spanish and Basque economies were again sank into a deep recession; and in 1994 unemployment reached peak figures of 25 per cent of the working population (Mees, 2003), but it started to decrease, gradually, after 1997 (Irvin, 1999). In that conjuncture, the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum undertaking has been described as a process of mutual seduction and risk-taking (Zulaika, 1997), and it was only implemented once rates of economic growth gave signs of stable recovery (Mees, 2003). Accordingly, the Guggenheim has also been described as a show organized by Basque government policymakers to attract tourists and to advertise the success of Basque capitalism to the world (Furió, 2000).

Thomas Krens allegedly invented a new kind of museum that would save the Guggenheim New York from a serious shortage of funds: the franchise museum (Zulaika, 2005). Nevertheless, Krens was finding it very difficult to have any buyers for his idea either in New York, or in the diverse European capitals he visited (Haacke, 2005). Eventually, the PNV policymakers bought his idea and agreed to fund the Guggenheim’s franchise in Bilbao. Therefore, bringing a Guggenheim Museum to the city of Bilbao was actually the Bilbao’s provincial and city governments’ deed (Moxey, 2005). The decision to open a Guggenheim Museum branch in Bilbao was a top-down action performed by local authorities and the PNV; and the Guggenheim was part of an ambitious urban renewal plan (Zulaika, 1997) that would be largely funded by Basque taxpayers. The risky decision was taken without public consultation: the process was surrounded by such secrecy and ambiguity that nobody was appointed for the post of artistic director (Zulaika, 2005; Camara, 2005).

Among academicians the Guggenheim Bilbao’s initiative turned out to be a matter of criticism: its grandeur has been depicted whether as a symptom of the contemporary spectacularization of the museum, and of their transformation into corporate entertainment complexes (Fraser, 2005, p. 42); or as an instance of the imposition of an authoritarian narrative of modernity that is more concerned with economic profit than with art (Zulaika, 1997). However, this thesis attempts at showing that the main reason why the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum became a controversial question was not economic. Significant to this discussion is that Frank Gehry’s spectacular building was a paradigm of innovative new architecture in which the container seems to be more
important than the content (Guasch, 2005); and that Frank Gehry’s architecture was something imagined by a particular group of experts with a specific academic knowledge. Many Basques reacted with perplexity in face of the building. In spite of being very distant from their representation of what public architecture should be like, it was placed in a central site of Bilbao, and was granted a position of high visibility in the public space. It is this very grandeur, allied to the building’s abstract aesthetics, what turned it into an architecture that threatened to modify the social construction of the Basque public space.

Moreover, in the Basque Country everything related to economy and culture is likely to be politicized, or liable to become object of a debate with political consequences. Predictably, the ordinary Basque citizen’s lack of familiarity with the language of modern and postmodern architecture and arts (Viar, 2005) served as a raw material upon which a discourse against the Guggenheim Bilbao’s project could be constructed. Jorge Oteiza and other agents/participants drew upon this basic gap that existed between international avant-garde architecture/arts and local ordinary citizens to boost a discourse that opposed the Guggenheim Bilbao project. However, the Basque artists’ and culture representatives’ strategies and goals regarding the Guggenheim Bilbao seldom coincided with ordinary Basque citizens’ own views. For the latter, the conspicuous Guggenheim Bilbao’s modern/postmodern aesthetic seemed to represent an invasion of a Basque public space. In other words, the new museum could be perceived as a symbolic violence in that it lacked the familiar images, symbols, smells of a local culture and architecture they could relate with. It seems that ordinary Basque people are prone not to subscribe most of the canons related to modern aesthetics. This might be the case of some of them who could freely choose their cultural experiences, because they view themselves as a separate, autonomous and differentiated people. In sum, what turned the Guggenheim Bilbao into a topic of debate was that the Basques’ common-sense representations of architecture and arts have generally been rather para-modern, instead of anti-modern.
Chapter three

Discursive psychology: the study of language as action

3.0. Introduction

This chapter aims at providing an outline of the main characteristics that inform the analysis of the data in the following chapters. Here I intend to highlight some differences between ideological analysis of discourse (IAD) and other types of discourse analysis that I consider relevant for my analysis of two Basque nationalist newspapers’ reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao. I will as well explain why I have given priority to approaches that are closer to IAD, although, simultaneously, I drew upon a combination of different types of discourse analysis.

Over the last twenty years discursive psychology has gradually established itself as a full-fledged theoretical position. Discursive psychology has been characterised by an eclectic and multidisciplinary approach to the use of language, in the sense of talk and text, to constitute social realities. To emphasize the importance of language to understand all kinds of psychological and social phenomena, discursive psychology has drawn upon a variety of fields that can provide the empirical and theoretical grounds to study language as action that constitutes reality. Some of the main theoretical insights that contributed to the development of a discursive psychology include the fields of: literary theory (Bakhtin, 1973, 1981; Volosinov, 1973), the philosophy of the ordinary language (Wittgenstein, 1958), linguistic pragmatics (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1962;), the sociology of scientific knowledge (Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984), the new rhetoric (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971; Billig, 1987; 2001), and ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks, 1962).

3.1. Discursive psychology: language viewed as thought, action and ideology

One of the main assumptions of discursive psychology is that social psychologists did not pay enough attention to the role of language and to the way that people’s views on the world are
constituted through social interaction. This assumption shows that for discourse analysts language has got a key role in social life which without language interaction would not be reproduced. Since language is viewed by discourse analysts as something to be used, the traditional distinction between ‘words’ and ‘action’ is misplaced (Billig, 1997). In that sense, Ludwig Wittgenstein saw language as a vehicle of thought, and thinking to be closely related to verbal interaction. Although Wittgenstein (1953) did not deny that inner processes of memory exist, he highlighted that people are using the word ‘remember’ in a specific way, when they say they are ‘remembering’. According to this philosopher of language, to understand what ‘remembering’ means it has to be observed how it is used in discursive interaction with specific purposes. What Wittgenstein was proposing, and later would be developed as an important concern in conversation analysis (CA) is that talk about inner mental processes was rooted in social and discursive activity. Therefore, discursive psychologists suggest that the study of ‘memory’ should be based on the analysis of what actions are people actually trying to accomplish when they make claims about ‘memory’.

In the 1920’s, Mikhail Bakhtin (1986) noted that ‘inner thinking’ was modelled in talk and text interaction; and that ‘self-reflexivity’ or ‘inner dialogue’, the knowledge or maturation of the ‘inner-self’, was achieved only in a dialogue with a plurality of other voices and outward utterances or views of the world. He underlined that humans have capacity of agency and fulfilment of the self, and that ordinary people can play a creative active role in the collective making of history. Moreover, he stressed that reflexivity and the understanding of the individual’s structural limitations are a preliminary condition for freedom. In this sense, Bakhtin bore in mind that language could not be totally generated by individual speakers/writers, although speakers/writers can reflexively relate to the generic structures of language and its conventions, and have an active/creative interaction with it.

In the last decades a range of social psychologists have adopted a social constructionist approach, pointing out that emotions and thoughts are not just inner processes of the individual human mind (Gergen, 1994; Shotter, 1995; Moscovici, 1984; Tajfel, 1981), but shaped by society and history. Particularly, Gergen (1973, 1985) emphasised that social psychological phenomena clearly fluctuate over time, depending on patterns of thinking and acting that are historically situated. In turn, Moscovici highlighted that social representations and other psychological concepts are created and transformed in specific historical and social sets, and cannot be reduced to individual
psychological states and functioning. Nevertheless, Moscovici also stressed that the use and expression of psychosocial constructs do not necessarily depend upon the context of interaction. In turn, Tajfel can be considered to fit better in the tradition of North American social cognition classic psychologists, such as Heider and Festinger, among others, in that he was looking to grasp some universal patterns to understand intergroup relations. Nonetheless, most social psychology approaches to language have tended to overlook that language has to be observed in practice, and that language is performed in interaction through speech acts. By contrast, discursive psychology rejects the idea that e.g. attitudes, remembrances, identification, attribution are inner processes that happen within people's minds; and propose that the analyst looks upon the actual context of interaction in which representations and descriptions are uttered.

A main project of discursive psychology is to advance the study of psychological topics by drawing upon the insights of discourse analysis and the sociology of the scientific knowledge (Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984). Potter and Wetherell (1987) adopt a broad definition of discourse as referring to all kind of written and spoken language, and emphasize that discourse is always action oriented. The fields of ethnomethodology, conversations analysis, and post-structuralism (Barthes, 1982; Foucault, 1991) have been pointed out as important influences for the constitution of discourse analysis (DA). All of them have in common their discursive focus, and their concern to analyse talk and texts as social practices. Discourse analysis work underlined the important role that constructions of a version play as factual accounts in talk and textual interaction. In other words, discursive psychology proposes that e.g. attitudes should not be treated as inner states of mind. Discursive psychologists stressed that attitudes can be read as opinions or accounts and treated as 'texts'. Thus, "they can be analysed as if they were linguistic productions: their ideological grammar and syntax can be explored." (Billig, 1997, p. 207). A key assumption of Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discursive Analysis (DA) is that descriptions and accounts of these descriptions serve to construct versions of the world. In turn, the same descriptions are constructed in discursive interaction in particular interaction contexts. Further, categories and descriptions are the way in which different versions of reality are constituted through talk and text. A stance of methodological relativism would involve, in practical terms, shifting the focus from the question of truthfulness in utterances, to what the utterances are doing and constructing. Methodological relativism, according to Potter (1996, p. 98/99), permits to avoid the pitfalls of becoming the vassal of a given group whose evaluations and descriptions can be taken as objective accounts of reality, when they are analysed as if uttered without the
mediation of any interaction and argumentative context.

An important idea disseminated by discourse analysts is that factual accounts have got two simultaneous orientations: an action orientation and an epistemological orientation. On the one hand, descriptions will always be constructed to accomplish some action and purposes. In addition, a description will always be constructed and will implicitly claim to be a factual version. As Potter (1996, p. 108) stressed, the epistemological orientation of a description is itself orientated to action, and itself a form of action, even if the utterer or writer who constructed such factuality is not necessarily aware that she/he is performing an action. In sum, a central assumption in discursive psychology is that peoples' descriptions are actually oriented to perform actions, and are not merely factual and neutral accounts of reality.

A main unifying criteria and concern among discourse analysts involves the variability of discourses that can be found in any discursive interaction. Discourse analytic approaches see language and discourse as not stable or unified, but as characterised by multiplicity of meanings that are in a constant flux. A typical analytical manoeuvre of discourse analysis is to detect repertoires of discourse. Such repertoires or discourses are signalled by the repetitive use of metaphors and vivid idioms in descriptions, and they provide a clue of what utterers are trying to accomplish in particular interaction contexts. Looking at variability between different repertoires or discourses deployed by utterers allows the analyst to observe how people explain, warrant, justify and manage their own accountability modifying their interpretative repertoires or discourses in different contexts of interaction. Thus it is assumed that variability provides valuable clues about the argumentative, functional and contextual patterns of the analysed discourse (Edwards and Potter, 1992). And rather to avoid or neglect it, discourse analysts look forward to find variability, which they consider a core analytic 'lever'. The concept of interpretative repertoires was coined by Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) to explain variability and contradictory discourses found in scientists' discourses accounting for they work. These sociologists of scientific knowledge (SSK) analysed how scientific discourse was socially constructed among biochemists they interviewed who accounted for the 'truth' and 'error' of their experiments using two main and contradictory interpretative repertoires: the empiricist and the contingent. The empiricist repertoire was pervasive in formal research papers where the scientists assumed that 'objective' facts explained the 'truth' of their own scientific beliefs. By contrast, in informal interviews the contingent repertoire was used to account for the errors of the other scientists, which were attributed to personal characteristics, social influences, etc. The
Gilbert and Mulkay's book drew attention to the fact that accounts and beliefs are delivered in particular social contexts, to achieve particular social functions, and that this is the reason why any discursive interaction presents a certain degree of variability. Discourse analysts pointed out that interpretative repertoires serve to construct an apparently unitary and coherent vocabulary upon a given topic or theme, but that the world those discourses actually construct is far from unitary. On the contrary, descriptions of events, or opinions over topics, are characterised by variability and serve to constitute what they are describing in different and even opposed ways (Potter and Wetherell, 1987).

Discourse analysts bear in mind the actual action orientation embedded in many descriptions. They draw attention to interaction contexts in which descriptions are typically used when actions affect sensitive issues. Thus, they have stressed that the use of factual language serves to tackle potentially conflictive themes, and to make them appear reasonable. That is, the claim of factuality in descriptions serves to argumentatively manage conflicting views of the world; to reinforce and prevent a version against attacks; and to undermine opposite versions. Discourse analysts suggest that descriptions are assumed to provide factual accounts and that the construction of factuality in descriptions has got the rhetorical purpose of serving as a weapon to protect one's own version (defensive rhetoric) and to attack all the potential counter-versions (offensive rhetoric). Thus, as Potter (1996, p. 107) put it, the rhetorical emphasis of discourse analysis serves to stress that there is a relation between the construction of a description and alternative descriptions. Thus, DA focused on disclosing a variety of rhetorical tools that can serve to protect and to counter any given description. In sum, the rhetorical analysis is necessary to work out how the construction of different versions of the world works in particular argumentative contexts. This way the procedures deployed to build up or protect some versions and to undermine other versions can be studied. Drawing upon Bakhtinian vocabulary, Potter proposed to label reifying discourse the typically defensive rhetoric that aims at reinforcing a version or description as if it was factual and solid. In turn, the same author proposed to depict discourses that undermine descriptions or versions of the world as ironizing discourses:

I will treat ironizing discourse as talk or writing which undermines the literal descriptiveness of versions. It is the opposite of reifying discourse: it turns the material thing back into talk which is motivated, distorted or erroneous in some way (Potter, 1996, p. 107).
Rhetoric has often been seen as synonymous with persuasion, and this idea of rhetoric has inspired important research in cognitive psychology that aimed at verifying how effective rhetoric can be to elicit a change of attitudes in people. On the contrary, the way discursive psychology understands rhetoric is based upon its alleged capacity to provoke the audiences' agreement, or what has traditionally been known as the 'suasive' rhetoric. Therefore, discursive analysts' main focus is on how antagonistic and opposed versions are rhetorically constructed whether defensively to reinforce a version, and in order to resist the offensive counter-versions, or offensively to counter and undermine alternative versions. In the discursive endeavour of factuality construction several rhetorical devices can be found that serve to build up the agent as a reliable source of factual accounts or discourses. For instance, the construction of the writer or utterer as someone who does not have interests at stake is one example, and category entitlement another. These rhetorical weapons and the situations in which they are typically deployed will be explained in more detail in the forthcoming analytical chapters. As it has already been pointed out, discourse analysts have highlighted that the construction and claims of factuality in description (epistemological orientation) is itself action oriented. Consequently, to present one's own version as factual and objective is a praxis orientated to strengthen a particular version of the world and to prepare it to counter opposite versions. The claim of factuality is such an important and pervasive element in discursive interaction that much of discourse analysis focus has been on uncovering the ways this management of factuality is operated in texts and talk.

The ideological Analysis of Discourse (IAD) highlighted that the construction of factuality of a version is related to particular rhetorical contexts in which different versions of the world clash. IAD is concerned with how objective historical and material circumstances influence individuals' consciousness and action orientation. IAD is as well interested in looking at argumentative activities: versions of events, accusatory and justificatory work. It is assumed that argumentative activities exhibit ideological patterns of reasoning and particular images of the social world. Therefore, IAD focuses on the detailed analysis of particular accounts. This fine-grain analysis of argumentative work is an attempt at simultaneously drawing attention to the immediate rhetorical context and to the broader socio-historical ideological context that shapes the use of language, as a means to provide a more empirical grounding to the study of ideology (Wetherell, 1998). The focus on details can serve to uncover the reified, taken for granted and habitualized common-sense assumptions that underpin oppressive hegemonic ideologies. For instance, IAD highlights the ideologically determined nature of "ideological dilemmas" (Billig et al, 1988); and tries to
work out the hidden work of ideologies that are embedded in e.g. unconscious habits, metaphors, and naturalized stereotypes. In this sense, IAD attempts at detecting, and tackling, the aspects of ideologically significant themes that are assumed to be delicate. Overall, IAD aims at understanding the relation between the temporal dimension of language and its particular historical time. IAD provides a picture of the social world in which diverse language actions and texts are interconnected and created in a concrete historical context (Volosinov, 1973). In my analysis I assumed that different textual discourses reported in the Basque nationalist daily press to argumentatively construct (reify) and protect a particular version of the Guggenheim Bilbao, and to counter, criticize and destroy opposite versions (ironization), were underpinned by both the specific political and economic conjuncture and by larger ideological contexts, such as Basque nationalism and international modernity.

3.2. Different emphasis put on the context indicates diverse DA approaches

In order to distinguish different approaches to discourse analysis a relevant clue can be to look at the different emphases. Some conversation analysts (CA) and discourse analysts (DA) (Antaki, 1994; Edwards, 1996; Potter, 1996) do in their analytical practise focus more on the verbal interaction between participants and on how participants try to perform particular activities, regardless of the wider context.

Conversation analysts have even proposed to stop looking upon 'context' as something exogenous to discursive interaction. Influenced by its microscopic focus on conversational interaction, the most radical approaches of CA have tried to present their technique as a neutral methodology in which all context is “endogenous” and depends on talk interaction between participants who are members of a given language community (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). CA has often been proposed as the study of the “speakers’ competence” in verbal interaction: the study of argumentation techniques that the speaker draws upon to construct a version, to defend and protect it from countering, and to undermine opposed versions in order to achieve specific goals. In this sense, discourse analysts indicate that the analysis must be action-oriented and should look at language as performed in immediate contexts; and as a set of social practices. According to Derek Edwards (1996) discourse analysis should look at what descriptions are doing in the sense of creating versions of the world with specific purposes through attributions of
blame and other procedures. In parallel, instead of evaluating the speaker's/writer's truthfulness, discourse analysts should be concerned with the study of purposes and implications of the utterer presenting his/her version of events or describing his/her identity and position as if these were a disinterested account of how things really are. Moreover, at times CA stressed that the immediate 'context' of any given utterance is also constructed and can be modified in talk within interaction between participants (Heritage, 1984).

The implication of all this is that analysts that use CA approaches to examine spoken or written language interaction do often tend to overlook the important influence that specific ideological and historical contexts have for problems of discursive interaction and thought. Nevertheless, other discursive psychologists (Billig, 1991; Wetherell and Potter, 1992) do also look at the interactional aspects of conversation or written language exchange, but from the outset they analyse their data in the light of ideology and precise historical contexts. Unlike traditional conversation analysts (CA), Billig (1987) noted that rhetoric should be seen as a widespread resource that is constantly deployed in discursive interaction by people who attempt at reaching understanding, and not simply try to protect their own version; and to counter opposed versions. In one article in which it is argued that actions are accomplished through context-bound "speech-acts" or "utterances", Billig (1997, p. 208/209) pointed out that a focus on "utterances" and particular argumentation/rhetorical contexts would benefit much cultural studies. On the other hand, Bakhtin highlighted that utterances are always part of a dialogic praxis in that they are pronounced as a response to counter-utterances in particular interaction contexts. In this sense, attitude statements can be considered opinions that are uttered in a dialogic relation to counter-opinions in highly rhetorical contexts of interaction. Michael Billig (2001) even noted that beliefs are only termed 'attitudes' when they are challenged, and he proposed to study attitudes as public positions in matters of controversy. He views attitudes as reflecting positions that imply a stance against a counter-position, and that have to be understood in dialogic relation with the rhetorical context of utterance. In this thesis I also adopt this Bakhtinian view that

dialogic conversation can offer the social psychologist a direct glimpse at the social processes of thought (Billig, 2001, p. 215).

The importance of language and the use of utterances in discursive interaction was first emphasised in the 1920's by Volosinov (1973) in the book Marxism and the Philosophy of
language. The Russian author pointed out how detailed analysis of the use of language in particular texts could serve to observe how consciousness is shaped by ideology within communication and interaction practices. Bakhtin described utterances as "speech acts", creating a concept that would influence much discursive rhetorical psychology and that emphasises the action orientation of language. As Bakhtin, Billig (1997) adhered to the assumption that human consciousness is constructed through language interaction, and he proposed that studying utterances in deep would contribute to a "materially based social psychology" (Billig, 1997, p. 210). The base of this discursive and rhetorical psychology approach are utterances conceived of as speech acts that are performed to accomplish some purposes in a particular socio-historical context. A key proposition of Billig to support his plea for a discursive social psychology approach is that the study of what an utterance is doing in a particular rhetorical context would be the best way to examine how such varied phenomenon as psychological states and identities are socially constituted. Bakhtin (1986) wrote that utterances are the key to analyse human language and interaction because any utterance belongs to a particular subject and material context of interaction. Therefore, the utterance is the 'real unit of speech or textual communication' (Bakhtin, 1986; Billig, 1997). A discursive dialogic perspective of analysis applied to social psychology should study not only memory, emotion, attitudes, but also what Bakhtin defined as 'genres of utterances'. These 'genres of utterances' are related to the building up of identities, such as national or ethnic identities; and they should be analysed paying attention to how people by talking about, describing, justifying, and using attitudes and memory reflect the material constraints of an outward criterion or wider historical context that shapes such words and the social practices such language contributes to confirm or criticize.

Now, I will briefly mention a few works from different theoretical approaches that have provided a rich insight on the working of political rhetoric for the construction of political and national identities. From a discourse analysis perspective there has been analysis of the way that British politicians typically use key rhetorical tools to address to their live audiences (Atkinson, 1984), or to their party members in meetings (Heritage and Greatbach, 1986), and of the way they manage to elicit the recipients' applause. These rhetorical resources used by British politicians were defined as 'clap-traps' (Atkinson, 1984), and seven key rhetorical devices were identified by Heritage and Greatbach (1986), such as contrasts, and puzzle-solutions, among others. Moreover, the discursive rhetorical approach applied to political rhetoric (Billig, 2003) has stressed that the notion of identification can also be treated as a rhetorical process, since social
identities are created through linguistic interaction that involves talk (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998) or text. Discourse analysts have been concerned to study how ordinary actors express their national identification through talk (Billig, 1991; Wetherell & Potter, 1992), and an important observation they made was that the presumed audience has got a crucial effect upon how elite speakers/writers construct their political discourses. For instance, discourse and rhetoric analysts argue that such a rich and influential theory as Self-Categorization Theory (SCT) should be understood in terms of rhetorical action/interaction, and of the business that is being accomplished, not as just an internal cognitive process. SCT (Turner et al, 1987) is grounded in Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1981), although it elaborated further insights on the complex process of group categorization. A core and original idea proposed by Self-Categorization Theory (SCT) was that once an individual self-categorizes as member of a group, she/he adheres to this groups’ representations and views of the world, and so she/he tends to accept the norms, values and even the shared stereotypes about outgroups. Thus, SCT intended to turn self-categorization the key psychological concept to tackle the complex question of intergroup relations and stereotyping. This theory worked upon the previous Social Identity Theory, which had stressed the importance of social categorization for the representation of the world in terms of ingroups and outgroups, and its repercussions over the ingroup’s positive representation and the outgroup’s negative representation, among other perceptual/categorization phenomena.

The discursive rhetorical approach to identification that I adopted in this thesis acknowledges the importance of self-categorization phenomena in the case of the Basque ethnic and political identity, although I also adopted the view that self-categories are not fixed, but are rhetorically built up. To put it shortly, self-categories can be used and transformed in a dialectical interaction with the rhetorical context (Wetherell, 1998). In work on political identification (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996) has been verified that self-categorization is a rhetorical action that can be adapted to different rhetorical contexts. Further, it is based on the construction of common interests and identification between utterer/writer and audience/reader. By looking at psychological and interaction phenomena, which involve identification of the speaker/writer with their audience/reader, the discursive and rhetorical analysis of political discourse can offer an insight on how identities are discursively constructed, contested, reasserted in particular rhetorical contexts in which the utterer modifies her/his discourse according to the presumed audience/reader.
Discourse rhetorical analysis also proposes to study ingroup and outgroup categorization (Tajfel, 1981) in terms of rhetoric of 'Us' versus 'Them', and what is this rhetoric doing in particular rhetorical contexts. Billig (2003) argued that group categorization depends upon acts of language in interaction contexts. Accordingly, he conceives of the use of 'Us' and 'Them' as oriented to the constitution of political and national ingroup loyalty, and thus it is necessary to examine it in the details of political rhetoric. A main procedure politicians draw upon to build up a sense of communality with their audiences, and to present themselves as loyal members of the nation their audiences presumably do belong to and identify with, is the ambiguous use of pronouns (Seidel, 1975). The lack of specificity of the 'We' that politicians commonly utter has got its specific rhetorical function: to suggest, as Billig pointed out (2003), an 'identity of identities', and to create the idea that the imagined audience is a united entity or community. Consequently, the others will be seen not as opposing only us, but as opposing universal common-sense principles. Billig stressed that this is typically accomplished by routine use of pronouns and political clichés. Accordingly, Billig (2001) stressed that, if they want to investigate ideology, social psychologists should incorporate insights from other fields of the social sciences: such as anthropology, history, linguistics, and new rhetoric. He proposed that a very suitable approach to understand how ideology works is to draw upon a rhetorical analysis of patterns of argumentation that permit verifying what has been taken for granted as common sense. In all rhetorical dialogue between different versions and voices, there is an explicit clash between arguments and counterarguments. The analyst has to note what is explicitly been said, but also what is left unsaid, unchallenged, and even what is presented as unchallengeable or untouchable and if the unsaid is assumed or not to be beyond controversy (Billig, 2001).

There is a further development in discursive psychology, which could have significant implications for cultural studies and the critical examination of ideology. Language not only constitutes consciousness, but it also constitutes the unconscious. Thus, utterances are not only expressive, but they can also be repressive. It should be possible to examine routine uses of language in order to reveal how discursive habits enable certain things to be said, and others to be left unsaid. In this respect, patterns of speech can have repressive functions, constituting a 'dialogic unconscious', which can be observed directly in patterns of social interaction (Billig, 1997, p. 209).

To put it shortly, while traditional conversation analysis (CA) is generally concerned with speakers/writers' competence and their discourses' functionality to accomplish specific goals; IAD analysts also focus on implicit ideological processes such as symptoms of underneath
repression embedded in utterances, and attempt at relating particular utterances to patterns of social dominance. Although some of the above examples serve to illustrate how CA have often addressed the topic of political persuasion, Wetherell (1998) and Billig (1999) pointed out that generally CA analysts seem to be unaware of several assumptions they make about the world that affect their analysis. For instance, they apparently take for granted that power asymmetries and conflicts are typical of institutional and public realms, but are not to be found in casual and private conversation that they appear to assume is a shelter characterised by participation and equality. This is generally the reason why CA analysts (Schegloff, 1997) consider that any attempt at explaining a verbal interaction drawing upon consideration of a wider historical context, beyond the real time interaction, risks the pitfall of value judgements. Unlike most CA analysts who apparently take for granted that people are engaged in rational verbal interaction with specific purposes, Billig’s (1995) IAD approach emphasises that, for instance, routine expression of banal nationalism is underpinned by unconscious habits of thought that hidden underneath conflict and repression. This is why for IAD analysts what is left unsaid is as relevant as what is being explicitly said; and they consider that there is always a dialogical relation between what is said or foregrounded (expressed) and what is omitted or backgrounded (repressed).

Some IAD analysts have argued that CA is too prisoner of empiricist conceptions of language interaction which is seen as an accumulation of technical procedures to analyse participants' competence in the real time unfolding of conversation. It has been suggested (Weltman, 2000) that the more traditional CA approaches give too much importance to the analysis of discourse and to rhetorical techniques that enhance the participants' speech competence. That is, it has been argued that CA’s focus on the shared rules of interactions does not provide the wider-scale social conflicts and interests that shape such participants' interactions. Further, this emphasis on the conscious would permit to overlook the ethical and ideological dilemmas that involve arguments over delicate issues: “there is an inherent preference for the conscious, for things which can be clearly brought to light. In CA then, there is a dominant interest in what actually appears on the transcript” (Weltman, 2000, p. 95).

In turn, Wetherell (1998) warned against the trend to make a too sharp distinction between, on the one hand, discourse analysis approaches that are viewed as affiliated to the traditions of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, and, on the other hand, analysis of the work of
ideology in discourses that follow post-structuralist traditions. Wetherell (1998) pointed out that social psychological discourse analysts took important steps heading to a more integrative stance across the different domains; and that this was expressed in their use of analytical concepts such as positioning, ideological dilemmas, variability, and interpretative repertoires, among others. For instance, Wetherell (1998) proposed to adopt an eclectic discourse analytic approach drawing upon concepts like interpretative repertoires that serve to analyse discursive interaction, while also capture the familiar “doxa” (Barthes, 1972), or the taken-for-granted, habitualized ideological aspects that underpin arguments and subjects’ positions:

These interpretative repertoires comprises members’ methods to make sense of this context—they are the common sense which organizes accountability and serves as a black-cloth for the realization of locally managed positions in actual interaction (which are always indexical constructions and invocations) and from which (...) accusations and justifications can be launched. (Wetherell, 1998, p. 400/401)

This integrative approach aims at getting over these alleged differences between CA and Ideological Discourse Analysis approaches to discursive psychology in order to set up the bases of a critical discursive social psychology. It proposes to combine a fine-grain analysis of the immediate discursive interaction and the examination of the wider historically situated ideological context that shapes the discursive construction of particular world views, interpretative repertoires and identities.

3.3. Critical Discourse Analysis and the study of news reports

In this section I aim at briefly describing what is known as the critical approach to discourse analysis, which has proposed new ways to examine how ideology works on verbal and written discourses. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) shares most of its basic assumptions with the above described discourse analysis approaches. Nevertheless, although CDA sees discourse and language as social and communicative practices; it is also conceived of as constitutive of and constituted by social and political contexts (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The critical discourse perspective practice’s defenders have argued that discursive acts constitute social conditions, and contribute to perpetuate or change the social status quo. Not unlike Michael Billig’s dialogical and rhetorical approach to discourse analysis, critical discourse analysts are generally more
concerned with the historicity of social and political contexts (Wodak et al., 1999) than e.g. conversation analysts. Thus it has been pointed out that CDA reflects a more general late-modernity's turn towards enhanced reflexivity in all social domains (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). It has been argued that CDA belongs to a long tradition that can be traced back to the classical (Greek) antiquity, but it has been noted that "what is distinctive about CDA within this tradition however is that it brings social science and linguistics (specifically, Systemic Functional Linguistics (…) together within a single theoretical and analytical framework, setting up a dialogue between them." (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 6). Therefore, an important feature that CDA has in common with other DA is its transdisciplinarity. In addition, they claim that they do not intend to set up a new method. This is how well known CDA researchers accounted for their lack of method in the traditional empirical sense:

We see CDA as bringing a variety of theories into dialogue, especially social theories on the one hand and linguistic theories on the other, so that its theory is a shifting synthesis of other theories, thought what it itself theorises in particular is the mediation between the social and the linguistic – the 'order of discourse', the social structuring of semiotic hybridity (interdiscursivity). The theoretical constructions of discourse which CDA tries to operationalize can come from various disciplines, and the concept of 'operationalization' entails working in a transdisciplinary way where the logic of one discipline (for example, sociology) can be 'put to work' in the development of another (for example, linguistics). Given our emphasis on the mutually informing development of theory and method, we do not support calls for establishing a method for CDA (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999).

In the last twenty years two relatively influential schools and subdisciplines for the later development of critical discourse analysis work have been the British discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1989; 1992; 2003), which has adopted the tradition of the Systemic Functional Linguistics, and the New Rhetoric or Theory of Argumentation (Perelman, 1979; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971). The latter has more specifically influenced the rhetorical discursive work of Michael Billig. In parallel, a discursive historical approach developed in Austria (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001): it has been influenced not only by the aforementioned models, but also by German 'politicoc-linguistics'; and by the critical theory tradition of philosophers and sociologists of the Frankfurt School such as Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse and Habermas. The latter school's
philosophy has influenced both the Discourse Historical Approach and the British Discourse Analysis of Fairclough and colleagues. A main idea that both Austrian and British CDA groups have adopted from the Frankfurt School is the notion of a ‘free public sphere’ (Habermas, 1989), an open space to discuss diverse views and negotiating and acknowledging of differences. However, the most important idea that both types of CDA have borrowed from the Frankfurt School is the notion of critique – i.e. that ideology needs to be analysed and criticized – and thus we should not just accept cultural productions. This notion of critique is probably more basic than that of the public sphere, and it is shared by van Dijk as well. This notion of social critique distinguishes CDA from CA. According to Reisigl & Wodak (2001), who follow Habermas' insights, CDA should be grounded in the conviction of the human right’s validity; and should take side against oppression, discrimination and injustice, and for emancipation, self-determination and recognition and inclusion of the different. Further, Reisigl & Wodak (2001) point out to the existence of important similarities between the Frankfurt School’s notion of an ideal ‘free public sphere’ and the New Rhetoric’s idea or the ‘theory of rational argumentation’ (Perelman, 1979; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971). That is, in both cases it is proposed an ideal communication space characterised by the possibility of a power-free communication in which logical/rational judgement would be the ultimate criteria to achieve an intersubjective agreement in a controversial topic of discussion.

According to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) the problem of democracy in late modernity and the dialogue across difference (Benhabib, 1992) is a core concern of CDA that warns against the risks of language being nowadays in the hands of undemocratic powers. Thus, CDA wants to democratize dialogue, to thematize language in different public spaces to enhance the practice of democratic dialogue:

Part of its project has been advocating a critical awareness of language as a fundamental element in a language education for a democratic society – fundamental because language is so central to contemporary social life, and to the calculations of and struggles over power, so that no one these days can develop the grasp of their social circumstances which is essential if they are to have any control over them, without a critical awareness of how language figures within them (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 10).

There is another approach to critical discourse represented by Teun A. Van Dijk who has extensively researched discriminatory discourses in the press. According to this author, a central concern of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been to disclose “the complex relationships
between dominance and discourse” (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 252). He proposed that critical discourse analysts should take a socio-political stance, and that their main target should be the power elites who maintain unchanged oppressive social systems and the hierarchy of power. In order to liberate and to show solidarity to those who are oppressed Van Dijk (1993) aims at studying the oppressors’ discourse and to unmask their myths and representations that perpetuate inequality making dominance appear natural. Although Van Dijk (1993) acknowledges that his approach pays “more attention to ‘top-down’ relations of dominance than to ‘bottom-up’ relations of resistance, compliance and acceptance”, he points out that “this does not mean that we see power and dominance merely as unilaterally ‘imposed’ on others”. In common with other critical discourse analysts (Fairclough, 1989), Van Dijk drew upon Gramsci’s (1971) concept of ‘hegemony. He pointed out that in some cases dominated groups are persuaded to accept the dominant groups’ versions or views of the world as natural and legitimate, even when those representations reproduce their status as oppressed groups. Although he is more interested in studying dominant groups’ discourses, Van Dijk (1993, p. 255) underscored that the dominant ideologies can be challenged by counter-powers:

critical discourse analysis is specifically interested in power abuse, that is, in breaches of laws, rules and principles of democracy, equality and justice by those that wield power. To distinguish such power from legitimate and acceptable forms of power, and lacking another adequate term, we use the term ‘dominance’. As is the case with power, dominance is seldom total. It may be restricted to specific domains, and it may be contested by various modes of challenge, that is, counter-power. It may be more or less consciously or explicitly exercised or experienced. Many more or less subtle forms of dominance seem to be so persistent that they seem natural until they begin to be challenged, as was/is the case for male dominance over women, White over Black, rich over poor. If the minds of the dominated can be influenced in such a way that they accept dominance, and act in the interest of the powerful out of their own free will, we use the term hegemony (...) (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 254-255).

Unlike some of the above mentioned discourse analysts, Van Dijk’s approach owes much to social cognitive psychology approaches. Van Dijk’s project is to study how dominant discourses reinforce and reproduce dominance in specific textual and speech contexts, and how through social representations addressed to different social groups they shape not only the discourses, but even the minds of people thanks to the control they exert over public discourses. Consequently, Van Dijk’s approach has been criticized for focusing only on social representations, identities and social relations in news discourses, and for backgrounding the interactive aspects of language, for tending to overlook intertextuality, and because his top-down approach “gives a one-sided
emphasis to news-making practices as stable structures which contribute to the reproduction of relations of domination and racist ideologies, which backgrounds the diversity and heterogeneity of practices.” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 30).

Newspapers have traditionally played the role of disseminating elite political discourse in the public sphere. Nevertheless, the aforementioned CDA approaches generally assume that the daily press’ reporting of policymakers’ discourses also contributes to the reproduction of a public sphere that permits citizens to participate in the political process (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002). They generally emphasise that although political elites’ institutionalised discourse attempts at exerting regulation and control over other languages and versions, their discourses are not entirely insulated from everyday discourses. Actually, there seems to exist a constant flow between institutionalised and non-institutionalised discourses in that politicians’ discourses do often appeal to common-sense values and concepts borrowed from everyday discourse (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002). In that sense, a main concern of critical discourse analysis approaches that combine top-down and bottom-up analysis is to study events and conjunctures that offer the possibility of social and political change in concrete social and historical contexts (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Fairclough, 1992; Billig, 2001). Ruth Wodak, Norman Fairclough, and Michael Billig have highlighted that interpretations of reality have to be open and dynamic, that there is not an ultimate correct interpretation of a text. Thus, CDA has been described as a non-method of analysis that, drawing self-reflexively upon the analysts’ own resources, tries to unite sociological and linguistic analysis of texts in order to examine the “interactive or ‘dialectal’ relationship between discursive actions and the contexts in which they occur”. (Barker & Galasinski, 2001, p. 64).

Discourse Analysis has attempted to find different means to examine the work of ideology in news discourse. In this sense, particularly CDA has drawn upon a set of instrumental concepts of discourses borrowed from the field of critical linguistics (Fairclough, 1995) as a means to analyse texts studying ideology. The risk of arbitrariness in interpretations is minimized by drawing upon the technique of systemic functional linguistic (SFL) to analyse how the choice of diverse discursive forms shapes discourse (Halliday, 1978, 1994; Halliday and Hasan, 1985). In the UK, CDA has been very influenced by SFL (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Similarly, SFL has also profoundly influenced the analysis of the ‘critical linguistics’ that have developed CDA at the University of East Anglia since the 1970’s (Fowler et al, 1979; Hodge and Kress, 1993).
of the main assumptions that CDA picked up from SFL is that texts and speech are multifunctional and three main functions are attributed to communicative practices: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational function is related to the text’s capacity to represent ideas, beliefs or views of the world. Through the ideational function writers or utterers are able to refer in words to the idea they have got of the outside world, making it intelligible. The ideational function is also conceived of as providing the speaker/writer the possibility to express their internal world in terms of e.g. cognitions, perceptions. The interpersonal function of a text or speech is related to how a text or a discourse permits interaction between the utterer or writer and the addressee. Its analysis serves to work out how this relationship between people is discursively constructed by the writer/utterer e.g. in terms of presuppositions and assumptions that reveal that the writer constructs an ideal relationship with the reader. On the one hand, the analysis of the interpersonal function indicates whether the writer/speaker has got an attitude of distance with regards to her/his own utterance or not, and how she/he evaluates it. It is also indicative of which ‘speech role’ the utterer/writer has adopted in relation to her/his utterance. On the other hand, the interpersonal function provides insights of the implicit ways in which one utterer/writer can position herself/himself when she/he addresses the interlocutor/reader in such varied ways as asking, committing to do something, thanking, informing, ordering, etc. In addition, Norman Fairclough (1992, p. 64) proposed that there is a third ‘constitutive effect of discourse’; the identity function, described as the building up of what are variously referred to as ‘social identities’ and ‘subjects positions’ for social ‘subjects’ and types of ‘self’ (Fairclough, 1992, p.64). The third function that Halliday (1978) underlined was the ‘textual function’:

this concerns how bits of information are foregrounded or backgrounded, taken as given or presented as new, picked out as ‘topic’ or ‘theme’, and how a part of a text is linked to a preceding, and following parts of the text, and to the social situation ‘outside’ the text (Fairclough, 1992, p. 65).

The techniques of SFL applied to the study of news reports, has served to draw attention to the fact that in newspapers’ coverage of any events, quotations are commonly deployed as a device to illustrate specific points within the story that is constructed through descriptions, and to add some colour to the news articles (Fairclough, 1995; 2003). A typical challenge writers use to face is how to report a controversial event, and the clash of arguments between groups or individuals who instantiate opposed representations of the same event and its protagonists, without appearing to endorse any opinion. In other words, there is a general norm in societies that claim to be
democratic: that news article's coverage of events and protagonists should be accurate and convey what really happened without using evaluative language. A very important journalistic strategy to construct their versions' credibility and authenticity is the use of factuality in news reporting (Erjavec, 2001). Yet an apparently simple and neutral action, such as one speech fragment selection, already constitutes an interpretation of what is more relevant; and thus it allows for an interpretation of “truth”. For instance, any quotation has got embedded a particular decision in terms of what is the 'gist' of the event that is being reported; and this selection suggests an interpretation which can modify the actual story. Thus quotation is a device that not only serves to suggest the writers' distance from what it is reported; but a device that also permits to disguise and channel biased information and to indirectly warrant a version that is presented as factual description.

The newspapers' news reports and stories have a clear teleology in the sense that they aim at providing to the readership an orientation as to how they should understand the events and represent their protagonists. This teleological orientation is implicitly embedded in descriptions of events and participants; and it is operated through discursive practices such as foregrounding, backgrounding, attribution of stake, denial of discrepancies, among other devices that discourse analysts have focused on (Wetherell, 1998). In other words, journalistic practices (e.g. selective quotation and descriptions) and ‘consensual modes of society” originate news values (Hall, 1978; Harley, 1982). News values assume there is always a consensual and reasonable point of view on the matter reported: “The consensus requires the notion of unity, which is represented in language in the form of the pronoun ‘we' and only one perspective of events” (Erjavec, 2001, p. 702). In that sense, quotation is a pervasive technique deployed in the press and different attempts have been made to describe quotation in all its subtleties. The most common general distinction is between direct and indirect quotation; nevertheless, this distinction has been considered to be too broad and simple. More specifically, it has been pointed out that the ways of reporting are more complex, and five types of speech reporting or quotation have been distinguished (Leech & Short, 1981), apart from the two broad types of quotation immediately listed: 1) direct quotation: when the speech of others is presented as verbatim reproduction of the utterers' speech. 2) Indirect quotation: the writer reports what the speaker said; and in writing it the writer takes a position as if he/she were an interpreter between the reader and the utterer (Leech & Short, 1981).

The distinction between different types of quotation is a focal issue of the analysis of ideology in
one striking feature of news discourse is the way in which it weaves together representations of the speech and writing of complex ranges of voices into a web which imposes order and interpretation upon them (Fairclough, 1995, p. 77).

Several theories have been written about the use of quotation marks (Saka, 1998). The use of quotation marks is so common in news report that even a term has been coined such as ‘scare quotes’ to describe their use as distancing devices that serve to isolate from the rest of the sentence (Bell, 1991) a particular word or phrase, often considered delicate, controversial or even not suitable for the newspapers’ own style, namely vocabulary implied to be e.g. too technique, slang, or sentimental. As a matter of fact it is clear that the use of ‘scare quotes’ can be quite varied, and Predelli (2003) noted that apart from the authors’ alleged distance from what appears in quotation marks, ‘scare quotes’ can be also deployed to suggest to the readership that the author is ready to contradict the ‘scare quote’.

The choice of what is eventually being quoted on a daily newspaper depends much on what version of events and participants the article’s writer wants to construct and present as factual. An original utterance can be radically transformed through techniques of levelling and sharpening, which operate subtle shifts of emphasis and finally present a quoted utterance in which the original story has been altered, but which can still be presented as factual.

CDA has at times defined “discourse” as “text in context”, and thus it has proposed an interdisciplinary approach (Wodak & Weiss, 2005) between neighbouring disciplines such as psychology, sociology, history and linguistics. In approaching political discourse in news reports “an analytical balance between text and context must be aimed at” (Wodak & Weiss, 2005, p. 127). In sum, relevant to the analysis of ideology in news reports is that the Systemic Functional Linguistic method designed a complex technique to deconstruct textual grammar. SFL stressed the functionality of language communication as a means to construct ideological consensus, or the idea that “a society shares all its interests in common, without division or variation” (Fowler, 1991). Some of the textual processes these techniques examine are: lexical choices; transitivity choices, e.g. nominalization/passivation and activation of protagonists that is used to formulate a version of who did what to whom; propositions, modality and implicit positioning of the writer. CDA has emphasised that texts relate to, and even include fragments of, other previous and
present texts, and therefore have adopted the concept of intertextuality. CDA noted that discourses are also connected to other past and present discourses, and have highlighted that interdiscursivity is a pervasive element of news reports (Wodak & Weiss, 2005). That is, CDA analysts have drawn attention to the polysemous plethora of voices that is included in news (Fairclough, 1995). They have highlighted the ideological significance of discursive aspects such as the relation between presuppositions and awareness of the existence of other texts/news reports (intertextuality) and voices (Bakhtin, 1986); and how this is linked with the incorporation of elements of other texts into a new text, through e.g. reported speech, which is viewed as instantiating the increase of heterogeneity and polyphony in the press (Fairclough, 1995). Further, they have noted that the analysis of the use of recontextualization “permits a systematic comprehension and reconstruction of media reports” (Wodak & Weiss, 2005, p. 127). Accordingly, Fairclough (1995), and the IAD bear in mind that

a single news item commonly weaves together representations of the discourse of a number of people. (…) a complex web of voices is woven (Fairclough, 1995, p. 79).

This thesis proposes to study the mediation between discourse and society in the Basque nationalist newspapers' reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao following a heuristic and interdisciplinary (Wodak & Weiss, 2005; Billig, 2001) approach of qualitative ideological analysis.

3.4. Studying ideology and identity from a dialogical psychology's perspective: heteroglossia and ideological dilemmas

In this subsection I aim at showing how IAD sees ideology as at the same time reproducing and changing reality; and how this approach represents ideological change and reproduction as a process that can be top-down and bottom-up, since IAD conceives of contemporary modern societies as characterised by increasing heteroglossy and reflexivity. Finally, I intend to provide some explanation of why the dialogic IAD suits the examination of rhetoric involving discourses on politics and national identity.
3.4.1. The dilemma of ideology

In the 1920's Russia, Volosinov (1973) pointed out that language is not an abstract and static system, but is characterised by its discursive creativity. That is, language was seen by this author as constituted in practical performances as speech acts, whether in texts or talk. Speech acts were depicted as language acts that were constantly shaped and changing according to the social and historical context. In other words, it was suggested that human thought and opinions were constituted by the outer praxis of communication, and that people formulated new utterances and opinions in response to interactional situations. In sum, Volosinov opened up a new path for the study of the constitution of human thought and ideologies. He shifted the focus from a social psychology that tended to study language as if it were the expression of feelings and thoughts located within the human mind, to a new approach that proposed studying the materiality of signs. That is, Volosinov proposed to study what words were actually doing and its effects on the outer world of language communication praxis in particular historical sets. The implication of this view as human subjectivity being dialogically shaped and transformed in interactions was that a particular ideology would come to be considered something that could be strengthened or weakened in everyday communication acts.

The idea of the social construction of ideology through the use of signs (words) in particular cultural fields (e.g. literate and popular culture) (Volosinov, 1973) also influenced poststructuralists such as Roland Barthes. Subsequently, psychologists who adopted this discursive, rhetorical and ideological approach suggested that by investigating ideology in different voices in interaction the analyst has to decode what is taken as common sense, what became the reified ideology (Bakhtin, 1986), or the ‘doxa’ (Barthes, 1972) of each historical epoch and context. This dialogical approach proposes that each society and historical period have their own common-sense ways to use psychological language and to depict social psychological phenomena (Harré and Gillet, 1994; Billig, 2001). Bakhtin (1986) who worked in the same circle of literature critics as Volosinov stressed that through utterances that they pronounce, people are in part free to create their own lives and to influence social world. This idea would later be picked up by post-structuralist Marxist semiologist Roland Barthes (1982) when he wrote his famous sentence claiming that the speaker is 'both master and slave' of language. By that, he was following Bakhtin’s insight that any utterance can be creative because potentially it leaves open the possibility that the speaker or writer will say something new that will be independent of
official and reified discourses. However, as Bakhtin, Barthes was also saying that people's utterances can reproduce words that are not of their making; ideas that repeat stereotypes and common-sense reified discourses. According to Billig (1997, p. 216), Bakhtin tried to sort out the dilemma of ideological analysis formulating his idea that utterances permit people both to reproduce existing discourses, and to create new discourses and/or counter-discourses in textual and speech interaction. As Billig noted, structuralist, post-structuralist and constructivist analysts of ideology had to face the dilemma of ideological analysis:

To the extent that ideology is seen to be a powerful code, its subjects appear as robotic dupes. If the subjects are depicted as freely creative, then the power of ideology is theoretically diminished. Far from being something which is abstractly remote, this dilemma is reproduced in the very act of utterance. Any speaker, in using language for a speech-act, must repeat words which are not of their making; yet in speaking, people are formulating their own utterances, saying things which have never been said before in response to new conversational situations (Billig, 1997, p. 216).

Discursive psychology is often described as part of the 'critical' turn in social psychology (Ibañez and Iñiguez, 1997). For years, there has been an ongoing debate on whether a top-down or a bottom-up approach to text or conversation analysis suits better a critical discourse psychology. The top-down approach is typically represented by Michel Foucault's (1991) work. He was allegedly interested in studying official and elite institutional discourses in order to challenge and demystify power and its oppressive discourses. The bottom-up approach is the one that has been described so far, and is typically concerned with everyday and routine communication exchange, performed often by ordinary people to negotiate their social and historical dilemmas in particular interaction contexts (Edwards and Potter, 1992; Wetherell and Potter, 1989).

More recently, Edley and Wetherell (1997) favoured an 'eclectic' approach to the analysis of ideology applied to the specific topic of the social construction of masculine identity, and proposed to tackle the implicit dilemma of ideological analysis by combining both top-down and bottom-up approaches. Following the abovementioned insights of Barthes (1982) and Billig (1991), they claimed to aim at analysing how men's discourse on masculinity reproduces the stereotypes of masculinity, and so men become the products of discourse, or how they can also create and produce new discourses. That is, analysts have to adapt and work with the dilemma of the complex dynamic interaction between subject and ideologies, without neglecting or trying to solve the discourse's dual constructive and constructed nature.
I have followed the example of a varied set of discourse analysts' work that combined the critical top-down approach with the detailed analysis of talk and text interaction from a bottom-up perspective (e.g. Billig et al, 1988; Fairclough, 1995; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). My position as the writer of this thesis will be that it is possible to bring about a critical discourse analysis of the variety of accounts on the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum, and its implications for the discursive negotiation of the Basque identity’s presence in the museum within this specific rhetorical context, without neglecting a detailed qualitative look at the rhetorical subtleties of language acts in the Basque nationalist press’ reporting.

3.4.2. The modern societies' heteroglossia, reflexivity and ideological dilemmas

At present-day, the classical Marxist concept of ideology has been labelled as negative in that it conceived of ideologies as an idealized and reified coherent set of ideas that the dominant groups imposed on their behalf to the rest of the society, and which had to be demystified and unmasked (Eagleton, 1991). By contrast, the Bakhtin Circle had a different concept of ideology as including all forms of social consciousness and expressed in signs through language interaction. In that sense, the Bakhtin Circle members adhered to what Larrain (1983) named the positive concept of ideology. For Bakhtin (1986) two main features of modernity were increasing heteroglossia and reflexivity. Heteroglossia for him was synonymous with hybridization, syncretism of diverse speech genres coming from diverse cultural fields like literate and popular culture; and was a general liberating trend of human communication. That is, Bakhtin saw human language and society as characterised by diversity and multiplicity of voices, and speech genres. Further, also a member of the Bakhtin Circle, Volosinov (1973) pointed out that modern society is marked by a plethora of contradictory and antagonistic discursive signs that elicit real effects on society. The pervasive phenomenon of heteroglossia in human communication emerges, according to Bakhtin and Volosinov, from the creative subject. In sum, the Bakhtin Circle’s dialogic approach to the human language was subjectivist and acknowledged the crucial role played by the subject in the construction of new discourses. However, the clash between alternative and new discourses (e.g. popular folk culture) and the official/reified abstract discourses is one in which particular social groups undertake their fight counting with a priori asymmetrical power resources.
The focus on discourse variability is also a main aspect of IAD and DA approaches, and Billig et al (1988), Billig (1991), and Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), among others, have adopted the Bakhtin Circle's idea of the modern societies' increasing heteroglossia. Work on discourse and rhetoric has shown how people express a compounded set of, often contradictory, positions and representations when they interact. Generally, discourse analysts agree that this variability is related to the fact that people strategically modify their discourses according to the argumentative context of the moment, and the actions they aim at performing (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Without disagreeing with these explanations of discourse variability, Billig (1991) made a point to observe that people do strategically evaluate the speech acts that they will perform; and that they do so altering their propositions to adapt them to particular argumentative contexts; and drawing upon common-sense opinions provided by culture and history. Common sense is a repository of opposed views of the world, and it makes everyday communication and discourses full of variable dilemmas and contradictory ideas and beliefs (Billig, 1991).

A main insight of the ideological dilemmas' approach (Billig et al, 1988) to discourse variability is that exploring the way ideological dilemmas appear in everyday talk and texts will allow the analysts to see ideology at work in the form of common-sense assumptions. Further, studying ideological dilemmas implies observing the 'thinking society' at work. That is, Billig et al (1988), propose that ideology is constituted and reproduced in a constant clash between contrary themes, which is performed not only by powerful institutions and groups, but also by ordinary people, in the middle of dilemmas, argumentation and contradictory views, which steadily give rise to new discussions. In other words, the ideological dilemmas approach acknowledges the creativeness of ordinary people in any argumentative debate.

As a matter of fact Billig and his colleagues did not deny the Marxist assumption that ideology was related to dominance and to naturalization of oppressive ideas that appeared as natural and inevitable. Significantly, what the discourse and rhetorical analysis emphasises is that ideology is not necessarily a system of thought imposed by elites on a top-down process, and that the socially constituted subject is not a passive and unthinking recipient of ideologies imposed by an intelligentsia, as structuralist Marxism implied. The ideological dilemmas approach avoids many cognitive psychologists' depiction of the subject as devoid of social and context's constraints; and permits studying ideological change and reproduction as a complex phenomenon. With this purpose Billig drew a distinction between 'intellectual ideologies' and 'lived ideologies', the
latter described to be composed by the common sense of a specific culture or society. According to Billig et al (1988), unlike intellectual ideologies, lived ideologies are not a set of coherent ideas, but are full of contradictory and fragmented views of the world. In sum, the 'ideological dilemmas' of everyday language interaction contain many competing arguments. Such heteroglossia and multiplicity of voices (Bakhtin, 1981), of 'lived ideologies' is considered a positive aspect of ordinary human thought. As Gramsci (1971) noted, 'common sense' is formed by the sediments of many generations' lived experiences, and Billig and his colleagues highlighted that is precisely the indeterminacy of common sense's variability what makes lived ideologies a flexible resource for everyday social interaction and sense-making. Further, they stressed that common sense contains the 'seeds of its own negation' (Edley, 2001, Billig et al, 1988), in that it never completely resolves arguments, and it provokes counterarguments that clash with opposite common sense in an agonistic unending debate.

The implication of all this is that contemporary politicians have to deal with the use of increasingly contradictory common-sense messages to persuade their audiences. On his book "A Rhetoric of Motives", Kenneth Burke (1969) drew attention to the role rhetorical identification of the politician with the audience plays for a successful persuasion effect of political discourses. As Burke himself acknowledged Aristotle, in is "Rhetorica", had already suggested that the politician's discourse can reach a higher degree of persuasiveness the closer her/his speech is from what the audiences are expecting or wanting to hear. According to Burke's own terminology, the politician has to construct a 'consubstantiality' or communality with her/his audiences. A typical way to construct a sense of communality with the audience is citing clichés about freedom, democracy, responsibility etc. The politician tries to construct 'consubstantiality' or 'common-substance' with the audiences by drawing upon shared commonplaces, or what has also been named 'ideographs' (McGee, 1980) or basic ideological values. Nevertheless, Burke (1969) drew attention to the fact that the construction of communality between politicians and audiences is not a straightforward process, mainly because it only works when the politicians are able to convey that they also share their audiences' views in all respects. In other words, politicians have to communicate that they value the very same things the audience values: that they have got the same common general morality and world view (Billig, 2003), and convey sincerity (Searle, 1969).

Another key insight proposed by the dialogic view of human language is the increasing
reflexivity of modern societies (Billig, 1992; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Ashmore et al, 1995). In modern societies the interaction between different dialects and languages, coming from diverse cultural fields, provokes the birth of a new cultural consciousness (Bakhtin, 1981). Accordingly, reflexivity is related to cultural and linguistic decentering and unfinished and open dialogue of the subject with other voices. It was probably Mannheim (1936/1960) who first proposed that the analysis of ideology should be self-reflexive. Therefore, he argued that a theory of ideology should include the analysis of the analyst’s own social determination in terms of ideas, since he understood that any theory of ideology also represented a particular social groups’ viewpoint and that it was pointless to claim its objectivity. Yet, the Bakhtin’s Circle members tackled this dilemma differently. They stressed that ideology is not necessarily a misrepresentation of social reality or something negative, and that therefore the admission that people’s utterances are ideologically determined and positioned was not a particularly serious accusation against them. Accordingly, the Bakhtin Circle assumed that the analyst is indeed ideologically positioned, and that whether she/he is actually neutral and objective is not the real question. In practice, a particular ideology’s validity does not depend on its ‘objectivity’ or ‘truthfulness’, but it confirms its validity, and claims new adherents, as a theory that makes sense of people’s everyday social existence. Moreover, reflexivity has been related with a democratization of the interaction between the reader and the text, in the sense of a critical reflection of the self, while actively assimilating the alien word. Bakhtin (1981) pointed out that by knowing others’ cultural viewpoints we can develop self-consciousness, enhancing our capacity of discernment of our own social/cultural determinations through autonomous action and thought. In addition, it can be said that for Bakhtin the self is in a constant process of becoming in an interaction with the other that can permit people to turn reflexively to understand themselves, although this process requires cultural decentering. Thus human self-reflection and the subject’s maturation also depends on language interaction and dialogue.

Going back to this thesis, the dialogical approach to political discourse and rhetorical analysis was most suitable to examine how the same newspaper’s writers adapted their discourse to different rhetorical contexts (e.g. the Basque and the Spanish linguistic contexts; or pro-secessionist or pro-autonomy readership) to report the same events. It permitted to examine the hypothesis that the newspapers, according to criteria of differently perceived imagined audiences, would modify their discourse and rhetoric aiming at building up a sense of ‘consubstantiality’ (Burke, 1969) with their imagined readership. This would be based upon a rhetoric of common
values and interests as a strategy to turn their arguments more persuasive; and to sell their particular version of the events as the only fair representation of factual reality. In turn, it was expected that the Basque nationalist press’ reporting of the opposite arguments would reflect a high degree of heteroglossia and consequent doubts, contradictions and ambiguous positioning, which would be constructed and modified in a constant dialogue with the opposite groups’ arguments.

3.5. Conclusion

Drawing upon the Ideological Analysis of Discourse (IAD), combined with techniques of the Loughborough School of Discourse and Rhetoric, and the Systemic Functional Language generally deployed by Critical Discourse Analysts (CDA) I will examine, throughout a two years period, discourse and rhetorical changes in the Basque nationalist newspapers’ reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao. The Basque newspapers’ discursive change or reproduction was underpinned by a constant dialogical flux between different voices (Fairclough, 1995), and conditioned by the wider socio-historical and ideological context. Discourse analysts have often focused on fine-grain qualitative analysis of particular texts (e.g. the two editorials from Egin I analyse in chapter 7), and this has at times lead the analysts of ideology to miss the process that makes discourses that attempt at imposing specific views of the world not only disseminate but also change, adapt to new contexts, or loose influence over time (Fairclough, 1992). I aimed at qualitatively analysing thematic and rhetorical shifts in discourses regarding the controversy over the Guggenheim Bilbao in a particular conjuncture (January 1997 to December 1998), because if in 1997 the crisis was at his hottest, in 1998 the debate had already started to cool down. The focus on ‘conjunctures’ permits to follow up how the writers and the quoted agents show contradictory positions, and how their speech actions or discourses can eventually bring about a transformation of their positions in a relatively short period. Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999) noted the advantages of focusing on conjunctures;

We also find it helpful to focus on ‘conjunctures’, in contrast with both structures and events. Structures are long-term background conditions for social life which are indeed also transformed by it, but slowly. Events are the individual, immediate happenings and occasions of social life. Conjunctures are relatively durable assemblies of people, materials, technologies and therefore practices (in their aspect as relative permanencies)
around specific social projects in the widest sense of the term. (...) The advantage of focusing upon conjunctures is that it allows us to trace through time the effect not just of individual events but of conjuncturally linked series of events in both sustaining and transforming (rearticulating) practices (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 22).

Therefore, I have opted by drawing upon both a content analysis and a qualitative analysis approach, and attempted to examine how the process of discursive change took place in the Basque nationalist press' reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum. A more quantitative classic content analysis permitted to map and compare the overall differences between the two analysed Basque nationalist newspapers in terms of general themes and connotations (favourable, neutral, unfavourable), and how some patterns changed over time. Content analysis provides a numerical description of frequencies and percentages of some general categories and themes and permits to follow up general patterns of discursive changes or permanencies. However, it leaves many questions unanswered, such as how and why did those discursive changes or reproduction take place in specific conjunctures. For instance, the disclosing of complex processes of selective omission and inclusion embedded in quotation with specific purposes or strategies, and the existence of underlying ideological dilemmas that underpin the implicit aspects of discourses, cannot be properly tackled by classical content analysis that deals with the coding and interpretation of explicit data.

To understand the shifting rhetorical contexts that permitted such evolution, as well as implicit and repressed underlying dilemmas that condition ideological change and reproduction, a more qualitative analysis of discourse and rhetorical practices is required. I consider that only a combined content analysis and qualitative approach will permit to examine a wider pattern of ideological change over time.
Chapter four

Content analysis of the Basque nationalist newspapers

4.0. Introduction

This chapter describes the classical content analysis method adopted to select and interpret the sample or raw material found in two Basque nationalist newspapers over a two years period. Therefore, I will argue that content analysis is a flexible method for quantitative analysis of data that is particularly suitable to tackle comparative analysis across time or between different clusters of data (Berger, 1998). From the beginning content analysis has focused on the analysis of the semantic aspects of political discourse (Kaplan, 1943, p. 230), examining particularly the sender and the message. Overall, content analysis has been defined as follows: 1) objective, because it permits the semantic analysis of the text’s manifest content; 2) systematic in that it proposes to apply the same procedure to all the analysed data; 3) quantitative in terms of counting frequencies of themes; 4) making inferences, like describing individual/group’s regular patterns (Berelson, 1952; Krippendorff, 1980). The latter aspect of content analysis as a method that allows the analyst making inferences refers to the preferential use of comparative approaches. Typically, content analysts have preferred to draw upon comparisons between different sets of data to infer general patterns of what is present in one individual or group considered separately, or in comparison to other individual/group or set of data, over a period of time. Here, it was intended to organize and codify the data to examine semantic patterns in terms of general themes, agents/participants and connotations (favourable, neutral and unfavourable). The aim was to elaborate a comparative content analysis of two ideologically differently positioned Basque nationalist newspapers in a way that suits a, subsequent, discourse and rhetorical analysis of written utterances about the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao; and the examination of discursive change between and within the newspapers over the years 1997 and 1998. The initial quantitative and qualitative content analysis of the raw data was made by hand, and this was, subsequently, complemented by the application of computer software packages chi square analysis that permitted to statistically confirm significant comparative differences across time and between different clusters of data. The classical content analysis here adopted provides the
opportunity to compare different sets of data, and different groups, over a wider period of time. It suits what Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) described as the study patterns of discourse change and reproduction in particular social conjunctures. The comparative semantic analysis of the Basque nationalist reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao can serve as a general orientation to tackle a more qualitative analysis of discourses and rhetoric that turned the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum into a less controversial topic in 1998.

Timeline of the events reported by the Basque nationalist press in relation to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum

Phase 1 (January 1, 1997- October 19, 1997, before the museum's inauguration)

Part 1: Between January and October 19, 1997, the Basque nationalists newspapers' predict the Guggenheim Bilbao's success or failure:

- In this period *Egin* and *Diario Vasco*'s editorials predict success or failure of the museum drawing e.g. upon varied quantification rhetoric.
- Policymakers' and other agents' economic predictions are quoted by the newspapers:
  - They usually draw upon cautious rhetoric of success (May-October 1997).
  - Possibility of private sponsorship is reported by the press that provoked a shift in policymakers' quantification rhetoric (late August 1997-October 1997).
  - First fortnight of October 1997: finally when the museum's opening date is arriving, the museum representatives' predictions of the GBM's success are quoted. This is the beginning of the new stage of the implementation of the Guggenheim Bilbao's policies, which would coincide with the reporting of mobilizations against the Guggenheim Bilbao's cultural project (October 3-15, 1997). So here the focus is on discourses and rhetoric the museum representatives used to face criticism against the museum.

Part 2: The debate over the museum's cultural project gradually becomes an economic and political mobilization issue:

- The policymakers' maximization of the Guggenheim Bilbao's importance is reported and several version building up strategies can be detected:
- The Guggenheim Bilbao is presented as being among the best contemporary art museums in the world (January 31, 1997- October 1997).
- The Guggenheim museum is built up as a big attraction (September 24, 1997- October 1997).
- The Basque newspapers' reporting suggests that policymakers and politicians assume that the Basques needed to catch up with international avant-garde (June 1997-October 1997).
- The first time discontent with the museum is mentioned by policymakers and museum representatives it is presented e.g. as an issue of political debate between the Basque provinces (March 1997-May 1997), without mentioning some Basques' criticism of its lack of cultural project for the Basques.
- Finally, the Basque culture representatives' criticism of the museum's cultural project and their mobilizations are reported in the Basque nationalist press (October 3-15, 1997). Diario Vasco tries to undermine Jorge Oteiza's legitimacy and dismiss the opposition he leads; Egin is more cautious on his support of mobilizations against the Guggenheim Bilbao.

Phase 2 (October 20, 1997-December 31, 1998, after the museum's inauguration).

Part 3: The Basque nationalist newspapers' reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao's success after its opening:
- First, success is presented as a surprise by the newspapers' own journalists (November 1997- early March 1998). The rhetoric of the Guggenheim Bilbao's success is adopted in Egin later than in Diario Vasco.
- In 1998 the success is presented as a "fait accompli" by both quoted museum representatives and the newspapers' own journalists (January 17, 1998-October 1998).
- There are different ways of reporting who were the tourists who visited the museum:
  - Reporting that sometimes seems to attempt at explaining why some Basques visited the museum (October 20, 1997-November 30, 1997).
  - The building up of the Guggenheim Bilbao as a museum that attracts many Spanish and foreign tourists (December 14, 1997- December 14, 1998); and also prestigious foreigners (February 5, 1998- May 13, 1998).

Part 4: The Basque newspapers' coverage of two events that might have contributed to cool off the debate over the museum's cultural project in 1998:
- First, the reporting of the attempted negotiation between the Guggenheim Bilbao and some Basque policymakers with Jorge Oteiza in March 1998:
  - The ambiguous use of rhetoric of expected surprise to report Jorge Oteiza's unexpected move (March 6-11, 1998): Diario Vasco's building up of rebuttal of potential criticism against Oteiza's decision, and Egin's rhetoric that suggests an ambivalent position.
  - Reactions to the conditions put by Jorge Oteiza to exhibit in the museum (March 12-15, 1998): Diario Vasco charges against Jorge Oteiza, and criticizes his new move whether in editorials or in news reports (March 12, 1998) cautiously drawing upon quoted experts' voices. Diario Vasco also less cautiously downgrades the Jorge Oteiza's Basque artists' generation movement by depicting it as irrelevant in a news report (March 15, 1998). Egin's rhetoric implies support of Jorge Oteiza, but avoids explicitly criticizing either policymakers or museum representatives; and its quoted museum representatives deploy a cautious rhetoric to address the issue, and leave the possibility open for further negotiations.

- Second, the reporting of an exhibition of young Basque artist Cristina Iglesias' work in the Guggenheim Bilbao in November 1998. There are subtle differences in the Basque newspapers' reporting of the event of Cristina Iglesias' work exhibition in the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum (November 6, 1998). While in Egin can be detected the building up of a version that suggest Cristina Iglesias is not a genuine Basque artist, in Diario Vasco her Basqueness is highlighted and upgraded.

Some of the main hypothesis that this content analysis of the Basque nationalist press' reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum permitted to confirm were as follows: 1) that the Guggenheim Bilbao was reported by the Basque nationalist press more often, and thus was a more controversial issue, in 1997 than in 1998; 2) that there was an important shift in terms of mentioned themes and favourable/unfavourable connotations over the years 1997 and 1998; 3) that "economy" and "Basque identity/culture" would be steadily among the most often mentioned themes throughout the years 1997 and 1998; 4) that there were significant quantitative differences between Egin and Diario Vasco in terms of themes and agents/participants mentioned; 5) that Egin and Diario Vasco reported the same themes and agents/participants with different favourable and unfavourable connotations; 6) that in 1997 the reporting of the themes "Basque
"identity/culture", "economy" and "modernity/international culture" would show a more unfavourable connotation in Egin than in Diario Vasco; 7) that there were important quantitative differences between Egin’s texts written in Basque and Egin’s texts written in Spanish, in terms of themes and connotations throughout the years 1997 and 1998; 8) that in 1997 references to the Guggenheim Bilbao were more negatively connoted in Egin’s Basque language than in Spanish language texts; 9) that although in both newspapers the reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao became more positive in 1998, in Egin the reporting of the theme “Basque identity/culture” remained more negatively connoted than in Diario Vasco.

4.1. The corpus

The research was based on data published by the newspapers Egin and El Diario Vasco, in the Basque Country, Spain, and encompasses the period between January 1, 1997 and December 31, 1998. These regional circulation newspapers broadly represented the two main different projects of Basque nationalism. El Diario Vasco is a liberal-conservative newspaper, the most read in Gipuzkoa: a mainstream high circulation newspaper. This journal survived Franco’s regime, and since the political transition period has been a PNV (Partido Nacionalista Vasco) partisans’ preferred daily newspaper; and, as we have seen (chapter 2), the PNV was numerically the most important Basque nationalist party, at least in Gipuzkoa. In Bizkaia the most popular newspaper, and also mirroring the PNV’s political position, is El Correo, which in that period was very similar to Diario Vasco: both newspapers were favourable to maintaining the current status of the Basque provinces as a Basque autonomy within the Spanish state. By contrast, Egin, created at the end of 1977, was a left-wing nationalist newspaper that supported the project of the seven Basque territories’ (scattered in France and Spain) secession from Spain and France; and was often accused of collaborating with ETA’s militias. This newspaper was mainly read by the people who identified or sympathized with the nationalist left-wing party Herri Batasuna (HB). Although it was a low circulation newspaper, Egin influenced the mainstream daily press in the Basque Country: it has been depicted as a newspaper in which many issues that were taboo in other newspapers, such as police torture and corruption, could be dealt with, because there was not any large shareholder that could apply a veto or impose any article to be published (Núñez Astrain, 1997, p. 131). In chapter 2, I have already described how in July 1998 Egin’s offices were closed down when a police investigation started on the grounds of an alleged cooperation between Egin and ETA; and that many of its journalists, members of the editorial board and staff
etc., were put in jail (Mees, 2003; Guasch, 2005). Shortly after, the same group of people managed to set up a new newspaper named *Gara* which was ideologically similar to *Egin* (Etxezaharreta, 2001). Nevertheless, even if *Egin* ceased to be published, I will refer to *Egin/Gara* news texts as if they were from *Egin*, even to those published after the latter newspapers’ abrupt closing down.

This thesis is based on newspapers’ data published in the conjuncture in which the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao was at its peak, but subsequently started to gradually cool off. While most of the sample is formed by news written in Spanish language, a smaller but substantial part of it was written in the Basque language; mainly in *Egin* (15 news articles, 3 opinion articles, 2 letters to the editor and 1 editorial in 1997), though also in *El Diario Vasco* (1 opinion article in 1997). In 1998 all the data in Basque were news articles.

The articles were classified by type as follows: news reports, opinion articles, letters to the editor, editorials, interviews, and cartoons. 112 news reports articles, 11 opinion articles, 4 letters to the editor, 2 editorials, 1 interview, and 5 cartoons that in 1997 were published in *Egin*, and referred to the Guggenheim Bilbao, were selected for content analysis. In turn, 82 news reports articles, 14 opinion articles, 11 letters to the editor, 7 editorials, and 7 interviews that in the same period were published in *Diario Vasco*, and mentioned the Guggenheim Bilbao, were selected. In 1998, 61 news reports articles, 3 opinion articles, 1 letter to the editor and 1 cartoon mentioned the Guggenheim Bilbao as part of their 'gist' in *Egin/Gara* and were selected for content analysis. In that year 27 news reports articles, 4 opinion articles, 1 editorial, and 2 interviews referred to the Guggenheim Museum as a main topic in *Diario Vasco*.

The content analysis was used to examine 201 texts from *Egin*, and 155 texts from *Diario Vasco*. The kind of journalistic genres that were selected and the criteria of selection will be stated below:

**News reports/articles**: As news reports were classified articles in which the writer claimed to convey information in a neutral and objective way. That is, articles in which the writer did not give any opinion, but merely described the facts or quoted other people’s statements. There were one hundred and ninety-four news articles in 1997 (refer to table 1), and eighty-eight in 1998 (refer to table 2). Frontpage news, and both main and secondary news articles in inside pages
were selected for content analysis. The criteria for inclusion of these news articles were that they should mention the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum (GBM) in their main title or headline, in the subheads, or in the lead or the text corpus' first paragraph. The news articles' secondary paragraphs were not analysed. Such method was preferred because in the traditional structure of news articles, the main content is presented in the article's initial parts. Newspaper analysts have tended to focus mainly on news headlines (Van Dijk, 1986). Many have assumed that headlines are what readers recall better after they read an article (Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983); and that therefore headlines are relevant for the understanding of how the readership consumes the rest of the article. Other analysts (White, 1997) have noted that not only the headline, but also the lead paragraph are the nucleus of the story and convey the article's 'gist'.

Opinion articles: These articles usually occupy a specific place in the newspaper and are signed by authors. These were articles generally signed whether by different professionals/experts, by journalists, or by specific personalities who somehow represented views/opinions of the local artistic, cultural or intellectual milieu. There were twenty-five opinion articles in 1997 (refer to table 1), and seven in 1998 (refer to table 2).

A different analytic strategy was applied for opinion articles in relation to that used with news reports. The reason is that there is not a single way to organize the text, given that each writer decides how he/she is organizing its order. To put it simply, initially all the text was read and the main contents were identified, according to their relevance or centrality in expressing the article's general goal. The paragraphs that conveyed a clear argument on the Guggenheim Bilbao were selected for analysis irrespective of the position they occupied in the text. However, if the museum was not mentioned in a main paragraph, but only in a less important one, the article was not selected for analysis.

Letters to the editor: These consisted in opinion letters addressed to the newspapers that mentioned the GBM in the headline or in the first paragraph. These articles typically occupy a specific page in the newspaper. The vast majority of these were letters signed by ordinary members of the public. There were fifteen letters to the editor in 1997 (refer to table 1), and one in 1998 (refer to table 2). The same criteria followed in the analysis of the opinion articles were also applied to this data.

Editorials: Editorials occupy a specific place in the newspaper and are assumed to mirror the consensual viewpoint of the newspaper. In the case of Egin, some editorials were not explicitly
labelled as such. Therefore, in addition to the typical editorials, all the unsigned opinion articles were also classified as editorials. There were nine editorials in 1997 (refer to table 1), and one in 1998 (refer to table 2). Only those editorials that mentioned the Guggenheim Bilbao in the headline, or in the first paragraph, were selected; nevertheless, on the whole, the same criteria applied to the analysis of opinion articles and letters to the editor were considered the most suitable to undertake the analysis of editorials. That is, those parts of the text that delivered a clear argument about the museum were identified and analysed, no matter whether they appeared at the editorial’s beginning, centre, or end.

Interviews: Only interviews which had the Guggenheim Bilbao as their main topic were included. There were eight interviews in 1997 (refer to table 1), and two in 1998 (refer to table 2). We selected interviews in which the Guggenheim Bilbao was mentioned in the headlines or main titles, the subtitles, the leads or article’s first paragraphs. Therefore, only the abovementioned parts of the texts were considered for the content analysis, and the rest of the questions and answers were not included.

Cartoons: A few cartoons in which the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum was mentioned were found in Egin throughout 1997. There were five cartoons in 1997 (refer to table 1), and one cartoon in 1998 (refer to table 2): all of them in Egin. These cartoons contained iconographic material. The content analysis was based on the dialogue of the cartoon characters.

Tables 1 and 2 show the total amount and the type of material analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Total numbers of types of texts about the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Egin and Diario Vasco in 1997.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGIN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116
Table 2: Total numbers of types of texts about the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Text</th>
<th>EGIN</th>
<th>EL DIARIO VASCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News articles</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion articles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the editor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. General themes

The general context in which the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum was mentioned was coded following a traditional content analysis that allows finding common meanings between initially scattered and apparently unrelated data. This process of bringing together a huge corpus involves the identification and coding of the general themes/supra-categories in which the particular reference to the Guggenheim Bilbao occurred, agents/participants who were mentioned and connotations (favourable/neutral/unfavourable). The categories used in the content analysis were worked out from semantic units found in clauses and paragraphs. First, I let the hard data to speak for themselves and, subsequently, I drew upon my own familiarity with the Basque nationalist press to undertake the interpretation of the context-bound meaning of the use of diverse lexis, adjectives, pronouns, etc. Finally, my own interpretation of the data was negotiated/agreed with my supervisor.

Below are listed the coding categories I drew upon for a content analysis based on comparison between different data sets.

Economy and planning: Under this category were included aspects such as the process of construction, the inauguration and events happening in the museum, the amount of money invested in the project and the degree of economic success. All the wordings stressing the positive impact of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum as stimulating tourism and the local economy, and the museum's success as an enterprise; or that tried to show the museum's popularity with the local population, were considered favourable. Conversely, all the wordings predicting failure of the museum as an enterprise, criticizing the cost of the project, or discussing its unpopularity in the eyes of the citizens, were considered unfavourable towards the museum.
Mere descriptions of the planning of the project, of the functioning of the already inaugurated museum, and different mentions of the program of events happening in the museum were thought to have a neutral connotation.

**Basque identity/culture:** Under this category came items that mentioned the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in relation to Basque identity/culture. Under this category were included any aspects of Basque culture, identity, art, such as Picasso's Guernica, names of cities and towns, restaurants, food, cultural entities and institutions, Basque language or Euskera, etc. Especial attention was paid to predictions of the possible impact that the museum could have on Basque culture. Points of view suggesting that the museum was opening its space to Basque artists or that it would bring positive influences to the Basque culture were considered favourable. Conversely, references stressing lack of interest of the museum in Basque culture, or negative impact on Basque culture, were considered unfavourable. At times, Basque culture was mentioned just to show how other social groups were concerned with specific issues such as the negotiations to bring the 'Guernica' painting to 'Bilbao'. When the attitude of the Guggenheim Bilbao in relation to Basque culture was not itself being evaluated the data were considered neutral opinions on the issue.

**Democracy/citizenship/rights:** Under this category came examples where the museum was mentioned in relation to commonly accepted values in contemporary democratic states. This category included discussions on issues of democracy and citizenship, such as human rights, or demands of higher accessibility of information, and respect of current laws. In sum, any mention of corruption, robbery, abuse of authority/power, misinformation, and so on associated to the museum was considered unfavourable when the blame was put on the museum. On some occasions the Guggenheim Bilbao was depicted in a favourable way. On the other hand, words such as democracy, human rights, and citizenship were mentioned without attributing any particular attitude to the Guggenheim Museum regarding these values. Therefore, these last wordings were considered neutral.

**Politics:** This category included examples in which articles discussed the GBM's politics, especially processes of negotiation between Basque and Spanish cultural or political authorities. In this case, most of the data referred to the endeavours to bring a famous Picasso's painting, "Guernica", to Bilbao for the museum's inauguration. In addition, references to the monarchy as representing the Spanish unity were also categorized as 'politics'. Yet again references were categorized as favourable, unfavourable or neutral.
Modernity/international culture: One of the criteria was to include in this category examples of what was being discussed about the GBM in relation to different symbols of international culture, such as foreign celebrities like Hollywood actors, members of the jet-set, cities like New York, London, etc., and internationally recognized artists like Picasso. Indeed, in this case the central question in terms of evaluation of attitudes was whether the museum would be able to fulfil its promise of bringing international art of very high quality to the Basque Country. These references were categorized as favourable when, for instance, references focused on positive appraisal of international culture in general; and as unfavourable when mentions underscored lack of quality, interest or value of the international culture symbols associated with the museum. When elements of international culture were just mentioned by the newspapers without evaluating their quality or artistic/cultural interest, these mentions were considered neutral.

Class identity: This category included examples in which the GBM was mentioned in relation to social classes within the Basque society. These references were categorized in terms of favourable, unfavourable and neutral views attributed to the GBM in relation to class identity. For instance, the invitation addressed to workers to visit the museum for free was considered a wording aiming at showing a favourable opinion of the museum towards less well-off classes. Conversely comments stating that the price of the entry ticket was unpopular, or showing that only very well dressed people were allowed to get in, were considered negatively connotated opinions on the museum’s views towards less wealthy classes. Mentions included in this category were considered neutral when the existence of different classes was mentioned in a descriptive way.

Spanish identity/culture: This category referred to instances when the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum was discussed in relation to the Spanish culture. References were coded in terms of favourable, neutral or unfavourable opinions. For instance, examples expressing the opinion that Spanish culture/art was going to be shown, or highlighted, by the museum were considered favourable. Examples that predicted lack of representation within the Guggenheim Bilbao of Spanish art and culture were classified as reflecting an unfavourable opinion about the relation between the Guggenheim Bilbao and the Spanish culture. References to different symbols like names of museums, cities, food, music, etc that were directly linked to various aspects of Spanish identity/culture were considered neutral when they were mentioned without attributing any stance as regards these issues.
Other cultural identities within the Spanish state: Under this category were gathered mentions of the Guggenheim Bilbao in relation to different regions within the Spanish nation state which can be considered culturally different from the Spanish core identity. This category included mentions to regions such as Catalonia, Galicia, Valencia and Navarre, where an important part of the population has got a native language other than Spanish/Castilian. As in the case of Basque and Spanish identities/cultures the point was to categorize references to the museum as being favourable or unfavourable to other identities within Spain. References implying that the Guggenheim Bilbao recognized the value of these cultures, like the opening of spaces to show works of art representative of these cultures and its artists, were considered favourable. Conversely, references to the museum’s attitude towards other national identities within Spain were considered unfavourable when stating that the museum neither recognized the value of these cultures, nor promoted its artists' works. Mentions of Catalan, Galician, Valencian and Navarre cultures were considered neutral when they consisted in mere descriptions of different aspects of such identities.

Other identities in the world: This category refers to mentions of the museum in relation to other ethnic or national identities in the world, like e.g. the Norwegian or the South American, without connoting any relation of these identities with international cultural symbols of prestige. These mentions to other identities in the world in the reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao were also categorized as favourable, unfavourable or neutral opinions.

4.3. Agents and participants

A further point we considered relevant was the identification of who were mentioned, or quoted, as talking about the general themes in relation to the museum. Accordingly, a list of groups or agents/actors was compiled:

Basque culture representatives: A cultural representative is someone who is relevant in a given country/region because he/she has influence in different areas of cultural, political, or economic sectors. I looked at people or entities such as social movements, Basque Justice’s Highest Court, the Eustat (Basque Statistical Institute) etc. This category also included individual public figures, such as Basque plastic artists and other Basque culture representatives.
Spanish culture representatives: This category included entities or people who occupy a position of real or symbolic leadership within the Spanish cultural sphere.

International culture representatives: This category included subjects who are not Basque or Spanish, like professionals of diverse areas whose prestige is internationally recognized, and also famous foreigners. Let's note that Frank Gehry, the architect of the Museum's building, was in turn considered also a representative of international culture, in spite of him being directly linked to the project.

Representatives of other cultural identities within Spain: This category included people and entities from regions of Spain characterized by some distinct cultural and identity aspects, such as language, that distinguish them from the core Spanish identity.

Basque journalists: This category included journalists who wrote in Egin and El Diario Vasco and mentioned the museum in their writings or statements. Actually, all journalists working in Egin and El Diario Vasco were automatically considered Basque journalists because they worked for Basque newspapers.

Spanish journalists: This category included journalists who worked in Spanish newspapers like namely 'El Mundo', 'El País' and 'ABC' that are also sold in the Basque Country. I looked at journalists who in that period were working in Spanish newspapers, no matter their actual ethnic background.

PNV politicians: This category included members of the Partido Nacionalista Vasco (Basque Nationalist Party). Some examples: the lehendakari (or Basque autonomous government's prime minister) José Antonio Ardanza, the President of the PNV Xabier Arzallus, but other less famous leaders of the party were also included.

HB politicians: This label contains the political party Herri Batasuna (later Batasuna) and its representatives.

EA politicians: This category referred to members of Eusko Alkartasuna, at that time the third Basque nationalist party in number of seats in the Basque Parliament. EA represented a
compromise between the mostly liberal-conservative and pro-autonomy discourse of the PNV, and the secessionist project of Herri Batasuna.

**PP politicians:** This category included members of Partido Popular. This right-wing Spanish party uttered an explicitly nationalist discourse. It was ruling Spain in 1997 and 1998, when the Spanish prime minister was José María Aznar.

**PSOE/PSE politicians:** This category included politicians of the main Spanish labour party, the PSOE (Partido Socialista Obrero Español).

**IU-EE politicians:** This category included politicians of Izquierda Unida (IU), located more to the left than the PSOE in the political spectrum. In the Basque Country this Spanish party’s local branch was then known as Ezker Batua and in that period formed a coalition with EE (Euzkadiko Ezkerra), another left-wing Basque party.

**Museum administrators:** this category refers to people in charge of the administration of the Guggenheim Bilbao, like Thomas Krens, president of the Guggenheim Foundation in New York, and Juan Ignacio Vidarte, the Guggenheim Bilbao’s director. They both held high responsibility positions related to the management and supervision of the museum’s functioning.

**Individual citizens of the Basque Country:** This category was a solution in order to describe people who did not represent any specific professional category or cultural movement. Mothers, friends, relatives of ETA’s victims, doctors in medicine, among others, were included in this category of people introduced by the press as ordinary citizens whom were given the opportunity to express opinions about the Guggenheim Bilbao.

**ETA:** This category included Euskadi ta Askatasuna (Basque Country and freedom), a paramilitary political group.

**Basque NGO’s and Associations:** This category included some Basque Non-Governmental-Organizations such as "Gesto por la paz" (known in English as "Association for Peace in the Basque Country"), "Egizan" (feminist movement ideologically close to the left-wing Basque nationalism), "Gernika gogoratuz" (literal translation: "Remembering Guernica", self-defined as Centre of Investigation for Peace and Transformation of Conflicts), "Eudel" (Euskadiko Udalen
Elkartea: Association of Basque Municipalities), etc. These NGOs represented different ideologies and social movements within the Basque society, and generally claimed to be independent from political parties.

**Trade unions:** This category included statements from trade unions that operated in a local basis and were also mentioned making utterances on the Guggenheim Bilbao. The two main Basque trade unions are LAB, which is considered HB's trade union; and ELA-STV that is seen as representing moderate Basque nationalist positions. Another trade union mentioned by the newspapers is UGT (Unión General de Trabajadores) that represents the PSOE.

**Ertzaintza:** This category included the Ertzaintza or Basque autonomous region's police institutions' representatives; and the erzainak or Basque policemen.

**Foreign tourists:** This category includes ordinary citizens of the European Union countries.

**Basque businessmen and trade associations:** This category includes individual businessmen, bankers and associations like AGACE (Asociación de Galerías de Arte Contemporáneo de Euskadi=Association of Contemporary Art Galleries of the Basque Country), which are concerned with the protection of the business interests within the Basque economy.

**Spanish Parliament:** This category includes references to members of the Spanish Senate and Congress.

**Ararteko:** This category includes the Basque autonomous region’s “defensor del pueblo” (ombudsman). The Ararteko has the role of defending individual citizens from arbitrariness, discrimination, errors, and negligence coming from the public administration. One of the main aims of this institution is to promote modifications in order to improve the laws on the behalf of the citizen.

**Art experts:** this category includes Basque, Spanish and international professionals described as art experts.
Chapter five

Content Analysis of the data

5. 1. Introduction to general frequencies of references to the museum in the Basque newspapers

First, it was intended to know in which year the GBM was a more important issue and whether references to the GBM were more frequent in Diario Vasco or in Egin, in 1997 and 1998. Therefore, it was thought to be pertinent to start this presentation of results with one table that would present the frequency of all items mentioning the GBM in 1997 and 1998 in Diario Vasco and Egin. The much higher frequency of references to the GBM in the first year indicated that this issue was more frequently mentioned in 1997 in Egin and Diario Vasco, than in 1998. Table 3 also shows the proportional differences of frequency in references to the GBM in Diario Vasco and Egin in 1997 and 1998.

Table 3: Frequencies and percentages of items mentioning the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Diario Vasco and Egin (Basque and Spanish language texts) in 1997 and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>51,61</td>
<td></td>
<td>597</td>
<td>43,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egin</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>48,38</td>
<td></td>
<td>786</td>
<td>56,83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 =29,606; df=1; p<0,0000
X2 (with Yates correction) = 29,269; df=1; p<0,0000

The results of the chi square comparison between Egin and Diario Vasco in 1997 and 1998 were significant (X2=29,606; df=1; p<0,0000) and confirmed that the frequency of references to the GBM in 1997 was higher in Diario Vasco than in Egin. Conversely, in 1998 there were more references to the GBM in Egin than in Diario Vasco.
Table 4: Frequencies and percentages of overall references in both newspapers to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in relation to the most frequently mentioned themes in 1997 and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency 1997</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency 1998</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque identity/culture</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>34.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernity/international culture</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>18.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy/human rights*</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of themes**</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5539</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basque identity/culture (X2=292,704; df=1; p<0.0000)
Economy (X2=159,746; df=1; p<0.0000)
Modernity/international culture (X2=164,488; df=1; p<0.0000)
Politics (X2=781,363; df=1; p<0.0000)
Democracy/human rights (X2=115,614; df=1; p<0.0000)
Total of themes 97x98 (X2=334,373; df=5; p<0.0000)

* class identity eventually merged with democracy/human rights.
** a wider category labelled as Rest of themes was created that encompassed Spanish identity and culture, other cultural identities within the Spanish state, and other identities in the world.

Table 4 above, which combines Egin and Diario Vasco, provides a list of frequencies and percentages of references to the GBM in relation to the most frequently mentioned themes over the period. These references to the GBM were chosen as the most important themes because, summing up both years 1997 and 1998, these were the most frequently associated to the GBM.

This table was intended as an introduction to the following questions: Which of these most frequent themes mentioned in references to the GBM tended to become proportionally more common over the period, and which ones turned to become proportionally less common over the period? How does the abovementioned pattern of a proportionally higher number of favourable references to the GBM in 1998 apply to each specific theme?

In table 4 it can be seen that on the whole, summing up the years 1997 and 1998, the GBM was more referred to in relation to the following themes: "Basque identity/culture" (34.87%), "Economy" (19.84%), "Modernity/international culture" (18.81%), and "Politics" (15.30%). The chi square analysis confirmed significant differences between the years 1997 and 1998 in the following themes: "Basque identity/culture" (X2=292,704; df=1; p<0.0000), "Economy" (X2=159,746; df=1; p<0.0000), "Modernity/international culture" (X2=164,488; df=1; p<0.0000), "Politics" (X2=781,363; df=1; p<0.0000), and "Democracy/human rights" (X2=115,614; df=1; p<0.0000). The comparison also indicated that references to the GBM in
relation to the three most important themes tended to be proportionally more common in 1998. Conversely, the GBM was proportionally less mentioned in 1998 in relation to themes such as “Democracy/human rights”.

The differences in favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM over the years 1997 and 1998 regarding specific themes were also analysed. The existence of significant differences in the case of some main themes was confirmed through chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM: “Basque identity/culture” ($X^2=73.017; df=1; p<0.0000$), “economy” ($X^2=38.188; df=1; p<0.0000$), and “others themes” ($X^2=4.391; df=1; p<0.0361$).

The results show that references to the GBM in relation to “Basque identity/culture” became proportionally more favourable and less unfavourable in 1998 than in 1997. The results also indicate that references to the GBM in relation to “economy” became proportionally more favourable and less unfavourable in 1998 than in 1997. On the other hand, the results indicate that references to the GBM in relation to “modernity/international culture” were proportionally more unfavourable in 1997 than in 1998. However, the chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references did not confirm significant differences over the period on this topic.

5.2: Comparison of favourable and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao between the years 1997 and 1998

This second part of presentation of results concerns the question of whether there was a proportional change in the amount of favourable and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum between the years 1997 and 1998. The results revealed a general pattern in references to the GBM in Egin and in Diario Vasco pointing to a more favourable reference to the GBM in 1998, when the issue became less controversial, than in 1997, when the GBM was indeed a far more controversial issue.

Table 5: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in 1997 and 1998 in both newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>78.82</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=109.31; df=1$ (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); $p<0.0000$

$X^2$ (with Yates correction)$=108.024; df=1$ (comp F/U); $p<0.0000$
Table 5 above presents the frequency and the proportion of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in 1997 and 1998. The differences of the chi square comparison between favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM in 1997 and 1998 were significant ($X^2 = 109.31; df=1; p<0.0000$). The results indicate that unfavourable mentions were proportionally more common in 1997 than in 1998. Furthermore, the results show than in 1998 there were proportionally more positive references to the GBM than in 1997.

The part that follows presents, respectively, tables of *Diario Vasco* (table 6), and *Egin* (table 7) which show the results of the analysis of shifts detected on each newspaper, now separately, in terms of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM over the years 1997 and 1998.

### Table 6: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in *Diario Vasco* in 1997 and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>79.62</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>75.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 22.14; df=1$ (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); $p<0.0000$

$X^2$ (with Yates correction) $= 21.039; df=1$ (comp. F/U); $p<0.0000$

$X^2 = 29.997; df=2$ (comparison between favourable, neutral and unfavourable references); $p<0.0000$

Table 6 above presents the frequency and the proportion of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* over the years 1997 and 1998. The chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that there were significant ($X^2 = 22.14; df=1; p<0.0000$) differences. According to the results, references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* became proportionally both more favourable and less unfavourable in 1998 than it was in 1997.

### Table 7: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in *Egin* (Basque and Spanish language texts) in 1997 and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>24.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>77.97</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>67.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 150.266; df=1$ (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); $p<0.0000$

$X^2$ (with Yates Correction) $= 148.329; df=1$ (comparison F/U); $p<0.0000$
Table 7 above presents the frequency and the proportion of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in Egin over the years 1997 and 1998. The chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that there were significant differences. The results indicate that Egin referred to the GBM more often in a favourable way and less frequently in an unfavourable way in 1998 than in 1997. The same pattern described above indicating differences over time was confirmed in the analysis of the representation of the GBM in relation to specific themes in Diario Vasco and in Egin, although mainly in the case of the three most frequent themes.

In the case of Diario Vasco the chi square analysis comparing favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that there were significant differences in the following main themes “Basque identity/culture” (X²=15,576; df=1; p<0,0001; X² (Yates correction)=14,224; p<0,0002), and “economy” (X²=6,119; df=1; p<0,0134; X² (Yates correction)=5,106; p<0,0238). The results indicated that references to the GBM in relation to “Basque identity/culture” were proportionally more favourable and less unfavourable in Diario Vasco in 1998 than in 1997. In relation to “economy” it was also found a proportionally higher frequency of favourable references and a proportionally lower frequency of unfavourable references to the GBM in relation to this theme in 1998. However, in relation to “modernity/international culture” the chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM did not confirm that there were significant differences between 1997 and 1998. Nevertheless, the general results suggest that in 1998 there were proportionally less favourable references to the GBM in relation to “modernity/international culture” than in 1997 in Diario Vasco.

In the case of Diario Vasco the chi square analysis comparing favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that there were significant differences in the following main themes “Basque identity/culture” (X²=15,576; df=1; p<0,0001; X² (Yates correction)=14,224; p<0,0002), and “economy” (X²=6,119; df=1; p<0,0134; X² (Yates correction)=5,106; p<0,0238). The results indicated that references to the GBM in relation to “Basque identity/culture” were proportionally more favourable and less unfavourable in Diario Vasco in 1998 than in 1997. In relation to “economy” it was also found a proportionally higher frequency of favourable references and a proportionally lower frequency of unfavourable references to the GBM in relation to this theme in 1998. However, in relation to “modernity/international culture” the chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM did not confirm that there were significant differences between 1997 and 1998. Nevertheless, the general results suggest that in 1998 there were proportionally less favourable references to the GBM in relation to “modernity/international culture” than in 1997 in Diario Vasco.

Regarding the frequency and the proportion of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM in Egin in 1997 and 1998, the chi square analysis comparing favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that there were significant differences in the case of the following main themes “Basque identity/culture” (X²=79,085; df=1; p<0,0000), “economy” (X²=44,83; df=1; p<0,0000) and “modernity/international culture” (X²=5,236; df=1; p<0,0221; X² (Yates correction)=4,32; p<0,0377). In relation to “Basque identity/culture” the results point to a proportionally higher frequency of favourable and to a proportionally lower frequency of unfavourable mentions in 1998 than in 1997. Also, in relation to “economy” it was found a proportionally higher frequency of favourable references and a proportionally lower frequency of
unfavourable references to the GBM in 1998 than in 1997. In the same way, in relation to references to the GBM linked to "modernity/international culture" the results pointed to a shift towards a proportionally lower frequency of unfavourable references in 1998 than in 1997.

5.3 –Comparison between Diario Vasco and Egin

Another relevant question was whether there were differences between Diario Vasco and Egin in the proportion of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM or not.

Table 8: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Diario Vasco and in Egin (Basque and Spanish language) in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diario Vasco (DV)</th>
<th>Egin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>329 (15.33)</td>
<td>120 (5.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1708 (79.62)</td>
<td>1568 (77.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>108 (5.03)</td>
<td>323 (16.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2145 (100%)</td>
<td>2011 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=204.504; df=1$ (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); $p<0.0000$

$X^2$ (with Yates correction) = 202.58; $df=1$ (comparison between F/U); $p<0.0000$

$X^2=206.413; df=2$ (favourable, neutral and unfavourable references); $p=0.0000$

Table 8 above presents the frequency and the proportion of all the favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in Diario Vasco and Egin in 1997. The chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references confirmed that there were significant ($X^2=204.504; df=1; p<0.0000$) differences between Diario Vasco and Egin. The results indicate that in 1997 Diario Vasco mentioned the GBM in a proportionally more favourable way than did Egin, and Egin mentioned the GBM proportionally more unfavourably than did Diario Vasco.

Table 9: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Diario Vasco and Egin (Basque and Spanish language texts) in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diario Vasco (DV)</th>
<th>Egin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>138 (23.1)</td>
<td>190 (24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>449 (75.2)</td>
<td>533 (67.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>10 (1.6)</td>
<td>63 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>597 (100%)</td>
<td>786 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=20.645; df=1$ (comparison between favourable and unfavourable); $p<0.0000$

$X^2$ (with Yates correction) = 19.445; $df=1$ (comparison between F/U); $p<0.0000$. $X^2=28.614; df=2$ (favourable, neutral and unfavourable); $p<0.0000$

Table 9 above presents the frequency and the proportion of all the favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in Diario Vasco and Egin in 1998. The chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references confirmed that there were significant ($X^2=20.645;$
df=1; p<0,0000) differences between Diario Vasco and Egin. According to the results, in 1998 the main difference was the higher proportion of unfavourable references to the GBM in Egin than in Diario Vasco.

The same general pattern permeated references to the GBM in Diario Vasco and Egin in relation to specific themes, e.g.: more favourable representation of the GBM in Diario Vasco, and more unfavourable representation in Egin in 1997; and more favourable representation of the GBM in both newspapers, as well as permanence of more unfavourable representation in Egin in 1998. The same general pattern of a more favourable representation of the GBM in Diario Vasco and a more unfavourable representation of the GBM in Egin, was found in 1997 in relation to specific themes. The chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references in 1997 confirmed that there were significant differences between Diario Vasco and Egin in relation to all the main themes "Basque identity/culture" (X2=105,69; df=1; p<0,0000), "economy" (X2=41,488; df=1; p<0,0000), "modernity/international culture" (X2=11,91; df=1; p<0,0006; X2 (Yates correction)=10,794; p<0,010) and "politics" (X2=8,4; df=1; p<0,0038; X2 (Yates correction)=5,186; p<0,0228). In all the cases the same trend is reproduced. So the results point to proportionally more favourable references to the GBM in relation to "Basque identity/culture", "economy", "modernity/international culture" and "politics" in Diario Vasco, and to proportionally more unfavourable references in Egin in 1997 in relation to the same themes. On the other hand, it can be mentioned that references to the GBM in relation to "democracy/human rights" seemed to be proportionally more unfavourable in Egin than in Diario Vasco in 1997. Nevertheless, these differences were not significant according to the chi square analysis.

In 1998 the chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM also confirmed that there were significant differences between Diario Vasco and Egin, but only in references to the GBM regarding "Basque identity/culture" (X2=18,104; df=1; p<0,0000). According to the results there were proportionally more unfavourable references to the GBM in relation to "Basque identity/culture" in Egin than in Diario Vasco in 1998. The favourable references to the GBM in relation to this theme were proportionally quite similar in both newspapers due to the increased number of favourable references to the GBM in 1998, mainly in Egin. The fact that the chi square comparison between favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM in relation to other themes, such as "economy" and "modernity/international culture", in 1998, did not confirm significant differences may be attributed to the fact that in these cases the proportion of favourable references to the GBM was quite similar in Egin and in Diario
The previous analyses were based on all texts, regardless of language. Now I will look only at the Spanish texts in *Egin* that will be compared with *Diario Vasco*’s texts. The same general pattern of a more favourable and a less unfavourable representation of the GBM in *Diario Vasco* than in *Egin* was confirmed through the comparison of frequencies of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* and in *Egin* in Spanish. The results presented in table 8 and 9 reinforce the impression that the ideological differences between newspapers had proportionally more influence than the use of Spanish or Basque languages.

Table 10: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* (only) in Spanish in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Egin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>79.62</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 152,903; df = 1 (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); p < 0.0000.
X² (with Yates correction) = 151,118; df = 1 (favourable and unfavourable); p < 0.0000.
X = 153,682; df = 2 (favourable, neutral and unfavourable references); p < 0.0000

Table 10 above presents the frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* in Spanish in 1997. The chi square analysis comparing favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that the differences were significant (X² = 152,903; df = 1; p < 0.0000). The results indicate that in 1997 there were proportionally more favourable and less unfavourable references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* than in *Egin* in Spanish.

Table 11: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* (only) in Spanish in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Egin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>449</td>
<td>75.20</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>66.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>597</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 22.09; df = 1 (comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); p < 0.0000
X² (with Yates correction) = 20.85; df = 1 (comparison F/U); p < 0.0000

Table 11 above presents frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* in Spanish in 1998. The chi square analysis comparing favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that the differences
were significant ($X^2=22.09$, $df=1; p<0.0000$). According to the results in 1998 there were proportionally more unfavourable references to the GBM in *Egin* in Spanish than in *Diario Vasco*.

### 5.4 - Differences between *Egin* in Spanish and *Egin* in Basque

In this section will be presented the results of the comparison of Spanish and Basque language texts in *Egin*. Basically, it was intended to demonstrate that the use of Basque or Spanish in *Egin* is related not only to the proportional choice of themes, but also to the proportion of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM. There were not enough texts published in Basque language in *Diario Vasco*, and thus this section will focus only on *Egin*.

Table 12: Frequencies and percentages of references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in relation to the most common themes in *Egin* in Spanish and in Basque in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Basque Frequency</th>
<th>Spanish Frequency</th>
<th>Basque %</th>
<th>Spanish %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque identity/culture</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>45.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernity</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International culture</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy/human rights</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of themes</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basque identity/culture in 1997 ($X^2=165.76; df=1; p<0.0000$)
Economy in 1997 ($X^2=151.133; df=1; p<0.0000$)
Modernity/international culture in 1997 ($X^2=149.081; df=1; p<0.0000$)
Politics in 1997 ($X^2=192.902; df=1; p<0.0000$)
Democracy/human rights in 1997 ($X^2=89.175; df=1; p<0.0000$)
Total of themes in 1997 ($X^2=38.542; df=5; p<0.0000$)

Table 12 above presents the frequency and proportion of references to the GBM in relation to the most often mentioned themes in *Egin* in Basque and in Spanish in 1997. The chi square analysis confirmed that there were significant differences between *Egin* in Basque and *Egin* in Spanish in 1997 in the case of the following themes: "Basque identity/culture" ($X^2=165.76; df=1; p<0.0000$), "economy" ($X^2=151.133; df=1; p<0.0000$), "politics" ($X^2=192.902; df=1; p<0.0000$), "modernity/international culture" ($X^2=149.081; df=1; p<0.0000$), and "democracy/human rights" ($X^2=89.175; df=1; p<0.0000$). The results highlighted that in 1997 *Egin* referred to the GBM in relation to "Basque identity/culture" proportionally more often in Basque than in Spanish. On the other hand, in 1997 *Egin* referred to the GBM in relation to "modernity/international culture" and "democracy/human rights" proportionally more often in
Spanish than in Basque.

Table 13: Frequencies and percentages of references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in relation to the most common themes in Egin in Spanish and Basque in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Basque</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque identity/culture</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernity/international</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy/human rights</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of themes</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basque identity/culture in 1998 (X2=200,166; df=1; p<0.0000)
Economy in 1998 (X2=135,734; df=1; p<0.0000)
Modernity/international culture in 1998 (X2=182,493; df=1; p<0.0000)
Politics in 1998 (X2=13,235; df=1; p<0.0003)
Democracy/human rights in 1998 (X2=10,0; df=1; p<0.0016; Yates correction X=8.10; df=1; p<0.0044)
Total of themes in 1998 (X2=no significance)

According to the results, in 1998 there were proportionally more references to the GBM in relation to "Basque identity/culture" in Egin in Basque than in Spanish; and more to the other themes in Spanish language articles; but similar proportion of mentions of "economy".

Table 14: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Egin in Spanish and Basque in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Basque</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2=13,206; df=1 (Comparison between favourable and unfavourable references); p<0.0003.
X2 (with Yates correction) = 12.28; df=1 (Comparison between favourable and unfavourable); p<0.0005.
X=21,129; df=2 (comparison between favourable, neutral and unfavourable references); p<0.0000

Table 14 above presents the frequency and the proportion of favourable, neutral and unfavourable
references to the GBM in Egin in Spanish and Egin in Basque in 1997. The chi square analysis confirmed that there were significant differences between Egin in Basque and Spanish in 1997 ($X^2=13.206; \ df=1; \ p<0.0003$). According to the results, Egin referred to the GBM in a proportionally more unfavourable way in Basque than in Spanish.

Table 15: Frequencies and percentages of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum in Egin in Spanish and in Basque in 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Basque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=3.094; \ df=1; \ p<0.0786$ (almost significant)

$X^2$ (with Yates correction)=1.868; $\ df=1$; Non significant (comparison between favourable and unfavourable).

$X=6.081; \ df=2; \ p<0.0478$

Table 15 above presents the frequency and the proportion of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM in Egin in Spanish and Basque in 1998. The results seem to point to a proportionally higher amount of unfavourable references to the GBM in Spanish than in Basque in Egin in 1998. However, the chi square analysis did not produce significant results due to the very small numbers involved.

Finally, it was intended to examine whether the proportionally higher frequency of favourable references to the GBM in Egin in Spanish than in Basque, and the proportionally higher frequency of unfavourable references to the GBM in Basque than in Spanish would be confirmed in the analysis of specific themes in 1997 and 1998. The chi square analysis of favourable, neutral and unfavourable references to the GBM confirmed that in 1997 there were significant differences between Egin in Basque and Egin in Spanish only in relation to “Basque identity/culture” ($X^2=28.461; \ df=2; \ p<0.0000$). The results indicate that in 1997 references to the GBM in relation to “Basque identity/culture” were proportionally more unfavourable in Basque than in Spanish. In 1998 the chi square analysis of favourable and unfavourable references to the GBM did not confirm significant results, but there was very little data in Basque.
5.5. Who were the participants who were quoted in the reports on the Guggenheim Bilbao in 1997

Since a main strategic use of reported speech is to provide the readership with an orientation as to how they should interpret the described events and participants, this subsection will examine which figures were quoted in the reports of the GBM. The same criteria of focusing on differences between the two newspapers and also between articles written in Basque and Spanish in *Egin* will be followed. Here will be presented only data about who were quoted in the two Basque newspapers throughout 1997.

Table 16: Frequencies and percentages of the general comparison of who were quoted as talking about the GBM in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* in 1997, listed in order of total frequency from higher to lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quoted participants</th>
<th>Egin F.</th>
<th>Egin %</th>
<th>Diario Vasco F.</th>
<th>Diario Vasco %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque culture representatives</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNV politicians</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum administrators</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens individually</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and other Iberian culture representatives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP politicians</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International culture representatives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herri Batasuna politicians</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertzaintza</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque NGO's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE-PSOE politicians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA (Eusko Alkartasuna) politicians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque businessmen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU-EE politicians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art experts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=273.654; \text{df}=16; p<0.0000$

Table 16 above shows frequencies and percentages of the total amount of quoted agents/participants in each Basque newspaper; and compares results of who in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* were presented uttering something unfavourable, neutral or favourable on the GBM in 135
1997. The results of the chi square comparison were significant ($X^2=273.654; \text{df}=16; \ p<0.0000$), and confirmed that *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* used different criteria of selection of who should be quoted as uttering something about the GBM. In *Egin* only *Basque culture representatives* (43.07%), *PNV politicians* (12.67%) and *Museum administrators* (13.49%) surpassed the mark of more than 10% of the quotations; while in *Diario Vasco*, *citizens individually* scored 20.41% of the quotations, followed by *Basque culture representatives* (19.23%), *PNV politicians* (18.19%) and *Museum administrators* (12.86%). In *Egin*, it is significant that *Basque culture representatives* were quoted as talking about the GBM proportionally much more often than in *Diario Vasco*. In turn, in the same period, *Diario Vasco* quoted *citizens individually*, *PNV politicians*, and *PP politicians* as talking about the GBM proportionally more often than *Egin*.

Table 17: Frequencies and percentages of the general comparison of who were quoted as talking about the Guggenheim Bilbao in *Egin*’s Basque and Spanish language texts in 1997, listed in order of total frequency from higher to lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of quoted participants</th>
<th>Basque language <em>Egin</em></th>
<th>Spanish language <em>Egin</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basque culture representatives</td>
<td>122 53.27</td>
<td>245 39.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum administrators</td>
<td>18 7.86</td>
<td>97 15.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNV (Partido Nacionalista Vasco) politicians</td>
<td>6 2.62</td>
<td>102 16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens individually</td>
<td>52 22.70</td>
<td>1 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and other Iberian culture representatives</td>
<td>3 1.31</td>
<td>41 6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB (Herri Batasuna) politicians</td>
<td>2 0.87</td>
<td>39 6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP (Partido Popular) politicians</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>41 6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA (Eusko Ta Askatasuna)</td>
<td>23 10.04</td>
<td>8 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International culture representatives</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>16 2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque businessmen</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>11 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA (Eusko Alkartasuna) politicians</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>7 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque NGO’s</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE-PSE politicians</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art experts</td>
<td>3 1.31</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertzaintza</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU-EE (Izquierda Unida-Euskadiko Ezkerra) politicians</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>229 100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>623 100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=272.425; \text{df}=16; \ p<0.0000$

Table 17 above presents the total frequency and percentages of the comparison of who were quoted in *Egin*’s articles written in Basque and in Spanish/Castilian language, in 1997, uttering something favourable, neutral or unfavourable on the GBM. The results of the chi square
comparison of who were quoted as wording something on the GBM throughout 1997 in Egin's articles written in Basque and Spanish language were significant ($X^2=272.425; \text{df}=16; p<0.0000$). In Basque language Egin articles, Basque culture representatives (53.27%), citizens individually (22.70%) and ETA (10.04%) were the most often quoted utterers. In Spanish language Egin articles Basque culture representatives (39.32%), PNV politicians (16.37%), and Museum administrators (15.56%) were by far the most often quoted. In terms of comparing Egin's Basque and Spanish language articles, it is noteworthy that in Basque language Egin articles citizens individually, and ETA, were much more often quoted than in the same newspapers' Spanish language articles; while Basque culture representatives were slightly more often quoted in the Basque language articles. In turn, PNV politicians, Museum administrators, Spanish and other Iberian culture representatives, HB politicians, PP politicians, and International culture representatives were more frequently mentioned in Egin's Spanish language articles.

In the following tables it is shown who were quoted as expressing favourable or unfavourable opinions on specific themes that like the previously listed content analysis tables have shown were the most controversial: economy, Basque identity/culture, and modernity/international culture.

Table 18: Frequencies and percentages of the comparison of who is writing or quoted as talking about economy in relation to the Guggenheim Bilbao in Egin and Diario Vasco in favourable and unfavourable terms 1997, listed in order of total frequency from higher to lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egin Favourable</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Diario Vasco Favourable</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper's own journalists</td>
<td>21 50,00</td>
<td>7 11,66</td>
<td>39 55,71</td>
<td>2 8,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque culture representatives</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>46 76,66</td>
<td>5 7,14</td>
<td>4 16,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens individually</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 6,66</td>
<td>13 18,57</td>
<td>13 52,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum administrators</td>
<td>15 35,71</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>8 11,42</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNV politicians</td>
<td>6 14,28</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 4,28</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertzaintza</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 24,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 5,00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International culture representatives</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1,42</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE-PSE politicians</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1,42</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 100%</td>
<td>60 100%</td>
<td>70 100%</td>
<td>25 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (Egin favourable x unfavourable) =80,325; df=5; $p<0.0000$ /  
$X^2$ (Diario Vasco favourable x unfavourable) =40,207; df=7; $p<0.0000$ /  
$X^2$ (Egin favourable x Diario Vasco favourable) =22,966; df=6; $p<0.0008$ /  
$X^2$ (Egin unfavourable x Diario Vasco unfavourable) =45,049; df=4; $p<0.0000$
Table 18 above presents frequencies and percentages of who were quoted in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* as making favourable and unfavourable comments on the specific theme of the GBM’s economy and its repercussions. The chi square comparisons of *Egin*’s favourable versus unfavourable quoted wordings ($X^2=80,325; df=5; p<0.0000$); *Diario Vasco*’s quoted favourable versus unfavourable wording ($X^2=40,207; df=7; p<0.0000$); *Egin*’s favourable versus *Diario Vasco*’s favourable ($X^2=22,966; df=6; p<0.0008$); and *Egin*’s unfavourable versus *Diario Vasco*’s unfavourable ($X^2=45,049; df=4; p<0.0000$), were all significant and confirmed that different utterers were quoted as wording something on the GBM more favourably connoted in *Egin*, and unfavourable references in *Diario Vasco*, in relation to economy. In *Egin*’s articles, throughout 1997, the newspaper’s own journalists made, on the whole, more favourable (50.00%) than unfavourable (11.86%) comments on economy in relation to the GBM. In addition, the same newspaper often quoted *museum administrators* (35.71%) and *PNV politicians* (14.28%) as uttering something favourable on the theme economy. Significantly, in *Egin*, the only outstanding group generally quoted as uttering unfavourable opinions on the GBM’s economic repercussions were Basque culture representatives (76.66%) who in the same newspaper never were quoted as wording any favourable opinion regarding the same theme. In *Diario Vasco*, whose writers assumed a far more favourable (55.71%) than unfavourable (8.00%) position, *museum administrators* (11.42%) and, not so often, *PNV politicians* (4.28%) were quoted as making favourable utterances on the GBM regarding economy; while mainly *citizens individually* (52%), and on a lesser degree *Ertzaintza* (24%), and *Basque culture representatives* (16%), were also quoted as conveying favourable views. In terms of inter-newspapers comparison between who were quoted as making favourable and unfavourable utterances on the GBM related to economy, *Egin* stressed, more than *Diario Vasco* did, that museum administrators and PNV politicians were more favourable; and that Basque culture representatives were more unfavourable. Meanwhile, *Diario Vasco* stressed, more than did *Egin*, that *citizens individually* and *Basque culture representatives* (actually all these quotations referred to quoted results of *Eustat*, the Basque statistical center) were favourable; and that *citizens individually* and the *Ertzaintza* were unfavourable.
Table 19: Frequencies and percentages of the comparison of who is writing or quoted as talking about Basque identity/culture in relation to the Guggenheim Bilbao in Egin and Diario Vasco in favourable and unfavourable terms in 1997, listed in order of total frequency from higher to lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Egin</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Diario Vasco</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque culture representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66,42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper’s own writers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28,57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB politicians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16,42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens individually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42,85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNV politicians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International representatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE-PSE politicians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA politicians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque businessmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (Egin favourable x unfavourable) = 112,522; df=9; p<0,0000/

$X^2$ (Diario Vasco favourable x unfavourable) = 61,085; df=6; p<0,0000/

$X^2$ (Egin favourable x Diario Vasco favourable) = 30,701; df=5; p<0,0000/

$X^2$ (Egin unfavourable x Diario Vasco unfavourable) = 22,468; df=8; p<0,0041

Table 19 above presents frequencies and percentages of who were quoted in Egin and Diario Vasco as making favourable and unfavourable comments on the specific theme of the GBM’s praxis and plans in relation to Basque identity/culture. The chi square comparisons of Egin’s favourable versus unfavourable quoted wordings ($X^2=112,522; df=9; p<0,0000$); Diario Vasco’s quoted favourable versus unfavourable wording ($X^2=61,085; df=6; p<0,0000$); Egin’s favourable versus Diario Vasco’s favourable ($X^2=30,701; df=5; p<0,0000$) and Egin’s unfavourable versus Diario Vasco’s unfavourable ($X^2=22,468; df=8; p<0,0041$), were all significant; and confirmed that there were differences between the newspapers. In Egin articles throughout 1997, the newspaper’s own journalists conveyed on the whole more favourable (28,57%) than unfavourable (6,42%) opinions in their reporting of Basque identity/culture in relation to the GBM. In addition, the same newspaper quoted museum administrators (42,85%) and PNV politicians (19,04%) as uttering something favourable on the GBM related to the topic of Basque identity/culture. Significantly, in Egin the only outstanding groups generally quoted as uttering more unfavourable and practically no favourable opinions on the GBM’s repercussions for
**Basque identity/culture** were mainly Basque culture representatives (66,42%) and HB politicians (16,42%). In *Diario Vasco*, whose writers generally expressed a more favourable (67,41%) than unfavourable (20,68%) position, international culture representatives (10,11%), and *PNV politicians* (6,74%) were quoted as making more favourable than unfavourable utterances on the GBM and Basque identity/culture; while Basque culture representatives (58,62%) and citizens individually (13,79%) were quoted as conveying more unfavourable than favourable views. In terms of inter-newspapers comparison between who were quoted as making favourable and unfavourable utterances on the GBM related to Basque identity/culture, in *Egin* it was more emphasised than in *Diario Vasco* that museum administrators and *PNV politicians* were favourable; and that Basque culture representatives were unfavourable. In addition, both *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* similarly quoted mainly Basque culture representatives' unfavourable comments on the GBM and its implications for Basque identity/culture, in no significantly different proportions. Meanwhile, *Diario Vasco*’s writers (67,41%) conveyed more than did *Egin*’s (28,57%) their positive stance in what concerns the GBM and the Basque identity/culture; and citizens individually and International culture representatives were quoted more often than in *Egin* as wording favourable opinions; while proportionally the newspapers' own writers presented more often unfavourable opinions than did *Egin*’s article’s writers.

Table 20: Frequencies and percentages of the comparison of who is writing or quoted as talking about Modernity/international culture in relation to the Guggenheim Bilbao in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* in favourable and unfavourable terms in 1997, listed in order of total frequency from higher to lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Egin</strong></th>
<th><strong>Diario Vasco</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper's own writers</td>
<td>3 8,33 4 15,38</td>
<td>63 61,76 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens individually</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>4 3,92 26 96,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>14 38,88 0 0</td>
<td>12 11,76 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representatives</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>Basque culture representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum administrators</td>
<td>15 41,66 0 0</td>
<td>6 5,88 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish culture</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>12 11,76 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representatives</td>
<td>PNV politicians</td>
<td>3 8,33 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>36 100% 26 100%</td>
<td>102 100% 27 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² (*Egin* favourable x unfavourable) = 51,031; df=4; p<0,0000/
X² (*Diario Vasco* favourable x unfavourable) = 108,053; df=6; p<0,0000/
X² (*Egin* favourable x *Diario Vasco* favourable) = 57,686; df=6; p<0,0000/
X² (*Egin* unfavourable x *Diario Vasco* unfavourable) = 49,173; df=2; p<0,0000

Table 20 above presents frequencies and percentages of how was the newspapers' own expressed
positioning, and who were quoted in *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* as making favourable and unfavourable comments on the specific theme of the GBM as representing a symbol of *Modernity/international culture*. The chi square comparisons of *Egin*'s favourable versus unfavourable quoted wordings (X²=51,031; df=4; p<0,0000); *Diario Vasco*’s quoted favourable versus unfavourable wordings (X²=108,053; df=6; p<0,0000); *Egin*’s favourable versus *Diario Vasco*’s favourable (X²=57,686; df=6; p<0,0000); and *Egin*’s unfavourable versus *Diario Vasco*’s unfavourable (X²=49,173; df=2; p<0,0000), were all significant; and confirmed that there were differences between the two newspapers. In *Egin* articles throughout 1997, the newspaper’s own journalists conveyed on the whole a more unfavourable (15,38%) than favourable (8,33%) opinion in their reporting of *Modernity/international culture* in relation to the GBM. In addition, the same newspaper quoted *international culture representatives* (38,88%) and *museum administrators* (41,66%) as uttering mainly favourable wordings on the GBM related to the theme of *Modernity/international culture*. Indeed, in *Egin* the only group quoted as uttering more unfavourable and not any favourable opinions on the GBM related to the theme of *Modernity/international culture* were Basque culture representatives (84,61%). In *Diario Vasco*, whose writers generally expressed a more favourable (61,76%) than unfavourable (0%) position, *international culture representatives* (11,76%), *Spanish culture representatives* (11,76%), *museum administrators* (5,88%) and *PNV politicians* (4,90%) were quoted as making more favourable than unfavourable utterances on the GBM and *Modernity/international culture*; but practically only *citizens individually* (96,29%) were quoted as conveying more unfavourable than favourable views; and *Basque culture representatives'* (3,70%) utterances were quoted only once to express an unfavourable opinion. In terms of inter-newspaper comparison between who were quoted as making favourable and unfavourable utterances on the GBM related to *Modernity/international culture*, in *Egin* it was more emphasised than in *Diario Vasco* that *museum administrators*, *international culture representatives* and *PNV politicians* were favourable; and that *Basque culture representatives* were unfavourable. In what concerns *Diario Vasco*’s writers (61,76%) it can be noted that they conveyed, more than did *Egin*'s, (8,33%) their positive stance in what concerns the GBM and the *Modernity/international culture*; and that *Spanish culture representatives* (11,76%) were quoted more often than in *Egin* (0%) as wording favourable opinions.
Chapter six


6.0. Introduction

The present chapter will look at qualitative aspects of the discursive and rhetorical shifts that were observed in Egin and Diario Vasco when, in the previous chapter's content analysis, the reporting of the museum was compared over a two years period. In the first and second sections will be examined an initial period that goes from January 1997 to the GBM's opening on the 20th of October 1997. It will be argued that this first period was characterized, in both Egin and Diario Vasco, by the idea that the Basque taxpayers and the public opinion were not enthusiastic in relation to the GBM's economic and cultural project, which future was represented as uncertain. This influenced the way the museum was portrayed in the Basque nationalist press in terms of construction of rhetoric to support/undermine two opposing general versions that predicted the project's success and failure. The chapter's third and fourth sections will be dedicated to examine how in the Basque nationalist press' reporting the economic and cultural debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao started to gradually cool off once the Guggenheim Bilbao's economic success in attracting tourists, and attempts at rapprochement between Basque artists and the museum, seemed to be confirmed in the fall of 1997, and throughout 1998.

6.1. Predicting the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum's success or failure

Between January and October of 1997 the Basque newspaper's reporting of the GBM tended to reflect scepticism regarding the museum's possibilities of success. During this period, neutral and unfavourable aspects of the GBM in relation to the Basque economy were quantitatively more mentioned than favourable aspects. In terms of discourse and rhetoric, a main feature of this period was that the newspapers' reporting included two broadly opposite views on possible economic consequences of the GBM project for the Basque autonomous region's and its citizens' economy. In the first subsection I will point out that there was a story line that predicted that the
museum might be a failure, and another story line that was constructed to rebut such predictions of failure. These versions on the GBM's failure or success were constructed in terms of arguments based on the number of visitors and the economic repercussions. In the second subsection I will look at how some GBM project's defenders were quoted in both newspapers, analysing why their discourses can be described as cautiously optimistic stories or accounts for the success the museum might have.

6.1.1. The newspapers' journalists' predictions

This subsection will look at how two different and opposite versions that predicted whether success or failure for the GBM were constructed as facts, and were presented as objective information based on description of actual facts or conditions. So, it can be analysed how Egin's editorials built up a version of the museum's failure and how they drew upon particular rhetorical devices to present their views as factual and reasonable accounts. Therefore, this section aims at examining rhetorical devices that were deployed to warrant claims of objectivity and impartiality in the two opposed versions in the debate over the GBM's success or failure. The present and the next subsections will serve to illustrate how the story of lack of success was accounted for in Egin and how, in turn, Diario Vasco accounted for a story of success. That is, the two subsections will look at how empiricist and quantitative repertoires were deployed to establish and contest claims of objectivity and factuality in Egin's and Diario Vasco's predictions on the GBM's project.

On his survey of news reporting, Van Dijk (1988) suggested that three main devices to present news as factual and objective are: providing evidence of reliable sources, giving indicators as numbers that convey precision and exactness, and directly quoting expert sources (pp. 84-87). Egin and Diario Vasco presented their news reporting construction work as an objective and 'factual' account of some events; and thus both newspapers deployed all these devices. In that sense, rhetoric of more or less precise numbers was deployed to predict the Guggenheim Museum's failure in a relatively short-term as a result of lack of enough tourists or visitors.

A main argument linked to the story of the GBM's foreseeable failure was that the museum would cost the Basque citizens too much, and that it would not bring enough economic profit. In the Spanish language (Extract 1) opinion article published in Egin (January 3, 1997) entitled
“1997: Guggengañó” (an expression that links two meanings año=year, and engañó=lie), the author, Iñaki Uriarte, signed the article as an architect, and thus drawing upon a rhetoric of category entitlement. That is, Uriarte was implicitly presented as someone who had expertise on the issue, and his identity was built up as someone who was entitled to criticize the GBM (Edwards and Potter 1992). According to Edwards and Potter (1992, p. 104-105) there are two closely connected aspects in fact construction: “The first is how the description is made to seem precisely that: a description rather than a claim, a speculation or indeed a lie. This is the force of doing description. The second is how the description is used to accomplish a range of activities; for example, indicating causal patterns, accounting for the actions of the speaker, attending to the concerns of the recipient. In discourse analytical terms, these can be seen as issues of construction and function”. In other words, fact construction is an issue that “concerns the sorts of devices and procedures that are used to make a specific version appear literal, solid and independent of the speaker” (Edwards and Potter, 1992, p. 105), and two elements such as corroboration and interest tend to be prominent in the construction of a fact as a version that is independent from the speaker. As Edwards and Potter (1992, p. 105) pointed out “these elements depend on the commonplace assumption that something claimed by independent witnesses is less likely to be a fabrication than would be the claims of a single witness; and that someone who has a strong personal stake may manufacture their story to fit with it. Discourse which bolsters or externalizes a version of events will often draw on one or both of these elements”.

Extract 1

1997. Guggengañó. [Headline] According to the Operative Plan, now, for the year 2000, only 500.000 visitors are expected, of whom 64,3% (24,3% peninsular and 40% from the rest of the world), that is, 231500, will be from outside: Catalans, Spanish, French, Galician, Italian, Japanese ... (...). A museum hardly generates of itself, except for very few people, an incentive to travel to a city; they are attracted by several of this place’s contents: urban morphology, beauty, accessibility, cleanliness, economic levels, leisure, education, security ... which provokes a more or less generalized foreign interest; in Bilbao there is a huge shortage of such attractions. (...) Among the several images that are associated with this pharaohnism, one, in the search of folklore, used to be that of a ship near the estuary. It is named “flagship” of the metropolitan Bilbao. Indeed, it is the titanium pirate ship, which after having plundered us culturally and economically sinks in the dockyard. This would be a new ‘Titanic’; the apparently unsinkable project, the country’s pride, but which adrift sank resoundingly in its opening voyage 1997-2000. (Egin, opinion article written by Iñaki Uriarte, January 3, 1997, p. 47)

At this stage, in Egin the editorials and articles that were critical towards the Guggenheim Bilbao typically predicted the museum’s failure based on economic arguments that involved quantification rhetoric (Potter et al., 1991). This rhetorical use of numbers was most often
deployed in descriptions of number of visitors expected and the costs of the project for the Basque economy. To account for the museum's success/failure, not only percentages and numbers were frequently used, but even unspecific quantitative vocabulary was deployed to construct rhetoric of maximization and minimization. Quantification rhetoric is typically used to warrant truth claims regarding a particular version of an event (Potter et al, 1991). In this opinion article, Inaki Uriarte used the term “plan operativo” (operative plan) to depict the Guggenheim Bilbao’s project as something that was neither well planned, nor solidly grounded in the real context in which the museum was set up. When Uriarte informed that the 'plan operativo' foresaw five hundred thousand visitors for the Guggenheim museum until the year 2000, he added a “solo” (only) that served like an orientation to the readers as to how they should read the editorial's main thesis: that the Guggenheim Bilbao would soon fail for lack of enough visitors. The article presented the numbers and percentages provided by the museum's representatives, who predicted how many visitors would come to see the museum, by using rhetoric of minimization of the importance of such numbers and percentages. Some examples of this minimization rhetoric can be found in the use of vocabulary such as “solo” (only) and “reducidísimas” (extremely few) when the editorial commented on the amount of visitors the GBM might attract. In parallel, also drawing upon a less specific quantitative vocabulary, Bilbao was depicted as a city, which lacked attractiveness for tourism, and a maximization of the city's lack of interest for visitors was constructed by stressing that “en Bilbao hay muchísimas carencias de estos alicientes” (in Bilbao there is a huge shortage of such attractions).

It should be noted that in Uriarte’s opinion article the rhetoric of numbers and contrast was deployed to justify the use of extreme metaphors that maximized criticism against the Guggenheim Bilbao, which was depicted as a Pharaoh’s museum, and also as a flagship. That is, Uriarte labelled the Guggenheim Bilbao a “flagship”, and compared it with the Titanic. He suggested that like the Titanic, the Guggenheim was an extremely ambitious project that would sink short after the beginning of its opening travel. A main argument that predicted the Guggenheim Bilbao’s eventual failure was that the Guggenheim Bilbao was not going to be able to attract enough tourists to the city of Bilbao; Uriarte argued that a museum cannot of itself be a relevant enough attraction to elicit interest for Bilbao in many tourists, unless this city provided some facilities such as urban morphology, leisure activities, security, cleanliness, a good economic level, etc. A rhetorical contrast was constructed between a city and a museum that were depicted as actually lacking enough attractiveness and resources to attract tourism and the ambition of the Basque politicians and representatives who supported a project that Uriarte
explicitly evaluated as pharaohnism. By implication, the editorial was highlighting that the project's supporters and the people in charge were disproportionately ambitious, and engaged in an irrational project doomed to fail. Jonathan Potter (1996) brought attention to what he considered a central feature of rhetoric: ‘maximization and minimization’. That is, he highlighted that numbers and quantification are often used in ways that enable building descriptive contrasts. Previously, influential work on how political rhetoric is constructed in texts has been written by Atkinson (1984), and Heritage and Greatbatch (1986). These authors stressed how the use of contrasts in a way that emphasizes the ‘factuality’ of one version, and the ‘arbitrariness’ of the other, makes a message more persuasive and convincing. In addition, the use of a huge variety of descriptive terms presented as ‘objective’ numbers, and more specifically the use in Egin’s opinion articles of statistics apparently provided by experts of the GBM, can be considered typical of the building up of an event or version in a way that serves to claim this is just ‘factual’ information. The rhetoric of factuality aims at protecting a version against potential undermining, and to prepare it to resist “criticisms of inaccuracy, falsehood or active confabulation” (Potter, 1996, p. 187).

Similar discourses and rhetoric were found in another opinion article published in Egin (extract 2) in May 1997, where Iñaki Uriarte repeated his discourse predicting the Guggenheim Bilbao’s eventual failure. The opinion article’s headline compared the Guggenheim with epidemics, a metaphor that underlined a predicted negative outcome. Drawing upon a rhetoric often deployed by politicians to make their discourses more persuasive and elicit the readers' adhesion, the Guggenheim Bilbao, the Pritzker Prize and other epidemics were listed together and implicitly presented as similarly contagious diseases. Once again, the author was introduced as an architect, and category entitlement rhetoric was used to build up the speaker’s identity as of a reliable expert who is entitled to talk about that specific topic.

Extract 2

Guggenheim, Pritzker Prize and other epidemics. [Headline] The opening of what the GBM members define as a museum's headquarters that is to be compared to the one from New York, is planned to happen with a grand inaugural exhibition: “The Art of the twentieth Century. Masterpieces of the Guggenheim Collection”, that in the Oriental world must have been already seen: Singapore, Dunedin (New Zealand), Taipei (Taiwan). This will diminish the important number of Japanese tourists that is calculated to come to Bilbao. Another exhibition is planned for later: “China, 5,000 years”. The latter is probably originated by the following that the Chinese cuisine has had in our land, and the interest provoked by the promotions that are made periodically in “China in the Corte Ingles”, where the fat buddhas of PVC that embellish many farm houses’ can be bought. (Egin, opinion article by Iñaki Uriarte, May 18, 1997, p. 18)
This time Uriarte drew upon a different argument to account for the shortage of tourists and for the subsequent failure he foresaw for the GBM: he pointed out that the GBM was planning to offer an exhibition for its opening: "Art of the twentieth century. Masterpieces of the Guggenheim collection", which according to Uriarte’s version had already been seen in places such as Singapore, Dunedin, and Taipei, all places that he labelled as the "Oriental world". Based on this information, the writer concluded that most Japanese people had already had the chance to see this exhibition, and then he uttered his arguments’ core point that, consequently, the number of Japanese visitors in Bilbao would be very small. In addition, the writer made reference to the museum’s or the PNV representatives' predictions that he argued had been unrealistic. The writer also made ironical comments on the second exhibition that the GBM was planning to organize: "China 5,000 years". He suggested that it was unrealistic to suppose that this exhibition of Chinese art might attract many people. He also pointed out that the choice of a Chinese topic for an exhibition ought to be related whether to the cheap Buddha that ordinary Basque peasants used to buy in the promotions granted by the popular big stores known as "El Corte Ingles" (kind of Spanish Marks and Spencer); or to the popularity of the Chinese restaurants in the Basque country. In sum, the writer was rebutting and undermining the argument that the GBM’s exhibitions might attract plenty of people by using a rhetoric of irony and mockery, and by depicting the GBM’s choice of exhibitions as unrealistic, superficial and bound to failure.

Relevant for this analysis is also the use of quantification rhetoric in the sentence: "lo que mermará el importante número de turistas japoneses calculado que acudirán a Bilbao" (this will diminish the important number of Japanese tourists that is calculated will come to Bilbao). Drawing upon unspecific and vague general quantitative terms such as "el importante número" (the important number) and "mermará" (will diminish), Uriarte, as in his previous opinion article, worked up a contrast between the museum’s predictions, which were implied to be partial and wrong, and a prediction that was claimed to be based on objective facts: the number of Japanese visitors would be drastically reduced by external factors that the GBM overlooked.

A news report article was published (extract 3) in Diario Vasco in May 1997, whose writers informed in the headline that "Dos de cada tres vascos ponen reparos a la inversión realizada en el Guggenheim" (two out of three Basques objected the investment made by the Guggenheim). At first sight, this headline seemed to indicate that this article’s writers intended to report how
unpopular the GBM’s project was among the Basques. However, the subhead pointing out that “los alaveses son más escépticos que vizcaínos y guipuzcoanos sobre la necesidad del proyecto” (people from Alava are more sceptic than people from Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa about the necessity of this project) did not confirm the initial impression that the text was focusing on the Basque citizens’ negative views regarding the museum. In other words, there was an important contradiction between the headline’s stress put on the unfavourable aspects perceived by the Basques, and the news report text which focused mainly on the Basques’ favourable opinions in relation to different aspects of the museum.

Extract 3

Two out of three Basques objected the investment made by the Guggenheim. [Headline] People from Alava are more sceptic than people from Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa about the necessity of this Project. Most Basque citizens consider that the Guggenheim Museum will have an effect on the Gran Bilbao’s economic and social development, and that it will improve the city’s image, giving rise to the Basque Country’s tourist growth and that will promote the cultural exchange and knowledge of the Basque art in the rest of the world. Also, the majority value positively American architect Frank Gehry’s futurist building, although 26% confess that they have not seen it yet. Nevertheless, 66% of the 1,839 people surveyed doubt or believe that the investment of more than 23,000 millions carried out in the transaction is not justified, which highlights the serious gaps in the museum’s politics of communication. The ‘economic’ effect. The number of citizens who know the Guggenheim, the social, economic and artistic circumstances that surround the museum is increasing. In parallel the numbers of those who discover positive aspects are also increasing, mainly among the inhabitants of Bilbao and Biscay. In general, the Basques consider that the art gallery will contribute to spread Biscay’s capital’s new image, which will promote the cultural exchange and the autochthonous art’s knowledge in the rest of the world, and that will re-boost tourism. However, they have got doubts when the museum introduces itself as driver of Euskadi’s social and economic development. The PNV, EA, and PP voters are those who trust more in the Guggenheim’s economic effect. When evaluating the investment carried out by the Basque institutions in the transaction - more than 23,000 million pesetas -, opinions were divided in three big blocks: the favourable, the opposed and those that are still in doubt. Elderly people and those who live in smaller population settlement tend to justify more the investment made. By virtue of the vote, the moderate nationalism (PNV, EA) and the Spanish-state’s left-wing parties (PSE-EE, IU) value it more positively. The opposition is basically centred on HB. (Diario Vasco, front-page news report, June 3, 1997)

Diario Vasco (extract 3) presented the information as objective data issued from a serious opinion poll, and empiricist language was used, which was based on numbers and percentages. The text quoted some predictions about the GBM’s future that were attributed to the opinion poll’s interviewees. The empiricist repertoire was one of the recurrent interpretative repertoires that Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) identified in their research on biochemists’ talk and writing. The empiricist repertoire included lexical, grammatical and stylistic features that accorded primacy to empirical data and that were deployed in diverse contexts aiming at accomplishing specific
actions. The empiricist repertoire served to work up a story in which data were described as emerging from rigidly conducted experimental procedures, and such accounts were constructed in an “impersonal style, with overt references to the author’s actions and judgements kept to a minimum...” (Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984: 57).

Most predictions found in *Diario Vasco*, in the same news report published on June 3, 1997 (extract 3), happened to foresee a positive effect of the Guggenheim Bilbao on the Basque economy and culture e.g. “contribuirá al desarrollo económico y social del Gran Bilbao” (it will have an effect on the Gran Bilbao’s economic and social development). Other example of positive prediction highlighted in the *Diario Vasco*’s account of the opinion poll results was the reporting that “los vascos estiman que la pinacoteca contribuirá a difundir una nueva imagen de la capital vizcaina, que fomentará el intercambio cultural y el conocimiento del arte vasco en el resto del mundo” (the Basques consider that the art gallery will contribute to spread Biscay’s capital’s new image, which will promote the cultural exchange and the autochtonous art’s knowledge in the rest of the world, and that it will re-boost tourism). Both sets of texts, whether the opinion articles published in *Egin*, or the *Diario Vasco*’s news report, drew upon the empiricist repertoire to reinforce their versions (and to undermine counter-versions) through the use of the rhetoric of science as a warrant that their arguments were based on objective facts, and not on particular stake.

As it has been noted earlier, another example of *Diario Vasco*’s use of quantification rhetoric (extract 3) can be found in this newspaper’s report that 66% of the 1,839 people interviewed did believe that the transaction was not justified. In the same article, this newspaper attributed the Basque population’s mistrust in relation to the GBM, to the museum’s communication policy’s weakness. One thing that such evaluation did indicate is that the *Diario Vasco*’s actual stance was that the investment in the Guggenheim Bilbao was justified; and implications of the Basque population’s lack of empathy with the GBM, and the not so favourable predictions they uttered, were backgrounded. That is, *Diario Vasco* noted how the opinion poll had also revealed that such doubts concerned mainly (and were limited to) what the newspapers described as some Basque citizen’s doubts on whether the investment was justified or not. Furthermore, this acknowledgement of the existence of negative predictions in relation to the Guggenheim Bilbao was downgraded when the same *Diario Vasco*’s report stressed that the main criticism and mistrust in relation to the GBM came from people who were politically close to the Basque left-wing party Herri Batasuna, drawing upon the readership’s common-sense assumption that this
group is synonymous with radical partisan rigidity. To sum up, this Diario Vasco's news report suggested that the opposition was mainly related to a specific and minority group in the Basque Country, which was understood to be a politically orientated and partial version of a minority who did not represent the Basque society's consensual view on the issue. The conclusion was based on a rhetoric of numbers pointing out that, although 66% of the Basques expressed the opinion that the investment in the museum was not justified, the majority of interviewees (71%) believed that the museum would benefit the Basque Country (extract 4). Moreover, Diario Vasco's accounts of the predictions in relation to the GBM's future, reflect the newspapers' effort to counterbalance and attenuate contradictions between the acknowledge of the existence of an important opposition to the GBM's project, and the construction of a story to support the argument that a majority of Basque citizens believed that the GBM's would be a success. In this sense, it can be remembered that Potter (1996) wrote about processes of ontological gerrymandering, in which typically more specific numbers, such as percentages, can be used to follow a particular part of a phenomenon to be picked out as relevant to the description, and used to further develop the argument in a way that benefits the argument being made.

Extract 4
Small opposition. [Subhead] The rejection of the investment does not reach particularly important proportions in Alava and Guipuzcoa, although the level of acceptance is smaller. The opinion pool highlights that, according to the data, the Guggenheim is a work that does awake neither excessive mistrust, nor an open opposition in any of the territories, although people from Alava are the most sceptic citizens. Although the citizens' view happens to be largely positive, even in the architecture’s evaluation, one of the aspects on which the interviewees have got less doubts - the Frank Gehry’s building arouses totally opposite reaction, without any intermediary tones -, and the 66% is not sure whether the investment is justified or not, which brings about serious doubts about the museum’s politics of communication. And all this happens, despite the fact that 71% of the interviewed people reaches the conclusion that the Guggenheim will benefit the country. The citizens with a better view on the museum belong to a medium-high social class that are sectors that generally maintain a more direct contact with the cultural activity. Once more, the rejection and the indifference happen to be meaningfully higher among Herri Batasuna voters. (Diario Vasco, news report, June 3, 1997)

Another means of fact construction through descriptions is the use of a rhetoric of elaborate and detailed information on one topic. Here it was stressed that the opinion poll on which Diario Vasco based its argument that the majority of the Basques predicted a favourable effect of the GBM, was the result of a complex and detailed comparison. This comparison was based upon diverse criteria such as size of population, political orientation, the three Basque territories or provinces, among others. Along with the stress laid on an empiricist language, and on
quantification rhetoric, this elaboration in the description of details was part of a rhetoric that served to construct a claim that this was a serious and objective account.

Going back to Egin, an opinion article was published (extract 5) on October 9, 1997, a few days before the Guggenheim’s opening. It was entitled “El Guggenheim y el imperialismo cultural” (The Guggenheim and the cultural imperialism). It predicted the Guggenheim Museum’s ruin, and deployed an extremely negative tone to dismiss the project, like e.g.: “totalmente rechazable” (deserves to be totally rejected); and “semejante losa a nuestras espaldas durante el resto de nuestros días como pueblo” (such a flagstone on our back for the rest of our lives as a nation). Something striking in this opinion article is that, although the headline indicated that the writer might develop the argument that the GBM would have negative effects on Basque culture, actually cultural arguments turned out to be secondary in this text that, instead, focused on economic and political arguments. Part of this article’s rhetoric to criticize the GBM project was based on category entitlement, given that the speaker was presented as a lecturer at the University of the Basque Country. This position as someone who was entitled to address this topic enabled the speaker to buttress the factuality of a version with highly negative and controversial accusations of involvement in a conspiracy, and this version was uttered against policymakers. In this case at least one extremely negative evaluation as: “el Guggenheim Bilbao Museoa es un proyecto totalmente ruinoso, totalmente rechazable” (the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum is a ruinous project, which deserves to be totally rejected), and the assumption that people should “decir que no a tanto despropósito” (to say no to all this nonsense), were both formulated to depict the GBM as a project doomed to failure. Such formulations were presented as a fact, and a rhetorical contrast was constructed that stressed the difference between the rationality of people who based on facts were able to say no to a crazy project, and the irrationality of those who were afraid to say the truth and, although they did not believe in the project: “lo defienden ahora con vehemencia, anunciando las mil y una maravillas que nos traerá, como si quisieran, convenciendo a los demás, autoconvencerse ellos mismos, sólo porque no han tenido la valentía de decir que no a tanto despropósito” (supporting it now enthusiastically, and spreading everywhere what it will bring us, as if they wanted, convincing the others, to convince themselves, only because they did not have the courage to say no to all this nonsense). Edwards and Potter (1992, p. 163) suggested that “within the rhetorical process involving the use of contrast in a discourse, a version can be presented as a fact and built up in opposition to an alternative, which tends itself to be formulated in an unconvincing or problematic manner.”
Extract 5

Among all this lavish celebration and solemn inauguration, it is worth raising the discordant voice, even if it is only to remind you that the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum is a ruinous project, which deserves to be totally rejected, which sooner or later we will have to tackle if we do not want to live with such a flagstone on our back for the rest of our lives as a nation. Even if it was only for the shame of those who never believed in such project, supporting it now enthusiastically, announcing it like a wonder, convincing the others, to convince themselves, only because they did not have the courage to say no to all this nonsense. Even if it were only because of the anxiety provoked by thinking about the goal they have scored against us, and the sight of the dollar's knights walking in their recently conquered feud. For all this, and for much more, we have to keep reflecting on the Guggenheim, more about its future, than about its past. (Egin, Opinion article signed by Josu Amezaga, October 9, 1997, p. 11)

The writer set up an explicit rhetoric of we Basques as victims: "la desazón de pensar que gol nos han metido" (the anxiety it provokes thinking about the goal they have scored against us). That is, victims of a plot perpetrated by others described as "caballeros del dólar" (the dollar's knights). His account of why the GBM should be rejected emphasized that there was a hegemony of those who imposed a positive discourse on the Guggenheim Bilbao, and that "merece la pena alzar la voz discordante" (it is worth raising the discordant voice) instead of remaining silent and oppressed as those who "no han tenido la valentía de decir no a tanto despropósito" (did not have the courage to say no to all this nonsense), which depicted the Basques as an oppressed minority in pointing out how difficult it was to go against the powerful pro-GBM establishment. Here the main argument against the GBM was based on a very vague or unspecific quantification rhetoric actually embedded in the adjective "ruinoso" (ruinous). This adjective describes a GBM's failure that the article predicts will be paid by all of 'us', stressing that there will be a terrible consequence: "vivir con semejante losa a nuestras espaldas durante el resto de nuestros días como pueblo" (to live with such a flagstone on our backs for the rest of our lives as a nation). At the same time, the reference to the ruinous fate of the Basques is contrasted with the dollar knights' power and strength, a figure that functions as the metaphor of a powerful economy, symbolized by a strong currency, and its arbitrary imposition over a conquered market, depicted as their "feudo" (feud). Nevertheless, it is striking that here the author did not say why the Guggenheim Bilbao's fate should turn to be so ruinous. Unlike the previous opinion articles' writers, here neither did the author mention any tourists or visitors to the museum, or use any rhetoric of numbers that could serve to construct any empiricist and factual tone in the article.

In this subsection it was examined how opposed versions predicting the Guggenheim Bilbao's economic failure and success were presented in Egin and Diario Vasco, in news reports and opinion articles. Some of the main patterns found were the use of numerical and non-numerical
quantification and category entitlement rhetoric. Both sides in the debate drew upon these specific rhetorical devices to present their versions of expected numbers of tourists for the GBM as objective and factual.

6.1.2. Policymakers' and other agents' predictions

In this subsection I will be looking at who were the utterers quoted in Egin and Diario Vasco’s news reports’ predicting the museum’s success. Apart from focusing on the rhetorical work that was being operated to construct a version of the GBM’s success, there will be an examination of the degree in which the quotations were presented as particular versions that were separate from the writer’s position. In addition, there will be an examination of the ways that the PNV politicians and the museum’s representatives were quoted as drawing upon rhetoric that is similar to the already described rhetoric developed by writers of opinion articles, to account for their story of success. Finally, part of this subsection will focus on the effects of the adoption by the PNV policymakers of a new argument that provoked an important discursive and rhetorical shift on both sides’ economic predictions.

6.1.2.1. The cautious rhetoric of success of PNV politicians who were quoted arguing in favour of the museum

An early example in Egin of a PNV government representative’s quotation accounting for why the GBM was going to be a success can be found in a news report published in May 1997 (extract 6). In this news report entitled “Las obras del Guggenheim a punto de concluir” (the works in the Guggenheim almost to be finished) Mari Carmen Garmendia, the head of culture and PNV politician, was quoted as uttering that 250,000 persons per year were expected to visit the Guggenheim in Bilbao. In this quoted speech the PNV representative also suggested that the evidence that the Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao was having a huge success with its last exhibitions, could be interpreted as a symptom of the GBM’s eventual success. It has to be noted that the Museo de Bellas Artes is located very close to the Guggenheim Bilbao. Mari Carmen Garmendia’s main argument to account for her prevision of 250,000 visitors per year for the GBM, was that the Museo de Bellas Artes had received 232,500 visitors in its last exhibitions. In 1997 there was an important rise of numbers of visitors to the Museo de Bellas Artes, but as Javier Viar (2005, p. 106) pointed out the phenomenon was not related to the Guggenheim Bilbao. Two exhibitions attracted many Spanish tourists: Masterpieces of Spanish Art in the
Museum of Budapest, and From Vedutism to the first avant-garde. Both exhibitions took place months before the Guggenheim Bilbao’s inauguration. That is, a politician was quoted as using a rhetoric of numerical (250,000 people; 232,500 visitors), and non-numerical quantification, while she underscored to be drawing upon empirical data to make her prediction. At the same time, she was also portrayed using rhetoric of comparison between the GBM and the other main museum in Bilbao, and maximization of the Museo de Bellas Artes' success. More specifically, she reportedly depicted the latter museum’s success as “espectacular” (spectacular), which is an equivalent of “huge success”, and is based on a non-numerical quantification rhetoric. The news report used indirect quotation, but emphasised that it was Mari Carmen Garmendia who uttered the described predictions and data. For instance, the indirect quotation served Egin to present the PNV representative’s prediction as something that they expected: “La titular de Cultura insistió en que esperan recibir la visita de 250.000 personas por año” (The holder of culture insisted that they expect to receive the visit of 250,000 persons per year). This is an example of the PNV politicians’ use of imprecise numbers that served to convey large numbers (quarter of a million), rather than precise accuracy. Although Egin seemed to implicitly acknowledge that the number of visitors might be high, such prediction was partially undermined by suggesting it was a partial opinion or stake of a particular group: the PNV. In this sense, it can be noted how the adjective “espectacular” (spectacular) was the only one that appeared in quotation marks or footing in the paragraph. Footing also served to indirectly stress that this was the speakers’ opinion, and to build up a distance between the speaker’s and Egin’s own stance. Other distance markers between Egin and the quoted speaker were verbs in the past tense that described what the speaker did: “insistió” (insisted) “se remitió” (referred to). The former verb, “insistió” was used to stress that the PNV’s head of culture repeated an argument that Egin’s remark was suggesting the newspaper considered unconvincing. In sum, in Egin’s quotations of PNV policymakers’ utterances the use of gist or indirect quotation prevailed, and footing was used for specific purposes. The choice of diverse types of quotation is related to accountability. Apparently, Egin was specially concerned with stressing that exaggerated vocabulary, such as “espectacular”, was typically related to a PNV’s rhetoric of hyperbolic maximization, and thus drew upon the use of “scare quotes” (Predelli, 2003) to underline that this kind of lexis was not part of Egin’s style, assumed to be more discreet and reasonable than Diario Vasco’s.

Extract 6
The works in the Guggenheim, about to be finished. [Headline] The Culture Minister insisted that they expect to receive the visit of 250,000 persons per year, and referred to the “espectacular” growth of visitors to the Museum of
Arts of Bilbao, that have reached the number of 232,500 during the four temporary exhibitions dedicated to Iturrino, Chillida, “annunciation” of the Greco, and collections of the Budapest Museum. (Egin, news report, May 8, 1997, p. 54)

Another PNV representative named Tomás Uribeetxabarria, was quoted in Egin, on June 13, 1997 (extract 7). According to this news report, the politician was requested by another politician from a different political party, the left-wing Izquierda Unida (IU), which is not Basque nationalist, to account for why the GBM’s pre-opening celebrations would last 15 days, before the definitive opening to the general public. Egin quoted the PNV politician as predicting (and thus justifying) that these fifteen preopening days would be highly profitable, and would help to make the GBM’s idea more marketable. This time Egin opted for a direct quotation of the politician’s utterances who drew upon rhetoric of contrast between what is common and what is rare. The rhetorical work the PNV politician was accomplishing was to maximize the importance of his predictions and thus presenting as a sure fact something that had not yet materialized. Potter et al (1991) did found similar rhetorical presentation of predictions as facts in their research on quantification rhetoric used in a TV program to account for predictions of success and failure in treatment of cancer. In the following sentence, from which Egin stressed its distance by using quotation marks, “unas expectativas inusitadas, mucho más altas de lo que imaginamos” (some uncommon expectations, which are much higher than we had figured out), the PNV politician was quoted arguing that the GBM had already aroused uncommon expectations. This utterance implied that the GBM was something great, beyond anything that had previously happened in the Basque Country, and that the expectations were higher than predicted. Probably, it was the first time ever that the story telling the possibility of the GBM becoming a big success was suggested in Egin, drawing upon non-numerical quantification rhetoric: a contrast between what it was more or less common, and what was very uncommon or “inusitado” (rare). Moreover, utterances that predicted the GBM’s success were surrounded by footing (Goffman, 1981), which underlined Egin’s distance. At the end of the same paragraph Egin drew upon the use of direct quotation to once again distance itself from another sentence uttered by the PNV politician. It was a sentence that also predicted the GBM’s success; “Son muchos los colectivos interesados - siguió el diputado foral- y a nosotros nos toca sacar rentabilidad del asunto, vender la historia” (There are many groups interested - followed the Basque Autonomous Community’s deputy - and it is us who have to know how to turn profitable this issue, to sell the story). In this particular sentence the quoted speaker was presented by Egin as “el diputado foral” (the Basque Autonomous Community’s deputy), which stressed his
relation with the PNV, implying that this is a PNV’s official version, and that he was a representative figure, “el diputado foral”, the deictic “el” (the) indicating that he was the one ‘Basque Autonomous Community’s deputy’. In other words, it was pointed out that he was someone who had links with power, an influential figure. Further, the quotation depicted the speaker using a non-numerical quantitative language, such as “muchos” (many), “rentabilidad” (profitability), and “vender” (to sell) to account for his argument on why the GBM would be a successful business. In addition, Egin’s footing stressed that there was a continuity between this sentence and the previously quoted sentence, an order of discourse; “siguió el diputado” (followed the deputy), and that this was the deputy’s utterance.

Extract 7
Fifteen very profitable days. [Headline] The Guggenheim Museum’s next opening is awakening worldwide “some uncommon expectations, which are much higher than we had figured out”, Tomas Uribeetxebarria answered this way the IU representative, when asked about the reasons why the Museum will be open to the public fifteen days after its inauguration. “Many associations are interested - followed the Basque Autonomous Community’s deputy - and it is us who have to make this issue profitable, to sell the story” (Egin, news report, June 13, 1997)

A news report entitled “cara al exterior” (with a view abroad) was published in Egin on October 16, 1997, which headline was ‘fifteen very profitable days’ (extract 8). Here, a PNV representative was quoted as predicting that the GBM would have a worldwide repercussion. This politician named José Bergara accounted for his argument for the GBM project drawing upon numerical and non-numerical quantification rhetoric. The use of numbers and other quantification permitted him to present as factual and reasonable the PNV policymakers’ main narrative that the museum was a first level international cultural infrastructure that would turn Bilbao into a wealthy and developed city, which could eventually overcome its economic crisis.

In Egin’s quotation, the PNV politician is portrayed as uttering the view that there are two groups in the Basque society; those that according to him were “quienes se obstinan en destruir la convivencia pacífica del país” (those that persist in destroying the country’s pacific living together), and those who were implied to act “con total normalidad y dignidad democrática” (with total normality and democratic dignity). The latter were assumed to be the ones that are favourable to the GBM. The quoted speaker also took for granted the existence of objective criteria to evaluate people’s degree of normality and democratic dignity. Thus some people were assumed to be acting according to a ‘total’ normality’, in rhetorical contrast to ‘others’ who persisted in their “sinrazón” (lack of reason), which can be understood as abnormality. The
reasonable and normal people were implicitly those citizens favourable to the GBM, the abnormal and deviant ones were the people who persisted in their irrational criticism of the project.

Extract 8

With a view abroad. [Headline] It was José Bergara who yesterday was entrusted to bring some economic data about the new Museum. Therefore, and once he stood out in the act that yesterday was carried out "with total normality and democratic dignity, and so to the lack of reason of those who persist in destroying the country's pacific living together" he said that six years after the first steps directed to the construction of the museum "today we open the doors of what it is a first order cultural infrastructure of international level that, in addition, will be a boosting element for the progress and development of Euskadi. Numbers. The Guggenheim Museum, pointed out the president of the Executive Committee, is a reality "because of the Basque people's economic and collective effort. Until now - he followed - we already count on 34 trustees, which will bring yearly amounts between 10 and 100 millions. We also count on the collaboration of four benefactor companies, that have committed to supply two millions and a half per year, and nine associated companies that will give 500,000 pesetas per year. The first two will provide the money over five years, while the associated ones will do it for a year, which guarantees for the rest of 1997 a quantity of 582 million pesetas, and until 2001, 2,450 millions. (Egin, news report, October 16, 1997, p. 49)

Following a very short subhead entitled "cifras" (numbers), Egin pointed out that the speaker was "el presidente del Comité Ejecutivo" (the executive committee's president). This is another example of how Egin was reproducing the PNV's rhetoric of category entitlement. It also confirms Egin's pattern of quoting speeches uttered by people who occupied a position of leadership, in which the position policymakers occupy in a power hierarchy was highlighted. The newspaper quoted the PNV politician as stating that the GBM had become a reality "por el esfuerzo económico y colectivo del pueblo vasco" (because of the Basque people's economic and collective effort). In that specific utterance, the PNV politician was acknowledging that the museum project was being paid also by the Basque citizens, and rhetorically using this story to suggest that many of them might be favourable to it. However, significantly, the politician used a cautious rhetoric, and avoided explicitly claiming that the majority of the Basque citizens were favourable. This cautiousness suggests that the speaker assumed it would be a too contentious and easy to rebut utterance. The politician also avoided making reference to the delicate matter of some Basques' criticism against the fact that the Basque citizens were funding a project, which was often depicted as very expensive, of high risk, and likely to become a failure. Nevertheless, the existence of counterarguments that predicted the museum's failure was implicit in the text. The speaker assumed no further elaboration of details would be necessary to appeal to the audience's set of common sense knowledge on the issue, and that the audience would easily
understand that the enemies of the GBM project, those who insisted on "la sinrazón de quienes se obstinan en destruir la convivencia pacífica del país" (the lack of reason of those who persist in destroying the country's pacific living together), were the same who insisted on opposing the GBM. In the PNV representatives' quoted utterances a group was assumed to represent the majority of the Basque citizens who supported the GBM project and democracy. Such group was rhetorically constructed as a majority group who represented the 'normal' values. This group was contrasted with another group who was rhetorically dismissed as an irrational undemocratic minority. Therefore, this extract instantiates a case of non-numerical quantitative rhetoric based on a description and contrast of two groups who were proposed as majority/normal and minority/abnormal. This contrast served to present the predictions of the GBM's success as rational and factual, and implicitly undermine counterarguments that predicted failure.

6.1.2.2. The reporting of the private sponsorship for the museum: a discursive shift in the PNV policymakers' quantification rhetoric

At this stage of the analysis, it can be noted how until August 1997 most economic arguments used in the debate over the GBM's viability predicted whether the project would be a success or a failure. Such arguments were mainly based on predictions of numbers of visitors that the museum might be able to attract. In other words, before August 1997 there cannot be found any explicit mentions of other possibilities than discourses predicting success or failure. This pattern was gradually modified over the summer of 1997, a period in which cultural arguments also started to surface in the debate over the GBM's project. It will be observed how news reports started to display a different argument that was based on the prediction that the project's survival was guaranteed by private sponsorship. Interestingly, Egin was first to mention the possibility of the museum obtaining alternative funding from private companies (extract 9) on August 19, 1997. A news report started with a headline that said "sponsors para el museo" (sponsors to the museum). The text reported that two famous Basque private companies like Iberdrola and BBV had signed a contract with the GBM, and had become "patronos" (bosses) of the museum. Significantly, the adjective "patronos" was presented in quotation marks, suggesting that much secret and ambiguity involved the question of who was in charge of the GBM. Further, it connoted that the museum was a highly elitist project in which only the biggest Basque business companies, such as the gas and electricity company Iberdrola, and the private bank BBV, would have the chance to take part, and might obtain some profit out of it.
Sponsors for the museum. [Headline] Iberdrola and BBV will contribute six hundred million pesetas to the Guggenheim Bilbao. The contract for their inclusion as “patrons” has been signed. (Egin, news report, August 19, 1997, p. 40)

Extract 10
Iberia and Guggenheim sign a collaboration agreement [Headline] (...) Likewise, when Iberia joins in the museum’s Foundation trust, they will take part in the functions appointed to this maximum organ of representation. With this agreement, “linking its name with an institution which is internationally prestigious and relevant will be the key for Bilbao”, Iberia intends to come closer to one of its most important markets, in the hope that the museum will become one of the centres of cultural attraction in the world. (Egin, news report, September 3, 1997, p. 42)

Another example in which this argument of alternative source of funding for the GBM coming from private companies was used can be found in a news report published in Egin in September 1997 (extract 10). In this occasion the headline was entitled: “Iberia y Guggenheim firman un acuerdo de colaboración” (Iberia and Guggenheim sign a collaboration agreement). In those days, Iberia could be described as being Spain’s main airline, equivalent to British Airways in the UK. Iberia was presented as a company that decided to set up a partnership with the GBM, because it predicted a brilliant future for the museum and Bilbao, and Iberia was also described as a company that represented the GBM as synonymous with international prestige and relevance. Arguments involving economic and prestige factors, both accounting for the reasons why Iberia decided to join and to sponsor the GBM, appeared in quotation marks. The account of why Iberia decided to sponsor the GBM project can be described as being based on the argument that the museum would be a success because it was something extraordinary that would become an international attraction. Nevertheless, the choice by Egin to describe that Iberia’s decision as one of “esperanza” (hope), instead of “certeza” (certainty), or “confianza” (trust), reveals Egin’s position of mistrust in relation to the GBM project. The newspaper constructed a distance between the speaker and its own position. Further, the quoted Iberia’s explanation of why they decided to join the GBM, indirectly served to suggest that there was not solid ground to predict the GBM’s success, and that this was a shocking and risky decision that needed to be justified because it could be a target of criticism.

On October 18, 1997, Diario Vasco published (extract 11) a news report entitled: “Más de 1200 personas, "amigas del museo"” (More than 1,200 persons, "friends of the museum"). By drawing upon the argument of the growing number of agreements between the GBM and private sponsorship, Diario Vasco also aimed at rebutting the version that predicted failure, and an
economic disaster that would affect the Basque taxpayers' economy. In addition, *Diario Vasco* used rhetoric that mixed precise (34) and imprecise (600; 1,200) numbers and time periods: 34 companies, 1,200 people become 'amigos' (friends) of the museum, and together they would bring 600 million pesetas to the museum. Further, a deictic pointer "este año" (this year) was used to emphasize the described events' factuality and immediacy. The source of the information was omitted, although "amigos del museo" (friends of the museum), "patronos" (patrons), and "amigos" (friends) appeared in quotation marks, and therefore implying that they were taken by some GBM's or PNV representatives' speech, and that such adjectives had not been arbitrarily chosen by the writer.

**Extract 11**
More than 1,200 persons, "friends of the museum". [Headline] A total of 34 companies have been transformed into "patrons" of the Guggenheim, and more than 1,200 people have become "friends" of the museum. Their contributions reached almost the 600 million pesetas for this year. (*Diario Vasco*, news report, October, 18, 1997, p. 63)

6.1.2.3. How the museum representatives were quoted as arguing for the Guggenheim Bilbao project

Over the year 1997 the Basque newspapers had played a role of spreading diverse policymakers' accounts and explanations in favour of the GBM's economic policies. In other words, quotations of the policymakers' speeches also had the function of presenting the Guggenheim Bilbao's benefits and predictions of success to a Basque citizenry, whose mistrust of the museum's viability was assumed by the writers. In October 1997 the Guggenheim museum was now ready to be inaugurated, and a new phase started in the strategy of selling the museum to the Basque public opinion. Then, policymakers undertook the actual application of the project; and the Guggenheim Bilbao's direct representatives, the authorities in charge and accountable for the project, were required to talk about how the project would be carried out. At this stage, *Egin* published on October 3, 1997 (extract 12) an interview with Thomas Krens, director of the Guggenheim Foundation, and the key agent who had negotiated the Guggenheim Bilbao project with Bilbao's officials and PNV politicians since 1991. In the headline the Guggenheim's Unites States' representative was portrayed as uttering this sentence: "Molesto a mucha gente porque hablo claro" (I am a nuisance to many people because I do speak clearly). In this interview Krens accounted for why the GBM would not be an economic failure. An *Egin's* journalist asked him whether he believed the museum would be financially viable in the long term, and if he
believed that the half a million visitors foreseen by him would actually come to the museum. Krens was reported answering to the last question with a brief sentence: "creo que va a haber muchos más" (I think there will be many more), which was a very optimistic answer, but did not explain why he did expect so many visitors. Instead, Krens skipped any further elaboration of his arguments, and he tackled the other question that was often been used to criticize the GBM project: the argument that the Basque autonomy’s government and the Basque taxpayers were funding most of the museum’s budget.

Extract 12
Thomas Krens “I am a nuisance to many people because I speak clearly. [Headline] (...) Do you think that the Museum can be financially viable in the long term, and that the half a million visitors you foresaw will come? I think there will be many more. Here only 45% of the money comes from the Basque authorities, compared with the 95% that the government gives to the Reina Sofia. And people say that it is very expensive for the Basques. In my opinion it is a good business, bearing in mind all the money it will bring to the city. I think it is necessary to look at it from this perspective. It will have an effect on all the region, from Santander to San Sebastian. (Egin, interview with Thomas Krens, October 3, 1997, p. 11)

Thomas Krens uttered an argument in favour of the museum drawing upon a rhetoric of comparing how much of the museum was paid by the Basque authorities and the money that the Spanish government was spending, in the same period, with the Reina Sofia museum in Madrid. According to Krens’ version the Basque authorities were funding only 45% of the GBM’s costs, not that much if compared with the 95% of the Spanish authorities’ funding of the Reina Sofia. Thomas Krens explicitly referred to people who used economic arguments to criticize the museum: “Y la gente dice que es muy caro para los vascos” (and people say it is very expensive for the Basques), although he avoided pointing out to any specific group’s accountability behind such criticism that stressed the museum’s opposition movement’s arguments’ weaknesses. This rhetoric of comparing two apparently not so different investments made in the familiar context of the Spanish nation state, permitted Krens to construct a discourse which rebutted the claims that the GBM was a very expensive project paid by the Basque citizens. Right after this, an argument based on economic aspects, and that dismissed criticism against the GBM’s project, was presented as a personal opinion. It served to emphasize how common-sense and reasonable was his own position, based on a straightforward prediction that was built up as if it was an obvious fact. That is, the prediction that the museum would bring much money to the city was presented as if it was already a fact: “A mi me parece que es un buen negocio teniendo en cuenta todo el dinero que va a traer a la ciudad” (I think it is a good business, bearing in mind all the money it
will bring to the city). Although the interviewer formulated a direct question related to the issue of how many visitors were expected for the GBM, Krens answered without explicitly referring to visitors. Instead, Krens argued that, eventually, the GBM was going to bring money and economic growth, not only to the city of Bilbao, but that it also "repercutirá en toda la región, desde Santander a San Sebastián" (will have repercussions in all the region from Santander to San Sebastian). In these sentences the verb was in the future tense ("va a traer", "repercutirá"), although Krens avoided saying when that money would arrive, and the possibility that such economic success, or positive repercussion, might arrive only in the long term was embedded underneath his utterance.

Another accusation that was uttered against the GBM is that it represented the United States' cultural imperialism (e.g. Zulaika, 1997, 2005; Guasch, 2005; Camara, 2005); and this was often related to the assumption that it would only benefit the Guggenheim museum's own business, and not at all Basque economy. Such accusations were underpinned by the version that it was unfair and undemocratic that the Basque taxpayers were funding a museum, which was just a satellite of the main Guggenheim museum in New York, and that they had never been allowed to express their actual opinion on the matter, e.g., on a referendum on the GBM (e.g. Camara, 2005; Zulaika, 1997, 2005).

Extract 13
The Guggenheim "is not a reflection of imperialism". [Headline] (...) In one interview given to Efe, Vidarte described the Guggenheim like "one of the important elements, from a qualitative point of view, of a strategy conceived to recover Bilbao and the Basque Country in urban and economic terms", and that it has resulted in the Basque government's and the Diputación Foral de Biscay's most ambitious cultural initiative. In relation to the museum's cost, calculated at more than 20,000 million pesetas, he indicated that other projects carried out in the Basque Country have meant high inversions, and that, for example, in the stadium of Anoeta, of Donostia, 10,000 million pesetas were spent, "the same as in the building designed by Frank Gehry", he pointed out. (Egin, news report, October 13, p. 34)

As the above extract illustrates, on October 13, 1997, Juan José Vidarte, the Guggenheim Bilbao museum's Basque director was quoted in Egin as accounting for why the GBM "no es reflejo del imperialismo" (is not the reflection of imperialism), as the quoted extract of Vidarte's discourse informed in the headline. According to part of Vidarte's discourse, the GBM would revitalize not only Bilbao's economy, but also the economy of the Basque Country as a whole. This argument of urban and economic revitalization of a decaying industrial city like Bilbao, was often found in
quotations of the PNV policymakers’ discourses, and was characterised by an emphasis put on predictions of a brilliant future for the Basque Country; albeit at this stage the museum was portrayed (e.g., Azua, 2005) as a long-term project, with benefits that would materialize in a future that was not specified. Like Thomas Krens had already done in an interview that was published ten days earlier, Vidarte was quoted as using rhetoric of comparison to support the argument that the GBM was not so expensive for the Basques. Unlike Krens, Vidarte did not explicitly refer to the existence of criticism against what was perceived as the GBM’s high cost for the Basque citizens, although his comparison between the 10,000 million pesetas that the Basques had spent funding the Anoeta stadium in San Sebastián, and the 20,000 million pesetas that was going to cost the museum, were designed to rebut arguments that portrayed the GBM as a Pharaoh’s luxury that the Basque taxpayers could not afford paying. Vidarte further elaborated his argument by highlighting that both buildings, Anoeta and the building designed by Frank Gehry, cost the same amount of pesetas: 10,000 millions. Within this argumentative line a building that like the GBM was described as having been ‘designed by Frank Gehry’, was implicitly presented as highly relevant and more important than the Anoeta stadium building. The latter building’s designer was not even mentioned and, thus, it was implied to be less prestigious.

Finally, it can be pointed out how no ordinary taxpayer was required to make any prediction on the GBM’s success or failure whether in the left-wing Egin or in the liberal Diario Vasco. In news reports and other journalistic texts, ordinary citizens were just mentioned as a number, or a generic profile, in statistics. They could also be called for a mobilization against the GBM, or rather seldom get a letter published in the section of letters to the editor, but ordinary citizens were implicitly not thought to deserve having their individual opinion published. It can be argued that this implicit criterion to select policymakers, instead of other voices, was due in part to the fact that the economic aspects of the GBM were assumed to be a more important issue in the Basque press, regardless of left-wing or liberal ideological orientation. It was also related to a contemporary ideology of expertise, and professional specialization (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999), which was reflected in the constant use of category entitlement rhetoric by both Egin and Diario Vasco, and also to the bureaucratization of Basque autonomous regional government’s politics and individual politicians’ discourses (Smith, 1979).
6.2. How the debate over the museum's cultural project became an economic and political issue before the Guggenheim Bilbao's opening

6.2.0. Introduction

In this section it will be argued that discourse on the cultural project of the museum was influenced by some implicit assumptions about Basque culture, which were difficult to tackle due to their dilemmatic nature. The debate over the GBM's cultural project will be analysed focusing on accounts that reflect different positions before the museum's inauguration. A main thesis defended here is that the data on the Guggenheim Bilbao's cultural project indicate a pattern of substitution and backgrounding of the cultural debate, and foregrounding of economic and political arguments. It will be also argued that each side had their own particular reasons to avoid a deeper debate on the GBM's cultural project. Consequently, the analysis will generally focus on what was explicit, implicit and missing in the Basque newspapers' reporting and on the underlying ideological dilemmas each newspaper faced (Billig et al, 1988). At the same time, this section will look at what all this complex rhetorical work was doing in terms of diverse strategies of fact construction in relation to versions of the GBM's cultural project that were addressed to differently imagined communities of merely Basque or Basque-Spanish audiences.

6.2.1. The policymakers' maximization of the museum's importance

This subsection will analyse why Diario Vasco can be considered to have displayed an active strategy to support the GBM's cultural project, while Egin's reporting of the GBM's cultural project can be described as part of a less active and rather defensive strategy. Unlike Egin, an assertive Diario Vasco's reporting oscillated between maximization of the Guggenheim Bilbao's importance as a centre of international avant-garde art, and the depiction of the GBM as a spectacular building and attraction. It will be argued that in Egin, the choice to quote policymakers and other representative figures, who delivered an apologetic discourse on the GBM, was related to a more reactive than active strategy of the left-wing newspaper, like stressing its distance from the quoted speeches, in the issue of setting more light on the rather vague GBM's cultural project.
6.2.1.1. Accounting for why it will be one of the best contemporary art museums in the world

I will first look at three extracts from *Egin*, each corresponding to different quoted speakers who uttered policy makers’ arguments supporting the proposition that the Guggenheim Bilbao would be an extremely important cultural project of international repercussion.

In a news report published in *Egin* on January 31, 1997 in Basque language (extract 14), the headline pointed out to certain problems to decide the Guggenheim Bilbao’s opening date. In this case the speaker was presented as a politician, the head of culture in Bizkaia. He was quoted as accounting for why he was favourable to put off the Guggenheim Bilbao’s opening date, and also for why the Guggenheim Bilbao was such an important project. The PNV politician talked against the plans of opening the museum in June, arguing that in this month there would be several other similarly important events taking place over the world in the contemporary arts' realm. That is, he was describing the Guggenheim Bilbao as a very important museum that deserved a special and unique opening, which would guarantee a worldwide repercussion. According to the politician's utterance, the main reason why the GBM deserved such a unique opening event was that it was the most important museum that would be open in the world at the end of the 20th century. In sum, *Egin* quoted a PNV representative and policymaker using rhetoric of maximization and exaggeration of the importance of the museum, and here footing (Goffman, 1981) also served to stress *Egin*'s distant position from what was assumed to be the policymakers' particular hyperbolic and exaggerated version. Nevertheless, *Egin*'s choice to quote a PNV policymaker’s utterance also meant that the left-wing journal was giving some echo to a position that descriptively built up the Guggenheim Bilbao as one of the best museums in the world, and it suggests that *Egin*'s stance regarding the GBM's cultural implications might be ambivalent.

**Extract 14**

The Guggenheim's opening date not decided yet. [Headline] Uribeetxebarria is "favourable to a rational delay. [Subhead] It has not been yet set any specific - or in more appropriate words: official - date for the Guggenheim Museum's opening. This is what the director of the Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia, Tomas Uribeetxebarria stated in the intervention he made in the Batzar Nagusiak at the request of Ezker Batua. Yesterday, Uribeetxebarria also used the same arguments that, very few days ago, were used by Juan Ignacio Vidarte who is the Guggenheim's main director: although he added a new word to his discourse: humidity. He said that "the works of construction are going very
well, but we have been through heavy rains, and it is possible that some humidity will develop, and we have to take top security measures”. He argued against doing it (the opening) in June, arguing among other things that several prestigious events will be carried out in the world, “and that we believe that the Guggenheim deserves an opening which is special and unique at an international level, mainly if we bear in mind that it will be the most important museum to open at the end of this century”. It seems that this is the most important reason for the members of the (Basque) parliament, “and because of that I am favourable to a rational delay”. (Egin, news reports, January 31, 1997)

The alternate use of direct and indirect quotations of the PNV politician’s utterances in Egin, followed a pattern: those utterances that contained the most exaggerated and evaluative content, e.g. ‘the most important museum that will open at the end of the century’, appeared in direct quotation marks or verbatim recall. So here a question can be asked: did Egin intend to stress that superlatives and other maximization devices were part of a rhetoric, which did not belong to their usual language repertoire, but were part of a typical PNV’s style or repertoire?

From June 1997 until the days that preceded the GBM’s opening in October, can be found some examples of Egin’s reporting of some policymakers’ utterances that stressed how important the museum was as a cultural project that represented contemporary art. In reporting this kind of policymakers’ speeches, Egin’s use of quotation marks, or direct quotation, alternated with indirect quotation or ‘gist’, could have the function of indicating that the left-wing newspaper was just describing the speaker’s utterances. Edwards and Potter (1992, p. 38) have pointed out a reason why footing or direct quotation became such a relevant topic in discursive psychology:

However footing becomes much more important in social psychology. It is one of the principal ways in which speakers display the accountability of their utterances; are they themselves responsible for their words or are they passing on the views of others? People can emphasise their distance from a particular attitude or evaluation by sharply making the animator/origin distinction or they can align themselves by blurring or ignoring the distinction. An analysis of footing and its management thus becomes an important part of understanding the way discourse is orientated to action. (Edwards and Potter, 1992, p. 38).

I shall argue that Egin’s position in the reporting of the GBM’s effect on the cultural realm was neutral in the period that preceded the GBM’s opening. To use Goffman’s (1981) notion of footing, the writer/animator drew upon direct quotation marks to stress distance from the policymakers’ more apologetic and hyperbolic speeches. Nonetheless, in this period, Egin’s defensive strategy of footing or gist was a limited one. The quotation of the original speakers’ utterances was typically chosen in cases when Egin’s writers assumed that policymakers were
using a very exaggerated rhetoric of maximization of the GBM’s importance as a cultural centre. It can be suggested that Egin might have selected fragments of discourses that showcased lexical examples of the PNV’s linguistic style, which tended to exaggeration. The thesis that Egin’s choice of direct and indirect quotation was related to a strategy to stress its distance from the policymakers’ use of a more baroque and metaphorical discourse, can be illustrated with the following examples of footing:

- “munduko onena” (the best in the world) (uttered by Thomas Krens, extract 15, quoted by Egin)

- “ceremonia solene” (solemn ceremony) (uttered by a PNV policymaker, extract 16, quoted by Egin)

- “su notoriedad como centro cultural” (its notoriety as a cultural centre) (uttered by a PNV policymaker, extract 16, quoted by Egin)

On the other hand, no matter whether Egin addressed to a specifically Basque audience (extract 15), or to a wider audience using the Spanish language (extract 18), it was assumed that part of its readership expected the newspaper to express an explicitly critical stance on the cultural issue involving the GBM. Later in this section further implications of Egin’s defensive/reactive strategy, and implicitly neutral stance on the policymaker’s extremely apologetic discourse on the GBM, will be analysed. The discourse and rhetoric analysis here applied shows that Egin frequently quoted policymakers’ speeches that drew upon a similar rhetoric to address to a Basque language or Spanish language readership: policymakers’ accountability for their arguments on the museum’s cultural project’s benefits was often based on non-numerical quantification (Potter et al, 1991). Moreover, such quantification was usually formulated through comparison between the GBM and other museums in the world. Such rhetoric of comparison served to present the GBM as the best (or one of the best) contemporary art museums of the world.

In the fragments of a Basque administration representative’s utterances quoted by Egin on October 3, 1997 (extract 16), a policymaker drew upon rhetoric of moral concern and responsibility to emphasise that the GBM was both an economic and cultural project that would benefit the Basque Country. Although it cannot be said that this utterance predicted the GBM’s success, here a PNV policymaker was pointing out that the Basque administration had a serious commitment with a project that was expected to boost the Basque economy and the Basque Country’s position as a famous cultural centre. Although the adjective international was missing,
it was implicitly embedded in these rather cautious quotations. Interestingly, it was Egin that drew upon footing to suggest that the PNV policymaker's utterance was a particular version/account of a GBM's and the Basque administration's "proyecto cultural" (cultural project). Furthermore, the policymakers' utterances' footing was accompanied by a slightly ironic remark in which Egin highlighted that this Basque administration's cultural project, "*es decir, el Museo Guggenheim de Bilbo*" (that is, the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum) was the Guggenheim cultural project. It was as if Egin implicitly assumed that the potential reader might find it difficult to immediately associate the GBM project with a cultural project. The rhetorical work operated by Egin's use of the expression "proyecto cultural" (cultural project), and of the verbal form "pretende" (intends), preceding the quotation, did implicitly point out that the GBM was still a project, a plan. Therefore, in the use of "pretende" was embedded the assumption that it was not clear which would be the outcome of such project for the Basque economy and culture.

On the other hand, extracts 15 and 16 confirm the pattern of avoidance of a real debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao's cultural project. In other words, although in both reports the first proposed topic seemed to be the GBM's cultural project, such discussion was very generically developed or tended to be abandoned. The report thus moved towards a debate on whether the GBM would succeed in terms of the "*posición económica del País Vasco*" (the Basque Country’s economic position). That is, the economic arguments permeated an eventually frustrated cultural debate on the GBM’s project. The sentences that mentioned the question of the GBM’s project were short and provided superficial evaluations without further elaboration of their arguments. Extracts 16 and 17 are examples of how the quotation of policymakers' utterances was harnessed as a means whereby Egin contributed to spread the proposition that the GBM was an important cultural project. It seems that Egin believed this was actually what part of the readership wanted to read. In this sense, Egin’s position on this debate could be generically described as an effort to maintain a neutral stance in the matter, while discretely criticizing some aspects of the museum.

**Extract 15**

Thomas Krens added that the Guggenheim museum of Bilbao will be "the best in the world among those that work with contemporary art" (Egin, news report text, July 30, 1997, p. 34)

**Extract 16**

The countdown starts [Headline] The Guggenheim Museum starts today its opening fortnight. [Subhead] Only the invited groups will be able to visit Frank Gehry's building. [subhead] The public will have to wait until October the 19th to enter. [Subhead] The Guggenheim Museum starts today the countdown that will culminate on the 19th, the real date in which the public will be able to visit for the first time its facilities, after having previously paid 700
pesetas. While this takes place, over the fifteen days there will be several acts directed to “diverse groups who are representative of the Basque society’s, and international community’s, social, political and professional sectors, which will culminate on the 18th with a “solemn ceremony” that will be presided over by the Spanish kings. The cultural project that intends to “symbolise the Basque administration’s commitment to promote the Basque Country’s economical position, and its notoriety as cultural centre” - that is, the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum - will open its doors this evening, with a first act addressed to the workers of companies that took part in the works of building of the museum. (Egin, news report, October 3, 1997, p. 49)

It can be argued that if Egin chose policymakers’ speeches in which the speakers used a rhetoric of lexical exaggeration to comment on the GBM’s cultural project, it also happened because it was easy to find such examples. As a matter of fact, it is enough to have a look at Diario Vasco’s texts to notice that such maximization of the GBM’s importance as a cultural and economic project was typical of Diario Vasco’s and the PNV’s rhetoric.

Extract 17

One of the best collections in the world [Headline] It would be incorrect to say that the Guggenheim’s collection is the best in the world. Even bearing in mind its specialization in the period between the impressionism, and contemporary art, its exact position in a hypothetical ranking of collections would provoke endless debates on the number of works, their quality, the artists represented, trends that stand out, and the registered absences (...). (Diario Vasco, news report, October 3, 1997, especial issue on the GBM, p. 8)

The above extract 17 serves as an illustration of how in Diario Vasco the GBM’s cultural project was at times rhetorically constructed as one of the best collections in the world without drawing upon policymakers’ utterances’ quotation. In other words, unlike Egin, Diario Vasco did not systematically use quotation of policymakers’ opinions to suggest a distant/neutral position in relation to rhetoric that maximized the museum’s extraordinariness. Nevertheless, in both newspapers the debate over the GBM’s cultural project regarding Basque art/culture was missing or left vague. A Diario Vasco’s news report published on October 3, 1997, focused on the discussion of whether the GBM was the best museum in the world. The use of non-numerical quantification was lexically expressed by terms such as: “la mejor” (the best), “ranking”, and “número” (number), and the report presented from the beginning a more cautious style than the one usually found in the policymakers’ utterances. That is, here (extract 17) the GBM’s cultural project was not presented as the best in the world, but as one of the best. It was assumed to be a more reasonable argument to present it in the headline as “una de las mejores colecciones del mundo” (one of the best collections in the world). The text’s first sentence’s rhetoric was so cautious that it seems to have been written by Diario Vasco as a strategic move to rebut any
possibility of accusation that they used exaggeration to support the GBM's cultural project, maximizing its positive aspects: "sería incorrecto afirmar que la colección Guggenheim es la mejor del mundo" (it would be incorrect to say that the Guggenheim's collection is the best in the world). Finally, it can be highlighted that the focus on the GBM's importance as a contemporary arts' international centre permitted the Basque newspapers to shift the discussion of the museum's cultural implications to a more general level; and therefore the question of clarifying the repercussions of the museum for the contemporary Basque artists and their work, and for the Basque citizens in general, was diverted and remained practically untouched.

6.2.1.2. Accounting for it as a big attraction

In the previous section has been pointed out how, by October 1997, a first phase in which policymakers provided a general account of the GBM's cultural and economic policy was already being completed, therefore, gradually giving way to a second phase in which policymakers undertook the actual task of starting to apply their model. Extract 18 reflects the Diario Vasco's use of specialized technological language to explain the GBM's model to a wider audience, without quoting any policymaker. This Diario Vasco's news report was reflecting what it was assumed to be a specialists' or experts' discourse. An implicit voice of expert authority was constructed through the use of a technical lexis (titanium, polyvalence, refrigeration towers, systems of ventilation, etc). Also a formal style was deployed to present what appeared to be a detailed description of many technological innovations in a project labelled the "flor de titania" (titanium flower). Here the GBM was presented as a complex building, drawing upon a rhetoric of contrast that compared its external architecture, described as offering some spectacular forms, and its internal architecture, which was presented as more neutral, although providing the sight of shapeless rooms of very varied sizes. All this elaborate description of the museum's architecture served as an innuendo to finally assert that they "dan al museo una polivalencia y una capacidad de exhibición únicas en el mundo" (give the museum a polyvalence and capacity of exhibition, which are unique in the world). In that sense, this extract confirmed a typical pattern of maximization and exaggeration of the GBM's importance as an initiative, and nothing indicates that the text's writer wanted to build up a position of distance in relation to such statement. Once again, the discourse was very vague with respect to what cultural project was aimed at. This focus on a technical language can be also considered an example of empiricist accounting (Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984) of some event, which "treats the phenomena themselves as agents in their own right, and either deletes the observer entirely or treats her as a passive recipient."
That said, this extract also provided an example of the paradox that the widespread use of the adjective “espectacular” (spectacular), which was drawn upon by many scholars to refer to the GBM’s external architecture and to criticize the museum as representing a theme-park, a shopping-mall or Disneyland (Camara, 2005), a McGuggenheim (Zulaika, 2005); and as typifying a culture of spectacle and increasing homogenization (Guasch, 2005), had a very different positive connotation when used by policymakers to stress the museum’s extraordinary qualities. Both extremes are instances of different views on and reactions to a trend towards spectacularization of arts and its institutions such as museums (Foster, 2002), of which the Guggenheim Bilbao has been considered prototypical case (Fraser, 2005). The building was interestingly depicted as “la flor de titania” (the titanium flower) in the article’s headline. This metaphor brings together a ‘flower’, which symbolized delicacy and beauty, and titanium, which is a material stronger than steel, that is considered to last much longer than any other metal used in construction. The titanium here connoted force and power, while it also served as a symbol of technological innovation. All this building up of the GBM’s description as synonymous with power and beauty, delicacy and technical innovation reinforced the text’s main argument that the GBM was something “único en el mundo” (unique in the world), and this version was presented accompanied by a technical lexis that underpinned the claim that it was based on solid empirical facts. Diverse analysts of the museum and its symbolism have pointed out the importance of technological innovation arguments to build up the museum as an extraordinary event: e.g. the claim that Frank Gehry’s building “used aerospace software” (Moxey, 2005, p. 176); that it was a “paradigm of innovative new architecture” (Guasch, 2005, p. 186); and that it “had curves created by “the most advanced” computer technology” (Fraser, 2005, p. 37). Moreover, the use of the adjective spectacular had the function to implicitly underscore something that at this stage was not yet explicitly uttered in Diario Vasco; the assumption that people would be seduced by the spectacular attractions provided by the museum; that they would admire it; and that the building was an attraction in itself. Embedded in the same text there is a sentence in which the spectacular external shapes of the building, and the internal architecture, were both assumed to be able to attract the public to the “contemplación de las obras de arte” (the contemplation of works of art). A close analysis of that sentence suggests that among the GBM’s policymakers prevailed the traditional representation of modern art museums (Guasch, 2005) as a top-down phenomenon in which an elite’s work (e.g. consecrated artists’ and genius’ creations) is passively admired and contemplated by the visitors.
Extract 18

The titanium flower. [Headline] Despite the building's apparent complexity, Frank Gehry has conceived the museum on three basic levels of public's access, plus one floor reserved to the systems of ventilation, the refrigeration towers and the elevator's machinery. It has responded to the spectacular external shapes within a more neutral architecture to facilitate the contemplation of works of art. A curious combination of shapeless rooms, some of them huge, others more conventional, gives the museum a polyvalence and capacity of exhibition that are unique in the world. (Diario Vasco, news report/advertisement, October 3, 1997, special issue on the GBM, p. 6)

Similar questions about the GBM building's inner architectural quality and capacity to exert attraction permeated Agustín Ibarrola's counterargument quoted by Egin (extract 19) that the museum's internal part was not as good as the external building. Interestingly, in this case Egin used direct quotation or footing to stress its distance from a prestigious Basque artists' rebuttal of the argument that the GBM was a standout because of its technological and aesthetic quality. This is a quite clear instance of how Egin drew upon footing to build up rhetoric that suggested a position of cautious distance in relation to either side in the clash of arguments surrounding the GBM's cultural project.

Extract 19

Agustín Ibarrola, critical towards this art gallery, commented that the installations' content "does not match" the building that dwells them, designed by Frank O. Gehry. (Egin, news report text, October 22, 1997, p. 42)

An implicit representation of the GBM as a show and as a big attraction can be detected (extract 20) in the following PNV's utterance on the GBM:

one of the most relevant and transcendental events of culture and progress in all our story [Diario Vasco, extract 20]

Here Diario Vasco quoted a PNV policymaker's comments on the GBM that apparently presented a cultural argument. However, the selected utterances developed a more central focus on economic discourse of progress that is recurrent among policymakers (e.g. Azua, 2005). This Diario Vasco's quotation of a PNV member's statement is an example of how describing the GBM's strategy as related to big "acontecimientos culturales y de progreso" (events of culture and progress), is a means whereby a PNV politician assumed that the museum was both a cultural and economic project to attract visitors to the Basque Country, and not a more economic than cultural project as it has been repeatedly highlighted by critical academic voices (e.g. Zulaika and
Guasch, 2005). Significantly, in this *Diario Vasco*’s text, the GBM is assumed to be an “acontecimiento internacional” (international event), concerned with the museum’s international repercussion, and the main emphasis is put on describing it as a big event. Therefore, no mention is made of a delicate issue: which repercussions a contemporary international art museum set in Bilbao might have for the promotion of the local artists’ work, and the extent to which Basque culture will have a place in it.

**Extract 20**
The political parties assure that ETA wants to “stamp on” Euskadi’s image. [Headline] (...) PNV: “They have wanted to darken one of the most relevant and transcendental events of culture and progress in all our story. It does not surprise us anymore that the violent people, and those who support them, try to use any international event to distort the image of Euskadi, and neither that they want to boycott all present and future projects in which Euskadi has placed all his expectations of development”. (*Diario Vasco*, news report, October 14, 1997, p. 5)

The existence of a plan to turn the GBM into a big attraction for an international public had already been suggested by *Egin* in a news report (extract 21) published in September 1997, during the days the city of San Sebastián-Donostia was celebrating its International Film Festival. The building where the film festival traditionally took place had been Victoria Eugenia, the glamorous festival headquarters in which movie celebrities gathered every year to attend film projections, cocktails and other festival related events. The news report headline announced that this year the Guggenheim had overshadowed the Victoria Eugenia, and a picture showed Spanish cinema celebrities and British actress Julie Christie in front of the Guggenheim Bilbao. Three events were constructed as international attractions, based on *Egin*’s assumption that its readers were already familiar with a certain commonplace repertoire: two traditional attractions that were considered local and international at the same time. The San Sebastián Film festival has existed since the 1950’s and officially enjoys a first-level international festival label, but is less famous than Cannes, Venice and Berlin. In turn, the San Fermines that are held in Pamplona (capital of Navarre) yearly in July, have attracted many international tourists since Ernest Hemingway portrayed the fiesta in his best-selling novel “The Sun Also Rises”. This rhetoric of associating the GBM with the aforementioned two events/attractions, suggest that *Egin* assumed the museum’s potential to become a new tourist attraction. In addition, the Guggenheim Bilbao was represented by *Egin* as having an advantage over the other two local/international big events: the Guggenheim Bilbao was a novelty that represented the arrival of the new millennium: “cerca del 2000 la cita es el bilbaino Guggenheim, a punto de abrir sus puertas” (by the year 2000 the meeting is in the Guggenheim of Bilbao, which is on the verge of opening its doors). Further, the
visit of a well-known actress to the Guggenheim museum, indirectly symbolized the GBM’s aim to attract international visitors. The fact that Julie Christie had links with the international movie industry served to suggest that the GBM’s project and the British actress’ “excursión cultural” (cultural excursion) were both related to glamour, image and international tourism.

Extract 21
The Guggenheim has taken the place of the Victoria Eugenia. [Headline] If in other times, when the contest was celebrated in July, the jury used to go to Sanfermines, by the year 2000 the meeting is in the Guggenheim of Bilbao, which is on the verge of opening its doors. The actress Julie Christie also joined the cultural trip. (Egin, news report, September 24, 1997, p. 45)

Extract 22
The people greet the ‘Guggy.’ [Headline] Hundreds of people in front of the Frank Gehry building to join the opening show. [Subhead] Hundreds of people from Bilbao uttered yesterday the essential! Oooh! when the king ordered to activate the spectacular lighting of the Guggenheim museum. Many people crowded in the security cordon to see again this fleeting building’s snapshot that looked so well in the New York Times newspapers’ papel conche Sunday’s supplement. [Subhead] (...) The citizens approached yesterday the museum’s vicinity with a mix of civic discipline and curiosity, and they carried out with the role that the Salomon Guggenheim Foundation and the Basque institutions ascribed them since 15 days ago: to admire from the outside this fascinating building erected by Frank Gehry with their taxes, and to envy the more than 800 invited people who had the privilege to see it from the inside, and to have a dinner, totally free, in the El Pez art gallery. The foreigners, mainly unknown people, disappointed. There was only a Rolls Royce parked in the Carlton hotel. “The men are old and bald, and the women are tall and peroxide blondes”, a young man explained to his girlfriend. (Diario Vasco, news report, October 19, 1997, p. 10)

Going back to Diario Vasco’s rhetoric to build up the GBM as a big international tourist attraction, it can be noted that in the day after the Guggenheim opening ceremony a Diario Vasco news report (extract 22) conveyed an explicit representation of the Guggenheim Bilbao as a big show that attracted a huge crowd. The opening ceremony was described as an “espectáculo” (show), the building as “fascinante” (fascinating), and the building’s external lighting as “espectacular” (spectacular). People were described as a reasonably well behaved crowd motivated by “una mezcla de disciplina civica y de curiosidad” (a mix of civic discipline and curiosity), although they were said to be a “gentio agolpado” (many people crowded), and eager to witness the big show. Interestingly, Diario Vasco delivered a description of what could be considered the local people’s ideal relation of passive admiration with the GBM:

they carried out with the role that the Salomon Guggenheim Foundation and the Basque institutions ascribed them since 15 days ago: to admire from the outside this fascinating building erected by Frank Gehry with their taxes, and to envy the more than 800 invited people who had the privilege to see it from the inside.
One of the striking aspects of these comments on the ordinary people who witnessed the arrival of visitors to the museum, in the opening ceremony, is that Diario Vasco assumed the crowd to fit the role ascribed to them: an attitude of admiration of the building, and a feeling of envy for the privileged ones. This way of describing ordinary people can be considered a case of implicit patronizing practiced by an elite who represent themselves as wiser than ordinary people, and thus ignore the ordinary people’s potential for autonomous thought and action. This also reflects the rhetoric of magnification/maximization of the GBM’s importance as a place that was expected would stir up the world’s attention. It is significant that in a rhetorical context which stresses that this is about show-business/entertainment the “extranjeros” (foreigners) were mentioned as part of the show;

The foreigners, mainly unknown people, disappointed. There was only a Rolls Royce parked in the Carlton Hotel. [Diario Vasco, extract 22]

Finally, Diario Vasco’s implicit patronizing of ordinary people’s lack of accuracy about the GBM’s cultural project, included the argument that since ordinary citizens had paid for Frank Gehry’s building with “sus impuestos” (their taxes) they were entitled to enjoy the show, and even to criticize minor details such as, for instance, how disappointed they were with the foreign invitees’ looks. Further, giving a tiny space to the ordinary people’s expression of frustration, and reporting them complaining about minor details, such as not having seen more famous and glamorous people arriving to the opening celebration, allowed Diario Vasco to build up/reinforce the claim that their description of the event was factual and fair, and included even critical voices.

6.2.1.3. Accounting for why the Basques needed to catch up with international avant-garde

The dialogic and discursive approach to textual analysis has pointed out that each epoch presents some kind of opposition of values, which are incorporated in the common-sense everyday thinking, and that provoke ideological dilemmas (Billig et al, 1988). When the GBM was finally inaugurated in October 1997, the Basque Country was completing its first decade in the European Union (EU) as a region that had gathered less symbols and resources of modernity than some other European regions. According to what has already been observed in the previous sections, concerning arguments that predicted success or failure, the PNV’s main argument to try to
enhance the GBM’s legitimacy in the eyes of the Basque taxpayers, was to suggest that it would be an economically viable project that would attract tourists from outside the Basque Country. Simultaneously, however, policymakers had to claim that the museum was concerned with the Basque citizens and their specific cultural, political and economic needs and longings.

In this subsection it will be observed how a complex rhetoric had to be deployed by Basque policymakers to tackle the issue of the modern avant-garde and its foreseeable repercussion for the local cultural and artistic developments. A main problem source of potential trouble that policymakers had to avoid was to suggest that they might share some particularly negatively connoted representations of the Basque culture and people as backwards, parochial and rural. First, they had to prevent the possibility that the GBM’s ambiguous lack of specific plans to include the works of contemporary avant-garde Basque artists in their exhibitions could be interpreted as despise or indifference for Basque avant-garde’s achievements. Second, they had to avoid any potential accusation of cultural elitism on the grounds that the GBM’s project was totally alien to the traditional Basque culture and its artistic manifestations. Further, the rhetoric found in the PNV politicians’ discourses could be related to the dilemma of not wanting to convey the idea that broadly speaking they considered the Basque avant-garde to be an isolated phenomenon that did not actually represent a Basque society. Well-known specialists, such as museum expert and director Javier Viar (2005, p. 108), have pointed out that Basque society has developed without awareness of what was going on in the international centres of avant-garde artistic creation. Expressing his rather favourable view on the museum the actual director of the Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao stated: “is a work of the highest cultural enlightenment, which Basque society has never been able to enjoy in such a social, direct, and dazzling way before” (Viar, 2005, p. 108). PNV policymakers’ discourses were formulated combining the two opposed common-sense arguments or propositions that the Basques had to change, and had to be culturally enlightened, but had also to remain unchanged in their traditions. As Billig et al (1988) pointed out everyday discourse often contains contradictory themes, because it is based on common-sense values as, for instance, justice and mercy, which often happen to be opposed and in practice provoke ideological dilemmas.

Extract 23
(A) The Pritzker architecture prize ceremony. Steve Fehn: “The museums are starting to be what the cathedrals were. [Headline] The Pritzker 1997 received his prize in the first social act celebrated in the Guggenheim. [Subhead] “The cathedral was a place for the soul on earth. Now the space for poetry, art and thoughts is the museum”, said yesterday the Norwegian architect Sverre Fehn. The author of buildings so emblematic of the Scandinavian
architecture as the Museum of the Glaciers received in another museum, the Guggenheim Bilbao, the twentieth Pritzker prize. More than four hundred invited people coming from five continents gathered in the first social act celebrated in the Guggenheim Museum, which was defined by the lehendakari Ardanza as symbol of the Basque people’s eagerness to “renew their millenary antiquity with the most stirring modernity”. (B) “The Guggenheim was also the centre of the lehendakari’s discourse, uttered in the academic act celebrated by night in the building designed by Gehry. Ardanza was the second to talk, after the Pritzker prize’s executive director Bill Lacy, and before the director of the Guggenheim Foundation Thomas Krens, the president of the prize’s jury J. Carter Brown, and the founder of the prize Jay Pritzker, and the prizewinner himself. (C) “What you are contemplating in this building, and what very soon you will be able to admire in this museum, represents neither an exception in our millenary history, nor a hasty leap in the dark not to miss the future”, indicated the lehendakari before more than four hundred invited people. “They reflect rather a constant feature of our way of being, and constitute the most genuine expression of what we have always done to survive in the world identical to ourselves”, he added. (Diario Vasco, news report, June 7, 1997, p. 79)

In extract 23 it can be seen how Diario Vasco presented Steve Fehn as an architect who designed some buildings that were “emblemáticos” (emblematic) of the Scandinavian architecture and who received the international Pritzker 1997 prize of architecture. Diario Vasco used category entitlement rhetoric (he is an architect), but also highlighted that Fehn was Norwegian/Scandinavian: a member of a particular ethnic group and culture. Further, he was a Norwegian artist who had succeeded in gaining international recognition in the field of architecture for a long career (two photographs showed Fehn as a white-haired aged man). This description of the protagonist and the event was part of a Diario Vasco’s rhetoric that implicitly proposed that a successful local artist could and also should gain international recognition. The prestigious Steve Fehn gave his impression on the GBM’s building, while Diario Vasco maintained a distance in relation to Fehn’s utterances that appeared in quotation marks. The Scandinavian architect was presented making a comparison between the new museums and the cathedrals. Fehn pointed out to some qualitative transformations in terms of a religious function that the cathedrals had in the past, and the positive function that the new museums played now: “espacio para la poesía, el arte y los pensamientos” (space for poetry, art and thoughts). Fehn chose to compare and stress parallelism between cathedrals and the Guggenheim Bilbao. This idea was embedded in the proposition that people in general would be impressed and would passively admire the great monument that represented the artistic and technological accomplishments of the second millennium’s end. In other words, the Norwegian architect’s utterances conveyed the version that the museum was the project of an elite of policymakers. In addition, Fehn’s comments suggested that it should not be expected anything else from such spectacular cathedral of the twentieth and twenty-first century art. Fehn’s was a representation of
the museum as a “white box”, or container of objects wherein, as in the cathedrals, people could contemplate and admire symbols of high-culture; and he shared this modern representation of the museum with the Basque lehendakari, José Maria Ardanza:

What you are contemplating in this building, and what very soon you will be able to admire in this museum, does represent neither an exception in our millenarian history, nor a hasty leap in the dark not to miss the future. [Diario Vasco, extract 23]

Such formulation was linked to a long tradition of “museums of modernity” set up to exhibit the best “international work”, as Ana María Guasch (2005, p. 187) pointed out. What Fehn and Ardanza did not seem to realize is that the GBM was breaking the modern museum’s conception. Unlike the GBM, which according to Guasch represented also a transition to a more decentralized conception of museum, the modern museum’s conception had been associated with a certain vision of the museum: “linked to great centres of power or major art capitals: New York (MoMa), Paris (the Pompidou) and London (the Tate), all museums dominated by “international” mainstream languages, a highly hierarchical and elitist vision, and a monoculture centered around an ethnocentric Western axis” (Guasch, 2005, p. 187/188).

Again rhetoric of numerical quantification served to maximize the importance of the event, which Diario Vasco stressed gathered more than 400 people (information that was repeated on two occasions) from the five continents. Those were not ordinary people, but important policymakers in executive positions, and the newspaper stressed that Ardanza was the second one to give a speech in a group of five very important (VIP) speakers, all of them from the United States of America. For some reason Diario Vasco’s choice was to quote exclusively Ardanza’s speech in which the Basque people were described as being eager to “renovar su milenaria antigüedad con la más rabiosa modernidad” (renew their millenarian antiquity with the most stirring modernity). Without any direct quotation marks, the newspaper described the Basque attitude in relation to modernity as an “afán” (eagerness), or very strong aspiration, to catch up with modernity. This instantiates the use in Diario Vasco of a vocabulary that tended to exaggerate some trends. Even if such evaluative term was presented as having being uttered by Ardanza, the lack of direct quotation or footing implied that there was not a clear demarcation between Ardanza’s utterances and Diario Vasco’s stand. This exaggerated way to address to the interest of the Basques to catch up with modernity through the GBM had embedded the idea that the Basques were ready to surrender and to admire a museum that would provide them with a magical way to reach
modernity. Ardanza’s discourse was based on the argument that the GBM could provide the Basques the opportunity to make a synthesis that combined the millenarian Basque tradition/history with modernity/future. He also claimed that the capacity of operating with such paradoxical combinations had been a constant feature of the Basques and their identity, and rebutted any possible counterargument or criticism pointing out that the GBM was a very risky undertaking.

First of all, it can be noted that the Basque autonomous region’s president is using rhetoric of negation, and the formulation of the sentence has got embedded the same accusation that it intends to rebut. It is implied in Ardanza’s utterance that the Basques, and the PNV, can be accused of being too traditional, and thus it is necessary to stress that this modern project “no representan ni una excepción” (does represent neither an exception) in the Basque Country’s history. Another implicit accusation that Ardanza’s utterance rebutted is the argument that the PNV did not make a good evaluation, and that this project showed a desperate and blind PNV’s jump into a too expensive symbol of modernity. In part (C) can be seen as well how Ardanza used an explicit rhetoric of the first person plural pronoun “nuestra milenaria historia” (our millenarian history), which conveyed an idea of community (Iñigo-Mora, 2004). This “nuestra milenaria historia” (our millenarian history) was a political rhetoric of inclusion to construct communality between the speaker and the addressee: a wide and unspecific community of people, assumed to be uniform and to share similar goals. It was likely an ambivalent reference to a “we community” (Mühlhäusler and Harré, 1990; Wilson, 1990); the previously mentioned (see part A) Basque people, in the wider and inclusive sense of people who are born and live in the Basque Country as often happened in the PNV’s political rhetoric. This was an example of rhetoric based on the combination of paradoxical elements, such as very ancient tradition and modernity, and reflected the clash between two common-sense assumptions: the Basques had to change and to remain unchanged in their imagined essential identity. The ideological dilemma, which underpinned utterances of an imagined ‘we Basques community’, reached its utmost expression in the Ardanza’s sentence quoted by Egin in which the PNV politician and Basque ‘head of government, accounted for why the fact that we undertook the GBM project should not be considered shocking:

“They reflect rather a constant feature of our way of being, and constitute the most genuine expression of what we have always done to survive in the world identical to ourselves”, he added. [Diario Vasco, extract 23]
At the same time, Ardanza's utterances reflected an implicit representation of the Basque culture as an underdeveloped realm that needed to catch up with the contemporary international art and market. This was more clearly reflected in the use of a rhetoric of hyperbolic exaggeration of the contrast between the stereotypes of the Basques as the most ancient culture of Europe, and a depiction of the GBM as a symbol of the "más rabiosa modernidad" (the most stirring modernity). Apparently, Ardanza’s arguments to support the GBM as a symbol of stirring and radical modernity that would shake what it was assumed to be the Basque Country’s cultural backwardness were based on a magical thought assumption. In other words, Ardanza appeared to be concerned with the ordinary citizen’s necessity to catch up with the twentieth century and the newer trends in the realm of international art, although this rhetoric served to conceal that the main concern was with turning the GBM a big tourist attraction. Further, his discourse conveyed the implicit message that it was possible to catch up with international contemporary art just by having access to the Guggenheim Bilbao, without any further elaboration, study, training, or other conditions.

The implicit proposition that the Guggenheim Bilbao would accelerate the artistic modernization of the Basque Country was also present in Mikhail Pietrovsky’s utterances (extract 24). Egin stressed that Mr Pietrovsky was the director of the Ermitage of Saint Petersburg, without mentioning that this was one of the most important museums in Europe, and a symbol of East European countries’ artistic accomplishment and prestige. In this sense, it can be highlighted that by choosing a Russian to comment on the GBM’s architecture, Egin put the debate in a supra dimension, in terms of history, society, etc. As a Russian, the Ermitage museum’s director appeared to be talking in a supra-local, supra-national, supra-European (out of the European Union) instance, and also out of history. The director of the Ermitage used the metaphorical figure of a “broche de oro” (golden brooch) that would connect the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries, and commented on the excellent quality of the architecture that he found it was a culmination of the twentieth century’s architecture. The constant use of quotation marks can be considered an effort of Egin to claim a distance in relation to Mikhail Pietrovsky’s utterances.

Extract 24

The Guggenheim Museum of Bilbao "is going to connect the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. From the architectural point of view it is excellent, I think that really it is a culmination of the twentieth century's architecture, means something similar to a golden brooch to what it was made in this century. It was expressed yesterday by Mikhail Pietrovsky, director of Saint Petersburg's Ermitage. (Egin, news report text, July 11, 1997, p. 37)
Nevertheless, Pietrovsky’s use of a metaphor like “broche de oro” (golden brooch) indicated that the GBM’s building was an accomplishment, while implying that it was a very luxurious, expensive and spectacular building. That is, a golden brooch had been a symbol of aristocracy, and was later adopted by the international bourgeoisie. This symbol of wealth is also present in the collections of the Ermitage, which although is famous for its modern art and early twentieth century avant-garde art collections, also includes earlier art related to the Russian aristocracy. It can be a commonplace in the European artistic milieu to use a figure like golden brooch to connote a big accomplishment or synthesis. However, it can also be suggested that Pietrovsky had a slip. His utterances might imply that he assumed the Guggenheim Bilbao to be a museum that like the Ermitage was not only about the art’s present, and future, but that it was also, like a traditional museum, about the past. Finally, Pietrovsky’s discourse reinforced the proposition that the GBM was a top-down project, fostered by a group of policymakers, and which had embedded an implicit vision of the Basque Country as a region that had still to “conectar” (connect) with the most avant-garde international architecture. The verb ‘to connect’ was used in a metaphorical way. The GBM was presented as a museum that was going to physically link two centuries, as if the Guggenheim Bilbao was a bridge that gathered all the artistic and technological innovations of the twentieth century, and it could serve as a bridge to the twenty-first century. The metaphor of the bridge that connected two centuries, and represented an accomplishment of the twentieth century’s architecture, had embedded the proposition that it would permit the region to catch up with the newest trends. Mister Pietrovsky’s arguments were indeed cultural, and were not invaded by political and economic arguments. However, he departed already from a solution, he was already heading to the twenty-first century, and did not tackle the dilemma of a cultural project for the Basque art. The pattern is that nobody was allowed to explicitly address the issue of why the Basque culture was assumed to be in need of catching up with contemporary art, although this question was implicit in Diario Vasco’s and Egin’s strategies to address the GBM’s cultural project.

It can be noted how both Egin and Diario Vasco selectively quoted arguments uttered by two international culture representatives who were not from the United States, and claimed that the Guggenheim Bilbao museum’s architecture was a big artistic and technological accomplishment. In the case of Diario Vasco this choice can be read as a strategy to reinforce, through prestigious international expert voices, the argument that the GBM’s building was of itself a very valuable good due to its artistic and technological quality and innovation. It was also part of a rhetoric to stress that such comments were made by representatives of the international culture not directly
linked to the project, and thus able to make an objective evaluation.

In the same day the GBM was finally inaugurated (extract 25) Egin published on his front page another quoted utterance of Ardanza’s speech that confirmed the pattern of implicitly linking the GBM with the modernization of the Basque identity. The Basque language news report quoted a Basque Autonomy president’s speech fragment. Egin selected an utterance in which Ardanza was once again uttering an explicit rhetoric of we, as it had previously been done when Ardanza was quoted in Diario Vasco (extract 23). Ardanza’s utterance apparently addressed the Basque language audience, although it is not clear whether Egin translated into Basque a speech that was originally made in Spanish or not. At least, Egin picked up an utterance in which Ardanza stressed that the GBM was an example of “geure” (our) confidence to renew and transform us. Ardanza used a very unspecific and generic kind of we that apparently did not address any audience. Nevertheless, the use of the Basque language in itself, together with the already familiar rhetoric of presenting the Basques as a community of people who were open to innovation and modernity, was indirectly suggesting to the Basque readers that this “geure” did indeed refer to the Basque people.

Extract 25

According to what Ardanza said in his discourse, the Museum “is a message of confidence in us and in the capacity of renewal and transformation we have got” (Egin, front-page news text, October 19, 1997)

The latter two extracts served to illustrate how Egin did maintain a discreet rhetorical style to present different quotations, which was very different from the maximization/exaggeration of the benefits of the GBM found in Diario Vasco.

A main pattern that Egin and Diario Vasco had in common was the difficulty to develop an explicit discussion of questions such as whether or not the Basque people were assumed to be in need of a symbol of contemporary international art like the GBM; and why different Basque cultural policymakers (e.g. Azua, 2005; Viar, 2005) have depicted the context as unfavourable to the creation of avant-garde art by local artists. The difficulty of developing a basic discussion on whether the GBM could really be a project concerned with cultural artistic production in the Basque Country pushed Egin to a position actually more reactive than assertive to policymakers’

8 Did it happen a couple of years later, a version that presented Pietrovsky as someone without stake on the Guggenheim would turn out rhetorically less persuasive: In 2001 the Guggenheim Global Network signed a partnership agreement with the Ermitage of Saint Petersburg, and the Russian museum joined the Guggenheim Constellations of Museums (Haacke, 2005, p. 121).
arguments. Given that the PNV’s main concern was the museum’s economic success, which was represented as the museum’s capacity to attract visitors and private sponsorship, a debate over the museum’s cultural project for the Basque Country was far less developed. And the Basque newspapers focused on economic arguments, or on debates that were presented as cultural, but tended to be used as a political weapon in the development of opposed versions over cultural issues that were less relevant. That is, the economic and the political debates superseded a real cultural debate, as will be analysed in the next subsection.

6.2.2. The discontent with the museum as an issue of political debate between the Basque provinces

The previous subsection focused on the analysis of why attempts to place the issue of the cultural production in the Basque Country were frustrated. This impasse or difficulty was also reflected on the debate over the benefit that the Basque Country as a whole would obtain from a museum that was set up in the capital of Biscay and not in the capitals of Gipuzkoa and Araba. The cultural debate involving predictions of the museum’s repercussion for the three provinces in the Basque autonomous region will be examined in this subsection.

In Diario Vasco the problem of the existence of a debate that questioned the GBM’s initiative reflected on a particular debate on how the GBM would relate to all Basque provinces, and whether it would benefit them or not. In an interview published on March 2, 1997, in Diario Vasco (extract 26), the headline presented Juan Ignacio Vidarte as the Guggenheim’s general director. Diario Vasco emphasised that Vidarte was occupying a position of power and leadership, as later in the text’s corpus would be stressed with more details: “es el director del Guggenheim Bilbao y el único que tiene su puesto” (he is the Guggenheim Bilbao’s director and the only one who has got his position). This rhetoric that stressed Vidarte’s important position in the Guggenheim Bilbao was complemented with an evaluation of his position’s relative importance in comparison with the position of the GBM’s artistic director: “un cargo por encima del director artístico, asegurado en el organigrama del museo” (a post above the artistic director, which is guaranteed by the museum’s organization chart). In this interview Vidarte seemed to be addressing a debate on how the GBM’s project would affect the Basque Country as a whole. Apart from the Basque Autonomy’s region in Spain, also other Basque regions such as Navarre, and Iparralde (the French Basque country) were mentioned in Vidarte’s accounting of why the
GBM’s project was “un proyecto de país y un proyecto que aspira a ser un elemento de vertebración” (a project of country and a project that seeks to be an element of cohesion). In Vidarte’s answers to a Diario Vasco’s journalist there were at least two main explicit messages. 1) That the Guggenheim Bilbao was not a unilateral project limited to Bilbao. Therefore, the Guggenheim Bilbao was presented as an interactive project that aimed at linking all the Basque regions with Europe. 2) By the same token, it was suggested that in this interview Vidarte would address the question of the GBM’s project and would clarify ambiguities regarding its initiative’s cultural content. This proposition was reflected in Diario Vasco’s mention of the “primeras adquisiciones de la colección propia ya se han realizado” (the first acquisitions of the own collection have already been made). It was also suggested in Vidarte’s reference to a museum “que aspira, en cuanto a su programación, a tener una proyección Europea” (that seeks, regarding its programming, to have an European projection).

The GBM’s cultural project was described as being the source of a controversy and according to Diario Vasco’s depiction an ongoing and persistent one: “la polémica sigue pendiendo” (the controversy is still pending). Vidarte was quoted as counterarguing that “en un proyecto de esta envergadura la polémica es por una parte razonable y lógica” (in a project of such magnitude the controversy is in one sense a reasonable and logical aspect). Diario Vasco presented the debate on the predicted GBM’s project’s benefits for Gipuzkoa, and other Basque regions, as a controversial issue, but the newspaper did not formulate its questions to Vidarte in a tone of accusation. Interestingly, several things were hidden and missing from Diario Vasco’s and Vidarte’s version. Apparently, Diario Vasco formulated very clearly the main question: “El Museo Guggenheim se quiere vender como proyecto de país. Sin embargo en Gipuzkoa se siente como algo ajeno” (The Guggenheim Museum wants to be sold as a project for the country. Nevertheless, in Gipuzkoa it is felt as something that belongs to somebody else). There is something striking in this formulation of the problem in this news report: Diario Vasco seemed to take for granted that the reader knew who were the unspecific people alluded. An impersonal personal pronoun ‘se’ was used with the transitive verb “vender” that served to omit who were the people that wanted to sell the GBM as a project for the country. The indexical ‘the’ indirectly indicated that it was this “país” (country), probably the Basque Country, given that this was written in a journal that was named El Diario Vasco. In addition, it was formulated in a way as leaving unspecified who in Gipuzkoa felt it as something “ajeno”. The use of nominalization permitted Diario Vasco to leave ambiguous and vague the actions, and the actual identity of people who were behind this debate. In other words, Diario Vasco omitted that behind such
actions there were some specific actors, such as PNV policymakers from Gipuzkoa, and other regions. These policymakers complained about some aspects of the GBM’s project that concerned their specific interests, and were not necessarily representative of wider interests of the Basque citizen’s concerning the GBM’s cultural project. In sum, here neither Diario Vasco, nor Vidarte, addressed the wider debate over the GBM’s cultural project’s benefits for the Basque citizens. On the contrary, what Vidarte was doing here was to reassure the GBM’s Basque administration’s allies, the PNV policymakers from other Basque provinces and regions, that the GBM’s project would certainly bear in mind the PNV’s political rhetoric and interests. Moreover, in the Diario Vasco’s interview it was suggested that the basic question of a cultural interaction of the GBM with the different Basque regions would be tackled. However, instead the interview moved towards an economicist language repertoire in terms of a confirmation that the GBM would also include and benefit other provinces. No further discussion of whether such benefits would be also cultural, apart from economic, was provided in this interview with Juan Ignacio Vidarte.

Extract 26
Juan Ignacio Vidarte. General director of the Guggenheim Bilbao. “If the Guggenheim turns out to be felt in Gipuzkoa as somebody else’s, it means that we have explained it badly.” [Headline] Eight months before the opening the Guggenheim Bilbao is getting ready to face the final mile. [Subhead] The building works will end in April, the first acquisitions of the own collection have already been made ... and the controversy is still pending. [Subhead] “In a project of such magnitude the controversy is in one sense a reasonable and logical aspect”, explains Juan Ignacio Vidarte. He is the director of the Guggenheim Bilbao and the only one who has got his position, a post above the artistic director, which is guaranteed by the museum’s organization chart. The Guggenheim Museum wants to be sold as a project of country. Nevertheless, in Gipuzkoa it is felt as something that belongs to somebody else. If it is like that is because until now we have not been able to explain it well enough, because if the Guggenheim is something, it is a project of country and a project that seeks to be an element of cohesion. The museum is not more of Bilbao than of Vitoria or San Sebastián. The project itself could not be understood if it was not conceived to be a museum that seeks, regarding its programming, to have an European projection and with a scope of acceptance directed to all the Autonomous Community, and also to Iparralde, Navarra and other neighbouring areas of the Península Ibérica. I do not think it is true that in Gipuzkoa is not considered a project for the people from Gipuzkoa. [Diario Vasco, interview, March, 2, 1997, p. 71]

A similar debate based on predictions of how the GBM’s cultural project might affect and benefit not only Biscay, but the other Basque provinces, was reported in another Diario Vasco’s news report (extract 27) published on May 19, 1997. This time, the GBM’s project was presented as “el proyecto vasco del Guggenheim” (the Basque project of the Guggenheim). In addition, it was commented that some policymakers were interested in promoting this project in all the Basque
The politicians in charge of the Guggenheim’s Basque project do not hide their interest to make all the Basque Autonomous Community feel as “their own” a museum that until now has been associated mainly with Bilbao. [Diario Vasco, extract 27]

A rhetoric that claimed commonplace values such as sincerity and transparency was used to suggest that the GBM’s policymakers fulfilled such requirements. Such commonplace values that constantly permeate political rhetoric were also described as *ideographs* by McGee (1980) who pointed out how ideographs can express basic ideological values like justice and mercy, which can provoke ideological dilemmas (Billig et al., 1988). Policymakers were depicted as being accountable for a so-called “el proyecto vasco del Guggenheim” (the Basque project of the Guggenheim), and assumed to be honest people who do not hide their particular interests or stake in the GBM’s project. That is, the formulation “no ocultan su interés” (do not hide their interest), served to rebut all existing doubts and accusations of a GBM’s plot to hidden its actual interests and projects to the public, and this is an example of “stake inoculation” (Potter & Edwards, 1990). This *Diario Vasco*’s news report’s explicit mention of a “proyecto vasco del Guggenheim”, once again, suggested that the GBM’s cultural project would be now explained and clarified. However, the explicit discussion of the GBM’s cultural project was frustrated in a text that happened to be more explicitly concerned with the GBM’s economic and political project than was the previously examined text (extract 26). Several expressions and sentences formulated arguments and representations that show how much this text was influenced by an economist discourse:

The Guggenheim prepares an offensive of ‘self-promotion’ in Guipúzcoa and Alava. [Diario Vasco, extract 27, headline]

External promotion. [Diario Vasco, extract 27, text]

This interest is political, but also commercial. [Diario Vasco, extract 27, text]

The *Diario Vasco*’s news report ended repeating a main economic argument, based on the rhetoric of numbers (see this chapter’s previous subsections). The newspaper accounted for why other Basque provinces, assumed to be jealous of Bilbao, should not worry. *Diario Vasco* reported that according to the museum’s previsions it was expected that many visitors to the
GBM would come from neighbouring regions of the Basque Country, such as Bordeaux and Santander. To sum it up, this is another example of the PNV’s and the Diario Vasco’s economic quantitative rhetoric, along with the implicit tendency to emphasise the policymakers’ power to foster cultural and economic policies for the Basque Country.

Extract 27

The Guggenheim prepares an offensive of ‘self-promotion’ in Guipúzcoa and Álava. [Headline] An exhibition will spread this summer in Donostia the Basque project of the museum of Bilbao. [Subhead] (...) External promotion. The politicians in charge of the Guggenheim’s Basque project do not hide their interest to make all the Basque Autonomous Community feel as “their own” a museum that until now has been associated mainly with Bilbao. This interest is political, but also commercial, according to the museum’s previsions that an important part of its visitors will feed on the geographical “arch” that goes from Bordeaux to Santander. (El Diario Vasco, news report, May 19, 1997, p. 71)

Since the GBM’s project was agreed between the PNV and the Guggenheim Foundation representatives, in 1991, there have been accusations against the GBM’s cultural project voiced by prestigious Basque artists like Jorge Oteiza and Agustin Ibarrola. One of the most common onslaughts uttered against the Guggenheim Bilbao was that the museum was alienated from local artists and their cultural production. In that sense attention can be drawn to the ambiguous use of the nouns “ajeno” (somebody else’s) and “propio” (own) in the last examined extracts from Diario Vasco:

If the Guggenheim turns out to be felt in Gipuzkoa as somebody else’s, it means that we have explained it badly. [Diario Vasco, extract 26, headline]

The Guggenheim Museum wants to be sold as a project of country. Nevertheless in Gipuzkoa it is felt as something that belongs to somebody else. [Diario Vasco, extract 26, text]

The politicians in charge of the Guggenheim’s Basque project do not hide their interest to make all the Basque Autonomous Community feel as “their own” a museum that until now has been associated mainly with Bilbao. [Diario Vasco, extract 27, text]

A main difficulty the PNV faced in selling the museum to the Basques, and also to the Spanish and foreign tourists, whom they wanted to attract, was the contradiction of having to present a project, which had nothing to do with the Basque culture and its artists, as if it was something “propio” of the Basque identity and culture. Policymakers argued that because the GBM was very different from traditional Basque culture the museum would serve to attract international
tourism to the Basque Country. This discourse that presented the GBM as Basque, which it was not; as very avant-garde and international, but still representing the Basque traditions; as concerned with attracting international tourism, but also with local culture and artists, was a potential source of argumentative contradictions and weaknesses.

A strategy to deal with the dilemma that the museum could be seen, simultaneously, as "propio" and "ajeno" by the Basques, was to omit the fact that many prestigious Basque artists were discontent with it. The GBM’s cultural project became subject of strong controversy in the Basque artistic milieu, and Diario Vasco assumed that its readership wanted to know more about such controversy. Then, the newspaper’s new strategy would be to mention the existence of discontent, and a general debate on whether the GBM was "propio" or "ajeno", but the cultural aspects of the controversy were kept vague and short (Edwards and Potter, 1992). Meanwhile, the controversy was described as an economic and political problem. It can be noted how "propio" was one of the few nouns in all the news reports that appeared in quotation marks; as if Diario Vasco wanted to highlight its distance from such discussion, whereby attributing this vocabulary to policymakers. The other examples belong to a different journalistic genre: the interview. Thus Diario Vasco did not need to stress that this was not its position. It was assumed that the readers would easily understand that Juan Ignacio Vidarte and a particular interviewer had pronounced such vocabulary. Either way, Diario Vasco constructed its position as distant from the discussion on whether the GBM was perceived as "propio" or "ajeno" by PNV policymakers.

At this stage, the GBM’s policymakers were still in a phase of introduction of the museum’s project to the public. Diario Vasco would keep its strategy of overlooking the Basque artists’ critical stance on the GBM’s cultural project until they organized public demonstrations and movements against the museum. The Basque artists’ mobilization against the museum would coincide with a new stage in the implementation of the GBM’s politics in October 1997, and this clash between the two sides provoked a certain specification of the GBM’s cultural policies.
6.2.3. The reporting of the Basque culture representatives’ criticism of the museum’s cultural project

At the onset of October 1997, for the first time, Basque artists’ discontent with the GBM’s cultural project was described in a special monograph that Diario Vasco dedicated to the Guggenheim Bilbao. Bearing in mind the artists’ fame and prestige, it is striking that Jorge Oteiza and Agustín Ibarrola’s criticism against the museum had not been reported earlier that year. Why so many policymakers’ opinions had found an echo over the year 1997 in Egin and Diario Vasco, while the Basque artists’ voices were omitted? A partial answer to this can be that the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao was formulated mainly in terms of the project’s economic repercussions.

A Diario Vasco’s (extract 28) headline was titled “detractores tenaces” (tenacious detractors). The article’s subhead maintained a descriptive tone that served to construct the Diario Vasco’s position as objective and factual: headline and subhead basically presented the protagonists (the Basque artists), the facts (an opposition to the GBM), their main argument (they saw the GBM as a new example of cultural colonialism aggression). In the headline the Basque artists were presented as a group who persisted in a position, implied to be very rigid (“detractores tenaces”). In this article Diario Vasco displayed several strategies to undermine the Basque artists’ mobilization’s legitimacy. One of Diario Vasco’s rhetoric to discredit the Basque artists’ movement was to highlight their action’s weaknesses;

A small boat will sail the Nervión estuary during the acts of the Guggenheim’s opening. In it will sail a group of artists with tens of blue, red and white flags, with the 54 stars of the United States. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

People who go out for a walk in the Volantin field at that time might think that this is just another act to celebrate the museum’s opening. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

The first fragment depicts a small boat with the big artists, decorated with flags and stars of the USA’s flag, sailing the big river; and this is a description that portrayed the event as something silly, and of little importance and repercussion. The second description contains a negative evaluation. It stressed that the Basque artists were not able to control even how any passer-by might interpret their action, whereby weaknesses were stressed by means of casting doubts about the Basque artists’ capacity to convey their action’s meaning.
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Another key strategy to challenge the Basque artist’s movement’s legitimacy was to use specific metaphorical images to describe their artistic productions. *Diario Vasco*’s description of the Basque artists’ work as “tejido cultural de Euskadi” (Euskadi’s cultural tissue) had a connotation of something alive, complex, rich, as if *Diario Vasco* wanted to convey its positive expectation in relation to the local artistic networks and their production. However, this metaphor of a “tejido cultural” (cultural tissue) was more ambiguous than it appeared at first glance. It also put forward a representation of the Basque artists’ work as being craft work, an organic element as a “tejido” (tissue), and a product that lacked sophistication and technologically did not live up to the contemporary international art’s standards.

The fragment that follows illustrates how *Diario Vasco* explicitly presented a Basque artist’s main argument to criticize the GBM project;

Since its beginnings the Guggenheim has aroused the mistrust of a considerable part of the Basque Country’s artists who have seen in the initiative a waste of public funding, which used to be destined to scholarships, subsidies and other forms to help the autochthonous creation. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

The opposition’s argument was already described, and subsequently *Diario Vasco* undertook another strategy that consisted in removing legitimacy from the opposite group. The Basque artists’ movement’s main leader was target of an aggressive rhetorical attack by *Diario Vasco*. Jorge Oteiza was described as a figure full of contradictions: an octogenarian who behaved as a young rebel, having many childish “rabietas” (tantrums);

Jorge Oteiza, an octogenarian whose rebel and complaining example had a deep affect on the youngest generations. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

He was also assumed to, actually, want to exhibit his art in the GBM, but was a prisoner of the dilemma of wanting to play the role of the “liderazgo moral de la oposición” (moral leadership of the opposition);

The moral leadership of the opposition against the museum has been bore by an artist who still rejects his work being exhibited in its halls: Jorge Oteiza [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

Here “aún” (still) indicated that Oteiza would soon change his mind, contradicting himself, and showing lack of consistency between his discourse and deeds.
Extract 28

(A) 'Tenacious detractors. [Headline] The majority of the Basque artists, headed by Oteiza and Ibarrola, see in the Guggenheim museum a cultural colonialism’s new aggression. A small boat will sail the Nervión estuary during the acts of the Guggenheim’s opening. In it will sail a group of artists with tens of blue, red and white flags, with the 54 stars of the United States. People who go out for a walk in the Volantín field at that time might think that this is just another act to celebrate the museum’s opening. But not. In reality, it will be a protest of some Basque creators who, inspired by Luis G. Berlanga’s movie Bienvenido Mr. Marshall, will manifest their rejection of an art gallery that, in their opinion has been built without bearing in mind Euskadi’s cultural tissue.’

(B) ‘Since its beginnings, the Guggenheim has aroused the mistrust of a considerable part of the Basque Country’s artists, who have seen in the initiative a waste of public funding, which used to be destined to scholarships, subsidies and other forms to help the autochthonous creation. The moral leadership of the opposition against the museum has been bore by an artist who still rejects his work being exhibited in its halls: Jorge Oteiza, an octogenarian whose rebel and complaining example had a deep affect on the youngest generations. For the author from Guipuzcoa, the word Guggenheim means the selling of the Basque culture to a multinational show business, a version of Disneyland applied to arts, the building of which reminds him of “a cheese factory.” Tantrums. [Subhead] Oteiza’s tantrums have been many and varied over the years. In many occasions he expressed his intention to abandon Euskadi, weary of its cultural policy, something he has not done yet. But this time his rejection must be attributed to a project that he intended to direct, but that finally was not carried out: the Alhóndiga cube. (...) The initiative was supported by the then Bilbao’s mayor José María Gorordo. But the arrival of the Americans cut short, according to the artist, what aspired to be a centre for “the education of the people”, although actually until then such a noble idea did not contain previsions of expenses and staff, of a project of activities and program. A little bit later, in 1993, Oteiza stated that “Lemoniz was not sorted out by good means, and it seems that neither the Guggenheim danger will”, alluding to the nuclear power station that was left unfinished because of ETA’s bomb attacks, among them the one that cost the life of the engineer José Maria Ryan.’

(C) ‘The octogenarian was not alone. Agustín Ibarrola attacked the future museum for being another piece – and a very important one – of the imperialism and cultural colonialism, which would finish reducing the Basque art to its minimal expression: “The estuary will become the channel of Panama. We the artists will sail in our own and in international waters under a foreign flag/pavilion”. Other two indispensable members of the avant-garde of Euskadi, José Antonio Sistiaga and Nestor Basterretxea, aligned with this kind of positions.’

(D) ‘The negative effect on the rest of cultural expressions is one of the arguments that was more frequently put forward to discredit the Guggenheim. The initiative absorbs an important part of the budget of the Department of Culture, what in the opinion of its detractors, will go to the detriment of the other museums, of theatre, cinema, and literature that depend on a higher or lesser degree of public funds.

(E) The atomic mushroom. [Subhead] The front of Guipúzcoa has underlined with total intensity this line of attack. According to the writer Julia Otxoa, “the Hiroshima-Guggenheim effect is total”. “The atomic mushroom, the grey titanium that covers the museum will pulverize the Basque culture, it will make disappear groups of music, editorials, art galleries...”. “Not even Franco would have done it better.” Anjel Lertxundi, Felipe Juaristi and Félix Marañá come close, with their logical personal nuances, to these sorts of utterances.’ (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 3, 1997, especial central issue on the GBM, p. 10)
Further, there was a carefully elaborated order of discourse, aiming at discrediting the Basque artists’ arguments and their claims of legitimacy by presenting them as biased accounts. The attribution of stake (Edwards and Potter, 1992) against Jorge Oteiza had been operated and the artist was portrayed not only as ‘childish’, ‘irrational’, ‘contradictory’, but also as having obscure personal interest or stake. Only then were described in Diario Vasco Oteiza’s strongest accusations against the GBM’s cultural and economic project, while suggesting that, by contrast, the newspaper’s own version of the events was unbiased;

For the author from Guipuzcoa, the word Guggenheim means the selling of the Basque culture to a show-business multinational, a version of Disneyland applied to arts, the building of which reminds him of “a cheese factory”. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

In this case, Diario Vasco drew upon direct quotation to demarcate its distance in relation to the mention of a very negative and complex metaphor that allegedly Oteiza had uttered against the museum: Jorge Oteiza had compared the Guggenheim Bilbao with “una fábrica de quesos” (a cheese factory). It was part of a rhetoric that included ironization of the PNV’s hidden disregard for Basque artists, and the PNV/GBM policymakers’ implicit elitist vision of culture as something to be implemented through top-down politics. The metaphor conveyed that the GBM’s so-called cultural project was an attraction, a park for tourists, a factory and a leasing like the Disneyworld multinational. Moreover, the metaphor of a “fábrica de quesos” (cheese factory) had the connotation of something organic, simple, bad tasting, lacking abstraction, and potentially stinking. In this sense, the “fábrica de quesos” (cheese factory) and the above examined metaphor “tejido cultural de Euskadi” (the cultural tissue of Euskadi) would be both on the same level: unsophisticate and pre-technological production. That is, Diario Vasco’s previous suggestion in this text that the Basque artists’ production was pre-technological and organic, was the answer to an utterance that had already been made in a former Jorge Oteiza’s intervention. Probably, Oteiza had in a previous text, or verbally, downgraded the PNV’s policymakers’ assumption that the museum would provide a shortcut to contemporary arts and technology. It was Bakhtin (1981) who noticed that text and talk are not unitary entities, because all texts and talks tend to bear fragments of other utterers’ voices in them. When Bakhtin claimed that all text is dialogic, by that he meant that all text is constructed not only with awareness about other utterers’ discourses, but also with awareness of manifold interpreters. This awareness of many interpreters is related to an implicit dialogism in texts, which tends to be constructed, for
example, with awareness of possible counterarguments that they might arise.

*Diario Vasco*'s strategy to rebut accusations that the GBM's cultural project was similar to the Disneyworld factory or to a cheese factory was to present Jorge Oteiza as someone notoriously temperamental, eccentric, incoherent and irrational;

Oteiza's tantrums have been many and varied over the years. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 28]

He was also presented as someone who had very concrete personal reasons to feel resentment towards the Basque administration;

this time his rejection must be attributed to a project that he intended to direct, but that finally was not carried out: the Alhóndiga cube. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 28]

The newspaper assumed that Oteiza was taking advantage of the existence of discontent among many Basque artists in relation to the GBM's project, taking his revenge for some personal failures, and arbitrarily blaming the Basque administration;

The initiative was supported by the then Bilbao's mayor José María Gorordo. But the arrival of the Americans cut short, according to the artist, what aspired to be a centre for "the education of the people", although actually until then such a noble idea did not contain previsions of expenses and staff, of a project of activities and program. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 28]

Another strategy to discredit Jorge Oteiza's legitimacy was to portray him as a very old man (on his eighties), tired and fed up, who had often announced his retirement and his intention to leave Euskadi, but never fulfilled his promise to quit the country;

In many occasions he expressed his intention to abandon Euskadi, weary of its cultural policy, something he has not done yet. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 28]

In the extract's part (B) can be read how in the occasions when Oteiza's criticism of the Basque cultural politics was mentioned, *Diario Vasco* used irony to stress an assumed contradiction between the artist's discourse and practice. The newspaper's strategy was to show how Oteiza did probably have what it ironically depicts as "noble ideal" (noble ideal); and that Oteiza's plans to set up a centre "para la educación del pueblo" (for the education of the people) were in contrast with the artist's practice of overlooking the economic and administrative aspects of such a
project. In short, *Diario Vasco* was using irony to point out that Oteiza was not only an idealist, but also that the artists’ project and utterances might be plain populism (McGuigan, 1997);

But the arrival of the Americans cut short, according to the artist, what aspired to be a centre “for the education of the people”; although actually until then such a noble ideal did not contain previsions of expenses and staff, of a project of activities and program. [Diario Vasco, extract 28]

In sum, the now decontextualized quotation of an Oteiza’s previous utterance, served *Diario Vasco* to stress the contradiction between Oteiza’s good intentions and bad deeds.

The lack of a cultural politics oriented to Basque artists and citizens was implied in the sentence in which Oteiza was presented as uttering that he felt “hastiado” (weary) with Euskadi’s cultural politics. It would have been difficult for *Diario Vasco* to explain Euskadi’s cultural project with display of strong arguments to underpin the version that the Basque administration did care for Basque contemporary art and artists, or for the Basque citizen’s access to it.

Finally, an important rhetorical move to discredit Jorge Oteiza’s moral leadership, and the whole Basque artists’ mobilization against the GBM was to associate Jorge Oteiza with two major evils: terrorism and criminality. *Diario Vasco* referred to a document that Oteiza had published years before. In that manifesto Oteiza had compared the Guggenheim with a nuclear power station (Lemoniz) that the Spanish central government policymakers had projected to open in the Basque seaside, between Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa. A persistent campaign of bomb attacks perpetrated by ETA, and a considerable mobilization against the project, contributed to postpone the controversial project, and eventually policymakers and authorities were persuaded in 1981 to give up the project. In order to undermine Jorge Oteiza’s prestige and legitimacy *Diario Vasco* proposed a parallelism between Oteiza’s radicalism, and ETA’s radicalism. The newspaper also stressed that the armed group’s bomb attacks had as a consequence the death of an engineer called José María Ryan. This rhetoric of associating Oteiza’s verbal charges against the GBM project with ETA’s bomb attacks and subsequent human casualties was related to a rhetoric of demonization and criminalization usually deployed against ETA and the left-wing party Herri Batasuna (later denominated Batasuna). Both Herri Batasuna and ETA were favourable to the Basque Country’s secession and self-determination from Spain, and to the use of violence and guerrilla warfare to achieve their political goals. The rhetoric of criminalization of the Basque

9 The letter in which Oteiza had compared the Guggenheim Bilbao with Lemoniz had been published in *Egin* on May 13, 1993 (Guasch, 2005, p. 191)
secessionist left-wing Basque groups was recurrent at the time in the Spanish press (Batista Viladrich, 2004), and the conservative party Partido Popular would succeed, a few years later, to make Batasuna illegal. That is, a policymakers' alternative strategy to end the debate over the GBM’s cultural project was to turn it into a police case and to depict the opposition group as criminals; and that is how Oteiza happened to be implicitly accused of being a terrorist from ETA in Diario Vasco. In sum, through such evaluations and moral judgements Oteiza was put beyond the moral order, outside the boundaries of what was assumed to be acceptable and commonsense (Bar-Tal, 1989). Nonetheless, the conservative Basque Nationalist Party’s preferred strategy to avoid the cultural question was to talk about economy.

Extract 29
The political parties guarantee that ETA wants to “trample on” the image of Euskadi. [Headline] (...) PSE-EE. “It is symbolic that this happened at the gates of an art gallery that represents the future of the Basque Country: This reflects the huge capacity to despise the Basque society’s constructive and positive energies, and estrangement of these fanatics and fascists from it. ETA is taking celebrations and infrastructures of worldwide relevance, such as the World Cycling Championship, last Saturday, or the Guggenheim today, as a reference for its actions (...). (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 14, 1997, p. 5)

In the same Diario Vasco’s editorial (extract 28) that made charges against the Basque artists' mobilization, in part (E), there was a paragraph that followed a subhead titled “La seta atómica” (the atomic mushroom). There the writer Julia Otxoa was directly quoted as uttering that “el efecto Hiroshima-Guggenheim es total” (The Guggenheim-Hiroshima effect is total). That is, she used a metaphor of war: the atomic bomb that ended World War II in Japan was compared with the destroying effect the Guggenheim would have on the local Basque culture. According to Diario Vasco that already depicted this group's leader, and implicitly the whole group of Basque artists, as radical and extremist, Julia Otxoa’s stand was that the Guggenheim was like an atomic bomb that “pulverizará” (will pulverize) all the existing expressions of Basque culture. She was also quoted as having added to this statement that “Ni Franco lo hubiera hecho mejor” (“Not even Franco would have done it better”). In the latter fragment of Julia Otxoa’s discourse there was an implicit representation of the GBM’s cultural policy as an authoritarian and elitist project fostered top-down by policymakers without consulting the Basque citizens. As Moxey (2005, p. 175) pointed out, this narrative is also found among scholars who are influenced by some Marxist (e.g. Fredric Jameson) views on globalization as the triumph of the multinational corporation. These scholars did represent the Guggenheim Bilbao as an example of this, whereby they typically predicted disastrous consequences for the dignity and autonomy of the Basque people.
One main assumption in the fragment of Julia Otxoa’s discourse quoted by Diario Vasco was that the survival of expressions of Basque culture depended on public funding. In sum, it can be noted how a Basque artist that was presented as representative of the movement of criticism of the GBM’s project was quoted using economic arguments: the lack of public funding for Basque culture. This is another example of how the politicization of the cultural question was accompanied by avoidance of the debate over the GBM’s cultural project for the Basque Country.

In Diario Vasco’s description of the Basque artists’ arguments to criticize the GBM’s project much emphasis was put on the Basque artist’s dependence on public funding. This pattern of stressing any Basque cultural activity’s dependence on public administration funding was also found in Egin’s reporting of a group of Basque culture representatives’ mobilization against the GBM’s cultural policy, as will be now examined. Also in October 1997, before the GBM’s opening (extract 30) other groups related to the Basque culture had their utterances of protest against the GBM quoted in Egin, although this Basque language news report omitted that such representatives of Basque culture were all ideologically close to Herri Batasuna. Therefore, in Egin’s description was embedded the assumption that these people represented a more general Basque artistic class’ discontent with the museum. The young Basque culture representatives portrayed in this Egin’s news report used similar arguments to the ones that the older artists had uttered in Diario Vasco. For example, they drew upon the same argument of accusing the GBM of representing a ‘cultural imperialism’, which they predicted would provoke a shortage of funding for, or the disappearance of, many local cultural projects.

Not only Diario Vasco’s news reports, but also Egin’s assumed that the GBM was already a fait accompli. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of presenting the GBM as an irreversible event was differently constructed. As it has been examined (extract 28), Diario Vasco’s stand was favourable, and even apologetic, in relation to the GBM, as its strategy was based on discrediting the opposition using rhetorical devices such as ironization and metaphors. On the other hand, Egin hesitated between a neutral position and the necessity to please part of the imagined readership, and the newspaper alternated between neutral and hostile positions.

An important difference between Diario Vasco and Egin was that each newspaper did choose to report a different mobilization against the GBM. Egin reported a mobilization of people who were less famous and associated with a left-wing and pro-Basque-secessionism milieu in the Basque culture’s realm. There were three main reported leaders of the demonstration, which was
due to take place the same day the GBM would be officially inaugurated. The first one was Iñaki Uriarte, an architect who had written several articles against the GBM, some of them already examined in this chapter. The others were Arkaitz Zarraga, representative of an organization to stimulate the use of the Basque language, and a painter called Irkus Robles. The news report included a picture of the three leaders who looked like young men in their thirties. The use of direct and indirect quotation served to highlight that Egin was just describing the fact that the Basque culture representatives assertively displayed their Basque identity. This Basque identity was expressed through the rhetoric of ‘we’ versus ‘them’, which stressed the differences between the Basques’ own identity and projects, and other identities and projects that were being imposed on ‘us’. There can be found several examples of utterances of ‘we’ or ‘us’, pronounced together with indexicals such as Euskal Herria, especially in the news report’s second paragraph (B):

(1) This is the main reason for the mobilizations that will be made from now on, as it was uttered yesterday: even if the Guggenheim Museum has been built in Euskal Herria, people who work in the art and the general culture of Euskal Herria have not been consulted at all, and this is bringing several consequences to our cultural identity. [Egin, extract 30]

(2) Instead of creating the space that the Basque culture needs, they have created a different space.” The other space, without any doubt, “is a valuation of the foreign culture”. [Egin, extract 30]

(3) According to Arkaitz Zarraga’s statement, and “this happens in a moment in which our culture is quite oppressed; to tell the truth, if it survives, it is because people want it, because the money has diminished a lot”. [Egin, extract 30] [italics in the original]

In sentences (2) and (3) Egin followed the pattern of using direct quotation or footing to report the Basque culture representatives’ critical stand regarding the GBM’s cultural project. Nevertheless, in sentence (2) Egin’s use of indirect quotation was ambiguous; the modal ‘zelantzarik gabe’ (without any doubt) implicitly positioned Egin and warranted the value of the opposition group’s arguments. Some of the opposition’s arguments that Egin reported under quotation marks were the predictions that the GBM would receive all the funding available for culture and would sentence to death many Basque cultural projects; that it represented a cultural imperialism, and that it had been imposed. In the latter sentence such accusations were uttered along with the rhetoric of ‘us Basques’ versus others, ‘our’ culture versus an imposed culture. Given that the news report was written in Basque for a Basque language readership, it might be assumed that the Basque audience to which it was addressed would understand ‘we’ as ‘we Basques’, and ‘our culture’ as ‘our Basques’ culture’.
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In sentence (1) Egin did not use direct quotation and, even though it was clearly indicated that this statement was uttered by a Basque culture’s representative, the newspaper left less explicitly marked that its own position was different from the quoted utterance. It gave the impression that Egin’s actual position was not necessarily so neutral in the reporting of mobilizations against the GBM’s project, especially when those mobilizations came from a group who was politically close to the left wing party Batasuna, and favourable to Basque secessionism from the Spanish state. It can be noted how the ‘we’ uttered in Egin’s quotations of left-wing Basque culture representatives was characterised by its vagueness (Edwards & Potter, 1992). It can be depicted as an unspecific ‘we’, which served to create an imagined uniform Basque community, to mobilize a Basque group, assumed to be compact and homogeneous, against a common enemy. Anyway, the presence in Egin of a more or less explicit rhetoric of Basque identity’s assertion will be subject of a more qualitative discursive and rhetoric examination in the next chapter in which two Egin’s editorials will be compared. At this stage, it will be good to remind how in its political speeches the PNV also tended to adopt the rhetoric of unspecific and widely inclusive ‘we’ (see extracts 23 and 25).

In other words, it can be said that Egin was trying to keep a difficult balance between two different versions that could make its position look contradictory. At some point the left-wing newspaper did change its strategy of criticizing the GBM based on economic arguments, such as predictions of numbers of visitors. Once the museum and the Basque administrations’ policymakers proved that they could attract private funding the museum ceased to be represented as faded to imminent failure. Then Egin started to depict the GBM issue in a rather neutral way, tending to use quotation marks when a controversial argument was uttered in favour or against the GBM. This move was related to an increasing view of the museum as irreversible fact: a business and economic project which survival was guaranteed beyond a short-term.

Extract 30

1) In defence of the Basque culture [Headline] It is intended to claim the Basque Country’s identity and the artists’ creation work. [Subhead] A demonstration will be held Saturday in Bilbo, at six o’clock in the evening. [Subhead] Under the slogan “we are a country”, next Saturday, the 18th of this month, a demonstration will be held in the streets of Bilbao. This march will start in the Arenal and will finish in the elliptical Plaza and is meant to express an attitude that is opposed to the “cultural colonization” that will bring to the Basque Country the Guggenheim Museum, which is about to be open. This is what highlighted yesterday the architect Iñaki Uriarte, the member of Euskal Herrian Euskaraz Arkaitz Zarraga and the painter Irkus Robles [Subhead]. It cannot be denied that the Guggenheim is a clear
reality: the building is there and it has got a very important physical presence in the city. However, the cultural content that this building has to bear has been designed without considering anybody, and moreover, “it has been imposed”.

2) This is the main reason for the mobilizations that will be made from now on, as it was uttered yesterday: even if the Guggenheim Museum has been built in Euskal Herria, people who work in the art and the general culture of Euskal Herria have not been consulted at all, and this is bringing several consequences to our cultural identity.

“Instead of creating the space that the Basque culture needs, they have created a different space.” The other space, without any doubt, “is a valuation of the foreign culture”. According to Zarraga’s statement, and “this happens in a moment in which our culture is quite oppressed; to tell the truth, if it survives, it is because people want it, because the money has diminished a lot.”

3) Historical debt. [Subhead] Zarraga, Uriarte and Robles declared that the investment required by the Guggenheim Museum has caused an amazing reduction to other types of cultural expressions, and they provided several data: “Eleven groups – schools of bertsolaris, theatrical groups, etc – have been left without any money at all. Currently the Basque culture receives 1.5% of the budget the Jaurlaritza has got available, no more than that, a very small amount of money is given to publications in Basque, to the Basque press, and, after all, this is nothing else than historical debt”. Nowadays, already, it is said that the debt is completely institutionalized. Therefore, “a cultural colonization is taking place in Euskal Herria”. Given this entire situation, yesterday’s members talked about silence: “In face of this situation we have always been sensitive, but we have always expressed our disagreement in silence. It does not mean, though, that we agree, not at all. And now that the Museum will be open, we think that it is indeed time to provide a different kind of answer.” [Egin, news report, October 15, 1997, p. 48]

Egin is a newspaper that claimed to be left-wing, and in opposition to the Basque administrations’ policymakers. It was widely assumed that most of this newspaper’ readers sympathized with Batasuna, which encompassed several groups, including a Marxist branch. As it has been shown, two groups of artists organized mobilizations against the GBM to criticize the museum’s cultural project. Diario Vasco that tried to counter and undermine the movements' legitimacy, mainly through a negatively connoted description of his leader, reported one of the mobilizations organized by famous artists headed by Jorge Oteiza. These prestigious cultural agents were viewed as pivotal/historical figures of the Basque avant-garde movement and Basque culture’s politicization (Zulaika, 1997; Guasch, 1985), and their criticism against the Guggenheim Bilbao could be seen as potentially damaging the museum’s image in the Basque society. The other mobilization was organized by a group with an ideological profile that was close to Batasuna, and the event was foregrounded and built up as important only by Egin. Particularly, in Egin’s Basque language texts an explicit rhetoric of Basque culture and community assertiveness was uttered against the GBM. It depicted the Basques as a community of victims of cultural and political oppression perpetrated by diverse external agents. In the Basque culture’s agents' utterances quoted by Egin it was explicitly stated that the Guggenheim Bilbao “imposatu egin
6.3. The reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao's success after the museum's opening

6.3.0. Introduction

In this section will be examined how the Guggenheim Bilbao's success was reported in Egin and Diario Vasco in terms of numbers and origins of visitors. It will be pointed out that a main pattern was to emphasise the presence of tourists from Spain and abroad, and minimizing the important number of Basque tourists in the museum. Although it will be acknowledged that this choice in the Basque newspapers' reporting of the museum's success was partly due to a really important and well-documented presence of tourists from outside and from abroad (outside of Spain) in 1997 and 1998 (Viar, 2005; Guasch, 2005), this narrative will be examined in the light of underlying ideological dilemmas.

6.3.1. The Guggenheim Bilbao's success presented as a surprise

One month after the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum's opening the results of the first balances asserting that the GBM was a successful business were published in Diario Vasco, but not yet in Egin. Not unlike in the previous period, different versions of the debate over the museum’s economic implications were constructed drawing upon quantification rhetoric. In a Diario Vasco’s editorial’s headline (extract 31), “cien mil visitantes” (one hundred thousand visitors) was assumed to be a huge figure, implying a considerable success. It was published on November 20, 1997, and was one of the first examples of reporting of the Guggenheim Bilbao’s success in this newspaper. In the same editorial (extract 31), Diario Vasco highlighted that “La respuesta de los ciudadanos ante el nuevo museo ha sorprendido a todos” (The citizen’s feedback in face of the new museum has surprised everybody). The editorial’s reporting of the museum’s success can be described as highly favourable. It accounted for success that the museum was reported to have in attracting “los más cercanos” (the ones living closer), who were implied to be Basque visitors.
Further, it linked the important number of Basque visitors in the museum with the presence of 11% of visitors from Gipuzkoa, which was described as a proof that the GBM was a sort of "apuesta" (bet). The interest of Basque visitors was implicitly attributed to the fact that there was a "poderosa infraestructura cultural" (powerful cultural infrastructure) that had awakened the tourists' interest because they wanted to see something big and spectacular associated with power and prestigious international avant-garde culture. Nevertheless, the total and proportional numbers of Basque and other visitors was missing; nor was there a direct attribution made in Diario Vasco of why the museum attracted many Basque visitors. The Basque presence in the museum was depicted as a surprise, as unexpected, and by contrast the editorial pointed out that the GBM had another "apuesta" (bet), and "reto" (challenge): attracting foreign visitors to the Guggenheim Bilbao. In this editorials' first paragraph it was assumed that the GBM project's main goal was an economic one: whether it was attracting tourists, and whether these tourists were international. Here the real "reto" (challenge) was considered to be turning the GBM an attraction for international tourists.

Extract 31

'The one hundred thousand visitors of the Guggenheim' [Headline] The citizens' feedback in face of the new museum has surprised everybody: the investment on this powerful cultural infrastructure, has aroused the interest of the ones living closer, but the challenge for the future is attracting foreign visitors. An 11% of the public came from Gipuzkoa, which confirms the idea that the museum of Bilbao is a bet for the whole Basque Country. (El Diario Vasco, editorial, November 20, 1997, p. 28)

In the same day, another page of Diario Vasco (extract 32) reported that the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum's representatives did not expect to receive more than 225,000 visitors in 1997, but that it was likely that these numbers might be surpassed;

... but this number will possibly be surpassed, given that, apart from having surpassed the 100,000 visitors in its first month open to the public, "this number has been steadily achieved". [Diario Vasco, extract 32]

This comparison between the predictions and the numbers of visitors received by the GBM at this stage was reinforced by the voice of a policymaker who uttered that these numbers had been steadily achieved. Nonetheless, this predicted number was used as a numerical reference that here served to corroborate the idea that the GBM was not only a success, but that it could turn out to be a bigger success than previously expected. Although the text does not make clear whether 225,000 is to be considered a large number, because the GBM is presented as a success it is
implied that 225,000 is a large number. Here quantification rhetoric (Potter et al., 1991) was used to construct a version of the GBM’s success: figures of a success that was not predicted were presented as surprising and this served to descriptively build up the GBM as a big success. In this Diario Vasco’s news report the Basque visitors’ presence in the museum was not mentioned.

Extract 32
For 1997 the Guggenheim Bilbao had foreseen to receive 225,000 visitors, but this number will possibly be surpassed, given that, apart from having surpassed the 100,000 visitors in its first month open to the public, “this number has been steadily achieved”. (Diario Vasco, news report text, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

In a news report (extract 33) that Diario Vasco published, on December 2, 1997, the headline reported that data issued from what it was assumed to be a reliable source (the Basque statistic official agency ‘Eustat’) confirmed the GBM’s success. Eustat made a survey that indicated tourism in the Basque Country had risen thanks to an international sporting event that happened in San Sebastian, and also thanks to the Guggenheim.

Extract 33
The Eustat confirms the increase of tourism in October, because of the Mundial and the Guggenheim. (Diario Vasco, news report headline, December 2, 1997, p. 20)

Only in December 1997 did Egin report the GBM’s success (extract 34). The news report constructed a version of the GBM’s success by presenting an empirical comparison of numbers of all the different museums in Spain. It also drew upon numerical and non-numerical quantification rhetoric reflected in the choice of lexical expressions such as three times, record and numbers of visitors to show that the GBM had been receiving more visitors per day than any other Spanish museum in three consecutive occasions.

Extract 34
The Guggenheim has broken in three consecutive occasions the record number of visitors received in a single day by a Spanish state’s museum (Egin, news report text, December 17, 1997, p.44)

This rhetorical move in Egin that joined the strategy of reporting the GBM as a project that was enjoying much success was accompanied by references (extract 35) to previous predictions of numbers of visitors made before the museum’s opening.

Extract 35

202
The Guggenheim surpasses its most optimistic predictions. (Egin, front-page news report headline, January 17, 1998)

Extract 36
The Guggenheim of Bilbao reached already the 426,000 visitors. (Egin, news report headline, March 3, 1998, p. 41)

The first extract makes an explicit allusion to predictions made before the museum's opening. In extract 36, the use of "ya" (already) implied that numbers of visitors had previously been predicted, and that these figures might be exceeded. Both extracts used an explicit rhetoric of confirmation of the GBM's success, while still implying some surprise.

6.3.2. The museum's success presented as a fait accompli

In this subsection will be examined how the GBM's success started to be explicitly presented as a fait accompli not only by the museum's representatives, but also by Egin and Diario Vasco.

Thomas Krens, a main museum's representative and policymaker (extract 37), was quoted by Egin on January 17, 1998. The newspaper presented Krens and Vidarte as enthusiastically claiming that the museum had had an enormously positive acceptance. Egin remarked that both representatives were not having any doubts about this success by commenting on their tone: "en un tono que no deja lugar para la duda" (a tone that did not leave place for any doubts).

Extract 37
Splendidly. [Headline] More than a quarter of a million visitors in the Guggenheim, which has increased its entries by 22 %. [Subhead]. Juan Ignacio Vidarte and Thomas Krens were yesterday the protagonists of the first official appearance of the people responsible for the Guggenheim Museum since it opened its doors, and they used a tone that did not leave place for any doubts "We have had an enormously positive acceptance - pointed out Krens - and we need to make clear that this is the first museum of Europe". (Egin, news report, January 17, 1998, p. 45)

The headline suggests a lack of distance, as if Egin shared and warranted Krens' view that this is a splendid event. That is, Egin did not construct a tone of distance to report what can be considered a GBM policymaker's rhetoric of exaggeration and maximization of the museum. Egin also accompanied its footing of Krens' speech by an extra reminder that it was Krens' discourse: "señalo Krens" (pointed out Krens). Thomas Krens' hyperbolic depiction of the GBM as the first museum of Europe, was very generic and vague. This quoted fragment of Krens'
utterance did not convey any specific justification for such attribution: the Guggenheim Bilbao’s success was assumed to be a fait accompli. The extract does not suggest any position of distance from what is being reported. The comment that their tone does not leave place for doubt is not implying only that Krens had no doubts (and others might have), but that there is no place for doubts. In sum, Egin’s reporting of the GBM’s policymakers’ utterances implies association with their comments, not distancing.

Six months later (extract 38), Juan Ignacio Vidarte, was quoted by Diario Vasco as stating that “para mí la peor pesadilla sería que el Guggenheim muriera de éxito” (For me the worst nightmare would be if the Guggenheim died of success). This ambiguous sentence, found in a Diario Vasco’s headline, reinforced the idea that the Guggenheim was already, without any doubt, an enormous success. This is the rhetoric that claims excess of success, and rather it implies that success can bring problems. It was uttered by the quoted GBM representative who constructed a coquette phrase to highlight that there was no doubt that the Guggenheim Bilbao is a success, and that this is an amazing success. In addition, it is also implying that there must be more than economic/quantitative success, which implies that the success has been achieved. That is, the period of comparing the actual numbers of visitors with the previous previsions seemed to be already over. Now, the rhetoric of the GBM’s success moved to another level of evaluation of the success as a fait accompli.

Extract 38
Juan Ignacio Vidarte. Director of the Guggenheim museum. "For me the worst nightmare would be if the Guggenheim died of success". (El Diario Vasco, news report headline, August 2, 1998, p. 58)

At this stage, the debate over the GBM’s success cooled off. In 1998 Egin and Diario Vasco were not opposing each other. Both Basque newspapers focused mainly on witnessing this success, drawing upon quantification rhetoric in terms of numbers of visitors, and the dilemmas appeared to have been left behind. In the meantime, as most of the following extracts illustrate, Egin ceased to be concerned with stressing that they were quoting policymakers’ or other sources’ utterances to report the museum’s success; and they only continued using quotation when something was uttered in a tone of hyperbolic exaggeration. It had already become a commonplace assumption or doxa (Barthes, 1972) to associate the museum with economic success, and talk of the GBM’s big success was not considered an exaggeration, although it is implicit in the descriptions that the Guggenheim Bilbao’s success still needed to be constantly
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confirmed.

Extract 39
'The records of the Guggenheim museum [Headline] On the verge of completing the first anniversary of its opening, the Guggenheim can present a balance of results that happens to be spectacular. The number of visitors to the museum has exceeded all the expectations, trebling the number that was advanced in the previsions twelve months ago.' (Diario Vasco, editorial, October 14, 1998, p. 35)

Extract 40
A main difference between Diario Vasco’s and Egin’s reporting of the GBM’ success as a fait accompli was in the style, and not in the content and connotation. The Diario Vasco’s editorial (extract 39) used a baroque narrative style in which expressions such as “espectacular” (spectacular) and “desbordado” (exceeded) show what it might be depicted as the influence of a Spanish baroque rhetorical style. This rhetoric of hyperbolic metaphors and expressions was often found in Diario Vasco, side to side with quantification and other rhetoric, in the cultural and economic debates examined in this chapters' previous sections, and it was also deployed to charge against the museum’s detractors. Is this a typically Spanish identity style to do rhetoric, which has been adopted by the Diario Vasco and the PNV policymakers to target a wider audience in the Basque Country? By contrast, these extracts confirm that in Egin a more discreet and descriptive style predominated also in the reporting of the GBM’s success. With some exceptions that will soon be examined, examples of baroque style of rhetoric appeared in a contrast with Egin’s own style and in quotation marks.

It is important to note that one thing Egin’s and Diario Vasco’s abovementioned extracts have in common is that tourists were mentioned in a very generic way, without specifying their provenance, and no attributions were made of why so many tourists visited the Guggenheim Bilbao.
6.3.3. The reporting of those who were visiting it

Another way to look at how the representation of the GBM in terms of economic success and tourist attraction shifted in relation to previous reports is to observe who were reported to be the GBM's visitors. Are there more Basque visitors than Spanish and foreign visitors? Which are the implications of such reporting on the GBM's visitors? The next two subsections will examine extracts in which tourists were reported to come from the Basque Country, Spain or from abroad. In these cases, it is possible to find a few attributions of why these tourists came to see the museum, and the discursive use of such attributions will be analysed.

In the analysed Basque newspapers there were two general ways to report who were the people who went to see the Guggenheim Museum, and turned it into a success. There is a way that avoids describing who these people are in terms of geographical and national background: they can be described just as 'visitors' or 'tourists', or as a 'multitude' in the sense of a crowd. The reporting of whether these 'visitors' or 'tourists' were from the Basque Autonomy’s region, or from elsewhere, was a relevant question that both newspapers tackled on several occasions. First, there will be examined examples in Egin and Diario Vasco in which this question of whether the GBM’s public was from the Basque Country or from outside was reported in a very generic way, drawing upon statistic data.

In a news report (extract 41), Diario Vasco reported that according to a survey made in November 1997's first fifteen days, a profile of the GBM’s visitors can be worked out: 52% were Basque; 35% Spanish, and 13% foreigners. This explicit acknowledgement that the majority of the museum’s visitors were Basque was unusual in Diario Vasco. Interestingly, the information appeared not in the headline, but in the text's corpus, which served to suggest it was not so important. In addition, this information was followed by the quotation of a sentence uttered by Juan Ignacio Vidarte, a GBM’s representative. He attributed the predominance of Basque visitors to the season; to a specific situation: "Esa también es una buena cifra, porque no es la mejor época para estos turistas" (this is also a good figure, because this is not the best season for these tourists). Thus, Vidarte’s statement implied that had the survey been made in a different period of the year, the number of Spanish and foreign visitors would have been much bigger. His remark implies that he would wish the proportions of foreign tourists to be higher.
Neither the GBM’s one hundred thousand Basque visitors, nor the Basque citizens’ percentages of the survey made in November 1997 were mentioned in Egin. Actually, almost one year later, in October 1998, in Egin (extract 42) the results of another survey comparing percentages of Basque, Spanish, and foreign visitors to the GBM were reported. The survey described that a year after the GBM’s opening 41% visitors had come from Euskal Herria; 32% from the Spanish state, and 27% from other countries. In extract 43 can be read a prediction of visitors made by a policymaker before the GBM’s opening, which confirms that by early March 1998 (refer to extract 36) the actual number of visitors was much higher than what had been predicted.

Extract 41
Data about the visitor’s origin and profile was extrapolated through a survey that was made with 6,663 of the visitors that came in this month of November. 52% are Basques; 35% Spanish, and the remaining 13% foreigners. “This is also a good figure, because it is not the best season for these tourists”, indicated Vidarte. (El Diario Vasco, news report text, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

Extract 42
The general director highlighted the good ratios observed in relation to the visitor’s geographic origin (41% come from Euskal Herria, 32% from the Spanish state, and 27 from other countries of the world), as well as the self-funding level that has been achieved in this first year of life ... (Egin, news report text, October 20, 1998, p. 20)

Extract 43
A full-dress formal opening. [Headline] (...) According to the Basque authority’s previsions, the museum conceived as Bilbao’s and Euskadi’s economic revitalization’s flagship, will receive 400,000 visitors per year, of whom half will be foreigners. (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 18, 1997, p. 62)

Diario Vasco’s and Egin’s reporting suggest that the PNV and the museum’s policymakers’ target were both the Basque/Spanish and foreign tourists. The success, it was implied, involved Basques, Spanish and foreign tourists (and it is implied in roughly equal numbers): without either, or if one group was substantially larger than the other, there would be no success. Therefore, the claims of success were warranted by suggesting that both Basques and Spanish/foreign tourists were visiting, which explains the remark about the season accounting for the lower figure of foreign tourists (extract 41).
6.3.3.1. Why were some Basques visiting it?

The introduction of this section has examined how the PNV and the museum’s policymakers’ rhetoric of the GBM’s success showed concern with the question of how many foreign, Spanish and Basque tourists had visited the GBM. In addition, it has been noticed how the Basque nationalist newspapers could not deny what the numbers were also reflecting: that many Basques had indeed visited the museum. In this subsection will be examined how some Basques were reported to be visiting the GBM, and which reasons were attributed for their visit.

For instance, there was a general pattern in Egin and Diario Vasco of mentioning, in a same sentence, that there were three general groups of tourists according to their geographical origin: the Basques, the Spanish, and the rest. Thus Basque visitors were presented as just other visitors, along with Spanish and foreign visitors of the GBM. Moreover, it has already been examined how in the Basque newspapers’ reporting some emphasis tended to be put on the presence of foreign visitors who in Egin (extract 44) were described as “numerosos extranjeros” (many foreigners), albeit the newspaper was unspecific about how many were the “bilbainos” (people from Bilbao) who were mentioned in the same sentence. It was unclear whether there were many or just a few of them.

Extract 44

Along with the many foreigners who go around the galleries, the people from Bilbao explained their yearning to see the museum, because of the novelty and great coverage it has had in the media, even if some of them also said to be interested in contemporary art. (Egin, news report text, October 20, 1997, p. 25)

In Egin there was some explanation for how the museum had succeeded in attracting the curiosity of the people from Bilbao. Some doubts were cast on whether the local public could really be interested in arts. Rhetoric of irony was used, based on the assumption that it was very likely that the people’s claim to be genuinely interested in contemporary arts might be shallow, and hiding the underlying reality of their lack of interest in it (Edwards, 1996, p. 248).

... even if some of them also said to be interested in contemporary art. [Egin, extract 44]

As Kotthoff (2003) has argued, irony can express negative evaluations by implicatum: by stating them positively. In addition, their interest in the GBM was explicitly attributed to the “novedad y gran repercusión que ha tenido en los medios de comunicación” (novelty and great repercussion
it has had in the media), and they were implicitly depicted as being driven by an irrational urge to see the museum, as people who are manipulated by the media and felt an "ansia" to see the museum. "Ansia" is semantically ambiguous since it can suggest yearning or longing and also the more negatively connoted anxiety. The attribution of local people's interest in the museum to novelty also suggested that it might not last. Finally, in this Egin's description of ordinary local people who went to see the Guggenheim Bilbao, there was embedded an implicit construction of the reporter, the media, and its own version as representing the objective and rational side. Briefly, in the former extract (44) ordinary people’s interest in the GBM was acknowledged, but explained by extraneous factors (i.e. media coverage, publicity, and novelty), implied to be temporary, and not by art or by the museum itself.

In Diario Vasco (extract 45) it was reported that a retired elderly man was the GBM’s visitor number 10,000. The newspaper described him as being from “Basauri” and informed that his full name was “Jesús Gorostizaga”, and so he was represented as being a local man with a Basque surname.

Extract 45
A pensioner from Basauri, is the 100,000th Guggenheim visitor. [Headline] The pensioner from Basauri, Jesús Gorostizaga, was the visitor number 100,000 of the Museo Guggenheim Bilbao, that yesterday completed one month since its opening. [Subhead] Yesterday afternoon Jesús Gorostizaga, a 72 years old pensioner from Basauri, decided that it was a good day to visit the Guggenheim for the first time. On the queue with his wife and grand-daughter, he arrived short after 4.30PM, but to him they gave not only the bracelet-ticket, but also the poster that appointed him the visitor number 100,000, and a trip to New York. “You represent the acceptance the museum has had”, told him Vidarte. And Jesús Gorostizaga, very at ease in front of the journalists, stated to be “very happy, because seeing this museum and besides receiving myself the present of a trip is something to be grateful for”. (El Diario Vasco, front-page news report, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

A rhetoric of vivid reconstruction of the event was deployed with specific details such as at what time did him arrive to the museum; relatives who accompanied him; and which prizes he received from the museum. The GBM’s director Juan Ignacio Vidarte was quoted as uttering that “usted representa la acogida que ha tenido el museo” (“you represent the acceptance the museum has had), and a “le dijo Vidarte” (told him Vidarte) was added to the footing that stressed it had been said by Vidarte. Overall, the newspaper seemed to warrant the GBM’s policymakers' version: it described the pensioner as very much at ease and put this description after the comment about acceptance. Further, the Basque man was quoted as attributing his visit to what it could be very
vaguely understood as a curiosity to see the museum. According to Guasch (2005, p. 193), in the ‘Guggenheim Magazine’ (issued in October 1997) Thomas Krens had announced that the Guggenheim had become Basque, but Guasch argued that instead the museum had become less Basque simply because it has steadily attracted mainly visitors from abroad. As a matter of fact the only actual attributions of why some Basques went to see the museum could be found in Diario Vasco’s section of letters to the editor, but even these explanations were very vague, as the next extract illustrates.

Extract 46
Guggenheim, Butrón: free entry. [headline] For this colossal Californian cauliflower that in order to sort out an economic-artistic problem of the Salomon-Guggenheirn Foundation, exclusively and only we the Basque people have paid an agreed official price, 23,000 million pesetas that, obviously, is not the real (price), apart from the foreseen near losses, a minimum of 1,000 millions until the year 2000. Besides the abusive price of the ticket to enter the Guggenheim building, 700 pesetas, as a poor museum it should cost not much, it is necessary that consumer associations, social groups and politicians put pressure on the authorities and suitable institutions to set up, as it is obligatory in a museum made public money, one day per week of free access. (...) Therefore, and given the unacceptable outrage that is being made in these areas, unless they are classified as what they really are, show-business, and their legislation changes, it cannot be deferred and is indispensable, and I am confident that reason is on my side. (El Diario Vasco, letter to the director addressed by Iñaki Uriarte. December 30, 1997, p. 23)

In a letter to the editor published in Diario Vasco (extract 46) the author claimed the necessity of having a day every week in which the access to the GBM should be free, given that the Basque citizens were also funding it. The letter contained several assumptions that supported the Diario Vasco’s rhetoric of the GBM’s success. A main assumption was that the author took the GBM’s project as a fait accompli. It is necessary to highlight that the letter’s author’s name was mentioned at the bottom, and that the author’s name was very familiar in the debate over the GBM. Iñaki Uriarte, used to sign opinion articles in Egin as an architect, and had a role of some visibility in the debate, and later resurfaced as one of the organizers of a mobilization against the museum. There can be even cast some doubts on whether he was the same Iñaki Uriarte who took an active part in the left-wing Basque artists’ opposition movement. Although this time Uriarte was not presented as an architect, he was portrayed using a similar rhetoric of predicting economic loses that the Basque citizens would have to cover. Another interesting assumption in this Iñaki Uriarte’s letter is the confirmation that the Basques would go to see the museum if it was less expensive. In sum, he was not saying that the Basques had been actually visiting the GBM, but that many of them who wanted to see it could not afford to pay the entry ticket; and he indirectly confirmed the version that the Basques wanted to see the Guggenheim Bilbao, without
making any attributions for such interest.

**6.3.3.2. The reporting of it as a museum that attracts many Spanish and foreign tourists**

This subsection will examine how both *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* tended to describe who were the visitors by highlighting the presence of foreign and Spanish tourists in the museum, and sometimes by downplaying or omitting the presence of Basque visitors.

Incidentally, extracts 47 and 48 reflect that hyperbolic expressions until then used exclusively by *Diario Vasco* to refer to the GBM’s huge success had already been incorporated by *Egin*’s Basque and Spanish language news reports. Both of *Egin*’s extracts reproduced an expression which had been repeated very often in *Diario Vasco* and other media and became a cliché related to versions of the museum’s success: *the spectacular Guggenheim museum and its spectacular success*. At this stage, the museum’s success was assumed to be a fait accompli; and no footing was used by *Egin* to indicate that the adjective spectacular was an exaggeration uttered by policymakers or other supporters of the project;

Bertako nahiz kanpoko turista andana ikusgarriak erakarri ditu Guggenheim Museoak ... *(The Guggenheim Museum has attracted spectacular queues of local and outside tourists ...)* [*Egin*, extract 47]

El caprichoso y espectacular museo Guggenheim, que algunos días ha rebasado los 9.000 visitantes, ... *(The capricious and spectacular Guggenheim museum, that on some days has surpassed the 9,000 visitors)* [*Egin*, extract 48]

**Extract 47**

In Easter, the Guggenheim Museum has attracted to Bilbo spectacular queues of local tourists and from outside, and it has provided a new liveliness to the capital that previously used to become empty. (*Egin*, front-page news report headline, April 12, 1998)

In the Basque language news report it was stated that the museum’s success was due to big numbers of “bertako” (local), and “kanpoko” (from outside) tourists. This use of “bertako” and “kanpoko” is more ambiguous and unspecific than it seems at first sight. Because the text is written in Basque, the reader tends to understand “bertako” as referring to people from the Basque Country, and “kanpoko”, as people from outside the Basque Country. However, here it is missing an explicit mention of any Basques, Spanish and foreigners, and the formula
*bertako/kanpoko* permits an ambiguity. So, it can be said that the text suggests that many tourists visited the museum, among them many Basques, but it did not explicitly say whether these "*bertako*" referred only to the Basques, and whether "*kanpoko*" referred only to international tourists or also to Spanish tourists. Such ambiguity when *Egin* addresses to its audience within rhetoric of us versus others has been examined in detail in the next chapter.

**Extract 48**

Foreigners even in Prim [Headline] On how is Bilbo-Bilbao of tourists and why, in the middle of the Guggenheim fever. [Subhead] The capricious and spectacular Guggenheim museum, that on some days has surpassed the 9,000 visitors, has put Bilbao in the international agenda of leisure and has triggered an unknown tourist invasion and a catering and commercial euphoria almost forgotten on the banks of the Ibaizabal estuary, still unpresentable. (*Egin*, news report in last page, September 15, 1998)

In an *Egin*’s Spanish language news report, published on September 15, 1998 (extract 48), the presence of Basque visitors was omitted, and the focus was on stressing that many international tourists had been visiting the museum;

has put Bilbao in the international agenda of leisure. [*Egin*, extract 48]

has triggered an unknown tourist invasion and a catering and commercial euphoria almost forgotten on the banks of the Ibaizabal estuary. [*Egin*, extract 48]

The depiction of the situation as "*una invasión turística desconocida*" (an unknown tourist invasion), served to stress that tourists are coming from outside the Basque Country. The following extracts illustrate how *Egin*’s reporting of who were visiting the GBM tended to select and emphasise examples of Spanish or foreign visitors to the museum. It served to confirm the PNV and GBM policymakers’ implicit version that the museum’s success depended mainly on foreign tourists, although it does not mean that they did not assume that Basque support was also necessary for the success. Thus, the examples and numbers of Spanish and foreign tourists in the museum had the function to confirm the implicit narrative that the GBM was a success because it was able to have an international impact.

**Extract 49**

The Guggenheim’s level ground, a dancing room. [Headline] (...) The dancers’ evolutions were immortalized by the tourists’ cameras, many of whom had Oriental features. (*Egin*, news report, June 17, 1998, last page)
Out of the total amount of visitors, approximately 20% come from outside the Spanish state, mainly from European countries and the United States. This percentage has increased up to 40% in the first summer season that is living the Guggenheim-Bilbao Museum. (Egin, news report text, August 8, 1998, last page)

It can be noticed that in all the abovementioned fragments of Egin’s news reports no attributions were made of why Spanish and foreign tourists were coming to see the museum.

In the same period Egin also reported the visit of some prestigious international architects to the Guggenheim Bilbao (extracts 51 and 52). It seems that rhetoric of category entitlement was deployed by Egin to stress the visits’ quality. Apparently, at this stage Egin assumed that his readers had some doubts about the museum’s quality and validity. Thus, selecting events with presence of international architects, and other experts, visiting the GBM could be considered rhetoric that stressed the international academic acknowledgement and legitimacy of the museum.

Extract 51
Philip Johnson, United State’s architect of international prestige, visited yesterday the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum to record a program on this building for the television channel BBS, informed sources of the art gallery. (Egin, news report text, February 5, 1998, p. 5)

Extract 52
Architects of all over the world saw Bilbao yesterday. [Headline] The 700 architect and experts who are participating in the Second World Meeting of steel buildings that started on Monday, saw yesterday the most important architecture works of Bilbao, including the Guggenheim. (Egin, front-page news report, May 13, 1998)

The following extracts will illustrate that also in Diario Vasco a very common strategy to report the identity of the museum’s visitors was stressing their foreign or Spanish identity.

Extract 53
Over the last summer the Basque Country registered an increase of 32.4% in the number of visitors in relation to the previous year’s same period. Tourism coming from the rest of Spain increased a 28% and from abroad a 40.3%. Biscay and, more precisely, Bilbao, is the zone where a bigger increase of tourists has been recorded due to the Guggenheim museum’s attraction. (El Diario Vasco, news report text, November 19, 1998, p. 19)

On November 19, 1998, Diario Vasco published the results of other surveys that confirmed the increasing interest of tourists in the GBM (extract 53). Here the newspaper drew upon rhetoric of
numbers that confirmed how important were the Spanish and the foreign tourists for the GBM’s success. The statistical figures pointed out that their presence had increased, as well as the benefits the presence of tourists from outside the Basque Country was already bringing to Bilbao and other Basque territories. This rhetoric that constructed a version of the museum based on numerical and non-numerical quantification rhetoric, involving figures of foreign and Spanish tourists to the museum, had been very common in Diario Vasco since the museum’s opening.

Extract 54
Scale in Donosti. [Headline] (...) With the short period gone by since the museum’s opening, it is early to make statistics and to set up patterns of behaviour, but hotels and restaurants have started to notice what it is to have a temple of contemporary art one hour away by highway. (...) José Juan Castillo, from the restaurant Casa Nicolasa has got it clear ... “we are noticing that quite a lot of people come to see the museum as a main goal, and later they travel to know San Sebastián. They are mainly foreigners who have links with the world of architecture, Italians, French, South Americans, and quite a lot of people from Madrid, and Catalans who come to eat and tell you that they have come to know the museum. In the restaurant Akelarre, that is run by Pedro Subijana they have also noticed it. “this bank holiday long weekend has been amazing, loads of Catalans and people from Madrid, and the majority commented to Pedro that they had been in Bilbao seeing the museum”, explains the manager woman. Later, in some time the statistics will arrive, but right now the people working in the catering business do already sense that the Guggenheim will bring to the Basque Country more than works of art. (El Oiario Vasco, news report, December 14, 1997, p. 3)

Extract 55
The Guggenheim increases by 80% the Italian tourism in Euskadi. (El Diario Vasco, news report headline, October 10, 1998, p. 25)

Extract 56
Excuse me, where are you from? – We? From Barcelona. This answer is the most repeated in the Inmaculada’s day among visitors of the Guggenheim. Javier and Esther, a couple from Huesca who live in Barcelona –he, economist; she, administrative-, said that they had arrived to Bilbao on the wave of the new museum’s fashion, “and because we are very fond of the Bay of Biscay”. (El Diario Vasco, news report text, December 14, 1998, p. 2 special supplement on the GBM)

Extract 54 described how restaurants and hotels from Gipuzkoa, which is not the same Basque province as Biscay, also had increased economic benefits because the GBM was not far away by car, and many mainly international tourists, though also Basque tourists, travelled and stayed visiting Gipuzkoa;

With the short period gone by since the museum’s opening, it is early to make statistics and to set up
patterns of behaviour, but hotels and restaurants have started to notice what it is to have a temple of contemporary art one hour away by highway. [Diario Vasco, extract 54]

Here, *Diario Vasco* indirectly attributed the interest of the foreign tourists to the fact that they wanted to visit “*un templo del arte contemporáneo*” (a temple of contemporary art).

In the second news report (extract 55), it was reported that the number of Italian visitors to the Basque Country had increased by 80% due to the attraction of the GBM, but without saying why Italians were coming to see the museum.

Finally, by the end of the year 1998 (extract 56) *Diario Vasco* reported one case of Spanish tourists who came to visit the museum. In the news report it was pointed out that the couple lived in Barcelona, although they were from Huesca, which is also outside the Basque Country. Their visit to the museum was attributed to the fact that they followed the trend to visit a new museum that became a fashion, and because they liked the region’s seaside;

they said to have arrived to Bilbao on the wave of the new museum’s fashion, “and because we are very fond of the Bay of Biscay”. [Diario Vasco, extract 56]

Footing was used by *Diario Vasco* to stress that such explanations of why the two youngsters visited the museum was a quotation of the tourists’ own utterances. And thus this was presented as an objective and factual account. This is actually a very rare example of *Diario Vasco* quoting ordinary people’s talk, and was selected because it confirmed the policymakers’ version of the GBM as a museum that would turn all the Basque Autonomous region a tourist attraction.

6.4. The reporting of the attempts at rapprochement between the 
Guggenheim Bilbao and the Basque artists

6.4.0. Introduction

This section will examine how the approach between the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and the Basque artists was negotiated and the different stages of this negotiation were reported in the Basque newspapers in terms of constructed versions of the events, attributions and rhetoric. A
main hypothesis is that the use of a rhetoric of Basque identity by PNV policymakers and *Diario Vasco* was a strategy aiming at mobilizing representative personalities of the Basque artists’ milieu who had opposed the Guggenheim Bilbao. This will involve looking at the museum’s supporters’ rhetoric of reconciliation between the Basque artists and the museum, and to how it overlapped with rhetoric of Basque identity assertiveness. That is, the Basque identity was assumed to be one of the most consensual values in a politically fragmented Basque society, and economic success was not considered enough to guarantee the museum’s political legitimacy. Therefore, a version was constructed that intended to use the prestige of some symbolic personalities in the domain of Basque arts to rebut the arguments that the Guggenheim Bilbao was not concerned with Basque identity and culture. This was part of what will be defined as rhetoric of reconciliation without restrictions that was proposed by the PNV policymakers.

6.4.1. A frustrated negotiation between the Guggenheim Bilbao and the old generation of Basque artists

Here there will be examined examples from different extracts of texts that reported an attempted reconciliation of the Guggenheim Bilbao with Jorge Oteiza, the most prominent leader of the Basque artists’ opposition. It will be argued that both newspapers drew upon rhetoric of reconciliation of the two sides in the conflict represented by Jorge Oteiza and the Guggenheim Museum; and that *Egin* used the rhetoric of reconciliation with some reservations to report the event of rapprochement making explicit mention of the existence of a former debate and confrontation between the museum and the Basque artists.

There are some examples of the use of the expressions "*aproximación*" (rapprochement) and "*acercamiento*" (rapprochement) in *Egin*. Semantically, these expressions have got a more descriptive and cautious connotation than the use of expressions such as "*se unen*" (they unite) in *Diario Vasco* to report the project of signing an agreement of collaboration between the Jorge Oteiza Foundation and the Guggenheim Bilbao. That is, apparently neutral and subtly different descriptions serve to construct diverse versions, and suggest different readings of what is going on (Edwards and Potter, 1992);

Juan Ignacio Vidarte confirmed yesterday that in the last months took place a rapprochement between the museum that he directs, the Guggenheim, and Jorge Oteiza, who seems to have filed an important part of the contrary attitude that since a beginning he had manifested against the former. [*Egin*, extract 57]
What is happening now is something that we have tried for a long time, although with more rapprochement in the last months. [Egin, extract 57]

The Oteiza foundation and the Guggenheim unite to boost the sculptor’s work. [Headline] [Diario Vasco, extract 59]

A main difference I want to stress between Diario Vasco’s and Egin’s rhetoric of reconciliation, is that Egin did manifest some restrictions in the reporting of reconciliation between the parts, while Diario Vasco’s version assumed there would be an unconditional and unrestricted reconciliation, as it will be examined later.

Extract 57
Oteiza looks at the Guggenheim. [Headline] The sculptor and the museum have got “an interest in common”, according to Vidarte. [Subhead] It is wanted to make a retrospective in 1999. [Subhead] He confirms that they have not talked about specific works yet. [Subhead] Juan Ignacio Vidarte confirmed yesterday that in the last months took place a rapprochement between the museum that he directs, the Guggenheim, and Jorge Oteiza who seems to have filed an important part of the contrary attitude that since a beginning he had manifested against the former. “We have an interest in common”, said Vidarte. [Subhead] What is happening now is something that we have tried for a long time, although with more rapprochement in the last months. Our intention was clear, we want to fill a hollow that the museum has in relation to Oteiza’s work, and we want to make it in a double aspect: on the one hand, incorporating some of his works to our permanent collection, and, on the other, organizing a big retrospective. Both are channels that interest us and that we try to develop. The Guggenheim Museum has manifested countless times and for a long time its interest to have the work of Jorge Oteiza who, on his turn, has on many occasions manifested publicly his contrary stance in relation to the art gallery; he even said that to the Guggenheim he would only go “guns blazing”. However, as the time went by, the sculptor seems to have given way - “maybe the fact that he has seen it finished has something to do with this change”, points out Vidarte (…)’ (Egin, news report, February 20, 1998, p. 20)

At this point I will start by analysing how in Egin’s rhetoric of reconciliation significant emphasis was put on how contradictory it seemed to be that someone like Oteiza would suddenly decide to accept an invitation to exhibit his works in the GBM. These are a few of the many examples in which Egin highlighted that Oteiza was the leader of the Basque artists’ opposition against the Guggenheim Bilbao;

...Jorge Oteiza who, on his turn, has in many occasions manifested publicly his contrary stance in relation to the art gallery; he even said that to the Guggenheim he would only go “guns blazing”. [Egin, extract 57]

Jorge Oteiza has headed for years the Basque artists’ opposition to the Guggenheim, which the sculptor from Orio labelled even as “pure Euskodisney fraud”. He even uttered that to the museum “he would only
The same high level of emphasis on the former controversy is not found in *Diario Vasco*: the newspaper tended to neutralize the importance of the former debate by mentioning it, but concluding the same sentence with the argument that at this stage the Basque artists should be now pragmatic and should turn the Guggenheim Basque;

The artist from Orio – always very critical with the museum – reasons more pragmatically and considers that since the art gallery is already a reality, what proceeds is to “turn Basque” the museum. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 63]

Jorge Oteiza maintains alive his criticism of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and its philosophy, but from his last pragmatism he considers that once it is already built is better to use it than to turn one’s back on it. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 63]

This was a new argument and debate that *Diario Vasco* attributed to Jorge Oteiza who was quoted on several occasions as making a statement that was assumed to serve as a justification for Oteiza’s change of opinion. This argument was presented as something uttered by Oteiza, and thus as something not invented by *Diario Vasco* or a PNV politician who might be accused of having stake. The newspaper could have picked up other Oteiza’s utterances, but this one did serve to support the PNV policymakers’ version that the Guggenheim Bilbao could be turned Basque and that consequently Basque artists should make it up with the museum. This can be considered an example of ontological gerrymandering (Potter, 1996) that served to support a particular position by presenting the argument as based on something that has been actually uttered by Oteiza, and not by a PNV policymaker;

But the change of opinion, regarding the museum, of Oteiza who already declared last Friday in this journal, as yesterday recalled Mari Karmen Garmendia, that since it already exists it would be wise to “turn it Basque”, started before and in that the architect of the Guggenheim’s building, Frank Gehry, has played. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 59]

The sculptor considers that since “it is so difficult to make something together between us, the Basques”, once the building is built it should be “turned Basque”. “What exists inside the Guggenheim should be Basque”, he adds. [*Diario Vasco*, extract 63]

Interestingly, *Diario Vasco* reported that Mari Carmen Garmendia, a PNV policymaker, and the Basque government’s head of culture, stressed the fact that it was Oteiza who uttered such
argument. Indirectly, a distance was constructed between the newspaper and an utterance that was attributed to a PNV policymaker who ultimately assumed the version that the museum was interested in contemporary Basque culture, and that the Basque artists wanted to exhibit their works in the GBM. This rhetoric proposed a new debate: that the GBM could be turned Basque. Nevertheless, an alternative narrative of the museum being chiefly concerned with international avant-garde can be found in Juan Huarte’s, the director of the Jorge Oteiza Foundation, accounts of why they managed to reach an agreement, and why a Jorge Oteiza’s works’ retrospective was considered to suit the Guggenheim Bilbao’s policies;

“No, no, look. Actually, Oteiza was awarded with the International Prize of sculpture of Sao Paulo in 1957, and in the 59 he considered finished his experimental artistic work. Thus, the Jorge Oteiza Foundation tries to put him in the place he is entitled to have as a very important European sculptor of the twentieth century. Hence the initiatives for a retrospective of him that would be made in the Guggenheim-Bilbao (…)”. [Egin, extract 58]

“The agreement has been quick because the objective is the same: to situate Jorge in the place that belongs to him as master of the European school”, pointed out Juan Huarte, president of the Jorge Oteiza Foundation. [Diario Vasco, extract 59]

The above listed fragments containing quotations of Jorge Oteiza Foundation’s president’s utterances (extracts 58 and 59), illustrate how Juan Huarte presented a different version of why Jorge Oteiza had been chosen to exhibit in the museum. In Huarte’s version Oteiza’s Basque identity is not mentioned, and instead the artist is presented as a great European sculptor. Thus, it can be argued that the fragments of Huarte’s talk that were quoted in the newspapers were oriented at constructing a version that would serve to rebut accusations that Oteiza’s reputation as the head of the Basque artists’ opposition to the GBM would be used and manipulated by the GBM and the PNV policymakers.

Extract 58
The travelling retrospective. [Headline] The exhibition of Jorge Oteiza in the Guggenheim-Bilbo will run the world. [Subhead] So was stated by Juan Huarte, responsible for the Oteiza foundation in Madrid. [Subhead] (...) Juan Huarte denies that the already well-known efforts and negotiations to install Jorge Oteiza in the Guggenheim-Bilbao constitute a “wrecking operation”. Something undeniable is clarified to him. That the world of arts and its secrets are being turned disproportionate with a view to the masses, to which has contributed quite a lot the highly publicized embracement of Zabalgana in front of a lay viewer who is unaware but not stupid, who started to question many things, even more when he knew that such hustle (or intrigue) concerns his taxes and pockets. With these operations, which are actually merely embellishments, a plot is made in an almost Masonic way, and with mysteries of cold war. 219
“No, no, look. Actually, Oteiza was awarded with the International Prize of sculpture of Sao Paulo in 1957, and in the 59 he considered finished his experimental artistic work. Thus, the Jorge Oteiza Foundation tries to put him in the place he is entitled to have as a very important European sculptor of the twentieth century. Hence the initiatives for a retrospective of him that would be made in the Guggenheim-Bilbao and, I am going to give you an exclusive, once it is brought to a close, it would travel through all the world. (...)” (Egin, news report, February 21, 1998, p. 46, written by the writer and journalist Rafael Castellanos)

Extract 59
The Oteiza Foundation and the Guggenheim unite to boost the sculptor's work. [Headline] The museum from Bilbao will receive a retrospective in the 99, and will buy works of the artist from Orio. [Subhead] The adjective “historical” was brought up several times in the signing of the agreement between the Jorge Oteiza Foundation, and the Guggenheim Bilbao Foundation for the carrying out of a retrospective exhibition of the sculptor from Orio in the most modern Basque museum, and the acquisition of works for his permanent collection. “The agreement has been quick because the objective is the same: to situate Jorge in the place that belongs to him as the master of the European school”, pointed out Juan Huarte, president of the Jorge Oteiza Foundation. The next step will be to start the selection of work for the exhibition, which the Guggenheim seeks to bring to other museums in the world. (...) The influence of Gehry. [Subhead] The contact between the two foundations started through the telephone two months ago, and yesterday’s was the second meeting the four signatories had, after the previous meeting four weeks ago in Bilbao. “A very quick agreement because the objective is the same”, emphasized Huarte. But the change of opinion, regarding the museum, of Oteiza who already declared last Friday in this journal, as yesterday recalled Mari Karmen Garmendia, that since it already exists it would be wise to "turn it Basque", started before and in that the architect of the Guggenheim's building, Frank Gehry, has played. “Gehry knew that Jorge detested him and his architecture, but he did not bother at all. He continued considering him the best sculptor in the world and used to compare him with Le Corbusier and Picasso. It touched him deep and drove him to make this turn”, reminded Huarte. (Diario Vasco, news report, March 11, 1998, p. 56)

In Egin's news report (extract 58) Juan Huarte is said to have denied that the rapprochement between the GBM and Oteiza was part of a plot to destroy the Basque artists' opposition movement. This text could be described as a hybrid between opinion article and news report, and was explicitly signed by a quite well-known writer and journalist. He constructed a version of the event in which it is suggested that Oteiza might have become an accomplice of a manipulation of image of the GBM; and this version was presented within rhetoric of comparing this event with the Masonic plots and cold war mysteries;

With these operations, which are actually merely embellishments, a plot is made in an almost Masonic way, and with mysteries of cold war. [Egin, extract 58]

In addition, it should be noted that in the same Egin's news report (extract 58) Juan Huarte's quoted utterance depicted a Jorge Oteiza who had ceased to do sculptural work almost forty years
ago. This implicit depiction of Jorge Oteiza as someone practically inactive has got a negative connotation, and it might be a reason why Egin's writer selected to quote this specific fragment of discourse.

6.4.1.1. Rhetoric of expected surprise?

An Egin’s news report was entitled (extract 60) “la vuelta a casa del hijo pródigo” (the prodigal son’s return home). The biblical metaphor of the prodigal son suggested that Oteiza had been a rebel who would end up returning home. Joseba Zulaika (2005, p. 160) has highlighted that Oteiza has been for decades the main disseminator of the message of contemporary avant-garde in the Basque Country, and a worldwide admired artist. The same author argued that “Oteiza’s paradox consists in that while New York’s world-class artists will consider him as their equal (Serra10 conceded to a reporter that he thought Oteiza was the greatest living sculptor, and Gehry called him one of the three or four fundamental artists of the century), the Krensified franchise museum will reduce him to a local artist whose value is seen as quite negligible” (Zulaika, 2005, p. 160).

Extract 60
The prodigal son’s return home. [Headline] Oteiza has led the artists’ opposition to the museum. [Subhead] He said that he would “only go guns blazing”. [Subhead] Jorge Oteiza has headed for years the Basque artists’ opposition to the Guggenheim, which the sculptor from Orio labelled even as “pure Euskodisney fraud”. He even uttered that to the museum he would “only go guns blazing”. He visited the art gallery, one month before its opening, at the invitation of its author, the architect Frank Gehry. This visit marked the beginning of his approach to the project. [Subhead] One month before the opening of the museum from Bilbao, unexpectedly, the sculptor from Orio visited the exhibition gallery’s works invited by its author, the architect Frank Gehry, whom he had not known personally until then. That encounter, the first of several visits of Oteiza to the Guggenheim – he also met Richard Serra –, seemed to be the beginning of an approach that had been bolstered by the sculptor’s environment, as recognized, in October of last year, by the president of the Oteiza Foundation, Juan Huarte. On that date he officially announced the opening of the Oteiza Museum in Alzuza for 1999. (B) Oteiza had not yet taken any decision about his presence in the Guggenheim, a museum against which he had directly fought, but the sculptor, said Huarte, “his friends and colleagues are putting pressure over him” in this sense. Anyway, in case he decided to install any of his works in Bilbo, it should be “with the maximum representation at his level, not in a corner”. On the 15 of December another bomb exploded: Oteiza and Eduardo Chillida were reconciled in a meeting celebrated in Zabalaga, the future Chillida museum in Hernani. With a text that was endorsed and signed by both – Beyond our differences there will be always a ‘space-time’ for the peace” -, as well as a hug to the posterity in front of the sculpture “Besarkada” [embrace], the two maximum creators of contemporary Basque art closed a wound that had been open for decades.

10 Sculptor Richard Serra
In the long series of reactions provoked at the time by the two artists’ reencounter can be found Juan Ignacio Vidarte’s, director of the Guggenheim-Bilbo, who asked if the reconciliation could mean an approach of Oteiza to the museum pointed out that “it would please us. We have always manifested that we would like that both Chillida and Oteiza be represented in the museum: Oteiza is already represented, and Jorge no, because he has not considered it convenient”. The desire to have the sculptor was obvious, to the point that two months later, on the last 18 of February, Vidarte travelled to Zarautz to have an interview with Oteiza. The previous negotiations had been channelled through the Oteiza Foundation, with the intention to get Oteiza to accept the realization of a retrospective in the Guggenheim, as a way to allow his entry to the museum. For Vidarte, “maybe the fact of having seen the museum finished has some relation to this change”. (D) Virulent opposition [Subhead] The discredit that Oteiza has poured out over the last years against Gehry’s project has made history. In a letter addressed to the mayor of Tolosa and to Mari Karmen Garmendia, and published in this newspaper in March 95, he stated that “our culturally impoverished towns make-up as old whores to Guggenheim for the poor tourism”. “Go ahead Guggenheim, this country is yours – he uttered on another occasion -. This country that even to organise a football team has to bring people from outside, when before it was natural and beautiful, this country to which its politicians suppressed the possibility to investigate artistic languages and that managed to marginalize our artists who overtook the same avant-garde movements. Go ahead Guggenheim, your Basquedisney circus, the moment you like”. On his book “Chronicle of a seduction”, Joseba Zulaika tells that as soon as the interview started, Oteiza told him: “Stop writing and talking rubbish. Kill them. I will pay you”, while the troika formed by Krens, Gehry and Serra, continued stating their admiration for the sculptor and maintained the invitation for him to exhibit in the museum of Bilbao. (Egin, news report, March 11, 1998, p. 50)

Some months earlier, Egin had depicted another event of reconciliation as something that took everybody by surprise, and compared it with a bomb;

On the 15 of December another bomb exploded: Oteiza and Eduardo Chillida were reconciled in a meeting celebrated in Zabalaga, the future Chillida museum in Hernani. [Egin, extract 60]

In the same news report’s subhead rhetoric of contrast was drawn upon to suggest how unexpected was the change of opinion of Oteiza who was portrayed by Egin as someone who had stated he would only enter in the GBM using violence, such as shooting bullets. His change of opinion is attributed to an invitation by Frank Gehry to come together to visit the museum;

He even uttered that to the museum he would “only go guns blazing”. He visited the art gallery, one month before its opening, at the invitation of its author, the architect Frank Ghery. This visit marked the beginning of his approach to the project. [Subhead] [Egin, extract 65]

Egin’s version presented the Guggenheim’s director, Krens, the architect, Gehry, and the sculptor Serra as people who had manifested their admiration and recognized Oteiza’s talent, and wanted
Oteiza to exhibit his works in the GBM. It is explicitly mentioned that this interpretation is based on a research made by Joseba Zulaika in his book about the GBM entitled “Chronicle of a seduction” (Zulaika, 1997), in which Oteiza was presented as someone who stated that he wanted to kill this very same people who admired him. This version seems to suggest that Oteiza was seduced by the GBM; nevertheless, this idea of seduction refers to a mutual seduction and it has not an explicitly negative connotation. It can be said that the connotation is rather positive in the sense that some relevant figures linked to this project are depicted as having expressed their admiration for Oteiza, and it is implied this is an achievement for the Basque artist. Thus Egin used indirect quotation of Joseba Zulaika’s book to build up a cautious distance suggesting that the journalist based the attribution on reliable academic sources. These attributions Egin made of Oteiza’s reasons to join the museum reflected the newspaper’s difficult and dilemmatic position. There is a conflict between the idea that the Guggenheim Bilbao should be criticized because it did not recognize the value of Basque artists and culture; and the opposed idea that it could serve as a platform for Basque artists’ individual recognition, and eventually might benefit the Basque artists as a whole (Billig et al, 1988);

Oteiza told him: “Stop writing and talking rubbish. Kill them. I will pay you”, while the troika formed by Krens, Ghery and Serra, continued stating their admiration for the sculptor and maintained the invitation for him to exhibit in the museum of Bilbao. [Egin, extract 65]

Egin also quoted Oteiza attributing the artist’s change of opinion to the fact that he might have realized now that the GBM was a fait accompli. It has to be noted that even in Vidarte’s quoted utterances, Egin did not mention Oteiza as stating that now the Guggenheim Bilbao should be turned Basque;

For Vidarte, “maybe the fact of having seen the museum finished has some relation to this change”. [Egin, extract 60]

Oteiza had not yet taken any decision about his presence in the Guggenheim, a museum against which he had directly fought, but the sculptor, said Huarte, “his friends and colleagues are putting pressure over him” in this sense. [Egin, extract 60]

Another hypothesis that Egin mentioned to account for Oteiza’s change of opinion was conveyed through the quotation of the Oteiza Foundation’s director’s utterances. In the latter fragment, Juan Huarte attributed the decision to pressures coming from colleagues and friends. So this version implied that Oteiza was vulnerable to change his mind according to pressures. In the
same page Egin published an opinion article (extract 61) that again used a religious metaphor that compared Oteiza with the devil. Oteiza is depicted as a very smart old man, and it is suggested that all his long dialectic process of criticism against the Guggenheim Bilbao can now be reinterpreted. The opinion article, signed by a well-known writer and journalist, recognized some values of Oteiza, and emphasised how rich (in terms of complexity) and influential has been his dialectic that, according to the author’s narrative, brought him to the museum. The article suggested that Oteiza had cheated everybody in order to get an exhibition in the GBM with all the honours, and that he had now accomplished his secret goal.

Extract 61

More for devil than for old. [Headline] (...) Nobody will dare say Oteiza is good. It is implicit in a legend chiselled blow to blow. Constant is the priests’ argument that the devil’s greatest skill consists in persuading gullible people of his non-existence. The Devil, let’s review Milton, or the adventures and doubts of Christ in the deserts, is the grand master of self-promotion through the word, the omnipresence, the ubiquity in somebody else’s languages, similar, foolish, know-it-all, analytical, or full of disdain. Oteiza is in the Guggenheim more for devil than for old, and it should be meditated by a whole youth who owes him, read, repeated, recreated or half given up, a very valuable discourse. One must be very obtuse not to have sensed that Oteiza i.e. his work of sculpture, is in the Guggenheim-Bilbao, along with the other no less transcendental one, the dialectic, far before it was erected near the estuary the big titanium insect. (Egin, opinion article, March 11, 1998, p. 50)

Although, this Egin's opinion article's version of Oteiza's approach to the GBM portrayed the sculptor as someone who cheated and manipulated everybody, it also implicitly assumed that exhibiting one's own works in the museum was an accomplishment, and maybe unwittingly suggested admiration for the artist. Again, it reflected an underlying ideological dilemma: Egin wanted to resist the museum's policymakers' argument that the GBM could benefit the local artists, and thus it was omitted that Oteiza's invitation to exhibit in the museum might be perceived by many as an achievement and recognition of a local/Basque artist as an international symbol of contemporary art (Billig et al, 1988).
An early example of rhetoric of reconciliation, used to depict an agreement between the Guggenheim Museum an a Basque artist, can be found in a news report (extract 66) published in *Diario Vasco* two weeks before the Guggenheim Bilbao’s opening. As it is described, the event sounds rather like a buying of Chillida’s collaboration through a commercial transaction, but it was the first step in a strategy that would be given priority after the museum’s opening.

**Extract 62**
The Guggenheim buys four new Chillida’s works and seals the peace with the sculptor. (Diario Vasco, news report headline, October 3, 1997, p. 72)

*Diario Vasco*’s report omitted the fact that Eduardo Chillida did never join the Basque artists’ mobilization against the museum, although the use of the expression “sella la paz” (seals the peace) suggested that both sides had finally solved a conflict. There was indeed a conflict between Chillida and the Guggenheim Bilbao, mainly because Thomas Krens did not consider that Chillida, who in the 1990’s had settled in the Basque Country, was international enough or representative of international contemporary art, and subsequently Krens did not want to purchase the artists’ works (Zulaika, 2005). Nonetheless, this was a minor conflict compared with the debate between Jorge Oteiza and the supporters of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum.

Now, it will be examined how the approach between Jorge Oteiza and the museum was reported in *Diario Vasco* in terms of rhetoric and construction of some versions; and how they served to rebut alternative versions of the events. In a news report (extract 63) that was published in *Diario Vasco*, shortly before the eventual signature of the protocol of agreement to exhibit Oteiza’s works in the GBM, the main emphasis was put on the change of opinion attributed to Jorge Oteiza. That is, the artist was described as having said that the Guggenheim Bilbao should now be made useful for the Basque culture. The newspaper constructed a version that depicted Oteiza as a pragmatic Basque artist who wanted to make good use of an undertaking:

Oteiza thinks that “the Guggenheim has to be useful for the Basque culture”. [Headline] [Diario Vasco, extract 63]

Jorge Oteiza maintains his criticism of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and its philosophy, but (...) he considers that once it is already built is better to use it than to turn one’s back on it. “The project did not interest me at all, but there is a moment in which it stops being a United States’ colony to become a building that comes out onto a Basque river – the Nervión -. From that moment it has to be used”, states Oteiza. [Diario Vasco, extract 63]
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Jorge Oteiza was portrayed as someone who freely changed his mind, unlike in one of Egin's versions, expressed through Huarte's utterances, in which he had been portrayed as someone who could have suffered some pressures. Another question mentioned in this Diario Vasco's news report is whether Oteiza would be criticized or not, and whether he was concerned or worried. The newspaper quoted Oteiza as stating that he was not afraid of criticism and also pointed out that Oteiza did not lower his head. That is, Diario Vasco implicitly portrayed him as someone who was not worried or shamed; and Diario Vasco assumed that there would be some criticism against the sculptor, but Oteiza's own words served to rebut their effect by assuming criticism as something more general that affected any human action.

Extract 63
Oteiza thinks that "the Guggenheim has to be useful for the Basque culture". [Headline] Jorge Oteiza does not lower his head and shows his satisfaction with the retrospective that the Guggenheim will dedicate to him before the summer. The artist from Orio – always very critical with the museum – reasons more pragmatic and considers that since the art gallery is already a reality, what proceeds is to “turn Basque” the museum. 90 years old, he does not stop, and works also in the sculpture that he plans to dedicate to Miguel Pelay de Orozco, while he studies plans in the nine meters steel work that he will install at the entry of the Reina Sofia Contemporary Art Centre from Madrid. Fortunately, Oteiza maintains his fierce vitality and announces new books and exhibitions, from the disillusionment of the land that he loves the most: the Basque Country, a Basque Country that he states has “annoyed and mistreated” him, since “here culture does not interest”. [Subhead] Jorge Oteiza maintains alive his criticism of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and its philosophy, but from his last pragmatism he considers that once it is already built is better to use it than to turn one’s back on it. “The project did not interest me at all, but there is a moment in which it stops being a United States’ colony, to become a building that comes out onto a Basque river – the Nervion -. From that moment it has to be used”, states Oteiza. The sculptor considers that since “it is so difficult to make something together between us, the Basques”, once the building is built it should be “turned Basque”. “What exists inside the Guggenheim should be Basque”, he adds. Oteiza states not to be worried for criticisms that could reach him after he accepted exhibiting in a place that he has criticised that much. “In this life what really concerns me is lack of criticisms. I enjoy being shaken and also like to shake. All human act is subject to other people’s comments". (El Diario Vasco, news report, March 6, 1998, p. 60)

Extract 64
(A) Turning Basque the ‘Guggy’ [Headline] Yesterday’s act in Alzuza is very historic. The signing of an agreement between the Guggenheim and the Jorge Oteiza Foundation means the pipe of peace between the sculptor and the museum of Bilbao, but also an approach among the Basque government and the artist from Orio. After the embrace of Zabalaga with Chillida, in December, Oteiza locks up the hatchet of war with his two more recurrent enemies: the Basque government and the Guggenheim. The museum will not only dedicate him an anthology that can arrive to New York; but will also buy works for his collection. (B) There are purists that criticise Oteiza for this new policy of approach: they prefer him staying in a trench giving and receiving blows until he dies. But Oteiza's entry in the
Guggenheim was a matter of time: it can be done now, when he is still alive, or it could be done in many years time, when he will not be here. Thus, the sculptor can see (even if it is from a distance) how the almighty lords of the Guggenheim go on pilgrimage to Alzuza, his spiritual reserve, to seal the peace. (C) Oteiza, the eternal rebel, the aggressive nihilist, offers a new service to the country applying to the museum his new possibilistic philosophy: given that the Guggenheim is a reality, it’d be best to make the most of it, to turn it Basque. It is yet an invention in which Manhattan rules more than Bilbao, but this challenge can be won. Is not about nationalities, it is about talent. It is possible not to connect with the shark Krens, but to connect with the genius of Gehry and Serra. It happened to Oteiza. The sculptor does not surrender, but he is taking the Guggenheim. The great conspirator is not senile: the embrace with Chillida was a lesson of peace, and what is going on now, is a lesson possibilism. Power and pragmatism: the medicine that this country is desperately in need of. (Diario Vasco, opinion article signed by Mitxel Ezquiaga, March 11, 1998, p. 56)

Simultaneously (extract 64) Diario Vasco published an opinion article in which metaphors such as “pipa de la paz” (pipe of peace), and the burial of the “hacha de guerra” (hatchet of war) were deployed. The metaphors served to construct a version of the events according to which Oteiza had definitely made up with his former enemies: the Basque government and the Guggenheim. The article closed with some sort of slogans that intended to synthesize the main points of this version assumed to offer the only rational solution. It was a version of reconciliation based on the argument of the museum as a fait accompli; and as something that should be tackled pragmatically, and that could indeed become more Basque. In this sense, it is good to remind that rhetorical contrast is often used to present a version as a fact. This version is constructed in opposition to an “alternative, which is itself formulated in an unconvincing and unproblematic manner”. (Edwards and Potter, 1992, p. 163)

...the embrace with Chillida was a lesson of peace, and what is going on now, is a lesson of possibilism. Power and pragmatism: the medicine that this country is desperately in need of. [Diario Vasco, extract 64]

Consequently, the article also pointed out that some people negatively depicted as “puristas” (purists), i.e. unrealistic and fanatics, would still criticize Oteiza because they expected him to behave as a hero, even if he got hurt or died. Accordingly, those who opposed Oteiza’s decision were the irrational ones, and Oteiza’s rational move’s rightness and rationality was contrasted with others’ irrationality;

There are purists who criticize Oteiza for this new policy of approach: they prefer him staying in a trench giving and receiving blows until he dies. [Diario Vasco, extract 64]
It has been pointed out by Atkinson (1984) that in political rhetoric contrast is usually deployed to stress the ‘factuality’ of one version, and the ‘arbitrariness’ of the other version. It serves to enhance one’s own version’s persuasiveness and makes it sound more convincing. Although it was assumed the readership knows them, *Diario Vasco* never said who could be such purists; it could be anybody who opposed the museum. Such persistence in criticizing the GBM was assumed to be totally irrational, and the version that Oteiza’s presence in the museum would take place sooner or later was put forward as the most resonable. It is significant that much space was used to expose arguments that were implicitly refuting counterarguments that could be uttered against Oteiza’s decision. A main argument within this rhetoric of reconciliation and burial of the war hatchet was to show why Oteiza’s action should not be considered a surrender. The first fragment below shows how by writing the word “toma” (takes) [in italics in the original] the article stressed that Oteiza was the active taker of the museum, implying that he was being pragmatic and would be the recipient of most benefits. In the sentence that followed, Oteiza was paradoxically depicted as the great conspirator (as if the writer acknowledged that he had been brilliantly conspiring against the museum) who “no chochea” (is not senile), and this was an attempt at rebutting eventual accusations and irony that he might already be too old and weak; and unaware of the implications of his actions;

The sculptor does not surrender, but he is *taking* the Guggenheim. The great conspirator is not senile (...).
[Diario Vasco, extract 64]

But Oteiza’s entry in the Guggenheim was a matter of time: it can be done now, when he is still alive, or it could be done in many years time, when he will not be here. Thus, the sculptor can see (even if it is from a distance) how the almighty lords of the Guggenheim go on pilgrimage to Alzuza, his spiritual reserve, to seal the peace. [Diario Vasco, extract 64]

The article also attempted to support its version that Oteiza’s action did not mean surrender, and did it reinforcing the idea that now it was the right moment to take this decision. Since Oteiza is still alive, he will witness how the very powerful lords of the Guggenheim go as pilgrims to the artists’ spiritual dwelling to seal the peace. Thus, is not Oteiza who will go to the museum, but it will be the other way round according to this version embedded with quite a lot of underneath irony. A description serves once again to support the argument that Oteiza’s individual value and talent is being recognized by the museum, and that it would be foolish to resist such invitation. This ironical description implicitly assumes that it is a humiliation for the ‘*powerful lords of the Guggenheim*’ to present themselves as humble pilgrims in Oteiza’s ‘*spiritual dwelling*’, and that
Oteiza will be able to witness the powerful lords paying such price for reconciliation. Nevertheless, although this description serves to suggest that Oteiza and his supporters might desire such a reverse of roles between the mighty and the powerless artist, the use of irony serves to deny that this might be actually happening. Discourse analysts have stressed that ironization is the reverse of reification, in which the way an event is described takes for granted that the version based on a description is a fact. “Irony occurs, of course, when a meaning different or opposite to the literal one is intended. Ironization refers to the process where descriptive language is treated not as genuinely descriptive but as having another purpose or as a deception” (Potter and Wetherell, 1987, p. 42).

Finally, another important element in the construction of this version of policymakers as actors who did not have any specific stake in a negotiation to bring Oteiza’s work to the GBM was also found in this opinion article. Here it was assumed that the museum’s invitation was not related to the artists’ nationality; and thus was not motivated by policymakers’ strategy to erode the Basque artists’ opposition, which is not even mentioned. This version presents Oteiza as someone who will be in the Guggenheim exclusively because of his talent, and not as the leader of a social movement, even if he later might make the best use of the opportunity to turn the museum Basque. This is part of an implicit denial of the very fact that the museum and the PNV policymakers needed to gain Oteiza’s collaboration as an important step in their strategy to weaken the Basque artists’ opposition. At this stage, Oteiza’s opposition to the museum was portrayed as the artist’s individual stance: he was not explicitly depicted as the leader of the Basque artists’ movement against the museum. In addition, Diario Vasco overlooked the actual possibility that even an individual could represent a cultural policy for the Basque Country at the collective level.

6.4.1.2. The reporting of the diverse reactions to the conditions put by Jorge Oteiza to exhibit his work in the museum

Suddenly, when the PNV policymakers and the GBM were already taking for granted that they had won Oteiza for the museum, the sculptor sent a letter to the media. He warned that he would not exhibit his works in the museum unless a main condition he had discussed with Vidarte was respected. He would only show his work not in an individual retrospective as the Jorge Oteiza Foundation and the GBM had announced, but in a collective exhibition of his group of the Basque School’s artists. On March 12, 1998, the reaction to Oteiza’s letter was reported in Diario
Vasco (extract 65) as something that had provoked general surprise, not restricted to the specific group of directly involved people. In Diario Vasco’s description of the reaction to Oteiza’s letter as a surprise it was implied to be totally unexpected that Oteiza would put any such condition to exhibit in the museum;

Oteiza surprised yesterday with a brief note sent to the media. [Diario Vasco, extract 65]

Sources of the Basque Government’s Department of Culture showed last night their surprise for Oteiza’s reaction, and expressed their trust that the agreement could become a reality “for which we will work”. [Diario Vasco, extract 65]

This version of general surprise was different from the version that Oteiza’s letter was just another episode in what it was depicted as a long running “culebrón” (soap opera) of the worst kind. This explicitly evaluative description of reactions to Oteiza’s letter, which operated a banalization and devaluation of Oteiza’s last message, depicting it as unimportant, was found in an opinion article published in Diario Vasco on that date and also in page sixty-four;

The soap opera is already one hundred percent Oteiza’s in the worst sense of the word. [Diario Vasco, extract 66]

the artist released in one of his already famous notes, in which he disavows everybody and makes much noise. [Diario Vasco, extract 66]

These can be considered examples of Diario Vasco’s use of extreme case formulation rhetoric. In other words, Oteiza was negatively described as an extreme case of difficult and irrational personality. Anita Pomerantz (1986) has highlighted that extreme terms are often used to strengthen an argument by presenting it as very obvious and ‘common-sense’. In this specific case, one Diario Vasco’s opinion article’s writer drew upon extreme terms (% percent; disavows everybody, in the worst sense) to describe Oteiza’s change of opinion as absolutely irrational, and not at all a surprise. There seems to exist a contradiction between it being described as irrational and not surprising. Nevertheless, the writer assumes that the readership is familiar with a certain public image of Jorge Oteiza as a temperamental artist e.g. prone to have “rabietas” (tantrums) (extract 28). Thus, it also had the function to discredit the artist and to reify the version that Oteiza was someone unreliable who constantly changed his opinion. In turn, it reinforced the main argument that Oteiza took a totally wrong decision; and that he might soon change his mind again and become more reasonable. This version dismissed Oteiza’s letter as unimportant, and so
it was understood that in this sense there was not reason to be surprised, whereby the event was implied to be less important.

Extract 65

(A) Oteiza disavows now the agreement between his Foundation and the Guggenheim. [Headline] The sculptor will only exhibit in the museum accompanied by the artists of his generation. [Subhead] One day after the Jorge Oteiza Foundation and the Guggenheim Bilbao Foundation signed in Alzuza a protocol of collaboration to make a retrospective and acquire work for the permanent collection of the museum from Bilbao, the sculptor, that on Tuesday attended the act, disavowed yesterday through a note “politicians and foundations to formalize any kind of agreement about my works”. Oteiza insists that his entry in the Guggenheim, as he explained “categorically” to the director of the art gallery Juan Ignacio Vidarte in a meeting at his house in Zarautz, it was only possible “with my Basque school’s generation”. [Subhead] (B) Nevertheless, Oteiza surprised yesterday with a brief note sent to the media. The sculptor started saying that “in face of news and smiling photographs PNV about the future of my work, I inform the public opinion that I disavow politicians and foundations to formalize any kind of agreement regarding my works. As regards the Guggenheim Museum I feel overwhelmed by the news I receive through the press, given that in the meeting, had in my house in Zarautz with Mister Vidarte, director, in the presence of my friend Inchaustegui (Jon Intxaustegi is the director of the ETB serial Basque creators and one of the architects of the reencounter between Oteiza and Chillida) I stated that my entry in the museum was only possible with my Basque school’s generation”. The text concludes saying: “I am very sick, I am 90 years old and I hope to be able to finish writing my memories in fragments. I only ask a little more time, and to be left in peace”. (C) Although the agreement signed on Tuesday did only point out the intention to “start to work together”, in the words of Vidarte, both foundations underlined the interest that the anthology will include all the experimental phases of Oteiza’s artistic trajectory. José Luis Merino, elected the retrospective’s curator, once he knew last night about the sculptor’s note, pointed out that “his decisions are his own, his freedom to change his mind is indeed his own”, but he added that he regretted that “his change of attitude is embedded by the advice of those he believes are his friend, but they are not” because his perverse hands of moss prevent him from being free to accept the contrary of what he now denies. The admiration of those who have favoured his name being projected to the universe remains resolute, waiting for a change”, he pointed out. Sources of the Basque Government’s Department of Culture showed last night their surprise for Oteiza’s reaction, and expressed their trust that the agreement could become a reality “we’ll strive for”. (El Diario Vasco, news report, March 12, 1998, p. 64)

Extract 66

Leave him alone, leave us alone’ [Headline] The soap opera is already one hundred percent Oteiza’s in the worst sense of the word. 24 hours after the signing of an agreement between the Oteiza Foundation and the Guggenheim Museum the artist released one of his already famous notes, in which he disavows everybody and makes much noise. Oteiza is an old and tired man who lives alone, in need of affection and recognition. He is surrounded by some good people who are concerned with making the Oteiza person, and the Oteiza artist live well his last years, but in his orbit moves mainly a court abounding in flattering people and those who seek their part of the plunder. The artist often changes his opinion, according to the last pressure. He had agreed to approach the Guggenheim, and at least three editors of the DV we have heard him saying so. The people from the Oteiza Foundation, directly appointed by Oteiza
and little suspicious of wanting to take their share, signed an agreement with the Guggenheim following Oteiza’s express instructions. Yesterday the artist made clear that he wants to enter the Guggenheim accompanied by his generation. Shall it be this way. The soap opera will continue and we will all get bored, but Oteiza will end up in the Guggenheim that, according to his words, “is necessary to turn Basque”. Leave him alone, yes, but mainly leave us alone. (El Diario Vasco, opinion article, March 12, 1998, p. 64)

Finally, it can be noted that Diario Vasco drew upon rhetoric of addressing to an unspecific and general we readership, or common sense. Not only people involved will feel tired with all this episodes, but also all the general audience of reasonable people (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971);

The soap opera will continue and we will all get bored, but Oteiza will end up in the Guggenheim that, according to his words, “is necessary to turn Basque”. [Diario Vasco, extract 66]

Meanwhile, Egin did not evaluate Jorge Oteiza’s decision. In Egin only the reaction of the particular agents involved was mentioned, and the Jorge Oteiza Foundation’s and the Guggenheim Bilbao’s director’s reactions were depicted as a feeling of confusion;

Confusion of the Oteiza Foundation and Vidarte. [Subhead] [Egin, extract 67]

The denial was received with confusion by the people involved who maybe had acted in a rush. [Subhead] [Egin, extract 67]

Egin even risked an interpretation of why the day after the signing of the agreement Oteiza’s apparently unexpected conditions to exhibit his work in the museum created such confusion. Egin discreetly suggested some doubts and built up an unspecific position on the matter; the newspaper used the attenuating modal “tal vez” (maybe) to put forward that the blame should be put on the Jorge Oteiza Foundation and the GBM, because they had likely acted in a rush. This interpretation also assumed that people involved in the negotiation were looking forward to have Oteiza in the museum, and implied that probably Oteiza did not care that much.

Both newspapers echoed Oteiza’s complaint that he was very old and sick, and that he wanted to be left alone. Nevertheless, in two texts simultaneously published on March 12, 1998, and both printed in page 64, Diario Vasco explicitly focused on Oteiza’s own rhetoric, in which the artist attributed to old age and illness his tiredness and necessity to rest. In a news report article (extract 65) Diario Vasco presented an utterance of someone involved in the negotiation that served to
reify a particular argument against Jorge Oteiza as a fact. José Luis Merino was presented as the person elected to be the curator of the planned Oteiza’s exhibition in the Guggenheim Bilbao. He was quoted as using the same argument that Oteiza was too weak to resist the pressures of any ill advise from people who were around him and whom he considered friends. Oteiza himself did not escape from being attacked by Merino, although he was described mainly as a victim. Merino was quoted as using a metaphor of “perversas manos de musgos” (perverse hands of moss) that hinder his autonomy and prevent him from being free to accept joining the museum. This metaphor of the hands of moss served to suggest that his hands were unable to create; they were weak and fragile as a vegetable, and determined Oteiza’s vulnerability. The same day the same version of a tired, weak and vulnerable Oteiza was found in an opinion article in *Diario Vasco* (extract 66). The newspaper used an explicit rhetoric of category entitlement to build up José Luis Merino as a legitimate figure to have a say on the issue. He was indeed a veteran art curator who had played an important role in the 1960’s and 1970’s, as the owner of a prestigious avant-garde plastic art gallery, and as curator/organizer of several avant-garde Basque artistic work’s exhibitions. Although *Diario Vasco* might not be aware of it, it was not the first time José Luis Merino and Jorge Oteiza had expressed opposed views about an exhibition: it is well documented that in the early 1970’s Oteiza had criticized a selection, of Basque contemporary artists, made by Merino for an exhibition in México, and that the sculptor declined the invitation to take part in it (Guasch, 1985). This version of vulnerability of the old artist served to attribute stake to Oteiza’s decision (Potter and Edwards, 1990), and to undermine Oteiza’s version that his decision was individually taken. His narrative highlighted the existence of a group of people who surrounded the artist and who exerted influence over his decision. It is implied that underneath Oteiza’s decision there were obscure interests at stake; and a specific group of unreliable people;

He is surrounded by some good people who are concerned with making the Oteiza person, and the Oteiza artist, live well his last years, but in his orbit moves mainly a court abounding in flattering people and those who seek their part of the plunder. The artist changes often his opinion, according to the last pressure.

[Diario Vasco, extract 66]

That is, although *Diario Vasco* and *Egin* both reproduced the letter in which Oteiza stated to be tired, old, and very sick, it was *Diario Vasco* (extract 66) the newspaper that picked up this particular part of Oteiza’s statement, and used it to further develop a particular version of the events. In other words, the choice of a repertoire of illness, death, and weakness by *Diario Vasco* was an ontological gerrymandering to develop the argument that Oteiza’s weakness made him prone to his milieu and some people’s manipulation, and that his decisions were wrong and due
to his lack of individual autonomy. Oteiza’s illness and weakness were chosen among a huge range of available descriptive terms. This description’s factuality seemed to be confirmed by Oteiza himself, as Diario Vasco highlighted, and the rhetorical use of this description would be to make their argument more resistant to “criticisms of inaccuracy, falsehood, or active confabulation” (Potter, 1996, p. 187). In turn, the Jorge Oteiza Foundation members who signed the agreement with the GBM, and also surrounded Oteiza, were depicted as people who did not seem to want to take advantage of the old and sick artist. It can be remembered that Heritage and Greatbach (1986) identified contrast as one of the key rhetorical devices. Contrast is typically deployed to undermine the opposite version of an event, and while here Diario Vasco’s writer’s version was presented as factual and impartial, Oteiza’s was depicted as biased (Edwards and Potter, 1992). In sum, in a very short span of time there was a radical change operated in the Diario Vasco’s representation and reporting of Oteiza’s health, levels of activity and energy: and the shift occurred straightaway as a reaction to Oteiza’s letter.

Egin constructed a version of the event in which it was assumed that there was not reason to doubt that Oteiza had indeed talked with the director of the Guggenheim Bilbao about his conditions to exhibit his works in the museum. In a news report (extract 67) Egin provided several details to support the version that this meeting between Vidarte and Oteiza really took place: where did it happen; the date and the existence of a well-known witness, etc. In Egin all these details were not presented like in Diario Vasco as a literal transcription of Oteiza’s letter to the media, but as if they were part of a version based on objective facts. That is, the meeting between Vidarte and its details were presented as something that did actually happen (extract 67). Thus Oteiza was quoted stating that he felt “abrumado por las noticias” (overwhelmed by the news) when he read about an agreement between his foundation and the GBM in which his condition of exhibiting together with his generation of the Basque school was ignored. In Egin’s version Oteiza’s reaction was presented as a logical one, implying that Oteiza seemed to be sincere. Nevertheless, neither Egin nor Diario Vasco risked evaluating the degree of truthfulness of Oteiza’s version claiming that he had previously directly informed Vidarte about which were his conditions. Instead, Egin maintained a distant tone thereby confirming that Vidarte and Oteiza did indeed have a meeting, but not stating that they talked about Oteiza’s conditions. Diario Vasco’s news report (extract 65) emphasised that Oteiza “insiste” (insists) on his version which implied that Oteiza should probably give up this version, but did not join the debate over whether he actually informed Vidarte about his conditions. A Diario Vasco’s opinion article (extract 66) went a step further stating that at least three editors of Diario Vasco witnessed that Oteiza agreed
with the approach between his foundation and the GBM, and thus emphasised the idea that Oteiza just happened to have capriciously changed his mind. Once again it was not discussed the point of whether Vidarte was informed of Oteiza’s conditions;

He had agreed to approach the Guggenheim, and at least three editors of the DV we have heard him saying so. The people from the Oteiza Foundation, directly appointed by Oteiza and little suspicious of wanting to take their share, signed an agreement with the Guggenheim following Oteiza’s express instructions. [Diario Vasco, extract 66]

There was a different way to avoid entering in the discussion of whether Oteiza’s conditions had been overlooked by the people involved in the signing of the agreement; it could be described as a preliminary document that did not specify anything concrete about whether Oteiza’s exhibition in the museum would be individual or collective (extract 65).

Extract 67
Oteiza sets the conditions. [Headline] He disavows “politicians and foundations” to formalize agreements about his works. [Subhead] He conditioned his entrance in the Guggenheim to the entry of his Eskuela Vasca (Basque school) generation. [Subhead] Confusion of the Oteiza Foundation and Vidarte. [Subhead] “Considering the news and the smiling photos PNV about the future of my work, I inform the public opinion that I disavow the politicians and foundations to formalize any kind of agreement with my works”. By writing, in order not to be misinterpreted, Jorge Oteiza forestall yesterday the signing of a protocol of collaboration between the Foundation that manages his project of museum in Altzuza and the Guggenheim+Bilbao; an agreement that meant his entrance in the museum that he has criticized so much. But Oteiza had put his conditions. The denial was received with confusion by the people involved who maybe had acted in a rash. [Subhead] It was thought that they had the approval of the author who on the 18th of February, in presence of his friend the television director Jon Intxaustegi, had received at his home in Zarautz, the visit of Vidarte. But the text sent yesterday to the media - Oteiza who does not read them often, felt “overwhelmed by the news” of the day -, he explained that in that meeting “I stated categorically that my entrance to the museum was possible only with my Basque School generation”. “Leave me alone” [Subhead]. The sculptor referred to the groups who appeared on his milieu by the middle of the 1960’s, such as the collectives Gaur, Emen and Orain, or later the school of Deba. Oteiza confessed to be very ill - he suffers from a respiratory insufficiency - and manifested his desire to “be able to finish writing my memoirs in fragments. I only ask a little bit of time and to be left in peace”. Waiting. [Subhead] “We have acted honestly – indicated Juan Ignacio Vidarte – (...) We believed that his work should be represented in the museum, and we wanted to make it with his consent, and hand in hand with the Oteiza Foundation, and thus we have made all the steps with both of them”. (...) “We think – said Vidarte – that the contradictions that exist at the very heart of them will be solved and, for our part we will keep waiting”. Finally, in what concerns the private conversation to which Oteiza alludes on his communiqué – which happened at his house in Zarautz between the sculptor himself, Vidarte and in the presence of Jon Intxaustegi – the head of the museum manifested his opposition to “publicly contradict Jorge Oteiza. But already in that meeting I manifested exactly what I have always said, that is, that I believed that he should be represented in the Guggenheim with a work that was
significant of his trajectory, and we wanted to make all the steps with him and the Foundation. And he showed his agreement". (Egin, news report, March 12, 1998, p. 50)

In the news report that Egin published the day after Oteiza sent his letter to the media, Vidarte, the director of the Guggenheim Bilbao, was required to give an account of why such evidence of lack of communication between him and Oteiza suddenly surfaced. Thus Vidarte was given the opportunity to explain his version of the events and to clarify a delicate point: if in the meeting he had been informed by Oteiza of his conditions, and he did not respect them; or if Oteiza was just lying. According to Egin’s own version it was assumed that the meeting between Vidarte and Oteiza had indeed happened. Vidarte’s own utterances were quoted in Egin, and according to the former’s version they had acted honestly, without tricks and secrets:

We have acted honestly – indicated Juan Ignacio Vidarte. [Egin, extract 67]

Vidarte’s narrative suggested that the contradictions were on the other side, and was not specified if he referred to the Jorge Oteiza Foundation or to the artist himself. Either way, Vidarte attributed the blame of what happened to the other side, implying that there were some questions that Jorge Oteiza might not have clarified with the people responsible for his foundation:

“We think – said Vidarte – that the contradictions that exist at the very heart of them will be solved and, for our part we will keep waiting”. [Egin, extract 67]

Finally, he stated that he was not going to publicly contradict Jorge Oteiza; an answer that implies that if he wanted he could contradict him, but that he did not want to:

the head of the museum manifested his opposite stance to “entering now to publicly contradict Jorge Oteiza (...)*. [Egin, extract 67]

In sum, this cautiousness found in both newspapers reflects how Jorge Oteiza’s message provoked an impasse in a difficult negotiation. Instead of accusing Oteiza of being a liar, and explicitly stating that there was never such a meeting in which Oteiza informed Vidarte of his conditions, Diario Vasco’s strategy was to blame Oteiza’s weakness and his dubious acquaintances for his change of opinion. Instead of accusing Vidarte and the Jorge Oteiza Foundation of having ignored Oteiza’s conditions and having tried to manipulate the artist, Egin cautiously suggested that they probably misunderstood each other. That is, Oteiza symbolically represented a golden age of Basque avant-garde plastic art, and thus he could serve as a symbol
of Basqueness, and also a symbol of contemporary art, as one of the creators of abstractionist movements such as Basque informalism (Guasch, 1985; 2005). At the same time he was seen as a very high profile figure in the opposition movement against the museum. Both sides in the conflict tried to use Oteiza for their own interests, which were often dilemmatic and compounded. The newspapers could have channelled accusations against Oteiza or Vidarte, but here the main question was not to know who was manipulating whom. Actually, at this stage in which a main question of the museum’s economic success was generally taken as a fait accompli, the newspapers assumed that their readers would be more interested in knowing whether the GBM would really offer any opportunity of international promotion to Basque artists. As it will be shown in this chapter’s last subsection, the negotiations between the representative of the old guard of Basque avant-garde and the Guggenheim Museum would be soon silenced. Instead, the Basque policymakers would undertake a strategy of cultural reconciliation that would relatively succeed in starting to transform the image of the Guggenheim Bilbao into a museum that did not ignore contemporary Basque plastic artists.

Extract 68

'The Basque school, waiting. [Headline] The companions of Oteiza believe that the sculptor’s decision must not determine their presence in the Guggenheim. [Subhead] On Tuesday Oteiza and the Guggenheim Bilbao Foundation signed an agreement of collaboration to organize with the latter a retrospective exhibition and to acquire works from the sculptor. On Wednesday Oteiza disavowed the agreement and emphasized, as he had already said, that “my entrance to the museum is only possible with my generation of the Basque School”. On Thursday the Guggenheim Museum reiterated its desire to have the artist from Orio, but never against his will. What is the opinion of the members of that Basque School? They believe that the ball is, as it has been for long time, in Guggenheim’s court. The decision of his presence or absence corresponds to the latter and should not be only conditioned by Jorge Oteiza’s will, who once again has managed to reopen a never closed debate. [Subhead] The Basque school did not last much time, “It isn’t enough time, like everything in this country”, says the painter and sculptor Néstor Basterretxea, barely a few months in 1966. Nevertheless, “it helped us to know each other and to have some Basque cultural awareness”, he adds. The last controversy aroused by Oteiza, the spiritual father of that movement, has brought him again to today’s news, and in addition through a new debate involving the “since the Guggenheim is here, what proceeds is to turn it Basque”, which was uttered by the artist from Orio. The debate is already open and considering the turmoil that Oteiza has aroused when he stated that he will only go to the Guggenheim accompanied by that Basque School, the artists who formed it keep themselves in an expectant background. Four of them express an opinion in these lines. “It is a public attitude of Jorge that benefits me, precisely for that, because I am serious, I don’t want to say anything”, explains Néstor Basterretxea. He was, under Oteiza’s leadership, and together with Agustin Ibarrola, one of the pillars of that movement. “Oteiza might think that those of us who were in that moment, because it is true that we were in the avant-garde of art, we deserve to be in a museum that is after all subsidized by the Basques”, says the artist from Bermeo who lives in Hondarrabia, and that yesterday met Oteiza to better understand the issue. Later, once he is clear about everything, yes he will give an
opinion. “Oteiza has got all the right to do anything he wants with his work. His work in the Guggenheim will contribute to open the way to other artists, Basques, Spanish, and Europeans, and to break the model of a museum leasing of New York. I am very grateful to the professional awareness that Jorge Oteiza has manifested towards the art in the Basque country”, explains Agustín Ibarrola. The same as the sons of the deceased Remigio Mendiburu, one of the members of the group Gaur, the gathering of artists from Guipuzcoa, the embryo of the Basque School. “Nowadays that everybody looks for himself, that one artist like Oteiza reminds the others is something incredible”, they say. For them, it is “unquestionable” that their father’s work be in the museum from Bilbao, “but the initiative should come from the Guggenheim itself more than from Oteiza”, they add. And in this point they also agree with Ibarrola. I refuse to accept our presence to be a previous condition to obtain Jorge Oteiza’s yes”, he points out. (...) “It has to be appreciated the fact that he desires so much to be with the other artists”, points out the also painter José Antonio Sistiaga, but his reflections bring him to a further point. “What he deserves is a big retrospective, in which his work would be seen alone, as a big poem, not in Bilbao, but outside”, explains Sistiaga, who picking up Oteiza’s phrase, “we have to win prizes abroad to be respected home”, and one idea of Hasier Etxeberria, he proposes that this retrospective would start “in New York, in Berlin, Cologne, Paris or out there where the art takes place, and later maybe on its way back, would arrive to Bilbao”. About turning the Guggenheim Basque for Ibarrola it is clear that “this museum will never have a significance in itself, neither of the country where it is set up, if it doesn’t have the wider representation of the Basques of that and the new generations”, and “until this country does take up again his sovereignty to establish the definition of its stable collection and temporary exhibitions, that the PNV’s irresponsibility has left in the hands of North America, we will keep witnessing shows like the unfortunate negotiation with Chillida days before the opening and now with Oteiza, that do not help this country at all”. “Those who do not live up to what has happened here in the an and have not taken the Basque creation with a minimum of seriousness are the people who have got aesthetic responsibilities to the museum. Krens has not been informed. There is the mistake”, points out Sistiaga. (...)’ (El Diario Vasco, news report, March 15, 1998, p. 79)

A few days after Oteiza’s letter to the media explaining his conditions to exhibit in the museum was reported, Diario Vasco published a news report article (extract 68) in which the members of the Basque school were quoted as saying their opinions on the issue. A striking aspect of this reporting is that Diario Vasco quoted several Basque artists’ own utterances to support the PNV policymakers’ argument that the participation of the Basque school should not be a condition for Oteiza’s exhibition in the museum. This argument was implicitly based on a negatively connoted description of the Basque school that put at stake the legitimacy of the 1960’s Basque abstractionist avant-garde movements. The importance of a prestigious and influential movement that linked Basque identity with contemporary plastic art trends, such as informalism (Guasch, 1985; 2005), was described as something that lasted only five months, implying that it was an isolated undertaking which did not have any further repercussion. The strategic argument was based on the commonplace assumption that something that last only a few months cannot be considered important and influential enough:
The Basque school did not last long, "It isn't enough time, like everything in this country", says the painter and sculptor Néstor Basterretxea, barely a few months in 1966. [Diario Vasco, extract 68]

The same Diario Vasco’s news report complemented this undermining of Jorge Oteiza’s defence and appraisal of the Basque school as a very important movement by depicting it as a school that was born and died in the same year: 1966. In this case Diario Vasco did not use any quotation, whereby this undermining could be understood as the newspapers' own evaluation:

A school that was born and died in 1966. [El Diario Vasco, extract 68]

A very different version about the Basque school had been constructed in Egin’s description a few days earlier:

The sculptor referred to the groups who appeared on his milieu by the middle of the 1960’s, such as the collectives Gaur, Emen and Orain, or later the school of Deba. [Egin, extract 67]

In Egin’s version the Basque school’s project was not limited to an experience that lasted only six months. Here at least four specific experiences of Basque school were named, and it was suggested that a mutual influence and a continuation over time also had existed. This version implicitly confirming that the Basque school had been an important and influential event in the realm of contemporary plastic arts, was oriented to persuading and reassuring the readership that Jorge Oteiza’s conditions were legitimate. Moreover, for once (extract 68) Diario Vasco echoed a Basque artists’ complaint, which was seldom mentioned in this newspaper. First Agustín Ibarrola was quoted stating that Oteiza’s work being exhibited in the Guggenheim Bilbao could awaken the interest of the museum in other Basque and Spanish artists. Agustín Ibarrola’s expression of gratefulness for Oteiza’s initiative to invite the Basque school to join the exhibition implicitly reflected how difficult it was for most Basque artists to exhibit their work and to gain recognition. This complaint of lack of support and recognition in the Basque Country as a burden for most Basque contemporary art creators was more explicitly uttered in a quoted sentence pronounced by another painter, José Antonio Sistiaga who was also described as acknowledging Oteiza’s gesture of good will. On the other hand, Sistiaga was quoted as stating that the people who got aesthetic responsibility in the museum and knew the value of local contemporary artists, should be made accountable for not having properly informed the director of the Guggenheim Museum of New York. However, Sistiaga’s complaints also served to support the version that albeit until then the Basque contemporary art had not received the recognition it deserved, the
GBM might change this trend, and offer the possibility to turn Basque the museum obtaining international recognition.

In addition, *Diario Vasco* constructed a version assuming that the museum would eventually offer the Basque artists the opportunity to turn it Basque and to gain recognition, and the accusation Ibarrola uttered against the PNV as a whole, depicting the political party as irresponsible, did not seem to make any sense and its effect was neutralized. It sounded like a personal opinion of someone who might soon change his discourse and negotiate with the museum. It was assumed that, even if Ibarrola had not realized it yet, the PNV and Ibarrola shared a similar project of construction of a Basque nation, and that both sides agreed on the main points mentioned in the quoted statements: it would be good to have more Basque artists in the museum, and the country needed more autonomy to enforce its cultural policy. Further, it served to suggest that all of them needed recognition and wanted to exhibit in the museum. Implicitly, it reinforced a version telling that the Basque artists needed the Guggenheim Bilbao much more than the museum needed them; and *Diario Vasco* also constructed a version according to which from now on the most talented contemporary Basque artists would be able to proceed to turn Basque the Guggenheim Bilbao. Thus putting an end to the conflict between the museum and the Basque artists was implicitly assumed to be the most reasonable solution. Once again, it was hidden the fact that Oteiza’s presence in the museum was part of a wider strategy to present to the Basque society an ideal image of reconciliation between the Basque artists and the museum.

### 6.4.2. The Guggenheim Bilbao and the young generation of Basque artists

In March 1998 the PNV and the Guggenheim Bilbao’s policymakers’ undertaking to reach an agreement between Jorge Oteiza and the museum was indefinitely postponed. Only after Jorge Oteiza passed away in 2003 could the Guggenheim Bilbao finally proceed to organize one exhibition of this artists’ work in the museum. In their plight to consolidate a climate of reconciliation between the Basque contemporary artists and the Guggenheim Museum a new strategy was set up. A young sculptress from San Sebastián or Donostia, the capital of Gipuzkoa, was chosen to be the first Basque artist to have her works exhibited in the museum. Her name was Cristina Iglesias and in *Diario Vasco* she was presented as a Basque artist from Donostia,
and in *Egin* as an artist from Donostia. In the latter newspaper the word Basque was never used to present her. Since Donostia is in the Basque Country, and there is a Basque tradition to introduce people mentioning where they are from, which it is taken for granted corresponds to the place where they are born, here it is assumed that she was Basque. Nevertheless, Cristina Iglesias did not have a typically Basque name, and her surname could perfectly be from somewhere else in Spain, probably from Galicia.

Extract 69
Cristina Iglesias is the protagonist of the first Basque monograph in the Guggenheim. [Headline] A multitudinous inauguration opened yesterday in the Guggenheim Museum of Bilbao the exhibition of the sculptress from Donostia Cristina Iglesias. In an exhibition charged with symbolism, since it is the first monograph that the Guggenheim dedicates to a Basque artist. This exhibition could be seen before in New York, Chicago and Madrid, and confirms Cristina Iglesias as a solid emerging value in the international circuit of art. In the image, the artist with one of her works in Bilbao yesterday. (*El Diario Vasco*, front-page news report, November 6, 1998)

Extract 70
(A) Cristina Iglesias’ happy return home. [Headline] - The sculptress opened the first exhibition that the Guggenheim dedicates to a Basque artist. Over the past two years the exhibition of the sculptress from Donostia Cristina Iglesias has travelled around the world. It started in the Guggenheim of New York, it travelled then to Chicago and Madrid, and “finishes home”, as stated yesterday by the artist in the Guggenheim Bilbao. Last night the exhibition was inaugurated, the first monograph that the museum dedicates to a Basque artist, and that can be visited until the 14th of February, with a cocktail full of people from Guipuzcoa. [Subhead] (...) *The hall* 103 [Subhead] Among the twenty works that the artist exhibits in the Guggenheim’s hall 103, there are two metallic forests, one of bamboo and other of eucalyptus, several silk screen prints in copper panels, three lattice works and a roof of concrete that hang in the atrium, at the hall’s entry. This work, will remain in the museum thanks to the artists’ donation, after the exhibition, together with a previously owned lattice. Among these “rapt and mysterious” pieces, as they were described by Carmen Giménez, the Guggenheim of New York’s twentieth century art’s curator, and this exhibition’s curator, the guests walked, because her work “has to be walked through and looked at with the idea of deciphering what we see” said the sculptress. (...) *From Gipuzkoa* [Subhead] *From José Maria Ruiz Urechegi*, president of Adegi, to the Member of the Parliament *Koruko Aizarna* who uttered that exhibitions like this one “not only show that we have great artists, but also first level artists as regards international projection” (...). (*El Diario Vasco*, news report headline and subhead, November 6, 1998, p. 63)

I pointed out this aspect of Cristina Iglesias’ identity, because it seems to be related to a more explicit use of the Basque identity in *Diario Vasco* for purposes of constructing a version of the museum as an art gallery concerned with Basque artists. The more discreet *Egin*’s version mentioning that she was from Donostia, but not depicting her as Basque (what *Diario Vasco* repeatedly did) reflected *Egin*’s effort to maintain a distance from *Diario Vasco*’s version of
reconciliation without restrictions. *Egin was* reacting once again to another *Diario Vasco’s* active construction of the version that Cristina Iglesias represented that the museum did recognize and gave opportunities of international projection to Basque contemporary artists. The newspapers’ different styles of reporting Cristina Iglesias’ ethnic identity was reflected in the two headlines that follow:

Cristina Iglesias is the protagonist of the first Basque monograph in the Guggenheim. [Headline] [*Diario Vasco*, extract 69]

Artistic dialogue [Headline] This is Cristina Iglesias’ proposal in her monographic exhibition. [Subhead] She exhibits in the Guggenheim until the 14 of February. [Subhead] The artist from Donostia considers “a challenge” to exhibit her work. [Subhead] [*Egin*, extract 72]

*Egin* presents a different version about Cristina Iglesias who is described as an artist who although born in Donostia, actually lived and worked in Madrid.

The exhibition that arrives to the capital of Biscay is the continuation of the monographic that this artist presented in the Guggenheim of New York, over the summer of 97, and that later has been in the Renaissance Society of Chicago and in the Palacio de Velázquez of Madrid, the city where currently lives and works the author. [*Egin*, extract 72]

Nevertheless, both newspapers' reporting of who was Cristina Iglesias had some points in common: *Egin* and *Diario Vasco* described how Cristina Iglesias had already exhibited her works and the newspapers assumed she was considered an important contemporary sculptress, in places such as New York, Chicago, etc. Each newspaper made a choice to quote someone present in the act of inauguration of Cristina Iglesias works’ exhibition in order to confirm their more or less explicit versions of in which degree Basque Cristina Iglesias' recognition could be considered 'our' artists’ recognition. *Diario Vasco* quoted a PNV politician who happened to be the Minister of culture, as uttering that this exhibition confirmed that ‘we’ have got great artists who have obtained a high level international projection. This speech was an expression of the version that the GBM would recognize individual local talents, but implicitly assuming that those outstanding talents deserved to be there once they achieved the status of internationally recognized artists, who do project 'our' art to the world. In *Diario Vasco* a PNV politician was quoted, the Minister of culture, as uttering a generic and unspecific 'we', which potentially might include all of 'us' Basques and Spanish, but also rather vague on whether it refers more specifically to the Basques. This kind of generic 'we', which can be differently read according to the audiences, is often used
in political rhetoric that seeks to construct a sense of communality between the utterer and the audience, and tries to reach a wide audience (Mühlhäusler and Harré, 1990; Wilson, 1990);

From José María Ruiz Urchegi, president of Adegi, to the Member of the Parliament Koruko Aizarna, who uttered that exhibitions like this one “not only show that we have great artists, but also first level artists as regards international projection.” [Diario Vasco, extract 70]

In Egin no PNV politician was quoted as talking about what Cristina Iglesias represented. Instead, the curator of Cristina Iglesias’ exhibition was presented as someone who also had worked in the Guggenheim Museum of New York over one decade. Her quoted speech served to confirm what Egin already had suggested: that since Cristina Iglesias worked and lived in Madrid, she was an outstanding representative of a generation of emerging contemporary artists who worked in Spain:

The exhibition, formed by nearly twenty of her most recent creations, has been organized by Carmen Giménez, curator of twentieth century art in the Guggenheim Museum of New York, since a decade ago. The curator of the exhibition, who was also present in the opening act, referred to Iglesias as an “outstanding member of an emerging generation of important contemporary artists who work nowadays in Spain”. [Egin, extract 72]

Juan Ignacio Vidarte, the general director of the Guggenheim Bilbao announced that the one of the sculptress from Donostia, “inaugurates a series of exhibitions related to the contemporary Basque and Spanish art, a topic that the Guggenheim museums will continue investigating, and which they will continue to deepen in the future”. [Egin, extract 72]

To put it briefly, each newspaper selected fragments of quoted personalities’ speeches to construct different descriptions of similar events. Descriptions supported versions of the events that were action oriented (Edwards and Potter, 1992) in the sense that they served to support (Diario Vasco) or undermine (Egin) the version that Cristina Iglesias exhibition represented a genuine rapprochement and reconciliation between the Guggenheim Bilbao and the Basque plastic artists.

Extract 71
A symbolic exhibition [Headline] - Cristina Iglesias’ exhibition in the Guggenheim of Bilbao is, first of all, a powerful and attractive introduction to the work of the sculptress from Donostia. But in addition this exhibition comes charged with a good dose of symbolism: is the first monographic exhibition that the museum from Bilbao dedicates to a Basque artist. In this case, a woman who despite her youth (she was born in 1956) is now one of the
most solid values in the international circuits of art. The exhibition that can be seen in Bilbao was before in New York, Chicago and Madrid, but its arrival to the great Basque Country's cultural infrastructure confers it a special dimension, and maybe that is why the inauguration was yesterday multitudinous: the Guggenheim becomes Basque for a few months. (B) As Cristina Iglesias herself says, as important as the fact that she is Basque is that she is a young woman. The other symbolic thing is that the great museum of contemporary art is since yesterday more contemporary than ever taking in a creator who is only 40 years old, which initiates a line that the museum should not abandon: conjugate the exhibitions of the great classics of modernity with the attention to the emerging values of the art, which is produced nowadays. And also turns out to be symbolic that the Guggenheim becomes more from Guipúzcoa with an artist from Donostia, and an exhibition sponsored by this territory’s entities, such as DV and the Bank of Guipuzcoa. Since yesterday, Cristina Iglesias’ sculpture, so architectonic in some of her works, dialogues with this temple of architecture that is Gehry’s building. The conversation is worth. (El Diario Vasco, opinion article signed by Mitxel Ezquiaga, November 6, 1998, p. 63)

Extract 72

Artistic dialogue [Headline] This is Cristina Iglesias’ proposal in her monographic exhibition. [Subhead] She exhibits in the Guggenheim until the 14 of February. [Subhead] The artist from Donostia considers “a challenge” to exhibit her work. [Subhead] The museum offer of the Guggenheim Bilbao has been extended until the 14 of February with a monographic exhibition of Cristina Iglesias. This exhibition gathers around twenty works from the young artist from Donostia who is arousing a big interest in the world of art on an international level. The exhibition that arrives to Bilbao is the continuation of the one that took place in the Guggenheim of New York in the summer of 97, and that later has crossed Chicago and Madrid. [Subhead] (...) (C) The exhibition that arrives to the capital of Biscay is the continuation of the monograph that this artist presented in the Guggenheim of New York, over the summer of 97, and that later has been in the Renaissance Society of Chicago and in the Palacio de Velázquez of Madrid, the city where currently lives and works the author. In each of these places, Cristina Iglesias had to adapt her pieces to the different locations. “This is a work – she explained – terribly sensitive to each space it occupies”. ( ...) The exhibition, formed by nearly twenty of her most recent creations, has been organised by Carmen Giménez, curator of twentieth century art in the Guggenheim Museum of New York, over the last decade. The curator of the exhibition, who was also present in the opening act, referred to Iglesias as an “outstanding member of an emerging generation of important contemporary artists who work nowadays in Spain”, and alluded to this initiative’s importance insofar as it seeks “the dialogue with the great architects and in Bilbao we can carry out the exhibition in one of the most beautiful buildings of this end of millennium”. (D) Juan Ignacio Vidarte, the general director of the Guggenheim Bilbao announced that the one of the sculptress from Donostia, “inaugurates a series of exhibitions related to the contemporary Basque and Spanish art, a topic that the Guggenheim museums will continue investigating, and which they will continue to deepen in the future”. (Egin, news report, November 6, 1998, p. 20)
6.5. Conclusion

This chapter has examined how discourses on the Guggenheim Bilbao’s economic and cultural repercussions changed over time in a dialectical process of confrontation between opposed versions (Fairclough, 1992). First, predictions about the economic effects of the Guggenheim Bilbao project were the main source of arguments for and against the museum. The argumentation on the Guggenheim Bilbao’s economic viability was mainly based on versions that described a future of economic failure, or discreet economic success. That is, the museum’s supporters’ predictions of economic success were, in general, cautious. In addition, economic arguments influenced and overlapped even predictions on the effects of the Guggenheim Bilbao for the Basque culture. A main concern was whether a project assumed to have been built to become a tourist attraction, and was funded mainly by Basque taxpayers, along with private partnership, would actually succeed. On the eve of the museum’s opening the cultural debate started to surface: two different mobilizations against the museum were organized by those who presented themselves as representing whether Basque culture as a whole, or modern Basque plastic art’s prestige. Nevertheless, at this stage Diario Vasco quoted the Basque artists’ utterances against the museum in a way that served to dismiss their movement and to undermine particularly their leader Jorge Oteiza’s legitimacy, while the artist was being approached by the Guggenheim Museum in secrecy. Gradually, Egin’s reporting of the cultural predictions and Basque mobilizations against it tended to turn into more cautious. The new argument that the Guggenheim Bilbao would obtain private funding, apparently, served its purpose of persuading part of the opposition that the museum would have other chances to survive in a medium-term. All this happened in a context in which the theme of Basque identity and culture was generally assumed to be a very important issue; and this rhetoric of Basqueness was mainly reflected in the PNV politicians’ discourses quoted in both newspapers. For instance, the Basque autonomous region’s president was quoted as saying that the GBM represented once again the Basques’ usual openness to modernity. However, most cultural predictions were characterised by ambiguity and superficiality and did not really serve to clarify doubts about the Guggenheim Bilbao’s cultural project. This ambiguity in the description of the Guggenheim Bilbao’s cultural project was related to the necessity of hiding some contradictions and dilemmas (Billig et al, 1988). In general, the Guggenheim Bilbao was perceived as a very expensive project paid, among other sources, by the Basque citizens, and as not concerned with Basque culture. Another source of potential tension was that this project would bring international avant-garde to the Basque
Country, and the quoted policymakers' implicit assumption that Basque society had much need of an injection of cultural modernity. Nevertheless, it can be noted that one further implicit assumption could be detected embedded in some descriptions: that ordinary Basque taxpayers were more concerned with Basque culture and, probably, less interested in an international contemporary architecture/art that the GBM represented.

Soon after the museum's opening, the Guggenheim Bilbao would be accepted as a fait accompli even by most of the opposition. It could be described as the phase of reconciliation between the different versions on the economic debate that eventually converged and assumed the reified success as a fact. At this stage was when the Basque government policymakers started a strategy to turn the Guggenheim Bilbao into a project perceived as totally legitimate by the Basques, although for that it was necessary to retrieve a rhetoric that would present the museum as an open project in transformation. The reporting of Jorge Oteiza's eventually frustrated approach to the Guggenheim Bilbao reflects different rhetoric to support diverse versions of the events in Diario Vasco and Egin. Diario Vasco's reporting that often seemed to warrant PNV politicians' rhetoric of reconciliation without restrictions was based on the use of the Basque identity as something that could be integrated and reunited with the Guggenheim Bilbao. Yet, although Basque government's politicians and the museum's policymakers were both portrayed in the Basque newspapers uttering a rhetoric of reconciliation, there were underlying tensions between two parallel discourses within the wider rhetoric of reconciliation. The PNV politicians' discourse suggested reconciliation without restrictions that was reflected in the generic argument that Basque artists can turn the Guggenheim Bilbao Basque. Meanwhile, the quoted Guggenheim Bilbao's and the Jorge Oteiza Foundation representatives' utterances implied the opposed idea that there were some specific restrictions: it had to be an internationally recognized avant-garde artist.

When Oteiza sent the letter with his conditions stating that he would only accept to exhibit in the museum with his colleagues from the Basque school, a series of arguments were drawn upon to dismiss Oteiza's proposal by discrediting its author and even the artistic movements he represented. In sum, this rhetoric of unconditional reconciliation was a strategy to neutralize the Basque artists' opposition by persuading them that they needed the museum to obtain individual recognition; and also to hidden that Oteiza's presence in the museum was needed because he was also Basque and the most visible head of the opposition movement. It was assumed that Oteiza's reconciliation with the museum would show to the Basques that the museum was not only an
economic success; but that it did recognize local talent; that it was a totally legitimate project, and
that it was pointless persisting in criticizing it.

On the whole, Egin’s reporting of the Oteiza’s negotiation with the museum reflects the
newspapers’ stance of describing the events as a reconciliation between the sides in conflict, but
putting some restrictions and reminding that there was and there is a debate over the Guggenheim
Bilbao’s cultural project. It shows Egin’s concern with an audience who is assumed might feel
cheated and disappointed with Oteiza’s rapprochement to the GBM, and some serious
doubts/accusations were reflected mainly in opinion articles. The rhetoric of reconciliation with
restrictions can be found in Egin at least until the end of 1998. Therefore, it can be argued that
although many dialectical battles had been won by the museum’s policymakers in their project to
sell the Guggenheim Bilbao to the Basque citizens, some resistances remained. The Basque
identity issue was so consensual in the Basque Country that the Guggenheim Bilbao had to
explicitly recognize and display the existence of a local production of high-level avant-garde art,
and exhibit work of Basque artists with international recognition. Finally, the rhetoric of
reconciliation was accompanied by a suggestion that the museum could be a good business in
terms of the promotion of local artists and the financial gains involved for all the participants. It
was rhetoric that predicted a brilliant future of collaboration between Basque artists and the
Guggenheim Bilbao; and at present-day there seems to exist an ongoing debate among
academicians on whether this promise has materialized or not (Guasch, 2005). In the examined
conjuncture, the omission of the previous debate and of the fact that it was the conflict and the
Basque artists’ opposition that made the museum turn its policy into more receptive to Basque
artists’ production (Viar, 2005), served to divert possible criticism that could stir up once again a
debate neutralized, but not dead.
Chapter seven

Language choice and political rhetoric in *Egin*'s editorials

7.0. Introduction

Two editorials from *Egin* were selected for a comparative analysis of political rhetoric. The editorials were chosen for two main reasons: that one was written in Basque and the other in Spanish; and that they were both published, in the same newspaper, in the interval of one day and addressed the same events. The data provides a rare opportunity to look at how language affects discourse in a situation when two editorials are published in the same context: the Basque newspaper *Egin*, and in the same period. There is not any reason why the editorials should reflect the use of different rhetoric, unless the fact that they are written in a different language (Basque or Spanish) has got an effect in the construction of discourse.

Ideologically *Egin* was a Basque left-wing newspaper, and its political stance was similar to Herri Batasuna, a political party that represented several social movements that shared the claim of a Basque independent state. This political group has pervasively been accused of being ETA’s political wing (Diez Medrano, 1995) and his eventual banishment in 2002 was a highly controversial issue (Mees, 2003; Guasch, 2005). At that time, *Egin* regularly published editorials which separately commented on the same events in Basque and Spanish languages. The Spanish editorial was entitled “*Reflexionar*” (to reflect), and was published in *Egin* on October 17, 1997. The Basque language editorial’s title was “*Monarkia Museoan*” (The Monarchy in the museum), published in *Egin* on October 18, 1997. Both editorials had the same size (refer to appendix 2), and were located on a left-hand column on a page (number seven) that contained as well one opinion article and one cartoon. The process involved the translation into English and the comparison of texts written in two very different languages: the Basque and the Spanish. The translation was made two hands between me and this thesis' supervisor, with the help of English-Spanish, English-Basque, and Basque-Spanish dictionaries, and drawing upon our respective knowledge of the use of such languages. Even when the final version of the translation was completed, our agreement on how to translate the editorials into English was always reached by repeatedly drawing upon/looking at the original Basque and Spanish versions. That is, we have been reflexively aware of the shortcomings of word-by-word translation from Basque and Spanish languages into English, and that the
eventual agreement we have reached has been a pragmatic solution. In this sense, I shall suggest that a "good-enough" translation has been achieved that accurately presents and permits to compare the use of Basque and Spanish languages for practical purposes.

This chapter intends to show the diversity and also similarities of discourses between the two Egin’s editorials that comment on events that happened on the eve of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum’s opening in October 1997. A main event presented in the editorials was ETA’s intended attack against the museum and the subsequent clash between ETA militants and the Basque autonomous region’s police, known as Ertzaintza, followed by one policeman’s death. The other event was the Spanish royal family’s presence in Bilbao for the museum’s opening ceremony.

Here I am proceeding to a deeper level of discourse analysis than in the previous chapter: I will be looking in linguistic detail at the way community and readership are constructed in Egin. This chapter will draw upon critical linguistic analysis of political discourse in the media (Fairclough, 1995), although special attention will be addressed to the dilemma that originated from the editorials’ effort to construct a common identity with their readership and the necessity to stress a particular position’s reasonableness by presenting their discourse as a universally reasonable argument (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971). It will also be observed the degree in which the editorials used personal pronouns like the ambiguous we (Mühlhäuser & Harré, 1990; Wilson, 1990) conveying a common national identity between the writer and the reader, aiming at constructing a discourse of unity and common destiny of an imagined community (Anderson, 1983); or how, instead, more unspecific pronominal forms were used to mark a position of distance between the writer and the readership. It is argued that this latter endeavor of representing a common imagined community tends to be specially complex in a context in which different versions of a nation or community are at stake and when the discourse is addressed to an audience that is assumed to be more or less fragmented according to the language (Basque or Spanish) that is used.

7.1. The use of we in the Basque language editorial “Monarkia Museoan”

7.1.0. Introduction

In the Basque language editorial "Monarkia Museoan"; the first person plural pronoun we
appeared in different ways. The first paragraph did not explicitly use we. Instead, a factual rhetoric was used to describe the events maintaining a tone of reasonable distance. In the first paragraph there is an example of we that can be described as absent, but implicit. Over the editorial’s body, the first person plural pronoun’s utterance was first implicit and later explicitly uttered in a process that involves three general steps. This strategy allowed the editorial to gradually construct a move towards a more explicit partisan rhetoric that only in the last paragraph would predominate.

7.1.1. The hidden we indicated by the deictic: the ambiguous use of *jendartean*

(1): "Errege-erregina espainolak gaur Bilbon izango dira. Guggenheim inauguratuko dute, zeina, batere zalantzarriz gabe, museoa baino askoz gehiago edizio enblematikoak den. Eta bisita honek *jendartean* polemika bizia sortu du". ("The Spanish king-queen will be today in Bilbao. They will inaugurate Guggenheim, that, without any doubt, is more than a museum, is an emblematic building. And this visit has created strong arguments among people")

In the editorial’s first paragraph, but in a subordinate clause at the paragraph’s end, an initial and very subtle way to imply a community of people was found in the word *jendartean* (among people), where the first person plural pronoun we was absent. Moreover, *Jendartean* (among people) referred to people that were, at first sight, represented in a passive position: as affected by processes started by other social actors. The word *jendartean* had an ambiguous meaning, because at the same time it meant *the people* and *people in general*. That is, it was unclear if there was a definite article embedded in this word. In Basque the form *jendearen artean* would have expressed more specifically the precise equivalent of *among the people*, and would include the definite article that could be understood as referring specifically to the Basque people. The ambiguous form *jendartean* permitted the editorial to imply a definite article, suggesting it was talking about *the people*. This definite article *the* is a form of deixis that indicated the position from which the speaker was talking, and the position that was framing the editorial’s discourse. The use of *jendartean* was a first and discrete deictic reference to *the people*; and thus the position from which the editorial was talking was also assumed to be *the people’s position*.

The use of *jendartean* in this context permitted to avoid the adjective *batzuk* (some) that implied not all. That is, only the use of a formula like *jende batzuren artean* (among some people), instead of *jendartean* (among people), would imply the lack of the abovementioned deictic pointer *a* (the) in this construction and would eliminate the semantic ambiguity that
marked *jendartean*. If the editorial had used *jende batzuren artean* it would point to a less unified community in which a sense of unity and totality would be missing. Here it is important to clarify that *jende batzuren artean* would not necessarily refer to the Basques, because there was not any deictic pointer to indicate so. What *jende batzuren artean* would convey is that not everybody agreed; and, consequently, it would depict a very different version of the events, far removed from the rhetoric of unity and communality of Basques that is found in the editorial’s last paragraph. Moreover, the use of *jendartean* has got two different semantic implications. The first semantic use of *jendartean* as *people*, can imply *people in general*, as members of a wider community than the Basque, or to *individuals* without any reference group. This *jendartean*, which is broad and unspecific, was used to suggest that the editorial was addressing an argument which could be universally understood as reasonable, and in this sense is an example of appeal to a universal audience of reasonable people (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971). On the other hand, *jendartean* implied *the people*, one specific people or community, but did it in a quite ambiguous way. It was so because *jendartean* suggested a Basque deictic *a* (‘the’) in between two different Basque words that were contracted to create the word: *jendea* (the people) and *artean* (among). This use of *jendartean* implying a deictic pointer was possible because in the Basque language two words can be contracted. This inexplicit deictic pointer ‘the’ was elaborated by merging the two vowels, at the end of the first word, with the first vowel of the preposition *artean* that starts with *a*. As can be seen in this example, the preposition *artean* starts with the vowel *a*, and this vowel does not change. This deictic pointer *a* (‘the’) can be described as ambiguous, in the sense that it melts with the initial vowel of the preposition *artean*; and cannot be described as an explicit deictic pointer. Nevertheless, *jendartean* suggested that these *jendea* (the people) were the Basque community or nation and that they constitute a whole. This connoted wholeness of *jendea* (the people) had embedded the further implication of people represented as acting and having a unity of destiny and identity.

Moreover, despite the meaning of *polemika bizia* (strong arguments) that implied people’s division in strong debates, some against, others in favour, this semantically ambiguous *jendartean* permitted the editorial to suggest that a huge amount of people in the Basque Country were against the visit of the Spanish royal couple. There are markers of Spanish identity such as *errege-erregina espanolak* (the Spanish king-queen), but in this first paragraph explicit markers of Basque identity were missing. The editorial mentioned Bilbao as a neutral place name and avoided uttering any explicit mention to the Basque nation, which was only implied by the use of a deictic pointer. As Billig (1995, p. 106) pointed out, the deictic words point to the ‘here and there’, to a concrete point that locates the speaker’s
position. One of the main features of deixis is that it can do its work discreetly, and it can be present in a text framing all the discourse and remain unnoticed. Pierre Achard (1993), analysing a sentence in a British newspaper, noticed that the word nation was not uttered, but, nevertheless, was framing all the text. It has to be clarified that both Achard and Billig analysed the use of deixis to imply nation states like the United States and the United Kingdom. By contrast, in this editorial we find a nation state like Spain, which is explicitly marked, and a nation like the Basque without a separate state, which is not mentioned, but is implied by an ambiguous deictic pointer. A prominent ambiguity was expressed by the use of a discreet deictic in *jendartean*. In the light of the context, deictic pointers function as clues that suggest to the reader particular assumptions of an imagined community (Anderson, 1983). In this sense, *jendartean* was a semantically complex and highly ambiguous construction in which several implied meanings fit together and nothing was specified. In the here analysed context, the use of ambiguity functioned to imply a unity and communality without explicitly stating it. One of *Egin*’s main features are its well-known Basque secessionist positions. It can be argued that by using the form *jendartean*, in a context in which it was inevitably assumed there would be a Basque readership, the editorial was able to imply a Basque community and nation; and that the editorial faced the dilemma of having to express its arguments to his audience in two different ways. On the one hand, the newspaper was addressing readers in a language that was assumed to be suitable for a particular Basque audience; a community, nationality or group that at this stage was not explicitly named yet. At the same time, potential readers were addressed as if they constituted a more general audience, and drawing upon a discourse that was assumed a more general audience might consider reasonable. Therefore, it will be suggested that at this stage the implied deictic pointer contained in *jendartean* can be an initial and discreet way of construction of the ambiguous inclusive/exclusive *we* rhetoric (Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990). Furthermore, the way it was constructed, the use of *jendartean* implied that both *the people* and *people in general* were equivalent and that there was no contradiction in combining both; nevertheless, *jendartean* was used in the context of a Basque language editorial published in the Basque nationalist newspaper *Egin*; and thus the first one, *the people*, had semantic priority, and the Basque audience would tend to read *jendartean* as referring to the Basque community or nation (Achard, 1993; Billig, 1995). A possible effect of the use of the ambiguous form *jendartean* was to imply that there was uniformity and unity of destiny among *the people*. The use of ambiguous terms in political discourses is part of a rhetoric to “suggest a harmony of interests and identities” (Billig, 1995, p. 90).

In sum, *jendartean* could be also considered a way of constructing a *we* between the speaker
and the audience. If Burke (1989) is correct, the identification is based on an assumption of common substance. But when, as it happens here, the terms of identification are ambiguous, so it is the assumed common substance of ‘Basqueness’ or of ‘universal rationality’.

7.1.2. An explicit but ambiguous form of we in a verb: derragun

(2): "Joan zen astearteko aitietatuko huts egindakoaren ondottu sortu diren kalapita eta isiluak alde batera uitz. derragun. Guggenheim burozko debatea euskal gizarte egokitik: eraikin abangoardista honen proiektu kulturalak, presupostu publikoetan eragin duen distorsioak, proiektuaren gidaritzaren titularitateak, euskal kulturari eskaintzen edo kentzen dizkion esparrika, erabaki guztiak marko gubernamentalean hartzeak, bestere berian inklapaturik daudenei kasuak egin gabe ... horrek guztiak, ezinbestez, kezka handia sortu du." ("Putting aside the dispute and trouble derived from the unsuccessful attack last Tuesday, we have to say that the debate that surrounds the Guggenheim concerns all the Basque society: the cultural project of this avant-garde building, the distortions that it has created in the public budgets, the appointment of the project’s head, the areas that it gives to or takes from Basque culture, the fact that all the decisions are taken in the government’s framework without paying attention to those who are involved in it ... all this has necessarily created great concern")

In the second paragraph an explicit first person plural pronoun we was used for the first time. Yet, this was a form of undefined we. More specifically, this we was a part of the phrasal modal verb form derragun (we have to say). This is an example of first person plural pronoun in which the we appears as part of the verb, and not as a separate category. This derragun had a normative connotation derived from the use of the phrasal modal form ‘we have to say’ and showed a positioning of the editorial in the act of making an affirmation uttering that the debate over the museum concerned all the Basque society. Derragun (we have to say) served to stress that this opinion was part of an important argument with normative force. This derragun was still unspecific about who was the speaker, the explicitly mentioned we: it was included as an element of a phrasal modal and linked to the infinitive of the verb esan (to say) that came immediately after. It is unclear whether this we referred only to the editorial or it included the reader. Ultimately, this statement was presented as something necessary to say in general; a rational argument to be uttered that presumably anybody could accept as reasonable. According to Wilson (1990, p.76), “‘we’ can be used to designate a range of individuals moving outwards from the speaker him/herself to the speaker plus hearer and the whole of humanity”. Thus the unspecific derragun implied a claim that what was being uttered was part of a more general common sense, and so the argument that built up the GBM as a very relevant issue that concerned all the Basque society was addressed to a universal audience (Perelman, 1989). The persuasive power of the use of an ambiguous we, that was located inbetween the speaker-inclusive we and the speaker-exclusive we, lies in its potential
to have different and complementary connotations. On the one hand, *derragun* could imply a writer-inclusive *we*, and reinforce a sense of communality and social bonding between the writer and the reader. Simultaneously, it could also suggest the writer-exclusive *we* position in which the writer’s role was foregrounded, and where the writer’s position was that of an editorial’s authority voice (Mühlhäuser and Harré, 1990, p. 175) with moral legitimacy to address to its passive audience. In cases in which modal phrases are combined with the use of a first person plural pronoun as in *derragun* (we have to say) the combination of an integrative and directive use of the pronoun has got particular rhetorical power (Mühlhäuser and Harré, 1990). *Derragun* suggested that ‘we are saying this because we are reasonable people’ and connoted a necessary distance between the editorial and what it was stated. The use of the ambiguous form *derragun* implied that the utterance was not just a partial account or one opinion, but a reasonable argument that any audience could share. Nevertheless, *derragun* still implied the editorial’s position as an agent who legitimately could address to a *we*, and to a community, conveying a message of unity and communality.

Moreover, *derragun* comes immediately after *kalapita eta istiluak alde batera utziz* (putting aside the dispute and trouble) and the editorial’s forthcoming conclusion: *derragun Guggenheimi buruzko debatea euskal gizarte guz(iari dagokiola* (we have to say that the debate that surrounds the Guggenheim concerns all the Basque society). This argument was presented as a reasonable argument once all the previous elements and examples of disagreements between Basques had been downgraded and put aside as something not too important. In this sense, the clause that started with *derragun* (we have to say) depended rhetorically on *alde batera utzi* (put aside); and on all the downgrading work operated in relation to events that had to be represented as irrelevant and, thus, deserving to be ignored. The editorial stated that in the aftermath of the events some *kalapita* (translated here as dispute) and *istiluak* (translated here as troubles) emerged. Both words have got semantically almost similar meanings, but the editorial’s choice to put them together can be related to some specific rhetorical purposes. Although *kalapita* and *istiluak* are semantically close, each word has got relatively different connotations. In general *kalapita* tends to refer to a dispute or trouble in which not too many people are involved, and which does not carry serious consequences. *Istilua* can be used to describe dispute or trouble, which can be trivial or more serious. In other words, in some cases *istilua* can be a fight and can refer to a serious disagreement. Another difference between *kalapita* and *istiluak* is that because sometimes the latter can connote a higher amount of people involved in a dispute or trouble, it might refer to a more serious trouble with stronger repercussions. So *istiluak* can be considered semantically ambiguous in the sense that is less specific about the degree of relevance of the
trouble, and about the amount of people involved. On the contrary, *kalapita* more explicitly suggests that the dispute and events were not so dramatic or relevant; and that its effects were not going to be so serious. The editorial’s choice of using the word in the singular reinforced this connotation of downgrading of an event. However, the potential effect of the use of *kalapita* was counterbalanced by the ambiguous use of *istiluak*. In this context, *istiluak* served as a repair in the sense that it implied partial recognition of the possible seriousness of the dispute. In Basque language the suffix *k* expresses the plural form, and the editorial’s choice of using the plural *istiluak* served to suggest that there were many reactions and troubles, thus functioning as a relative upgrading of the events. Although the use of *kalapita* suggested rhetoric of downgrading, a consequent upgrading work, accomplished through the use of *istiluak*, did eventually convey that the events might actually have some further repercussions. Complex and relatively subtle rhetoric of downgrading the events as something irrelevant was constructed in the editorial in a discourse that was part of a rhetoric of unity and communality of goals between Basques. While the editorial’s discourse emphasized unity and communality of projects and goals in the Basque society, such rhetoric was in contradiction with the extreme example of lack of unity and disagreement among Basques that represented the death of a Basque ertzaina in a confrontation between Basques. The downgrading of the events, which was systematically built up through the omission of the agents/participants involved, or drawing upon adjectives to refer to the attack as *huts egindakoak* (unsuccessful), and to the reaction as *kalapita* (dispute) and *istiluak* (troubles), was part of a rhetoric that implicitly dismissed this issue of division among Basques as something relatively irrelevant and unimportant that should finally be *alde batera utzi* (put aside), as it was explicitly stated. On the other hand, the use of *kalapita* and *istilua* served to avoid possible criticism from either side by suggesting that this was the editorial’s objective and reasonable voice: the events were indeed relatively downgraded; yet, the newspaper still partially recognized that the events were not irrelevant.

The previous downgrading of an event was part of rhetoric designed to make sound reasonable the claims that the issue of division among Basques should be *alde batera utzi* (to put aside) and that the real issue was a different one; and so important that it was marked by a *derragun* (we have to say), as to suggest a watershed or divide between more and less important questions. In this example, the killing of an ertzaina in a confrontation between ETA militants and Ertzaintza, an example of strong fragmentation and lack of unity among Basques, had to be formulated as something less relevant, and a different account of the events was proposed by the editorial designed to represent Basque unity and communality and the importance of common goals and action. As discourse analysis (e.g. Edwards and Potter,
1992) has pointed out, formulations are versions of events that are related to communicative actions and interests like undermining a different version of an event. In the statement *derragun, Guggensteini buruzko debatea euskal gizarte guztiari dagokiola* (we have to say that the debate that surrounds the Guggenheim concerns all the Basque society) the editorial made a significant semantic move in relation to the first paragraph. In this clause three rhetorically relevant elements were put together: the ambiguous inclusive/exclusive first person plural pronoun *we* included in *derragun* (we have to say), the nation marker noun *euskal* (Basque), which was mentioned for the first time, and the adverb *guztiari* (to all), which functioned as a definite marker of unity that implied a sense of wholeness. This three identity or community markers were gathered in a clause in which the Guggenheim Bilbao, and other related issues, were presented as very important problems that concerned all the Basque society. However, this *euskal gizarte guztia* (the whole Basque society) appeared here as separated from *derragun*, that included the writers’ *we*, and from the object of debate; and the Basques were presented as mere recipients of a discourse about an issue that not only affects, but should as well concern, all of them. That is, an uncontroversial *we* was presented, as the writer who was concerned with the GBM, that seems to be constructed as a distant observer who addresses to a whole community of Basque citizens. Further, this *we* assumed to be uttering a reasonable argument in a tone that any universal *we*, or reasonable audience in the world, might consider rational and should subscribe to. Yet, these three elements were presented in a cautious way that still avoided the utterance of an explicit *we Basques*, since the *we* embedded in *derragun* (we have to say) was implied to refer to the writer, and *euskal gizarte guztia* (all the Basque society) referred to the reader. So a distance was constructed between the active position of *we*, and the passive Basque society as a whole, the latter represented as the argument’s recipient. Even if an important rhetorical step was elaborated here by representing, in the same sentence, the whole Basque society as a unity, along with the explicitly uttered first person plural pronoun *we*, all these elements were presented as if separate.

The conclusive statement *horrek guztiak, ezinbestez, kezka handia sortu du* (all this has necessarily created great concern) closed the second paragraph. Here, *horrek guztiak* (all this) was an example of nominalization and consequently the passive verbal form *sortu du* (has created) did not specify who were reacting against the museum’s negative aspects. Participants were omitted in a sentence where a prescriptive tone was emphasized drawing upon the modal adverb *ezinbestez* (necessarily). This omission of agents and recipients made the clause sound more abstract and distant from the described events (Hodge & Kress, 1993). In this sentence the plural adverb *guztiak* (all) did not refer to people, but to the series of
situations that had been described. It is an ambiguous sentence that left open the interpretation about whether it referred to all the Basque people; to almost all the Basque people; or to a more general audience. This semantic ambiguity permitted the editorial building up a tone of distance and objectivity in the description of examples that were selected in the argumentation that justified their polemical statement about the GBM; and their version could be presented as a description also addressed to a general audience. This assumption was presented as a consequence and a fact; as well as description of people’s reasonable opinion. The use of ezinbestez (necessarily) indicates that the editorial used rhetoric of addressing to a general “common sense” or universal audience who would consider their arguments reasonable, and thus corroborate their substance as universally valid arguments (Perelman, 1989, Burke, 1989). Furthermore, as noted earlier, the assumption about kezka handia sortu du (has created great concern), marked with the adverbial ezinbestez (necessarily), stressed that this concern was something with prescriptive force. Thus, an argument about the necessary concern among the Basques with the museum was presented as a reasonable consequence of events in the light of what has been previously described. This rhetoric also enabled the editorial to present the topics of debate as something that should necessarily concern the Basque citizens and permitted to indirectly face the dilemma of the existing division of opinions about the Guggenheim Bilbao. In addition, this final horrek guztiak, ezinbestez, kezka handia sortu du (all this has necessarily created great concern) complemented the tone of prescriptive necessity implied by the use of derragun (we have to say) at the beginning of the same sentence.

This complex rhetoric was related to the dilemma of the editorial addressing a community of Basques as a whole in a context in which only some of them agreed with the editorial’s assumptions, and there were many elements that brought conflict and lack of unity among Basques. The editorial constructed an image of imagined unity, stressing Basque communality aspects by ambiguous phrasing; yet, it drew upon rhetoric of criticizing/moralizing some of the Basques that did not act according to what were assumed to be the Basque group’s interests. Therefore, the editorial had to balance the contradictions between its combined assumptions that there should be a unity of all Basques and, at the same time, that examples of Basques who acted according to interests viewed as being opposed to their own group’s should be, and were being, criticized.
7.1.3. The explicit utterance of we Basques: euskaldunok and euskaldunoi

In the fourth paragraph euskaldunok (we Basques) was finally explicitly uttered as a separate category. More precisely, the we Basques appears at the end of the sentence, in a subordinate clause, and in an argument that presented a particular group, the Basques, as victims of an imposition politikaren sail guztietan (in all departments of politics) perpetrated by others. As an explicit identity marker, euskaldunok (we Basques) was uttered within a rhetoric of we versus others. This utterance of the we Basques came together with another important rhetorical move: in this paragraph the Spanish state was finally identified as involved in a situation explicitly represented as a conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state. So this we Basques category was made in the light of a general context characterized by conflict between Euskal Herria (the Basque Country, possibly including the northern territories, in France, and the whole Navarre) and Estatu espinola (the Spanish state). Furthermore, a main argument put forward by this sentence is that the presence in Bilbao of Spanish state’s representatives, and the GBM itself, were symbols of the wider political imposition that the Basques endure. A point was made to describe the we Basques as a community sharing a common experience of political oppression. This is an aspect that will be analysed in more detail later in this chapter. However, here the emphatic pronoun guzti (all) did not relate to the uttered we Basques. Instead, it served to emphasize this oppression’s seriousness and generality that, it was argued, happened politikaren sail guztietan (in all departments of politics). On the whole, this fourth sentence that is based on rhetoric of opposition between Basques and others, ended with an explicit positioning in favor of we Basques represented as victims. Rhetoric of contrasting the Basque community and the Spanish state constructs an ambiguous imaginary community. Moreover it is unclear whether this we Basques included or excluded those who were implied not to be 'good' Basques, like PNV politicians and the Ertzaintza (Basque autonomous region’s police).
"Gauden gaudenean gauza hauek alpatzea alfer lana badirudi ere, ozenki esan behar da gure herriaren oraina eta geroa gupida gabe baliatuztuko dituzten arazo larrak bideratzeko ezinbesteko den subiranolasuna ez digutela bestek errekonozitzen euskaldunoi. Honela izan da orain arte, eta gerora ere halaxe izan dadin, pauso berria markatuko du errege-erregina espainolen gaurko bista.lak." ("Even if at the moment we are now, the mention of these things seems to be an useless work, it must be said loudly that others do not recognize to us our Basques' sovereignty, which is indispensable for moving forward the serious problems that will without mercy determine our present and our future. It has been this way until now, and in order to maintain it this way in the future, today's Spanish king-queen's visit will make another step."")

In the fifth paragraph we Basques was uttered several times through the use of various pronominal forms such as we, our or us. A main rhetorical move was the mention of gure herriaren (our country’s). Furthermore, in the same sentence, the utterance of gure herriaren (our country’s), together with euskaldunoi (to us Basques/Basque speaking Basques), was a discursive step forward in relation to the rhetoric of euskaldunok (we Basques/Basque speaking Basques) found in the fourth paragraph: finally, it was explicitly stated that this is our country. This gure herriaren (our country’s) utterance was complemented with the use of euskaldunoi (to us Basques/the Basque speaking Basques). In its last paragraph, the editorial was explicitly stating that this is the country of 'the Basques/the Basque speaking Basques' and that this is gure herriaren (our country’s) problem, suggesting a whole community of people sharing the same project and destiny, tightly related to the Basque nation and language. Moreover, this nationalist discourse was constructed within a rhetoric of opposition between what it is and should be universally recognized as gure (ours): like territory, identity, some rights, etc; and everything oppressed by bestek (others). Ultimately, the Basque nation was uttered and represented as a whole community of destiny; united by common goals and practices and a common oppression perpetrated by others. In sum, the editorial suggested that the Basques were oppressed because others did not allow euskaldunoi (to the Basques/Basque speaking Basques) to create their own independent nation state, which would be the expression of gure herria (our country). It was assumed the Basques did need to set up their separate nation state; one which would fit an underlying narrative that presented an international context conditioned by established nation states (Billig, 1995). The Basque nationalist discourse also tends to be constructed within a rhetoric of opposition between us, the Basques, and them, the others. Nevertheless, the editorial’s use of euskaldunok and euskaldunoi was ambiguous in a Basque language context, in which such nouns could be read both as a generic we Basques, which would suggest a wider and unspecific community of Basque people, and as we the Basque speaking Basques, which would point to a more specific community of Basque speaking people. If the noun euskaldunok was used in a Spanish language editorial it would explicitly make reference to the Basque speaking community and would exclude Basques that do not speak the Basque language. As it is used here
euskaldunok suggests both the wider and the core community of Basques; and this euskaldunok is further ambiguous in the sense that, at first sight, it is unclear whether it also includes the Basques living in the Basque Country’s French side or even the Basques in the Spanish Navarre. However, even if the reference to an unspecific and potentially all encompassing bestek (others) suggested that the conflict was not limited to the Basque territory within the Spanish state, throughout the editorial the context was depicted as of confrontation between the Basque Country and the Spanish state. Thus, it was indirectly conveyed that here euskaldunok were the Basques in Spain. The omission of the Basque French territories and Navarre also pointed to an underlying representation of the conflict as limited to the Basque Spanish territories.

The fifth paragraph’s first sentence started with a comment emphasizing the difficulty, in that particular moment, of uttering the argument that followed: gauden gaudenean gauza hauek aipatzea alfer lana badirudi ere (even if at the moment we are now, the mention of these things seems to be an useless work). In this initial clause can be found the first person plural pronoun we linked to the verb “egon” (to be); the first person plural of the present tense gauden gaudenean. Here, we suggested the assumption that there was a group of people who not only happened to be in the same situation, but they also shared other things. This we addressed people that also might share the opinion that the discourse of change, previously presented as compulsory and very important for the future of the Basque Country, had little chance to influence some people who had power to change the situation. It was implicit that those people, depicted as difficult to influence, were other Basques who, previously, had been criticized and represented as working on the behalf of the Spanish state.

Here the first person plural pronoun was again ambiguously unspecific (Wilson, 1990). It is not clear whether it referred only to the writer, to both the Basque speaking writer and reader, to a generic Basque society or even to a more general audience or reasonable common sense. Bearing in mind that this was a Basque newspaper, and that the editorial was written in Basque, this we can be interpreted mainly as addressed to writer(s) and readers; a we that might convey the assumption that both could be included in the wider category of we reasonable "euskaldunak" (Basque speaking Basque people), aiming at changing the situation, while we are aware of the difficulties. In sum, this statement indicating that gauza hauek aipatzea alfer lana badirudi ere (even if ... the mentioning of these things seems to be an useless work) was part of the construction of a tone of reasonable pessimism and awareness of the difficulties that the Basque secessionist movement had to face; and it counterbalanced the main rhetoric of Basque unity and sovereignty. Significantly, this tone of
reasonable awareness of the difficulties was followed by an important argument: ozenki esan behar da gure herriaren oraina eta geroa gupidagabe baldintzatuko dituzten arazo larriak bideratzeko ezinbesteko den subiranotasuna ez digutela bestek errekonozitzen euskaldunoi (it must be said loudly that others do not recognize our Basques' sovereignty, which is indispensable for moving forward the serious problems that will without mercy determine our nation’s present and future). The verbal form esan behar da (it must be said) appeared in the passive form at the beginning of this clause. It is unclear who this editorial assumed should utter this statement, which was presented as necessary. A prescriptive esan behar da (it must be said) created a tone of distance between the speaker and his utterance; it suggested that this was not a particular discourse of a specific group; and that its reasonableness was located beyond the writer’s particular stance. Here the adverbial ozenki (loudly) also emphasized that this argument was important and difficult to utter in the current political context. In addition, the adverbial ozenki (loudly) served to stress that this was a compulsory statement, thus, reinforcing the idea of necessity that esan behar da (it must be said) also conveyed. At this stage euskaldunok (we Basques/Basque speaking Basques) were represented as a community with very arazo larriak (serious problems) to tackle. So, the political subiranotasuna (sovereignty) was assumed to be a necessary condition that would allow the Basques to sort out these problems. A dramatic tone was constructed that emphasizes the urgency, difficulty and seriousness of the issues to tackle; drawing upon lexis, such as nouns (arazo/problems), adjectives (larriak/serious, gupidagabe/without mercy), verbs (baldintzatu/determine).

An explicitly partisan discourse about the Basque nation was finally uttered: that this is the country of euskaldunak (the Basques/Basque speaking Basques) and that this is gure herria (our country). However, the editorial suggested this within a discourse about the awareness of how difficult it was being listened, which indirectly referred to the difficulty of bringing all Basques together; and stressed rationality, reasonableness and sense of reality of the Basque secessionist project. Moreover, rhetorically this claim of a Basque separate nation was justified as something compulsory, the unique solution to change the current experience of a politically oppressed and victimized Basque nation. In sum, the editorial did not claim that the Basques wanted an independent Basque nation state, but that they needed one.
7.2. Describing the others in “Monarkia Museoan”

7.2.0. Introduction

This subsection will analyse how this Egin’s Basque language editorial depicted the Spanish king and queen’s visit to Bilbao for the Guggenheim Museum’s inauguration and ETA’s intended bomb attack with the outcome of a Basque policeman’s death. Special attention will be addressed to Egin’s rhetoric to maintain and reinforce its version of Basque unity/communality throughout the depiction of events, agents and victims; and to the resulting omission and backgrounding of extreme examples of conflicts between Basques; and to the use of ironization rhetoric to treat explicit examples of collaboration between PNV politicians and the Spanish state representatives.

7.2.1. The Spanish state’s representatives: the Spanish king and queen are not our king and queen

(1): "Errege-erregina espainolak gaur Bilbon izango dira. Guggenheim inauguratuko dute, zeina, batere zalantzarak gabe, museoa baino askoz gehiago edo fizio emblematikoa den. Eta bista honek jendartean polemika bizia sortu du". (“The Spanish king-queen will be today in Bilbao. They will inaugurate Guggenheim that, without any doubt, is more than a museum, is an emblematic building. And this visit has created strong arguments among people”)

The editorial’s first paragraph mentioned the visit of the Spanish king and queen to Bilbao and described what they were doing there: inaugurating the Guggenheim museum. Although any explicit editorial’s positioning in relation to these events and protagonists was absent, in the first paragraph the king and the queen were described as errege-erregina espainolak (the Spanish king and queen). By stressing the Spanish king and queen’s Spanishness, it was suggested that they were the king and queen of the Spanish, and implied that they were not our king and queen. Had their presentation been accompanied by a deictic like e.g. “the king and the queen”, this would have implied that they were represented as the king and queen of the Basques too.

The first paragraph’s second sentence informed about the Spanish king/queen’s main activity in Bilbao: Guggenheim inauguratuko dute (they will inaugurate Guggenheim). This sentence is anaphorically linked to the previous one in which, unlike here, the Spanish king
and queen were explicitly mentioned. The anaphoric they was not emphasized and is found only in the verb dute (they will) and not as a pronoun. This complex sentence stated that the king and the queen: Guggenheim inauguratuko dute, zeina, batere zalantzarik gabe, museoa baino askoz gehiago edifizio emblematikoa den (will inaugurate Guggenheim that, without any doubt, is more than a museum, is an emblematic building). Here the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum (GBM) was presented just as Guggenheim, which served to stress the evaluative statement that the GBM was more than merely a museum; and also backgrounded the fact that the museum was in Bilbao. A subordinate clause stated, in the same sentence, that batere zalantzarik gabe (without any doubt) the museum that the Spanish king and queen were going to inaugurate was more than a museum an emblematic building. This representation of the GBM was marked by the modal expression batere zalantzarik gabe (without any doubt), which made reference to what was presented as a widespread common-sense assumption about the museum. Here it was claimed that what was being stated was indeed a non-positioned description of one object (the GBM) and some of its actual features. Moreover, implicitly, the Spanish king and queen were portrayed doing more than opening a museum, precisely because it was stated that the Guggenheim museoa baino askoz gehiago edifizio emblematikoa den (is more than a museum, is an emblematic building). So, depicting the Guggenheim as the emblem of something else, which is not just a museum, implied that the Spanish king and queen were not just opening a museum in Bilbao, but that they were doing something else. However, this something else was a problematic issue (Billig et al, 1988) and, at this stage, the editorial avoided saying what it was that the king and queen were doing in Bilbao apart from inaugurating a museum. The placement of batere zalantzarik gabe (without any doubt) near museoa baino askoz gehiago edifizio emblematikoa den (more than a museum is an emblematic building) to reinforce what it was stated about the museum, did not happen at random. This batere zalantzarik gabe (without any doubt) indicated that what was being said about the museum being an emblematic building, and the connotations of this statement for the visit and actions of the king and queen, was a relevant part of the discourse that was being constructed by the editorial. The use of a description brings specification of things and entities, and consequently carries a categorization of the object that is described, as for example the GBM was categorized and constituted here as something emblematic. In this case, the editorial’s writers had to cope with the dilemma that this statement was an issue that could be discounted as a product of stake or interest (Edwards & Potter, 1992), as being partial, because it was assumed by them not only that this was a relevant issue, but that what it was implied by this statement about the GBM, the emblem of something else that was not described, but only suggested, would not be endorsed by everybody. So this batere zalantzarik gabe (without any doubt) that was placed there indicated also something that the
editorial explicitly negated: the editorial's awareness of the possibility that somebody could have doubts about this statement's implications. In sum, this *batere zalantzarik gabe* (without any doubt) was doing three different things at the same time: stating that everybody did indeed agree about this argument; also indirectly raising the possibility that somebody could have doubts about the same argument, and explicitly denying the existence of any doubt and disagreement.

7.2.1.1. The Spanish king and queen viewed as active agents

The Spanish king and queen, who were once represented, literally, as *bisita honek* (this visit), and also the Guggenheim Museum, were all activated: that is, they were depicted as active agents whose actions had the effect to cause *polemika bizia* (strong arguments). The editorial constructed an event in which *bisita honek* (this visit) was described as an actor/action that had *sortu du* (created) something that did not exist, or was not there before: *polemika bizia* (strong arguments). The way the king and queen were connected to the causation of arguments was very subtle: the use of the nominalized *bisita honek* (this visit), as an indirect way to refer to the king and queen, served here to attenuate the agency and made the discourse sound reasonable, factual and not positioned (Halliday, 1994; Hodge & Kress, 1993). In addition, the first paragraph's order of presentation of the protagonists constructed a subtle contrast between active agents and passive recipients: in the headline and in the first sentence, the main active agents were foregrounded and explicitly named as institutions (*Monarkia museoan/The monarchy in the museum; Errege-erregina esplainolak/The Spanish king/queen*), but their actions were not mentioned; and in the second sentence a suggested anaphoric *they* represented the king and queen less directly, and this time their action was mentioned. Also in the same sentence, the Guggenheim was presented first foregrounded, but in a passive position, as beneficiary of the king/queen's action, and later as an object with some attributes in a subordinate clause. Finally, in the first paragraph's third sentence, the protagonists, represented as the active agent, and the passive recipients, were both presented together; but this was formulated drawing upon language that attenuated the implied contrast between the two opposites. Briefly, the active agents were not presented anymore as the Spanish king/queen, but as the nominalized word *bisita honek* (this visit). This was a very subtle and unspecific way to suggest that the recipient people might be the Basque people. As Norman Fairclough has stressed, describing actors and events using the active or the passive transforms the rhetoric of a discourse:

The significance of 'activation' and 'passivation' is rather transparent: where social actors are mainly activated, their capacity for agentive action, for making things
happen, for controlling others and so forth is accentuated, where they are mainly passivated, what is accentuated is their subjection to processes, them being affected by the actions of others, and so forth. (Fairclough, 2003, p. 50).

On the whole, this was part of a story constructed to present the polemic as an opposition between perpetrators and people who reacted as an effect, but a very subtle rhetoric was elaborated to present it as a factual statement. In addition, the first paragraph’s organization in three sentences, whereby the whole was linked by a set of different devices like anaphora and conjunctions (eta/and), contributed, in turn, to smoothen the rhetoric of contrast that was eventually constructed between the active agents and the passive recipients. This was the onset of an implicit and ambiguous rhetoric that, as the editorial progressed, would gradually become an explicit rhetoric of differentiation between the Spanish state and the Basque people.

7.2.1.2. The Spanish king and queen’s visit: an example of collaboration between the Spanish state and some Basques

In the second paragraph the nominalized Guggenheimer buruzko debatea (the debate that surrounds the Guggenheim) and proiektuaren gidaritzaren titularitateak (the appointment of the project’s head) were represented as active elements, although the use of nominalization permitted the editorial to omit who were the active agents behind the debate and the museum’s project. First, the GBM was presented as eraikin abangoardista (avant-garde building), which implied that it was not something that everybody might appreciate, and that there was an ongoing controversy over it. In addition, eraikin abangoardista honen proiektu kulturalak (the cultural project of this avant-garde building) drew upon a reasonable discursive style to suggest that there were doubts about the cultural project that the museum represented, yet omitting any specific criticism. This objective and descriptive tone was
subsequently dropped and what followed was a shift towards a more explicit criticism: *presupostu publikoetan eragin duen distortsioak* (the distortions that it has created in the public budgets). In spite of its explicit negative connotation, the word *distortsioak* (distortions) left vague the point of who were accountable and should be blamed for such *distortsioak*. Next, came a reference to *proiektuaren gidaritzaren titularitateak* (the appointment of the project’s head), which again suggested that there was something wrong requiring more elaborate explanation; and the use of the word *titularitatea* (that refers to the ‘project’s head’) implied the existence of an ongoing pro-counter debate over that specific matter, but still did not clearly state the problem, or who was responsible. The next argument, *euska/ ku/turari eskaintzen edo kentzen dizkion esparruak* (the areas that it gives to or takes from Basque culture) expressed concern with the effect the GBM might have on the Basque culture. This was presented as an explanation of why the debate over the museum concerned all Basque citizens, and as a reasonable and neutral discourse in which the editorial did not take explicit position. This reasonable tone was achieved when the same clause leveled the predicted positive and negative consequences for a Basque culture that was represented as a passive recipient of actions triggered by the museum’s project. In the same clause, it was also suggested that there are some questions that remained unresolved and ambiguous. The list of issues of concern was completed with two negative statements: *erabaki guztiak marko gubernamentalean hartzek, betiere bertan implikatuk daudenei kasurik egin gabe* (the fact that all the decisions are taken in the government’s framework without paying attention to those who are involved), implied that some of the people directly involved in the project were actually powerless. The main sentence stating that all the decisions were taken in the government’s framework was an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986), which was presented as a fact. As Edwards & Potter (1992) pointed out, extreme case formulations “can be used to make a report or version more effective by drawing on the extremes of relevant dimensions of judgment” (Edwards & Potter, 1992, p. 162). In this case the use of extreme case formulation served to imply that people were not really controlling the museum, and according to this version *erabaki guztiak* (all the decisions) were taken by the government. Note that the clause did not explicitly say if those taking all the decisions were the Spanish or the Basque government, but it was implied that both the Basque autonomy's and the Spanish central governments were controlling the museum, and that the former had less power to take decisions. This ambiguity left open the possibility for the reader to infer who were the main agents; the secondary agents; and the powerless people. In sum, the rhetorical move accomplished in this paragraph, from a discourse of *debate* to a discourse of *great concern* in relation to the GBM project, was not a neutral list of events. The selected examples, to justify why the museum was described as an important *debate* for Basque society and that *has
created great concern, convey a rather negative representation of the museum.

(3): "Gaur, errege-erregina espainolek, gorte probintziano smoking alkitatua inguratuk, beren aginpidea errotuko dute Bizkaiko lurrean Ardanzaren baimenarekin eta jelkideen oniritzearekin." ("Today, the Spanish king-queen, surrounded by a provincial court of rented dinner jacket, will reinforce their rule in the land of Biscay with the permission of Ardanza and with the acceptance of the PNV members")

In the third paragraph a significant shift of tone took place from an objective/descriptive to an explicitly positioned and critical language. At this stage, the editorial explicitly uttered the argument that the reason why the Spanish king and queen were in Bilbao was that beren aginpidea errotuko dute Bizkaiko lurrean (they will reinforce their rule in the land of Biscay). According to the editorial’s account, this event represented a confirmation and reinforcement of the Spanish rule over the Basque territory. This interpretation of the events was presented as a fact, and was assumed to be a common-sense idea. In this sentence the only explicitly mentioned identity marker was the Spanish. In turn, the Basque Country was metaphorically represented by Bizkaiko lurrean (in the land of Biscay). Bizkaiko (of Biscay) mentions Bizkaia, one of the provinces of the Basque Country, and it can be used as a neutral/descriptive term that refers to a territory. However, here the word lurrean (in the land) was put together with Bizkaiko (of Biscay) and both nouns functioned as metonymy in which one part of the territory (a piece of land from Biscay) stood for the whole. All the Basque Country was suggested here by Bizkaiko lurrean (in the land of Biscay): in this context Bizkaiko lurrean served to, discreetly, imply a part of the wider Basque land.

The Spanish king and queen’s Spanishness was stressed once again. They were not the king and queen, but more specifically the Spanish king and queen. Thus a subtle representation of the Spanish state as an enemy was built up by means of describing actions, perpetrators and victims. More specifically, the editorial constructed rhetoric of contrast between active Spanish perpetrators (the Spanish king and queen) and a passive recipient represented as Bizkaiko lurra (land of Biscay). The prominent position in which the Spanish state’s representatives were presented at the beginning of the sentence and, by contrast, the Bizkaiko lurrea (in the land of Biscay) that appeared in a subordinate clause, stressed this pattern of discourse about perpetrators and victims.

In the third sentence there was another important rhetorical move: for the first time, some particular elements in the Basque society were explicitly identified as acting on the behalf of the other side: the Spanish state. What was uttered here about the PNV as behaving and acting in favour of the Spanish interests was highly polemic; and the editorial drew upon
metaphorical language that included some explicit derision. The tone used to describe the PNV politician’s interaction with the Spanish representatives was ironical and accompanied by emotional rhetoric. This irony was most explicit when the editorial described the Spanish king and queen, in Bilbao, as *gorte probintziano smoking alkilatuaz inguraturik* (surrounded by a provincial court of rented dinner jacket). This metaphor included the noun *gorte* (court), with a connotation of something that was archaic and old-fashioned; and the adjective *probintziano* (provincial) served to stress how local the Basque politicians were, and how artificial, awkward and ludicrous they looked. *Smoking alkilatuaz* (rented dinner jacket) is a metaphor and metonymy that added to this negative depiction of some Basque politicians in a context in which they did not belong. Here the object *smoking alkilatuaz* was standing for the person who wore it. It was implied that there would be many 'rented dinner jackets' in this celebration, one for each local politician, and that all the local politicians had to rent a dinner jacket, which was something that they rarely wore. This metaphor also stressed that this kind of court celebration was a very extraordinary event for local politicians. This metaphor was based on a historically long lasting cultural representation or stereotype of Basques as peasants (Pérez-Agote, 2006) who it is assumed would not fit into social milieus that require sophistication. The editorial writer seemed to oscillate between a positive representation of the Basque traditional identity (in which peasants occupied a standout position), and awareness, or even reproduction, of negative stereotypes that French and Spanish nationalisms contributed to spread about an imagined “strange”, backward, and rude Basqueness (Pickering, 2001). In addition, this is a metaphor that depicted a subordinate relationship between a central part of the (Spanish) country, represented by the court, and a fringe province that lacked political autonomy in relation to the Spanish state. So, the argument that constructs a criticism of the PNV politicians’ actions was based on assumptions about how a truly Basque PNV’s position and action should be. The PNV politicians were assumed to be acting against the interests of what was viewed as the ideal model of a unified and coherent Basque community. Thus they were described as a symptom of the effects of the Basque territory’s dependency/subordination to the Spanish state.

Moreover, some protagonists of the events like lehendakari Ardanza (then president of the Basque autonomous region) and other members of the Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV), assuming that the readership knew all the references, were explicitly named only at the end of the paragraph. Significantly, the editorial did not explicitly mention the more widespread name of this party. Instead, the term *jelkideak* (members of the PNV party) was used. Both the Basque name (Eusko Alderdi Jertzaila/EAJ) and the already mentioned Spanish acronym, conveyed a specific Basqueness that was named in EAJ or PNV. By contrast,
jelkideak which means members of this specific party (the PNV), but does not mention the name vasco, was a subtle way of referring to the EAJ/PNV without naming the Basqueness which was inherent in the name of this party. It has to be pointed out that the word jelkidea was not a widespread and well-known term, and that it was mainly used within the political party’s realm. It can be argued that here we find avoidance of using the party’s name; and of uttering its literal meaning. It was a formulation which emphasized that the PNV was a party that did not represent the whole Basque nationalism, but just a specific part of it.

Finally, here the PNV politicians were represented as ambiguous intermediate agents who were perpetrators and victims at the same time. The order and position in which the agents appeared in the paragraph’s sentences also confirmed this representation of the Spanish representatives as the main agents; and the PNV representatives as secondary perpetrators and victims who reacted to the Spanish representatives’ initiative. Thus, the PNV’s actions of giving baimena (permission) and oniritzia (acceptation), and that indicated the PNV’s active collaboration with the Spanish state, were represented as relatively secondary actions. This subordinate position that was given to the PNV can be considered a partial attenuation of criticism against them, although, on the whole, the argument also made a point to stress the PNV’s responsibility. This criticism of the PNV politicians was part of a wider rhetoric that represented us versus the Spanish others, in which the PNV politicians were assumed to be those of us who were with the others, increasing with their actions the division among Basques. Nevertheless, the editorial did not explicitly say that these Basque politicians, whose Basqueness was not highlighted, were traitors.

7.2.1.3. We Basques and our enemies

(4) "Euskal Herriaren eta Estatu espainolaren arteko liskarraren azken aktoa orain dela ordu gutxi burutu zen agertokian bertan - ertzain baten hilketaren eta zenbait euskaldun gazteren atxilotetaren ondorio paradigmatikoarekin - liskarkide den Estatuko ordezkarri nagusi goren hauek, baita inauguratuko duten museoa bera ere, politikaren sail guztietan euskaldunok pairatzen dugun imposizioaren simbolo dira." ("The last act of the conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state carried out a few hours ago in the scenery itself - with the paradigmatic result of one ertzaina’s death and the arrest of some Basque youngsters - where these highest representatives of the state which is also one part of the conflict, as well as the museum (they) are going to inaugurate, are a symbol of the imposition that we Basques suffer in all departments of politics")

In the fourth paragraph, for the first time, the Spanish state was identified as involved in what was explicitly represented as a political conflict Euskal Herriaren eta Estatu espainolaren arteko (between the Basque Country and the Spanish state). It was emphasized that the Spanish king and queen were symbols of a wider oppression taking place politikaren sail
guztietan (in all departments of politics). The active role of the Spanish state and its representatives as perpetrators of political oppression against the Basques was further emphasized when the Spanish king and queen were depicted as *liskarkide den Estatuko ordezkari nagusi goren hauek* (these highest representatives of the state which is also one part of the conflict), which stressed that the Spanish state was actively engaged in a conflict with the Basque Country. Moreover, this paragraph began presenting the argument that the physical context of the events, or the GBM, was a scenery in which the last act of the political conflict between *Euskal Herria* and the Spanish state was carried out. Here it was underlined that the main events happened all in one place: the museum. This place is described as an *agertokia* (scenery) of the last act of the conflict between *Euskal Herria* and the Spanish state. The word *agertokia* (scenery), and the expression *azken aktoa* (the last act), both have a metaphorical connotation, indicating that the events were rehearsals of a theatrical function; part of a play performed in a scenery. This theatrical metaphor served to construct a parallelism between two apparently different events. First, one of the issues or 'acts' rhetorically associated with this metaphorical figure was the political conflict between the Basque nation and Spain, which importance and seriousness was stressed. The other issue was the act of inaugurating the museum; an action that the editorial highlighted was performed by Spanish representatives. In sum, the theatrical metaphor related two different things that happened in the museum’s realm, and reinforced the argument that the museum’s inauguration was somehow linked to the main issue of political conflict between the Basque nation and the Spanish state.

Finally, within this rhetoric of *we Basques versus our enemies*, which prevailed throughout the fourth paragraph, those Basques who, like the PNV politicians, was presumed did not act in the interest of the Basque Country were not even mentioned. The Guggenheim Bilbao was described here as *Estatuko ordezkari nagusi hauek inaguratuko duten museoa* (the museum that these highest representatives of the state will inaugurate), suggesting once again that the protagonists were the Spanish representatives; and that there was a gap between the Basque society and politicians/policymakers who supported the museum. This representation could be also implying that the Spanish state should be made accountable for the museum, rather than the PNV.

(5) "Gauden gaudenean gauza hauek aipatzea alfer lana badirudi ere, ozenki esan behar da gure herriaren oraina eta geroa gupidagabe baldintzatuko dituzten arazo larriak bideratzeko ezinbesteko den subiranotasuna ez digutela besteak errekonoiziten euskaldunoi. Honela izan da orain arte, eta gerora ere halaxe izan dadin, pauzo herria markatuko da errege-erregerina espanolen gaurko bistak." ("Even if at the moment we are now, the mention of these things seems to be an useless work, it must be said loudly that others do not recognize to us
our Basques’ sovereignty, which is indispensable for moving forward the serious problems that will without mercy determine our present and our future. It has been this way until now, and in order to maintain it this way in the future, today’s Spanish king-queen’s visit will make another step.”

In the fifth paragraph, apart from the Spanish oppressors, a more general and unspecific category of enemies was mentioned: bestek (others). This bestek did not include a deictic pointer indicating any specific other. So, for the first time, the editorial was apparently suggesting that the Spanish state was not alone in a project that aimed at thwarting the process of the Basque people having a separate/sovereign nation state. In sum, the editorial seemed to suggest that others were not merely the Spanish state, but any state or political agent who stood against the Basques’ secessionist movement. The editorial ended with a negative evaluation of the museum’s opening ceremony by the Spanish king and queen, whose Spanishness was stressed again. The editorial’s last sentence was: 

honela izan da orain arte, eta gerora ere halaxe izan dadin, pauso berria markatuko du errege-erregina espainolen gaurko bisitak (It has been this way until now, and in order to maintain it unchanged in the future, today’s Spanish king-queen’s visit will make another step), which stressed that the event reinforced and reproduced a power relation, which was unfavorable to the Basques. Briefly, the editorial’s last paragraph emphasized the Basques’ necessity to be sovereign, and blamed whether unnamed or specific others who did not recognize the Basques’ indispensable sovereignty. One of the editorial’s main rhetorical points was to suggest that, no matter how spread the conflict and feelings of disagreement were, there was a Basque community; and that the Basques were united by a common experience of political and cultural oppression; and the argument that the perpetrators were the enemies of the Basque land. This discourse of the Basques’ oppression served to claim the Basques’ suitability as candidates in urgent need to have their own independent state. That is, the editorial’s rhetoric served to justify the claim of an independent Basque state as the necessary solution for the long-lasting oppression of the Basques.

7.3. The confrontation between ETA and the Ertzaintza: one ertzaina’s death in “Monarkia Museoan”

(I) : "Joan zen astearteko utentatu huts egindakoaren ondotik sortu diren kalapita eta istiluak alde bat eta utzi, derragun, Guggenheimi buruzko debatea euskal gizarte guztiari dagokiola: eraikin abangoardista honen proiektu kulturalak, presupostu publikoetan eragin duen distortsioak, proiektuaren gideritza-zoren titularitateak, euskal kulturari eskaintzen edo kentzen dizkion esparruak, erabaki guztiak marko gubernamentalak harzeak, betiere bertan implikaturik daudenei kasurik egin gabe ... horrek guztiak, ezinbestez, kezka handia sortu du." ("Putting aside the dispute and trouble derived from the unsuccessful attack
last Tuesday, we have to say that the debate that surrounds the Guggenheim concerns all the Basque society: the cultural project of this avant-garde building, the distortions that it has created in the public budgets, the appointment of the project’s head, the areas that it gives to or takes from Basque culture, the fact that all the decisions are taken in the government’s framework without paying attention to those who are involved in it ... all this has necessarily created great concern”)

The editorial’s second paragraph started with a subtle discourse arguing for the necessity of putting aside all the things that divided people, *kalapita eta istiluak alde batera utziz* (putting aside the dispute and troubles). The editorial’s use of the adjective *huts egindakoa* (unsuccessful) emphasized that nothing too relevant had happened as a consequence of the attack and, therefore, contributed to downgrade its importance. The way this account was organized, permitted the omission of some elements that would set a radically different version of the events. Neither the Ertzaintza, nor ETA, were mentioned here, and no reference was made to the Basque identity of both groups. The protagonists were missing, and agency was omitted: this account did not tell us either who were the active perpetrators, or the victims of the events. Moreover, other crucial information was missing: not only both groups involved in the confrontation (ertzainak and ETA militants) were Basque, but also the dead ertzaina was Basque. By describing the attack as a failure the editorial omitted a relevant piece of information: that a Basque policeman died during the attack that triggered a fight between two Basque groups; ETA and the Ertzaintza.

(2) "Euskal Herriaren eta Estatu esplainaren arteko liskarraren azken aktoa orain dela ordu gutxi burutu zen agertokian bertan - ertzain baten hilketaren eta zenbait euskaldun gazteraren atxilotetaren ondorio paradigmatoarekin - liskarkide den Estatuko ordezkari nagusi goren hauek, baita inauguratuko daten museoa bera ere, politikaren sail guztiatzen euskaldunok pairatzen dugun inposizioaren sinbolo dira." (“The last act of the conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state carried out a few hours ago in the scenery itself - with the paradigmatic result of one ertzaina’s death and the arrest of some Basque youngsters - where these highest representatives of the state which is also one part of the conflict, as well as the museum (they) are going to inaugurate, are a symbol of the imposition that we Basques suffer in all departments of politics”)

In the fourth paragraph’s first sentence’s main clause the editorial still avoided mentioning ETA and the Ertzaintza, even if at the onset the paragraph described an event in which these two Basque groups were the protagonists. Thus, here the clash between ETA and the Ertzaintza becomes: *Euskal Herriaren eta Estatu esplainaren liskarraren azken aktoa* (The last act of the conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state). Only when finally rhetoric highlighting the importance of the conflict between the Basque Country and the Spanish state had already been stressed, this pattern of the ertzaina’s death omission would be broken. At this stage, an extreme example of lack of unity among Basques, such as one
ertzaina's death, was explicitly mentioned for the first time. More specifically, the context of conflict was proposed as an interpretative frame to explain the dramatic consequences for the Basque people; and the ertzaina’s death was presented as the result of the political conflict. Moreover, the ertzaina’s death was mentioned along with a reference to those who were presented as the other victims of a conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state: here two Basque youngsters who have been put in prison were mentioned. It is rhetorically significant that those who had been arrested were presented as gazte euskaldunak (Basque youngsters), which foregrounded their Basque identity, and the fact that they were young people in a situation that depicted them as victims. By contrast, the ertzaina who died, and the confrontation that provoked his death, were presented here as ertzaina baten hilbeka (the death of one ertzaina). This rhetoric represented the ertzaina as an impersonal policeman, and did not mention that he was Basque: even his Basque surname was missing. The use of bat (one) to refer to the ertzaina added to the construction of this ertzaina as a remote and anonymous subject. So the Basque identity marker category euskalduna was explicitly granted only to one side: to the Basque youngsters. In sum, the ertzaina’s death was presented as the outcome of a general conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state; and it was suggested that the ertzaina happened to be another victim of the conflict. Ultimately, a parallelism was built up between the ertzaina’s death and the Basque youngsters’ arrest. Both the ertzaina and the Basque youngsters were presented as victims of a wider context of conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state. Further, two events like the death of one ertzaina, and the arrest of two Basque youngsters, were depicted as ondorio paradigmaticoa (paradigmatic result). The facts were evaluated, drawing upon rhetoric stressing that these were model events: examples of very common and routine events in the Basque country. As the same sentence later conveyed, more explicitly, in Egin’s Basque language editorial discourses were framed by a rhetorical context in which the conflict was mainly represented as a confrontation between all Basques and others who were against the Basque community’s interests.

7.4. The Spanish language editorial: "Reflexionar"

7.4.0. Introduction

This section aims at analysing how the readership was addressed, in the context of Egin’s Spanish language editorial, in terms of attempts at rhetorically constructing identification with the readership; and the implications of the rhetoric used to depict us and the others for the
understanding of strategies adapted to a specific interpretive frame that entails the use of the Spanish language.

7.4.1. The use of impersonal pronouns and the passive to talk about people – the rhetoric of people as victims

In the case of Egin's editorial in Spanish language a distant third person tone was maintained throughout the editorial that systematically used passive and impersonal pronouns; and no utterances of group identity markers, such as the first person plural we pronouns, were made. In Egin's Spanish language editorial even the commonly used noun Basques was entirely omitted. Instead of we Basques rhetoric, implying a collective community of Basques, implicit discourse on people in general was found.

Paragraph 1 (Spanish editorial - "Reflexionar")

"La muerte del erighthouse Agirre merece, además del respeto debido a toda tragedia humana una serena pero decidida reflexión sobre los diversos elementos que han rodeado el caso, desde el presunto objetivo de la acción hasta las dramáticas consecuencias de los hechos que se sucedieron a partir de la acción policial de la Ertzaintza". ("The erighthouse Agirre’s death deserves, besides the due respect to all human tragedy, a calm but determined meditation about the diverse elements that have surrounded the case, from the action’s likely goal to the dramatic consequences of the facts that happened starting from the ertzaintza’s police action.")

Paragraph 2 (Spanish editorial - "Reflexionar")

"La intervención de ETA, con un objetivo imposible de concretar en estos momentos, no presenta aspectos novedosos que puedan sorprender a nadie. Tampoco el enfrentamiento entre un policía autonómico y un militante armado supone novedad alguna. Ya se dieron los casos del parque de Etxebarria y Lioi, saldándose aquellos con la muerte de dos miembros de ETA. Y a pesar de todo, la muerte de Agirre y las posteriores detenciones siguen siendo el elemento de referencia más nitido para entender la realidad del conflicto y su intensidad". ("ETA’s intervention, with a goal impossible to specify at these moments, does not present any novelty aspects that could surprise anybody. Neither the clash between an autonomous region’s policeman and an armed militant is any novelty. There were the cases of Etxebarria park and Lioi, those ended with two ETA members’ death. And anyway, Agirre’s death and the later arrests remain the most clear element of reference to understand the reality of the conflict and its intensity")

Paragraph 3 (Spanish editorial - "Reflexionar")

"Sujetos a la única versión de los hechos conocida, expuesta por la parte policial, puede creerse que ETA pretendía atentar en el Guggenheim, bien contra las instalaciones del controvertido museo, bien contra alguno de los representantes del Estado que allí iban a congregarse. Y puede constatarse que los policías que dirige Aizkoria trataron de impedirlo y detener a los militantes". ("Subjected to the only version of the facts, presented by the police, it can be believed that ETA intended to make an attempt on the Guggenheim, whether against the controversial museum’s installations, or against any one of the state’s representatives who were going
to assemble there. And it can be verified that the policemen whom Atutxa leads tried to prevent it and to stop the militants.

Paragraph 4 (Spanish editorial - "Reflexionar")

"La imposición cultural que representa el proyecto Guggenheim, la oposición popular suscitada, la lucha armada, la próxima visita de los monarcas españoles para plantar la pica española en Euskal Herria y la cada día más implicación de la Policía autonómica en la represión del independentismo configuran el escenario en el que se ha desarrollado el drama que ha concluido con un policía muerto, tres detenidos y varias familias destrozadas. Lo más triste de todo es comprobar que tanto dolor no resulta suficiente para alentar en las filas del nacionalismo autonomista la reflexión que les lleve a romper con la estrategia del españolismo y haga posible dar pasos firmes hacia la paz.". ("The cultural imposition that represents the Guggenheim project, the popular opposition aroused, the armed fight, the next visit of the Spanish monarchs to put in the Spanish pike in Euskal Herria and the each day increasing involvement of the autonomous region’s police in the repression of the pro-independence movement shape the scenery in which has developed the drama that has concluded with a dead policeman, three arrested persons and several devastated families. The saddest of all this is to verify that all this pain is not enough to encourage among the pro-autonomy nationalism ranks the reflection that would bring them to break off with the pro-Spain strategy and makes it possible to take firm steps towards peace.").

In the third paragraph, some examples of the editorial’s use of impersonal pronouns can be found that contributed to the construction of a tone of distance between the writer and the addressed audience. Grammatically the choice of the plural in sujetos (subjected), and the choice of shifting to the singular in puede creerse (can be believed), and in puede constatarse (can be verified), are all relevant. At this stage, the editorial had avoided the use of the plurals "podemos creer" (we can believe) and "podemos constatar" (we can verify) that would have presented a first person plural pronoun we and would have broken the tone of distance and neutrality. In this paragraph, two claims about knowledge were uttered. The first one, puede creerse (can be believed), showed a tone of careful qualification for a qualified support to a thesis that suggested there were some doubts about the official version concerning ETA’s intended bomb attack against the GBM. Here sujetos (subjected) and única (only), served to suggest that this is a limited and partial version of the hechos (facts) that anyone could believe. Accordingly, Sujetos a la única versión de los hechos conocida, expuesta por la parte policial (Subjected to the only version of the facts, presented by the police) emphasized that there was only one available version of the hechos (facts), and implied that other versions might exist that deserve to be heard. By implication, this other unknown version is ETA’s version. Then, there was a switch from a cautious tone in puede creerse (can be believed) to a more assertive tone in puede constatarse (can be verified), which implied that it had to be believed that the Ertzaintza aimed at stopping los militantes (the militants). Thus the Ertzaintza’s actions were presented as something that anyone could verify. The personal
pronoun *se*, which appeared as a suffix of the infinitive of the verbs "creer" (to believe) and "constatar" (to verify), is a third person pronoun, but can be masculine and feminine and singular or plural. This choice permitted to leave open and unspecified who were those people the editorial was indirectly referring to. Further, the ambiguity of a passive verb plus an undetermined pronoun: *puede creerse* (can be believed) and *puede constatarse* (can be verified), reinforced a tone of distance between the writer and what was being uttered in relation to both ETA's and the Ertzaintza's actions. The Spanish *se* is equivalent to the neutral English “it”, which was analyzed in the pronominal scale proposed by Rees (1983), and complemented by Maitland and Wilson (1987), for the politician's use of pronouns in English language and it has got the effect of suggesting that the editorial might refer to anyone, or to a universal audience (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971). For Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) the use of the unspecific “on” in French language, which is equivalent to the Spanish *se*, can be seen as a means whereby a choice perceived as difficult could be avoided. It is not clear whether the editorial shared this representation of the events, but the use of an unspecific pronoun *se* permitted the editorial to maintain a tone of cautious and reasonable discourse; and this version could be presented as non-partisan rhetoric based on implications and objective facts.

7.4.2. The perpetrators and the victims

This section will focus on interpretative repertoires that framed *Egin*’s Spanish language editorial’s discourses depicting perpetrators and their actions against *people in general*, and Basque pro-independence groups who were explicitly mentioned in this context.

In the third paragraph, the Spanish monarchy was first referred to as *los representantes del Estado* (the state’s representatives). A deictic pointer *the* was used to stress that this is *the state*; and *the state* could only be the Spanish state. Nevertheless, not only the identity marker Spanish was omitted: also any explicit mention of the monarchy was missing here. Such ambiguous way to present *los representantes del Estado* (the state’s representatives), permitted the editorial to leave open the implicit possibility that the PNV members could also be included in a broad category of state’s representatives. Moreover, according to this formulation it was assumed that, for the reader, the Spanish state was indeed *the state*. After the above-mentioned first indirect reference, only in the editorial’s final paragraph *los monarcas españoles* (the Spanish monarchs) were explicitly mentioned. The expression chosen to address the Spanish king and queen indicates a preference for a tone of formal respect, although the monarchy was explicitly depicted as Spanish, and was underscored that
the Spanish monarchy represented the Spanish state in the Basque Country. A metaphorical image was used: *plantar la pica española* (to put in the Spanish pike), which suggests that this situation of the Basque territory’s Spanish rule had remained unchanged since very remote medieval times; and that this rule had been asserted by means of war and violence, according to a nationalist narrative in which the Basque territory was viewed as a land that had been conquered by Spanish rulers. Consequently, the Spanish state’s representatives were ‘activated’ as social actors and perpetrators in contrast with a ‘passivated’ *Euskal Herria* (Fairclough, 2003). Further, the Spanish monarchy was negatively depicted in a long paragraph that presented a list of specific elements that *configuran el escenario en el que se ha desarrollado el drama* (shape the scenery in which has developed the drama). The choice of including the royal couple’s visit in a list of negatively connoted aspects of the Guggenheim Bilbao is an example of how a list of descriptions clustered together can have the effect of reinforcing the building up of such descriptions as representative and factual (Drew, 1990; Jefferson, 1990). In this particular description the royal visit was presented as one of the ingredients that complicated with tragic consequences the clashes between different groups.

In *Egin*’s Spanish language editorial any reference to a debate or polemic over the Spanish king and queen’s visit was missing, but the rhetoric argument of the public opinion against the museum was used two times. First, in the editorial’s third paragraph, the participle *controvertido* (controversial) functioned as an adjective, stressing that there was a debate in the Basque society over the GBM. The proposed interpretative frame was that public opinion was divided; some people being favorable and others unfavorable. Therefore, it was also implied that not everybody were against the museum. Once again, the use of the third person served to construct a distance between the writer and what was being written, and the editorial’s positioning was unclear. Second, a very different example of the public opinion’s argument’s use is found in the editorial’s fourth paragraph. Here the main clause opened with an affirmation that functioned as a statement of fact: *la imposición cultural que representa el museo* (the cultural imposition that represents the museum). The verb “*imponer*” (to impose) had been nominalized and turned into the noun *imposición*: whereby an action was presented as an abstraction, and its agents were omitted (Hodge and Kress, 1993). Such statement about the museum representing a cultural imposition was assumed to be an objective fact; and no effort was made to reinforce such statement by providing examples of why it was such an imposition. This main clause was followed by another nominalization in a subordinate clause that literally mentioned *la oposición popular suscitada* (the popular opposition aroused) by the museum. So a link was constructed between those two affirmations in which the verbs
were presented as nouns, whereby agency behind such actions was backgrounded. The order of discourse also contributed to suggest that the popular opposition against the museum was a logical outcome of the cultural imposition that the museum represented. So the GBM was assumed to be the symbol of an action that had provoked a collective opposition, although the editorial left vague and unspecified who was behind such action. In this case, \textit{la oposición popular suscitada} (the popular opposition aroused) implied that this was a \textit{popular} movement and that \textit{people in general} or ordinary people were against the museum.

Further, \textit{Egin}'s Spanish language editorial's fourth paragraph mentioned a list of negative factors presented as separate elements in the same scenery, and all these elements were presented in a nominalized form: the popular opposition against the GBM; the armed fight; the Spanish monarchy's visit; and the repression of Basque secessionism in which the Ertzaintza was said to be increasingly involved. Although it was not explicitly stated that the GBM was related to the negatively depicted Spanish monarchy and the Ertzaintza, the location in the same list of several negatively connoted events served to the strategy of enhancing the factuality of an indirectly suggested link between the museum and the political/cultural repression of Basque identity.

What it was here explicitly stated was that the Spanish royal couple was in Bilbao to reinforce the Spanish rule over the Basque Country; and that the museum was a symbol of cultural imposition. The editorial further suggested that both the GBM and the Spanish monarchy were related to the political oppression not of the Basque nation, which is never explicitly uttered as such, but of the Basque secessionist movement(s). On the whole, in the Spanish linguistic context, rhetoric of opposition between us and the Spanish state was relatively attenuated and, therefore, people in general were depicted as debating over the Guggenheim Bilbao, but not over the Spanish state’s and its representatives’ presence in the Basque Country.

On the other hand, in this Spanish language editorial the PNV politicians were explicitly depicted as collaborating with the Spanish state. Moreover, a tone of solemnity was used to refer to the Spanish monarchy and to the PNV from a rhetorical position which stressed how serious and important were for the Basque Country the implications of the collaboration between the PNV and the Spanish state. In the third and fourth paragraphs it was similarly built up a PNV’s representation as closely collaborating with the Spanish nationalism. First, in the third paragraph, the well-known PNV politician Juan Mari Atutxa was depicted as an active social actor behind the Ertzaintza’s actions: here, Atutxa was explicitly accused of
being behind the instructions that pushed the Ertzaintza to act as policemen, the term policias (policemen) implying that theertzainak acted as Spanish policemen. That is, it was assumed that readers knew Atutxa and would, immediately, associate him with his not explicitly mentioned political party. Thus this Egin’s Spanish language editorial indirectly associated the PNV with an action perpetrated by the Ertzaintza; whereby the depiction of the Ertzaintza’s action as a police action subtlety implied a PNV politician’s involvement in a repressive and negative action against ETA militantes (militants). Here, the Ertzaintza and the PNV were being ‘activated’ as social actors, while ETA was ‘passivated’. Through the choice of an ideologically more respectable vocabulary that depicts ETA members as militantes (militants), which can be used both as a positive and negative term, the editorial avoided rhetoric of criminalizing and labeling ETA as terrorists (Lazar & Lazar, 2004). In addition, the editorial kept away from making any attributions of premeditation for ETA’s actions (Pillar, 2001).

This PNV’s ‘activation’ process was an innuendo that preceded the rhetorical move that was operated in the editorial’s fourth paragraph; there it was suggested that the PNV seemed to be indifferent to the reasonable sadness and pain that was assumed people in general felt. The PNV was referred to as the nacionalismo autonomista (pro-autonomy nationalism), stressing that the PNV was only one part of a wider Basque nationalist movement. This political party was represented as unwilling to change his estrategia del españolismo (pro-Spain strategy) and thus accountable for a situation that they could modify if they wanted. The term españolismo (pro-Spain strategy) expressed the process of homogenization and centralization of the Spanish state; and this term is commonly used to suggest similarities between Spanish centralization and cultural homogenization policies and fascism. Further, the utterance of españolismo (pro-Spain strategy) came together with rhetoric of criticism and accusation uttered against the PNV; and positioned the editorial as sympathetic to Basque secessionism. By implication, the PNV or the pro-autonomy nationalists were represented acting as if they were not Basque nationalists. Paradoxically, in Egin’s Spanish language editorial, españolismo (pro-Spain strategy), a term created, and mainly used, in Spanish language, and that is an explicit marker of Spanish identity, was the word that also showed the editorial’s Basque nationalist stance.

It can be argued that in this Spanish language editorial the readership was implicitly addressed as people in general. For instance, in the third paragraph, people were implied to be human beings with families who suffered with their relatives’ death or arrest. Moreover, in the fourth paragraph it was stated that all kind of people were enduring the consequences of constant
clashes between ETA and the Ertzaintza. Nonetheless, here people in general, some of them assumed to be Basque, were not represented as victims of political oppression, but as collective victims of a tragedy; and as if they had the common goal of one day living in a peaceful Basque Country; the latter a discourse of peace that was common in the PNV’s rhetoric. In the fourth paragraph, a group was singled out as victim of political persecution: the Basque secessionists who were explicitly represented as the particular group who suffered political oppression/repression directly executed by the Ertzaintza, although under the pro-autonomy PNV’s and the Spanish state’s guidance.

In sum, in this section it has been analysed who were represented as perpetrators and victims. Briefly, in Egin’s Spanish language editorial two interpretative repertoires were found about the victims’ identity. That is, victims were identified as people in general (human beings) and as the Basque pro-independence movement (also human beings). The latter were represented as victims not only of a general situation of conflict and confrontation between different groups in Basque society, which victimized human beings living in Basque soil, but as the particular target of political oppression perpetrated by the Spanish state. Egin’s Spanish language editorial’s rhetoric of unity was not based on the utterance of a we Basques community and the editorial described Euskal Herria as a fragmented society. In addition, the Spanish language editorial’s writer did explicitly mention ETA, and the relatively contradictory interpretative repertoires upon which the discourses were framed permitted the latter group’s portrayal as victims of Spanish state’s oppression against the wider Basque secessionist movement.

7.4.3. The confrontation between ETA and the Ertzaintza: one ertzaina happened to die

In the previous subsection it has been pointed out that in Egin’s Spanish language editorial ETA was explicitly mentioned. The use of unspecific personal pronouns and the passive permitted the editorial to construct a tone of distance and neutrality in relation to ETA. The Spanish language editorial’s writer was not writing in the language that ETA systematically used in his official communiqués, and it puts him/her in a position, or rhetorical context, of distance in relation to ETA. In addition, it has been noted that the editorial did not utter any explicit rhetoric of the Basques’ unity. Although a rhetorical us versus them opposition was constructed, it suggested that people in general (including the ertzaina), some of them assumed to be Basques, were victims of a tragedy, and implied that ETA and Basque secessionists were the specific category of victims/recipients of political repression. At the
same time, the writer presented a more fragmented Basque political arena in which criticism against the Ertzaintza was more explicit; and apparently contradictory interpretative repertoires to represent ETA and the dead ertzaina were used.

In Egin’s Spanish language editorial the dead ertzaina was mentioned three times. First, the ertzaina was mentioned at the beginning of the editorial’s first paragraph: la muerte del ertzaina Agirre (ertzaina Agirre’s death); and his death was presented as an event, not as an action (Hodge & Kress, 1993). The ertzaina’s Basque surname was not only mentioned, but the Basque spelling “Agirre” was chosen instead of the more Spanish “Aguirre”. Apart from being personalized, the ertzaina’s Basqueness was considered, but not emphasized. His death was categorized as una tragedia humana (a human tragedy); and it was stated that as a result it deserved a respeto debido (due respect). This formulation omitted ETA and implied that the ertzaina Agirre’s death was something that was not related to any specific perpetrator’s action (Pillar, 2001). According to this interpretative frame the ertzaina happened to die as a consequence of tragic events, but it was implied that he was not killed; and thus any potential accountability, or attribution of blame, was avoided. Subsequently, una serena pero decidida reflexión sobre los diversos elementos que rodean el caso (a calm but determined meditation about the diverse elements that have surrounded the case) was recommended. This advice did not seem to refer to any specific audience, but to a more general common sense: for the first time, it was implied that people in general, and not just Egin’s readers, or the Basque autonomous region’s citizens, should reflect on an event depicted as relevant, complex, and ambiguous. The use of the participle debido (due) as a complement of the word respeto (respect) reinforced the prescriptive tone of the request. This was part of a rhetoric based on commonplace humanist ethics’ repertoire (Sartre, 1954) that presented the ertzaina as a human being; and as a victim of a wider human drama. It served to construct a tone of solemnity that highlighted how the editorial recognizes not only the importance of the events, but specially the victim’s humanity. Further, this rhetoric appealed to an imagined humanity of victims to suggest a sense of communality and build up identification with the readership (Burke, 1989; Weiss, 1996).

In the second paragraph’s last sentence the ertzaina’s Basque surname Agirre was mentioned again. In a same sentence two negative consequences of the clash between ETA militants and the Eztaintza were implied to be on a same level: the first mentioned outcome was la muerte del ertzaina Agirre (ertzaina Agirre’s death); the second consequence was las posteriores detenciones (the later arrests). In both cases some actions were presented as events: the verbs were nominalized; and the events and the social actors involved were depicted drawing upon
abstract language. This rhetoric choice served to construct a tone of distance between the writer and what was uttered; according to a pattern of omitting actions and perpetrators. Further, the consequences were proposed as a reference to reflect on a situation vaguely described as *el conflicto* (the conflict). It was not specified who were arrested; either their Basqueness or youth were omitted, but the use of the adjective *posteriores* (later) emphasized that the arrests were the result of the ertzaina’s death.

Finally, in the last paragraph, the ertzaina was mentioned merely as a category: *un policia muerto* (a dead policeman), part of a wider drama that also included *tres detenidos* (three arrested persons). This was a subtle way to present the ertzaina, the arrested persons, and their shattered families all of them as symbolic, exemplary and impersonal victims of something wider: a conflict described as a collective drama. A tone of reasonable and objective description of some actions was constructed when the editorial presented the victims not as individuals or Basques, but as plain human beings; and the main implication was that there were other victims; and that this human category of victims included ETA militants. Meanwhile, the clash between ETA and the Ertzaintza was mentioned in all the editorial’s paragraphs; and a negative representation of the Ertzaintza was constructed, starting from the first paragraph, at the end of which a controversial affirmation was uttered, whereby the Ertzaintza’s action was labeled an *acción policial de la Ertzaintza* (Ertzaintza’s police action). In the next three paragraphs, the editorial justified this utterance by underlining that the Ertzaintza was a police institution formed by active agents; unlike ETA that was depicted rather as a victim. In the third paragraph, there is a sentence the main clause of which suggested that more reliable information should be available, but that people were, unfortunately, subjected to limited information; and this was implied to be the outcome of a particular situation: the information was *expuesta por la parte policial* (presented by the police) and the police was presumed to be an unreliable source of information. In addition, the use of *parte* (part) served to reinforce the idea that this was, merely, a partial version of the events presented by one of the sides; and to suggest that the Ertzaintza might have some hidden stake.

Only once the Basque police force was mentioned as Ertzaintza that is their institutional name. It can be noted that although the term is used in both Spanish and Basque, it was created from the Basque language. Further, in the Spanish language text *ertzainak* tended to be referred to as *policías* (policemen). In the third paragraph *ertzainak* were described as *los policías que dirige Atutxa* (the policemen whom Atutxa leads). Juan Mari Atutxa was a high profile PNV politician: in the 1990’s he occupied the position of ‘Minister of Interior of the
Basque autonomous region’s government; and was responsible for the application, in the Basque autonomous region, of different regulations issued by the Spanish central state in relation to security, public order, etc. In the Basque society, semantically, the words policías and policial have a different connotation than the words ertzaina and Ertzaintza. The term policía (police), chosen to refer to the Ertzaintza, has got the resonance of a policía nacional. That is, it brings back memories of a repressive Spanish police (Conversi, 1997; Mees, 2003; Pérez-Agote, 2006). So in these examples can be argued that the use of expressions like acción policial, and los policías que dirige Atutxa, served to imply that the Ertzaintza was acting like the Spanish national police, known as Guardia Civil; and that Atutxa being their lead was acting as a Spanish central state’s repression’s collaborator. Thus by means of highlighting Atutxa’s figure, and relating it to the Ertzaintza, the Basque police’s actions were implied to be linked with the other two agents’: the PNV and the Spanish state. Subsequently, the paragraph’s last sentence represented the Ertzaintza as perpetrators. This portrait was presented reinforced by an emphatic y puede constatarse (and can be verified) that not only presented it as a fact, but also linked this with the previous sentence and contributed to highlight the contrast between ETA’s vague goals and the obvious Ertzaintza’s intention: trataron de impedirlo y detener a los militantes (tried to prevent it and stop the militants).

In the editorial’s last paragraph this accusation against the Ertzaintza was finally explicitly uttered. In sum, in Egin’s Spanish language editorial, the Ertzaintza was ‘activated’ as a social actor and explicitly accused of being increasingly engaged in the repression of the Basque pro-independence movement. The Spanish language is not the language ETA has used in the political communiqués this organization regularly published in Egin in the 1990’s. It can be argued that this permitted the Spanish editorial’s writer to start representing ETA from a relatively distant position. In other words, the Spanish editorial’s rhetoric of unity was not based on a discourse about unity of Basques; and the writer did not need to utter an explicit we Basques. Consequently, here ETA, instead of being omitted, was explicitly referred to as a relatively complex entity or group, within a tone of reasonable distance between the writer and ETA.

In Egin’s Spanish language editorial, ETA’s frustrated bomb attack was already mentioned in the first paragraph. However, the acronym ETA, or any reference to this armed group, was missing in a paragraph that focused on depicting the ertzaina’s death as a tragedy; and tended to background anything that could suggest specific ETA’s agency behind the events. Here an evaluation of the ertzaina Agirre’s death as a tragedy was complemented with a rhetoric that emphasized how the actual goals of such acción (action) remained unclear. More precisely,
the adjective *presumible* (likely), which referred to the *objetivo de la acción* (action’s goal), underlined that some doubts persisted about the version of the events. In addition, euphemistic expressions like *acción* (action) and *intervención* (intervention) to refer to ETA’s bomb attack attempt were ways to attenuate the agency behind an act of violence (Pillar, 2001; Lazar & Lazar, 2004). While ETA’s activity was labeled merely as an *acción* (action), in the same paragraph the Ertzaintza’s performance was labeled as *acción policial* (police action); and thus the police force was rhetorically activated: it was argued that the facts happened because the Ertzaintza started a police action. The highly controversial implication was that if the Ertzaintza did not act like Spanish policemen the ertzaina Agirre’s death would not have taken place. It was also implied that some ETA members were trying to escape from the Ertzaintza; and that they had to kill the ertzaina to avoid being arrested. So here the editorial constructed an explicit rhetoric of accusation/blaming against the Ertzaintza; a rhetoric that implied the writer’s proximity in relation to ETA; nevertheless, this aspect was made more subtle by means of lack of direct reference to ETA. If the editorial had not used rhetoric of implicitly downgrading, while actually justifying, ETA’s actions drawing upon indirect implications, *Egin* could have been accused of trying to justify the ertzaina Agirre’s death and of being partisan of ETA.

The editorial’s second paragraph started with a complex and ambiguous evaluation of ETA’s intended bomb attack. Although ETA’s action and the group’s acronym were explicitly mentioned, for the first time; the action was described using the euphemistic term *intervención* (intervention): a nominalization of the verb and an attenuated way to describe an intended bomb attack. That is, *intervención* (intervention) was the same word of common use to refer, for example, to a surgery or to a political speech. Yet, the use of nominalization and euphemism permitted ETA to be presented as an active agent, while the chosen vocabulary had the effect of attenuating its actions’ repercussions. In the clause that followed, it was stated that this intervention had *un objetivo imposible de concretar en estos momentos* (a goal impossible to specify at these moments), which indicated that it was too early to say what ETA intended to do; and that the Ertzaintza’s version’s truthfulness could not be taken for granted. Moreover, this sentence ended with a subordinate clause that, referring to ETA’s intervention, made a second statement: *no presenta aspectos novedosos que puedan sorprender a nadie* (does not present any novelty aspects that could surprise anybody). At first sight, this sentence could be simply understood according to its literal meaning: that no one would be surprised by ETA’s action, because it did not present any novelty aspect. Here the pronoun *nadie* (nobody) appeared to stand for a generic or universal audience (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971); and it was still unspecific about who were these people whom
ETA’s action would not catch unaware. However, looking at this clause’s interaction with the rest of the sentence, it can be argued that this clause was also suggesting that ETA’s action’s goals were often *impossible de concretar* (impossible to specify). The use of *en estos momentos* (at these moments) emphasized that this was a temporary circumstance; and served to attenuate one affirmation that the adjective *imposible* (impossible) made sound too strong. Accordingly, *en estos momentos* (at these moments) would imply that even if at this stage the events were *impossible de concretar* (impossible to specify), they would possibly be explained or specified later. In sum, it can be argued that this second paragraph involved a subtle criticism of ETA’s goals drawing upon a tone of discreet perplexity in relation to ETA.

In this *Egin*’s Spanish language editorial’s second paragraph’s second sentence it was suggested that the clashes between an ertzaina, here represented as *un policía autonómico* (an autonomous region’s policeman), and an ETA militant, here represented as *un militante armado* (armed militant), were nothing new. An attenuation of the events’ importance was constructed by indirectly depicting them as *enfrentamiento* (clash), which is a nominalization of the verb *enfrentarse* (to clash), and described part of the event, but this was an euphemistic way to describe a clash that provoked a death. Through nominalization of the verb *enfrentarse* (to clash), and the perpetrator’s strategic placement in a subordinate position in the clause; as well as the omission of the name ertzaina and the acronym ETA, the delicate fact that an ETA member killed a Basque ertzaina was backgrounded. The affirmation of this kind of events being a routine was viewed by the writers as requiring justification and further elaboration: all this was provided in the sentence that followed that gave an example of a previous clash between Ertzaintza and ETA, which had also caused deaths: *Ya se dieron los casos del parque de Etxebarria y Loiu, saldándose aquellos con la muerte de dos miembros de ETA* (There were the cases of Etxebarria park and Loiu, those ended with two ETA members’ death). The chosen example was one in which the victims were ETA members; nevertheless, even though the perpetrators were implied to be the Ertzaintza, their agency is not emphasized. Moreover, the editorial used rhetoric of numbers (Potter et al., 1991), in which two dead ETA members and one dead ertzaina were put on a same level. Although this rhetoric acknowledged that there had been victims in the Ertzaintza’s side, it suggested that there had been more victims in ETA’s side. A former event had been chosen that described some ETA militants as victims or passive recipients, whether of circumstances, or of other agents’ actions, but these events were not explicitly presented as something representative of ETA as a whole. Rather, these were implied to be representative but particular events; and the writer provided a general orientation to leave open the possibility for the reader to draw upon her/his own familiarity with events/actors to construct a representation of ETA as victims.
The third paragraph represented ETA as an active agent, although in a subordinate position in the sentence that followed a depiction of the Ertzaintza also as an active agent. Since the modal verbal form *puede creerse* (it can be believed) indicated that it was not clear against who ETA intended to attempt; it contributed to somehow attenuate ETA’s agency. Here it was stated that the events’ interpretation was something that required a cautious approach, thus making up another example of a pattern according to which the editorial’s writer subtly implied a position in relation to ETA, but ultimately built up a rhetoric that claimed a stance of distance and objectivity in relation to what was being commented on ETA.

Only at the end of the third paragraph can there be detected a semantic move in the sense that ETA was depicted as *los militantes* (the militants) whom the Ertzaintza tried to *detener* (stop), a word that in this context suggests both to stop and to arrest. Semantically the term *militantes* can imply recognition that ETA was a group formed by militants who fought for an ideology that might be legitimate (Fortin, 1989), and part of a political movement that the Ertzaintza is trying to repress. That is, a relatively subtle rhetoric was constructed that depicted ETA militants as victims of a repression perpetrated by the Ertzaintza; and it showed the editorial’s ideological stand. In sum, here is found the same pattern of rhetorically constructing a parallel between Agirre’s death and ordinary people’s everyday tragedy as the result of a wider context of conflict. Although it was acknowledged that the ertzaina’s death was the outcome of clashes between ETA militants and the Ertzaintza, the main blame was not attributed to specific agents, but to an impersonal/abstract lack of peace in the Basque Country. In parallel, this rhetoric suggested that the ertzaina Agirre’s death was related to the fact that the Ertzaintza acted as if they were Spanish policemen working for the political repression of the Basque secessionist movement. Briefly, *Egin*’s Spanish editorial’s common use of the passive to depict actions and perpetrators; and of a third person distant tone to refer to people in general, allowed the writer to sound reasonably distant when, actually, depicting both ETA and people as victims and constructing a complex discourse to imply that the Ertzaintza, the PNV and the Spanish state were the main “active” agents behind the events that caused the ertzaina Agirre’s death.
7.5. Conclusions of the comparison between Egin’s Basque and Spanish language editorials

7.5.0. Introduction

This analysis looks at differences between Egin’s Basque and Spanish language editorials in the representation of the same event and its protagonists. It aims at showing that there are significant differences in how Egin’s Basque and Spanish language editorials construct their rhetoric on the Basque nation and its relation with the Spanish state. This question will be illustrated with examples that outline that such differences are related to how the potential readership is imagined by the Basque language and Spanish language editorials’ writers. Two main points will support my argument regarding the role the use of a different language has got in Egin’s editorials. One point that will be stressed is that Egin’s Basque and Spanish language editorials use a different rhetoric to address their respective imagined readership. The second question is related to how the Basques are imagined in the Basque and Spanish language editorials.

7.5.1. The protagonists’ shifting or steady representation as victims or perpetrators

7.5.1.1. Who are we and who are the others

The rhetoric of a united we Basques imagined community was more explicit in Egin’s Basque language editorial than in the Spanish language editorial's rhetoric. In Egin’s Basque language editorial the explicit utterance of a we Basques imagined community (Anderson, 1983), went together with omission of examples that showed lack of unity among Basques. That is, Egin’s Basque editorial’s rhetoric emphasized similarities between Basques and an explicit rhetoric of ‘we Basques versus the Spanish state’ was constructed. This pattern of highlighting unity among Basques and differences between the Basque ingroups and the outgroups was most noticeable in the depiction of the Spanish state as perpetrators, and of the Basques, as an implicitly cohesive collective of victims.

All this was in contrast with the Spanish language editorial, which did not have an explicit rhetoric of we Basques. The Spanish language editorial used a tone of concern to criticize
diversity explicitly accusing the Ertzaintza, and the PNV of collaborating with the Spanish state. Thus it assumed that *Euskal Herria* was a fragmented society in which only specific groups were victims of political repression, while others (Ertzaintza and the PNV) were presented as collaborators of the Spanish state's repression against the particular secessionist Basque movement (ETA and the omitted Herri Batasuna). In other words, in *Egin*'s Spanish language editorial a rhetoric of criticizing diversity was associated with a more explicit representation of *Euskal Herria* as a fragmented society. Paradoxically, in the Spanish language editorial, the writer avoided uttering an explicitly partisan Basque position, and tended to maintain a tone of distance and neutrality. Yet, the use of the term *españolismo* to refer to the PNV's political stance as favourable to the Spanish state's politics of repression against the Basque pro-independence movement, expressed a position of criticism against the PNV and the Spanish state, and implied the editorial's empathy with ETA's goals.

By contrast, in *Egin*'s Basque language editorial the delicate issue of the PNV's collaboration with the Spanish state's repression was attenuated by the use of a tone of mockery and derision. This rhetorical use of the metaphor *smoking alkilatuaz* (of rented dinner jacket) presented the PNV politicians as awkward and hilarious in a situation of interaction with the Spanish monarchy, within a discourse that emphasized the contrasts between the two sides; and subtly implied that the Spanish court's milieu did not suit the too-Basque PNV politicians. In addition, the PNV was also implied to be just a particular group within the broader Basque nationalist politics. This rhetoric of implying that the PNV politicians did not belong to the Spanish court's milieu ultimately served to suggest that, as implied Basques, they were too different from not only the Spanish monarchy and court milieu, but also different from the Spanish.

### 7.5.1.2. Diverse ways to describe agents and perpetrators that suggest different positions in relation to ETA

A main consequence of the rhetorical pattern of omitting any example of lack of unity among Basques was the omission of ETA and the Ertzaintza in the Basque language editorial. In *Egin*, the editorials' writers tended to express a different starting position in relation to ETA: two different degrees of distance/proximity can be compared through the analysis of explicit or/and implicit political messages or interpretative repertoires to refer to ETA. A broader qualitative analysis, drawing upon an intertextual approach, is required to verify how, when the topic is ETA, the Basque language contains a connotation that the Spanish language does not have. Such intertextual context might also shed light on how the discourse of othering was
differently constructed in the Basque and Spanish language editorials. In other words, to understand the effect the Basque language's use had in Egin's editorials representation of ETA requires a survey of texts that are an exact reproduction of ETA's own communiqués. More specifically, here it is necessary to look at communiqués that ETA addressed to Egin (refer to appendix 4) a few days after the intended bomb attack and the GBM's opening ceremony. A communiqué was published, in the Basque language, five days after the here analysed editorial's publication. The communiqué's original version was also written in Basque (which is the language of all ETA's communiqués). ETA's choice of the Basque language was a political action and the fact that this language has been systematically used by ETA, highlights the Basque language's representation as ETA's language. Consequently, in Egin's Basque language editorials the writer was positioned as someone who uttered an explicit we Basques, implying a unity of Basques that includes ETA. However, given that the events involving ETA's actions were highly controversial, the editorial had to maintain a rhetoric of distance in relation to this group. In this sense, in the Basque language editorial, ETA and, at times, even the Ertzaintza were omitted; and their agency was attenuated by nominalization of their actions. Further, the rhetoric of contrasting the Basques with an othered Spanish state also served to omit ETA and the Ertzaintza's agency. The omission of ETA is a pattern that allowed the Basque language editorial to maintain a rhetoric of reasonable distance in relation to ETA, although ETA was, yet, implied to be part of the we Basques community.

Conversely, in the Spanish language editorial ETA was explicitly mentioned on several occasions and thus represented as a particular group in the Basque politics' realm. In addition, the Spanish language editorial's rhetoric suggested that ETA militiamen were rather victims than perpetrators of some events that caused an ertzaina's death. Different rhetorical devices were used to imply that ETA could be included in a broad category of victims; like nominalization of ETA's actions and the use of euphemistic lexis such as intervención (intervention) to refer, respectively, to ETA and his strategy of action. Specific vocabulary was chosen that explicitly represented ETA as a group of "armed militants", and avoided the rhetoric of othering the armed group, whereby the Basque-Spanish majority press has, systematically, categorized them as plain terrorists, depicting the group as active perpetrators of murder, as the following examples from Diario Vasco illustrate:

Extract 73
La Ertzaintza cree que el terrorista arrestado el lunes fue el autor material del asesinato de Agirre. (The Ertzaintza believes that the terrorist arrested on Monday was the material author of Agirre's murder) [Diario Vasco, News report subhead, October 15, 1997, p. 6]

289
La apertura del Guggenheim será un homenaje al ertzaina asesinado - El agente tiroteado por un comando de ETA falleció ayer tarde por una hemorragia masiva. (The Guggenheim’s opening will be a tribute to the murdered ertzaina - The agent shot by a commando of ETA died yesterday of a massive haemorrhage) [Diario Vasco, Front-page news report’s headline and subhead, October 15, 1997]

The Spanish language editorial’s semantic choice served to suggests that ETA was a group with a “political goal”; and it implicitly positioned the writer as someone who at least did not negate that ETA’s “armed fight” might be legitimate. Moreover, the Spanish language editorial’s writer’s rhetoric implied a cautious distinction between ETA and other victims of the conflict, which positioned him/her as relatively distant in relation to ETA. This Spanish editorial’s rhetoric of implying that ETA’s fight might concern only a part of the Basque population, contrasted with the Basque editorial’s implication that ETA was part of a united community of we Basques; all victims of the Spanish state’s oppression. If ETA was implicitly constructed as a victim, the Ertzaintza was explicitly depicted as a perpetrator. A subtle rhetoric of us versus them was implied behind the Spanish editorial’s constructed contrast between the Ertzaintza, as active perpetrator, and ETA as a victim. This interpretation of the Ertzaintza as perpetrators of an action against ETA was reinforced by the use of vocabulary such as acción policial (police action), los policías (the policemen), policía autonómica (autonomous region’s police), and by putting the Ertzaintza in a position that preceded ETA in the sentence.

At this stage of the comparison of the two Egin’s editorials, it can be noted that neither editorial explicitly mentioned the party Herri Batasuna, which in the Spanish language editorial was, by implication, assumed to be part of the particular supragroup of political oppression victims, along with ETA. Therefore, the Spanish language editorial assumed that its readership’s main national reference was the Spanish state and that they might consider the project of an independent Basque state to be associated with a particular group in the Basque society. In Egin’s Spanish language editorial it was assumed that any utterance implying a united we Basques community, imagining the Basques as a united nation, was a discourse that would not have the same appeal for part of a readership who reads in Spanish and is culturally and politically fragmented. Thus instead of taking an explicitly partisan Basque position, the writer kept the tone of a distant observer who addressed human beings who were represented as victims of a context of conflict in a highly fragmented Basque society. The rhetoric of tragedia humana (human tragedy) that accompanied the explicit depiction of the ertzaina as a
human being with a Basque surname, implying a recognition of Agirre as a Basque ertzaina, was counterbalanced by the subsequent ambiguous depiction of the same victim as an anonymous policeman, and by putting Agirre’s and two ETA members’ death on a same level, all of them as symbols of a tragic conflict in which Basques were implicitly killing each other. A similar rhetoric of indirectly comparing the ertzaina’s death with what was presented as another outcome of the repression perpetrated against the Basque secessionist movement was constructed in the Basque language editorial, where Agirre was depicted as if he was an anonymous ertzaina. The Basque language editorial’s strategy of missing the ertzaina’s Basque surname, and thus backgrounding the ertzaina’s human attributes, while, in turn, the arrested persons’ youth and Basqueness was stressed, followed a general pattern of emphasizing how united the Basques were, and how different they were from the Spanish state and its collaborators. That is, even if the Basque and Spanish editorials used a different rhetoric to address the question of the ertzaina’s death and his identity, both editorials’ implicit message was that the main responsibility for the ertzaina’s death lies on the Spanish state’s political strategy to repress the Basque pro-independence movement.

Although the Ertzaintza and the PNV were explicitly made accountable for their collaboration with the Spanish state in the represión del independentismo (repression of the pro-independence movement), the Spanish language editorial’s writer implicitly assumed that such pro-independence movement was a particular movement, which concerned a specific group, and not the whole Basque society. Therefore, one way to address to the Spanish language readership drawing on a common ground discourse was explicitly uttering that they were all victims of a tragedy who wanted to live in peace in a territory they inhabited, which was assumed might be part of “the state”, instead of an imagined united Basque community. In that sense, the inclusion of an abstract concept like “la paz” (the peace), which is a discourse more frequently found in the majoritarian press (see the Diario Vasco’s extract below), is an example of how in Egin the Spanish language editorial was more explicitly permeable to other discourses and interpretative repertoires than the Basque language editorial.

Extract 75

... , con el decidido propósito de construir su futuro en paz y libertad. (..., with the determined purpose of constructing a future of peace and liberty) [Diario Vasco, Editorial, Title: ‘ETA contra los vascos’, October 14, 1997 - Paragraph 2]

In sum, in the Basque language editorial, the utterance of a united community of we Basques, which implicitly included ETA, and the PNV, as a nation of victims of political oppression
that was perpetrated by the Spanish state and unspecified others, was related to the alternation of Basque identity rhetoric that was both affirmative and defensive. That is, the use of a discourse of compulsion and necessity served to justify the legitimacy of the creation of an independent Basque state. By contrast, the Spanish language editorial’s rhetoric of criticizing diversity and the PNV’s and Ertzaintza’s political strategy, while suggesting that people in general were victims of a conflict, instead of victims of political oppression, was related to a mainly defensive rhetoric. The latter rhetoric tended to avoid the explicit utterance of we Basques, and the question of an independent Basque nation state, proposed as a goal for an imagined collective community; and, furthermore, the Spanish language editorial was permeable to discourses that proposed superordinate goals, such as peace, to tackle the question of a political conflict.

7.5.2. The Spanish state’s deixis

A qualitative analysis of political rhetoric in Egin’s editorials was necessary to work out how implicit was the grammar of the imagined readership; and how implicitly imagined was the country in which this readership was assumed to be living. In the previous subsection it has been shown that how in Egin the Basque and Spanish editorial’s readership were assumed to be different, the writers constructed a different rhetoric of us versus others. In both Egin’s editorials the rather ambiguous term of Euskal Herria was used. According to Estornes Lasa (1967), the term Euskal Herria, which literally means “region of the Basques” or “region of the Basque language”, was already widespread in the sixteenth century. The term has traditionally been used by the Basques to define their country (Conversi, 1997), and at present-day is used to refer to all the territories where the Basque language is (or has been) spoken in the northern Basque Country and Navarre (south-west of France) and the southern Basque Country and Navarre (north of Spain). The concept of Euskalerria or Euskal Herria tends to be used to oppose the political and historical nation states that represent Spain and France (Núñez Astrain, 1997). The other term often used as a synonym of Basque Country or Pais Vasco is Euskadi. In turn, Pais Vasco is the name used in traditional Castilian/Spanish language to refer to the Basque Country; and Euskadi was a term invented by the PNV’s founder Sabino Arana to refer to the Basque Country in Basque, but triggered by the PNV’s growing political influence its use eventually spread (Conversi, 1997). It can be noted that some argue that the noun Euskadi formed by the prefix Euzko (the Basque race) plus the suffix -di (locality) was designed to “eliminate the cultural component and emphasize community of race” (Conversi, 1997, p. 67). However, in the last decades language has tended to gain a more prominent position in the definition of Basqueness (Shafir, 1994), and,
nowadays, the word *Euskadi* is mainly used to refer to three southern Basque provinces, also known as ‘Comunidad Autónoma Vasca’ (CAV). Thus the PNV and Herri Batasuna have often used the term *Euskadi* to refer to the territories of Gipuzkoa (or Guipúzcoa), Bizkaia (or Vizcaya) and Araba (or Alava), in a way that excludes the northern Basque territories, in France, and Navarre. Further, the Castilian name *Pais Vasco* has also been used by some to refer to the above mentioned social-cultural region denominated *Euskal Herria* in Basque, encompassing the six or seven historical Basque and Navarrese territories. That is, the Castilian denomination for the Basque Country is more ambiguous in the sense that it can be used to refer both to *Euskadi* (three Basque territories in Spain) or to *Euskal Herria* (all the six or seven territories or provinces).

Instead of *Pais Vasco* or *Euskadi*, the Basque and Spanish language editorials chose the term *Euskal Herria* to refer to the Basque Country, which, as Conversi (1997) pointed out, has got a more cultural than racial connotation. It has been noted how *Euskal Herria* means ‘the Basque people/nation’, in the linguistic sense of ‘the country of euskara’. It refers, in its original sense, to the whole of the people who speak Euskera (Conversi, 1997), regardless of the territory where they live; thus including the places in France and Spain where the language has been traditionally spoken. In turn, *Euskal Herria* is the term preferred by Herri Batasuna and ETA to refer to a territory they consider their own (Núñez-Astrain, 1997); and *Euskal Herria* is also the term that allegedly the Basques’ forebears had chosen to define themselves, giving extreme significance for the language: “Euskal Herria, the etymological significance of which is ‘the Basque speaking nation’, which refers as much to the country as to the people”. (Núñez-Astrain, 1997, p. 1). Both Egin’s Basque and Spanish editorials used the term *Euskal Herria* to name the Basque Country, and it had the rhetorical effect of representing the Basque Country as a nation and an ethnic community (the whole Basque Country, including the seven Basque territories) versus the Spanish nation state. Semantically, the term *Euskal Herria* is ambiguous in the sense that it can refer to an ethnic community or to a nation: it can acquire a different connotation depending on the context of the utterance being an exclusively Basque (both ethnic/national connotation), or a Spanish (mainly national connotation) language editorial. Egin’s editorials did not mention either the term *Euskadi*, that would contribute to suggest that the opposition between the Basque nation and Spain was limited to three Basque territories within the Spanish state’s realm; or the more ambiguous Castilian language term *Pais Vasco* that, as it has been shown above, was confusing because it tended to be used both as *Euskadi* and as *Euskal Herria*. Thus the use of *Euskal Herria* implied that both Egin’s editorial’s writers aimed at constructing a discourse about six/seven Basque territories as an integral whole, emphasizing that these Basque territories and the
Spanish state were two separate entities. In addition, the term *Euskal Herria* permitted the Basque and Spanish editorial’s writers to address their imagined audiences with a word that explicitly referred to a Basque ethnic community and nation, which transcended the political and historical French and Spanish administrative boundaries; and represented all the imagined Basque speaking territories as an integral unity. In sum, unlike the terms *Pais Vasco* and *Euskadi*, *Euskal Herria* conveyed the meaning of the Basque Country as a nation and a community. Significantly, this term is often used to imply an opposition to the actual political situation of fragmentation of the Basque territories between two nation states: Spain and France, even if the latter was not explicitly mentioned in either editorial. Finally, it can be argued that the rhetorical use of a term like *Euskal Herria* indicated that Egin’s Basque and Spanish editorials’ writers viewed their readership as sharing the representation of an imagined Basque community, or nation, as an entity which is separate from the actual political and administrative organization of the Basque territories as part of the French and Spanish nation states.

However, in Egin the rhetorical contrast and the imagined distance between the Basques and the Spanish were less explicit in the Spanish language editorial than in the Basque language editorial. That is, in the Spanish language editorial the clashes between ETA and the Ertzaintza were not explicitly depicted as an example of confrontation between a Basque nation and a Spanish state; and *Euskal Herria* was implicitly represented as a fragmented society. This representation of events and agents/protagonists was related to the assumption that the Spanish language editorial’s readers belong to the Spanish state, deictically indicated by *del Estado* (of the state). So the use of a deictic pointer to refer to the Spanish state, without explicitly naming it, shows how in the Spanish editorial the writer assumed his/her readership lived within the Spanish nation state’s boundaries, and it was implicit that the editorial did not address readers living in other states such as France. In other words, the writer was implicitly assuming that the editorial would not have a Basque French readership. As Billig (1995) has pointed out, the nation’s deixis is part of a routine imagining habit, which tends to pass unnoticed. The nation state’s name does not need to be uttered, since the use of the deictic *the state* already indicates what is taken for granted: that *the state* is the reader’s specific nation state. In a world system that is organized in nation states, the readership of Egin will tend to read *del Estado* as being a reference to the Spanish nation state. This use of deixis is pervasive in the phenomenon that Billig (1995) described as banal nationalism: the routine remembrance and display of symbols of a nation state. The nation state tends to be taken for granted, although it has to be constantly reinforced. It can be argued that the Spanish language editorial did not explicitly address a Basque community, but
implied people in general, assuming that the readership was part of a wider community of Spanish language readers who were localized within the Spanish borders; and not necessarily in the Basque Autonomous Community and southern Navarre. This discourse did not deliberately exclude the Basques in France, although it was implicit that those Basques who are not Spanish speakers were not addressed by the Spanish language editorial, which is assumed addressed mainly to Basques, and other groups and individuals, in the Spanish nation state.

In the Basque language editorial the readership was assumed to be part of an imagined community (Anderson, 1983) of explicitly uttered we Basques. Significantly, utterances such as the Spanish state, which were missing in the Spanish language editorial, and emphasized that the editorial was referring to the specific Spanish state, while also implying that this was not our state, were explicitly uttered in the Basque language editorial. In the Basque language editorial can be found an example of omission of the word Spanish when referring to the state. Nevertheless, this use of the deictic in Estatuko ordezkari nagusi goren hauek (these highest representatives of the state), appeared in a subordinate clause of a sentence which had previously presented the event as Euskal Herriaren eta Estatu espinolaren arteko liskarraren azken aktoa (the last act of the conflict between Euskal Herria and the Spanish state). That is, the same sentence had already explicitly indicated that Estatuko, referred to Estatu espinolaren. Furthermore, hauek (these) clearly referred back to the first part of the sentence where Estatu espinolaren was already uttered. Summarizing, in the Basque language editorial the state’s deixis was ambiguous and uttered as part of a rhetoric of us (a stateless nation) versus them (the enemy state). The two alternative deictic and non-deictic ways to refer to the Spanish state found in Egin’s Basque language editorial indicate that the editorial’s writer was ambiguous about the imagined readership. Although the deictic Estatuko suggests that the editorial might be talking about Spanish politics, there was not clear distinction between politics and Spanish politics or a clear deictic signaling that the editorial might be addressing to a Basque readership, assuming that they lived within the Spanish state’s borders. In the Spanish language editorial’s del Estado, the deixis was clearly pointing out that the editorial’s writer assumed that the readership was Spanish, whereas in the Basque language editorial the deixis was subtle and ambiguous: although the writer seemed to address to Basque politics within the Spanish state’s realm, the editorial also moved towards imagining the “we Basques community” as a readership who might be located beyond the Spanish state’s boundaries. However, these differences must not be interpreted as related to a deliberate policy of inclusion or exclusion of groups within a rhetoric of us versus others. On the contrary, the more or less explicit or ambiguous Spanish deixis in Egin’s
editorials was linked with the fact that different language contexts positioned the editorials’ writers in different rhetorical situations. These rhetorical situations had an effect on the way the writer viewed his/her readership as more/less related to one or other linguistic-symbolic context; and this affected the choice of rhetorical terms.
Chapter eight

Conclusion

This thesis looked quantitatively and qualitatively at the discursive shifts in the Basque nationalist press’ reporting of the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum. The analysis was based on a revision of theoretical and methodological literature on traditional content analysis, and ideological discourse analysis, combined with a socio-historical approach to nationalism applied to the specific case of the Basque Country. A three-level quantitative and qualitative discourse analysis approach provided important resources to thoroughly examine the development of the particular event/crisis of the Guggenheim Bilbao, and its underlying ideological dilemmas, until it gradually became a less controversial issue.

Some of the general hypothesis that the content analysis served to verify were that the Guggenheim Bilbao became more accepted in 1998; and that its portrayal was more negatively connoted in Egin than in Diario Vasco. It also provided evidence that the economy and the Basque identity/culture were pivotal themes in the debate over the GBM.

However, a main reason why a content analysis method was adopted can be related to my own intellectual journey. I was born in the Basque Country and completed primary and secondary schooling in an ikastola (Basque language school). Subsequently, in the University of the Basque Country, in Leioa, near Bilbao, I graduated in media and communication sciences, in 1992. Between 1994 and 2002, I spent most of the time in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) where I undertook my postgraduate academic journey working as a researcher, and where I eventually completed a Master in Social Psychology. There I studied theories such as intergroup relations and social representations, which I used when I analysed Basque and Brazilian nationalisms. In that period of my life, I believe I developed a more distant insight of the phenomena of nationalism, and Basque nationalism in particular. I also published papers on nationalism in Brazilian and Mexican academic journals. In addition, over the years I got the habitus of adopting the method of content analysis that provides a general orientation or big picture to orient the analysis of patterns of representation and discursive change when comparing different sets of data. Nevertheless, the adoption of the theoretical and methodological tools of discourse analysis permitted me to tackle the ideological debate over the Guggenheim Museum looking in detail at contradictions, and dilemmas, in the clash of different versions on the same events and actors; and to examine what triggered potential change or reproduction of common-sense/naturalized views/representations underpinned by,
for example, nationalist discourses on Basque identity. In that sense, I shall claim that if from a more qualitative discourse analytic position my methodological choice to draw upon content analysis might seem somehow less coherent, I think that this piece of work reflects a conjuncture of transition between my previous academic background and my current more qualitative approach to social psychological phenomena and to the work of ideology in the Basque press.

Overall, the content analysis highlighted differences in Egin between texts written in Basque and in Spanish, as well as important shifts over time in terms of reported themes and connotations. However, to understand the detail of these phenomena, the content analysis had to be complemented with in-depth qualitative analysis of the argumentative flux between different versions of events and agents/participants. I focused on the qualitative analysis of rhetorical tools, such as e.g. quantification, and the use of metaphors that draw upon stereotypes. I attempted to examine how diverse rhetorical strategies constructed specific versions of reality that claimed factuality and coherence, and thus expressed underlying contradictions and ideological dilemmas (Billig et al, 1988). The qualitative analysis of ideological dilemmas provides a wider picture of a Basque political and cultural system that undertook the project to open a Guggenheim museum in Bilbao. One of the main reasons why the debate over the Guggenheim Bilbao was underpinned by a set of complex ideological dilemmas is that while some might have considered that Bilbao and the Basque autonomous region’s provinces had good conditions to set up an international modern art museum, a widespread competing opinion was that some of the conditions were not given yet.

The qualitative in-depth analysis of two Egin’s Basque and Spanish language editorials, which reported a similar crisis/event and agents/participants, permitted a thorough examination of two different ways of constructing left-wing Basque nationalist political and community discourses in rhetorical contexts that are assumed to be identical apart from the language used. The use of the Basque language was associated with a discourse that addressed a Basque speaking community context, whereby the editorial addressed to the readership as to a separate, differentiated and united Basque community. In turn, the Spanish language editorial assumed that the Basque society and its readership are both highly fragmented and it addressed the latter as if they were part of the Spanish society and “humanity in general”.
Before the museum’s opening, the main themes of debate involved predictions on whether the GBM would have positive or negative repercussions for the Basque economy and taxpayers. The analysis of discursive change in the analysed conjuncture (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999) showed that at the onset a quantification rhetoric in terms of expected numbers of visitors was often accompanied by category entitlement rhetoric (e.g. expert voices such as architects and economists in signed opinion articles). Discourse and rhetoric analysis was necessary to infer how *Diario Vasco*’s initial reporting discreetly highlighted the benefits of the Guggenheim Museum for the local economy, without assuming an explicit position. At this stage, policymakers’ often cautious economic predictions and Basque politicians’ and foreign prestigious agents’ utterances emphasizing the benefits of modern architecture/art for the Basque Country were extensively quoted by *Diario Vasco*, and contributed to an implicitly favourable portrayal of the Guggenheim Bilbao. In turn, *Egin*, rather defensively, used devices such as “scare quotes” (Predelli, 2003), among others, to suggest distance and mistrust in relation to quoted speeches of diverse agents who, similarly, commented on the economic/cultural benefits that the project might trigger. Overall, the analysis of reports of economic predictions showed that whether the GBM would be a success was generally assumed to be unclear.

A qualitative analysis of discursive processes as influenced by a changing context, and underlying ideological dilemmas, served to examine several examples of discursive change. First, how in the aftermath of the museum’s opening, a main strategy of policymakers was to present empirical data to confirm that the Guggenheim Bilbao’s economic success was a fait accompli. Second, how *Diario Vasco*’s rhetoric of the GBM economic success ceased to be cautious. Third, how even *Egin* would later support and warrant the discourse that presented the museum as a big success. The qualitative analysis showed how the newspapers reacted with perplexity to an unpredicted GBM’s success among Basques. One of the main factors of surprise was to notice that some Basques also expressed interest in the museum. The success was rather unexpected, since the Basque nationalist press’ reporting, at times, conveyed the view that the majority of the Basques were indifferent to (or lacked deep investment/interest in) the modern art/architecture the GBM represented. The newspapers’ underlying assumption that for many Basques the museum was just a temporary attraction can be detected in both newspapers’ reporting of examples of Basques who visited the museum. Further, a higher presence of Basques than any other kind of tourists in the museum might be interpreted as a symptom of the failure of policymakers’ plans to use the GBM as a cultural symbol that would attract tourists and investments from outside the Basque Country. At that time, the idea of the GBM as an economic success was consensual among Basque nationalists. Strategically,
Diario Vasco's and Egin's reporting emphasized the presence of Spanish and foreign tourists in the museum. A close look at Egin's discursive moves indicates that even this newspaper aligned itself close to policymakers' positions.

In parallel to this, for Egin the presence of Basques in the GBM represented the adhesion of some Basques to the arguments, goals and projects of the PNV and its policymakers, but also represented part of its readership. Thus the presence of Basques in the GBM, along with tourists from other provenances was reported as being equally important. However, another part of its readership was assumed to remain against the museum and the downgrading of some particular Basques' interest in the GBM as something temporary could be interpreted as an attempt to please the former.

In the case of Diario Vasco, reporting the Basque presence in the museum could serve as a rebuttal of potential criticism against policymakers who were often accused of not trying to make the Guggenheim Bilbao a museum for the Basques (Guasch, 2005). That is, another main source of potential ideological dilemma was that the GBM had been planned to attract other tourists than Basques, but had to be sold also as a Basque project to please the Basque taxpayers who were funding it.

In short, eventual shifts on discourses about the GBM's repercussions for the local economy and the Basque identity/culture were underpinned by a set of complex ideological dilemmas (Billig et al, 1988). Each newspaper, separately, tried to deflect the attention from such dilemmas and weaknesses/contradictions of their arguments in order to present a version of the events that would permit the newspapers to claim objectivity, factuality and coherence. Overall, Egin tried to maintain a position of neutrality, while noticing that part of the Basque public might feel attracted and seduced by the museum and its promise of modern technology, tourism, and economic growth. At that stage, Egin's quotation of diverse policymakers' utterances was carefully used. Quotations permitted the newspaper to suggest a relatively neutral stand. Nevertheless, Egin also drew upon rhetoric of occasional discreet criticism of the museum's cultural project, and used quotations to suggest distance/mistrust in relation to PNV policymakers' baroque rhetoric which stressed, for example, the museum architecture's unique qualities. On the other hand, the newspaper took into consideration, and partially warranted, the left-wing Basque artistic groups' opposition movement.

It is striking that, even among the museum's initiatives' detractors, the question of the Basque culture was generally tackled drawing upon economic arguments. Apparently, a similar view of the capitalist society, market and business influenced the arguments and counterarguments.
on the museum’s initiative. Further, this underlying view of economy as more important than culture facilitated Egin’s explicit discursive move towards the adoption of the version of the GBM’s success. Following Barthes’ (1984) insights on the symbolic regime, I suggest that the GBM’s debate’s development was tightly related to the wider context of the Basque society in which it happened. It can be noted that in the fall of 1997 the Basque economy was growing faster than the Spanish (Irvin, 1999). According to Barthes a symbolic regime is not just a gathering (or antagonism) of symbols. The debate’s symbolic regime would thus be related to a set of homogeneous rules, which were based upon common-sense assumptions of what was a priority for the Basques. Barthes had pointed out how the diverse actors and adversaries in May 1968’s demonstrations drew upon arguments that affected the degree in which the two sides shared a same symbolic discourse. In the GBM’s controversy similar phenomena can be noted. The two main Basque nationalist groups and their respective newspapers assumed that economy had priority over culture. Culture’s perceived importance was related to its potential use as a political tool for each Basque nationalist groups’ particular mobilization strategies. The analysis of discourses on the Guggenheim Bilbao’s implications for Basque culture also highlighted another version that mainly the PNV policymakers attempted to disseminate, and that Diario Vasco subscribed. This was the argument that the Guggenheim Bilbao was interested in Basque avant-garde artists, and the implication that the museum might serve to promote Basque artists’ work. This argument was pivotal in the strategy to build up the Guggenheim Bilbao as a museum that legitimately deserved to be positively viewed by the Basque citizens. The latter category implicitly subsumed the taxpayers who were indirectly reassured that their funding of the project was worthwhile.

A closer look to the immediate conjuncture of the second period (post-inauguration) indicates that specific shifts of language, like the sudden adoption of a rhetoric of reconciliation by the PNV policymakers, might have been also influenced by specific socio-historical factors like the onset in October 1997 of initial signs of the beginning of a peace process in the Basque Country. This Basque nationalists’ undertaking would bring together Herri Batasuna and the PNV, after a long period of political polarization between main left-wing and conservative representatives of Basque nationalist. This political rapprochement between Basque nationalisms might have had an indirect effect on Egin’s more subtle and cautious rhetoric to depict an approximation between Jorge Oteiza and the Guggenheim Bilbao in 1998.

Chapter seven explored how in the Basque Country the imagined readership and rhetoric about who are we, and who are the others can be differently constructed even in the similar ideological context of a specific left-wing Basque nationalist newspaper: Egin. The two editorials addressed the same events and agents/participants in the same newspaper, in two
consecutive days. It presented a rare opportunity to examine how in Egin the use of a language modifies the rhetorical context from which the writer addresses her/his political and community discourse to the readership. The imagined readership is differently represented depending on whether the language used is Basque or Spanish. The rhetoric of we and otherness was different when the editorial addressed the readers in Basque from when the editorial was written in Spanish. Further, there were different descriptions of agents/participants, versions of who was perpetrator/victim, or active/passive agent, as well as different emphasis put on partisan Basque nationalist discourses that were explicitly uttered in Basque language, but were substituted by impersonal third person pronouns in the Spanish language editorial.

The use of the Basque language assumed that all the readers addressed are Basques, and that the “Basque community” can be described as a whole. In this context, a version was built up in which examples that contradicted such assumption of Basque unity were backgrounded or omitted. Significantly, the Basque policeman’s identity was constructed as impersonal and remote (his Basque surname was omitted, and also that he was killed by other Basques), and ETA was implicit in the narration, but never mentioned. In the rhetorical context framed by the use of Basque, common identity of all Basques was reinforced through the reproduction of stereotypes about Basqueness, such as the image of the Basque peasant. Once decontextualized from its historical use by the French and Spanish nation state nationalisms, this stereotype could serve to a double new purpose: ironization and moralization of the Basques who collaborate with explicit symbols of Spanish oppression and imperialism.

In turn, in the Spanish language editorial the audience was assumed to be fragmented. The editorials’ way of appealing to the audience was to stress common-sense assumptions that there are two groups of Basques: the left-wing secessionists, and the majority of the Basques depicted as victims. Significantly, the Spanish editorial’s discourses were framed by the assumption that part of the Spanish language audience did not identify as Basque. In terms of the rhetorical construction of identification between the writer and the readership, the lack of Basque partisan rhetoric was substituted by a discourse of “common humanity” of people victims of a tragic conflict. Such rhetoric allowed the writers to make more explicit attribution of blame for the ertzaina’s death. The Basque policeman was described as a Basque young man victim of a tragedy that affected everybody in the Basque Country. Ultimately, the Spanish state and its collaborators (PNV and the Basque autonomous region’s police) were rhetorically constructed as perpetrators. By contrast, ETA was constructed as a victim. This effect was achieved through the systematic use of the third person and passive verbs.
Finally, it can be noted that the comparative fine-grain ideological discourse analysis of the two editorials offered the opportunity to observe something that the qualitative discourse analysis of discursive interaction would have missed: different ways to imply the Spanish state’s taken-for-granted deictic. In the Spanish language editorial the Spanish nation state’s deictic was explicit. It was clearly suggested that the writer addressed to the state, unwittingly conveying the assumption that her/his and the readerships’ nation state was the Spanish. That is, although the editorial was written in a reputedly Basque secessionist newspaper, the editorial addressed its readership as members of the Spanish state. This comparative analysis of political rhetoric also served to confirm that the Spanish deixis was far more ambiguous in the Basque language context. Although the Basque language editorial also explicitly commented on the Basque and Spanish politics a strategic use of the Basque language permitted the construction of a more subtle deixis. The Basque language was used with the rhetorical effect of suggesting the possibility that the editorial might be also addressing to those Basques living outside the Spanish nation state limits.

For the nationalist politicians and press the Guggenheim Bilbao might be a symbol that could be used to represent the Basque search of more cultural and economic autonomy or even sovereignty. The qualitative ideological discourse analysis permitted to examine the hidden assumptions within Basque nationalist politicians’ rhetoric. On the one hand, those policymakers who uttered rhetoric claiming that the Basques needed the GBM, often assumed that the addressed people might not be interested in it. On the other hand, Egin’s Basque editorials’ rhetoric argued that others do not allow Basques, considered as we, to obtain (our) collective sovereignty. They did not claim that the Basques want to be sovereign, but that they need to be sovereign, thereby assuming that many Basques did not share this project either.

In relation to the first assumption that the Basques are not interested in international modern art, we could wonder if this commonplace assumption could not be a nationalist politicians’ strategy to maintain Basque nationalist rhetoric while expressing a traditional model of Basque culture. If large numbers of Basques were explicitly adopting other themes, projects, aesthetics, that convey adhesion to symbols of modernity, would not Basque nationalists represent this as a threat? Would it not be perceived by nationalists as a symptom of loss of “the Basque cultural identity”? Part of the analysed texts that quoted expert voices seemed to address an urban readership. Maybe, the newspapers assumed that part of the readership had started to feel “attracted/seduced” by the museum, as I suggested above. However, this new trend was not upgraded by the Basque nationalist coverage of the debate.
In chapter 6, I examined the reporting of the PNV politicians’ construction of Basqueness and, in chapter 7, the rhetoric to address to differently imagined linguistic communities in Egin. Both analyses served to identify a complex set of ideological dilemmas. The Basque nationalist political parties and the press have to address an audience/readership who is often assumed to be Basque, but not necessarily nationalist. Some of the dilemmas of the Basques that have been mapped in this thesis could be further analysed in other qualitative ideological discourse studies in the light of a general context of international modernity, viewed as a political and cultural phenomenon. Modernity to be fully enjoyed requires a certain degree of cultural and political autonomy and differentiation. Basques nowadays face three sets of dilemmas regarding how to be modern, yet remaining a culturally differentiated ethnic group. Modernity requires: 1) to become well defined subjects (as individuals/collectivity) in terms of culture and language; 2) self-delimited space/territory; 3) political autonomy. How to differentiate from others is an issue that the Basques have not solved yet. Adoption and reproduction of stereotypes that associate Basqueness with tradition has been an available formula for either conservative and left-wing Basque nationalisms. The nationalists’ assumption that the Basques would not develop a genuine interest in modern art seems to be a symptom of this pattern of reinforcing a representation of the Basques as a traditional people. The analysis of political discourses in the Basque nationalist press suggests that being traditional/modern is a dilemma of Basque society. Nonetheless, the main dilemma is whether to be culturally and politically autonomous/sovereign, which would allow the Basques to construct a self-definition of Basqueness. To achieve a modern self-definition it will be necessary to have a cultural context that recognizes the value of Basqueness and maintains freedom; but this condition is not given yet. The constructions of an explicit we Basques partisan discourse claiming that the Basques need sovereignty, and an ambiguous nation state deixis, suggest that in Egin’s Basque language's rhetorical context Basqueness is constructed as a long-term project/representation. It also points to a thoroughly different evaluation of the analysed conjuncture, implying the version that one day the Basques might find their own formulas to transcend the present-day cultural and political dilemmas and limits.
APPENDIX 1 –Extracts in the original language

Extract 1

1 1997. Guggengano. [headline] (...) Según el Plan Operativo, ahora, para el año 2000 sólo se prevén 500.000 visitantes, de los cuales el 64,3% (24,3% peninsulares y 40% resto del mundo), es decir, 231.500, serán forasteros: catalanes, españoles, franceses, Gallegos, italianos, japoneses ...( ...) Un museo por sí mismo apenas genera, salvo a reducidísimas personas, atractivo para viajar a una ciudad; éstas atraen por una suma de contenidos de ese lugar: morfología urbana, belleza, accesibilidad, limpieza, niveles económicos, ocio, educación, seguridad ... lo que provoca un interés exterior más o menos generalizado; en Bilbao hay muchísimas carencias de esos alicientes. (...) Entre las varias imágenes a las que se asocia este faraonismo, una, en busca del folklore, suele ser la de un barco junto a la ría. Se le denomina el "buque insignia" del Bilbao metropolitano. Efectivamente, es el barco pirata de titanio, que después de habernos saqueado cultural y económicamente naufraga en el astillero. Este sería un nuevo 'Titanic'; el aparentemente insumergible, el orgullo del país, pero que a la deriva se hundió estrepitosamente en su travesía inaugural 1997-2000'. (Egin, opinion article headline and text written by Iñaki Uriarte, January 3, 1997, p. 47)

Extract 2

'Guggenheim, Premio Pritzker y otras epidemias. [headline] (...) La apertura de lo que los miembros de GBM definen como una sede museística equiparable a la de New York, está prevista con una gran exposición inaugural: "Arte del Siglo XX. Obras maestras de la Colección Guggenheim", que ya habrán visto en el mundo oriental: Singapur, Dunedin (Nueva Zelanda), Taipeh (Taiwán). Lo que mermará el importante número de turistas japoneses calculado que acudirán a Bilbao. Posteriormente está programada otra muestra: "China 5.000 años". Esta última es, probablemente, fruto del arraigo que ha tenido la cocina china en nuestra tierra, y el interés que suscitan las promociones que periódicamente se hacen en "China en el Corte Ingles", donde se pueden comprar orondos budas de PVC que emblellcen numerosos baserris.' (Egin, headline and text of opinion article by Iñaki Uriarte, May 18, 1997, p. 18)

Extract 3

'Dos de cada tres vascos ponen reparos a la inversión realizada en el Guggenheim.' [headline] Los alaveses son más escépticos que vizcainos y guipuzcoanos sobre la necesidad del proyecto. [subhead] La mayor parte de los ciudadanos vascos considera que el Museo Guggenheim contribuirá al desarrollo económico y social del Gran Bilbao, de forma que mejorará la imagen de la ciudad, promoverá el crecimiento turístico del País Vasco y fomentará el intercambio cultural y el conocimiento del arte vasco en el resto del mundo. También son mayoría los que valoran positivamente el edificio futurista del arquitecto norteamericano Frank Gehry, aunque el 26% confiesa que todavía no lo ha visto. Sin embargo, el 66% de las 1.839 personas encuestadas duda o cree que no está justificada la inversión de más de 23.000 millones efectuada en la operación, lo que pone de relieve las serias lagunas en la política de comunicación del museo. El 'efecto' económico. Cada vez son mas los ciudadanos que conocen el Guggenheim y las circunstancias sociales, económicas y artísticas que rodean el museo. También crecen paralelamente los que descubren aspectos positivos, sobre todo entre los habitantes de Bilbao y Vizcaya. En general, los vascos estiman que la pinacoteca contribuirá a difundir una nueva imagen de la capital vizcaína, que fomentará el intercambio cultural y el conocimiento del arte autóctono en el resto del mundo, y que relanzará el turismo. Sin embargo, tienen más dudas cuando el museo
se presenta como impulsor del desarrollo social y económico de Euskadi. Son los votantes del PNV, EA y PP los que más confían en el efecto económico del Guggenheim. A la hora de valorar la inversión efectuada por las instituciones vascas en la operación - más de 23.000 millones de pesetas -, las opiniones se dividen en tres grandes bloques: los favorables, los contrarios y los que mantienen la duda. Son las personas de más edad y los residentes en núcleos de población más pequeños los que tienden a justificar en mayor medida la inversión efectuada. En virtud del voto, es el nacionalismo moderado (PNV, EA) y los partidos de izquierda estatal (PSE-EE, IU) los que la valoran más positivamente. La oposición se centra fundamentalmente en HB.' (Diario Vasco, Front page news headline, news report headline, subhead, and text, June 3, 1997)

Extract 4

‘Escasa oposición. [subhead] El rechazo a la inversión no alcanza proporciones especialmente imponentes en Álava y Guipúzcoa, si bien el grado de aceptación es menor. La encuesta destaca que, en función de los datos, el Guggenheim es una obra que no despierta ni excesivos recelos ni una oposición abierta en ninguno de los tres territorios, aunque los alavéses son los ciudadanos más escépticos. Aunque la visión de los ciudadanos resulta mayoritariamente positiva hasta en la valoración de la arquitectura, uno de los puntos donde los encuestados menos dudan - el edificio de Frank Gehry despierta posiciones totalmente encontradas, sin tonos intermedios -, el 66% no lo tiene claro o cree que la inversión no está justificada, lo que pone en tela de juicio la política de comunicación del museo. Y eso que, pese a todo, el 71% de las personas encuestadas llega a la conclusión de que el Guggenheim será beneficioso para el país. Los ciudadanos que mejor ven el museo pertenecen a una clase social media-alta, sectores que generalmente mantienen un contacto más directo con la actividad cultural. Una vez más, el rechazo o la indiferencia resulta significativamente mayor entre los votantes de Herri Batasuna’. (Diario Vasco, news report subhead, and text, June 3, 1997)

Extract 5

‘El Guggenheim y el imperialismo cultural [headline] Entre tanto fasto y solemne inauguración merece la pena alzar la voz discordante, aunque sólo sea por recordarles y recordarnos que el Guggenheim Bilbao Museoa es un proyecto ruinoso, totalmente rechazable, y al que antes o después tendremos que meter mano si no queremos vivir con semejante losa a nuestras espaldas durante el resto de nuestros días como pueblo. Aunque sólo sea por la vergüenza que supone ver a quiénes, sin haber creído nunca en dicho proyecto, lo defienden ahora con vehemencia, anunciando las mil y una maravillas que nos traerá, como si quisieran, convenciendo a los demás, autoconvencerse ellos mismos; sólo porque no han tenido la valentía de decir que no a tanto despropósito. Aunque sólo sea por la desazón de pensar que gol nos han metido, y de ver pasearse por su feudo recién conquistado a los caballeros del dólar. Por todo esto, y mucho más, tenemos que seguir reflexionando sobre el Guggenheim, más sobre su futuro que sobre su pasado.’ (Egin, Opinion article signed by Josu Amezaga, October 9, 1997, p. 11)

Extract 6

‘Las obras del Guggenheim, a punto de concluir. [headline] (...)La titular de Cultura insistió en que esperan recibir la visita de 250.000 personas por año y se remitió al “espectacular” crecimiento de visitantes en el Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbo, que han llegado a ser 232.500 durante las cuatro exposiciones temporales
dedicadas a Iturrino, Chillida, “Anunciación” del Greco y fondos del Museo de Budapest.’ (Egin, news report headline and text, May 8, 1997, p. 54)

Extract 7
‘Quince días muy rentables. [headline] La próxima inauguración del Museo Guggenheim está despertando en todo el mundo “unas expectativas insuñitadas, mucho más altas de lo que imaginamos” “unas expectativas insuñitadas, mucho más altas de lo que imaginamos”. Tomás Uribetxebarria contestó así al representante de IU, cuando este le preguntó por las causas que han motivado que el Museo se abra al público quince días después de su inauguración. “Son muchos los colectivos interesados - siguió el diputado foral- y a nosotros nos toca sacar rentabilidad del asunto, vender la historia”. (Egin, news report headline and text, June 13, 1997)

Extract 8
‘Cara al exterior. [headline] ( ... ) Fue José Bergara el que ayer se encargó de aportar algún dato económico sobre el nuevo Museo. Así, y una vez que destacara que el acto de ayer se llevaba a cabo “con total normalidad y dignidad democrática, con lo que a la sinrazón de quienes se obstinan en destruir la convivencia pacifica del país” dijo que seis años después de los primeros pasos encaminados a la construcción del Museo “hoy abrimos las puertas de lo que es una infraestructura cultural de primer orden internacional que, además, será un elemento tractor para el progreso y el desarrollo de Euskadi”. Cifras. [subhead] El Museo Guggenheim, señaló el presidente del Comité Ejecutivo, es una realidad “por el esfuerzo económico y colectivo del pueblo vasco. Hasta el momento - prosiguió - contamos ya con 34 patronos, que aportaran cantidades anuales entre 10 y 100 millones al año. Además contamos con la colaboración de cuatro empresas benefactoras, que han adquirido el compromiso de aportar dos millones y medio al año y nueve empresas asociadas que darán 500.000 pesetas al año. Las dos primeras aportaran el dinero durante cinco años, mientras que las asociadas lo harán por un año, lo cual asegura para lo que queda de 1997 una cantidad de 582 millones de pesetas y hasta el año 2001 2.450 millones”. (Egin, news report headline and text, October 16, 1997, p. 49)

Extract 9
‘Sponsors para el museo. [headline] Iberdrola y el BBV aportarán seisientos millones de pesetas al Guggenheim-Bilbo. Firmado el contrato para su inclusión como “patronos”.’ (Egin, news report headline and subhead, August 19, 1997, p. 40)

Extract 10
‘Iberia y Guggenheim firman un acuerdo de colaboración [headline] ( ... ) Asimismo, al integrarse Iberia en el Patronato de la Fundación del museo, participará en las funciones designadas a este órgano máximo de representación. Con este acuerdo, “uniendo su nombre a una institución de prestigio y relieve internacional que será la clave para Bilbao”, Iberia pretende acercarse a uno de sus más importantes mercados, con la esperanza de que este museo se convierta en uno de los centros de atracción cultural más importantes del mundo’. (Egin, news report headline and text, September 3, 1997, p. 42)
Extract 11
'Mas de 1.200 personas, “amigas del museo” [headline] Un total de 34 empresas se han convertido en “patronos” del Guggenheim y más de 1.200 personas se han hecho “amigos” del museo. Las aportaciones de unos y otros alcanzan casi los 600 millones de pesetas para este año’. (El Diario Vasco, news report headline and text, October, 18, 1997, p. 63)

Extract 12
'Thomas Krens “Molesto a mucha gente porque hablo claro” [headline] (...) ¿Cree que a la larga el Museo podrá ser viable financieramente y que vendrá el medio millón de visitantes que usted pronosticó? Creo que va a haber muchos más. Aquí sólo el 45% del dinero viene de las autoridades vascas, comparado con el 95% que da el gobierno al Reina Sofía. Y la gente dice que es muy caro para los vascos. A mi me parece que es un buen negocio teniendo en cuenta todo el dinero que va a traer a la ciudad. Creo que hay que mirarlo desde esta perspectiva. Repercutirá en toda la región, desde Santander a San Sebastián.’. (Egin, headline and text of interview with Thomas Krens, October 3, 1997, p. 11)

Extract 13
'El Guggenheim “no es reflejo del imperialismo”. [headline] (...) En una entrevista concedida a Efe, Vidarte calificó el Guggenheim como “uno de los elementos importantes, desde el punto de vista cualitativo, en una estrategia concebida para revitalizar urbanística y económicamente Bilbao y el País Vasco” y que se ha traducido en la más ambiciosa iniciativa cultural del Gobierno vasco y de la Diputación Foral de Vizcaya. Respecto al costo del museo, cifrado en más de 20.000 millones de pesetas, indicó que otros proyectos realizados en el País Vasco han supuesto inversiones elevadas, y que, por ejemplo, en el estadio de Anoeta, de Donostia, se gastaron 10.000 millones de pesetas, “lo mismo que en el edificio diseñado por Frank O. Gehry”, apuntó.’ (Egin, news report headline and text, October 13, p. 34)

Extract 14

Extract 15
'Bilboko Guggenheim Museoa "arte garaikidea lantzen dutenen artean munduko onena" izanen dela
Extract 16

'Comienza la cuenta atrás. [headline] El Museo Guggenheim inicia hoy su quincena inaugural. Sólo los colectivos invitados podrán visitar el edificio de Frank Gehry. El público tendrá que esperar hasta el día 19 de octubre para entrar. [subhead 1] El Museo Guggenheim comienza a partir de hoy la cuenta atrás que le hará desembocar en el próximo día 19, fecha en la que el público podrá visitar por vez primera sus instalaciones, previo pago de 700 pesetas. Mientras esto ocurre, durante quince días habrá varios actos dirigidos a "diversos colectivos representativos de los sectores sociales, políticos y profesionales de la sociedad vasca y la comunidad internacional", que culminarán el día 18, con una "ceremonia solemne" presidida por los reyes españoles." (subhead 2) El proyecto cultural que pretende "simbolizar el compromiso de la Administración vasca para potenciar la posición económica del País Vasco y su notoriedad como centro cultural" - es decir, el Museo Guggenheim de Bilbao - abrirá sus puertas esta tarde, con un primer acto dirigido al colectivo de trabajadores de las empresas que han participado en la construcción del Museo.' (Egin, news report, October 3, 1997, p. 49)

Extract 17

'Una de las mejores colecciones del mundo' [Headline] Sería incorrecto afirmar que la colección Guggenheim es la mejor del mundo. Incluso teniendo en cuenta su especialización en el periodo comprendido entre el impresionismo y el arte de nuestros días, su exacta posición en un hipotético ranking de colecciones daría lugar a interminables debates sobre el número de obras, la calidad de las mismas, los artistas representados, las tendencias destacadas y las ausencias registradas. (...) (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 3, 1997, special issue on the GBM, p. 8)

Extract 18

'La flor de titanio. [headline] Pese a la aparente complejidad del edificio, Frank Gehry ha concebido el museo en tres niveles básicos de acceso público, y una última planta reservada a los sistemas de ventilación, las torres de refrigeración y la maquinaria de los ascensores. A las espectaculares formas exteriores ha respondido dentro de una arquitectura más neutral para facilitar la contemplación de las obras de arte. Una curiosa combinación de salas informes, algunas enormes, con otras más convencionales, dan al museo una polivalencia y una capacidad de exhibición únicas en el mundo.' (El Diario Vasco, news report/advertisement, October 3, 1997, special issue on the GBM, p. 6)

Extract 19

'Agustín Ibarrola, crítico con esta pinacoteca, comentó que el contenido de las instalaciones "no se corresponde" con el edificio que las alberga, diseñado por Frank O. Gehry.' (Egin, News text, October 22, 1997, p. 42)

Extract 20

'Los partidos aseguran que ETA quiere "pisotear" la imagen de Euskadi. [headline] (...) PNV: "Han querido ennegrecer uno de los acontecimientos culturales y de progreso más relevantes y transcendentales de toda nuestra historia. Ya no nos sorprende que los violentos y quienes les apoyan, intenten utilizar cualquier
acontecimiento internacional para distorsionar la imagen de Euskadi, ni tampoco que quieran boicotear todos los proyectos de presente y de futuro en los que Euskadi tiene depositadas sus expectativas de desarrollo”.

(...)’ (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 14, 1997, p. 5)

Extract 21

‘El Guggenheim desbancó al Victoria Eugenia. [headline] Si en otros tiempos, cuando el certamen se celebraba en julio, el jurado iba a Sanfermines, cerca del 2000 la cita es en el bilbaíno Guggenheim, a punto de abrir sus puertas. La actriz Julie Christie también se apuntó a la excursión cultural.’ (Egin, news report, September 24, 1997, p. 45)

Extract 22

‘El pueblo Saluda al “Guggy”. [headline] Cientos de personas se agolparon ante el edificio de Frank Gehry para sumarse al espectáculo de la inauguración. [subhead] Cientos de Bilbainos exclamaron anoche el ¡Oooh! de rigor cuando el rey ordenó activar la espectacular iluminación del museo Guggenheim. El gentio gentío agolpado al otro lado del cordón de seguridad pudo contemplar de nuevo esa fugaz instantánea del edificio que tan bien quedó en el papel couche del suplemento dominical del New York Times. [subhead] (…) Los ciudadanos se acercaron ayer a los adelantos del museo con una mezcla de disciplina cívica y de curiosidad, y cumplieron con el papel que la Fundación Saloman Guggenheim y las instituciones vascas le han atribuido desde hace 15 días: admirar desde fuera el fascinante edificio erigido por Frank Gehry con sus impuestos, y envidiar a los más de 800 invitados que tuvieron el privilegio de contemplarlo por dentro y cenar gratis total en la galería El Pez. Los extranjeros, en su mayoría desconocidos, decepcionaron. Sólo había un Rolls Royce aparcado en el hotel Carlton. “Ellos son viejos y calvos, y ellas son largas y rubias teñidas”, le explicó un joven a su novia.’ (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 19, 1997, p. 10)

Extract 23

A) ‘Entrega del premio Pritzker de arquitectura [subhead] Steve Fehn: “Los museos comienzan a ser lo que eran las catedrales” [headline] El Pritzker 1997 recibió su premio en el primer acto social que se celebra en el Guggenheim. [subhead] “La catedral era el lugar para el alma en la tierra. Ahora es el museo el espacio para la poesía, el arte y los pensamientos”, decía ayer el arquitecto noruego Sverre Fehn. El autor de edificios tan emblemáticos de la arquitectura escandinava como el Museo de los Glaciares recibió en otro museo, el Guggenheim Bilbao, el vigésimo premio Pritzker. Más de cuatrocientos invitados provenientes de los cinco continentes se reunieron en el primer acto social celebrado en el Museo Guggenheim, que fue definido por el lehendakari Ardanza como símbolo del afán del pueblo vasco de “renovar su milenaria antigüedad con la más rabiosa modernidad.” (B) “También el Guggenheim centró el discurso del lehendakari, pronunciado en el acto académico celebrado por la noche en el edificio diseñado por Gehry. Ardanza fue el segundo en tomar la palabra, tras el director ejecutivo del premio Pritzker Bill Lacy, y antes que el director de la Fundación Guggenheim Thomas Krens, el presidente del jurado del galardón J. Carter Brown, el fundador del premio Jay Pritzker y el propio galardonado. (C) “Lo que ustedes contemplan en este edificio y lo que muy pronto podrán admirar en este museo no representan ni una excepción en nuestra milenaria historia ni un precipitado salto en el vacío para no perder el futuro”, indicó el lehendakari ante los más de cuatrocientos invitados. “Reflejan más bien una constante de nuestro modo de ser y constituyen la expresión más genuina de lo que siempre hemos hecho para sobrevivir en el mundo idénticos a nosotros mismos”, añadió.’ (Diario Vasco,
Extract 24
'El Museo Guggenheim de Bilbao "va a conectar los siglos XX y XXI. Desde el punto de vista arquitectonico es excelente, pienso que realmente supone una culminacion de la arquitectura del siglo XX, significa algo similar a un broche de oro a lo hecho en este siglo". Así lo expresó ayer Mikhail Pietrovsky, director del Ermitage de San Petersburgo,...' (Egin, news report text, July 11, 1997, p. 37)

Extract 25
'Ardanzak bere mintzaldian esan zuenez, Museoa "geure buruagan eta zaharberriatu eta eraberritzea dugun ahalmenean konfianza mezua da."' (Egin, front-page news text, October 19, 1997)

Extract 26
A) "Juan Ignacio Vidarte. Director general del Guggenheim Bilbao. "Si el Guggenheim resulta ajeno a Gipuzkoa es que lo hemos explicado mal" [headline] A ocho meses de la inauguración el Museo Guggenheim de Bilbao se prepara para encarar la recta final. Las obras finalizarán en abril, las primeras adquisiciones de la colección propia ya se han realizado... y la polémica sigue pendiendo. "En un proyecto de esta envergadura la polémica es por una parte razonable y lógica", explica Juan Ignacio Vidarte. Es el director del Guggenheim Bilbao y el único que tiene su puesto, un cargo por encima del director artístico, asegurado en el organigrama del museo. [Subhead] - "El Museo Guggenheim se quiere vender como un proyecto de país. Sin embargo en Gipuzkoa se siente como algo ajeno. Si es así es porque hasta ahora no lo hemos sabido explicar suficientemente bien, porque si el Guggenheim es algo, es un proyecto de país y un proyecto que aspira a ser un elemento de vertebación. El museo no es más de Bilbao que de Vitoria o San Sebastián. El proyecto como tal no se entendería si no fuera concebido como un museo que aspira, en cuanto a su programación, a tener una proyección europea y con un ámbito de acogida dirigido a toda la comunidad autónoma y también a Iparralde, Navarra y zonas cercanas de la península ibérica. Yo no creo que sea cierto que en Gipuzkoa no se considere como un proyecto de los guipuzcoanos".' [Diario Vasco, interview, March 2, 1997, p. 71)

Extract 27
'El Guggenheim prepara una ofensiva para ‘venderse’ en Guipúzcoa y Álava. [Headline] Una exposición divulgará este verano en Donostia el proyecto del museo bilbaíno. [Subhead] (...) Promoción exterior. [subhead] Los responsables políticos del proyecto vasco del Guggenheim no ocultan su interés por hacer que toda la Comunidad Autónoma Vasca sienta como “propio” un museo que hasta ahora ha sido asociado sobre todo con Bilbao. Ese interés es político, pero también comercial: según las previsiones que maneja el museo, buena parte de sus visitantes se nutrirá del “arco” geográfico que va de Burdeos a Santander'. (El Diario Vasco, news report, May 19, 1997, p. 71)

Extract 28
A) 'Detractores tenaces [headline] La mayoría de los artistas vascos, encabezados por Oteiza e Ibarrola, ve en el museo Guggenheim una nueva agresión del colonialismo cultural. [subhead] Un pequeño barco surcará la ría del Nervión durante los actos de inauguración del Guggenheim. En él navegará un grupo de
artistas con decenas de banderas azules, rojas y blancas, con las 54 estrellas de los Estados Unidos. Los que a esas horas salgan de paseo por el campo Volantín quizá piensen que se trata de otro acto para celebrar la apertura del museo. Pero no. En realidad, será una protesta de unos creadores vascos que, inspirándose en la película de Luis G. Berlanga Bienvenido Mr Marshall, manifestarán su rechazo a una pinacoteca que, a su juicio ha sido construida de espaldas al tejido cultural de Euskadi.

B) "El Guggenheim ha suscitado desde sus comienzos los recelos de una buena parte de los artistas del País Vasco, que ha visto en la iniciativa un derroche de fondos públicos, destinados con anterioridad a becas, subvenciones y otras formas de ayuda a la creación autóctona. El liderazgo moral de la oposición al museo ha llevado un artista que aún rechaza que su obra se exponga en sus salas: Jorge Oteiza, un octogenario cuyo ejemplo rebelde y protestón ha calado en las generaciones más jóvenes. Para el autor guipuzcoano, la palabra Guggenheim significa la venta de la cultura vasca a una multinacional del espectáculo, una versión de Disneylandia aplicada al arte, cuyo edificio le recuerda a "una fábrica de quesos."."

Rabietas [subhead] Las rabietas de Oteiza han sido muchas y variadas a lo largo de los años. En múltiples ocasiones ha manifestado su intención de abandonar Euskadi, hastiado de su política cultural, lo que de momento no ha cumplido. Pero esta vez su repudio hay que atribuirlo a un proyecto que él pretendió dirigir y que finalmente no salió adelante: el cubo de la Alhóndiga. (...) La iniciativa contaba con el apoyo del entonces alcalde de Bilbao, José María Gorordo. Pero la llegada de los americanos truncó, según el artista, lo que aspiraba a ser un centro "para la educación del pueblo", aunque bien es cierto que hasta entonces tan noble ideal carecía de unas previsiones de gastos y plantilla, de un proyecto de actividades y programación. Algo más tarde, en 1993, Oteiza declaraba: "Lemoniz no se solucionó por las buenas y parece que tampoco el peligro Guggenheim", en alusión a la central nuclear que quedó inacabada por los atentados de ETA, entre ellos el que costó la vida al ingeniero José María Ryan.

C) "El octogenario no estaba solo. Agustín Ibarrola atacó al futuro museo por ser una pieza más - y muy importante - del imperialismo o colonialismo cultural, que terminaría reduciendo el arte vasco a su mínima expresión: "La ría se convertirá en el canal de Panamá. Los artistas navegaríamos por aguas propias e internacionales bajo pabellón extranjero". Otros dos miembros imprescindibles de la vanguardia de Euskadi, José Antonio Sistiaga y Néstor Basterretxea, se alinearon con este tipo de posiciones.

D) "El efecto negativo en el resto de las manifestaciones culturales es uno de los argumentos que con más frecuencia se ha esgrimido para menoscabar el Guggenheim. La iniciativa absorbe una parte importante del presupuesto del Departamento de Cultura, lo que, en opinión de sus detractores, irá en detrimento de los demás museos, del teatro, del cine o de la literatura que dependen en mayor o menor medida del erario público".

E) "La seta atómica [subhead] El frente de Guipúzcoa ha subrayado con suma intensidad esta línea de ataque. Según la escritora Julia Otxoa, "el efecto Hiroshima-Guggenheim es total". "La seta atómica, el titanio gris que cubre el museo pulverizará la cultura vasca, hará que desaparezcan grupos de música, editoriales, salas de arte...". "Ni Franco lo hubiera hecho mejor". Anjel Lertxundi, Felipe Juaristi y Félix Maraña se acercan, con sus lógicos matices personales, a esta clase de afirmaciones. [El Diario Vasco, News report, October 3, 1997, especial central issue on the GBM, p. 10)"

Extract 29

"Los partidos aseguran que ETA quiere "pisotear" la imagen de Euskadi. [headline] (...) PSE-EE: "Es simbólico que haya tenido lugar a las puertas de la pinacoteca que representa el futuro del País Vasco. Esto
deja clara la gran capacidad de despreciar las energías constructivas y positivas de la sociedad vasca y el alejamiento de estos fanáticos y fascistas de ella. ETA está tomando como referencia para sus acciones celebraciones e infraestructuras de relevancia mundial como el Campeonato Mundial de Ciclismo el pasado sábado o el Guggenheim hoy’(…)’ (El Diario Vasco, news report, October 14, 1997, p. 5)

Extract 30


Extract 31

‘ Los cien mil visitantes del Guggenheim. [headline] La respuesta de los ciudadanos ante el nuevo museo ha sorprendido a todos: la inversión en esta poderosa infraestructura cultural ha concitado el interés de los más cercanos, pero el reto de futuro es atraer a los visitantes extranjeros. Un 11% del público procedía de Gipuzkoa, lo que abona la idea de que el museo de Bilbao es una apuesta para todo el País Vasco.’ (El
Diario Vasco, editorial, November 20, 1997, p. 28)

Extract 32
'Para 1997 el museo Guggenheim Bilbao había previsto recibir 225.000 visitantes, pero puede que la cifra se supere, puesto que, además de haber superado en su primer mes abierto al público los 100.000 visitantes, "esa cifra se ha conseguido de una manera constante "' (Diario Vasco, News report text, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

Extract 33
'El Eustat confirma el aumento del turismo en octubre por el Mundial y el Guggenheim'. (Diario Vasco, news report text headline, December 2, 1997, p. 20)

Extract 34
'El Guggenheim ha batido en tres ocasiones sucesivas el récord en la cifra de visitantes recibidos en una sola jornada por un museo en el Estado español ... ' (Egin, news report text, December 17, 1997, p. 44)

Extract 35
'El Guggenheim supera sus previsiones más optimistas.' (Egin, front-page news report headline, January 17, 1998)

Extract 36
'El Guggenheim de Bilbo alcanzó ya los 426.000 visitantes.' (Egin, news headline, March 3, 1998, p. 41)

Extract 37
'Viento en popa. [headline]. Más de un cuarto de millón de visitantes en el Guggenheim, que ha superado sus ingresos en un 22%.' [subhead] Juan Ignacio Vidarte y Thomas Krens protagonizaron ayer la primera comparecencia oficial de los responsables del Museo Guggenheim desde que éste abriera sus puertas y lo hicieron en un tono que no deja lugar para la duda "Hemos tenido una acogida enormemente positiva - señaló Krens- y hemos de tener claro que éste es el primer Museo de Europa"' (Egin, news report text, January 17, 1998, p. 45)

Extract 38
'Juan Ignacio Vidarte. Director del Museo Guggenheim. "Para mí la peor pesadilla sería que el Guggenheim muriera de éxito"' (El Diario Vasco, news headline, August 2, 1998, p. 58)

Extract 39
'Los récords del museo Guggenheim - A punto de cumplirse el primer aniversario de su inauguración, el Guggenheim puede presentar un balance de resultados que resulta espectacular. La cifra de visitantes al museo ha desbordado todas las expectativas, triplicando el número anticipado en las previsiones hace doce meses.' (Diario Vasco, editorial's headline and text, October 14, 1998, p. 35)

Extract 40

314
'Jornada de Puertas Abiertas para los más de nueve mil Amigos del Museo Guggenheim. Se ha convertido en la segunda pinacoteca más visitada del Estado español.' (Egin, news subtitles, October 20, 1998, p. 20)

**Extract 41**

'A 6.663 de los visitantes que acudieron durante la primera quincena de este mes de noviembre se les realizó una encuesta a partir de la cual se han extrapolado los datos sobre procedencia y perfil de los visitantes. El 52% son vascos; el 35% españoles y el 13% restante extranjeros. "Esa también es una buena cifra, porque no es la mejor época para estos turistas", indicó Vidarte." (El Diario Vasco, news report text, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

**Extract 42**

'El director general destacó también los buenos ratios que se observan en cuanto al origen geográfico de los visitantes (el 41% proceden de Euskal Herria, el 32% del Estado español, y el 27 de otros países del mundo), así como el grado de autofinanciación que se ha alcanzado en este primer año de vida ...' (Egin, news text, October 20, 1998, p. 20)

**Extract 43**

'Estreno de gala del Guggenheim. (...) Según las previsiones de las autoridades vascas, el museo concebido como buque insignia de la revitalización económica de Bilbao y Euskadi, recibirá al año unos 400.000 visitantes, de los cuales la mitad serán extranjeros.' (El Diario Vasco, news report headline and text, October 18, 1997, p. 62)

**Extract 44**

'Junto a los numerosos extranjeros que recorrían las salas, los bilbaínos explicaban sus ansias para ver el museo por la novedad y la gran repercusión que ha tenido en los medios de comunicación, aunque algunos también decían estar interesados por el arte contemporáneo.' (Egin, news report text, October 20, 1997, p. 25)

**Extract 45**

'Un jubilado de Basauri, visitante 100.000 del Guggenheim. El jubilado de Basauri Jesús Gorostizaga fue el visitante número 100.000 del Museo Guggenheim Bilbao, que ayer cumplía un mes desde su apertura [subhead] Ayer por la tarde Jesús Gorostizaga, un jubilado de Basauri de 72 años, decidió que era un buen día para visitar por primera vez el Guggenheim. A la cola para comprar la entrada llegó, con su mujer y su nieta, poco después de las 4.30 de la tarde, pero a él no solo le entregaron la pulsera-ticket, sino también el cartel que le nombrara visitante 100.000 y un viaje a Nueva York. “Usted representa la acogida que ha tenido el museo”, le dijo Vidarte. Y Jesús Gorostizaga, muy suelto ante los periodistas, decía estar “muy contento, porque ver este museo y encima regalarte un viaje a uno es de agradecer.” (El Diario Vasco, front-page news report headline and text, November 20, 1997, p. 72)

**Extract 46**

'Guggenheim, Butrón: visitas gratuitas. Por esa colossal coliflor californiana que para solucionar un problema económico-artístico de la Salomón-Guggenheim Foundation, hemos pagado única y
exclusivamente el pueblo vasco un precio oficial pactado, 23.000 millones de pesetas que, evidentemente, no es el real, además de las próximas pérdidas previstas, un mínimo de 1.000 millones hasta el año 2000. Al margen del abusivo precio de la entrada al edificio Guggenheim, 700 pesetas, como museo pobre debiera costar poco, es preciso que las asociaciones de consumidores, grupos sociales y políticos presionen a las autoridades y organismos competentes correspondientes para que se establezca como es obligatorio en un museo hecho con dinero público, un día a la semana de entrada gratuita. (...) Por todo ello y a la vista del inadmisible atrayente que en estos recintos se está cometiendo, de no ser que se clasifiquen como lo que en realidad son, espectáculos, y su legislación sea otra, es inaplicable e imprescindible y en la confianza en que la razón me asiste. '(El Diario Vasco, headline and text of letter to the director addressed by Iñaki Uriarte, December 30, 1997, p. 23)

Extracto 47
'Bertako nahiz kanpoko turista andana ikusgarriak erakarri ditu Guggenheim Museoa Aste Santuan Bilbora, eta lehen hutsik geratu ohi zen hiriburutari bizitza berria eman dio.' (Egin, Front page news headline and text, April 12, 1998)

Extracto 48
'Guiris hasta en Prim. [headline] De cómo está Bilbo-Bilbao de turistas y por qué, en plena fiebre del Guggenheim. [subhead] El caprichoso y espectacular museo Guggenheim, que algunos días ha rebasado los 9.000 visitantes, ha colocado a Bilbo en la agenda internacional del ocio y ha desencadenado una invasión turística desconocida y una euforia hostelera y comercial casi olvidada a orillas de la ría Ibaizabal, todavía imprescindible.' (Egin, news subhead in last page, September 15, 1998)

Extracto 49
'La explanada del Guggenheim, un salón de baile. (...) Las evoluciones de los bailarines fueron inmortalizadas por las cámaras de los turistas, muchos de ellos de rasgos orientales.' (Egin, news headline and text, June 17, 1998, last page)

Extracto 50
'Del total de visitantes, aproximadamente un 20% procede de fuera del Estado español, principalmente de países europeos y de Estados Unidos. Este porcentaje se ha incrementado hasta el 40% en la primera temporada veraniega que vive el Museo Guggenheim-Bilbao.' (Egin, news text, August 8, 1998, last page)

Extracto 51
'Philip Johnson, arquitecto estadounidense de prestigio internacional, visitó ayer el Museo Guggenheim Bilbao con ocasión de la grabación de un programa sobre dicha instalación por parte de la cadena televisiva BBS, comunicaron fuentes de dicha pinacoteca.' (Egin, news texts, February 5, 1998, p. 5)

Extracto 52
'Mundu guztiko arkitektoek Bilbo ikusi zuten atzo. Astelehenean Donostian hasiak Altzairu-Erai kuntzako Munduko II. Biztarrean parte hartzen ari diren 700 arkitekto eta adituk Bilboko arkitektura lanik garrantzitsuenak ikusi zituzten atzo, Guggenheim barne.' (Egin, front-page news headline and text, May 13, 1316
Extract 53
'Durante el pasado verano, el turismo en el País Vasco registró un incremento del 32,4% en el número de visitantes con respecto al mismo periodo del año anterior. El turismo procedente del resto de España se incrementó en un 28% y del extranjero en un 40,3%. Vizcaya y, en concreto, Bilbao, ha sido la zona donde se ha registrado un mayor incremento de turistas debido al atractivo del museo Guggenheim.' (El Diario Vasco, news report text, November 19, 1998, p. 19)

Extract 54
'‘Escala en Donosti. [headline] (...)Con el poco tiempo transcurrido desde la inauguración del museo es pronto para hacer estadísticas y establecer patrones de comportamiento, pero hoteles y restaurantes donostiarras ya han comenzado a notar lo que es tener un templo del arte contemporáneo a una hora por carretera. (...) José Juan Castillo del restaurante Casa Nicolasa lo tiene claro... “Estamos notando que hay bastante gente que viene a ver el museo como principal objetivo y luego se desplaza a conocer San Sebastián. Son sobre todo extranjeros que tienen relación con el mundo de la arquitectura. Italianos, franceses, sudamericanos y bastantes madrileños y catalanes que vienen a comer y te comentan que han venido a conocer el museo”. En el restaurante Akelarre, que regenta Pedro Subijana también lo han notado. “Este puente ha sido una pasada, han venido un montón de catalanes y madrileños y la mayoría le comentaban a Pedro que habían estado en Bilbao viendo el museo”, explica la encargada. Dentro de un tiempo llegarán las estadísticas, pero de momento los hosteleros ya intuyen que el Guggenheim va a traer al País Vasco algo más que obras de arte’. (El Diario Vasco, news report headline and text, December 14, 1997, p. 3)

Extract 55
‘El Guggenheim eleva un 80% el turismo italiano en Euskadi.’ (El Diario Vasco, news headline, October 10, 1998, p. 25)

Extract 56

Extract 57
hace tiempo, si bien en los últimos meses con más aproximación. Nuestra intención es clara, queremos cubrir el hueco que el museo tiene respecto a la obra de Oteiza y queremos hacerlo en un doble aspecto: por un lado, incorporando alguna de sus obras a nuestra colección permanente y, por otro, organizando una gran retrospectiva. Ambas son vías que nos interesan y que intentamos desarrollar". (B) El Museo Guggenheim ha manifestado de forma reiterada y desde hace tiempo su interés por contar con la obra de Jorge Oteiza quien, por su parte, también en multitud de ocasiones ha manifestado de forma pública su postura contraria a la pinacoteca; llegó incluso a decir que al Guggenheim sólo iría “a tiros”. A la vuelta de los años, no obstante, el escultor parece haber cedido posiciones –“quizá el hecho de haberlo visto acabado tenga algo que ver con este cambio”, apunta Vidarte (...).“ (Egin, news report, February 20, 1998, p. 20)

Extract 58

‘(A) La antológica, itinerante. [headline] La muestra de Jorge Oteiza en el Guggenheim-Bilbo recorrerá el mundo. [subhead] Así lo afirma Juan Huarte, responsable de la fundación Oteiza en Madrid. [subhead] (…)Desmiente Juan Huarte que los ya notorios esfuerzos y negociaciones por instalar a Jorge Oteiza en el Guggenheim-Bilbao constituyan una “operación de pique”. Se le esclarece algo innegable. Que el mundillo del arte y sus entresijos se está desmesurando de cara al vulgo, a lo cual ha contribuido no poco la reiteración publicitaria del abrazo de Zabalaga ante un espectador profano que, ignaro pero no necio, comenzó a preguntarse muchas cosas, más aún conociendo que tales tejemanejes le atanen al bolsillo de sus impuestos. Que estas operaciones, al fin y al cabo de embellecimiento, se consipran de forma cuasi masónica y con misterios de guerra fría. (B) “No, no, mire. Es que a Oteiza le conceden el Premio Internacional de Escultura de Sao Paulo en 1957, y en el 59 da por concluida su labor artística experimental. Entonces, la Fundación Jorge Oteiza intenta colocarlo en el lugar que le corresponde como importantísimo escultor europeo del siglo XX. De ahí las iniciativas para que se le haga una antológica en el Guggenheim-Bilbao y, voy a pasarle una exclusiva, para que, una vez clausurada, viaje itinerante por todo el mundo. (…)”’ (The Jorge Oteiza's exhibition in the Guggenheim-Bilbao will cross the world. This is asserted by Juan Huarte, responsible for the Oteiza fundation in Madrid) (Egin, news report subtitle, February 21, 1998, p. 46, written by the writer and journalist Rafael Castellanos)

Extract 59

‘La fundación Oteiza y el Guggenheim se unen para impulsar la obra del escultor. [headline] El museo bilbaino acogerá una antológica en el 99 y comprará obras del artista de Orio. [subhead] El adjetivo “histórico” salió a relucir varias veces en la firma del acuerdo entre la Fundación Jorge Oteiza y la Fundación Guggenheim Bilbao para la realización de una exposición antológica del escultor oriotarra en el más moderno museo vasco y la adquisición de obras para su colección permanente. “El entendimiento ha sido rápido porque el objetivo es el mismo: situar a Jorge en el lugar que le corresponde como maestro de la escultura europea”, señaló Juan Huarte, presidente de la Fundación Jorge Oteiza. El próximo paso será comenzar la selección de obra para la muestra, que el Guggenheim aspira a llevar a otros museos del mundo. (…) La influencia de Gehry. [subhead] Los contactos entre las dos fundaciones comenzaron vía teléfono hace dos meses y la de ayer fue la segunda reunión que los cuatro firmantes mantuvieron, tras la anterior de hace cuatro semanas en Bilbao. “Un entendimiento muy rápido porque el objetivo es el mismo”, recalcó Huarte. Pero el cambio de opinión hacia el museo de Oteiza, que el pasado viernes ya declaró en este periódico, como ayer recordó Mari Carmen Garmendia, que ya que existe lo que procede es “vasquizarlo”,
comenzó antes y en él ha jugado el arquitecto del edificio del Guggenheim, Frank O. Gehry. “Gehry sabía que Jorge no le podía ver ni a él ni a su arquitectura, pero no le importaba un ápice. El le seguía considerando el mejor escultor del mundo y le comparaba con Le Corbusier y Picasso. Eso le tocó por dentro y le impulsó a dar ese giro”, recordó Huarte.’ (Diario Vasco, news report headline, March 11, 1998, p. 56)

Extract 60

(A) ‘La vuelta a casa del hijo pródigo. [headline] Oteiza había liderado la oposición de los artistas al museo. [subhead] Decía que no iría “si no era a tiros”. [subhead] Jorge Oteiza ha liderado durante años la oposición de los artistas vascos al Guggenheim, al que el escultor de Orio llegó a calificar de “pura estafa euskodisney”. llegó a afirmar que al museo “sólo iría a tiros”. Un mes antes de su inauguración realizó una visita a la pinacoteca a invitación de su autor, el arquitecto Frank Ghery. Esa visita marcó el inicio de su acercamiento al proyecto. [subhead] Un mes antes de la inauguración del museo bilbaino, de forma sorpresiva, el escultor de Orio visitó las obras de la pinacoteca a invitación de su autor, el arquitecto Frank Ghery, al que no conocía personalmente hasta entonces. Aquel encuentro, el primero de varias visitas de Oteiza al Guggenheim – también estuvo con Richard Serra -, parecía el inicio de un acercamiento que Habría sido impulsado por el entorno del escultor, según reconoció en octubre del pasado año el presidente de la Fundación Oteiza, Juan Huarte, quien en esa fecha anunció oficialmente la apertura del Museo Oteiza en Alzuza para 1999. (B) Oteiza todavía no había tomado decisión alguna sobre su presencia en el Guggenheim, museo al que se había enfrentado directamente, pero el escultor, dijo Huarte, “está siendo presionado por amigos y por compañeros” en este sentido. No obstante, en caso de que decidiera instalar alguna de sus obras en Bilbao, debería ser “con la máxima representación, a su nivel, no en una esquina”. El 15 de diciembre saltaba otra bomba: Oteiza y Eduardo Chillida se reconciliaban con un texto suscrito y firmado por ambos – “Más allá de nuestras diferencias habrá siempre un ‘espacio-tiempo’ para la paz” –, así como con un abrazo para la posteridad ante la escultura “Besarkada”, los dos máximos creadores del arte contemporáneo vaso cerraron la liga abierta durante décadas.

(C) Entre la larga serie de reacciones suscitadas en aquellos días por el reencuentro entre ambos artistas se podía hallar la de Juan Ignacio Vidarte, director del Guggenheim-Bilbao, quien, ante la pregunta de si la reconciliación podría suponer un acercamiento de Oteiza a su museo, apuntaba que “nos agradaría. Siempre hemos manifestado que nos gustaría que tanto Chillida como Oteiza estuvieran bien representados en el museo: Chillida ya lo está y Jorge no, porque él no ha considerado conveniente”. El deseo de tener al escultor era evidente, hasta el punto de que dos meses más tarde, el pasado 18 de febrero, Vidarte se desplazaba a Zarautz para entrevistarse con Oteiza. Las negociaciones previas se habían encauzado a través de la Fundación Oteiza, con la intención de conseguir que Oteiza aceptase la realización de una retrospectiva en el Guggenheim, como una forma de posibilitar su entrada en el museo. Para Vidarte, “quizá el hecho de haber visto acabado el museo tenga algo que ver con este cambio”. (D) Virulenta oposición [subhead] Las descalificaciones que Oteiza ha vertido a lo largo de los últimos años contra el proyecto de Ghery han hecho historia. En una carta dirigida al alcalde de Tolosa y a Mari Karmen Garmendia, y publicada por este diario en marzo del 95, afirmaba que “nuestros pueblos culturalmente empobrecidos se maquillan como putas viejas Guggenheim para el turismo pobre”. “Adelante Guggenheim, este país es tuyo – decía en otra ocasión -. Este país que hasta para organizar un partido de fútbol tiene que traer gente de fuera, cuando antes esto era natural y hermoso, este país al que sus políticos suprimieron la posibilidad de investigación de lenguajes artísticos y
que lograron marginar a nuestros artistas que lograron adelantarse a las mismas vanguardias, adelante Guggenheim, vuestro circo vascodisney, cuando queráis'. En el libro "Crónica de una seducción", Joseba Zulaika cuenta que nada más comenzar la entrevista, Oteiza le dijo: "Déjate de escrituras y chorradas. Mátalos. Yo te pago", mientras la troika formada por Krens, Ghery y Serra seguía manifestando su admiración por el escultor y mantenián la invitación de que expusiera en el museo bilbaino.' (Egin, news report, March 11, 1998, p. 50)

Extracto 61
'Más por diablo que por viejo. [headline] (...) De Oteiza nadie osará ni plantear que es bueno. Ello va implícito en una leyenda golpe a golpe cinzelada. Mendaz es el argumento de la clerigallla de que la habilidad suma del Diabo consiste en convencer a los incautos de su inexistencia. El Diabo, repasemos a Milton, o las andanzas y dudas del Cristo por los desiertos, es el gran maestro de la autopromoción por la palabra, la omnipresencia, la ubicuidad en lenguas ajenas, afines, adversas, necias, sabihondas, analíticas o desdenosas. Oteiza está en el Guggenheim más por diablo que por viejo, y eso lo debería meditar toda una juventud que le debe, leído, repetido, recreado o abandonado a medias, un valiosísimo discurso. Muy obuso hace falta ser para no haber intuido que Oteiza, o sea, su obra escultórica, está en el Guggenheim-Bilbao, junto con la otra no menos trascendental, la dialéctica, desde mucho antes de erigirse junto a la Ría el gran insecto de titanio.' (Egin, opinion article, March 11, 1998, p. 50)

Extracto 62
"El Guggenheim compra cuatro nuevos trabajos de Chillida y sella la paz con el escultor" (Diario Vasco, news report headline, October 3, 1997, p. 72)

Extracto 63
'Oteiza cree que "hay que aprovechar el Guggenheim para la cultura vasca." [headline] (...)Jorge Oteiza no baja la cabeza y se muestra satisfecho con la antológica que le dedicará antes del verano el Guggenheim. El artista oriotarra – muy crítico siempre con el museo – razona más pragmático y considera que una vez que la pinacoteca es ya una realidad, lo que procede es "vasquizar" el museo. A sus 90 años, no se detiene, y trabaja también sobre la escultura que piensa dedicar a Miguel Pelay de Orozco, mientras estudia los planos de la obra de nueve metros de acero que instalara a la entrada del Centro Reina Sofia de Arte Contemporáneo de Madrid. Afortunadamente Oteiza mantiene su feroz vitalidad y anuncia nuevos libros y exposiciones, desde el desencanto que le produce la tierra que más ama: el País Vasco, una Euskal Herria que asegura que le ha "hartado y maltratado" ya que "aquí no interesa la cultura". [subhead] (B) Jorge Oteiza mantiene viva su crítica al Museo Guggenheim Bilbao y a la filosofía que lo edificó, pero desde su último pragmatismo considera que una vez construido es mejor utilizarlo que darle la espalda: "El proyecto no me interesa nada, pero hay un momento en que deja de ser una colonia estadounidense para convertirse en un edificio que se asoma a un río vasco – el Nervión -. Desde ese instante hay que usarlo", asegura Oteiza. (C) El escultor considera que ya que "es tan difícil hacer algo entre nosotros, los vascos", una vez construido el edificio habría que "vasquizarlo". "Que lo que haya dentro del Guggenheim sea vaso", añade. Oteiza manifiesta no sentirse preocupado por las críticas que puedan llegarle tras aceptar exponer en un lugar al que tanto ha criticado. "En esta vida lo que de verdad me importa es que no haya críticas. Me gusta que me sacuden y también sacudir. Toda actuación humana está sujeta a los comentarios de los demás". (El Diario Vasco,
Extract 64

"(A) Vasquizar el ‘Guggy’ [headline] El acto de ayer acto de ayer en Alzuza tiene mucho de histórico. La firma del acuerdo entre el Guggenheim y la Fundación Jorge Oteiza supone la pipa de la paz entre el escultor y el museo de Bilbao, pero también un acercamiento entre el Gobierno Vasco y el artista de Orio. Tras el abrazo de Zabalaga con Chillida en diciembre Oteiza encierra ahora el hacha de guerra con sus dos enemigos más recurrentes: el Gobierno Vasco y el Guggenheim. El museo no sólo le dedicará una antológica que puede llegar a Nueva York, sino que comprará obras para su colección. (B) Hay puristas que critican a Oteiza por esa nueva política de acercamientos: lo prefieren en la trinchera dando y recibiendo palos hasta la muerte. Pero la entrada de Oteiza en el Guggenheim era cuestión de tiempo: puede hacerse ahora, cuando aún está en vida, o podía hacerse dentro de muchos años, cuando no esté aquí. De este modo, el escultor puede ver (aunque sea a distancia) cómo los todopoderosos señores del Guggenheim peregrinan a Alzuza, su reserva espiritual, para sellar la paz. (C) Oteiza, el eterno rebelde, el agresivo nihilista, presta un último servicio al país aplicando a su nueva filosofía posibilista: ya que el Guggenheim es una realidad, lo mejor es aprovecharlo, vasquizarlo. Aún es un invento en el que manda más Manhattan que Bilbao, pero ese pulso puede ganarse. No se trata de nacionalidades, sino de talento. Se puede no conectar con el tiburón Krens, pero sí con el genio de Gehry o Serra. Eso le ha sucedido a Oteiza. El escultor no se rinde, sino que toma el Guggenheim. El gran conspirador no chochea: el abrazo con Chillida fue una lección de paz, y lo de ahora, una lección de posibilismo. Paz y pragmatismo: la medicina que este país está pidiendo a gritos." (Diario Vasco, opinion article signed by Mitxel Ezquiaga, March 11, 1998, p. 56)

Extract 65

"(A) Oteiza desautoriza ahora el acuerdo entre su Fundación y el Guggenheim. [headline] El escultor sólo expondrá en el museo acompañado por los artistas de su generación. [subhead] Un día después que la Fundación Jorge Oteiza y la Fundación Guggenheim Bilbao firmaran en Alzuza un protocolo de colaboración para realizar una retrospectiva y adquirir obra para la colección permanente del museo bilbaino, el escultor, que el martes no estuvo presente en el acto, desautorizó ayer a través de una nota “a políticos y fundaciones para formalizar ningún tipo de acuerdo sobre mis obras”. Oteiza insiste en que su entrada en el Guggenheim, tal y como expuso “con rotundidad” al director de la pinacoteca Juan Ignacio Vidarte en una reunión mantenida en su casa en Zarautz sólo era posible “con mi generación en la escuela vasca”. [subhead] (B) Sin embargo, Oteiza sorprendió ayer con una breve nota enviada a los medios de comunicación. El escultor comienza diciendo que “ante noticias y sonrientes fotos PNV sobre el futuro de mi obra comunico a la opinión publica que desautorizo a politicos y fundaciones para formalizar ningún tipo de acuerdo sobre mis obras. Con respecto al Museo Guggenheim me siento abrumado por las noticias que recibo de la prensa, ya que en la reunión mantenida en mi casa en Zarautz con el senor Vidarte director en presencia de mi amigo Inchaustegui (Jon Intxaustegi es el director de la serie de ETB Creadores vascos y uno de los artífices del reencuentro entre Oteiza y Chillida) expuse con rotundidad que mi entrada en el museo sólo era posible con mi generación en la escuela vasca". El escrito concluye diciendo: “Estoy muy enfermo, tengo 90 años y espero poder terminar de escribir mi memoria en fragmentos. Pido sólo un poco de tiempo y que me dejen en paz”. (C) Aunque el acuerdo firmado el martes sólo marcaba la intención de “ponernos a trabajar”, en palabras de Vidarte, ambas fundaciones remarcaron el interés de que la antológica recoja todas las fases
experimentales de la trayectoria artística de Oteiza. José Luis Merino, elegido comisario de la retrospectiva, conocida anoche la nota del escultor, señaló que “sus decisiones son suyas, su libertad de cambiar de idea, cómo no, también es suya”, pero añadió que lamentaba que “su cambio de actitud esté imbuido por el asesoramiento de quienes él cree amigos y no lo son, porque sus perversas manos de musgo le impiden que sea libre para aceptar lo contrario a lo que ahora niega. La admiración de los que han propiciado que su nombre se proyecte hacia el universo sigue firme, a la espera de un cambio”, señaló. Fuentes del Departamento de Cultura del Gobierno Vasco mostraron anoche su sorpresa por la reacción de Oteiza y expresaron su confianza en que el acuerdo pueda convertirse en realidad, “para lo que trabajaremos”.

El Diario Vasco, news report, March 12, 1998, p. 64

Extract 66

‘Que le dejen en paz, que nos dejen en paz. [headline] El culebrón es ya oteizano cien por cien en el peor sentido de la palabra. 24 horas después de la firma del acuerdo entre la Fundación Oteiza y el Museo Guggenheim el artista emitió ayer una de sus ya famosas notas en las que desautoriza a todo el mundo y hace mucho ruido. Oteiza es un señor viejo y cansado que vive solo, necesitado de cariño y de reconocimiento. Le rodean algunas buenas personas preocupadas en que el Oteiza persona y el Oteiza artista viva bien sus últimos años, pero en su órbita se mueve sobre todo una corte donde abundan los aduladores y quienes buscan su parte del botín. El artista cambia de opinión con frecuencia, según la última presión. Había dado el visto bueno a su acercamiento al Guggenheim, y al menos tres redactores de DV se lo hemos escuchado decir. La gente de la Fundación Oteiza, designada directamente por el escultor y poco sospechosa de ir a sacar tajada, firmó el acuerdo con el Guggenheim por indicación expresa de Oteiza. Ayer el artista matizó que quiere entrar al Guggenheim acompañado por su generación. Que así sea. El culebrón seguirá y todos nos aburriremos, pero Oteiza acabará en ese Guggenheim que, según sus palabras, “hay que vasquizar”. Que le dejen en paz, sí, pero sobre todo que nos dejen en paz a nosotros.’ (El Diario Vasco, opinion article, March 12, 1998, p. 64)

Extract 67

‘(A) Oteiza pone condiciones [headline] Desautoriza a “políticos y fundaciones” para formalizar acuerdos sobre sus obras. [subhead] Condicionó su entrada en el Guggenheim a la de su generación de la Escuela Vasca. [subhead] Desconcierto de la Fundación Oteiza y Vidarte. [subhead] “Ante noticias y sonrientes fotos PNV sobre el futuro de mi obra comunico a la opinión pública que desautorizo a políticos y fundaciones para formalizar ningún tipo de acuerdo con mis obras”. Por escrito, para que no se le pudiera malinterpretar, Jorge Oteiza salió ayer al paso de la firma de un protocolo de colaboración entre la fundación que gestiona su proyecto de museo en Altzuza y el Guggenheim-Bilbao; un acuerdo que significaba su entrada en el museo al que tanto ha criticado. Pero Oteiza había puesto sus condiciones. El desmentido fue recibido con desconcierto por los implicados, quienes tal vez se habían precipitado. [subhead] (B) Se suponía que tenían el visto bueno del autor, quien el pasado 18 de febrero, en presencia de su amigo realizador de televisión Jon Intxaustegi, había recibido en su domicilio de Zarautz, la visita de Vidarte. Pero en el texto enviado ayer a los medios de comunicación – Oteiza, que no los lee habitualmente, se sintió “abrumado por las noticias” del día –, el escultor explicaba que en aquella reunión “expuse con rotundidad que mi entrada en el museo sólo era posible con mi generación en Escuela Vasca”. (C) “Que me dejen en paz” El escultor se refería al grupo surgido en su entorno a mediados de la década de los 60, como los colectivos Gaur, Emen y Orain o más
La escuela Vasca, a la espera. [headline] Los compañeros de Oteiza creen que la decisión del escultor no debe condicionar su presencia en el Guggenheim. [subhead] El martes la Fundación Oteiza y la Fundación Guggenheim Bilbao firmaron un acuerdo de colaboración para organizar en este último una exposición antológica y adquirir obras del escultor. El miércoles Oteiza desautorizó el convenio y recaló, como ya había dicho, que “mi entrada en el museo sólo es posible con mi generación en la Escuela Vasca”. El jueves el Museo Guggenheim reiteró su deseo de contar con el artista de Gueiría, pero jamás contra su voluntad. ¿Y qué opinan los integrantes de aquella Escuela Vasca? Ellos creen que la pelota está, como desde hace mucho tiempo, en el tejado del Guggenheim. La decisión sobre su presencia o ausencia compete a éste y no debe estar sólo condicionada por la voluntad de Jorge Oteiza, que una vez más ha conseguido reabrir un debate nunca cerrado. [subhead] La Escuela Vasca duró poco, “demasiado poco, como todo en este país”, dice el pintor y escultor Néstor Basterretxea, apenas unos meses de 1966. Sin embargo, “sirvió para conocernos y tener una cierta conciencia cultural vasca”, añade. La última polémica encendida por Oteiza, el padre espiritual de aquel movimiento, lo ha vuelto a traer a la actualidad, de la mano además de un segundo debate en torno a “ya que el Guggenheim está aquí, lo que procede es vasquizarlo” que dijo el artista oriotarra. El debate está abierto y ante el torbellino levantado por Oteiza al afirmar que sólo irá al Guggenheim acompañado por aquella Escuela Vasca los artistas que la formaron se mantienen en un segundo plano expectante. Cuatro de ellos opinan en estas líneas. (C) “Es una actitud pública de Jorge que a mí me beneficia, precisamente por eso, por ser serio, no quiero decir nada”, explica Néstor Basterretxea. El fue, bajo el liderazgo de Oteiza y junto con Agustín Ibarrola, uno de los pilares de aquel movimiento. “Oteiza pensará que los que estábamos en aquel momento, porque es verdad que estábamos en la vanguardia del arte, merecemos estar en un museo que al fin y al cabo está subvencionado por los vascos”, dice el artista bermeano asentado en Hondarribia, que ayer se reunió con Oteiza para conocer en profundidad el asunto. Después, cuando tenga claro todo, sí opinará. “Oteiza tiene todo el derecho a hacer con su obra lo que le dé la gana. Su obra en el Guggenheim contribuirá a abrir el camino a otros artistas vascos, españoles y europeos y a romper el modelo de museo sucursal de Nueva York. Yo agradezco esa conciencia profesional manifestada por Oteiza hacia el arte del País Vasco”, explica Agustín Ibarrola. Igual que los hijos del fallecido Remigio.
Mendiburu, uno de los integrantes del grupo Gaur, la reunión de artistas guipuzcoanos germen de la Escuela Vasca. “Hoy que todo el mundo va a lo suyo, que un artista como Oteiza se acuerde de los demás es algo increíble”, dicen. (C) Para ellos es “indiscutible” que la obra de su padre esté en el museo bilbaino, “pero más que de Oteiza debería ser del mismo Guggenheim la iniciativa”, añaden. Y ahí también coinciden con Ibarrola. “No niego a aceptar que nuestra presencia sea únicamente una condición previa para obtener el sí de Jorge Oteiza”, indica. (...) “Es de reconocer que desee tanto estar con los demás artistas”, indica también el pintor José Antonio Sistiaga, pero sus reflexiones le llevan a un punto más allá. “Lo que se merece es una gran retrospectiva, en la que se vea su obra sola, como un gran poema, pero no en Bilbao sino fuera”, explica Sistiaga, quien retomando la frase de Oteiza, “tenemos que ganar premios fuera para que nos respeten en casa”, y una idea de Hasier Etxeberria, propone que esa retrospectiva comience “en Nueva York, en Berlín, Colonia, París o allí donde el arte sucede, y luego quizás de vuelta, llegue a Bilbao”. (D) Y sobre vasquizar el Guggenheim para Ibarrola está claro que “este museo nunca tendrá entidad propia, ni del país donde está instalado, si no se posee una amplia representación de los vascos de esa generación y de las nuevas” y que “hasta que este país no retome su soberanía para establecer la definición de su colección estable y exposiciones temporales, que la irresponsabilidad del PNV ha dejado en manos de Norteamérica, seguiremos asistiendo a espectáculos como la desgraciada negociación con Chillida días antes de la inauguración y con Oteiza ahora, que no favorecen en nada a este país”. “Los que no están a la altura de lo que aquí ha sucedido en el arte y no han tomado con un mínimo de seriedad la creación vasca han sido las personas que tienen responsabilidades estéticas en el museo. Krens no ha sido informado. Allí está el fallo”, indica Sistiaga. (...)’


Extract 69
‘Cristina Iglesias protagoniza la primera monográfica vasca del Guggenheim. [headline] Una multitudinaria inauguración abrió ayer en el Museo Guggenheim de Bilbao la exposición de la escultora donostiarra Cristina Iglesias. Es una muestra cargada de simbolismo, ya que se trata de la primera monográfica que el Guggenheim dedica a un artista vasco. Esta muestra pudo verse anteriormente en Nueva York, Chicago y Madrid, y confirma a Cristina Iglesias como sólido valor emergente en el circuito internacional del arte. En la imagen, la artista con una de sus obras ayer en Bilbao.’ (El Diario Vasco, front-page news report, November 6, 1998)

Extract 70
‘El feliz regreso a casa de Cristina Iglesias [headline] La escultora inauguró la primera muestra que el Guggenheim dedicó a un artista vasco. [subhead] Durante dos años la exposición de la escultora donostiarra Cristina Iglesias ha viajado por el mundo. Comenzó en el Guggenheim de Nueva York, viajó después a Chicago y a Madrid y “termina en casa”, según decía ayer la artista en el Guggenheim Bilbao. Anoche se inauguró la muestra, la primera monográfica que el museo dedica a un artista vasco y que se podrá visitar hasta el 14 de febrero con un cóctel rico en asistentes guipuzcoanos. [subhead] (...) (La sala 103 [subhead] Entre la veintena de obras que la artista expone en la sala 103 del Guggenheim hay dos bosques metálicos, uno de bambú y otro de eucaliptus, varias serigrafías sobre grandes planchas de cobre, tres celosías y un techo de hormigón que cuelga en el atrio, a la entrada de la sala. Esta obra, gracias a la donación de la artista, quedará tras la exposición en el museo que ya poseía una celosía. Entre esas piezas “ensimismadas y misteriosas”, según la calificó Carmen Giménez, la conservadora de arte del siglo XX del Guggenheim de
Nueva York y comisaria de esta exposición, caminaban los invitados, porque su obra “hay que caminarla” y mirarla con la idea de descifrar lo que vemos”, dijo la escultora. (...) Desde Gipuzkoa
Desde José María Ruiz Urchegi, presidente de Adegi, a la diputada de Cultura, Koruko Aizarna, quien decía que exposiciones como ésta “no sólo demuestran que tenemos grandes artistas, sino también artistas de primera línea en cuanto a proyección internacional” (...).'

(El Diario Vasco, news report headline and subhead, November 6, 1998, p. 63)

**Extract 71**

‘Una exposición simbólica [headline] La exposición de Cristina Iglesias en el Guggenheim de Bilbao es ante todo una poderosa y atractiva introducción en la obra de la escultora donostiarra. Pero además, esta exposición viene cargada de una buena dosis de simbolismo: es la primera exposición monográfica que el museo bilbaíno dedica a un artista vasco. En este caso, una mujer que pese a su juventud (nació en 1956) es ahora uno de los valores más sólidos en el circuito internacional del arte. La muestra que puede verse en Bilbao estuvo antes en Nueva York, Chicago y Madrid, pero su llegada a la gran infraestructura cultural del País Vasco le confiere una dimensión especial, y quizás por eso la inauguración fue ayer multitudinaria: el Guggen se vasquiza por unos meses. (B) Como dice la propia Cristina Iglesias, tan importante como el hecho de que sea vasca es que se trata de una mujer joven. Y es que también resulta simbólico que el gran museo del arte contemporáneo sea desde ayer más contemporáneo que nunca al acoger a una creadora de apenas 40 años, lo que inicia una línea que no debería abandonar el museo: conjugar las exposiciones de los grandes clásicos de la modernidad con la atención a los valores emergentes del arte que se realizan ahora. (C) Y resulta finalmente simbólico que el Guggenheim se guipuzcoanice con una artista de Donostia y una muestra patrocinada por entidades de este territorio, como DV o el Banco Guipuzcoano. Desde ayer, la escultura de Cristina Iglesias, tan arquitectónica en alguna de sus obras, dialoga con ese templo de la arquitectura que es el edificio de Gehry. La conversación merece la pena.’

(El Diario Vasco, opinion article signed by Mitxel Ezquiaga, November 6, 1998, p. 63)

**Extract 72**

‘Diálogo artístico. [headline] Esa es la propuesta de Cristina Iglesias en su muestra monográfica. [subhead] Expone en el Guggenheim hasta el 14 de febrero. [subhead] La artista donostiarra considera “un reto” mostrar su obra. [subhead] La oferta museística del Guggenheim Bilbao ha sido ampliada hasta el 14 de febrero con una exposición monográfica de Cristina Iglesias. Esta muestra reúne una veintena de obras de la joven artista donostiarra, que está suscitando un gran interés en el mundo del arte a nivel internacional. La exposición que llega a Bilbo es continuación de la que se llevó a cabo en el Guggenheim de Nueva York en verano del 97 y que después ha pasado por Chicago y Madrid. [subhead] (...) (C) La exposición que llega a la capital vizcaína es continuación de la monográfica que este artista presentó en el Guggenheim de Nueva York durante el verano del 97, y que posteriormente ha pasado por la Renaissance Society de Chicago y por el Palacio de Velázquez de Madrid, ciudad en la que actualmente vive y trabaja la autora. En cada uno de estos lugares, Cristina Iglesias ha debido adaptar sus piezas a las diferentes ubicaciones. “Es una obra – explicó – tremendamente sensible a cada espacio que ocupa”. (...) La exposición, formada por cerca de una veintena de sus creaciones más recientes, ha sido organizada por Carmen Giménez, conservadora de arte del siglo XX del Museo Guggenheim de Nueva York desde hace una década. La comisaria de la muestra, presente también en el acto de inauguración, se refirió a Iglesias como “destacada integrante de una
generación emergente de importantes artistas contemporáneos que trabajan hoy en España” y aludió a la importancia de esta iniciativa en la medida que busca “el diálogo con los grandes arquitectos y en Bilbao podemos llevar a cabo la muestra en uno de los más bellos edificios de este fin de milenio”. (D) Juan Ignacio Vidarte, el director general del museo Guggenheim Bilbao anunció que la de la donostiarra Cristina Iglesias, “inaugura una serie de exposiciones relacionadas con el arte vasco y español contemporáneo, un tema que los museos Guggenheim seguirán investigando y en el que seguirán profundizando en el futuro”. (Egin, news report, November 6, 1998, p. 20)’
E en el apretardo de un editorial "Monarkia Museoan" de 1997 de la revista "Erruzketa", sePublicaron textos que fueron presionados por la prensa y los medios de comunicación, lo cual llevó a la creación de un nuevo partido político, el "Partido Monarkia Museoan", que obtuvo un gran éxito electoral.

El texto principal de esta página es un editorial sobre la situación política en el País Vasco, donde se habla de la importancia de la cultura y la preservación del patrimonio histórico. Se menciona la importancia de la Iglesia y la monarquía en la historia de Euskadi, y se abordan temas como la enseñanza del vasco en las escuelas y la promoción de la cultura vasca.

El texto también menciona la figura de la reina Sofia de España, quien se ha destacado por su compromiso con la cultura y la educación, y se hace un llamado a la importancia de la educación en la formación de ciudadanos comprometidos con la cultura vasca.

En resumen, este editorial es un ejemplo de la importancia de la cultura y la preservación del patrimonio en la sociedad vasca, y se hace un llamado a la importancia de la educación y la formación de ciudadanos comprometidos con la cultura vasca.
editorial

Reflexionar

a la muerte del etarrana Agirre me recuerda, además del respeto debido a toda tragedia humana, una serie pero decidida reflexión sobre los diversos elementos que han rodeado el caso, desde el presumible objetivo de la acción hasta las dramáticas consecuencias de los hechos que se sucedieron a partir de la acción policial de la Errenteria.

La intervención de ETA, con un objetivo improbable de concretar en estos momentos, no presenta aspectos novedosos que puedan sorprender a nadie. Tampoco el enfrentamiento entre un policía autónomo y un militante armado supone novedad alguna. Ya se dieron los casos del parque de Errenteria y Liñiz, salándose aquellos con la muerte de dos miembros de ETA. Y a pesar de todo, la muerte de Agirre y las posteriores detenciones siguen siendo el elemento de referencia más nítido para entender la realidad del conflicto y su intensidad.

Sujetos a la única versión de los hechos conocida, expuesta por la parte policial, puede creerse que ETA pretendía atentar en el Guggenheim, bien contra las instalaciones del controvertido museo, bien contra alguno de los representantes del Estado que allí hallan a congregarse. Y puede constatarse que los policías que dirigía Atutx trataron de impedirlo y detener a los militantes.

La composición cultural que representa el proyecto Guggenheim, la conocida popular suscitada, la lucha armada, la próxima visita de los monarcas españoles para plantar la pica española en Elksilk Herrería la gran día más implica la Policía autónoma en la repetición de los independentistas confundir el escenario en el que se ha desarrollado el drama que ha concluido con un policía muerto, tres detenidos y varias familias destrozadas. Lo más triste de todo es comprobar que tanto dolor no resulta suficiente para alentar en las filas del nacionalismo autónomo la reflexión que les lleve a romper con la estrategia del españolismo y haga posible dar pasos firmes hacia la paz.

hoy escribe

Altaffaylla Oinez

Etxulara es antiguo, sepultado y profundo, el pasado cuandd se cita. El etxulara, embalsamado en las botas de la gran llanura fría, ha soñado durante siglos con los navazos y ha pervivido, a su vez, en el sueño anclado de las gentes. Despatadodo como su castillo rodoclo, lo han pulido las aguas de incontables avenidas torrenteadas, ha sido rodeado de último, perviviendo justo a los ceremonios olivos al paso del tiempo que todo lo ciuda.

El etxulara es un hilo sonoro elegido por los antepasados que la costumbre grabó en nuestra mente como voz cantada en el sonido de una casa. Un huco lingüístico, nada común, que impregna los últimos gestos del vivo y se destila a gata cosa tan suave aunque profunda. El etxulara es en el castillo robado azotado por el viento de los mil papeles que la Historia siempre tuvo para señalar los pueblos humanizados. El etxulara es fundamentalmente volúmenes de ser, y las bandoleras del sur y de la zona media son, sobre todo, vocación para que el etxulara sea. Una íntima, en las tierras bajas del Roya, es la ruta que se sigue a tener sedentarios por más tiempo el fuego y la lengua.

Bajo el imperio romano una ardiola podría atraviesar la Peninsular Ibérica de árbol en árbol sin pasar el suelo, tal vez la abonación de estos bosques. Algo semejante ocurre con el etxulara en Navarra, donde ya es posible recorrerla de extremo a otro escrutando en todas partes un ensamblaje, unidos por la huella del arte y la lengua, que se recuerda a nuestros hijos, que se crean a nivel de convicciones, que se convierten en un placer colectivo por el etxulara, los que lo dan, los que lo hacen. Juego que se hace pasar por argumento convincente no se conviene sobre la mentira de decretos. El etxulara no es el patrimonio de ningún, porque es de todos. Es la única lengua que a lo largo de su Historia siempre ha sido contemporánea de los navazos. Las demás, sencillamente se dejaron olvidar en los archivos polvorientos de la memoria, dejándonos la herencia de hermosísimas palabras como el propio nombre árabe de Tafalla: Altaffaylla.

La fiesta del Nafarroa Oinez será un inmenso patio de recreo en el que podremos jugar todos. Ayudar y ayudarnos, pero el mérito es de los habitantes de la zona. Están aportándose inventando una patria común para todos nosotros: la patria del etxulara.

La fiesta del Nafarroa Oinez será un inmenso patio de recreo en el que podemos jugar todos. Ayudar y ayudarnos, pero el mérito es de los habitantes de la zona. Están aportándose inventando una patria común para todos nosotros: la patria del etxulara.

I a fiesta del Nafarroa Oinez será un inmenso patio de recreo en el que podremos jugar todos. Ayudar y ayudarnos, pero el mérito es de los habitantes de la zona. Están aportándose inventando una patria común para todos nosotros: la patria del etxulara.

Yo los juzgo al etxulara, josa y luego al chaparral. Espero el causar jotas en abundancia, pruebo de que la gente de la zona se ha volcado en el Oinez.

López & Pérez

Appendice 3 - Original editorial "Reflexionar"

 '\n
E l esquiro es antiguo, sepultado y profundo, el pasado cuando se cita. El esquiro, embalsamado en las botas de la gran llanura fría, ha soñado durante siglos con sus vistazos y ha pervivido, a su vez, en el sueño anclado de las gentes. Despatadado como su castillo rodoclo, lo han pulido las aguas de incontables avenidas torrenteadas, ha sido rodeado de último, perviviendo justo a los ceremonios olivos al paso del tiempo que todo lo ciuda.

El esquiro es un hilo sonoro elegido por los antepasados que la costumbre grabó en nuestra mente como voz cantada en el sonido de una casa. Un huco lingüístico, nada común, que impregna los últimos gestos del vivo y se destila a gata cosa tan suave aunque profunda. El esquiro es en el castillo robado azotado por el viento de los mil papeles que la Historia siempre tuvo para señalar los pueblos humanizados. El esquiro es fundamentalmente volúmenes de ser, y las bandoleras del sur y de la zona media son, sobre todo, vocación para que el esquiro sea. Una íntima, en las tierras bajas del Roya, es la ruta que se sigue a tener sedentarios por más tiempo el fuego y la lengua.

Bajo el imperio romano una ardiola podría atravesar la Peninsular Ibérica de árbol en árbol sin pasar el suelo, tal vez la abonación de estos bosques. Algo semejante ocurre con el esquiro en Navarra, donde ya es posible recorrerla de extremo a otro escrutando en todas partes un ensamblaje, unidos por la huella del arte y la lengua, que se recuerda a nuestros hijos, que se crean a nivel de convicciones, que se convierten en un placer colectivo por el esquiro, los que lo dan, los que lo hacen. Juego que se hace pasar por argumento convincente no se conviene sobre la mentira de decretos. El esquiro no es el patrimonio de ningún, porque es de todos. Es la única lengua que a lo largo de su Historia siempre ha sido contemporánea de los navazos. Las demás, sencillamente se dejaron olvidar en los archivos polvorientos de la memoria, dejándonos la herencia de hermosísimas palabras como el propio nombre árabe de Tafalla: Altaffaylla.

La fiesta del Nafarroa Oinez será un inmenso patio de recreo en el que podremos jugar todos. Ayudar y ayudarnos, pero el mérito es de los habitantes de la zona. Están aportándose inventando una patria común para todos nosotros: la patria del esquiro.
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