

'Hispanic' philosophy? Given the book's inclusion in Rodopi's 'Philosophy in Spain' series, why does Candelaria include Caso? As a foil to Spanish thought? As a representative of another brand of that thought in the context of a former colony? The author does not say.

Candelaria does acknowledge that his introductory study is necessarily limited, and that, especially in the case of Unamuno, his academic interest runs counter to the writer's own attitude. (He dedicates his first chapter to demonstrating that *Del sentimiento trágico* is, indeed, a philosophical text, written for philosophers.) Yet he sets up a further limitation, I think, by discrediting the aesthetic concerns so present in Unamuno's and Caso's work. Attempting to frame the 'crisis of modernity', he writes, '[a]esthetic, moral, and religious values, [...] are largely non-cognitive expressions, objectifications, and projections of attitudes and dispositions. It follows, then, that [...] [a]esthetic, moral, and religious claims are not veridical' (1). Such parameters place a handicap on a study of two thinkers who take aesthetics quite seriously. Might it not be, one wonders, that art, rather than taking sides in the fact/value debate, mediates between them? Candelaria's failure to consider this question keeps him from formulating a truly original approach to Unamuno and Caso. His opposition between Unamuno's 'decisionistic' championing of life over reason and Caso's 'intuitionist' effort to establish a scientific basis for ethics is unsurprising, and largely overlooks suggestive terms like Unamuno's ubiquitous 'entraña' and Caso's use of 'desinterés' (each mentioned only in passing).

In the end, Candelaria brings Unamuno and Caso into contact with the Western philosophical tradition, yet refuses to examine their dialogue with that tradition on their own terms. The result, reinforced by the condescending tone of his final 'Coda,' is that he perpetuates a view of these thinkers as representatives of a cultural other: weak, superstitious masses who fail to accept the modern world. When Candelaria writes that 'the problem of modernity is *only a problem for those who* hold that human beings are both natural and spiritual' (143; my italics), one gets the sense that the foregoing analysis serves to set up straw men for the author to knock down.

Finally, I must note that infelicitous repetition, sentence fragments and typos plague the text. Also alarming are several dubious translations (e.g.: Unamuno's description of Kant's 'salto inmortal' rendered as 'immortal somersault' [31]) and inconsistency in the inclusion of the original Spanish with cited passages. This lack of stylistic rigour contributes to my sense that this book does not ultimately provide an engaging introduction to Unamuno and Caso.

LESLIE HARKEMA

*Yale University.*

MARIO MARTÍN GIJÓN, *Los (anti)intelectuales de la derecha en España: de Giménez Caballero a Jiménez Losantos*. Barcelona: RBA. 2011. 412 pp.

Among the more curious phenomena of the last fifteen years in twentieth-century Spanish cultural history have been attempts by liberal critics to 'rescue' right-wing writers and intellectuals from a supposedly undeserved oblivion. Partly building on José-Carlos Mainer's seminal *Falange y literatura* (Barcelona: Labor, 1971; revised and expanded in 2013), more recent examples include books by Andrés Trapiello, Javier Cercas and Jordi Gracia. In most cases, the rescue operation has consisted in divorcing an author's work as much as possible from its unsavoury political context, focusing either on its 'purely' literary or aesthetic value, or on the author's later whole or partial disavowal of his youthful right-wing convictions (see Gracia's work on Dionisio Ridruejo). Interestingly, these same critics have tended to apply renewed critical scrutiny to writers and intellectuals from the Left, construing their commitment to progressive or radical causes such as Communism or Anarchism as misguided, opportunistic, pig-headed, or immoral (see Gracia's *A la intemperie: exilio y*

*cultura en España* [Barcelona: Anagrama, 2010] or Trapiello's *Las armas y las letras: literatura y guerra civil* [Barcelona: Planeta, 1994]).

For those of us who harboured doubts about these rescue projects—which often resembled a whitewash based on too clinical a differentiation between culture and ideology—Mario Martín Gijón's new intellectual history of the Spanish Right comes like a breath of fresh air. For one, rather than separating art and politics Martín Gijón works from a standard definition of the public intellectual as a social and political critic who speaks truth to power and questions the social order: a 'contrapeso crítico al poder y vigilante de sus abusos' (22). Second, Martín Gijón reveals the tremendous extent to which Spanish writers associated with the Right habitually collaborated with political and ecclesiastical authorities—which after 1939 took charge of all the major cultural and educational institutions, including the universities and the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC)—to root out the figure of the critical public intellectual altogether, from the figure of the rural *maestro* to the intellectual leaders of Spain's *Edad de Plata*. In eight chapters that chronologically cover the period from 1920s to the present—but delving back into earlier centuries when appropriate—Martín Gijón reads a host of prominent figures from the Right as examples of a particularly Spanish tradition of anti-intellectualism that is still going strong today. In the process, he also identifies those who worked hard to defend the notion of the intellectual as social critic. In the first group he includes individuals like Ernesto Giménez Caballero, Enrique Suñer, the later Ramiro de Maeztu, Miguel Artigas and Federico Jiménez Losantos. Featuring prominently in the second group we find Unamuno and Ortega y Gasset.

Martín Gijón, who was born in 1979, belongs to the generation of Spanish academics hardest hit by the long stagnation of the Spanish university, characterized by a chronic lack of positions for recent PhDs—a situation that since the crisis of 2008 has become nothing short of catastrophic. After a prolonged academic stay in Germany, he was fortunate to land a teaching position at the Universidad de Extremadura. He is quite prolific; since 2009 he has published four monographs and a collection of short stories. His previous work focused on important but undervalued writers who were forced to leave Spain after the Spanish Civil War such as José Herrera Petere and Máximo José Kahn. What makes *Los (anti)intelectuales de la derecha* stand out is, among other things, its refreshingly comparative, transnational outlook. In an illuminating introduction, the author places his own project in relation to Richard Hofstadter's classic *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* and Paul Johnson's *The Intellectuals*. Like Hofstadter, Martín Gijón very usefully lays bare the basic rhetorical and political strategies of the Right's long campaign against a progressive, critical, secular Spanish intelligentsia.

Among Martín Gijón's more polemical points is the argument that Spain's transition to democracy resulted in an unfortunate decline of the public intellectual. Lulled into complacency by commerce, and co-opted by the large media conglomerates, many of the country's writers and journalists abandoned their critical function. 'La desaparición de las revistas que habían servido de plataforma de pensamiento crítico', Martín Gijón states, '[...] o la conversión de un diario como *El País* [...] en periódico gubernamental con escaso margen para la crítica, produjeron la despolitización de no pocos intelectuales' (308). In this critical view of democratic Spain, Martín Gijón's diagnosis largely coincides with that presented by Guillem Martínez, Ignacio Echevarría and Amador Fernández-Savater in *CT o La Cultura de la Transición. Crítica a 35 años de cultura española* (Barcelona: Debolsillo, 2012). At the same time, he shines a lucid and unflattering light on the self-serving trajectories of current right-wing pundits such as Federico Jiménez Losantos and José María Marco, whose lucrative careers are fuelled by their alliance with powerful conservative media conglomerates.

The one point that Martín Gijón may have fleshed out more is the prickly question of populism as a driving force in twentieth-century politics—and one that traverses the political spectrum from the extreme left to the extreme right. As Hofstadter noted, anti-intellectualism and populism—'resentment and suspicion of the life of the mind and of those who are

considered to represent it'—are two sides of the same coin. Martín Gijón points out, but only in passing, that the distrust of bourgeois intellectuals among the traditionalist Catholic right, including the Church hierarchy, is mirrored by a similar distrust among the left. (In twentieth-century Spain, this tendency was most salient among Anarchists and Communists, while the PSOE was traditionally more welcoming toward the learned.) In relation to populism, I would also argue that the figure of Ortega looms more ambivalently than Martín Gijón presents him. For Martín Gijón, Ortega's secularism and liberalism, which earned him a position as a permanent target for critique from the reactionary Right, places him squarely among the true critical intellectuals: he was an 'intelectual cívico por excelencia' (233). Yet it could be argued that Ortega had his populist and opportunistic side as well, in stylistic terms for example. (This is also one of the aspects that the Right seized on in an attempt to undermine the philosopher's prestige: the book quotes Tomàs Carreras i Artau's critique of Ortega as a writer driven by a 'desig d'agradar abans que de filosofar'.) Martín Gijón is right to signal a central paradox in figures such as Giménez Caballero, Maeztu and Jiménez Santos: in the end, the ideologues of right-wing anti-intellectuals are themselves intellectuals. Their work manifests a curious and sometimes painful element of self-disavowal, if not self-hatred, often rooted in resentment. (Again, this is an element not dissimilar to the one described by some counterparts on the radical Left, such as Jorge Semprún.)

*Los (anti)intelectuales de la derecha en España* is not only a necessary retort to the work of Gracia, Cercas and Trapiello because of its unforgivingly critical take on the less-than-savoury tradition of Spanish right-wing thought. What makes it such a refreshing read is also Martín Gijón's straightforward, biting style, peppered with an occasional aphorism. ('El fanatismo del converso', he writes about former leftists turned extreme rightists, 'es siempre el más inmisericorde' [355].) If Gracia, Cercas and Trapiello are the champions of coyness, rhetorical play and political ambiguity, Martín Gijón says it like it is. In the end, his study makes an eloquent and convincing case for the continued relevance and necessity of the public intellectual as secular critic. The nature of his own work suggests that this is a role he himself is poised to take on sooner rather than later.

SEBASTIAAN FABER

*Oberlin College, Ohio.*

ANDREW A. ANDERSON, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero: The Vanguard Years (1921–1931)*. Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta. 2011. 340 pp.

Ernesto Giménez Caballero is one of the most important (albeit polemical) figures of the Spanish *Avant-garde*, and like many of the authors engaged with narrative fiction at that time, has suffered from severe critical neglect. In part eclipsed by poets of the Generation of 1927, and then relegated to virtual oblivion after the transition to democracy in post-1975 Spain because of his espousal of fascism, most of his fictional works were simply not read in Spain, let alone abroad. Even the academic community was virtually silent for years, except for a few lone voices such as Douglas Foard, the late Nigel Dennis, Enrique Selva and a few others. Anderson's well-researched and engaging monograph is therefore a much needed and welcome contribution to the field of Peninsular *avant-garde* studies.

Ernesto Giménez Caballero was a prolific writer, critic, journalist and public speaker, and a complete study of his works would run into many volumes, which is why Anderson has wisely decided to focus exclusively on Giménez Caballero's most productive and interesting period; namely the decade referred to in the title of the monograph as the 'vanguard years'. During this decade Caballero was a soldier in Morocco, was later imprisoned for criticizing the army, wrote some of his most his experimental novels such as *Yo, inspector de alcantarillas* and *Hércules jugando a los dados*, numerous articles, reviews and *avant-garde* essays,