

May 2022

Inter-Subjectivity: How Should a Spanish Oral Historian Analyse the Oral Life Stories of ETA Activists?

Nicolás Buckley

Universidad Europea de Madrid, nico.buckley.martin@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/boga>



Part of the [Basque Studies Commons](#), and the [Oral History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buckley, Nicolás (2022) "Inter-Subjectivity: How Should a Spanish Oral Historian Analyse the Oral Life Stories of ETA Activists?," *BOGA: Basque Studies Consortium Journal*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

<https://doi.org/10.18122/boga.10.1.1.boisestate>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/boga/vol10/iss1/1>



Inter-subjectivity: How should a Spanish oral historian analyse the oral life stories of ETA activists?

Nicolas Buckley

Introduction

How can we reconstruct the past? History, as a discipline, has been shaped through time in an attempt to answer this question. Beginning in May 1968, a new cultural movement emerged, *post-modernity*, and it consolidated with the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989.¹ Before the last quarter of the twentieth century (especially after World War II), testimonies had played a key role in Academia. But at the end of the century, facts were questioned like never before and historians started putting even more attention to the construction of narratives. In the second half of the 21st

¹ In geopolitical terms, the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1991 marked the 'end of ideologies', a key element of the post-modern era. However, we might consider 'May 1968' as the 'cultural starting date' for the post-modern paradigm in terms of the hegemony of the 'politics of identity' (gender, memory... etc).

century, two approaches to interpreting history collided as I developed my doctoral thesis on ETA activists. On one hand stood the British historians—the so called *hispanistas*—who have successfully tried to reconstruct the Spanish civil war as a complete phenomenon. These historians hold that objectivity is the ultimate goal when seeking historical truth. On the other hand, with the consolidation of the post-modern paradigm, new studies on memory and emotions emerged, and history became more closely associated with other disciplines, such as sociology or anthropology. No doubt this multidisciplinary approach has enriched history. Nevertheless, history, as a discipline that seeks to understand the past in all of its dimensions, has also been compartmentalized, and some competing approaches to it have been undervalued. In my work as an oral historian, conducting research on ETA activists' life stories, there is a complex inter-subjectivity to be studied. This inter-subjectivity formed between myself—my identity as a Spanish, middle class man born in 1985—and a research subject's own unique background and identity, cannot be neutralized. It is valid to ask: is inter-subjectivity the simple outcome of the interaction between two persons, in terms of oral history, the narrator and the interviewer? This article will show how disadvantageous is to fade the researcher into the background. Inter-subjectivity enriches the discipline of history proving how historians cannot be categorized just as 'social scientists', but also as practitioners who could work in the field like anthropologists or ethnographers.

The phenomenon of intersubjectivity has been widely debated among oral historians during the past years. Alessandro Portelli (1981), argues that this phenomenon could be understood as a process where the narrator (the informant) and the interviewer (the historian) negotiate their authority during the interview. At some point, according to Portelli (1981), during the interview the narrator could end up distrusting the interviewer taking into account that the final manuscript would be a 'total product' of the interviewer. In this respect, Kathleen Bee (1991), interviewing women of the Ku Klux Klan, acknowledged how she had arrived to the interviews with some prejudices taking into account her commitment with progressive politics. Nevertheless, after the interview took place, she realized how she shared some opinions and assumptions of the narrators. As Bee (1991) saw most of the women on the Klan as "interesting, intelligent and well informed" we can understand the phenomenon of intersubjectivity in the opposite direction of what Portelli implies; maybe sometimes the narrator changes the view of the interviewer, maybe even the final product (the manuscript) would be closer to the interviewer worldview than the opposite.

Oral historians are constantly influenced by previous generations. As a Spanish oral historian, the Spanish Civil War is the main historical event that shaped the country's modern identities. The civil war started in 1936, and pitted those loyal to

the democratic liberal republic, founded in 1931, against the conservative and fascist forces that opposed the modernization process that the republican authorities started. The war culminated with the establishment of General Francisco Franco's dictatorship, which lasted for 36 years. In 1975, the year Franco died, a transitional political process began, shifting the dictatorship to a democratic regime. The symbolic end of the transitional period occurred in 1982, when the Spanish socialist party (PSOE) won the elections. At this time, the new liberal Spanish state's main threat was ETA (an acronym in the Basque language for what translates to 'Freedom for the Basque Country'), the only European terrorist group active until the definitive ceasefire in 2011.

The stark differences between the older generations that appreciated the new democratic state, versus the younger generations that were disenchanted with it, begins to explore important subjectivities.² Kostis Kornetis (2014) described this phenomenon as "generational betrayal". For the Spaniards that experienced increased civil liberties and other benefits during the Spanish transition, ETA mainly represented a threat to the liberal democratic values. For younger generations, that did not live through the dictatorship or the transition, ETA represented a strange phenomenon. For one, most of the generation who was born during or after the Spanish transition, could not recognize their selves in ETA's violent actions. On the other hand, ETA's struggle against the fascist legacy persisting in new Spanish democracy was provocative and transgressive, and therefore, appealing to certain segments of the youth. Symbols like king Juan Carlos I (named by dictator Franco his successor) or the consolidation of a 'consumerism' based on neo-liberal culture, were key factors to understand how this radical youth emerged within the new Spanish democracy.

In the same line of Portelli, Lynn Abrams (2016), in his well-known handbook on oral history, reflects inter-subjectivity as a process held between two subjects (the narrator and the interviewer) which, at the end, will determine how the narrator tells his life story. Taking into account that oral history was born to give a voice to people who normally were not able to express publicly their daily life concerns, Abrams holds that oral historians should pay attention to the process of inter-subjectivity, and how the interaction with the interviewer can "contaminate" the narrator's story.³ Without denying the importance of this argument, oral historians

² Most of the Spanish generation who experienced the transition during the decade of the 1970s saw the benefits of leaving aside a cruel dictatorship. Ironically, part of the generation born during the 1970s and 1980s who did not live this turbulent period, felt a sense disappointment with their parents. Instead of making a 'social revolution' (part of the dreams that this generation had in mind during the dictatorship), this older generation acted with a more pragmatic behaviour trying to shift a dictatorship to a liberal democracy based on free market and a consumerist culture. These 'subjectivities' define the Spanish politics in the present XXI century.

³ World War II is the origin of what today we call 'the era of testimony'. Ex American soldiers told their traumas to a psychoanalyst in order to 'get their life's back'. For a broader reading: Terkel, 1984.

should consider the risks of talking about themselves (our fears, fantasies or dreams) in order to analyze the inter-subjectivity process which take place in an interview. In the 21st century exists an agreement between pedagogues about how knowledge should be transmitted in horizontal ways.⁴ Today the subjectivities of the author are part of a flourishing postmodern epistemology.⁵ Precisely, collective traumas generated in a 'present which cannot be separated from the past' like the constant remembering by the Spaniards of the Spanish Civil War and the Basque Conflict, can be seen as an opportunity for oral historians to talk about our weaknesses and contradictions during the research process of these kind of conflicts.

In this article, we place the history of ETA and the Basque Conflict as a 'war of narratives', about what the 'germ' of the conflict really was: the repression of the Spanish State over the Basque nationalist movement or rather the illegitimate violence provoked by ETA against innocent victims. Gaizka Fernandez Soldevilla and Raul López Romo are probably the two most well-known historians who have tried to demonstrate how the Basque Radical Community created by ETA had been 'obsessed' to threaten everyone who thought differently from them, especially after the death of dictator Francisco Franco in 1975.⁶ In academic circles, these scholars received the 'credit' of being the first to build a consistent historiography about the negative effects of ETA's terrorism over the Basque and Spanish population in a period (the last decade of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty first) when the terrorist group was still active. They were 'brave enough' to not fear the consequences of the terrorist organization with their research. On the other hand, we cannot assume that there is a systematic historiographical work corpus that had been trying to understand ETA 'from inside'. Most of the attempts that follow this trend came from scholars from the Anglo Saxon world such as John L. Sullivan and Robert P. Clark⁷ or from Basque anthropologists who tried to explain their own existence in Basque lands analyzing the cultural networks.⁸ Finally, coming from the cultural studies, the work of Carrie Hamilton and my own, had tried to go in deep within the subjectivities of ETA activists, making these accounts the core to understand the long armed conflict.⁹

The impact and role of oral history in the post dictatorial Spanish transition

⁴ See: Giroux, 1997. Or Castells and others, 1994.

⁵ See: Maturana and Varela, 1987. Or Rick and Van der Tuin, 2012.

⁶ These are some examples of their work: Fernández Soldevilla, 2012. Fernández Soldevilla, 2020. López Romo, 2018. López Romo, 2015.

⁷ Some valuable books from these scholars: Sullivan, 1988. Clark, 1990.

⁸ Justo two examples: Aretxaga, 1988. Zulaika, 1988.

⁹ See: Hamilton, 2007. Buckley, 2020.

In the 21st century, after more than 60 years since its end, the Spanish Civil War's (1936-1939) historiography is extensive. In 1975, after Franco's death, new civil war analyses and narratives about the conflict emerged.¹⁰ During the dictatorship (1939-1975) the only acceptable discourse held Franco as the rebel leader that saved Spain from communism, which was appealing to the anti-communist global political tendency of the time. This perspective differed from other historians of Spain, which came to be known as *hispanistas*. The *hispanistas* —which were primarily from Great Britain, but also from other European countries and the United States— travelled to Spain at the dictatorship's end and at the beginning of the Spanish transition, to try to understand what had happened during the civil war and the dictatorship. Although the term *hispanista* makes reference to the interest of European historians of an 'exotic and uncivilized Spain', these scholars helped to fill an 'historiographical void' which can be translated as an 'outsider's perspective' in terms of taking distance from the object of study. The civil war and the Spanish transition were the main topics of discussion for the generation born between the 1930s and 1940s.¹¹ Yet, for those born between the 1980s and 1990s, the Spanish transition had its own problems, due to the dictatorship's legacy within the new democracy. These problems and remnants of the dictatorship existed because of an unspoken 'Pact of Forgetting', in which the crimes committed by Franco's army, and other national institutions, could not be held to trial or penalized due to a narrative of reconciliation in which the Spaniards should look forward and forget a traumatizing past.

Past sometimes distorts the present. Novel is a literary genre where the reader sometimes finds difficult to distinguish fiction from empirical reality. Precisely because this complication, in Spain, until very recently (the end of the 1980s), memory was more associated to novels rather than to the discipline of history.¹² In this line of argument, David Herzberg explains how history and memory cannot be compartmentalized. He asserts how to "narrate life is to re-present it in the whole of its authenticity" (Herzberg, 1991). The relation between self and history helps to explain how ETA's new leftist revolutionary violence was a result of the Spanish

¹⁰ Hugh Tomas, *The Spanish Civil War*, Victoria, Australia: Penguin Books, 1965. This book is considered the first serious attempt of writing a history work of the Civil War. Until Tomas's book, most of the historiography of the war consisted in propaganda made by the Franco regime. Hugh Tomas was the historian who started shaping the 'myth' of *hispanistas* as those who bring an objective analysis to a war which had raised the most intense passions within Spaniards.

¹¹ The fact that the perpetrators of the dictatorship were never tried by a (national or international) court, explains in part why this generation remained, for the rest of their lives, with a permanent 'unhealed wound'. See: Casanova, 2016.

¹² This historian Caroline Boyd had analysed how the crimes committed by the Francoist regime were not part of the political agenda until the end of the 1980s. Until that period 'talking' about the war and the dictatorship in Spain was more associated to novels and films rather than to academic research. The political transition had not been successful in implementing a restorative justice for the victims. In this sense, talking about the victims was more related to a 'personal issue' rather than a political one. See: Boyd, 2008.

Civil War, and indeed Franco's dictatorship. Paloma Aguilar and Clara Ramírez-Barat (2016) argue that, in the transmission of political identities, there can be three or four subsequent generations that inherit a past collective trauma. While the civil war and dictatorship represents a collective trauma for the Boomer generation, ETA symbolized something completely disconnected for this same generation –an unhistorical anomaly that did not need to be analyzed.

For most of the historiography on ETA, the Basque conflict could be understood through the obstinacy of ETA of not abandoning the use of the violence with the arrival of democracy.¹³ Nevertheless, my research revealed a broader statement: The modern Basque conflict can be defined as the unwillingness of the *Izquierda Abertzale* (ETA's social base) to be part of the social pact (as well as *Pacto de Olvido*) made by the Spanish state (those Francoist elites in favor of the arrival of democracy and most of the anti-Francoist opposition, including the communist party) in order to insert Spain within the European power structure. In what sense can the modern Basque conflict born within the Spanish transition, be approached from the 'outsiders' perspective as the '*hispanistas*' did with the civil war, taking into account the different social context between the Spanish 1930s and the 1970s?

During my doctoral research, especially during the field trips to the Basque country to conduct interviews with ETA activists, I realized that the attempt of scholars to emotionally distance themselves from their object of study, was one of the main problems with the Basque conflict bibliography.¹⁴ For more than 30 years, the Spanish Civil War historiography had been written from the winner's one-sided perspective during the dictatorship's existence ; yet, the Basque conflict historiography did not. Basque conflict historians commonly assume and depict ETA as a 'rational' insurgence group until the end of Franco's reign, and then, as a 'ruthless' terrorist group during the democratic period.¹⁵ Nevertheless, adhering to these stereotypes was exactly what I sought to avoid in my fieldwork and interviews in the Basque Country. Oral history could help to analyze the subjective views of ETA activists and the way they themselves told their stories. Rather than being emotionally distant from the ETA activists, as the *hispanistas* did with the Spanish Civil War protagonists, my purpose was to explore the narratives that emerged, particularly as a Spanish citizen living the cultural heritage of the transition and the open wounds of the civil war, during the time the interviews were conducted in 2012.

¹³ These are just some examples: Mata-López, 1993. Or Elorza, 2000.

¹⁴ Having a sociological approach, Diego Muro analysed ETA and the Basque Radical Community trying to take distance from his object of study. Approaching the Basque conflict with an ethnic dimension, the life stories of ETA activists did not form part of his study. Diego Muro, *Ethnicity and Violence: The Case of Radical Basque Nationalism* (New York, Routledge, 2008).

¹⁵ Fusi, 2000.

The way oral historians deal with inter-subjectivity has been highly debated. The oral historian Carrie Hamilton (2008) in her article, *On Being a 'Good' Interviewer*, asks: "What happens when the narrator is not an 'ideological hero', and is instead someone whose political views the interviewer does not share, or indeed, may even detest?" The *hispanistas* who contributed to the Spanish Civil War's historiography can be divided, in simple terms, into two categories: 1) Those who highlighted the Second Republic's contribution (1931-1939) to the popular classes' welfare and the construction of a modern Spanish state, and 2) those who emphasize the 'chaos' of the Second Republic's political regime and its inability to bring social peace and stability to the Spanish society. Building his work in the process of 'unmasking' the crimes committed by the Francoist dictatorship, we can place Paul Preston in the first group of *hispanistas*. Stanley G. Payne, known as a 'revisionist' in terms of highlighting in his work the 'good things' (such as stability and economic growing) that bring the dictatorship, is the most representative figure of the second group. To add to Hamilton's previously stated question: can we compare this division between *hispanistas* (those taking a more favorable position about the II Republic and those who emphasize its failures) with the emotional burden that oral historians experience when we interview activists of armed insurgent groups?

In the outcome of my doctoral thesis, the different political periods that took place during the Spanish transition, are portrayed through the life stories of different ETA activists. My intention was to analyze the different power structures of the Spanish state (prison system, job market, cultural hegemony, etc.) and its new democratic regime, as revealed through the ETA activists' micro stories. Though ETA is usually portrayed and characterized by the violence that some activists perpetrated over Spanish society, I explore the activists' emotional landscapes while attending to their daily lives during the Basque conflict. During the interviews, my objective was simply to meet and get to know these people, and I rejected to speak exclusively about the violence inflicted. To some, this may appear as if I support the ETA struggle. In a private conversation with a well-known *hispanista*, the historian told me that during the interview process, perhaps I had suffered a sort of Stockholm syndrome with the ETA activists.¹⁶ In other words, according to this *hispanista*, ETA activists had convinced me that their political struggle and attempt to establish an independent Basque state, was 'right'.

If the *hispanistas* emphasized objective analysis of the Spanish Civil War from an 'outsiders perspective', what was the point of depicting my emotional insights, particularly in reference to my national identity? In her *Autobiography of a Generation*, the oral historian Luisa Passerini (1996, 10) makes inter-subjectivity

¹⁶ This syndrome describes a condition where a captive victim befriends their captor.

the core of her work: “There are strong elements of seduction in narrating one’s life. One woman says to me: ‘I’d like to see you again, not just during an interview’. Me too. I tell her bits of my life, I serve as a mirror for her critical moments.” In my thesis’s first draft, I referred to an ETA activist as a ‘friend’. Immediately, someone from my university strongly recommended that I change it for another word. Is it appropriate to describe the narrator as a friend? Though it goes against the methodology of more orthodox historians, this question reveals the, potentially, conflictive relationship between researcher and subject of study.

During the research process, the *hispanistas*’ work was my main reference for studying Spanish history, using a distant and “objective” European perspective. Though their analysis of social history was useful and valid to my work, at the end of my research, I tried a different approach.¹⁷ By letting go of many assumptions, I allowed myself to change through my interactions with ETA activists during the interviews and, indeed, change my analysis of ETA activists and the Basque conflict. In terms of discussions about oral history intersubjectivity, my research took a similar path than oral historian Erin Jessee. While Jessee, interviewing Rwandan Genocide, struggle to ‘sharing authority’ in terms to not fall into a ‘ethnographic seduction’ (been immersed within the narrative of the victims), my research process was more introspective.¹⁸ In this sense, my ‘emotional willing’ to break with a previous generation of Spaniards who experienced a material progress during the Spanish transition adds the ingredient of ‘intergenerational memory’. This generation (who shared the same worldview of *Hispanistas*) did not see too many benefits in exploring post transition violence. If in Rwanda, during 1994 more than 500,000 citizens were brutally murdered by a Hutu ethnic community over a Tutsi minority population, the main work of Jessee (2017, 14) consisted in capturing how “Rwandans make sense of their post-genocide lives.” On the other hand, for a previous generation of Spaniards who had experienced the benefits of leaving the dictatorship, they did not feel the necessity of exploring the violence of ETA in terms of ‘making sense of their lives’. If ETA’s violence was not successful in changing the narratives of daily life Spaniards, why then did we need new research about a topic which was ‘not in conflict’? There was ‘no conflict’ precisely because their transcripts were hidden from the public records. Bringing them to the surface was the task of the oral historian.

In one of the first serious attempt to try to explain oral history from a broader regional perspective (South America and the Iberian Peninsula), Rina Benmayor, María Eugenia Cardenal de la Nuez and Pilar Domínguez Prats (2007) asserted that in countries where democracies had been built from the recent memory of the dictatorship, oral testimonies cannot be analyzed without understanding how

¹⁷ These are some of the most interesting works written by *hispanistas* on social history: Balfour, 1989, Preston, 1995, Graham, 2005.

these tensions framed the interviewers' narratives. In Spain, Franco's dictatorship and the violence ETA provoked are two faces of the same coin. Undoubtedly, the pain provoked by both phenomena over part of the Spanish population is something that cannot be disputed. But rather, what debated is how Spanish society should deal with this recent turbulent past. Moreover, making oral history in Spain and dealing with ETA's historical phenomenon means that just the simple act of storytelling about these activists' lives provokes personal contradictions: I will likely generate emotional irritation to many within Spanish society, as well as to the activists when they read what is written about themselves.

Passerini (1996, 10) describes her *Autobiography of a Generation* as "much less and perhaps, somewhat more, than a social history." During the research process, I felt more comfortable trying to construct the ETA activists' mental landscapes rather than a social history of ETA through the lengthy armed Basque conflict. On the one hand, as a Spanish citizen who had studied political science and has read the main historical works on the Basque conflict, it was not difficult to explain its social history. On the other hand, my perception of the Basque conflict was constantly challenged by the ETA activists' testimonies, as well as my perception about my own self. During the interviews, conducted in 2014 and 2015, the ceasefire had already been reached, and the 2008 global economic crisis was the main concern among Spaniards. How could it be possible that a leftist revolutionary organization ceased the armed activity in the middle of one of capitalism's biggest crises? Assuming the thesis that political violence was not accepted anymore by the western masses in a twenty first century context, the end of ETA did not mean of the end of the confrontation between the Basque Radical Community and the Spanish state. As a young Spaniard, understanding the young middle-class Basques' motivations to join a *guerrilla* warfare seemed relevant to current left wing social movements that contemplated violence to challenge the capitalist system.

In this context of 'late capitalism', hedonism, as part of a postmodern culture, was spread through a consumerism culture. During the interviews, I was profoundly affected by those who had abandoned their ordinary lives for a cause, at times being deprived of liberty in prisons for several decades.

Translated from a conversation about the 1970s in Spain, in the middle of the Transition:

Narrator: When I was 14 or 15 years old, I felt as a Basque Nationalist. But not like a Basque Nationalist from PNV [Basque Nationalist Party]. In that period the PNV did not exist on the streets.

Buckley: But the PNV was a strong political force in that period.

Narrator: That's not true. Maybe that's what the books say. But the PNV were just a few grandpas [said in a derogatory tone]. In 1976 [the year after Franco's death] there was only one movement.

Buckley: What movement are you talking about?

Narrator: You know exactly what I mean. The movement of the *Izquierda Abertzale* (Basque Radical Community). It was the only movement that was on the streets.¹⁹

When the narrator refers to the PNV (Basque Nationalist Party), we need to understand that it symbolizes one of the greatest archetypes born out of the Spanish transition. The PNV, until today, represents a combination of traditional Basque values, including Christian values, while combining a modern European vision on economic progress and middle-class aspirations. When the narrator challenges me with the question about the movement he was referring, he implicitly disputed my own identity as a middle-class Spaniard. With his words, he implied that the Basque Radical Community was the only one in the whole Spanish state that actually fought against the neoliberal agenda, and thus, only those who belonged to their community, could be proud of themselves.

If we understand nationalism as a permanent tension between those forces who want to conserve popular traditions and those political trends in favor of modernization, Basque identity had always been part of this tension. The discipline of anthropology had concentrated on how the rural areas of the Basque country, with fluent speakers in *Euskera*, had been confronted with the urban world, where the Castilian language went in hand with the industrialization and the 'progressive forces' of history.²⁰ These tensions were expressed perfectly in Sabino Arana's ideology, the main corpus of modern Basque nationalism. At the end XIX century, Arana shaped through *bizkaitarrismo* (a kind of theory that advocated for sovereignty of the Basque territory of Vizcaya) and the rejection of *maketos* (those workers who emigrated from the Spanish south in order to find jobs at the Basque industry) the principles of basque nationalist movement. The whole twentieth century could be summarized (in terms of the expansion of the nationalist movement inside the Basque territories) in the effective strategy of PNV by combining the self-perception of preserving the traditions and, conversely, achieving a modern social pact between unions and business men. However, this 'harmony' within the Basque nationalist movement 'blew up' with the death of dictator Francisco Franco in 1975 and the consolidation of a nationalist working class movement (ETA's social base) which not only wanted to achieve sovereignty but rather to put in question one of the most important pillars of western

¹⁹ Interview that took place in Bilbao (24/07/2014).

²⁰ See: Heiberg, 1989.

civilization; private property. On one hand, the emergence of ETA shifted the historical confrontation between Castilians (representing a centralized Spain) and Basques (tired of being on the hands of ‘underdeveloped’ Castilians). However, paradoxically, at the end of the 1990s, the long armed Basque conflict ended up with ETA representing Arana’s own ethnicism of radical opposition between Basque and Spanish identity.²¹

This permanent ideological dispute that took place during all the interviews between the narrators and myself could be translated into two inseparable phenomena: My experience as a field researcher, and the *hispanistas*’ experiences in regards to the transition. If ETA has been blamed by *hispanistas* as well as the Spanish state for threatening the transitional democratic process, these same *hispanistas* blamed the anarchist movement during the 1930s for being a destabilizing force for the liberal democratic republic. Sebastiaan Faber argues that the battles of memory about the Spanish civil war and dictatorship has provided Hispanism, or *Hiberian Studies*, to gain momentum. In this line of argument, Faber (2017) asserted that historians of Spain who gained prestige during the transition’s aftermath (1980s and 1990s) were given a platform by media conglomerates that were interested the narrative of an ‘immaculate transition’. In other words, if Santos Juliá or Paul Preston criticized the fascist uprising civil war and the dictatorship, but analyzed the Spanish Transition and the *Pacto de Olvido* as a necessary step in the reconciliation process, the Spanish mainstream media and thus, the rest of the economic and political establishment, rewarded the narrative.

We understand the Basque conflict as a product of the Civil War, as the beginning of a process in which a Spanish Nationalist culture was imposed over the peripheric regions during the 36 years of Franco’s dictatorship. From that point, we can trace two parallels. First fall, the role of the anarchist union CNT (*Confederacion Nacional de Trabajadores*) played within the Second Republic, promoting *accion directa* in order to defeat the fascist enemy and, therefore, rejecting the Republican Army’s hierarchical role. Secondly, the rejection by ETA during the transition to be part the Spanish consensus in order to implement a *pacto de olvido* considered as a necessary step by the Spanish political establishment in order to achieve reconciliation. This parallel is key to understand a narrative in which the *outsiders* are located in the periphery of the historical analyses. The anarchists during the II Republic and the Civil War represent the non-rational actors of history. Those who practiced violence not to achieve pragmatic objectives (such as focusing exclusively in defeating the fascist enemy), but to reach a ‘romantic revolution’ where all kinds of property will be abolished. In this parallel, ETA during the 1970s talked about utopic ideas like Basque self-

²¹ This work develops this thesis in which ETA, at the end of its existence, was indistinguishable from Arana’s main premisses: Elorza, 2000.

determination in a moment where the Spanish society yearned to be European, modern and, more importantly, to achieve similar levels of purchasing power as the rest of Europeans. Thus, my process of intersubjectivity with ETA activists in an academic environment surrounded by *hispanistas* is challenged by an emotional territory with clear epistemological limits. Intersubjectivity enriches history uncovering the narratives (i.e. economic growing vs terrorist actions) that a nation state use in order to maintain the status quo.

Nevertheless, there are still exceptions that pierce these boundaries. In Ronald Fraser's book (1979, 5), *Blood of Spain: An Oral History of the Spanish Civil War*, the author talks about the necessity of displaying "the intangible atmosphere of events" as well as "the subjective, a spectrum of the lived experiences of people who participated in those events." While oral history tends to be at odds with a more conventional academia, under the guise of journalism it can be highly respected. In the *Life and Death of the Spanish Republic*, the British correspondent, Henry Buckley (2013, 2), stated: "I hope that my presentation of Spanish happenings as I witnessed them from the fall of General Primo de Rivera onwards, may cause others to reflect on the reasons for the tragic fate of the Spanish Republic." The prestige of this book, considered a classic by *hispanistas*, is not due to new revelations about the civil war itself. Rather, it is praised for the journalist's ability to describe the mood of the masses and the personalities of the Republic's different political leaders. This is what makes *Life and Death* a remarkable account of Spain in the 1930s. Likewise, my attempt to bring an emotional perspective to the Basque conflict through the life stories of ETA activists is connected to both the works of Fraser and Buckley, which gave human accounts of the Spanish Civil War.

Taking into account that Henry Buckley was my grandfather, his journalistic, eyewitness approach has certainly conditioned my research process and analysis of the ETA activists' life stories. His journalistic approach is similar to my own as an oral historian in that it gathers insights focused on people and personal reflections. However, there is one important element that separates my work from his. The *Life and Death of the Spanish Republic* portrays the people who were on the 'right' side of history— the republicans who fought against fascism. As we saw before, the discussion between *hispanistas* about the II Spanish Republic hinges upon whether the Republic brought about democracy to Spain, as most believe, or whether it only generated social disorder and chaos, which few argue. Nevertheless, between *hispanistas* there is no discussion (indeed, there is total consensus), about the terrorist role that ETA fulfilled during the transition years and, thus, the harm it inflicted on Spaniards during the democratic period. While the *Life and Death of the Spanish Republic* supported the views of most *hispanistas* in depicting the Republicans' views, then, what does my work represent for these same *hispanistas*, as it analyses the life stories and emotions of those who worked to destroy the hard-earned democratic society?

Intersubjectivity: more than a dispute in moral authority

Oral historian Valerie Raleigh Yow (2005, 177) asserts that the interview “can open a treasure chest that will enrich your own life, or maybe a Pandora’s box of troubles”. Yow understand the intersubjectivity process as the opportunity for the narrator to not get a totally ‘step back’ and thus to not be ‘scared’ in terms of feeling obligated to bring all the attention to the narrator. In this respect, my personal experiences interviewing ETA activists had always a tone (or a balance) where I need to negotiate with myself until what point I was willing to risk my reputation in from of the narrators. In other words, as a researcher I did not want to just explore from the beginning the darker part of their political activism (the use of violence). For previous generations of Spaniards, that could be seen as a weakness or a product of the so-called ‘Stockholm syndrome’ which I supposedly suffered. During the interviews, had I pressed the ETA activists into confessing their violent acts to me, perhaps the interviewing process would have been more difficult. Yet, the conflict that I dealt with while hearing the ETA activists’ stories was related with my willingness to respect their testimony, but at the same time to rescue and analyze the conflictive narratives that at times emerged during the interviews. Within the intersubjective process, an attitudinal shift took place when I realized that a self-perceived emotional inferiority, stemming from being a young middle-class student from Madrid before Basque rebels who risked everything for an ideal, which stopped me from challenging their narratives. Following Yow’s argument, the intersubjectivity process between the narrator and the oral historian should not be analyzed exclusively with oral historians as ‘good listeners’ who let narrators ‘express themselves’. Intersubjectivity means an interaction between actors—a constant movement where both are changed when the interview ends.

During my field trips to the Basque country to interview ETA activists, I was unsure about what I sought from their testimonies. This ‘uncertainty’ was the proof of the emptiness that my encounters with ETA activists will fulfill. In the two trips to the Basque country, I was so excited to be before those activists that the rest—such as having a coherent topic for the thesis— was not really important. I felt that the privilege of talking to these activists and recording these conversations would inevitably lead me to some final conclusions.

An important aspect of fieldwork, particularly in the attempt to interview former activists of an insurgent armed group, is gaining the locals’ trust, which then leads to key introductions to potential narrators. Because I am from Madrid, representing a centralist Spain, integrating myself within the Basque Radical Community was not easy. If oral historians need a pleasant disposition in order to attract narrators to partake in their research, when the research subjects are

activists of an armed insurgent group, this need is even more intense. In fact, my whole research was made possible through X, an ETA activist that became a friend, who then introduced me to other narrators.²² This helps illustrate the fine line separating a narrator from the interviewer.

In the Basque city of Bilbao, I spent days with X, having dinner, drinks, and just walking around the city. Was this just because I wanted to extract important research information, or was it because I found him charming and pleasant to be around? Probably, the truth is somewhere in the middle. After taking two different trips out to see X, and being in constant contact with him, on the last night I spent with him we were out *de poteo*— a Basque expression that refers to bar hopping. In the last bar, X and I shared a deep and personal conversation. In this moment, I started to feel sad because I was leaving for Madrid the following day, and I knew that was the last time that I was going to see him. I was probably affected by the ‘atmosphere of rebellion’, but I felt the courage to talk to him about a topic I had not been able to before: violence. I asked X about the violent acts he had practiced as an ETA activist. X did not hesitate to describe actions like setting up bombs in the warehouses of big enterprisers and shooting police officers. This was a terrible and embarrassing moment for me because I could not bear the idea of him thinking that I had intentionally gone out for drinks to discuss this violence. As we said our goodbyes that night, X gave me his hand in a kind of formal farewell, but I insisted to giving him a hug because the night had been very special to me. This moment and interaction represent a unique aspect of oral historians’ work. We are intentionally pleasant with narrators, knowing that they are the core of oral history; yet, at the end of an interview, or even an informal chat with a narrator, some oral historians may feel a special bond, and this feeling is what probably makes us go on to the next interview.

Buckley: For me, something interesting is that, when I talk with you, you always bring the conversation to the ideological terrain. Nevertheless, you do not connect the repression that you suffered with the fact of continuing with the armed struggle. It seems that when we talk, you keep your experiences (your daily life in prison) strictly to yourself. But, as an activist, you seem ‘abstracted’ in the struggle for the self-determination for the Basques. What seems interesting is that, during the whole interview you did not connect the ideological struggle....

X: With how I suffered...

Buckley: Yes. It is interesting how you take this humility to yourself.²³

²² I decided to not reveal the identities of these activists because they are not the protagonists of this article. Rather, this article focuses in the intersubjective process between them and me.

²³ Interview that took place in Bilbao (24/07/2014).

This excerpt expresses precisely the importance of putting attention to the emotional bonds that emerge between the oral historian and the narrator during the interview process. Rather than talking to him about the pain that ETA victims suffered in the terrorist attacks perpetrated by the organization, I was surprised on how the narrator did not connect his personal suffering in prison with the armed struggle. I used the word 'humility', which is usually a compliment for most, to describe the activist. Is it right for a social scientist to use this (emotional) compliment to describe a terrorist? I would rather say that this situation shows and interview's unpredictability. More concretely, it represents how within the Basque conflict, ETA perpetrators do not see themselves as perpetrators, but neither as victims.

X was the narrator with whom I experienced the greatest intimacy, but the most shocking life story I heard was from Y. He was an ETA activist who was in charge of killing an important Spanish public figure, but, before the job could be completed, Y was stopped by the police. The public figure Y tried to kill was, at the time, one of the most hated persons in the eyes of the Basque Radical Community and other groups in the Spanish radical left. During my years of political activism, my peers and I made jokes about the use of violence against the person that Y had tried to assassinate, which put me in an uncomfortable position during the interview. On one hand, I wanted to prove to Y that I could understand his assassination attempt. On the other hand, as with X, I felt bad about the possibility that Y may feel that I was trying to disingenuously gain his trust. How honest could I be about my own feelings and beliefs while working with Y's testimony?

Buckley: I know that sometimes I talk too much. To me, you seem a very calm and reflective person. But I am still waiting to see your doubts. I am not talking about your doubts in respect to the organization. I am speaking about human doubts.

Y: But doubts... In what sense?

Buckley: I don't know. These are my frustrations when I do these kinds of interviews.

(...)

Y: The armed struggle is an essential act. Well, I have been educated in a normal family (...) I have not been educated in order to kill. Thus, of course that some doubts emerge. On a human level, many doubts emerged...²⁴

²⁴ This interview that took place in Bilbao (24/07/2015).

At the beginning of this conversation, I mentioned that I talked too much. Explicitly, with this sentence, I apologized to the narrator. However, this apology implicitly served to introduce a new topic: doubts. In the brutal confrontation between ETA and the Spanish state, which lasted more than 50 years, there were not many recesses that allowed for the conflict's analysis. In this conversation, I expressed my frustration in my inability to talk with ETA activists about their doubts about the armed struggle. Y's enigmatic answer—in starting with saying that the armed struggle is “*essential*” and ending by acknowledging that it “brings many doubts”—reflects perfectly my previous frustration: sometimes activists' doubts about the use of violence reveal more truth than any of their ideological reflections about the Basque conflict.

During my research, the most difficult moment in terms of establishing a good line of analysis with the narrator's oral testimony was when I met Z. While X and Y were both pleasant people, and easy to talk to, my relationship with Z was not quite the same. For oral historians, it is important not to romanticize the characters of their narrators when they tend to have noble inclinations, such as revolutionaries or missionaries, for example. This romanticizing could perhaps be a better description than the Stockholm Syndrome mentioned earlier. On the other hand, oral historians are taught that if a narrator expresses contemptible ideas (such as racist or homophobic comments, among others), then he or she should make an effort to set aside any adverse feelings towards them and their stories. But what happens when there is antipathy between an oral historian and a narrator? With X and Y, I shared an ideological affinity for the anti-fascist and socialist principles they expressed. Also, in terms of violence, Y's willingness to talk about a specific armed action that had earned him a significant reputation within the Basque Radical Community, did not evoke in me any negative feelings. Contrariwise, during the entire interview, Z was condescending, and behaved as if I had no knowledge about ETA or the Basque conflict, which was extremely negative. But, more importantly, with Z I felt something that I did not feel with other narrators. As Z talked about the reasons for being sentenced to a long imprisonment, I felt that he had been dragging an emotional burden within himself for many years.

Much of my fieldwork research in the Basque country was largely improvised. In fact, when Y told me that he had attempted to kill a famous Spanish public figure, I was completely astonished because I had deliberately not researched this ex ETA activist's life before talking with him.²⁵ With Z I lived a similar situation, but instead of Z revealing something that I did not know, when I asked him why he was detained, he exclaimed: ‘I won't say a word about that!’ But what was *that*? After

²⁵ The main reason was because I felt that ‘spontaneity’ should be the main rule during the interviews. That was the only way to see how different narratives emerged during the process.

interviewing Z, I looked him up on the internet and realized that he had been accused of murdering an ETA activist in a reckoning within the organization. This situation revealed to me that as an oral historian, I can view political violence through the framework of it being used in a revolutionary struggle. In other words, oral history brings the opportunity to connect the intimate life of a person with his/her aspirations to challenge the current state of affairs. However, Z's case put me in a different scenario. His arrogant behavior towards me and his dark past within ETA, placed Z's testimony beyond the research framework, as he enacted violence against one of his own.

Buckley: You know that the main subject of my research is ETA.

Z: But that should not be the main topic.

Buckley: Well, every scholar chooses his topic of research.²⁶

This final piece of the transcript, reflects not only a constant tension between the Z and me, as the oral historian. It also surfaces an important narrative that illustrates the historical consciousness of ETA activists: ETA as an organization is not the beginning or the end of anything. ETA is just an instrument, a tool for the Basque people to achieve freedom. Within this narrative, my research about ETA activists' life stories is, at least, baffling. If the *Izquierda Abertzale* (Basque Radical Community) is a transversal movement made by unions, political parties, and ETA—representing just the armed faction—what is the purpose of concentrating my research in these activists? Over several decades, most of the Spanish media has focused only on the ETA terrorist attacks throughout the lengthy Basque conflict. What, then, is the positive effect that my research can bring to the general Spanish public? In the transcript, Z is telling me that I am going in the wrong direction with my research. In his eyes, my line of enquiry is not helping the Basque Radical Community achieve its objective. I represent just another standard Spaniard looking for morbid tales about ETA terrorists.

Those who sought to explain ETA's violence within the Basque nationalist movement had ignored grassroots politics in terms of understanding the modern armed conflict. Interestingly, this lack of attention had provoked that political scientists coming from U.S universities to focus on social history in order to explain the phenomenon of the Basque Radical Community. One of the pioneers in this commitment was Cyrus Ernesto Zirakzadeh, whose research established a relation between the 1960's industrialization process and the attendance of Basque workers in churches where they could listen Jesuits priests talking about the

²⁶ This interview that took place in Bilbao (24/07/2014).

'communist manifesto' in order to support them with demands.²⁷ This disconnection of the major part of academia analysing ETA in terms of forgetting the social movement behind the organization, was also part of my intersubjectivity process with ETA activists. The distrust of the narrators towards me was in part due to the popular belief within the Basque Radical Community that most people in Madrid do not understand this movement from below. The Basque armed conflict reproduced the historical distrust between a Castilian culture which sees itself as the core of the Spanish state, and a Basque culture which is seen from the south of Spain as isolated and 'closes in on itself'.

In his autobiographical work *My Sister and I*, Friederich Nietzsche (1984) connects his pessimism about life and himself with his honesty as a philosopher. For Nietzsche, his sister's flaw was not her passions, but rather her conformist notion of the concept of peace, which naturally made her accept the current status quo. Nietzsche's transgression in having the courage to criticize himself could be compared to my own transgression of rebelling against the *hispanistas* and my parent's generation, who were never able to challenge the status quo of the political and economic regime born from the Spanish transition during the 1970s. In other words, while talking positively about ETA activists or, at least, without focusing exclusively on their armed actions, I constantly felt a transgressive impulse. It is precisely this impulse (meaning my personal curiosity to dig in the contradictions of my parent's generation) that becomes an important element between the oral historian and the analysis of inter-subjectivity in oral history. Nietzsche's constant will to go deep into the dark universe of human beings has influenced anthropologists and oral historians, not just in order to analyze reality in its own complexity, but also in the way these social scientists have observed their own selves.

Scholarly discussions about oral history intersubjectivity are related in my research with intergenerational memory and trauma. Most of the autobiographies quoted in this article are from authors who have lived turbulent historical periods. The writer Stephan Zweig and the historian George L. Mosse, although from different generations, both lived the rise of fascism in Europe during the 1930s. Mosse (2013, 4) states "if man is only what history tells, then it is tempting to put one's own life in historical perspective, especially when that life contains discontinuities and experiences which were brought about by the course of history." In the memoirs of Zweig (2013) and Mosse, they portray themselves as witnesses of history, due to the personal difficulties that they experienced during fascism's rise in Europe. In this respect, the violence provoked by terrorist groups like ETA or the Italian Red Brigades during the last quarter of the twentieth century, did not have the same romanticism than the political violence that

²⁷ Zirakzadeh, 1991, p29.

occurred in Europe during the inter-war period. In other words, nowadays, in the first quarter of the twenty-first century, for historians and social scientists, fascism as a political ideology that was born in a specific European context of the 1930s, is still an attractive phenomenon that generates debate. On the contrary, the failed attempt of terrorist groups, like ETA and the Red Brigades, to create a revolution in a post-modern individualistic society within a post Iron Curtain context—where the end of communism was an existential threat to the western capitalist powers—made these same experts have little interest on the memoirs that could emerge from these activists.²⁸

My generation, millennials born during the 1980s, were living in a western society where the communist party and the Christian church were not institutions anymore that could provide solid answers for the current state of affairs. In other words, we inhabited a world that lacked understanding. This led to me writing about a group of people that, for better or worse, tried to radically change the status quo in a society of mass consumerism, who in some cases, were bored of its own habits. If memoirs of people who fought for civil rights or against fascism should be told as inspiration for future generations, then what is the point of telling stories of ETA's moral and ideological defeat? It is precisely the juxtaposition between a generation like mine, who did not witness any radical transformation in our society's structure, and the 'losers' of a previous generation who did not achieve any significant social transformation with their armed struggle, which makes the analysis of inter-subjectivity relevant. Oral history in a post-modern society, where it is accepted that there is no universal truth, could be a useful tool to help people explain their own existence.

Conclusion

As Jo Labanyi (2010, 223) understands emotions as *practices*, my attempt to look back to my own research did not seek to understand the meaning of the emotions that I experienced during my fieldwork, but rather what these emotions *did* to me. After contemplating the *hispanistas'* work as a necessary step in updating the Spanish contemporary historiography, I realized that, in a significant way, the Basque conflict gave us, 21st century scholars, the possibility to deeply explore inter-subjectivity processes. As Peter Novik (1988, 1) has said, in this century we assume that "historical objectivity is not a single idea, but rather a sprawling collection of assumptions, attitudes, aspirations and antipathies." ETA activists shaped my character through their testimonies, and made me understand that being an *outsider* of the Basque conflict did not necessarily imply having a broader

²⁸ How many historical works exist on the topic of political violence analysed through the life stories of ETA activists? The production is very scarce. One of the most relevant works: Carrie Hamilton, 1999.

and objective perspective, rather I saw first-hand how history is not static and all human beings—narrators and oral historians alike—are in constant movement. Coming back to Labanyi (2010, 223), we understand that “subjectivity is based on relationality with others and with things.” Inter-subjectivity would represent a ‘next step’ to enlighten historical processes in which the living accounts of the protagonist of the conflict joined together with the symbolic worlds and experiences of oral historians who, in one way or another, have experienced the same conflict.

We can summarize three kinds of intersubjectivity process between the ETA activists and me which, conversely, enabled us to explore different narratives of the Basque Conflict. The first one is the sacrifice. Most of the ETA activists in my research lived during the end of Franco’s dictatorship. Unlike my generation, born in the aftermath of the transition, the activists experienced the dictatorship’s calamities and, more importantly, risked their lives fighting against it. This sacrifice could turn into arrogance when these same activists highlight how ETA was, in their words, the only organization that struggled against the dictatorship’s legacy during the democratic period. But, interestingly, the same narrative of sacrifice, which appeared as arrogance, could be transformed into humility. Most of the narrators were tortured when they were detained by the police. Nevertheless, none recounted the experience as if they were victims. ETA’s historical claim against the Spanish state was never that their activists were tortured by civil servants, but rather how the Basque people should obtain the right of self-determination. Finally, the inter-subjectivity process between the oral historian and an activist of a terrorist organization comes to a methodological question. In the research’s outcome, what image does the activist want the researcher to depict about him or her, and their organization and actions? Inter-subjectivity challenges the basic rules of epistemology. It situates the narrator and the oral historian at a similar level, that is, both are capable to produce knowledge.

The fact that most *hispanistas* were in Spain during the transition made them witness to a progress within the Spanish society in terms of achieving a series of civil rights. In the work of *hispanistas*, the anarchists movement constantly appeared as guilty of provoking chaos within the democratic institutions of the II Republic.²⁹ Making an analogy, if the anarchists were those who ‘damaged’ the II Republic of the 1930s, ETA represented the main threat to a new Spanish democracy born in the 1970s after more than three decades of dictatorship. This grand narrative in terms of looking for a ‘scapegoat’ in order to explain the two most important historical events of Spanish 20th century (civil war and transition), is becoming ‘old fashioned’. Choosing the best of the new, we can approach *postmodernity* not as a “ludic relativism”, but as a process in which we

²⁹ Two examples that follow this pattern: Paul Preston, 2012. Stanley G. Payne, 1969.

can open the present to the past.³⁰ The Spanish transition implied a ‘pact of oblivion’ or, at least, a tendency of ‘looking to the future’ in an attempt to consolidate Spain as a modern country. The emergence of a new historiography which focuses on the subjectivities of the activists which practiced insurgent violence during the 1970s-1980s, can counteract the problematic attempt to erase the past, and the historical bonds that shaped its own community.³¹

The fact of been grappled within the dichotomies of ‘having a distant and objective approach’ vs ‘trying to become closer to the narrator and thus accepting the possibility that he would change my own analysis as historian’ is part and parcel of a post-dictatorial and democratizing Spanish context. If Pierre Nora coined the term “*egohistoire*” to express the method of portraying the own subjectivities of the historian, later Luissa Passerini (2007, 3) theorized intersubjectivity as elucidating “the connections between the legacy that forms historiography as a discipline, and their own choices in the field of history.” The relation between the narrator and the interviewer appears in my research through different historical waves of conflict lived by the Spaniards through the long twentieth century. The echoes of the 1930s civil war arrived to the 1970s Spanish transition in which Spain lived a ‘*simulacrum*’ in which the wounds of the civil war supposedly started to be healed. My ‘*egohistoire*’ or the process of intersubjectivity interviewing ETA activists is the third wave. It represents an intergenerational ‘war o memoirs’ in which the ‘unhealed wounds’ arrived to the surface expressing different forms of looking to the past.

What is the role of the historiography of the Basque conflict in dealing with this ‘war of memoirs’ taking into account the subjective nature of this concept? Traditionally, Spanish social scientists had preferred to not use subjective categories (memoirs, subjectivity, consciousness...) and, therefore, to use a more ‘objective’ vocabulary (with statistics and other sources that come from a quantitative methodology) in order to analyze the conflict: “Youth, more available to mobilization, especially those who lived the years 1975-1979 (...), is the segment of population which feel more Basque rather than Spanish.”³² These words from well-known international sociologist Juan Linz implicitly states that being a Basque pro-independence is related to being young and having lived the ‘turbulent’ years of the transition. This omission of the ‘personal choice of the activists’, is an excellent proof of how scholars used the ‘scientific rigor’ depending on the sympathies of their own researcher. Just to put an opposite example in analyzing the Spanish transition within the Basque conflict, lets examine these

³⁰ The expression ‘*ludic relativism*’ was taken from: Jo Labainyi (2007, 92).

³¹ An example of this new historiography: Beorlegui, 2017.

³² See Linz, 1986, p54. Translate by the present author. Original text: “La juventud, más disponible para la mobilización, sobre todo los que vivieron como adolescentes los años 1975-1979 (...), es el sector que mas se siente solo vasco y menos ‘español’.”

words of Francisco Letamendia, probably the most well-known Basque scholar in analyzing ETA from 'inside': "The Moncloa pacts establish a brutal jump towards a syndicalism with a western profile, where the professional leaders negotiate with the patronal and the state..."³³ With these words, Letamendia is implicitly 'putting the finger on the wound' explaining how the Spanish transition was simply a political operation which benefited the economic elites. In Letamendia 's analysis, from that moment the Basque conflict could not be seen any more as a product of the 'post dictatorship politics', but rather as an obstacle to modernize the country.

My own contradictions in terms of position, subjectivity and participation within the process of interweaving ETA activists reveal future possible lines of enquire in terms of intersubjectivity in post dictatorial and democratizing contexts. The moral superiority that could transmit activists of armed insurgent groups to a young oral historian who is making his/her doctoral thesis is related with an intergenerational trauma.³⁴ The shyness of the interviewer represents the historical thread of a confrontation with the ultimate outcome of producing winners and losers. Strangely, the sense of 'losing the war' against the Spanish state is precisely what made ETA activists to hide this emotion during the interview, and therefore to try to demonstrate that 'they are still there' and thus their struggle is alive. It is precisely the non-willing of appearing as 'losers' taking into account their life experience in the form of the sacrifices made during the confrontation with the state, what could be a vantage point to start for future scholars entering in the field. Intersubjectivity is thus something more than the relation between the narrator and the interviewer. It reveals the process of how oral historians confront advances, stigmas, prejudices, and power relations within the main line of enquiry took by previous historiography. European insurgent violence that took place during the last quarter of the twentieth century forms, inevitably, part of the collective unconscious of the European population. Indeed, intersubjectivity is already part of the historiography, we just need to help it to arrive to the surface.

Bibliography

³³ Letamendia, 2003, p94. Translated by the present author. Original quote: "Los pactos de la Moncloa constituyen el salto brutal hacia un sindicalismo de corte occidental en donde son las cúspides profesionalizadas son las que negocian con la patronal y el Estado."

³⁴ We can define 'intergenerational trauma' as the process by which a generation inherits collective fears that were built by a previous generation. Generally, these kind of traumas have an origin in wars or military dictatorships.

- ABRAMS, L. (2010) *Oral History Theory*. London and New York, Routledge.
- AGUILAR, P. and C. RAMÍREZ-BARAT (2016). "Generational dynamics in Spain: Memory transmission of a turbulent past". *Memory Studies*, 1-17, Doi: 10.1177/1750698016673237.
- AGUILAR FERNÁNDEZ, P. (1996) *Memoria y olvido de la guerra civil española*. Madrid: Alianza.
- ARETXAGA, B. (1988) *Los funerales en el nacionalismo radical vasco*. San Sebastián: La Primitiva Casa Baroja.
- BALFOUR, S. (1989) *Dictatorship, Workers and the City: Labour in Greater Barcelona since 1939*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- BEE, M. K. (1991) *Women of the Klan*, Berkeley, Los Angeles. London: University of California Press.
- BENMAYOR, R, M. E. CARDENAL DE LA NUEZ and P.DOMÍNGUEZ PRATS (2016) *Memory, Subjectivities and Representation*. London: Palgrave McMillan.
- BEORLEGUI, D. (2017) *Transición y Melancolía. La experiencia del desencanto en el País Vasco*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- BOYD, C. (2008) "The Politics of History and Memory in Democratic Spain", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 617: 133-48.
- BUCKLEY, H. (2013) *Life and Death of the Spanish Republic. A Witness to the Spanish Civil War*. London and New York, Tauris.
- BUCKLEY, N (2020) *Out of Prison. ETA Life Stories Become History*. Reno: Centre for Basque Studies.
- CASANOVA, J (2016) "Disremembering Francoism: What is at Stake in Spain's Memory Wars? In *Interrogating Francoism. History and Dictatorship in Twentieth-Century Spain*. London: Bloomsbury.
- CASTELLS, M, and others (1999) *Critical Education in the New Information Age*. Lanham: Rowman & Little Field Publishers.
- CLARK, P (1990) *Negotiating with ETA. Obstacles to Peace in the Basque Country 1975-1988*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1990.

- ELORZA, A, J.G, GARMENDIA, G. JAÚREGUI, Y F. DOMÍNGUEZ (2000) *La historia de ETA*. Madrid: Colección historia.
- FABER, S (2019) *Memory Battles on the Spanish Civil War. History, Fiction, Photography*, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- FERNÁNDEZ SOLDEVILLA, G (2012) *Sangre, votos, manifestaciones: ETA y el nacionalismo vasco radical, 1958-2011*. Madrid: Tecnos, 2012.
- FERNÁNDEZ SOLDEVILLA, G (2020) *El terrorismo contra la transición*. Madrid: Tecnos, 2020.
- FRASER, R (1979) *Blood of Spain: An Oral History of the Spanish Civil War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FRASER, R (2010) *In Search of a Past*. New York, Verso.
- FUSI, J.P (1984) *El Pais Vasco: Pluralismo y Nacionalidad*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- GIROUX, H (1997) *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope. Theory, Culture and Schooling. A Critical Reader*. Colorado and Oxford: Westview Press, 1997.
- GRAHAM, H. (1995) "Introduction. Culture and Modernity. The Case of Spain,". In *Spanish Cultural Studies; An Introduction; The Struggle for Modernity*, edited by Helen Graham and Joe Labanyi. New York: Oxford University Press.
- GRAHAM, H. (2005) *The Spanish Civil War. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- CARRIE, H. (1999) *The Gender of ETA and Radical Basque Moral Community*. Royal Holloway University of London, PhD diss.
- CARRIE, H (2008) "On Being a Good Interviewer: Empathy, Ethics and the Politics of Oral History". *Oral History*, vol 36, no.2, Autumn.
- HAMILTON, C (2007) *Women and ETA: The Gender Politics of Radical Basque Nationalism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- HEIBERG, M (1989) *The making of the Basque Nation*, Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- HERZBERG, D.K. (JAN., 1991) "Narrating the Past: History and the Novel of Memory in Post War Spain". *Modern Language Association*, Vol. 106, No. 1pp. 34-45.
- KORNETIS, K. (2014) "Is there a future in this past? Analyzing 15M's intricate relation to the Transition". *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*. DOI: [10.1080/14636204.2014.938432](https://doi.org/10.1080/14636204.2014.938432).
- LABANYI, J. (2007) "Memory and Modernity in Democratic Spain: The Difficulty of Coming to Terms with the Spanish Civil War". *Poetics Today*, 28:1, Spring.
- LABANYI, J. (2010) "Doing things: Emotion, Affect and Materiality". *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 11:3-4, 223-233.
- LETAMENDIA, F. (2003) *Historia del nacionalismo vasco y de ETA (Volumen II). ETA en la transición (1976-2002)*, Donostia, R&B Ediciones, 2003.
- LINZ, J. (1986) *Conflicto en Euskadi*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1986.
- LÓPEZ ROMO, R (2016) *Informe Foronda. Los efectos del terrorismo en la Sociedad vasca*. Madrid: Catarata, 2015.
- LÓPEZ ROMO, R, (2018) *Memorias del terrorismo en España*. Madrid: Catarata, 2018.
- MATURANA, H and VARELA, F. (1998) *The Three of Knowledge. The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Boston & London: Shambhala.
- MATA LÓPEZ, L. (1993) *El nacionalismo vasco radical: discurso, organización y expresiones*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.
- MOSSE, G. L. (2013) *Confronting History. A memoir (George L. Mosse Series in Modern European Cultural and Intellectual History)*. Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin Press.
- MURO, D. (2008) *Ethnicity and Violence: The Case of Radical Basque Nationalism*. New York: Routledge.
- NIETZSCHE, H. F. (1984) *Mi Hermana y yo*. Madrid, EDAF.

- NOVICK, P. N. (1988) *The Noble Dream. The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- PASSERINI, L. (1996) *Autobiography of a Generation. Italy, 1968*. Middletown, Connecticut, Wesleyan University Press.
- PASSERINI, L. (2007) *Memory and Utopia. The Primacy of Intersubjectivity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- PAYNE, G. (1969) *The Spanish Revolution*. New York; Norton and Company.
- PORTELLI, A. (1981) "The Peculiarities of Oral History". *History Workshop Journal*, Volume 12, Issue 1, Autumn, 96-107, <https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/12.1.96>.
- PRESTON, P (1995) *The Politics of Revenge: Fascism and the militin 20th century Spain*. London: Routledge.
- PRESTON, P (2012) *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-Century Spain*. London: Harper Press.
- RICK, D and VAN DER TUIN, I (2012) *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies*. Ann Arbor: Open Humanities Press.
- SULLIVAN, J (1988) *ETA and Basque Nationalism. The Fight for Euskadi 1980-1986*. London: Routledge.
- TERKEL, S (1984) *The Good War. An Oral History of World War II*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- THOMA, H (1965) *The Spanish Civil War*. Victoria: Penguin Books.
- ZIRAKZADEH, C. E (1991) *A rebellious people. Basques, protests and politics*. Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press.
- ZULAIKA, J (1988) *Basque Violence: Metaphor and Violence*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- ZWEIG, S (2013) Zweig, Stephan. *The World of Yesterday*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska.