UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

The Existential Crisis in Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky: The novel as the vehicle for the analysis of national and spiritual distress.

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Spanish

by

Tyler David Dutchover

Dissertation Committee:
Distinguished Professor Gonzalo Navajas, Chair
Associate Professor Viviane Mahieux
Professor Jacobo Sefamí

2022

DEDICATION

For my wife Jessica

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Navajas, who has invested countless hours in my work. His guidance and support have encouraged me throughout my research. Furthermore, his incredible work ethic has inspired me to approach life with the same vigor. Without his guidance and consistent help, this dissertation would not have been possible.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the other members of my committee, Dr. Mahieux and Dr. Sefamí, who have provided insightful comments and suggestions for my work. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Ruvalcaba of California Baptist University, who initially encouraged me to pursue doctoral study and cultivated my passion for Spanish literature.

Additionally, I am deeply grateful to my wife Jessica, whose support and exhortation has pushed me to continue my studies. She has been the pinnacle of unwavering stability throughout this process.

I thank the University of California, Irvine and the Spanish department for the financial support in the form of the Regent's Fellowship, Graduate Dean's Recruitment Fellowship, and stability through a multi-year Teaching Assistantship.

VITA

Tyler David Dutchover

2015	B.A. in Spanish, California Baptist University
2016	M.S. in Education, California Baptist University
2017	M.A. in Diploma Internacional de Profesor de Lengua Española, Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca
2019	Teaching Assistant, Department of Spanish, University of California, Irvine
2021	Teaching Assistant, Department of Spanish, University of California, Irvine
2022	Ph.D. in Spanish, University of California, Irvine

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Existential Crisis in Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky: The novel as the vehicle for the analysis of national and spiritual distress.

by

Tyler David Dutchover

Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish

University of California, Irvine, 2022

Distinguished Professor Gonzalo Navajas, Chair

The Existential Crisis in Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky: The novel as the vehicle for the analysis of national and spiritual distress contributes to the field of Spanish literature by analyzing the links between the works of two of the world's most important novelists, Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky, during moments of national and international crisis and transformation. As part of the examination into the utilization of the novel to address social, political, and individual crisis, my research addresses Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky's unique programs for individual totality within the context of an abundance of propositions for societal restoration. My study provides a historical background for both countries with respect to philosophical and social ideologies, including the movements of positivism, Krausism, and the introduction of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* in Spain, and feudalism, westernization, and the corresponding political developments in Russia. Both Dostoevsky and Baroja reject programs for societal remediation on the basis of an unrelenting preference for individualism, exemplified in many of the protagonists of their works. Baroja's novels *El árbol de la ciencia*, *Mala hierba*, *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, *Aurora roja*, *César o nada*, and *Zalacaín el aventurero*, along with Dostoevsky's novels *The Gambler*, *Notes from the Underground*, *The Brothers Karamazov*, and

Crime and Punishment, denote a shared view of the impossibility of achieving total individual fulfillment in life, but they differ in their proposals to address this problem. Baroja suggests an amalgamation between reason and vitality, with preference given to individual vitality due to its power to sustain life and inspire action. Dostoevsky advances the acceptance of Jesus Christ as one's savior, in accordance with his adherence to Eastern Orthodox Christianity, and an embrace of suffering to confirm one's individuality. In addition to depicting their respective programs, their novels serve as a vehicle to penetrate the structure of dominant ideological systems. While researchers have established a general connection between Baroja and Dostoevsky, my research seeks to expand and develop the previous relevant literature by presenting a wholistic overview of their programs advanced in their novels.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter I

The Transformation of the Novel

The process of globalization in the nineteenth century amplified human relations. It allowed for an expanded ability to communicate, the amplified spread of ideas, and consequently, a magnified basis for conflict. Despite the ramifications of this conflict, demonstrated most distinctly in the early twentieth century[1], this amplification nevertheless gave way to new modalities to address these novel issues in artistic and literary works. Although these works had been utilized correspondingly in the past, their increased reach gave them newfound purpose and utility. One such genre, the novel, particularly in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, has demonstrated its practicality to disseminate important ideas and sentiments in times of chaos. Two immensely important novelists utilized this medium to address issues plaguing their respective nations. A lack of research has been carried out with respect to the connection between Pío Baroja y Nessi and Fyodor Dostoevsky, as these two authors represent pillars of literary greatness in moments of national and international turmoil. Their works, with particular attention placed on the novel due to its length and popularity, demonstrate unique programs to address issues relevant to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These issues continue to plague humankind to this day, cementing the value of their study in both life and literature. This study seeks to identify and assess the harmonic elements and distinctions between both authors with respect to individual and national crisis, the role of the novel within the philosophical movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and emphasize their regenerative proposals to address the issues of their time. This chapter will provide an introduction to the study by providing

[1] WWI, WWII, and the Spanish Civil War, among other conflicts represent the ramification of this conflict.

relevant background and context, the research problem and aim, the objectives and questions for the study, the significance and limitations of the research, and a general outline to organize the work.

The turn of the twentieth century epitomizes one of the greatest attempts for collective *progress* in the history of humanity. Spearheaded by the spirit of technicity, the empirical sciences, and faith in humankind's ability to dominate all, the dominant European ideology propagated the integration of the individual subject within social and political superstructures to strengthen the collective. Despite this international quest for progress, Matthew White estimates[2] that the twentieth century, and primarily during the first fifty years, was the bloodiest century in history. The significant loss of life coincided with perhaps the most extreme collective unification of fascist nations, Italy and Germany, in modern times[3]. At the same time, the notion of the individual subject's "Existence"[4] continued to be debated by European philosophers, creating a dialectic confrontation between the notion of individual existence and the collective social and political superstructures within which the individual subject was incorporated. The spirit of technicity, faith in humanity's domination over the elements, the overarching belief in the capacity of the empirical sciences to answer life's existential questions, and other consolidation programs in Europe in the early twentieth century provided philosophers and novelists the occasion to propose alternative notions of regeneration[5] and existence[6]. We will delve into the modalities in

[2] He totals his estimates in the Worldwide Statistics of Casualties, Massacres, Disasters and Atrocities.
[3] In *Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt argues that the collectivity of these fascist states was not really collective at the individual level, but rather it constituted the collectivity of atomized individuals through careful measures taken by the Italian and German governments.
[4] Henceforth referenced to as merely *existence*.
[5] With respect to this notion of regeneration, I am not linking this concept with closure or a culmination of some sort, as some philosophers and novelists did not adhere to traditional forms of religion, but rather proposals by authors in Europe that face the horrors and destruction during the turn of the century in an authentic manner, extending theoretical ideals and their philosophical positions to human beings generally.
[6] These notions are primarily focused on the individual over the collective.

which philosophers and novelists propose alternative notions of existence, primarily individualistic, all the while emphasizing the individual regenerative theories offered to humankind in critical situations. In this, it is clear that the novel, particularly during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is utilized as a primary mode to present and analyze ideas and consider programs for resolution beyond merely theoretical texts.

I. Study Background

Following the literary movements of Romanticism and Costumbrismo in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Europe, the world experienced a dramatic change. The chaos that ensued in the early twentieth century, a byproduct of a tumultuous nineteenth century complete with social, political, and religious conflicts, altered the course of a literary genre: the novel. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, novels such as *Ivanhoe* by Walter Scott or the works of the "Costumbrista" writers, Mariano José de Larra, Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, and José María de Pereda had been used as a form to represent reality. In *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, Roberto González Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker highlight that the "Costumbrista" writers maintained a, "… preoccupation with minute detail, local color, the picturesque, and their concern with matters of style is frequently no more than a subterfuge. Astonished by the contradictions observed around them, incapable of clearly understanding the tumult of the modern world, these writers sought refuge in the particular, the trivial or the ephemeral" (491). In contrast to the Costumbrista and Romantic writers, the mid-nineteenth century and early twentieth century novelists began to modify the role of the novel. Far from a method to convey the picturesque and beautiful, these novelists viewed their work as a modality to interpret and alter society. European authors like Fyodor Dostoevsky, Leo Tolstoy, Leopoldo Clarín, Emilia Pardo Bazán, Miguel de Unamuno, Pío Baroja, among others, sought to address

societal ailments that plagued humanity. Spearheaded by Émile Zola, whose novel *Germinal* sought to create social change for the betterment of humankind, the novel morphed into a sociological, political, and spiritual tool to address social inequities.

These novelists, in recognition of the chaotic times in which they lived, included a stark social critique in their work. However, their critique also advanced a specific proposal, as each offered a proposition of the problematic issues that they identified within society. Likewise, thinkers such as Mikhail Bakunin, Karl Marx, Miguel de Unamuno, and José Ortega y Gasset simultaneously generated proposals to address the tumult of the day. Their theoretical proposals, combined with the newfound purpose of the novel within society, allow for the contemplation of remediation within society through the novel. The figures of Karl Marx and Mikhail Bakunin provide a clear example of this phenomenon, as both rejected traditionalism, manifested in each case through capitalism and the Catholic Church. Both proposed an alternative to achieve an improved future for humanity. They sought a more just, equal, and progressive society through their proposals. Similarly, Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky utilized their medium, the novel, to offer regenerative proposals to address the changing landscapes of their countries, one that they argued demonstrated signs of degradation. Although their individual proposals are different from other novelists and thinkers, they share the belief that humanity could remove itself from the worldwide chaos of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and achieve some form of improvement.

Both Baroja and Dostoevsky recognized the changing tides, evidenced through political and social movements, and utilized the novel to combat the ideologies that they deemed dangerous. Likewise, both writers, along with Miguel de Unamuno and Leo Tolstoy, demonstrate a shared desire to remediate the issues of their time through the novel. In the case of Baroja and Dostoevsky, a remedy is proposed at multiple levels, including national, international, and

personal. This remedy can be understood as a method to alleviate humanity from the struggles of the day.

Pío Baroja acts as a linking agent between philosophical and social forms of resolution prevalent in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Drawing on many of Nietzsche's notions of ethics and regeneration, Baroja utilizes the novel to propose a more current concept of personal and national regeneration through ironical heroism. Likewise, Dostoevsky's proposal for resolution in the novel, perhaps more internationally recognized than Baroja's due to Russia's shorter literary history[7] and the reduced number of novelists in Russia in comparison to Spain in that time period[8], represents a similar link to philosophical proposals to improve Russian society. In the chapter "The Ruse of the Russian Novel" by William Mills Todd III, found in Franco Moretti's comprehensive *The Novel: Volume I*, the author highlights the lack of constraints for Russian novelists in particular: "Where native traditions were absent, they drew creatively on foreign ones, returning them to Europe in forms that later Europeans did not immediately recognize. Where critics were absent or nearsighted, they found devises for proposing models of reading to their public. Where economics drove them to serial publication in the thick journals, they used this opportunity to invent ways of plotting and narration that kept endings and characterizations open until the very end – and at the very end" (Todd 423).

[7] The vast majority of the internationally acclaimed Russian novels came during a short period during the late nineteenth century. Richard Freedman proposes that this was due to a lack of a primary novelist in Russia during prior centuries: "In this respect Russia's problem was compounded by the absence of at least one supreme literary figure who had, in the distant past, blended the formal with the colloquial in such a way as to create a living, modern language of sufficient richness and dignity to make a great literature possible. Dante in Italy, Chaucer in England, and Cervantes in Spain had accomplished this necessary task in the late Middle Ages or the Renaissance, but it was not until the nineteenth century that Russia found such a voice in Alexander Pushkin" (*The Novel* 75).

[8] William Mills Todd highlights this fact in his chapter "The Ruse of the Russian Novel," arguing that illiteracy during the nineteenth century determined a limited number of novelist jobs due to limited readership.

Baroja and Dostoevsky's novels aim to improve the collective through a focus on the individual. This focus seeks to generate an enhanced 'wholeness of being'[9], understood not as the attaining of an abstract personal perfection, but rather an individual sense of totality[10]. Barbara Hannah, in *Striving Toward Wholeness*, highlights the difficulty to define the notion of wholeness: "It has become very difficult to express what one means by "wholeness" in terms that are likely to convey something intelligible to the present-day reader, yet most people still feel an immense satisfaction when they see a tree or a plant, that has fulfilled the pattern of its being to the greatest extent possible" (Hannah 1). As open-ended as this approximation is, it emphasizes the aim of all creatures to seek some sense of totality, an urge she argues is strongest of all in humankind, as well as forming the basis of all religious pursuit. Baroja and Dostoevsky's novels offer their proposals for this sense of wholeness[11], uniquely attuned to the circumstances of their time. Their programs offer a view of the novel as a key mode to convey personal and national distress.

II. Research Problem

The connection between Russian and Spanish literary figures, particularly related to writers of both countries in the late nineteenth century, has been extensively studied in Spain. Despite sharing a continent, their divergent literary paths have provided fertile ground to analyze the influence of each countries' primary authors in both nations. Nevertheless, Baroja and Dostoevsky have, by and large, been analyzed individually, as the depth and breadth of their individual works has warranted focused study. This is not to say that scholars have not recognized their connection,

[9] From this point on, 'wholeness of being' will be referred to without the single quotation marks.
[10] "In earlier days it was self-evident that every living creature was striving to complete the pattern of existence as fully as possible" (Hannah 1).
[11] Their proposals do not guarantee totality, but rather move toward personal satisfaction either in the present or future moment.

among them Jordi Morillas Esteban and Andeu Navarra Ordoño, but the focus has primarily been on Dostoevsky's influence.

Two articles written by Jordi Morillas Esteban on this topic, namely "Dostoevsky in Spain: A Short History of Translation and Research" in the journal *Dostoevsky Studies* and "La recepción de Dostoievski en Pío Baroja" in *Estudios Dostoievski*, offer a detailed and thought-provoking perspective on Baroja's immense admiration for Dostoevsky[12], the influence the Russian author had on the Spanish novelist, and Baroja's contact with Russian literature during his younger years[13]. Likewise, Andeu Navarra Ordoño's article "La recepción de Dostoievsky en Pío Baroja" in the journal *Sancho el sabio* delves into Baroja's outlook on Russian literary works and political movements, with a specific focus on his literary relationship to Dostoevsky. These works analyze Baroja's view of Dostoevsky, along with the influence that the Russian had on the Spanish writer. These articles are clear and concise with respect to Dostoevsky's influence, but they do not dive into these authors proposals for societal and individual regeneration. Furthermore, they focus on Baroja's essays and comments pertaining to the Russian author, leaving their larger bodies of work, their novels, largely unaddressed. This gap in the existing literature can offer important details regarding the way the novel was utilized to address social, political, and individual crisis.

III. Research Aim and Questions

Given the lack of research related to the connection between the novels of Pío Baroja y Nessi and Fyodor Dostoevsky, this study aims to identify and evaluate the affinities as well as the

[12] Morillas Esteban references Pío Baroja's essay *Desde la ultima vuelta del camino* when describing his admiration for Dostoevsky: "But if there is a Spaniard who really deserved to be called a «Dostoevskian writer» in the full sense of the word, this is undoubtedly Don Pío Baroja, who asserted that he was an «enthusiastic admirer» (65) of Dostoevsky throughout his life" (Morillas 131). Cf. Baroja (1949): 314.

[13] "El interés de Baroja por las letras y la cultura rusas se puede observar ya en sus años de estudiante, cuando en el diario *La Unión Liberal* de San Sebastián publica un total de 13 artículos dedicados a diversos autores rusos bajo el título de «Literatura rusa»" ("La recepción de Dostoievski en Pío Baroja" 118).

differences that exist between the two authors with respect to individual and national crisis, the influx of philosophical ideologies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and present their regenerative programs. The goal then, is to emphasize the role of the novel to communicate these commonalities and differences, analyzing its capacity to address distress and convey the human condition. As a result, I aim to address the following research questions in my work: How do Baroja and Dostoevsky utilize the novel to address national distress? What ideological and hallmark common traits and differences exist between each author related to their novelistic characters? What is the proposal for each author to remediate the crisis of the inner being and attain wholeness of being? By researching these questions, I hope to address a few key unattended issues in the literature of these two great authors.

IV. Research Significance

My research aims to fill a gap in the literature of Russia and Spain, albeit significantly more work is required to entirely do so. Dostoevsky's literary popularity, even among the canonical works in the U.S. public school system to this day, highlights his relevance. Pío Baroja y Nessi, likewise, is recognized internationally, often for his association with the *Generación del 98*, yet the magnitude of his work is grossly underappreciated in North America. As such, I hope to address the current shortage of research between the two authors and provide applicable value to the role of literature in moments of national and international crisis.

V. Study Limitations

Although the study of Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky can offer valuable insights for the modern day, the focus of this dissertation is the manner in which both authors utilized the novel to present their programs for individual and societal resolution. As such, this work is not apt to be applied to modern international and individual distress in either Russia or Spain. Furthermore,

this dissertation limits itself to the authors' utilization of the novel due to constraints pertaining to thesis length and time. The entirety of Baroja and Dostoevsky's work, with the inclusion of short stories, essays, and letters, would allow for a more comprehensive conception of their respective programs.

VI. Structural Outline

To properly conceptualize these programs, it is important to establish a structural outline for my research. This dissertation contains five chapters, composed of the introduction, historical background, analysis of Baroja's novels, analysis of Dostoevsky's novels, and the research findings. The first chapter provides a brief background to this study, emphasizing the genre of the novel and relevant literature to the primary authors. Additionally, this opening chapter has highlighted the significance of the research, its limitations, and will provide a complete structural outline to organize and sequence the work toward its logical conclusions.

Chapter II, "The Crisis of National Education in Nineteenth Century Spain and Russia," will establish the historical ideological, social, and political scenes in both Spain and Russia, which will situate and contextualize both Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky's novels. The first four sections of this chapter highlight the role of religion in both Spain and Russia, the social and educational changing of the guard that took place in nineteenth century Spain, and the philosophical ideas that ushered in this transition. I will emphasize the influence of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* in Spain, along with the philosophical proposals presented by Friedrich Nietzsche, Auguste Comte, and Karl Christian Friedrich Krause. These first four sections place primary emphasis on Spain, as the fifth section will serve as a transition toward the Russian situation. The linking agent between these two countries is a shared period of crisis, albeit for different reasons, as the last three sections highlight the unhinging of a relatively unchanged

Russian context. I will focus on the practice of serfdom, along with its abolition, which generated the need for a new social structure. These seven sections establish the conditions in which Baroja and Dostoevsky crafted their novels, positioning their work socially, politically, and ideologically.

In Chapter III, "Nothingness and Spirituality in Baroja," I will build upon the historical, social, and philosophical themes introduced in chapter two, focusing specifically on the Baroja novel. I will divide the chapter into four sections, assigning some of Baroja's literary works to each section. The first section, "Institutions and Vitality in Spain," will analyze the novels *Camino de perfección (pasión mística*) and *Aurora roja*. The subsection dedicated to *Camino de perfección (pasión mística)* will provide a brief overview of the text, delve into the Spanish educational institution with respect to Nietzsche and innate creativity, and highlight the intersection of vitality and reason with reference to José Ortega y Gasset. The following subsection referencing *Aurora roja* will further highlight Baroja's disdain of institutions, simultaneously emphasizing the novelist's fascination with anarchism. The second section, "Decadence and Social Inequities in Spain," will analyze the novels *El árbol de la ciencia* and *Mala hierba*, focusing on the inadequacy of traditional education to prepare citizens for modern-day society. The subsection dealing with *El árbol de la ciencia* will provide a brief overview of the text, detail the presentation of education in the novel, and underscore the depiction of national decadence through Spanish society. The ensuing subsection, analyzing *Mala hierba*, will take a closer look at the ineffectiveness of traditional Spanish education, according to Baroja, with references to Krause's philosophy, and will analyze the represented loss of a national ethic.

The third segment, "Baroja's Man of Action," with the subsequent subsections analyzing *Zalacaín el aventurero* and *César o Nada*, depicts Baroja's proposal for the spiritual malady plaguing both Spanish society and the individual. In these works, Baroja provides a glorification

of the 'man of action', akin to Nietzsche's philosophy regarding the ideal *Übermensch*, or "overman." Consequently, this glorification of action serves as a proposal to address and oppose national and individual decadence. The subsection focused on *César o Nada* will examine traditional Catholicism, reiterate Baroja's position regarding institutions, and emphasize the protagonist's political ambition. The following subsection, emphasizing *Zalacaín el aventurero*, presents a concise depiction of Baroja's 'man of action'. The final section, "The Novel's Purpose," draws on the only literary work not classified as a novel, *Juventud, egolatría*. This section serves as a catalyst to transition to Dostoevsky's novels, emphasizing the connections and distinctions between both authors with respect to their philosophical positions, political ideologies, and personal beliefs. Furthermore, I will draw on the philosophy of José Ortega y Gasset, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, while simultaneously utilizing texts written by Gonzalo Navajas and Manolo Garrido Palacios regarding Baroja and Krausism. The goal of this chapter is to provide a philosophically stimulating analysis of the manner Baroja utilizes the novel as a vehicle to highlight national and individual crisis.

Chapter IV, "Guilt and Redemption in Dostoevsky," will also delve into the historical, social, and philosophical themes present in the two previous chapters, but with a primary focus on Fyodor Dostoevsky's novels *The Gambler*, *Notes from Underground*, *Crime and Punishment*, and *The Brothers Karamazov*. These novels, ordered in such a way, allow for the most fitting comprehension of Dostoevsky's proposal that humanity must confront a great common and universal void. As such, the novels deal with the recognition of a problem, the existing propositions to address it, their practical insufficiency, and Dostoevsky's personal program to remediate this issue.

The first section, "The Crisis of the Inner Man," focused on *The Gambler*, analyzes Dostoevsky's personal relationship to his protagonist with respect to his gambling addiction. In this, the crisis of the inner man, coupled with the national complications of westernization, reveal a need for faith, an element highlighted in Tolstoy's *A Confession*. Furthermore, I will delve into the manner in which Dostoevsky points out that this westernization generates moral and social discontent for the Russian individual. The second segment, "The Impotence of Socialism and Utopia," focused on *Notes from Underground*, highlights the argument of the deeply satirical figure of the man from the underground. Understood within the context of Chernyshevsky's socialist proposal found in his novel *What is to be Done?*, along with the rising popularity of Marxism, Dostoevsky emphasizes the failure of these ideologies and the vital importance of individuality.

The third section "The Inadequacy of Religion," undertaking *The Brothers Karamazov*, will permit a greater comprehension of Dostoevsky's positions on utopianism, guilt, Catholicism, and the Russian social issues of the late nineteenth century. Given the length and depth of this renowned novel, the focus will be on the chapters "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare" and "The Grand Inquisitor," as these develop Dostoevsky's notion of the void facing humanity, a belief shared by Nietzsche and demonstrated in his "The Parable of the Madman." The establishment of this position relating to an unescapable void corresponds to the final section "God or the Void," addressing *Crime and Punishment*, as it will emphasize the Nietzschean role that Raskolnikov assumes, albeit Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* was preceded by *Crime and Punishment*. This final portion will dive into the crisis of the inner man, its relation to the Russian nation, and the notion of guilt.

Chapter V, “Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky’s Regenerative Programs,” presents the conclusions based on the historical background of Spain and Russia, the analysis of Baroja’s novels, and Dostoevsky’s novels and their relation to Pío Baroja. In my research, I argue that the psychological and individual turbulence of central characters serves as a mirror image of the political, social, and spiritual unrest of the respective Spanish and Russian nations. Additionally, the profile of these characters is also linked to the general intellectual and cultural condition of their times. My bibliographical sources include a repertoire of central authors of the second half of the nineteenth century and additionally, in Baroja's case, the first half of the twentieth century. Although, I will refer to the historical context of the times, the emphasis of my dissertation will be on the specific contributions of Baroja and Dostoevsky to the highly charged ideological debate of their time. In this final section, I will analyze both the affinities as well as the differences that exist between these two authors for which the novel was not only a form of entertainment, but a rigorous and profound way to achieve knowledge about the human condition.

Chapter II

The Crisis of National Education in Nineteenth Century Spain and Russia

I. The Role of Religion in Nineteenth Century Education

In Friedrich Nietzsche's "The Parable of the Mad Man," following his proclamation of the godlessness of society, the madman calls out to those listening to him, "I have come too early," he said then; "my time has not come yet. The tremendous event is still on its way, still travelling - it has not yet reached the ears of men" (180). Nietzsche's parable foreshadows the philosophical ramifications of a societal rupture from traditional modes, primarily related to religious belief. Although Nietzsche words were written in 1882, they could not be more apt to describe the growing philosophical, social, and political crisis taking place at the onset of the twentieth century in Europe. Only fifty years earlier, the seeds of the transformation had already been sown in Spain, subsequently yielding significant tension with respect to national education, social organization, and political ideas. A highly religious nation prior to the twentieth century, the last half of the nineteenth century represents a clash between traditional and progressive ideologies, manifested markedly in the educational sector. Likewise, in Russia, a similar battle between traditional and progressive ideologies waged war on the practice of serfdom.

Although perhaps less religiously linked than the Spanish situation, the last half of the nineteenth century produced a period of crisis in both nations that would express itself violently. Godlessness, although it was a contributor, was not the sole cause of this crisis, but rather the tension between progressive and traditional ideals. Both education in Spain and the abolition of serfdom in Russia, points of contention in each country, affected the social, political, and economic landscape of both nations for years to come. In Spain, progressive ideals challenged the supremacy of the conservative Church, contributing to the formation of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*,

sympathies for the philosophical programs of Krausism and positivism, and the rise of political ideas, such as anarchism.

These movements and tensions make up the context in which Pío Baroja wrote his novels. Likewise, in the Russian situation, and given the primarily static history of Russia until Lenin, allows for an augmented conception of the historical context in which Tolstoy and Dostoevsky wrote their masterpieces. Baroja, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy blatantly expose the societal issues of their respective nations, representing crisis not only collectively, but also individually. To better recognize the collective and individual crisis presented by these authors, and Baroja and Dostoevsky in particular, a general comprehension of the historical factors affecting both Spain and Russia, namely the educational transformation of the former and the abolition of serfdom in the latter, is imperative.

During the nineteenth century, the Spanish education system, underwent perhaps the most significant transformation in its history. In the first half of the nineteenth century, education was considered a privilege only enjoyed by the wealthy and those associated with Catholic Church. At a local level, the Church had been tasked with this pedagogical responsibility, but broad standardized education, regulated by a state body, was non-existent. Consequently, the number of illiterate citizens during this epoch was staggering, with some estimating that, of the population of school-aged children, over 80% were incapable of reading or writing (Gómez Moreno 90). Furthermore, these same estimations reveal that over 40% of the educators in the country did not have a specific degree in their branch of instruction[14]. It is appropriate, therefore, to assume that the quality of Spanish education in the nineteenth century was severely lacking on a national scale.

[14] "El índice de analfabetismo supera el 80 %, la mitad de los niños en edad escolar están sin escolarizar, algo más del 42 % del profesorado de instrucción primaria no posee titulación especifica y más del 60 % de las escuelas no tienen el material técnico ni arquitectónico adecuado" (90).

However, the dominant philosophical and literary movements of the nineteenth century dramatically influenced the development of educational programs during this time period, consequently bringing about an increased focus on the 'hard' sciences[15] and a rupture from traditional models of education. These developments, while substantial, created new challenges for European nations and Spain in particular. Such developments are visible as early as 1812, such as the Constitution of 1812, which foreshadowed the insurmountable obstacles that traditional modes of education would face. The Constitution of 1812 called into question the practice of educating merely those in privileged positions, reflecting a societal shift in thinking: "… [E]n España surge como un estallido de igualdad y libertades plasmándose en la Constitución de 1812 en la cual el pueblo se declara soberano. En esta constitución histórica se recoge la importancia de la educación del pueblo, para que con ello las futuras generaciones puedan participar y ser responsables de los asuntos públicos y continuar el sendero de los designios de la nación" (García Caballero 37). Consequently, the Church and the Nation, intertwined as they were in the early nineteenth century, entered into a period of elevated tension regarding widespread approaches to education. The movement to implement a national education for all Spanish citizens sowed seeds of transformation that would not be fully realized until the following century. The pursuit of a modern educational system was an arduous and problematic process, complete with ideological debate from proponents of traditional Catholic education and those who backed progressive education[16].

[15] The 'hard' sciences are often considered sciences that are believed to have an elevated level of rigor and exactitude. Subjects such as physics, mathematics, and chemistry are colloquially considered 'hard' sciences, while philosophy and sociology are considered 'soft' sciences.

[16] Those who favored traditional Catholic education are often referred to as 'conservatives', while those who favored more progressive education are referred to as 'liberals'.

During the reign of Isabella II from 1854 to 1856, a period known as the *Bienio progresista*, the Progressive Party sought to normalize education at a national level. Reflecting a moderate ideological shift from the previous fifty years, the Progressive Party instituted a law that would sow the seeds of change for Spanish education over the remaining forty-three years of the nineteenth century. Instituted in 1857, the Ley de Moyano established and maintained the right to education for all citizens. While this right was a diversion from the ideological position of Spanish conservatives, it did not withdraw pedagogical power from the Catholic Church. "Se reconocía también el derecho de la Iglesia a velar por la pureza de la doctrina, de la fe y de las costumbres y a vigilar la educación religiosa en los estudios que se impartían, ampliando así su presencia hasta las aulas universitarias." (Palacios 93). In effect, the Ley de Moyano introduced the practice of public instruction to all citizens, but further reinforced the grip that the Catholic Church held on pedagogy. Although an affront to the Church's role in education would come just two decades later, it is important to consider the ideology of this traditional Spanish education to recognize the gravity of these liberal developments over the subsequent fifty years.

The texts utilized to educate past generations in Spain allow a window into the Church's ideological position toward education. They permit a more comprehensive view of the transition during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as national education was mandatory for primary school students from 1838[17] onward. Educational texts present social, religious, and political outlooks on life, serving as barometers to gauge common attitudes of the epoch. "Los textos escolares reflejan, como ninguna otra fuente documental, los principios básicos y las ideas que se pretenden transmitir en cada época" (Palacios 101). In her thorough research of commonly used children's reading texts during the nineteenth century in Spain, Carmelita González Rodríguez, in

[17] Although mandatory, education was very rarely feasible for the poor.

Ideología y educación religiosa en los libros de lectura, emphasizes the underpinnings of traditional Catholic education. In this time period, the Catholic Church adhered to traditional values, focusing on subjects such as math, literature, and arithmetic, but preserving the foundation of Catholic principles and beliefs. The educational ideology of the Church and the State in the early nineteenth century, therefore, emphasized the knowledge and providence of God, and the subservience of all human beings to Him.

Rodríguez argues that educational texts serve as a transmitter of cultural, moral, and societal values. In this, she inherently links the notion of national ideology with educational texts for children, citing this link to their role in educating the future generation and passing a stringent code of conduct established by the government and the Church. She contends that the notion of religion is presented in three different forms in educational texts of the nineteenth century. First and foremost, she claims that educational texts reflect the notion of religion as a doctrinal body that contains a corpus of unquestionable truths. Within this corpus, the Christian doctrine is presented as the precept by which the Catholic individual must live out his or her faith. Furthermore, the Christian doctrine is seen as a mechanism by which salvation may be offered to the individual, and consequently the Church maintains that the Catholic faith is the sole path to salvation. Second, Rodríguez argues religion acts as an aid to life, serving principally as a guide for an improved life. Without religion, the assumption is that one would be lost and, without a compass, incapable of navigating life's difficulties, unable to truly discern right from wrong or find meaning for his or her life. Third, she asserts that educational texts emphasize religion's function to provide peace for one's inner life, satisfying existential inquiries and acting as a beacon of hope. Religion within Spanish society, and specifically the Catholic religion, provided answers to questions pertaining to the individual's origin, his death, and his temporary purpose. Rodríguez

argues that this ideology of religion, reflected in Spanish society, defined the dominant educational ideology of the nineteenth century. Taking from commonly used texts of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, she provides practical examples of this education in practice, a traditional education referenced and critiqued often by Pío Baroja[18].

During a time period in which philosophers had begun to raise questions about the existence of God, exemplified in the work of Nietzsche and Bakunin, the Catholic Church, and consequently the State, continued to neglect such inquiries in their educational programs. From the onset of primary school, and likely much earlier in their respective homes, students were taught the existence of God as an unquestionable truth. To doubt God's existence would be unreasonable and unproductive. The ideology of the traditional mode of education is, therefore, clearly one of submission to traditional truths. Rodríguez emphasizes that children's books of the late nineteenth century do not specifically teach about the existence of God, but rather present it as a fact. "Por otra parte, la existencia de Dios se transmite como una verdad que no necesita argumentos verbales para probarla. La ideología sobre la existencia de Dios se une a la de Dios Creador. El mundo existe porque existe Dios y no es necesario recurrir a ninguna otra argumentación, lo revelan los signos y manifestaciones de la creación" (González Rodríguez 242). The sole being of God, unquestioned, thus implies that the Spanish society, in accordance with the Catholic Church, argued for a set of unalienable truths that could not be denied within the realm of education. Given the ideological framework maintaining the indisputable existence of God, the knowledge and providence of God were central themes imparted to students.

[18] An example of Baroja's critique of this system is Fernando Ossorio's personal resolution in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* at the conclusion of the book. Ossorio emphasizes that he will encourage his son to be educated in accordance with his son's personal will and reject the teachings of those that Ossorio believed impaired his ability to live out his personal will. However, this conclusion is frustrated, as his mother-in-law sews a Bible verse into the sash of the child.

Similar to the existence of God, and the providence and knowledge of God, the educational ideology of the Church and the State prepared future generations for duty within society. Interwoven within the other two, Rodríguez points out that children's educational texts emphasized that the existence of God, given the knowledge and providence of God, necessitated the individual's participation in a holy life. In effect, the recognition of God's existence demanded the individual worship God. Additionally, God's knowledge and providence encouraged the individual to establish a personal and collective connection with God to receive such providence. In practical terms, Rodríguez states, "[e]n el significado global del contenido religioso de los libros escolares de lectura se describe que el hombre cristiano en la tierra tiene que llevar una vida religiosa que le conduzca a Dios" (245). This religious life, beneficial first and foremost to the individual, is advantageous for society as a whole, as a group of selfless, caring, and devout individuals would generate a peaceful and productive collective. Repeatedly highlighted in children's texts, the first act of man, or child in this case, was to worship God. In response to God's providence and salvation, children were instructed to worship God: "Por tanto, la adoración es el culto debido a Dios que se manifiesta exteriormente en el homenaje que el hombre le rinde por los actos de adoración, que son actos de alabanza, de bendición y ensalzamiento por los favores recibidos" (244). In addition to worship, children 's texts stress the need for continual prayer, in accordance with the biblical message. Rodríguez provides a direct quote from a children 's educational text written by Solís y Miguel to accentuate this point. "La oración es la obra mejor con que podemos empezar y acabar el día" (246). In addition to blessing food presented to the children, they were also expected to pray outside of school hours. These texts present a view of the dominant ideology of the nineteenth century in Spain, one emphasizing the unquestionable existence of God, the providence and omnipotence of the Catholic God, and the duty of the

individual to live a religious life[19]. These religious responsibilities, therefore, reflect a biblical set of principles outlined for Catholic believers.

II. *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* and its Teachings

The education of the last half of the nineteenth century is not notably distinct from that of the first half of the century, evidenced by the expectation for national education outlined in the *Reglamento de 1838*. The ideology of Spanish education in the late nineteenth century can be considered a continuation of the Christian notion of education, a highly religious education with irrefutable truths being found principally in the Bible and propagated by members of the religious organization. As Rodríguez underlines, this ideology favors the preservation of the Catholic Church, the very institution that provided the education: "En consecuencia, el contenido fundamental de los libros escolares de lectura del último cuarto del siglo XIX se centra en los valores religiosos y morales de la Religión Católica para preservar, como se recoge en los prólogos, al niño de la corrupción y las malas costumbres, para formar su corazón e inspirarle máximas religiosas y morales" (249). However, the ushering in of a new period, with a new set of values and morals, would call into question the traditional education promoted by the Catholic Church. The 1870s represent a transformational decade marked by the consolidation of capitalism and a working class in Spain. These changes, along with the addition of Article 11 of the *Constitución de 1876*, cause the tension between those in favor of more innovative modes of education and politics and those in favor of the teachings of the Catholic Church to begin to boil over: "El artículo 11 reconocía la religión católica como la oficial del Estado, pero a su vez proclamaba la libertad de cultos y de conciencia. El sector más intransigente del catolicismo mantenía que la confesionalidad del Estado implicaba el control ideológico de las escuelas" (Palacios 94).

[19] "Según estos libros de lectura, la escuela le instruye en el catecismo y la doctrina cristiana, a la vez que se les acostumbra en las prácticas piadosas; …" (González Rodríguez 248).

However, this ideological control would be challenged over the next thirty years, beginning with *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*.

Under the charge of Francisco Giner de los Ríos[20], a group of university professors[21] designed and established the *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, also known as the ILE. Created in 1876, this group was known for its humanist and liberal philosophical bent with regard to education. However, perhaps the most important ideological proposal *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* offered was the push toward a cosmovision with complete confidence in scientific study to attain knowledge: "La Institución llevó a cabo una importante tarea de renovación cultural y pedagógica sin precedentes en los siglos XIX y XX en España. En sus estatutos se declaraba ajena a todo interés religioso, ideología o partido político, proclamando el derecho a la libertad de cátedra, la inviolabilidad de la ciencia y el respeto a la conciencia individual" (UPC 1). As a result, in opposition to the Catholic viewpoint that the source and origin of all knowledge is God, the ILE argued knowledge should be verified through science. While this does not inherently make the creators of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* atheist, it does represent a dramatic shift in ideals with respect to knowledge. Inspired by the philosophy of the German philosopher Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, Julián Sanz del Río and Francisco Giner de los Ríos spearheaded Spanish interest in Krause's ideas regarding societal reform.

The works of German philosopher Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, completed only partially prior to his premature death in 1832, had a significant impact on Spanish society in the mid and late nineteenth century. His book, *Urbild der Menschheit* (1811), in English *The Archetype of Mankind*, garnered the most attention from Spanish intellectuals. Introduced by the

[20] He was Professor of Law and International Law at the University of Madrid.
[21] The group was composed of Lorenzo Luzuriaga, Antonio Machado, José Ontañón Urias, Juan Uña Shartou, Manuel Ontañón Valiente, Gloria Giner de los Ríos, and Francisco Giner de los Ríos.

Spanish Head of Culture Julián Sanz del Río, the book had a significant influence on the founder of the ILE Francisco Giner de los Ríos and a considerable number of Spanish intellectuals and citizens. Although the philosophy of Krause is complex, it embodies the conflicting values of the Spanish nation during the late nineteenth century. As mentioned, the conflict between traditional values and the rising influence of progressive ideals created a seemingly insurmountable discord between those of opposing sides. In addition to this conflict, the revival of European philosophy during the nineteenth century left many in Spain concerned the nation would fall behind its neighbors. In order to harmonize the societal tensions and keep pace with the philosophical developments of other European nations, Krause's philosophy was adopted in many intellectual circles, subsequently influencing education, politics, and society at large. The significant success that Krause's ideas had among the Spanish population, at least in part, was due to his ideological method known as *harmonic rationalism*. To comprehend this harmony, and the subsequent influence that Krause had on Spanish education, it is imperative that we have a basic understanding of Krause's philosophy.

Often described as a speculative view of history, the primary goal of Krause's philosophy was to provide an idealistic foundation by which humans could reach their maximum potential. This pursuit of one's potential was the ultimate objective, a pursuit that was only feasible through the internal harmony of ideas. Julián Sanz del Río, professor and briefly the Minister of Culture for Spain, reiterates Krause's notion of harmony as, "... siendo el compuesto armónico más íntimo de la Naturaleza y el Espíritu debe realizar históricamente esta armonía y la de sí mismo con la humanidad, en forma de voluntad racional, y por el puro motivo de esta su naturaleza, en Dios" (xii). This harmony, in theory, would give way to a sort of utopian notion of humanity, as the collective of harmonic individuals would foster an environment for the betterment of every other

individual: "In other words, the individual would discover the right balance among antagonistic forces, and the aforementioned balance would lead humankind to reach its potential in life" (Rubio 10). However, to achieve this potential, at the individual level first, Krause argued that one must go through an analytic and synthetic phase[22].

For our purposes, we will focus on the analytic phase, as it represents the primary aspect of Krause's philosophy adopted and utilized by Spanish intellectuals. In the analytic phase, the individual begins from the point of the intuitive 'I', or '*yo*'[23]. From this starting point, the intuitive 'I' recognizes itself first and foremost, and then its own finiteness[24], as the existence of the other limits its own potential. "The fundamental intuition of the ego, the pure self-consciousness of being the self-same and whole essence, is therefore the epistemological anchor of the analytical-ascending part of science: everything that is known in the analytical-ascending part of science must be known with the same certainty as that which is known in and through the fundamental intuition of the ego and in this sense must be able to be deduced or read off of the fundamental intuition of the ego" (Göcke 36). While the goal of Krause's philosophy is the pursuit of one's maximal potential, the recognition of the other automatically limits that potential. Taking into account this acquired knowledge, Krause defines being as 'what one is' and essence as 'that which is'. This is important to recognize, as Krause argues that an entity is essentially "what it is" in itself. Therefore, the ego must be analyzed both as a whole and in its parts that constitute the whole. "With this vital discovery, the 'I' could recognize the presence of the spirit and the body, both of which, harmonically joined, constitute the person. In addition, these three parts - spirit, body, and

[22] The analytic and synthetic phases are also known as the analytic-ascending part of science and the synthetical-descending part of science.
[23] The Intuitive 'I' is also referred to as the 'ego'.
[24] "Since the ego is not the principle of science as such, due to its finitude, but since the fundamental intuition of the ego is the beginning of science, it follows that Krause must arrive at the intuition of the principle of science only by describing that which the ego must necessarily bring to the knowledge of himself" (Göcke 36).

the individual - are part of the spiritual world, nature, and humanity, respectively" (Rubio 12). Thus, the ego recognizes the presence of the other through the self: "That is, the ego is subordinated to the material categories of selfhood (*Selbheit*) and wholeness (*Ganzheit*), and to the formal categories of directedness (*Richtheit*) and comprehension (*Fassheit*). Next, the ego phenomenologically observes that once any of these categories is given, it is impossible not to recognize the presence of the others: the wholeness of the ego is not separable from the selfhood of the ego" (Göcke 37).

Consequently, it is important to grasp the notion of the self, also known as the intuitive 'I' or 'ego', to comprehend the notion of unity within panentheism. Krause argues that the limitedness of the intuitive 'I' provides innate knowledge of the possibility of a limitless being, namely God. "Based on this it follows that in the analytical-ascending part of science, understanding of the transcendental constitution of the ego has to enable us to understand that there is a higher principle beyond the categories and their existence that is adequately referred to as God, if God is considered as the fact and knowledge principle of science" (Göcke 36). Krause would argue that God, although one with everything, was not limited by the world. According to Krause, the ego utilizes the principle of sufficient reason, a principle that Krause argues is accessible *a priori*, to determine that the notion of God is infinite, which enables the transcendent constitution[25] of the ego in the first place. Therefore, the intuition of the ego is knowledge of God from God and thus science is divine knowledge from God.

Consequently, Krause sought the fusion of faith in God and the pursuit of one's individual potential. In contrast to the Catholic Church's goal of magnifying God and God alone, Krause sought the harmony of a belief in God and the freedom of individual pursuits. In fact, he argued

[25] The transcendent constitution of the ego is the self required to create a unified self-consciousness.

that the individual should emulate the divine in their personal lives, effectively pursuing an ethical bedrock on which to build aesthetically, morally, and scientifically[26]. The individual's emulation with the divine through art and science depended on ethics, a notion that is intertwined with the community as a whole. The pursuit of the individual and collective potential, with a panentheistic[27] God-affirming framework, resonated with Spanish intellectuals like Sanz del Río and Giner de los Ríos. The social discontent of the day, aided in part by the grievances some citizens had with the Catholic Church, fostered an environment in which some individuals were more readily able to accept a slight diversion from the teachings of the Church. Rather than a full-scale Nietzschean rejection of God, Krause allowed Spanish intellectuals to find common ground with their traditional beliefs and their desire for societal reform and action.

Much like the Catholic Church's promotion of ideological viewpoints regarding the notion of knowledge springing forth from God's omnipotence, which inherently demands the individual's response, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* promoted philosophical views in favor of the supremacy of science and the individual's subsequent duty[28] within society as a result of such an assertion. The conception of knowledge for the founders of the ILE, therefore, is dependent on the action of *doing*: "La Institución quisiera continuar acentuando en su escuela aquella orientación educativa a que constantemente aspiró, y que consiste, no en aprender las cosas, sino en aprender a hacerlas. Este carácter es aplicable a todas las enseñanzas. Pero mientras en las llamadas teóricas

[26] "If, however, we relate this to the idea of God, that is, to the idea of the ultimate principle of fact and knowledge, which, deploying the principle of sufficient reason, has to exist, if there is a ground in virtue of which the ego possesses its observed essentialities at all, then it follows that this thought itself can only be caused in us by God: for the thought of God is by definition a thought of an infinite and unconditioned ultimate ground, which can only be united with the finite knowing subject through an infinite ground itself: because the object of knowledge is considered infinite, the subject of knowledge considered finite, knowledge of God as the infinite principle of science can only be grounded in God Himself" (Göcke 39).

[27] Panentheism: The belief or doctrine that God is greater than the universe and includes and interpenetrates it.

[28] This duty can be understood as the responsibility to enact change in order to improve societal conditions. Much like the duty prescribed to believers by the Bible in reverence to God, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* sought to equip citizens educationally in order to live out new ideals for the betterment of collective society.

(Lenguaje, Matemáticas, Historia, Filosofía. etc.), exige para su realización pocos medios exteriores, pues el hacer depende en ellas casi exclusivamente del ejercicio del pensar reflexivo, en las que se llaman prácticas (Dibujo, Física, Química, Ciencias Naturales, etc.), no porque lo sean más que las otras, sino porque su hacer depende en gran parte de la actividad manual, se necesitan, para aprender a hacer, muchas condiciones exteriores" (UPC 5). Similar to the idea that the individual must worship God, pray to Him, and live a life dedicated to the statutes presented in the Bible, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* so too established the social responsibility of the individual. To attain maximal individual liberation, possible only through a similarly liberated education, the individual must focus on his or her manual activity.

Inspired by Krause's ideas, the principles and educational orientation of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* reveal an oppositional standard for educating children to that of the Catholic Church. With the goal of amplifying the culture, and simultaneously amplifying student knowledge of Spanish culture, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* sought to provide widespread education to allow students to take ownership of their individual lives. Citing a humanistic ideology, the founders of the ILE aimed at providing students with the tools to alter their destiny: "Para conseguirlo, quisiera la Institución que, en el cultivo del cuerpo y del alma, "nada les fuese ajeno". Si le importa forjar el pensamiento como órgano de la investigación racional y de la ciencia, no le interesa menos la salud y la higiene, el decoro personal y el vigor físico, la corrección y nobleza de hábitos y maneras; la amplitud, elevación y delicadeza del sentir; la depuración de los gustos estéticos; la humana tolerancia, la ingenua alegría, el valor sereno, la conciencia del deber, la honrada lealtad, la formación, en suma, de caracteres armónicos, dispuestos a vivir como piensan; prontos a apoderarse del ideal en dondequiera; manantiales de poesía en donde toma origen el más noble y más castizo dechado de la raza, del arte y de la literatura españoles" (UPC

3). In opposition to the belief that God was in control of each and every aspect of one's life, a belief maintained by the Catholic Church, the ILE utilized education as a mechanism for social mobility. Much like the children's texts that presented the ideological belief systems of traditional modes of education, the ILE promoted texts as a fundamental form of self-empowerment: "La Institución aspira a que sus alumnos puedan servirse pronto y ampliamente de los libros como fuente capital de cultura; pero no emplea los llamados "de texto", ni las "lecciones de memoria" al uso, por creer que todo ello contribuye a petrificar el espíritu y a mecanizar el trabajo de clase, donde la función del maestro ha de consistir en despertar y mantener vivo el interés del niño, excitando su pensamiento, sugiriendo cuestiones y nuevos puntos de vista, enseñando a razonar con rigor y a resumir con claridad y precisión los resultados." (UPC 4). Although the educational goals of the ILE are often phrased in utopian language, they represent a radical change in the traditional mode of education in Spain. This influence from *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* is clearly visible in Pío Baroja's work, specifically in his novel *Camino de perfección: (Pasión mística)*[29].

In opposition to the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church in Spain, progressive educational texts of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century highlight the need for the individual to assume his or her individual will. While this position pertains to all aspects of life, it is especially prevalent in children's texts as they relate to civic duty. In *El niño republicano* by Joaquín Seró Sabaté, this call to take hold of one's will is clear in the correlation between one's free will and his or her civic duty to vote. "No ha habido, no hay, no habrá ni puede haber régimen alguno que sea capaz de substituir a este en el que cada ciudadano, en una sociedad

[29] Ossorio's final rejection of the Church's teaching and the value of the individual will are epitomized through his decision to foster an environment of personal liberty for his son. Ossorio determines that he will teach his son in accordance with his son's personal desires, an ideal popularized by Nietzsche. However, Ossorio's plan is frustrated by his mother-in-law and, symbolically, by the societal structures in place.

de orden, de trabajo, de mutua inteligencia, goza de libre albedrío para intervenir en la cosa pública con la expresión de su voluntad, que es el voto" (10). In effect, although the overarching theme of this particular passage is one's right to vote, the pursuit of one's will is commended. In contrast to the teachings of the Church[30], which had been one in the same with traditional education, Sabaté's text insinuates that free will in public service is a right and great privilege of which all should actively participate. Distinct in their focus on the individual will over the will of God, a hallmark of traditional education[31], the ideology of progressives was a markedly more humanistic approach to education. Given the divergent starting positions in relation to values, it is unsurprising that this is merely the first of many ideological issues that generated tension between progressive and traditional educators.

While traditional education in Spain emphasized the importance of civic duty, emerging first and foremost as an act of service to God, the primary focus was never on this particular responsibility. Rather, children were taught to view their current lives as merely a blip in time in comparison to eternity. Instead of visualizing civic duty as a means in itself, it was viewed as a means to appease and serve God for a reward in the afterlife. Furthermore, the Catholic Church viewed pain and hardship as modes of religious testing by God and the effect of humankind's sin[32]. However, the focus of progressive education in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century was increasingly present-focused, fomenting a humanistic approach to immediately

[30] The Catholic Church of the time emphasized that one's primary duty was the glorification and service of God, inherently suppressing the individual will.

[31] La relación del hombre con Dios se expresa en el cumplimiento de unos deberes religiosos. Estos deberes vienen determinados por el poder de Dios y la dependencia del hombre. Deberes como amar, respetar, obedecer, adorar son los que el niño cristiano tiene que cumplir c o n temor reverencial, p o r estima y sometiéndose a la ley divina... " (González Rodríguez 244).

[32] There are multiple biblical texts that affirm this position, including 1 Peter 4:12-13, John 15:18-20, and James 1:2-4. James 1: 2-4 "Count it all joy, my brothers, when you meet trials of various kinds, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing."

remedy social issues. The tension can be understood as a distinction in focus, as progressives sought to actively address social issues with or without the help of God. Thus, progressives inherently question the traditional notion of human dignity, arguing that one can be dignified through action. "La República es un régimen de dignidad humana. El pueblo republicano tiene para regular su vida las leyes que él mismo se da por medio de sus representantes y las mejora o las substituye a conveniencia para que rindan un beneficio igual para todos" (Sabaté 10-11). Traditional Catholic education emphasized the innate fallenness of mankind, arguing that human dignity could only be attained through the spiritual remediation or assistance of Jesus Christ. However, *El niño republicano* presents "La república"[33] as a collective of individuals, as a regimen of human dignity, inherently challenging the notion of fallenness[34] promoted by traditional education in Spain. Furthermore, Sabaté's passage implicitly carries a present-centered message, as the *'todos'* do not reflect some future utopian society, but rather those of all social classes in Spain in the early twentieth century. Clearly, the affirmation of human dignity and singular focus on the present strike a wedge between traditional and progressive education. Nevertheless, they were not the only causes of discord among educators during this time.

It is evident that La República and *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* sought to provide children with practical training and guidance to address social issues of the present time, seeking to live up to some measure of human dignity. However, beyond merely propagating practical education for social change, progressive education promoted an alternative cosmovision, as evidenced by children's texts. Progressive children's texts emphasized the value of liberty and the individual free will, intertwined with an almost religious fervor for the supremacy of democracy.

[33] "La república" stands for La Segunda República Española.

[34] Fallenness is the religious notion of sin passed down to all humans from Adam and Eve's original sin. In short, it implies that all humankind is inherently sinful and guilty.

The antithetical ideologies of traditional and progressive education, paralleling the political and social conflicts among both groups, are reflected in both these educational texts and documents highlighting the manner in which the students should be instructed. One particular children's text, *Juanito* written by P.A. Parravicini, epitomizes the goal of traditional education, namely, to encourage students to believe in Jesus Christ and have complete faith in Catholicism: "La única religión verdadera, que es la de Cristo, la Católica, Apostólica y Romana, Verdadera, sí, porque inspirada por el mismo Dios existe desde el principio del mundo; se sostiene constantemente en su esencia y en su doctrina" (Parravicini 14). Clearly, the first responsibility of the Catholic educator was to encourage unabated faith in Jesus Christ. However, in *Historia de la educación en España (1857-1975)*, Manolo Garrido Palacios points out that, "[e]n el prólogo *Dos palabras al lector* del libro reseñado *Lecturas Ciudadanas,* de 1932, se recoge:

"*... Ello aconseja llevar a la escuela y dar a los niños y niñas, desde los primeros años, las nociones fundamentales de la democracia y los preceptos constitucionales, para que vayan encarnando en las costumbres y en el corazón del pueblo*[35]*"* (103). In effect, the values of democracy and reverence for community precepts assume the utmost importance for this educational reformation campaign. These notions embody the true principles of liberal education, with liberty and the adulation of the free will encapsulating the movement in opposition to traditional Catholic education. This exaltation of the free will, paralleling philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche's valuation of the individual free will, reflects the influence of nineteenth century philosophical thought on Spanish progressives. This thought, inspiring an ideology clearly at odds with that of the Catholic Church, created significant tension in policy and education. To comprehend this ideological confrontation of the value of the individual free will in the face of the

[35] Manolo Garrido Palacios references *Lecturas Ciudadanas (Educación Cívica)* by Victoriano F. Ascarza.

traditional teaching of submission to God's will, it is important that we have an adequate comprehension of the manner in which educational progressives were influenced by Friedrich Nietzsche.

III. Nietzsche and the Influence of the Individual Will

In Nietzsche's third essay of *On the Genealogy of Morals*, the German philosopher highlights his displeasure with a systematically Christian European society. He does this by reflecting on the ascetic ideal in philosophy and culture. Nietzsche's concern for the ascetic ideal is borne out of his aim to deconstruct *slave morality*[36], although he does not assert that this ideal is synonymous with what he calls errant morality. Nevertheless, he defines the ascetic ideal as the ideal to which humans aspire to deny themselves the pleasures of life for a 'greater' purpose. Nietzsche argues that the ascetic ideal sprang out of a dark realization, as humans grappled with the notion that their lives were potentially meaningless. The ascetic ideal, however, emphasizes the rejection of one's passions and desires on higher grounds, demonstrating control over oneself in the name of differing ends. To illustrate these ends, Nietzsche argues that the value of the ascetic ideal for the artist, philosopher, and religious believer is unique. The Christian denies his or her passions for the sake of obedience to God, the philosopher denies his or her passions for the sake of a more adequate environment to embark in philosophical thought, and the artist's denial for his or her passions is meaningless[37]. Although the ascetic ideal takes on different forms for different groups, Nietzsche argues that this ideal is inherently contradictory.

[36] Nietzsche emphasizes that there are two primary forms of morality in European culture, namely "Master morality" and "slave morality." "Master morality" gives merit to pride and individual power, while "slave morality" gives merit to meekness, kindness, and empathy ("Friedrich Nietzsche | Genealogy of Morals (Part 1) | Existentialist Philosophy & Literature" Sadler).

[37] This is emphasized in the case of Wagner, who initially rejected the ascetic ideals through his music, but later in his life praised the ascetic ideals.

Nietzsche argues that the ascetic ideal is meaningless, as it implies that life with all of its sensory pleasures and distractions should be rejected. Nietzsche insinuates that there must have been something desirable about these ideals, given that they were so universally accepted in Europe. However, he argues that the very concept is a contradiction because it is 'the will trying to stop the will', which is life against itself. In this, Nietzsche implies that life is related intrinsically to the individual will. He claims that the desire for power by hoping to control all of life is manifested in this desire to live out the ascetic ideal. However, what could explain the appeal of the ascetic ideal to so many philosophers who sought the maximal expression of the human will through thought and philosophy? Nietzsche points out that many philosophers, including Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, and Schopenhauer, either did not marry or hated marriage due to their philosophical commitment. Following this logic, Nietzsche determines that, in one way or another, these philosophers were denying the passions of their lives, namely intimate relationships, companionship, and procreation, for the sake of their perceived higher purpose. The higher purpose in the case of these philosophers was their philosophy, which leads Nietzsche to assert that, for the philosopher, the ascetic ideal is not a denial of one's existence, but instead an affirmation of the existence in which the philosopher insists on his own existence and no other. Philosophers recognize that they produce at their best when they are isolated, and therefore have determined that the ascetic ideal is valuable to their craft. The ascetic ideal is a representation of the philosopher's desire to make philosophy and the philosopher him or herself the only meaningful reality. Nietzsche asserts that the philosopher sees in the ideal the optimum of conditions to achieve maximal knowledge. However, Nietzsche suggests that the value that philosophers have

placed on this notion for humanity, their personal benefit, and specifically the human will[38], has become a detriment to society.

Although Nietzsche insinuates that the aforementioned philosophers associated the meaning of the ascetic ideal with the maximization of their sense of power, he maintains that the very notion of the ascetic ideal is still "life against life." In fact, he goes so far as to say that the ascetic ideal is generated from an instinct to protect oneself from a degenerating life. What does Nietzsche mean by a degenerating life? If Nietzsche associates a life truly lived and enjoyed as one that pursues the passion of human emotions, which he affirms, then a *degenerating life* is one of weakness. The antithesis of Nietzsche's *Übermensch*[39], over 'overman', this degenerating individual runs to the ascetic ideal to escape the horror of a purposeless life. Nietzsche argues that this person is one of many that form part of the primarily religious European society of his day. He defines this mass of individuals as weak and sick, unable and unwilling to forcibly enact their personal wills. Nietzsche argues that these humans ignore or reject their power, and they constitute the vast majority of European society. Those who are effectively living a 'degenerative life' cling to the one thing that would give their life meaning or power, namely the ascetic ideal. However, how can a group of sick and weak individuals, who are living a powerless life, do anything within their own power[40]? Nietzsche claims that there is another member of society that encourages the masses to live out the ascetic ideal. Nietzsche introduces the ascetic priest, an individual that appears repeatedly throughout every society and in every era. This individual strives for power over the masses through the notions of guilt and shame. He is uniquely equipped to guide the

[38] And perhaps more importantly to Nietzsche, the value that religious institutions have placed on the ascetic ideal.
[39] The Oxford Languages Dictionary defines this individual the following way: "The ideal superior man of the future who could rise above conventional Christian morality to create and impose his own values, originally described by Nietzsche in *Thus Spake Zarathustra* (1883–85)."
[40] An example would be choosing to live out the ascetic ideal.

masses because he is spiritually well, as Nietzsche asserts that those who adhere to their passions are the spiritually well, while those who adhere to the ascetic ideal are spiritually sick.

Nietzsche emphasizes that it is impossible for the spiritual healthy to care for the spiritually unhealthy because the unhealthy would infect the healthy. Instead, he proposes that the ascetic priest finds his role in caring for the sick. He is already sick according to Nietzsche, but he should be slightly stronger than the masses so that he can dominate them. The ascetic priest has the responsibility of redirecting the blame of the masses from those who persecute them to the masses themselves, effectively rendering them useless both individually and collectively. Nietzsche argues that this system has created the concept of sin and shame, which keeps the unhealthy and weak separate from the spiritually healthy. The ascetic priest does not cure the masses, but only alleviates their suffering by redirecting their gaze to a heavenly setting distinct from their present lives, rendering the suffering of their current lives bearable. The ascetic priest fights the discontent the people experience by convincing them that their suffering is both a result of their sin and a necessary aspect of their refining[41]. The reward of the meek will come in the afterlife, making their present situations only temporary. The believer thus accepts the struggle of his or her life as a comprehensible trial and accepts his or her lot in the present day. According to Nietzsche, in opposition to the forceful enaction of the individual will, the ascetic priest utilizes the ascetic ideal to pacify the sick and weak. Effectively, the ascetic priest, stronger than the masses but still unwell, dominates them by imposing the ascetic ideal.

Nietzsche asserts that the only way that an individual could potentially oppose the ascetic ideal would be through the self. Therefore, the self, overcoming the ascetic ideal, is determined

[41] Effectively, Catholic and Christian believers argue that they are refined, or made more like Jesus, until they enter heaven in accordance with God's will. Hebrews 12:6 states, "because the Lord disciplines the one he loves, and he chastens everyone he accepts as his son" (*New International Version*).

to be the only way that an individual could overcome the dominant European philosophical system of the day. Furthermore, Nietzsche argues the epitome of one's life is found in one's energy and his or her will, as one's existence does not depend on what he or she is, but on what he or she does. Effectively, one must take action and ownership of one's existential situation and live in accordance with his or her natural desires. He asserts that an individual must free himself from all inherited traditions relating to magic, theology, anthropology, and positivism to take a stand against a degenerating life. A good life, then, is only found in freeing oneself from the belief systems and traditions that inhibit one's will. Nietzsche affirms that adherence to one's individual will, and the subsequent rejection of established beliefs, would permit the establishment of a new ethic and the maximization of potential for one's life.

Clearly, the progressive educational movement, spearheaded by *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, maintained similar values and appreciations for the individual free will. While progressives were not necessarily atheists like Nietzsche, their ideology was certainly at odds with the Church's teaching regarding submission to God's will. The Catholic Church, comprehending the Bible as the true word of God, emphasizes that submission to God's will over the will of the individual[42], as even the Lord's prayer states:

"Your kingdom come.

Your will be done,

On earth as it is in heaven" (*New International Version* Matthew 6:10). The influences of Nietzsche's philosophy on the Institution are clear, but it would be inappropriate to suggest that educational progressives had adopted all of Nietzsche's philosophy. In fact, a hallmark of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*'s ideology was unwavering faith in science. Vicente García

[42] Examples of this notion can be found in Psalms 40:8, Psalms 143:10, and Matthew 26:42.

Caballero highlights the ideology of those of distinct educational positions, particularly the division between faith in science and faith in God, the following way: "... todo esto pone de manifiesto a la división existente en esos momentos en el país en relación a la ruptura de la unión de la fe en este periodo, resurgiendo una pasión por la ciencia, de libertad de ciencia frente a la Iglesia, que a nivel universitario se traduce en libertad de enseñanza, conquista con la revolución el[sic] 68, pero que aún no cristalizada en la sociedad" (39)[43]. Nietzsche, however, rejected the notion that science could merely replace God as the sole contributor of truth for society. In his third essay of *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche argues that science does not create values, and as such it is incapable of opposing the ascetic ideal. Nietzsche rejects any and all knowledge that relates to religion and the idea of an objective point of view. He writes: "There is no such thing as an "objective" point of view;" (87). As a result, he is in opposition not only to the hard sciences, in their pursuit of one objective truth, but also in opposition to the Kantian notion of universal truths. The influence of Nietzsche with respect to the value of the free will for progressive educators is clear, but it must be stated that the ideology of the ILE was not wholly in alignment with this German philosopher. Nevertheless, any philosophical sympathies with Nietzschean ideas were certain to bring about increased tension with the traditional Catholic system of education, an entity Nietzsche relentlessly opposed.

Cementing this rising educational tension and extending it into the political, Vicente García Caballero highlights the existent discord between the two sides in *La educación en la España de finales del siglo XIX*. He argues that many attempts on the part of those in favor of a more progressive and liberal education were subverted by the Church in order to maintain control over all educational matters. The Church continued to maintain a tight grip on education, empowered

[43] Vicente García Caballero referenced the following work from the Fundación Francisco Giner de los Ríos: Bol. I.L.E. 1880 pp. 138.

by a highly religious nation. "Todo esto introdujo un inmovilismo en la gestión administrativa y en las reformas educativas debido al debate político entre Liberales, que proponían La Libertad de Cátedra en un Estado de Libertad de Conciencia, frente a Conservadores y la Derecha Católica, que ante un Estado Confesional resumía la necesidad del control ideológico por parte del Estado, pero algunos acuerdos progresistas pudieron sentar las bases en puntos importantes como la reforma de las enseñanzas en la instrucción primaria y Bachillerato, así como la autonomía de la Universidad" (38). Although there is no distinct point at which the boiling tension between the traditional and progressive educators reached its culmination[44], the early twentieth century represents an evolution toward progressive ideals, driven by mass migration to urban centers and new political ideas generated from growing social discontent.

Although educationally progressive ideals had grown their roots in the late nineteenth century through *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, created in 1876, many of the plans of the Institución for education reform were frustrated by the State and the Church in the late nineteenth century. Although they had some popular support, by and large the religiosity of the nation favored the Church's control over educational matters. This is evident in policies and laws that were passed like particular articles in the *Ley de Congregaciones* that defended the right of Catholic parents to educate their children in Catholic schools. However, the changing tides of democracy and capitalism in Spain brought about increased migration toward urban centers: "Asistimos a las primeras grandes corrientes migratorias hacia la ciudad, que trajeron de la mano una revolución considerable en las costumbres y creencias tradicionales" (Palacios 99). The urbanization of Spanish society gave rise to new issues and social problems, necessitating social discontent with

[44] Politically and socially, this specific point can be understood as the Spanish Civil War.

policies designed for a nation of a distinct time. As social opinions began to change regarding national matters, so too did political preferences and educational sympathies.

The establishment of La Segunda República in Spain, headed by Niceto Alcalá-Zamora, Diego Martínez Barrio, and Manuel Azaña in subsequent years, gave *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* its path to wide-scale acceptance, in part because *La Segunda República* viewed education as the key to social change. "La República siempre estuvo convencida de que el atraso español se podía superar con un Sistema Educativo adecuado. El gobierno de Azaña culpabilizó de aquél a los métodos llevados a cabo por el profesorado religioso y se centró en su sustitución por partidarios de los nuevos planteamientos, intentado erradicar la presencia social de la Iglesia. Se pretenderá establecer un sistema educativo unificado aplicando nuevos valores. Este nuevo modelo provocará tensiones políticas, tensiones en la sociedad y en el interior del propio magisterio, teniendo enfrente a los sectores más reaccionarios y conservadores" (Palacios 99). Backed by La Segunda República, progressive education began to overtake the Church as the primary institution for societal education and reform.

Although *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, particularly in the late nineteenth century, maintained distinct values from those of the Church, it did not necessarily deem the Church as a malignant institution for Spanish society. Rather, the ILE sought to improve the quality of life for all citizens through education. At the same time, La Segunda República launched an ideological assault on the dominance of the Church in an attempt to drive education from the Church's control: "El enfrentamiento laico-religioso tomó como campo de batalla la política educativa y la República proyectó la generalización de la enseñanza pública para liquidar así el monopolio de la Iglesia, aunque no lo permitirían ni el tiempo ni el dinero" (Palacios 100). Solidified through the *Misiones*

Pedagógicas[45], in which La República sought to provide a measure of culture to rural Spanish citizens, the transition toward a new morality began to take hold. The ILE, backed by this new political party, found itself necessarily at ideological odds with the Church. Not limited merely to education, La República and the ILE brought about an affront to Ecclesiastic education that, while extremely popular in the urban centers, would face significant hostility in the rural zones. "En las zonas rurales la incidencia de las nuevas corrientes llegaría a ser mínima. La fuerte presencia del sentimiento religioso marcaría ciertamente las pautas del comportamiento general" (Palacios 100). In the same way that some were offended by the Church's insistence on one sole belief system, that needed to be either be rejected or accepted, the push for secular education was met with animosity from the rural masses. Causing further social, political, and educational tension between the urban centers and the rural population, "[e]l anticlericalismo oficial cristalizaría en el decreto de 1932, que disolvía la Compañía de Jesús, y en la *Ley de Congregaciones Religiosas*, que, un año después, limitaba el ejercicio del culto católico, secularizaba los bienes eclesiásticos y expulsaba de la docencia a los regulares[46]" (Palacios 100). Given that the vast majority of the citizens lived in the urban centers, the keys to national education were placed firmly in the hands of progressives.

Consequently, the transition of influence among competing educational powers in Spain dramatically altered the evolution of ideas propagated within educational circles. Having moved toward a more secular education in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century,

[45] Durante aquel mismo verano de 1933, la República puso en marcha las llamadas *Misiones Pedagógicas*. Se pretendía acercar la cultura a los pueblos aislados. Profesores y estudiantes, principalmente de la Universidad de Madrid, llevaban medicamentos y libros, representaban obras de teatro clásicas, proyectaban películas y, con la cooperación de los aldeanos, construían escuelas. El recibimiento de las Misiones fue desigual, muchas veces dependiendo de la actitud que tomara el párroco local frente a las mismas. (Palacios 105).

[46] One interesting result of this law was that the profession of instructor gained some popularity, as the requirement for additional education necessitated an increase in pay and stability.

progressives approached issues within education heavily influenced by the philosophical developments of the time. As stated, Krause's philosophy significantly impacted the thought of the creators of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, but the expansion of secular education in Spain is due, at least in part, to a number of philosophical, political, and social circumstances. Like the rest of Europe, the increased focus on the sciences had a considerable impact on the conception of the foundation of education, leading to the questioning of the origin of knowledge. Simultaneously, the ideas of Auguste Comte began to take form in Spain. "La penetración de las ideas positivistas en España provoca, por los años 1875-1880, una verdadera ebullición intelectual que da lugar a violentos debates en el Ateneo (de Madrid, de Barcelona, etc.) y sobre todo en la prensa, entre los partidarios y los defensores de «los grandes principios morales, sociales y religiosos». El vehículo de las nuevas ideas son revistas como *Revista Contemporánea*, *Anales de Ciencias Médicas*, e incluso -y el dato es revelador de una nueva actitud intelectual de los krausistas- *El Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*" (Lissorgues). Comte's positivism, outlined in his book *Cours de philosophie positive*, affirms that, "... all knowledge regarding matters of fact is based on the "positive" data of experience and that beyond the realm of fact is that of pure logic and pure mathematics" (Feigl 1). As such, positivism aligned perfectly with the secularist educational ideology of progressives. In brief, Comte's positivism postulated that there existed a law of three stages within the intellectual development of humanity. The first phase, known as the theological, asserts that life's happenings can be elucidated by the supernatural. Comte argued that this phase was primitive because these supernatural powers were unable to be verified. The second phase, known as the metaphysical, maintains the same questions about life, but provides alternative answers in the form of perfecting principles or abstract entities. Comte argued that these responses were simply a method to argue that the original questions were

unanswerable, an excuse for their own inadequacy. The final stage, the positive, neglects causes of phenomena and seeks laws that rule these phenomena: "Humankind reached full maturity of thought only after abandoning the pseudo explanations of the theological and metaphysical phases and substituting an unrestricted adherence to scientific method" (Feigl 3). Although Comte's positivism moves toward a classification of the sciences, ultimately leading to the final science of sociology[47], the philosophy adopted by many progressives in Spanish educational circles represented a juxtaposition of Krause's and Comte's ideas.

IV. Auguste Comte and Krausism

The interrelation of Comte's positivism and Krausism is complex yet telling of the educational condition of the day in Spain. In the face of Europe's scientific progress, many of the scientific minds in Spain found Krause's philosophy to be too idealistic, necessitating the adoption of other philosophies in conjunction with Krausism. While not vehement *Krausistas* like the creators and propagators of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, many were educated and brought up in Spain during the blossoming of Krause's ideas. "Es muy significativo que los más excelsos cultivadores de las ciencias humanas que entran en España en la estela del movimiento positivista sean hombres que en sus años de formación pasaron por las aulas de los profesores krausistas o por las de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza" (Lissorgues). Consequently, the juxtaposition of the scientific spirit in Spain and Krause's philosophy present a unique ideology adopted by many Spanish progressives. "Efectivamente, el movimiento krausista español alcanza su plena madurez histórica cuando deja de ser un sistema metafísico-filosófico homogéneo, es decir, cuando los creadores de La Institución Libre de Enseñanza (1876) matizan sus doctrinas, hasta tal punto que en adelante el krausismo puede llamarse *Institucionalismo*, y cuando los discípulos de Sanz del

[47] "Para Auguste Comte (1798-1857), las leyes de encadenamiento de las varias ciencias forman la ciencia última que es la sociología; así considerada es la filosofía del sistema, su objeto es la Humanidad" (Lissorgues).

Río y de Giner asimilan parte de las nuevas corrientes positivistas forman esa otra nebulosa denominada *krauso-positivismo*" (Lissorgues). Spanish progressives embraced a sort of hybrid philosophy aimed at embodying the spirit of the times and the notion that the individual was improvable[48]. Although Spanish citizens did not immediately reject of the existence of a personal God, an idea promoted by the Catholic Church, *krauso-positivismo* represents a perceptible shift in the educational ideology of the day, particularly with respect to the notion and purpose of knowledge. This philosophical attitude toward an individual's betterment through scientific progress and one's perfectibility permeating throughout education would have significant social and political repercussions.

V. Anarchism and the Spanish Educational System

In addition to the changes brought about by the spirit of scientific progress and notion of one's perfectibility, clearly separate from any religious concept, progressives became increasingly frustrated with the social state of Spain in the early twentieth century. The country was clearly divided, with many maintaining allegiance to the traditional teachings of the Church, while others seeking a complete overhaul of a country they saw in decline. Many progressives in the early twentieth century, many of whom were educated in the new educational context[49], sought to cement their ideas for a new nation through political action. While socialism had firmly taken hold of many in Spain in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, anarchism was primarily appealed to the marginalized working classes. The rise of capitalism in Spain and Europe

[48] Para Giner, como para Krause y Sanz del Río, el hombre es un ser perfectible en sus diversas cualidades racionales, sentimentales, sociales, estéticas, físicas...; es una unidad orgánica, expresión de «la bondad de la naturaleza»; ninguna de sus cualidades, ninguno de sus atributos debe menospreciarse. Despreciar al cuerpo «es olvidar la ley de la armonía divina en la humanidad» (cit. en Abellán, 1989a, pág. 157).

[49] Although causal relationship between the influence of those educated with Krausist ideals and their subsequent shift toward anarchism has been debated, it is highly likely that the progressive ideas of La Institución Libre de Enseñanza paved the way for the influx of new European ideas like anarchism.

as a whole, traditionalists unwillingness to adapt to the changing times, and the poor conditions of workers led to remarkable interest in anarchist ideas throughout Spain, but most notably in Catalonia. "From its inception, Spanish anarchism was part of the larger international movement. Its philosophy and doctrines were profoundly influenced by ideas of Proudhon, Michael Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin" (Alexander 40). Although there were multiple factions of anarchism growing in Spain simultaneously, some of the more popular factions were the peasant and workers anarchism in Andalucía and the anarcho-syndicalism in Catalonia. The former, known as La Asociación Internacional de Trabajadores (AIT), enjoyed considerable nationwide attention before the Spanish Civil War. "Without question, one of the two anarchist theoreticians who had most influence on Spanish anarchism was Michael Bakunin. He was the one who sent an Italian follower to Spain to win the incipient labor movement there over to anarchism, first in Madrid, and then in Barcelona, giving rise to the Spanish anarchist movement" (Alexander 9). Although Bakunin never personally went to Spain, his anarchist ideology took hold within various sects of the working class in Catalonia and Madrid. In theory and practice, Bakunin was an enemy of the State[50], an enemy of the Church[51], and a fierce proponent of radical social revolution. These attributes are hallmarks of the Spanish anarchist movement during the last years of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. Although the trouble for the Spanish anarchist

[50] "It is evident that all the so-called general interests of society supposedly represented by the State, which in reality are only the general and permanent negation of the positive interests of the regions, communes, associations, and a vast number of individuals subordinated to the State, constitute an abstraction, a fiction, a falsehood, and that the State is like a vast slaughterhouse and an enormous cemetery, where under the shadow and the pretext of this abstraction all the best aspirations, all the living forces of a country, are sanctimoniously immolated … " (Alexander 11).

[51] Bakunin positions himself as an enemy of the Christian religion, arguing that, "[f]or ten centuries Christianity, armed with the omnipotence of Church and State and opposed by no competition, was able to deprave, debase, and falsify the mind of Europe. It had no competitors, because outside of the Church there were neither thinkers nor educated persons" (40). According to Bakunin, the Church provided the eternal mirage in order to distract the people that they were giving their political and social liberty over to the ruling classes. Bakunin, therefore, argues that Christianity, and inherently Judaism, has led to the creation of unequal societies. (*God and the State*).

movement to define an alternative system to the system they opposed has been well-documented[52], it is clear that revolution was a vital aspect of its development.

Although the anarchist revolution had taken hold of European intellectuals and the working class in major Spanish cities, there were many within Spain that rejected aspects of anarchy, namely violent revolution. Much of Pío Baroja's work in the early nineteenth century deals with the social issues plaguing Spanish society. Many of Baroja's characters in his novels maintain and exchange ideas relating to the political happenings of the early twentieth century in Spain, providing a series of historically plausible situations to critique or represent the particular epoch. A prominent ideology reflected through the characters of many of Baroja's novels is anarchism. Of his own position, Baroja writes in *Juventud, egolatría*: "Yo he sido siempre un liberal radical, individualista y anarquista. Primero enemigo de la Iglesia, después del Estado; mientras esos dos grandes poderes estén en lucha, partidario del Estado contra la Iglesia; el día que el Estado prepondere, enemigo del Estado" (Baroja 19). Clearly, Baroja's anarchist position does not correspond directly to the political ideology of anarchism, but rather that for which it stands, unrestricted individual liberty. Although there are many characters in Baroja's novels that adhere to one form of anarchy or another, namely Jesús[53] and Mingote[54] in *Mala hierba* and Manuel[55] in *Aurora roja*, Baroja clearly diverges from this political ideology. "Los desheredados de Baroja optan en general por el anarquismo, pero más que como un ideal político consciente "de clase",

[52] "Although the Spanish anarchists endorsed different aspects of the Bakunin and Kropotkin versions of anarchist philosophy at various times, they did not officially present a detailed picture of the kind of society they wanted to create to displace capitalism until May 1936, two months before the outbreak of the Civil War" (Alexander).
[53] Jesús rejects authority and eternity (Colin 435), but also dreams of a utopian society possible through the innately good nature of humans freed from societal obligations.
[54] Mingote can be understood as anarchist only loosely, given his belief in anarchism of the will.
[55] In *Aurora roja*, Manuel reports, "... a mí la anarquía me parece bien, con tal que venga en seguida y le dé a cada uno los medios de tener su casita, un huertecillo y tres o cuatro horas de trabajo; pero para hacer más que hablar y hablar, como hacéis vosotros, para llamarse compañeros y saludarse diciendo '¡salud!', para eso prefiero ser sólo impresor" (562).

asumen estas ideas como un modo de autoafirmación individual frente a la adversidad del medio" (Mauro 13). The self-affirmation of the individual, and primarily the individual will, is a prominent feature of Baroja's work, and a clear affirmation of specific elements of anarchist ideology and the aforementioned Nietzschean valuation of the will. The literary anarchism and exaltation of the freedom of the will are evident in Baroja's style and novels[56]: "El anarquismo está presente en estas obras, pero más que como ideología política organizada, como manifestación de rebeldía, de autoafirmación individual. Baroja simpatiza con el anarquismo, pero no en el plano político de las luchas obreras, sino más bien en sus planteamientos éticos; el anarquismo para él es un método de crítica social y un modo de liberación individual" (Mauro 30). However, in opposition to the political anarchism of the day in Spain, which often called for revolution to achieve an ultimate improvement to life for the individual and collective, Baroja finds no solution to the issues that plague mankind. Therefore, Baroja's anarchism is not revolutionary, but merely intellectual and ideological. This position was not limited only to Baroja in Spain, but to other prominent intellectuals from the country that most influenced the La Asociación Internacional de Trabajadores in Catalonia.

Much like his compatriot Michael Bakunin, Leo Tolstoy, and to a lesser degree Fyodor Dostoevsky, shared some notion of intellectual sympathy for the ideology of anarchism. Although the social situation of Russia was very different from that of Spain, some common elements, namely the issue of workers' conditions[57], plagued both nations. In Tolstoy's essay "On Anarchy," he writes, "[t]he Anarchists are right in everything; in the negation of the existing order and in the assertion that, without Authority there could not be worse violence than that of Authority under

[56] As evidenced through the ending of *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*.
[57] While Spain's issue dealt with workers, the Russia situation is distinct in its abolition of serfdom beginning in 1861.

existing conditions. They are mistaken only in thinking that anarchy can be instituted by a violent revolution" (1). Like Baroja, there is a rejection of the possibility of success for those who embark on violent revolution in the face of systemic oppression. Tolstoy argues that a violent response merits a violent reaction, and thus the only form of enacting meaningful change to a self-serving institution would be, "... to fight the Government by means of thought, speech, actions, life, neither yielding to Government nor joining its ranks and thereby increasing its power" (1). In opposition to Bakunin's fierce affirmation of social revolution, Tolstoy argues that the only permanent revolution is that of the "regeneration of the inner man" through Christianity. While this conclusion is certainly distinct from Baroja's, it represents a similar conclusion to Dostoevsky, who argued that the only way to regenerate the inner person was through a deeply personal religious regeneration[58]. While anarchist ideas are prevalent in Dostoevsky's work, primarily in *Notes from Underground* and *Demons*, it is difficult to argue that Dostoevsky had any sympathy for anarchist political ideals. One could even argue that his elucidation of Pyotr's anarchist group in *Demons* is purposefully satirical toward the anarchist ideals of violent revolution. However, the protagonist's argument in *Notes from Underground* approaches anarchist ideology, as he pursues ultimate ideological freedom in the form of a life lived as a means without end. In effect, the process of becoming, but never fully being, can be considered an anarchist notion. Furthermore, Dostoevsky emphasizes that the individual is primary, although his proposal for individual peace is much more akin to Tolstoy than Baroja. Much like the Spanish social, educational, and political situation, the Russian social and political state in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries reveals a period of crisis between traditional and progressive values. The rising tension of this

[58] Dostoevsky was an Eastern Orthodox Christian.

epoch led to significant conflicts, both ideological and physical, between those of opposing sides in both nations during the first half of the twentieth century.

VI. The Russian Novel and the Russian Political Scene

Although one of the primary features of Spanish history is the conflict between traditionalists and progressives on the educational front, which was both influential to and revealing of the social conflict of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, an equally determining conflict for the Russian empire was the issue of the abolition of serfdom. Politically, Russia differed significantly from the Spanish State in the late nineteenth century, even if anarchist ideals had been introduced and began to circulate around the same time. Russia had maintained an autocracy since the fifteenth century, a level of governmental consistency that the more centralized Spain could never possibly imagine in this particular epoch[59], with the tsarist regime maintaining absolute authority. The tsar, effectively a sovereign, employed various bureaucratic individuals in his or her name, beginning with Ivan III in 1462 and lasting until 1905. Usually closely aligned with the Eastern Orthodox Church, the tsar was given significantly more power than monarchs in Europe during the same time period. Despite this political difference between Spain and Russia, both nations shared a rising social tension caused by the emergence of progressive ideals originating from the influence of various western European nations. The prevalence of these new ideas in Russia, particularly around the midpoint of the nineteenth century, generated a boom in Russian literature. "The most celebrated period of Russian literature was the nineteenth century[60], which produced, in a remarkably short period, some of the indisputable masterworks of world

[59] The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

[60] "Beginning about 1860, Russian culture was dominated by a group known as the “intelligentsia,” a word that English borrowed from Russian but which means something rather different in its original Russian usage. In the word’s narrow sense, the “intelligentsia” consisted of people who owed their primary allegiance not to their profession or class but to a group of men and women with whom they shared a common set of beliefs, including a fanatic faith in revolution, atheism, and materialism." (Morson).

literature" (Morson 4). Perhaps the two most influential writers of this Russian literary boom, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, represent agents of significant social change not only for Russia, but also for Spain and the rest of Europe.

To comprehend the backdrop of the novel in Russia, and primarily the works of Dostoevsky, it is imperative that we comprehend the historical situation within Russia. This situation, one that some have referred to as static history[61] until Lenin, is plagued with the 'peasant question', that is, the question regarding the role of the serf or peasant within a modernizing society. The complicated state of the serf and his or her relationship to nobility and the autocracy in Russia is highlighted extensively in David Moon's comprehensive book *The Abolition of Serfdom in Russia: 1762-1907*. In accordance with the title, Moon highlights the social, political, and historical state of Russia, pertaining primarily to the drawn-out process of abolishing serfdom in the country. This gradual process effectively preserves Russia's social structure established during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

"The main reason why the state bound a large part of its peasant population to nobles' land was to support its military forces" (Moon 9). Given Russia's massive borders and landmass, there was a constant need for military personnel to be ready for action at a moment's notice. A consequence of this issue was the expense incurred to the people, as the government funded their military salaries through taxation. Although financial resources were at a minimum for Russia during the sixteenth century, the state identified a method to utilize its significant resources, yielding resources from its land, to address the issue at hand. To repay individuals for their service in the military, primarily nobles who were demonstrating their fealty to the tsar through service, the state guaranteed these individuals land and a workforce to cultivate it. Thus, the state began a

[61] Russia was primarily a feudalist society until the Revolution of 1917.

process to bind significant portions of their citizens, mainly peasants, to the land, effectively making large quantities of the population serfs. Given the ties between the nobility and the state at the time, there was little done to prevent the exploitation of these large bodies of people. This practice of binding individuals to land and relegating them to the status of serfs was done for over two centuries. Although Peter III brought an end to the practice in 1762, the precedent for society had already been established. "Peter III's act in 1762 ended this hierarchy of service in which nobles served the state and serfs served nobles" (Moon 2). However, while nobles were no longer obliged to serve the state directly through military or civic service, serfs were not liberated from the land. Feudalism had become a very profitable system for both the state and the nobility, as both sought to maximize the extraction of resources from these individuals. The complexity of the relationships between the primary national entities in Russia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the autocracy, nobles, and serfs, created a difficult road to the abolition of serfdom.

The relationship between the tsar and the nobility between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries can be understood as cautious fealty, as the tsar depended on the complicity of the nobles to maintain his power and the nobility depended on the tsar for their elevated role in society. An example of this complex relationship was the compensation and control given to nobles for their service in the government. "Serfdom gave the nobility control over the labour of roughly half the peasant population of the Russian Empire" (Moon 14). Had nobles been expected to participate in military and social service without such compensation, it is not difficult to see the possibility of an upheaval of the governance of autocracy. Likewise, the subordination of the majority of the population, those consigned to the land[62], to a select few demonstrates the importance of the

[62] Those who were consigned to the land were peasants, many becoming serfs for the rest of their lives.

nobility to the tsars during this epoch[63]. Equally complicated, the relationship between serfs and the nobility can be understood as, generally, an unequal relationship. While there are exceptions to this generality, some serfs were given education and high status under the tutelage of their noble masters, the vast majority of serfs were uneducated and heavily exploited. Most serfs were expected to work prolonged hours on the lands owned by nobles. However, nobles were heavily outnumbered by serfs, which led to a persistent fear of social rebellion. Although serfs were certainly given the short end of the stick, many serfs were given plots of land within the noble's expanse to develop their own crops and living quarters to remain on the land at all times, a deal that functioned as a form of appeasement for the serfs. Furthermore, some serf communities were given a sliver of autonomy, but the community was always at the mercy of a noble changing his or her mind. Despite their precarious recompense, the condition of the serf was highly restricted within Russian society. Serfs did not have freedom to move, were at the mercy of the policing of their noble masters, and could be sold at a moment's notice. Given the complex relationships between the serfs and the nobility, much like the mindful relationship between the tsar and the nobility[64], the abolition of serfdom was a long time coming.

Although the exact origins of the notion of serf liberation are difficult to determine, it is clear that a multitude of factors, including intellectual, social, and geopolitical influence, were prominent in the movement toward serf freedom. Beginning in the early eighteenth century, the autocracy, despite benefiting significantly from feudalism, took notice of the opposition experienced by a great number of serfs. "In 1724 Peter the Great expressed the view that his

[63] The tsar needed to ensure that the nobility would remain loyal to him, so he provided a profitable situation for the nobility by giving them land and most of Russia's population to work it.
[64] Although the relationship between the tsar and the serfs has been hotly debated, it is believed that they did maintain some fealty to the tsar. One dominant argument for the reason for this faithfulness to the tsar includes the notion that serfs were ignorant to the true intentions of the tsar, believing his desire to liberate them if not for the will of the nobility.

peasant subjects should be cared for and protected against excessive exploitation" (Moon 16). Peter the Great was just one of many tsars that, although extent and intention is difficult to measure, sympathized with Russian serfs[65]. Thus, returning to the complex relationship between the autocracy and the nobility, it is clear that an outright abolition of serfdom would have caused great social distress at the time. While the morality of such a decision is in question, it is obvious that such a decision would jeopardize the autocracy. In fact, it is evident that both the nobility and the tsar worked in self-interest. Furthermore, the vast majority of the members of the nobility worked in order to maintain serfdom for as long as feasibly possible. However, the reforms to the military during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries changed Russia considerably, as the nation became a major European power (Moon 32). Coupled with the Peter the III's act of 1762, numerous sections of the Russian population began to voice their opposition to serfdom[66]. Although some have argued for the significant role of Russian intellectuals in the abolition of serfdom, it is more likely that the combination of Russian Europeanization, the influence of liberal ideas following the European Enlightenment, and structural changes to Russia's economy and society had more to do with the abolition of this abusive system.

Given Russia's practice of serfdom and the expanse of land traversing from eastern Europe to far-reaching points in Asia, Russia's economic growth lagged significantly behind that of many European nations[67]. The addition of the monumental number of illiterate peasants and the rural

[65] Catherine the Great and Alexander II both clearly took interest in the state of serfs in their time.
[66] Moon argues that many of the historians' arguments for a 'peasant moment' bear the marks of common state thought at the time, namely Marxist ideas that there must be a rebellion for the proletariat to rise up. Moon presents a nuanced argument demonstrating that the abolition of serfdom was primarily a result of efforts of those outside of serfdom.
[67] "Throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, Russia's economy developed more slowly than did that of the major European nations to its west. Russia's population was substantially larger than those of the more developed Western countries, but the vast majority of the people lived in rural communities and engaged in relatively primitive agriculture" (Curtis 33).

nature of the country further slowed the progressive social development that had taken hold during the Enlightenment in Europe during the eighteenth century. This is not to say that Russia did not experience considerable transformation during this time period, but Russia's geography worked against the rapid exchange of new ideas common to the Enlightenment. When Enlightenment ideas did arrive, they caused many to reconsider the social fabric that made up Russian life, namely the role of serfdom within society. "European Enlightenment argued that human beings were essentially good, but were constrained by oppressive institutions such as serfdom, which should therefore be reformed (Hampson, 1968)." (Moon 29). Although notions of serf liberation had been circulating prior to the nineteenth century, they took hold following the Enlightenment, particularly among intellectuals[68]. Although there was hope of serf liberation among these groups, very little changed during the first half of the nineteenth century, confirming the notion of Russia's static history. Despite the efforts of intellectuals, even those educated in Europe liberally in the nobility and some government officials with progressive ideals, serfdom continued unabated in Russia. "Nevertheless, Russian serfdom was becoming an anachronism as similar systems of unfree labour were being abolished throughout east-central Europe, and had largely disappeared in western Europe by the end of the middle ages (Blum, 1978)" (Moon 22). The educated elite, those typically with the financial resources to dedicate considerable time to the question of serfdom, were those given the most voice in the matter, but ultimately, the decision would rest in the hands of the tsar and his autocracy. To comprehend the influence, however minimal, that these intellectuals[69] had on the autocracy's decision, it is imperative that we highlight some of the major developments with regard to the question of serfdom during the nineteenth century.

[68] "Enlightened, humanitarian arguments against personal bondage were a secular version of older, radical religious objections (Hilton, 1973; 207-213)" (Moon 29).

[69] "Members of both main intellectual movements - Slavophiles and westernizers - were opposed to serfdom" (Moon 30).

Although the philosophical ideals of the Enlightenment played a prominent role in the influence of intellectuals with respect to their desire to reform serfdom, other ideas were proposed apart from those on ethical grounds. "Nevertheless, both economic factors and social stability influenced intellectuals, nobles, state officials and the tsars themselves when they considered the future of serfdom" (Moon 27). The Russian economy was designed always to favor the State, first and foremost, and then the nobility. One result of this economic bias was the notorious high spending and indebtedness of the nobility, which further accentuated the country's economic issues. Intellectuals argued that serfdom was to the detriment of the nation both due to the effect it had on the economy and the unequal bond it placed on a majority of the nation's citizens. Furthermore, many intellectuals came from noble families, yet they argued against the system that had benefited them. Most intellectuals were clearly motivated to dismantle the system of serfdom because they believed it was one of most detrimental systems to Russian society. Intellectuals like Chicherin, Tolstoy, and Turgenev, and briefly Dostoevsky[70] played prominent roles in bringing attention to the issue of serfdom in a modernizing society. "In 1856, in an article published anonymously in *Voices from Russia*, the westernizer Chicherin saw the abolition of serfdom as a precursor to a range of reforms he believed Russia needed" (Moon 57). Although these intellectuals dealt with considerable censorship on the part of the Russian state, their works had an influence on the few individuals, some of whom were high ranking officials in the state, who were literate in Russia. "Aware that the censors would not permit direct attacks Turgenev followed Radishchev's example and used a literary device" (Moon 30). Although their true influence has

[70] "He had recently been released from four years in penal servitude for his role in the Petrashevsky circle*, an alleged conspiracy of utopian socialists, dedicated in part to alleviating the plight of the peasantry"; "Unlike his contemporary Leo Tolstoy, Dostoevsky did not make peasant life a focal point of his creativity. He is best known as an urban writer, probing the depths of the individual psyche against the bleak backdrop of St. Petersburg's slums. While he shared Tolstoy's faith in the innate goodness of the Russian common folk, the *narod*, his attention as a writer was drawn toward the moral dilemmas of Russia's educated society" (Knight Summary).

been debated in a widely illiterate society, it is clear that their notoriety brought some attention to their critique of the Russian social system. Despite the full-fledged opposition to serfdom from intellectuals and the hesitant consideration of the abolishing of serfdom from those within the autocracy, there was some in favor of this traditional system.

As highlighted, the vast majority of intellectuals opposed the feudal system imposed during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Russia, but there was not a complete consensus intellectually. "Not all Russian intellectuals opposed serfdom. One of the most prominent writers of the first half of the nineteenth century, Nicholas Gogol, defended the institution in a collection of letters published in 1847 as *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. In contrast to many of his educated contemporaries, Gogol did not accept the enlightened, liberal notion that people were inherently good but were constrained and oppressed by institutions, such as serfdom, that inhibited human freedom. Rather, he adhered to the Christian belief in 'original sin', which taught that, after Adam and Eve's fall from grace, people were innately sinful and needed to be protected from their own base instincts" (Moon 31). Interestingly, Dostoevsky, an Eastern Orthodox Christian, maintained similar beliefs regarding the individual's innate sinfulness, yet he starkly opposed the system of serfdom. While it is a subject less emphasized in his novels, there is a resistance to the practice of serfdom on the same Christian grounds that Gogol utilizes. Peculiarly, these two drew distinct conclusions regarding this feudal system through their religious faith. Outside of the intellectual realm, there was expected resistance to the notion of the abolition of serfdom from those who benefited most from the practice, namely the nobility. One primary argument against the abolition of serfdom proposed that the social fabric of the nation, and it must be emphasized that this social state favored those making the argument, would be in jeopardy if serfs were liberated. This stemmed from a very low opinion about the natural ability of serfs to

maintain social order without the policing of the nobility. Vasilij Aleksandrovič Dolgorukov, an advisor to the tsar, highlights this negative opinion following the tsar Alexander II's inquiries into the question of the peasant in Russia. "In his report for 1857, moreover, Dolgorukov noted that the majority of nobles feared that peasants lacked the education to comprehend civil rights, and that if they were given full freedom they would behave like 'wild animals', leading inevitably to disorders, robberies and murders" (Moon 59). Although Moon has highlighted that there were relatively few social disturbances on the part of the serfs during the last official years of serfdom, the concern of the nobility is revealing of the relationships they maintained with the serfs that served them. Although the majority of the nobility was reluctant to grant serfs their freedom, when the time came for the abolition of serfdom, there was little public opposition to the tsar's decision.

In 1861, peasants made up the majority of the nation's population, effectively outnumbering the rest of the Russian population by over 21 million. "At the time, there were around 22 million peasants (35% of Russian population) and 100,000 noble estate owners" (Moon 5). Russia, as a whole, was a completely rural society, a stark contrast to other developed European nations that had begun to see mass migration to urban centers. However, due to a combination of economic interests, progressive ideals regarding the oppression of the serfs, new intellectual ideas, and a desire to modernize the nation, the tsar Alexander II's began the process to abolish serfdom. "The legislation Alexander II ratified on 19 February 1861 was lengthy - around 360 pages of printed text - and very complicated, as befitted the scale and complexity of the task" (Moon 69). Although many intellectuals critiqued the bureaucratic language of the text and others argued that the measures did not meet the needs of the peasants, the statutes laid out a process to gradually abolish serfdom.

The statutes outlined in the text consisted of three distinct stages. The first stage, known as the 'transitional period', consisted of a two-year period where effectively nothing would change. In a sense, this 'transitional period' functioned to prepare serfs and the nobility to come to terms with the new order and prepare for life without serfdom. The second stage, 'temporary obligation', "... the freed serfs were guaranteed permanent use rights of allotments of land in return for fixed obligations…" (70). In effect, peasants gained some measure of freedom during this period, as the move toward autonomy was put into place. In the final stage, the 'redemptive operation', peasants could purchase the land they lived on from the nobles and begin a forty-nine-year process of paying off their purchase. The government, dealing with a banking crisis, established a loan system by which the peasants would pay 5 percent interest yearly for their purchase. Although it can be argued that this resolution benefitted the peasants, as it made them proprietors, the nobility benefited perhaps more so from these statutes[71]. The tsar Alexander II's decision to give the superior deal to the nobility is in alignment with the idea that the nobility needed to be placated in order for them to agree to the deal[72], as a lack of participation in this abolition would have led to significant social unrest. In an economic sense, serfs were consigned to be in debt and to make mortgage payments to the state for a considerable amount of time, while the nobility was effectively paid out up front. While most had paid their debts by the start of the twentieth century, it cannot be said that serfs were placed on equal footing to the nobility during the nineteenth century[73]. Nevertheless, alternative conclusions have been drawn from the abolition of serfdom, with one being the Leninist idea that the abolition of serfdom paved a way for the rise of the

[71] Serfs were given land of lesser quality "In the non-black earth and black earth zones of Great Russia' etc., estate owners were guaranteed to retain at least one-third of the productive land on their estates" (Moon 76).
[72] "The terms of the redemption operations were, however, made favourable to the nobles to encourage them to opt for it, and thus transfer the peasants on their estates to the final stage of the reform process" (Moon 80).
[73] "Most radical intellectuals believed that peasant living standards were in decline following, and as a result of, the terms of the abolition of serfdom" (Moon 119).

modern industrial proletariat[74]. The other, however, asserts that the tsar Alexander II delayed revolution and saved the autocracy by pacifying both the nobility and providing the peasants with a disputed *improved* quality of life through ownership and freedom.

VII. The Cultural Inheritance of Serfdom and the Social Crisis of Russia

Following the declared abolition of serfdom, a crisis of national proportions challenged the relatively unchanged, albeit unequal, Russian society. Centuries earlier, the social hierarchy in Russian society, the *sosloviia*, had defined feudal sectionalization based on birth. The designation of citizens into the five categories, the clergy [*dukhovenstvo*], nobility [*dvorianstvo*], merchantry [*kupechestvo*], middling urbanites [*meshchanstvo*], and peasantry [*krest'ianstvo*], clashed with Peter I's social Table of Ranks proposal, "to open service careers to people of talent and ability, rather than birth status" (Kimball). Although the proposal for a new social structure sought to provide a more equitable environment to move about socially[75], Peter never fully dismantled the *sosloviia*. Consequently, the social hierarchy in Russia found itself in a tense and precarious situation long before the abolition of serfdom. The abolition simply added more fuel to the flame, presenting challenges for individuals who believed they did not fit into any of the prescribed designations.

In the late 1870s, a group of public intellectuals, who fit this mold, began to actively engage in Russian affairs. They were known as the *intelligentsia*[76]. Due to the modernization of Russia

[74] Many historians have also made a direct link between what they have seen as the limitations of the 1861 reform and the peasant revolutions of the early twentieth century (Acton, 1970: 50-1; Shanin, 1986: 92). All attempts to make a direct, causal link between the abolition of serfdom and the rural revolutions, however, rely too heavily on hindsight. Just because the reform of 1861 was followed around half a century later by two peasant revolutions does not necessarily mean that one caused the other" (Moon 123).

[75] The *Table of Ranks* included compartments for civilian, military, church, and the royal court.

[76] The use of the word 'Intelligentsia' has been employed in a number of ways in Russian history, but it in the 1870s, "[t]he word supplied a taxonomic label for a distinct group of people whose professional identity or public function were no longer described by the traditional categories of the Russian social structure into which they were born, nor did they fit the categories of the state's own rankings and definitions of state service" (Kimball 1). Although many

and the pursuit of education or a career, many individuals found themselves unable to find an adequate place in either the *sosloviia* or the *Table of Ranks*. "Seeking new lives as old social-estate definitions failed them, they found it difficult or repugnant to accept positions within the service hierarchy, the other major category of social existence in the Russian tradition" (Kimball). Rather, Alan Kimball points out that many of these intellectuals took positions as economic managers, journalists, teachers, physicians, financial planners, and writers. Many of the intelligentsia, along with other intellectuals, criticized the lack of intellectual and economic progress in the country[77], a common theme in Russian literature in the nineteenth century. This period is often referred to as the "Golden Era" of Russian literature, as literary giants such as Alexander Pushkin, Nikolai Gogol, Anton Chekhov, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky received international recognition for their work. Although their literary contributions cannot be simplified to one overarching theme, a common denominator was the portrayal of Russia's obstructions to national progress both internally and internationally.

Fyodor Dostoevsky held sympathies with the cause of the *Intelligentsia* in the 1840s, but ultimately opposed the moral depravity and intellectual superiority he associated with this group after his exile. In fact, his exile is due to these circumstances, or specifically his involvement with a group that sought to free the peasantry from their woeful circumstances, known as the Petrashevsky Circle. The Petrashevsky Circle consisted of individuals with socialist sympathies that aimed to create a revolution in Russia. Fearful of a repeat of the *Revolutions of 1848*, the tsar Nicolas I had Dostoevsky arrested for his involvement and he was sentenced to death on November 16, 1849. Although Dostoevsky was famously spared from the death penalty only moments before

---

have classified the *Intelligentsia* as merely a group of revolutionaries in Russia, Lenin held very low opinions of these individuals and sought to distance the Communist Party from them.

[77] A common critique set forth in Spain by Spanish intellectuals as well at the time.

his execution, other members of the Circle were not so fortunate to escape death[78]. Dostoevsky's sympathies for the cause[79] of the *Intelligentsia* faded following his escape from death and conversion to Eastern Orthodox Christianity. He would later criticize the supposed moral and intellectual superiority of the *Intelligentsia* in his novels, including *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground*. In *Notes from Underground*, the protagonist, an educated writer, is constantly filled with the Romantic writings of European authors and believes himself morally and intellectually superior to other Russian citizens. Likewise, Raskolnikov, in *Crime and Punishment*, represents "a general moral disintegration" of Russian society through the use of an educated individual with a superiority complex (De Jonge 87). Despite Dostoevsky's critique of ideals popular to the *Intelligentsia*, he remained an opponent of serfdom and reflected issues with the Russian cultural inheritance of this system in his work.

Dr. Clint Walker, in his article titled "On Serfdom, Sickness, and Redemption: The Peter the Great Subtext in *Crime and Punishment*," makes a nuanced argument for the inheritance of a sort of cultural sickness[80], prevalent primarily in the educated classes and the *Intelligentsia*, due to reforms instituted by Peter the Great and the remnants of serfdom. He writes, "[f]or Dostoevsky, the Emancipation of 1861 liberated the serfs from external or legal bondage, but it did not free the educated class from the spiritual bondage and national guilt that were byproducts of the Petrine Reforms" (94). The aforementioned protagonists, Raskolnikov and the writer in *Notes from Underground*, support this argument. Although Dostoevsky recognized the important cultural work that Peter the Great completed, he nonetheless emphasized the issues created by his

[78] Mikhail Petrashevsky himself died while in exile.
[79] Primarily the institution of western political systems such as socialism.
[80] This is a direct quote from Dostoevsky's notebook in 1865:"With Peter's reforms and European life we took into ourselves the bourgeois form of life and separated ourselves from the people, as in the West. From this [action] consciousness and self-analysis developed, but material for [living] knowledge (directly from the life of the people) continually grew less and less (The Day, No. 5, 1865) PSS, XX, 194." (Walker 108).

reforms[81]. Walker emphasizes that, "*Crime and Punishment* represents Dostoevsky's attempt to bring this cultural disease to the surface in the hope that it might lead toward national healing and renewal, for as he notes in "Two Camps of Theorists":

It is not a sickness that is in the full view of all that is dangerous…but one which lies deeply hidden, one which has still not come to the surface …. It is the same in society…

Dostoevsky's grappling with Russia's cultural disease did not end with *Crime and Punishment*; the subsequent appearance of *Demons* and *The Brothers Karamazov* suggests that he found the malady far more pernicious, widespread and deep-rooted than he at first suspected" (108). As a result, the abolition of serfdom, coupled with Russia's already unstable social identity, led Dostoevsky to address social issues plaguing Russian society. With the exploration of the exercise of the individual will despite obstructive environmental circumstances, Dostoevsky's protagonists represent both the individual and collective crisis of Russian society.

In recognition of the contentious political, social, and cultural stage set in both Russia and Spain, it is clear that the influx of progressive ideas, including the Nietzschean idea of a godless society, positivist ideology, and anarchist ideas, led to a significant general national crisis on both the collective and individual level. The addition of the social unrest of both nations allows for a better understanding of the context in which Baroja and Dostoevsky wrote and the ways this influenced their work.

[81] "Despite Dostoevsky's belief in the historical necessity of Peter, who he felt stimulated the development of Russia's national self-consciousness, by the mid-1860s he nonetheless concurred with the Slavophiles that the Petrine cultural inheritance represented a kind of national "sickness" from which educated Russians still needed to free themselves" (Walker 93).

Chapter III

Nothingness and Spirituality

I. Institutional Inadequacy and Vitality

Harmony between Reason and Vitality in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*

Pío Baroja's *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* portrays a spiritual journey undertaken by the protagonist Fernando Ossorio, an individual who functions as a conveyer of issues plaguing Spanish society at the turn of the century. More concretely, Baroja's novel, published in 1902, relays the tensions boiling over between progressive and traditional ideologies in the early twentieth century. With respect to societal issues, Baroja critiques the pedagogical role of the Catholic Church, an institution that he asserts acts as an oppositional agent to individual creativity and the human will. Consequently, Baroja's persistent focus on Fernando Ossorio's spiritual qualms exhibits his assertion that the individual must live with vitality, a concept also addressed by Friedrich Nietzsche in the late nineteenth century and by José Ortega y Gasset more than two decades after the publication of the novel in 1923. To illustrate the practical ramifications of this societal and spiritual tension Baroja utilizes the figure of Fernando Ossorio.

Although Fernando Ossorio exhibited great promise in his youth, the death of his influential grandfather, and the resulting existential questions produced from this tragic event, deterred him from reaching his potential. Ossorio was educated in a Catholic school and often felt inclined to the notion of spiritual reconciliation, but he often favored the atheism first introduced to him by his late grandfather. Following the conclusion of his studies in medical school, Fernando decided against a career in the field and instead tried his hand at painting. Living in Madrid, Baroja presents Fernando as a neurotic individual lacking individual passion or purpose for his life. This is presented clearly from the onset of the novel, as Fernando describes his personal emptiness. "—

Esto no creas que me ha molestado; lo que me molesta es que me encuentro hueco, ¿sabes? Siento la vida completamente vacía: me acuesto tarde, me levanto tarde, y al levantarme ya estoy cansado; como que me tiendo en un sillón y espero la hora de cenar y de acostarme" (6). Confounding his lack of passion, he asserts that he is incapable of ascertaining his personal function: "—¡Ah! ¡Si yo supiera para qué sirvo! Porque yo quisiera hacer algo, ¿sabes?; pero no sé qué" (7). He is superficially religious, yet he finds himself incapable of satisfying his spiritual longing through religious participation. When he moves in with his aunt Laura and engages in an incestuous relationship with her, he reaches his breaking point. The hypocrisy of his life, specifically the complicated relationship between his mystical passion and erotism, causes him to break down. Although he pursues solace in religion, art[82], and his senses[83], notions historically proposed to remediate the individual state, he nevertheless reaches the point of neurosis and thus embarks on a 'camino de perfección', following the example of Saint Teresa of Jesus.

Ossorio commences his journey by fleeing Madrid with a revolver and sufficient money for his travels. While traversing from one place to another, enduring physical, spiritual, and emotional hardship along the way, he meets a German man named Max Schultz. Max introduces Ossorio to Nietzsche[84], and subsequently proposes that one must accept life in itself and neglect the transcendental[85]. As the protagonist's journey continues, he questions whether he was born to be a mystic[86], as his tendency is to yield to the doctrine of faith as the sole source of truth.

[82] Despite Ossorio's painting, he still reaches the breaking point.
[83] The pursuit of satisfaction in his senses is demonstrated by his relationship with Laura.
[84] "—Al oírle a usted, se diría que es Buda o que es Cristo.
—¡Oh! No compare usted a Nietzsche con esos miserables que produjeron la decadencia de la Humanidad" (35).
[85] "—Y ese progreso, ¿para qué? ¿qué objeto tiene?" (34). Although Max does appear to maintain a belief in God, it is clearly an impersonal being.
[86] "—¿Habré nacido yo para místico? —se preguntaba Fernando algunas veces. Quién sabe si estas locuras que he tenido no eran un aviso de la Providencia. Debo ser un espíritu religioso. Por eso, quizá, no me he podido adaptar a la vida. Busquemos el descubrir lo que hay en el fondo del alma; debajo de las preocupaciones; debajo de los pensamientos; más allá del dominio de las ideas" (62).

However, Ossorio finds that religion, like art and the pursuit of his physical senses, weakens his psyche. Instead, he explores three alternative paths to attain wholeness of life: love, adherence to his personal conscience, and the fulfillment of his individual will. The preceding sections reveal a notable change in the protagonist's demeanor, as he discovers the merit of love[87]. Additionally, after Fernando denies his desire to seduce the young Adela, his process of self-reflection brings him to the cognizance that, "[n]o; no era sólo el animal que cumple una ley orgánica: era un espíritu, era una conciencia" (73). Immersed in nature, and symbolically reintegrating into his own personal nature, Ossorio engages in a relationship with his cousin Dolores[88].

Following their marriage, Fernando confirms his new life and inner peace attained through the neglect of his mystical passions. Instead, he animalistically pursues his personal nature and, thus, attains the sense that he has regenerated his inner being. This inner being, having been stifled by both traditionalism and his mystical passions, is freed through his adherence to his personal nature. During the final section, Ossorio contemplates the vitality of his newborn son, declaring his decision to educate him in accordance with his particular notion of vitality. In doing so, he neglects and condemns the educational role of the Church and its ascetic ideals. This denouncement of the Church, perhaps Spain's most historically notable institution, is linked to Baroja's anarchist sympathies. Despite Ossorio's strong individualistic resolution, Baroja offers a frustrated conclusion: "Y mientras Fernando pensaba, la madre de Dolores cosía en la faja que habían de poner al niño una hoja doblada del Evangelio" (127).

Although Ossorio's final pledge to educate his son according to his will is seemingly frustrated, Baroja is clear in his disapproval of the education system established by the Church in

[87] "La única palabra posible era amar. ¿Amar qué? Amar lo desconocido, lo misterioso, lo arcano, sin definirlo, sin explicarlo" (XXV, 158). Por eso la gran mística Santa Teresa había dicho. "El infierno es el lugar donde no se ama" (159).
[88] Dolores is related to Ossorio only by marriage.

Spain. Ossorio, recollecting his Catholic studies as a youth, says, "¡Qué vida! ¡Qué horrorosa vida! ¡Estar sometido a ser máquina de estudiar, a llevar como un presidiario un número marcado en la ropa, a no ver casi nunca el sol!" (87). The previously described educational system of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century in Spain, which created "máquinas de estudiar," represents the negative influence of the Catholic Church and the cause of Ossorio's neurosis. The reference to machines, relegated to the study of knowledge determined by the Church, reveals an elimination of individual creativity in favor of collective routine and tradition. In opposition to the program proposed by *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, which sought to awaken interest in cultural matters, Ossorio presents the Church as a dogmatic institution that prevents the personal growth of the individuals that fall under its influence.

Although the term 'creativity' is not explicitly utilized by Ossorio, it represents the antithesis of a machine, the sole purpose of such being the fulfillment of a prescribed duty. It is inherently selfless, as it is destined to serve the purpose of those who programmed it. Ossorio wholly rejects this purpose[89] due to its oppositional position with respect to the individual will and innate creativity. Through Ossorio, Baroja emphasizes the value of the individual over all institutions, affirming an educational pedagogy akin to that proposed by *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* and a philosophical position in alignment with Nietzschean ideals.

Following the birth of his son, Ossorio is resolute in the position of his role in society. In opposition to his position during his 'camino', in which he was a critical observer of the Catholic Church's role in education, Ossorio takes ownership of his individual responsibility with respect to education[90]: "Él le dejaría vivir en el seno de la Naturaleza; él le dejaría saborear el jugo del

[89] "Cuando más se sufre, cuando los sentimientos son más intensos, se le encerraba al niño, y se le sometía a una tortura diaria, hipertrofiándole la memoria, oscureciéndole la inteligencia, matando todos los instintos naturales, hudiéndolo en la oscuridad de la superstición, atemorizando su espíritu con las penas eternas…" (87).
[90] His individual role is oppositional to that of the Church.

placer y de la fuerza en la ubre repleta de la vida, la vida que para su hijo no tendría misterios dolorosos, sino serenidades inefables" (128). Ossorio acts in this instance, granting his son the ability to live "en el seno de la Naturaleza." In his new life, he takes steps to determine his son's formation, choosing a pedagogical method in alignment with *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*. Although Baroja is opposed to all institutions, the message of this particular educational body is in accordance with Ossorio's final declaration. In the *Principios and orientaciones* section of the Institution's program, the founders state: "Los principios cuya más alta expresión en la época moderna corresponde a Pestalozzi y a Froebel, y sobre los cuales se va organizando en todas partes la educación de la primera infancia, cree la Institución que deben y pueden extenderse a todos los grados, porque en todos caben intuición, trabajo, personal y creador, procedimiento socrático, método heurístico, animadores y gratos estímulos, individualidad de la acción educadora en el orden intelectual como en todos, continua, real, viva, dentro y fuera de la clase" (Ruiz 2). Clearly, there is a personal and individualistic nucleus by which *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza* aims to impart educational action. Like Ossorio's final proclamation, which rejects the education of his son in the same manner as the masses[91], the Institution emphasizes the need for individuality and creativity in education, a fundamental principle of Baroja's philosophical program.

Although it is clear Baroja utilizes Ossorio to reject Spanish institutions, there is one institution in particular that bears the brunt of Baroja's critique. In his assertion that his son would live in accordance with his nature, Ossorio's position stresses the failure of the Church and his alignment to Nietzschean ideals. Fifteen years before the publication of *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, Nietzsche wrote in *On the Genealogy of Morals*: "The Church certainly is a crude and boorish institution, that is repugnant to an intelligence with any pretense of delicacy, to a really

[91] "Él le alejaría del pedante pedagogo aniquilador de los buenos instintos; le apartaría de ser un átomo de la masa triste, de la masa de eunucos de nuestros miserables días" (127).

modern taste" (19). In his work, he proposes a new ethic, arguing that an individual must reject the teachings of the Church and assume his or her own will. In this, Nietzsche proposes the individual is only capable of assuming responsibility for his or her life by putting off the ascetic ideal imposed by the Church and willfully accepting his or her animal instincts. Baroja affirms this conclusion with Ossorio's final symbolic[92] declaration, asserting, "Él dejaría a su hijo libre con sus instintos: si era león, no le arrancaría las uñas; si era águila, no le cortaría las alas" (127). In opposition to the Church, which would seek to limit the child's will in favor of the religious notions of self-control, selflessness, and humility, Baroja proposes the individual take ownership of his or her *animal-like* nature. In this, Baroja affirms Nietzsche's proposal to put off the ascetic ideal[93] and embrace one's individual will. In the same vein, Ossorio rejects the weight the Church had placed on the concept of sin, further aligning Baroja with Nietzsche's rejection of the Church. Reminiscing about his educational formation in a Catholic school, Ossorio recalls: "Era el Colegio, con su aspecto de gran cuartel, un lugar de tortura; era la gran prensa laminadora de cerebros, la que arrancaba los sentimientos levantados de los corazones, la que cogía los hombres jóvenes, ya debilitados por la herencia de una raza enfermiza y triste, y los volvía a la vida convenientemente idiotizados, fanatizados, embrutecidos; los buenos, tímidos, cobardes, torpes; los malos, hipócritas, embusteros, uniendo a la natural maldad la adquirida perfidia, y todos, buenos y malos, sobrecogidos con la idea aplastante del pecado, que se cernía sobre ellos como una gran mariposa negra" (87). In conjunction with the rejection on the part of Ossorio, Baroja aligns himself with

[92] The correlation between animal instincts, proposed by Nietzsche, and Ossorio's mention of his son being a lion or eagle is a clear indication of the influence of Nietzsche's ideas in Baroja's work.

[93] Ossorio resolves to allow his son to pursue an alternative ethic, one that would bring 'serenidades inefables": "Él le dejaría vivir en el seno de la Naturaleza; él le dejaría saborear el jugo del placer y de la fuerza en la ubre repleta de la vida, la vida que para su hijo no tendría misterios dolorosos, sino serenidades inefables" (127).

Nietzschean ideals regarding ethics and cements his status as an intellectual anarchist, repudiating the teachings of the Catholic Church.

However, despite Baroja's rejection of the Church in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, Fernando Ossorio nevertheless battles mystical passions, signaling a spiritual longing that is left unsatisfied by reason alone. Baroja emphasizes that social institutions are incapable of fulfilling such a longing, but the novel provides a practical substantiation of the necessity for the individual to establish cohesiveness between the philosophical, the scientifically empirical, and the vital to attain individual wholeness of being[94]. This particular novel offers a confirmation of the need for the inclusion of vitality into the individual subject's existence. To fully comprehend this notion of vitality, it is imperative that we have a working understanding of the value that another Spanish philosopher of the same epoch, José Ortega y Gasset, maintained of its benefit. Although Baroja does not go so far as Ortega y Gasset in promoting the redemptive merits of vitality, he does offer a similar validation of the necessity of instinctive vitality to achieve personal wholeness of being.

In his work, *El tema de nuestro tiempo*[95], Ortega y Gasset offers a complex philosophical look at the issues of reason and vitality within culture and life. Ortega seeks the amalgamation of these two concepts, which he argues had been inadequately represented in the twenty-first century. Kantian reason had assumed primacy in the years prior to Ortega y Gasset, but he argues reason had been insufficient to answer life's primary questions. Like Unamuno, who claims that life's biggest questions are left unanswered by the philosophical view that the empirical sciences are the

[94] Wholeness of being can be understood as the harmonic state of contentment and totality to which many of Baroja's characters aspire. Refer to Chapter I for an in depth definition.
[95] Although Ortega y Gasset's work was written twenty years after the publication of *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, it is essential for the comprehension of the notion of vitality.

key to all knowledge[96], Ortega y Gasset claims that vitality must be included into the cultural repertoire of knowledge to address the issues afflicting individual existence. Thus, Ortega y Gasset intends to play a bipartisan role in defining cultural knowledge by taking both empirical scientific evidence and vitality into account. To encapsulate this idea, he writes, "[l]a razón pura tiene que ser sustituida por una razón vital, donde aquella se localice y adquiera movilidad y fuerza de tranformación" (2).

To grasp Ortega y Gasset's statement regarding the substitution of pure reason for "una razón vital" in *El tema de nuestro tiempo*, it is imperative to have an adequate comprehension of Ortega y Gasset's previous ideas[97]. Ortega y Gasset claims that, in European culture, vital values have become devalued while reason had reigned as the primary modality of the cultural discourse to address all of life's questions. A lively culture has been destroyed by the supremacy and primacy of reason, leaving spontaneity and inspiration completely removed from European culture. He proposes that philosophy, art, and science are coming to realize their errors and they intend to find progressively, "…una síntesis más franca y sólida" between reason and vitality. In reference to truth, Ortega y Gasset argues that life is temporary and constantly changing, while

[96] In *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*, Unamuno mentions Alfred Tennyson's quote regarding the matter, citing, "… for nothing worthy of proving can be proven, nor yet disproven" (62).

[97] In *Meditaciones del Quijote*, he writes, "Yo soy yo y mi circunstancia y si no la salvo a ella no me salvo yo," effectively affirming that life is a complex structure. Furthermore, circumstance and the world generate the issue of living for the self, to which salvation of the self emanates in the form of the culture. Culture, therefore, is seen as the primary form of redemption for the individual being according to Ortega y Gasset. Referencing the many complex works of Ortega y Gasset, including but not limited to *Unas lecciones de metafísica*, *¿Qué es el conocimiento?* and *En torno a Galileo*, Ortega claims that human life is a successive passing of dramatic character. In this, he asserts that God and reason do not intercede to determine the course of one's life, but the drama of time unfolds undetermined throughout history. By asserting the distance of God from life, Ortega, while not completely rejecting God, borders on pantheism. In *Historia como sistema*, he argues that man does not have an inherent nature, but is rather influenced the shared successions of history. As a result, he claims that Kantian reason does not originate from transcendental truths. In *El tema de nuestro tiempo*, Ortega y Gasset asserts that reason has reigned supreme throughout the previous one-hundred years, but it has revealed itself insufficient to mend the gap between life and culture. He proclaims that rational culture must recognize that it is born of life and therefore must serve life's purposes.

truth is both never-ending and unchanging. In this, he opposes relativism, asserting that there is an unchanging truth that does not bend to the personal cosmovision and beliefs of individuals. However, he argues that rationalism aligns with the concept of unchanging truth, but that it does not satisfy the temporality of life.

As a result, Ortega y Gasset proposes the doctrine of the point of view, *doctrina del punto de vista*, in which he states that the limited point of view of the individual does not render his ideas incorrect, but merely represents a manifestation of his limited knowledge. To illustrate this point, Ortega y Gasset provides the example of two individuals looking at the same landscape and perceiving different things[98]. He affirms that all viewpoints and perspectives are therefore real and may be all true, but simply limited. He argues that this creates an open dialogue regarding truth, and that it is impossible to have one single truth that can be known.

Ortega y Gasset's viewpoint regarding truth and redemption, therefore, can be understood as his response to the collective social and political superstructure's definition of being. In accordance with the problem of the individual subject's existence, Ortega y Gasset offers vitality as his redemptive plan for the individual, hoping that the combination of vitality and reason for the individual will create an improved collectivity. It is clear, then, that Ortega y Gasset opposes the notion of the individual subject integrated within the social and political organization. He asserts that the errant philosophical belief in reason alone generates the knowledge of a missing element to being, and thus inspires the need for vitality. Pío Baroja's novel *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* puts into practice this idea of vitality and its relation to individual being in a

[98] Ortega y Gasset provides the following example: "Desde distintos puntos de vista, dos hombres miran el mismo paisaje. Sin embargo no ven lo mismo. La situación hace que el paisaje se organice ante ambos de distinta manera. Lo que para uno ocupa el primer término y acusa con vigor con todos sus detalles, para el otro queda obscuro y borroso. Además, como las cosas puestas una detrás de otra se ocultan en todo o en parte, cada uno de ellos percibirá porciones del paisaje que al otro no llegan. ¿Tendría sentido que cada cual declarase falso el paisaje ajeno? Evidentemente, no; tan real es uno como el otro" (*El tema de nuestro tiempo* 42).

practical manner.

Baroja's *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* acts as a text linking various philosophical proposals for wholeness of being prevalent in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries[99]. Drawing on many of Nietzsche's notions of ethics, Baroja utilizes the novel to propose a more current notion of wholeness of being through ironical heroism. In particular, *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* offers a theoretical look at Spain's philosophical traditions. When Ossorio embarks on his path to perfection, he contemplates the morality of the Church, the education of his son, and the value of the human will. In this, the process of becoming, or self-refinement[100], corresponds to the approximation of being with the individual human will. Baroja asserts that the Church and its role in the education of the Spanish nation had failed citizens by imposing its ascetic ideals, demanding strict adherence to tradition, and eliminating the innate creativity of the individual.

The frustrated conclusion to *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* leaves a sense of failed 'overcoming'. That is, the true resolution of such contradictions does not take place and the prevailing sense of 'overcoming' is synthetic[101]. When Ossorio contemplates his current state, Baroja asserts that Ossorio, "...ya no podía arrojar de su alma por completo aquella tendencia mística por lo desconocido ..." (127). Although he attempts to live a life in conformity with his own nature, this ideal sense of 'overcoming' is not completely realized. He decides to "overcome" his mystical passions rationally, but practically he is unable to carry out this proposition due to the lingering effect of his forced integration in the dominant Spanish social and political organizations

[99] For our purposes, we will limit ourselves to the panentheistic proposal by Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, the atheistic proposal by Friedrich Nietzsche and Arthur Schopenhauer, and the agnostic proposal by Pío Baroja and José Ortega y Gasset.
[100] A process by which the individual seeks to reach their full potential, be that physically, intellectually, or spiritually.
[101] There is a falsity to this supposed 'overcoming'.

during his youth. In this, Baroja correlates the incorporation of the individual within the collective as a great danger, as it impedes the individualistic aspects of being. He resolves, as previously mentioned, to give his son the opportunity to grow up according to his own nature and vitality, undeterred by the traditional repressive norms of organized society and religion. In this, Baroja, asserts the value that he places on vitality, similar to Ortega y Gasset, arguing that this notion is for the greater good of the individual being. Despite the prevailing sense of a failed 'overcoming', Baroja emphasizes the value of vitality, understood as the unhindered pursuit of the individual will. Therefore, Baroja's *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* emphasizes the necessity of establishing harmony between reason and vitality to pursue individual completeness of being in the face of collective disorientation and confusion.

Baroja's Opposition to Spanish Institutions in *Aurora roja*

Baroja asserts one must live with individualistic vitality in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, a position that would coincide with the ideas typical of political anarchism during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Europe. Baroja's *Aurora roja* is the most politically charged work within the trilogy *La lucha por la vida*. Manuel, the protagonist, represents Baroja's dive into the political psyche of the epoch, reflecting on and analyzing seemingly real political positions relevant at the time. Ignacio Elizalde, in his book *Personajes y temas barojianos*, encapsulates Baroja's ability to delve into the politics of the turn of the century and adequately reflect his personal positions. "Baroja toma el pulso de la España del siglo XIX y refleja sus males. No es un pensador o historiógrafo, es un novelista. Pero de los retratos que nos deja se puede definir cual es su posición hacia esa España, eje de su obra" (Elizalde 75). While characters do not necessarily represent the convictions of their authors, Baroja's novels act as a conveyer of his beliefs, offering sharp criticism of the Spanish nation. In *Aurora roja*, Manuel's political

sympathies may best align with those of Baroja, but Juan represents a dynamic look at Baroja's complicated relationship with anarchism. This anarchist ideology can be best described as philosophically oriented, rather than practically executed. To comprehend this relationship, it is imperative that we analyze both the figures of Juan and Manuel in *Aurora roja*, providing details regarding the novel's primary developments.

Aurora roja allows for the manifestation of the aspirations and the practical possibilities of the anarchist political movement, highlighting the social angst prevalent at the turn of the century in Madrid. Elizalde emphasizes this point: "Con esta novela penetramos en la agitación social de Madrid y en las polémicas que sostienen. Socialistas y anarquistas. Baroja ha querido plasmar la politización a que estaba sometido el mundo del trabajo a finales del XIX y la lucha por encontrar una salida justa, salvadora" (153). Following the depiction of the horrors of city life in the first two novels of the trilogy, *La busca* and *Mala hierba*, Baroja turns to political ideologies, namely anarchism and socialism, in search of a refuge for a marginalized society. The 'Aurora roja', a relatively small group of individuals who meet to discuss anarchist ideals, provide a unique look at the movement both theoretically and practically in the Spanish capital. Baroja's own position is clear by the culmination of the trilogy, emphasizing a fierce opposition to all institutions, even those with the pure intentions of human liberation for all individuals.

The novel commences with a conversation between the brothers, Manuel and Juan, as the latter recounts the cause of his existential crisis. A scandal involving one of the priests at their seminary and his recent dabbling in literature[102] had inspired Juan to leave the seminary. Following their conversation, Baroja transports the reader forward in time, some fifteen years later, depicting Manuel's current state, living with his widowed sister Ignacia and La Salvadora in a

[102] These books include *Los misterios de París* by Eugène Sue and *Les Miserables* by Victor Hugo.

cheap domicile in Madrid. Their situation is stable, but by no means luxurious. Having left seminary as well, Manuel maintains uninspired dreams of one day owning a printing press, but his lack of urgency or passion prevent him from fulfilling these ambitions. He is, effectively, living a life of abulia, lacking the vitality described in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*.

Without warning, Juan presents himself at Manuel's home following fifteen years of travel throughout Europe, having made a name for himself as a sculptor. He immerses himself into Manuel's life and entertains La Salvadora and Ignacia with his stories of his bohemian life. In addition to the women of the house, Juan becomes friendly with many of Manuel's friends, who are all involved in varying degrees with anarchism. Juan is intrigued with their anarchist ideas and decides to dedicate himself entirely to their fulfillment, rejecting his successful career as an artist. During Juan's political rebirth, Manuel opens a printing press with the financial assistance of Roberto, a friend of his from England.

Baroja includes considerable debates from the anarchist meetings and conversations, allowing the reader to peer into a window of time in which the Spanish capital was brimming with political ideas. Manuel briefly entertains anarchist ideologies, but he becomes less convinced after a considerable amount of time, having listened to the faulty arguments of his friends. On the other hand, Juan is further persuaded at the conclusion of each meeting, developing an almost mystic-like passion for the anarchist cause. Although Manuel's friends share a commitment to anarchist individualism, they contradict one another when debating the manner in which anarchism should be practically carried out, revealing one of Baroja's greatest qualms with practical anarchism. The lives of Juan and Manuel grow apart, as Juan determines his purpose to be related to the anarchist cause and Manuel elects a bourgeoisie lifestyle.

Juan publishes articles in anarchist magazines and articles, gaining him a fair amount of

notoriety in Madrid. However, at the peak of his involvement in the cause, he falls gravely ill. Despite the resistance of his family, he refuses to take the necessary time to recuperate, believing the anarchist cause far greater than his individual health. While still unwell, Juan receives a letter from an Italian individual named Passalaqcua, which causes significant concern for both La Salvadora and Manuel, as the Italian is a relatively well-known violent anarchist from Barcelona. When Passalaqcua comes to stay with Juan, in Manuel's house, La Salvadora, Ignacia, and Manuel discover that Passalaqcua had brought a bomb in his suitcase. Manuel and La Salvadora disable the bomb, but the commotion surrounding the Italian figure garners the attention of the police. They investigate the situation and find Manuel and La Salvadora to be unsuspicious actors in the situation, but they remain highly suspicious of Juan.

Days later, Roberto visits Manuel and informs him that he will be giving him the printing press without charge. Manuel and Roberto have a conversation that impacts the protagonist tremendously, as Roberto argues it is impossible to attain social utopia and that the only solution to such a conundrum is to fight for life. Although this fight for life is not explicitly detailed, Roberto insinuates that an individual must live a life of action and pursue his or her desires to the maximum. Inspired by this conversation, Manuel decides to kiss La Salvadora when he returns home, subsequently asking to marry her. While Manuel begins to experience success at the end of the novel due to his newfound vigor for life and decision to embrace his position within the bourgeoisie class, Juan succumbs to his illness and passes away. This divergence of the paths for the two primary protagonists is symbolic, as Manuel's decision to engage in materialistic pursuits is rewarded, while the theoretical pursuits of Juan cost him his life.

Juan, the brother of the protagonist Manuel, serves as a blueprint to reveal Baroja's sympathies with anarchism, along with his hesitancy to fully embrace this ideology in practical

situations. Gonzalo Navajas argues that his distinctive position as both a Spanish citizen and an 'outsider' allows him to critically analyze the Spanish political dilemma and provide what some might call more objective insight: "Juan, por ejemplo, en *Aurora roja*, posee un discernimiento penetrante sobre el entorno físico y humano de Madrid (del que ha estado alejado por un tiempo) que convierte sus observaciones en asertos especialmente significativos sobre la condición de esa ciudad y sus habitantes. Ve y oye lo que los que han vivido siempre en esa ciudad no son capaces de ver y oír. Su visión es amarga pero precisa. El texto la favorece de manera obvia. De ese modo, el lector percibe Madrid a través de un observador doblemente valioso que posee el conocimiento directo de un ciudadano nativo del país al mismo tiempo que ha adquirido la distancia crítica que un extranjero tiene de modo innato al quedar al margen de los hábitos perceptivos de los habitantes del propio país" (Navajas 86). Baroja introduces Juan not merely as a Spanish citizen during the opening chapter, but also, in the past, a transmitter of Spanish ideals and notions, evidenced distinctly by his desire for the priesthood. Juan's link and subsequent separation from Catholicism, which is intrinsically associated with Spanish values and national ethic, provide him with a profound comprehension of the Spanish nation. Nevertheless, his distance from Spain, fifteen years in total, gives him an alternative viewpoint he would have otherwise been blind to within the canonry. That is to say, his relationship to the Church, and the likelihood that he would have been unable to travel abroad as he did, would have hindered his ability to attain a sense of objectivity when discussing the Spanish nation. Navajas asserts that the text privileges his view of Madrid due to his closer proximity to objectivity. As a result, Juan, and specifically his philosophical and practical view of anarchism against what he views as the oppressive Spanish political state, are a telling transmission of Baroja's notion of anarchism.

With the exception of Manuel, who is at least comparatively similar, Juan undergoes the

most transformative process of any character throughout *Aurora roja*. He leaves the seminary due to a loss of faith, vagabonds through European cities, finds some success as an artist, returns to Madrid, adopts anarchist ideas, and eventually comes to die for the cause. His trajectory can be described as initially the pursuit of pleasure, and eventually the quest for personal purpose. Despite his relatively short exposure to anarchism, Juan fully and wholly embraces the anarchist cause both philosophically and in practice. Baroja defines Juan's anarchism in a favorable manner. "El anarquismo de Juan tenía un carácter entre humanitario y artístico. No leía Juan casi nunca libros anarquistas; sus obras favoritas eran las de Tolstoi y las de Ibsen" (87). In effect, Juan discovers a new ethic within the anarchist cause, replacing the void corresponding to his loss of faith. His anarchism was based on a religious notion of human goodness, expressed through the removal of institutional and authoritarian chains from the individual. Juan's belief stresses the idea that the removal of these metaphoric chains would result in internal peace and liberty. Through Juan's public discourse, Baroja describes Juan's anarchic liberation: "Él no veía en la cuestión social una cuestión de jornales, sino una cuestión de dignidad humana; veía en el anarquismo la liberación del hombre. Además, para él, antes que el obrero y el trabajador, estaban la mujer y el niño, más abandonados por la sociedad, sin armas para la lucha por la vida .... Y habló con ingenuidad de los golfillos arrojados al arroyo, de los niños que van a los talleres por la mañana muertos de frío, de las mujeres holladas, hundidas en la muerte moral de la prostitución, pisoteadas por la bota del burgués y por la alpargata del obrero" (196).

In his account of Juan's anarchism, Baroja emphasizes Juan's faith in the inherent goodness of the individual. The goodness of the individual, when liberating from the authorities that be, would result in an improved society, consisting of individuals reaching their personal potential for the betterment of their nation and themselves. In this, Baroja recognizes the rational merit of the

anarchist ideal, but Juan's fate demonstrates a limited workability of this theory. Baroja eulogizes Juan's ideal, but demonstrates the organizational inefficiency of anarchism both through the meetings held by the 'Aurora roja' and the figure of Juan. The meetings accomplish relatively little, and Baroja highlights the notable differences between those of the same political party. Given the individual nature of anarchism, Baroja stresses the slight, albeit divisive, differences between those who met together, the members of the 'Aurora roja': "El anarquismo del Libertario era el individualismo rebelde, fosco y huraño, de un carácter más filosófico que práctico; y la tendencia de Maldonado, entre anarquista y republicana radical, tenía ciertas tendencias parlamentarias. Este último quería dar a la reunión aire de club; pero ni Juan ni el Libertario aceptaban esto; Juan, porque veía una imposición, y el Libertario, además de esto, por temor a la policía. Una última forma de anarquismo, un anarquismo del arroyo, era el del señor Canuto, del Madrileño y de Jesús. Predicaban éstos la destrucción, sin idea filosófica fija, y su tendencia cambiaba de aspecto a cada instante, y tan pronto era liberal como reaccionaria" (87).

Although Baroja does not clearly criticize this individualization of political ideals in this instance, he presents the ideas to demonstrate the impossibility of practical collective unification among stark individualists. Furthermore, the death of Juan symbolizes the termination of not merely the functionality of anarchism, but the impossibility of utopia. Juan's utopian notion of anarchism is not carried out, and Spain continues its course unfazed by this idealistic and passionate individual. Nevertheless, Baroja is not capable of completing shaking himself free of the anarchist utopian ideal, as Elizalde highlights that, "[e]ste idealismo y utopismo, que Baroja implícitamente critica en el anarquismo, es lo que en definitiva más le atrae de él" (152).

Thus, Baroja emphasizes the merit of individuality within philosophical anarchism, but the impossibility of this movement to transform a nation and address all its subsequent ills. This is

not to say that there is no benefit to practical anarchism, given that it would, hypothetically, destroy the power of authoritarian institutions, but rather that Baroja is incapable of fully embracing this ideal in a practical manner. For this reason, Elizalde argues that Baroja's individualism does not quite reach the realm of anarchism, but the lines are blurred: "Esta actitud de Baroja profundamente individualizante le condujo a una actitud, sino estrictamente anarquista, sí anarquizante" (150). Nevertheless, Baroja is clear in his disgust for the Spanish establishment, both socially and politically, extending even to alternative political movements. Navajas emphasizes that Baroja's position, critical even of movements renowned as capable of societal reform, deemed as such due primarily to the rise of liberal education and new European ideas, is fiercely individualistic: "En *Aurora roja*, la crítica de los partidos supuestamente progresivos y favorecedores de cambios sociales profundos se ofrece sin reservas. No se dispensa a los movimientos de izquierda del análisis crítico con que esa misma izquierda examina a sus contrarios. Se revela además que los movimientos de izquierda son incapaces en ese momento histórico de una visión de grandeza que les dé una comunidad de propósito al margen de sus diferencias" (86). In this, Baroja demonstrates his dedication to philosophical and theoretical anarchism, simultaneously revealing the lack of viable political options to remedy the ills plaguing Spanish society. Thus, Baroja, fiercely opposed to the inefficiency and unfairness of public Spanish institutions, proposes that politics are thus incapable of addressing the inner battle within each individual.

II. Catholicism and Anarchism

Individual Subversion in *El árbol de la ciencia*

Baroja's novels *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* and *Aurora roja* identify a fundamental issue within Spanish society, focusing primarily on the individual's journey, both physical and metaphorical, to reject the established order. As mentioned, Ortega y Gasset and

Baroja identify the problem facing the individual as a result of the insufficiency of Kantian reason alone to the neglect of vitality, effectively asserting that society had come to embrace an errant philosophical position in order to address the crisis of being. However, the Spanish author's emphasis on the spiritual qualms of the individual does not indicate an embrace of a return to the traditional, much like the philosophical propositions of European thinkers Karl Jaspers in *The Philosophy of Existence* or Miguel de Unamuno in *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*. Rather, Baroja highlights that the problematic conception of being is inherently linked to the collective organization of social and political ideas into which the individual is integrated. In *El árbol de la ciencia*, Baroja's protagonist is conditioned by the issues of Spanish society at large, inherently presenting the loss of wholeness of being in the form of personal and social decadence. Although Baroja provides clues to his program to address the glaring issue affecting society in *El árbol de la ciencia* and *Mala hierba*, he clearly confirms these in *Zalacaín el aventurero* and *César o nada*. The focus of the former two novels is the identification of individual and collective decadence, highlighting the significant problem afflicting Spanish society. To comprehend this individual and national situation, it is essential that one have a clear comprehension of Andrés Hurtado's role as a conveyer of societal issues and identify Baroja's position with respect to religion within Spain. A brief analysis of the philosophical role of religion within society for Mikhail Bakunin and Miguel de Unamuno, two philosophers fundamental to Spanish thought in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, allows for the situating of Baroja's position in *El árbol de la ciencia*.

El árbol de la ciencia, published in 1911, is a semi-autobiographical novel of the life of Pío Baroja y Nessi, as he studied to be a doctor and subsequently left that career to pursue his passion of literature. The events of the novel take place between 1887 and 1898 and synthesize a time period in which the political, economic, and social issues of the *Generación del 98* are

constantly referenced. While the novel can be read superficially as a tragedy in the life of a capable young man without a passion for life, the existential themes throughout the book highlight the restlessness of Pío Baroja in the face of the situation of religion, politics, and education in Spain. The tragic fate of the main character, Andrés Hurtado, provides the reader with an adequate portrayal of Baroja's position concerning the opposition between intelligence and vitality.

The first segment of *El árbol de la ciencia* presents Andrés Hurtado in a formative period of his life, as he has recently enrolled in the Universidad Complutense de Madrid to study to be a doctor. Despite his large family, the loss of his mother had left a significant hole in his heart. Due to his father's laziness, Andres's sister had been charged with leading the house. Although Andres had always been distant from his family, his love for his youngest brother Luisito is clear, exhibiting a personal sense of responsibility for the younger brother's well-being. Throughout the story, Andrés often recalls pertinent memories during his younger years, specifically referencing his first communion accompanied by his mother. In this event, he recalls her religious fanaticism and his immense fear of the Catholic priest. Although he does not reflect fondly on his past internally, he does not carry his burdens openly for all to see. He passes his medical exams and begins his clinical hours in a hospital, all of which cause him to realize how little he truly cares for medicine. Nevertheless, he does find some solace in the midst of his career frustration, as he begins to develop a library with books that both inspire and further isolated him.

In one of his final classes, Andrés is inspired by a professor that applies his theories of mathematics to biology. He begins to read Kant, Fichte, and Schopenhauer, although he becomes disillusioned with most philosophers barring Kant. Baroja begins to define the protagonist's worldview, which contends that justice in the world is unattainable and causes him to lean toward spiritual anarchism based solely on sympathy and kindness without practical proposals. Like other

Baroja's protagonists, Andrés struggles immensely with the purpose of life. "¿Qué hacer? ¿Qué dirección dar a la vida? —se preguntaba con angustia. Y la gente, las cosas, el sol, le parecían sin realidad ante el problema planteado en su cerebro" (*Él árbol de la ciencia* 68). During this time of philosophical discovery, Andrés learns that his brother Luisito has fallen ill to a dangerous fever.

During the second part of the novel, Andrés meets two sisters with a friend from his university. The younger sister, named Lulú, is described as, "marchita por el trabajo, por la miseria, por la inteligencia" (56). The second part details the relationship between Lulú and Andrés, which is relegated simply to a friendship, as Andrés does not find her attractive whatsoever. In addition to their relationship, Andrés begins to have philosophical conversations with his Uncle Iturrioz, who maintains that philosophy causes those who study it not to act. "Es lo que tiene de bueno la filosofía […] le convence a uno de que lo mejor es no hacer nada" (64). Baroja utilizes Iturrioz to represent an alternative viewpoint from the masses, one from which Andrés may develop his own epistemology. In the face of a Spanish modernity, depicted as a society without desire to escape mediocrity, Andrés's conversations with Iturrioz allow him to solidify his discontent with modernity and arrive at his own philosophical conclusions.

In the third and fourth part, Andrés goes from locale to locale working and searching for work. During this time, he discovers that his brother Luisito has passed away from tuberculosis, but surprisingly, he is indifferent to his death. The subsequent parts detail his philosophical conversations with his uncle, his marriage for practical reasons with Lulú, his happiness found in leaving medicine to begin work as a translator, and the successive demise of it all. Andrés discovers that action, specifically an all-encompassing focus on work to the rejection of his inner rationality, allows him to briefly escape his internal distress: "Los únicos momentos agradables de su vida eran cuando se ponía a trabajar. Estaba haciendo un estudio sintético de las aminas, y

trabajaba con toda su fuerza para olvidarse de sus preocupaciones y llegar a dar claridad a sus ideas" (174). In this, Baroja finds contentment only when he refuses to acknowledge his philosophical preoccupations and perhaps more importantly the status quo, namely the tendency of Spanish society to embrace laziness and choose the path of least resistance.

Despite this brief period of repose, Andrés's contentment is fleeting, as Lulú recounts to him that she has become pregnant, which removes Andrés from the protective environment that he had created for himself. At the end of the novel, their son dies during childbirth, and Lulú passes away only a few days later. Andrés's understanding of the contradiction between vitality and reason, highlighted by a previous realization in the novel: "La vida era una corriente tumultuosa e inconsciente, donde todos los actores representaban una comedia que no comprendían" (53), leads him to commit suicide. Without Lulú, Andrés is philosophically incapable of overcoming the purposelessness of his life, effectively highlighting Baroja's position regarding the importance of this contradiction. In this, Baroja emphasizes that reason alone in incapable of sustaining life permanently.

Baroja stresses in *El árbol de la ciencia* that the life of the protagonist was always destined to suicide, as the only conceivable escape from Andrés's state is that very act. His temporary happiness, found through matrimony and the hope of a new life, is quickly erased. Andrés's life, marked by suffering[103], from the death of his mother to the death of his wife, is a constant search for respite from existential inquiries. Having rejected the traditional religion of the nation and his mother due to its hypocrisy, Andrés sought wholeness of being in philosophy: "Andrés Hurtado, que se hallaba ansioso de encontrar algo que llegase al fondo de los problemas de la vida, comenzó

[103] "Había en él algo anormal, indudablemente. ¡Es tan lógico, tan natural en el hombre huir del dolor, de la enfermedad, de la tristeza! Y, sin embargo, para él, el sufrimiento, la pena, la suciedad debían de ser cosas atrayentes" (39).

a leer el libro de Letamendi con entusiasmo. La aplicación de las matemáticas a la Biología le pareció admirable. Andrés fue pronto un convencido" (25). This rejection of previous modes of being in order to attain personal satisfaction and contentment represent a rejection of traditional religious fervor. The presentation of Andrés's dive into the unknown is an expression of Baroja's redirection of the protagonist's spiritual longing for philosophical freedom, although unsuccessful, in opposition to biblical submission. Thus, Baroja's depiction of Andrés, a figure epitomizing a new generation in Spain, serves to emphasize Catholicism's inability to address the country's depravity, as the religion acted as both a past and present torment to the protagonist.

Although the complicated historical relationship between the Church and the State has already been established, Baroja's recurrence to the notion of spiritual qualms through his protagonists, Andrés in this case, allows for reflection of the relationship between Catholicism and Spanish society at the turn of the century. This relationship, having been severed ever so slightly in the early twentieth century from its previous grandeur, continued to hold deep societal roots within the country. Traditional Catholic values, with a focus on the teaching of biblical and evangelical principles, were still inserted in education despite the opposition of the more progressive segments of society. Baroja, through the individual of Andrés Hurtado, portrays religion as a tormentor that cannot be fully eradicated from the individual psyche. In effect, Baroja proposes that Andrés's religious experience fomented a sense of spiritual longing that eventually will lead him to pursue answers to life through philosophy. In essence, Andrés is incapable of achieving wholeness of being due to his spiritual qualms and discontent with his fulfillment of societal expectations[104], created from his experience within a religious society. Consequently, Baroja's philosophical position regarding the role of Catholicism within Spanish society, and

[104] Social expectations of the time included the pursuit of a respected career through education.

specifically its responsibility to address societal decadence, can be better understood within the context of two immensely important philosophical works: Mikhail Bakunin's *God and the State* and Miguel de Unamuno's *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*.

In *God and the State*, Mikhail Bakunin defends the need for the separation of religion and the State. The insertion of religious values into conventional education, he argues, was a result of the Church's imposition of its values on the nation. He writes, "[s]uch are the absurd tales that are told and the monstrous doctrines that are taught [Christian & Jewish], in the full light of the nineteenth century, in all the public schools of Europe, at the express command of the government. They call this civilizing the people! Is it not plain that all these governments are systematic poisoners, interested stupefies of the masses?" (6). Bakunin does not call for merely separation of Church and State, but also for an absolute break-up of the State from the Church, emphasizing the irrationality of religious belief. He continues, "[i]t is evident that whoever finds it essential to his happiness and life must renounce his reason, and return, if he can, to naive, blind, stupid faith, to repeat with Tertullianus and all sincere believers these words, which sum up the very quintessence of theology: Credo quia absurdum" (8). Much like in the case of Andrés Hurtado, Baroja too emphasizes the lack of rationality in Catholicism. Furthermore, Baroja emphasizes that there is a spiritual longing that is not satisfied in life due to reason, a desire for wholeness that Andrés is unable to attain. As a result, Baroja's position indicates that while rationality is valuable, it is not capable of addressing the social ills that plague the individual and society standing alone. While Bakunin asserts that reason is the foundation of epistemological thought, Baroja argues for the inclusion of additional elements to attain individual satisfaction, simultaneously considering the effect of spiritual longing on one's life. In this, Baroja, while firmly in opposition to the Catholic Church, demonstrates the significance of spirituality in one's journey. Much like Miguel de

Unamuno, Pío Baroja also emphasizes the spiritual in one's formation. Nevertheless, Baroja clearly does not adhere to Unamuno's ideological position regarding the rationality of eternal life, and subsequently a return to a traditional value of transcendental to address internal dissatisfaction and to solidify the notion of being.

In *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*, Unamuno argues that the concept of eternal life, a key tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions, might be more plausible or reasonable, than many other concepts easily accepted in philosophy, effectively arguing for a return to a traditional ideology focused on the transcendental, albeit with a significant difference from Catholicism of the day. In reference to the notion of eternal life, he says, "[y] aun si esa creencia fuese absurda, ¿por qué se tolera menos el que se les exponga que otras muchas más absurdas aún? ¿Por qué esa evidente hostilidad a tal creencia? ¿Es miedo? (*Sentimiento trágico de la vida* 90). Unamuno emphasizes the necessity of the inclusion of a conversation regarding the possibility of eternal life in the realm of philosophy and academia. While Bakunin writes about these concepts, he dismisses them immediately as unreasonable, focusing instead on the preposterousness of both. Unamuno's justification for the presence of a debate regarding eternal life finds its essence in the notion that many other topics in philosophy are considered admirable for debate, yet he argues their uselessness. Baroja's depiction of Andrés emphasizes this conflict, as both religious fervor and philosophical thought lead him to an intense feeling of dissatisfaction, effectively highlighting Baroja deviation from both of these philosophers. Bakunin's proposition for rationality alone and Unamuno's proposal for the inclusion of the transcendental represent points of contention for Andrés in his journey. These points of disharmony for Andrés emphasize Baroja's take on the conflict between traditional and progressive ideologies at the turn of the century. Nevertheless, Andrés's fate, being primarily attributed to his experience with the Catholic dogma in his

childhood, aligns more closely with Bakunin's position with respect to religion's place within society. In this sense, both Baroja and Bakunin share in their assertion that religion is incapable of addressing the new challenges facing modern Europe.

Both Baroja and Bakunin oppose the Christian form of redemption, Bakunin arguing that, "[f]or ten centuries Christianity, armed with the omnipotence of Church and State and opposed by no competition, was able to deprave, debase, and falsify the mind of Europe. It had no competitors, because outside of the Church there were neither thinkers nor educated persons" (*God and the State* 40). Bakunin, therefore, argues that Christianity, and inherently Judaism, had led to the creation of unequal societies. Bakunin argues that there is only one possible response to the problems facing society, namely, the putting off of religious ideologies in order to assume a reasonable position. This form of wholeness of being, however temporary, seeks the full realization of reason without the weight of faith according to Bakunin: "They are the instinctive and passionate protest of the human being against the narrowness, the platitudes, the sorrows, and the shame of a wretched existence. For this malady, I have already said, there is but one remedy — Social Revolution" (*God and the State* 12). This, however, marks the extension of Baroja and Bakunin's philosophical sympathies, as Baroja rejects the notion that social revolution should fill the void created by a lack of religious sentiment. In Gonzalo Navajas's book *Pío Baroja: El escritor y su literatura,* he highlights Baroja's opposition to the notion that social revolution is necessary to resolve the maladies affecting the individual. "Baroja propone una equiparación valorativa de los movimientos tradicionales y los renovadores que cuestiona la pertinencia de las pretendidas diferencias fundamentales entre ellos. Su posición es particularmente peculiar y arriesgada para su contexto histórico en el que los programas radicales se conciben como los únicos capaces de satisfacer las necesidades sociales más profundas de la comunidad. Para Baroja no

basta cambiar las estructuras sociales. Debe emprenderse además al mismo tiempo el proceso de transformación de la naturaleza humana individual" (17). Baroja's position with respect to societal and individual issues, therefore, shares similarities with Bakunin and Unamuno, namely the need to reject traditional Catholicism and the need to embrace contradiction, but by and large, indicates a deviation from their revolutionary plans to address modern societal and individual issues. Baroja's plan rejects a return to the traditional or an embrace of social revolution, but rather embraces the embodiment of individual subversion to dominant collective structures and belief systems in the process of self-realization. Nevertheless, Baroja emphasizes that societal and individual issues do not pertain merely to full-fledged devotion to Catholicism or political ideologies, but also to social depravity[105], a point made painstakingly clear in *Mala hierba*.

Social Depravity in *Mala hierba*

Mala hierba, the second novel in the trilogy *La lucha por la vida*[106], encapsulates the moral degeneracy of an entire nation. If *Aurora roja* represents the social doctrine that had taken ownership of the suffering and pain of society's marginalized through the movement of anarchism, *Mala hierba* serves as an illustration of the deterioration of that organized society. As a result, *Mala hierba* is qualified to address the significant issues for which Baroja argues the institution of religion was unprepared to address in *El árbol de la ciencia*. Soledad Puértolas suggests that the events of *Mala hierba* occur between 1892 and 1896[107].

---

[105] Nevertheless, Baroja does assert that Catholicism's hypocrisy had a significant impact on the depravation of Spanish society.

[106] We have already addressed the final book in this trilogy: *Aurora roja*.

[107] "Centramos la obra en el tiempo por medio del único acontecimiento histórico que aparece en la trilogía: la coronación de Alfonso XIII, citada en *Aurora roja* y que, como sabemos, tuvo lugar el 17 de mayo de 1902. Este hecho, unido al reencuentro de los dos hermanos Manuel y Juan, protagonistas de la trilogía, que sucede dos años antes del episodio de la coronación (deducidos del discurso del tiempo en la novela), nos lleva a concluir que *Aurora roja* se desarrolla entre 1900 y 1902. Por otra parte, en este encuentro Juan y Manuel dicen haber estado separados quince años, precisamente desde que Manuel llega a Madrid en las primeras páginas de *La busca*. De todo esto se deduce claramente que La busca empieza en 1885, y que la trilogía abarca el período de la Regencia: 1885-1902" (Puértolas, 11-12).

These events serve as a precursor for those in *Aurora roja*, but Baroja's utilization of the depiction of social degradation serves as a catalyst for his reflection on the hypocrisy of a nation's morality. This ethic, both propagated and contorted by the Church, had accomplished little to improve the lives of the marginalized in Madrid, as the characters depicted shamelessly reveal a level of debauchery that one would consider unimaginable for a European capital at the end of the nineteenth century. The demonstration of moral depravity, coupled with Baroja's reoccurring presentation of the tension between rational thought and irrational impulses, gives insight into Baroja's alternative ethic. This ethic, albeit with significant disparities, corresponds to another philosophical movement of the epoch, *Krausism*, one that had taken the realm of public education by storm. To comprehend Baroja's moral stance, one that is supported by the works of Carlos Longhurst and Marsha Suzan Collins[108], it is necessary to situate Baroja's posture within the larger cultural context. Although *Mala hierba* does not provide an overarching illustration for Baroja's moral stance, it serves as a starting point to comprehend his critique of the late nineteenth century moral depravity prevalent in Spain's capital city.

Baroja's depiction of the degeneration of society through the portrayal of the foul elements of the city is common throughout the trilogy *La lucha por la vida*. This depiction of societal deterioration emphasizes the crisis of morality in a nation in the process of transition. According to Hibbs, "[e]n varias de sus novelas, Baroja incurre en una reflexión desencantada sobre la ciudad como microcosmo degradante y degradado, en el que las deambulaciones de los protagonistas reflejan el ambiente fin de siglo y la lesión de energía moral que lo caracteriza" (284). To transmit his point, Manuel traverses through numerous Spanish locales, interacting with individuals devoted to every imaginable vice: "En estas zonas donde los grupos sociales se componen y

[108] Carlos Longhurst's work is *Las novelas históricas de Pío Baroja* and Marsha Suzan Collins's is *Pío Baroja's Memorias de un hombre de acción: And The Ironic Mode. The Search for Order and Meaning.*

descomponen continuamente debido a la condición nómada de los habitantes, vive una población abigarrada, socialmente excluida y transgresora: prostitutas, mangantes, gitanos, esquiladores y gente pobre que se dedica a oficios de todo tipo" (287). These individuals, addicted to nefarious lifestyles, despite Spain's "status" as a Catholic nation, provide fertile ground by which Baroja may work out an alternative ethic.

Much like in *Aurora roja*, Baroja utilizes Manuel as a conveyer and critic of Spanish society at large. Solange Hibbs, in her article titled "La ciudad como espacio de transgresión y decadencia en la novela finisecular (La trilogía *La lucha por la vida* de Pío Baroja)," highlights the modes in which Baroja emphasizes social degradation. "Pío Baroja acude a todo tipo de información en torno al tema de la vida de los barrios, de los suburbios en los márgenes de la realidad. Los cuadros minuciosamente detallados de la miseria urbana reflejan algunas de las preocupaciones penales, sociales e incluso científicas de más resonancia entre los reformistas del siglo XIX" (295). In communicating these marginalized populations, Baroja's literary style is evident, as he depicts a realist and mundane portrayal of the horrors of urban life.

Baroja reintroduces Manuel in the second book of the trilogy by contrasting him with the character of Roberto, two individuals that clearly represent opposite ends of the spectrum with respect to their lifestyles. Roberto wakes early each morning eager to work and accomplishes an impressive amount every day. "Ahora, después de traducir invariablemente diez páginas, voy a la calle de Serrano a dar una lección de inglés; de aquí tomo el tranvía y marcho al final de la calle de Mendizábal, vuelvo al centro, me meto en la casa editorial y corrijo las pruebas de la traducción. Salgo a las doce, voy a mi restaurant, como, tomo café, escribo mis cartas a Inglaterra y a las tres estoy en la academia de Fischer. A las cuatro y media voy al colegio protestante. De seis a ocho paseo, a las nueve ceno, a las diez estoy en el periódico y a las doce en la cama" (20). In opposition

to Roberto, Baroja presents Manuel as apathetic, waking late and lacking motivation in every aspect of life. Manuel's only task includes engaging in conversation with bohemians at a local cafe, which stirs in him the desire for the life of an intellectual. Manuel makes his desire to engage in intellectual life clear to Roberto, who urges him to reconsider, given the value that he places on the notion of labor. This difference of opinion between the two individuals leads to significant conflict, as Roberto's tireless desire to work and lack of intellectualism repulse Manuel.

One day, Manuel, still without a viable income, informs Roberto that he plans to marry a woman. Against Roberto's advice, Manuel marries, but later ends the marriage after a short period of time. The following chapters highlight the misadventures of the protagonist, as Manuel enters the services of a baroness who tricks rich men, and even briefly becomes a gardener. In these failures, Baroja demonstrates the degradation and general apathy of almost every character in the novel. Aside from Roberto, who is portrayed as the only individual desirous of work, Spanish society is portrayed entirely apathetic toward the trials of professionalism, causing significant suffering beyond that experienced by those in the workforce.

Upon his return to Madrid, Manuel, having fallen into the abysses of despair, accepts Roberto's proposition to work with him. Dedicating himself to labor in a printing press, Baroja indicates that Manuel's life has changed permanently. However, his laziness haunts him, and he returns to his previous life on the streets, stealing and spending time with individuals involved in crime, eventually causing him to develop a hatred toward life itself. Baroja portrays a sordid and vicious world, revealing individuals stealing from a man having just committed suicide, an incestuous relationship between a brother and a sister, and a cold-blooded murder. Leaving nothing to the imagination, Baroja exposes the most shameful acts of a modern society. "Miedos, temores colectivos que alimentan el imaginario de la ciencia se trasvasan en los textos literarios

en los que las descripciones hiperbólicas de los males contemporáneos cobran tintes sombríos y los convierten en cuadros esperpénticos. La mendicidad, la infancia abandonada, la insalubridad, la prostitución y la delincuencia más o menos organizada son temas que inundan la trilogía …" (Hibbs 295). It is clear, therefore, that Baroja's desire is to emphasize the lengths of national depravity, representing the degeneration of Spain's citizens both physically and socially.

Manuel's lack of drive exposes him to the worst the city has to offer, an unabashed form of deterioration facing a nation that was perhaps unthinkable in the past. On the other hand, the representation of Roberto, contrasted from the depiction of those living on the streets, is that of a respectable individual. Although his life is by no means perfect, he is stable and able to enjoy his work. Baroja utilizes Roberto to provide a sharp critique of bohemian life, presenting him as different from those of the morally depraved mass. In this, Baroja provides a conception of a new ethic, unrelated to religious ideology[109]. Roberto acts as a mouthpiece for Baroja referencing both bohemians and the apathetic in his conversation with Manuel: "—Ellos yo no sé si han hecho o no indignidades; como comprenderás, eso a mí no me va ni me viene; pero cuando un hombre no puede comprender nada en serio, cuando no tiene voluntad, ni corazón, ni sentimientos altos, ni idea de justicia ni de equidad, es capaz de todo. Si esta gente tuviera un talento excepcional, podrían ser útiles y hacer su carrera, pero no lo tienen; en cambio han perdido las nociones morales del burgués, los puntales que sostienen la vida del hombre vulgar. Viven como hombres que poseyeran de los genios sus enfermedades y sus vicios, pero no su talento ni su corazón; vegetan en una atmósfera de pequeñas intrigas, de mezquindades torpes. Son incapaces de realizar una cosa. Quizá haya algo genial, yo no digo que no, en esos monstruos de Alex, en esas poesías de Santillana; pero eso no basta, hay que ejecutar lo que se ha pensado, lo que se ha sentido, y para

[109] Although perhaps not entirely different, as the depraved sectors of society are deemed morally errant by both The Church and Baroja.

eso se necesita el trabajo diario, constante. Es como un niño que nace, y la comparación, aunque sea vieja, es exacta: la madre lo pare con dolor, luego le alimenta en su pecho y le cuida hasta que crece y se hace fuerte. Esos quieren hacer de golpe y porrazo una obra hermosa y no hacen más que hablar y hablar" (26). In Roberto's dialogue, Baroja offers a glimpse into his personal program to address the national apathy that overwhelms the masses of Madrid. Furthermore, he does not merely target the marginalized at the lowest end of society, but rather highlights that the abhorrent conditions of society had expanded to all sectors.

Although brief, Roberto's excerpt regarding bohemian life and those without vitality is valuable because it represents one of Baroja's strongest critiques of Spanish society. Roberto is distinct from any other character presented in the trilogy, primarily because he is diligent and ferociously hardworking. He contrasts himself to all others due to his lack of apathy toward life and the forceful action he takes to define himself. He does not adhere to traditional beliefs in order to define his sense of being, but defines himself through action. Creating a correlation between action and being, Roberto tells Manuel, "—¡Obrero! ¡Quia! Ojalá lo fueras. Hoy no eres más que un vago y debes hacerte obrero. Lo que soy yo, lo que somos todos los que trabajamos. Muévete, actívate. Ahora la actividad para ti es un esfuerzo; haz algo; repite lo que hagas, hasta que la actividad sea para ti una costumbre. Convierte tu vida estática en vida dinámica. ¿No me entiendes? Quiero decirte que tengas voluntad" (26). As mentioned, Roberto's words are few in *Mala hierba*, perhaps purposefully[110], yet Baroja clearly sets this character on an ethical pedestal. Baroja conveys Roberto's comments in an almost religious manner, intending to convert Manuel to his way of life. However, Roberto's role is to warm others of impending doom, as there is no

[110] Roberto is a man of action, not words.

mention of piety nor kindness, which are elements of Baroja's ethic proposed in other novels. Rather, Roberto condemns Spanish society for the laziness and lack of will of its citizens.

Written within the context of Krausism's educational ascendance, Baroja's moral stance presents some similarities to the philosophy popularized in Spain by Julián Sanz del Río. The notion of morality for Krausism maintains some similarities with Baroja's position in *Mala hierba*, but there are important distinctions as well. To situate Baroja's condemnation of Spanish society, and simultaneously differentiate Baroja's alternative ethic from that of the Church, it is imperative that we comprehend the educational movement, and its morality, during its tumultuous context.

For Krausism, the free will determines the morality of an action, similar to Kant's philosophy, as the act of willing for the individual is deemed good. Daniel Rueda Garrido's article "Krause, Spanish Krausism and Philosophy of Action" simplifies Krausist morality: "In other words, while the philosophy of action studies actions from the point of view of the rational process involved in establishing a guiding idea, morality has to do with actions from the point of view of will, as confirming in reason (will, reason and action are the essential elements of the human being for Krausism, depressed through the symbols of heart, head and hand)" (Garrido 175-176). Relating this notion of morality to Spanish education, the inherent good expressed through will of action sheds light on the inclusion of experiential learning into the domain of knowledge.

The idea of action is, however, complex, as it pertains to internal, external, social, and individual acts. Nevertheless, in a practical sense, Krausism does implicitly set forth that actions must be for the betterment of the human well-being to be considered moral, emphasizing the intentions that correspond to the will of the individual[111]. Providing a clear depiction of morality

[111] Garrido highlights that rational actions, in a similar manner to which Aristotle conceived it, are required to pursue human well-being. However, he highlights that this well-being can be presented as the content that must also be willed.

for Spanish Krausism, Garrido writes, "[f]or instance, the Krausist intellectual and political Fernando de los Ríos Urruti argued that the moral exigencies are only a subsidiary consequence of the description of the laws and principles that guide our will to act (1997: 49). In this sense, the will is, for Krausists, the way in which the human condition is empowered to express or determine itself through particular actions (Giner de los Ríos, H., 1903: 48). However, these particular actions determine only some of the human possibilities, never the totality, which would be what they understand as human essence. Therefore, we attain self-realization through our activities but this self-realization or completion is only partial at each time (Giner de los Ríos, H., 1993*:* 49)." (Garrido 177).

Self-realization, through action, represents the manner in which the individual and the community may realize their potential, confirming the individual's identity[112]. The confirmation of one's identity, or being, remains contingent on that of the Absolute Being, which also has its being in activity. "While human beings pursue the actualization of their possibilities with their activity, the Absolute is pure activity in which all possibilities are actualized." (Garrido 181). Humans, then, validate their being through the connectedness of their actions to those of the Absolute Being.

Although Baroja's focus in *Mala hierba* is the condemnation of a degenerate society, plagued by every conceivable vice, the contrasting depiction of Roberto provides a brief outline of Baroja's ethic. His disgust of national apathy is clear, as it is one of the primary causes of suffering for the marginalized and the bohemian alike. In this, Baroja identifies a great evil plaguing Spanish society, inherently correlating apathy to social demise. This is evident

[112] "This last remark leads us to the full ethical point of Krausism, for which the highest law of human activity and final purpose cannot be other than the good, and what is good is the realization of the human essence in life, the actualization of (all) its possibilities (Giner de los Ríos, H., 1993: 119)." (Garrido 178).

throughout the novel, as the apathetic suffer immensely due to their laziness. However, Roberto represents an enigma to the other characters, choosing to reject the path of least resistance and effectively defining his being. This introduction to Baroja's 'man of action' seizes life through forceful movement and relentlessness. He is as he achieves, working tirelessly to accomplish his will. Baroja's portrayal of this individual demonstrates the interconnected of his program with the notion of action.

This brief introduction to his ethic, like Krausism, corresponds to the confirmation of one's being. For Baroja's program of reconciliation and Krausism, coexisting during the same epoch, decisive action confirms, asserts, and strengthens the individual. Distinct to Krausism, however, is the necessity to direct action toward good, bettering both the individual and society. Baroja's focus, rather, is activity geared toward the betterment of the individual, regardless of society's imposition. Roberto's brief comments and work ethic, contrasted to that of the other characters presented in *La lucha por la vida*, highlights Baroja's vision of the 'man of action', one who achieves a sense of morality through vital work, be that labor or conquest. However, Roberto serves as merely an introduction to this 'man of action', a realization that occurs more thoroughly in *Zalacaín el aventurero* and finds its ultimate realization in *César o nada*.

III. Baroja's 'Man of Action'

Confirming the self in *Zalacaín el aventurero*

Baroja's *Zalacaín el aventurero*, written in 1909, renders an incipient depiction of the Spanish philosopher's 'man of action'. Fatherless and poverty-stricken, the opening chapters present the protagonist Martín Zalacaín's formative years. Living as an outsider in the Basque city of Urbia, Baroja details Zalacaín's affection for a local girl named Catalina, the death of his mother, and the adoption of him and his sister by their great uncle Tallagorri. Tallagorri serves a

pedagogical purpose in Martín's life, as he rejects traditional education in favor of a more holistic edification. Not without his vices[113], Martín´s individualistic educator and caregiver loses his life to alcohol abuse. Nevertheless, his teachings leave a foundational impact on Martín, inspiring individualistic and energetic passions, elements that epitomize Baroja's 'man of action'.

Zalacaín and his sister remain in the house of his love interest, Catalina, and her brother Carlos following the death of their great uncle. Zalacaín opposes Carlos's desire to marry his sister, thus reigniting a generational feud between the two families. Carlos attempts to take Martín's life, causing the protagonist to flee, thus beginning his adventures. These adventures take place in the midst of the Carlist Wars, as Zalacaín recognizes the profitability of the exchange of goods in such a time. Given the Basque region's central location between Spain and France, Martín profits from his fearlessness and unique ability to use multiple identities. The focal point of Martín's business adventures is Baroja's emphasis on the protagonist's voracious individualism, which makes him capable of separating himself from the religious, political, and ideological movements of his time. Furthermore, despite Martín's inclination toward financial opportunism, he is detached from economic greed. Baroja's emphasis is not the riches that Zalacaín attains from his bravery, but rather the individualism exemplified through this process. With respect to politics, although Zalacaín is forced to fight in the Carlist War, he is ideologically detached from its cause, as he views it merely as a mode to attain power for the clergy. Some of Baroja's sharpest criticisms come by way of Martín's perception of the priest, along with a general rejection of dominant superstructures and established society. With reference to cities, Martín says, "Para mí las ciudades están hechas por miserables y sirven para que las saquen los hombres fuertes…" (64).

[113] "Sin vino y sin patharra soy un hombre muerto" (27).

Martín rejects the modes of his day as he is only able to satisfy his desire for nonconformity through battle.

Following his passions, Martín becomes a retired soldier at only twenty-four years old due to a wound garnered in battle. In his pursuit of personal purpose, he seeks out Catalina to marry her, discovering that her brother has garnered a considerable reputation in the town. Following their marriage, Martín and Catalina have a child, which generates a tranquil life for the entire family. Nevertheless, Zalacaín is incapable of living a life of individually perceived insignificance and, against Catalina's wishes, he decides to fight again. Although successful in a bloody battle, the fight is short-lived and the Carlist army withdraws from Spain.

Concluding the novel, Martín and Carlos find themselves reunited. Carlos spits in his sister's face, causing Martín to attack him in a fit of rage. During their brief fight, Martín is shot by el Cacho and has but only a few moments to say goodbye to his wife. Baroja concludes the novel glorifying this man of courage, highlighting the inscription of his grave:

"Duerme en esta sepultura
Martín Zalacaín, el fuerte.
Venganza tomó la muerte
De su audacia y su bravura.
De su guerrera apostura
El vasco guarda memoria;
Y aunque el libro de la historia
Su rudo nombre rechaza,
¡Caminante de su raza,
Descúbrete ante su gloria!"

In this, Baroja highlights the 'man of action', perhaps more aptly defined in *César o nada*, but nevertheless emphasized in the primitive representation of Martín Zalacaín. Zalacaín finds contentment and satisfaction only through action, compelled constantly to satisfy his desire to reject traditional society. He typifies and embodies a sentiment shared by another Baroja character, Chimista of *Los Pílotos de altura*, in which he states, "La gente parece más feliz cuanto más primitivo e ignorante" (198). In the same way, Zalacaín contemplates his lack of purpose in times of tranquility. A life of action, while not necessarily directly oppositional to a life dedicated to thought, prioritizes action over reason. Zalacaín's adventures epitomize a careful balance between action and thought, with preference always given to brute force. The protagonist utilizes reason and wit to achieve a favorable outcome, yet his behavior necessitates the utilization of thought. Zalacaín's actions put him in danger, but his capacity for reasoning removes him from perilous situations. Despite this balance, Zalacaín's appetite for action is the cause of his death, as reason would favor a level-head when dealing with one's foes with so much to lose. Gonzalo Navajas emphasizes the paradox of his death, writing, "Zalacaín muere lejos del campo de la acción bélica arriesgada y dinamizadora" (*Pío Baroja: El escritor y su literatura* 43). Nevertheless, Zalacaín's death serves a purpose, as it is the manifestation of his nonconformity, consistent even in death, as the history books reject his name. Despite the rejection of this establishment, Zalacaín achieves the status of legend. His nonsystematic self-realization acts as a mode to confirm his being[114], even in death. This Barojian proposal of being must be comprehended within the context of the epoch to both situate it chronologically and further comprehend its significance for Baroja's program with respect to morality.

[114] Much like the Krausist's notion of being.

In opposition to Baroja's preliminary definition of being, expressed through Zalacaín, Miguel de Unamuno and Karl Jaspers offer a philosophically charged definition of the notion of being related to the critical situation in Europe in the early twentieth century. However, despite their philosophical nature, these authors also provide theoretical proposals for societal resolution related to the inclusion of the transcendental into the realm of rationality, a staple of modern philosophical thought in the early twentieth century. Consequently, Unamuno and Jaspers argue that individual wholeness of being is dependent on these forms of traditionalism. Therefore, one must reject the social and political superstructures of societal organization and individually return to those of days past. For Jaspers, it is the demand for the transcendental, a notion highly unpopular in European culture and thought following the turn of the century. For Unamuno, wholeness of being is dependent on the opposition of rationalism and faith, an affront to individual integration within the collective due to the social tendency to trust the empirical sciences. Their proposals to address the concerns plaguing society, in accordance with the existential notion of existence, present society with remedies for the crucial problems prevalent at the turn of the century. Distinct from Baroja, these two thinkers propose a sort of hybrid return to the past, including theocracy yet maintaining renovated links with rationalism. With respect to Miguel de Unamuno, the practical verification of these proposals for individual existence is clear, particularly in *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, as Unamuno presents the individual's need for the dialectical relation between the transcendental and the rational. The contemplation of the notion of being, particularly related to a return to traditional modes, allows for an adequate reflection on the disparity of Jaspers's and Unamuno's philosophies to situate Baroja's proposal for individual wholeness of being within society at the turn of the century.

Karl Jaspers, in *The Philosophy of Existence*, rejects any form of empirically scientific

examination of the notion of being, searching for a philosophical justification for the need of the transcendental. Jaspers defines the term *das Umgreifende*, the nucleus of his philosophy, which means Encompassing. This notion of Encompassing maintains two distinct yet compatible dimensions, composed of the subjective and objective domains. The objective feature of Encompassing includes Being itself, while the subjective feature of Encompassing composes Being as self-identity. Thus, through consideration of one's self-identity, the individual is capable of rising toward *Existenz*. *Existenz* is the innermost self, what some might refer to as the soul, that is unable to be approximated by any empirical science. "As *Existenz* I am especially freedom and decision projected toward the future. Time is not as it is for empirical existence, a perpetual passing; it is perpetual appearance and disappearance of *Existenz*" (Nguyen 221). This notion stems from *Transcendence*, the epitome of authority and is uniquely related to the concept of *Existenz*. The freedom attained through *Existenz* creates a response, either demanding authorization or opposition to authority. Consequently, to reinforce the freedom attained through *Existenz*, or fortify the essence of freedom opposed by authority, the authority of transcendence is vital to individual human existence. In effect, one must consider his or her self-identity to rise toward *Existenz*, properly situating Jaspers in the ensemble of philosophers relating individual being with action, a proposal supported by Baroja. Although Jaspers's notion of transcendence is not necessarily traditional in that it does not adhere to Catholic dogma, it does give way to a traditional return to transcendence, a stark deviation from the growing atheist sympathies of Europe in that epoch. Miguel de Unamuno, on the other hand, proposes a more traditional notion of being, one more closely aligned to Catholic ideals.

While Unamuno does not adhere wholeheartedly to any religious institution or belief, his persistent desire for eternal life makes him a deeply spiritual individual. In this sense, both Baroja

and Unamuno grapple with an unceasing spiritual restlessness. However, while they share a certain uneasiness regarding life's meaning, they diverge in their proposition to address this anxiety. In *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*, Unamuno emphasizes that modern science, during the early twentieth century, had addressed many questions that scientists had asked, but it could not answer the essential questions of life. Why do humans, knowing that they will die, still seek immortality? What causes the internal desire to remain alive forever if death is simply the culmination of life and the natural succession of evolution? Is there life after this life?

Unamuno argues that these questions remain unanswered by the empirical sciences, leaving the most important aspects of life, according to Unamuno, to persist in an unresolved state. Unamuno mentions Alfred Tennyson's quote regarding the matter, citing, "… for nothing worthy of proving can be proven, nor yet disproven" (62). In short, Unamuno highlights that the existential inquiries pertaining to God, religion, and the afterlife would remain in a state of irresolution. That irresolution is understood when one recognizes that these inquiries have the potential to be the most important in life, yet reason and science remain unfit to address them.

As previously highlighted, Unamuno emphasizes the necessity for the inclusion of the conversation regarding the possibility of eternal life in the realm of philosophy and academia. In Unamuno's novels, he reiterates the necessity of the transcendental to attain wholeness of individual being in the realm of the social and political collective. This program, perhaps less developed than other previously highlighted plans for resolution[115], is nonetheless an individualistic program. In this sense, it is akin to Baroja's notion of individualism, as Baroja's characters gain contentment and satisfaction, however futile, in the moments when they reject dominant societal structures. Nevertheless, Unamuno encourages all of society to include the

[115] Unamuno only asks to have a rational conversation regarding the possibility of eternity, while others prescribe sweeping programs for individuals.

concept of eternity into the philosophical conversation pertaining to individual existence, as the collective political and social superstructures have determined eternity to be a notion impeding empirical progress. Thus, Unamuno proposes a plan geared toward the individual willing to stand against the collective, much like Martín Zalacaín in *Zalacaín el aventurero*. Unamuno proposes that the individual take action to question the dominant trends in philosophy to explore the nature of his or her being. In his novel *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, Unamuno provides content to rationally contemplate the transcendental in conformity with his plan for resolution presented in *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*.

In *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*[116], Unamuno utilizes the protagonist to propose the notion of the irreligious and unbelieving saint, a concept that is an obvious contradiction. Although Don Manuel is a fictional character, the consideration of his status is essential to Unamuno's reasoning, as Unamuno utilizes novels, or *nivolas*, in order to convey philosophically challenging material to generate intellectual thought. This intellectual thought, particularly pertaining to the consideration of the notion of the transcendental, permits the contemplation of created characters within the reader's reality. The blurring of lines between sainthood and apostacy is clearly a goal of Unamuno's, as the townspeople submit Don Manuel's name for beatification[117]. This contradiction found in Unamuno's work is representative of his notion of the contradiction as the unifying element of life. He argues that the contradiction is an element in all aspects of the relationship between the transcendental and the human, as the Church seeks reason to validate its faith in God, yet reason appears incompatible with the Church's fundamental dogmas. In *Del*

[116] *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, written and published in 1931 by Miguel de Unamuno, epitomizes the genre of *nivola*, as relatively few actions or descriptions occur in the novel. The setting of the novel is Valverde de Lucerna, an imagined provincial town near a lake in Spain. Miguel de Unamuno presents the contradictory figure of Don Manuel, a priest whose good works go beyond those of any other clergymen.
[117] Don Manuel's actions, faking belief, are akin to the Marxist notion of administering opium to the townspeople.

sentimiento trágico de la vida, Unamuno asserts that both faith and reason are vital to the human experience. The matters presented in Unamuno's novels demand the contemplation of rational themes pertaining to philosophy and the transcendental. Although Don Manuel is a philosophically oriented thinker, as his rationality does not allow him to wholeheartedly accept Catholicism, he recognizes the necessity of the transcendental for the individual's survival. Effectively, he argues that completeness and contentment are dependent on the amalgamation of faith and reason.

Like Unamuno and Jaspers, who both condemn the movements of their time, Zalacaín likewise rids himself of the shackles of his epoch. He firmly cements his legacy as an individual, as he pursues personal passions, confirming his nonconformity through action. Martín Zalacaín rejects all forms of authority, be it political, social, and religious, thus positioning himself against every conceivable movement of his time.

Superficially, one could read *Zalacaín el aventurero* as an oppositional proposal, on Baroja's part, to the redemptive plans suggested by Miguel de Unamuno and Karl Jaspers. However, there is more to Baroja's representation of Martín Zalacaín. There certainly are significant differences between these three thinkers, namely Baroja's rejection of institutional religion and the notion of sin, notions upheld by Miguel de Unamuno and Karl Jaspers in their proposals. Both Unamuno and Jaspers highlight the necessity of theocracy as well as rationalism, emphasizing the value of both. Effectively, these philosophers propose a return to traditionalism due to the value garnered through both faith and reason. Baroja recognizes the merit of reason, but points out its role in stripping the individual of meaningful purpose for his or her life. Furthermore, Baroja appears to oppose traditionalism, but his fascination with Nietzsche indicates that his opposition must be rooted in a fierce disgust of the inclusion of religion, one inherently linked to Spain's traditional past. In this, clearly, there is a significant discord between Baroja and

the other two thinkers. Nevertheless, Baroja clearly highlights the contradiction with respect to being, written plainly, that rationalism alone denies meaninglessness to life.

As previously mentioned, Jaspers rejects the notion of being on the basis of pure scientific examination, requiring both subjective and objective domains to establish the notion of Encompassing. Likewise, Unamuno requires the contradiction of faith and reason and, more specifically, the transcendental to establish the individual's being. Although Baroja does not explicitly correlate rationalism with a lack of purpose in *Zalacaín el aventurero*, he emphasizes that Zalacaín establishes both his being and his purpose through action. It is only when he is conscious of his lack of action that he begins to internally decay. This phenomenon can be ascertained clearly through his conversation with a military friend, Briones:

"— Es usted la inquietud personificada, Martín –dijo Briones.

— ¿Qué quiere usted? He crecido salvaje como las hierbas y necesito la acción, la acción continua. Yo, muchas veces pienso que llegará un día en que los hombres podrán aprovechar las pasiones de los demás en algo bueno.

— ¿También es usted soñador?

— También.

— La verdad es que es usted un hombre pintoresco, amigo Zalacaín.

— Pero la mayoría de los hombres son como yo.

— Oh, no. La mayoría somos gente tranquila, pacífica, un poco muerta.

— Pues yo estoy vivo, eso sí; pero la misma vida que no puedo emplear se me queda dentro y se me pudre. Sabe usted, yo quisiera que todo viviese, que todo comenzara a marchar, no dejar nada parado, empujar todo al movimiento, hombres, mujeres, negocios, máquinas, minas, nada quieto, nada inmóvil …" (179). In this, Baroja correlates action with living, and thus emphasizes the need

for action to establish being. He does not entirely reject rationalism, but rather emphasizes its subversion to action, implying that war is an essential element of his life. In doing so, Zalacaín's depiction supposes an alternative ethic, clearly distinct from traditional notions of morality.

Gonzalo Navajas highlights Zalacaín's need for war as his chosen mode to destroy traditional values associated with societal order. "La guerra significa para Martín el camino más apropiado para la destrucción de los valores de la *civitas* que origina el orden y las leyes imperantes que él rechaza" (42). Baroja deviates from Krausist morality, as Zalacaín does not inherently aim to do good for the community, but rather seeks to supplant the social code of ethics. War is necessary to establish his being, dynamically carried out with vitality. War, then, from this perspective would not be considered amoral, but rather the epitome of morality, as it cements one's personal identity. "Martín rompe con las normas que los demás obedecen porque les dan una identidad cierta. Esas normas, que son indispensables para otros, para él son un impedimento para el desarrollo de su individualidad" (Navajas 41). Furthermore, Baroja indicates that Zalacaín's confirmation of being destroys the abstract code used to define oneself, effectively eradicating the need for categories and conquering all in his path. His ethic of action, therefore, is personal and nonconforming, inherently confirming his being. *Zalacaín el aventurero*, then, offers a brief example of the socially and morally regenerative program proposed by Pío Baroja within the context of the turmoil of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, a context with a multitude of ideas, such as those presented by Jaspers and Unamuno. The notion of this program finds its full development in the novel *César o nada*.

Establishing a New Ethic in *César o nada*

Baroja's *César o nada* epitomizes his philosophical program to address societal decline, namely the decline highlighted by the *Generación del 98*. Baroja's proposal to address this decline

stresses the issue of traditional ethics, as the author emphasizes the problem of the lack of confidence inspired in human knowledge due to society's inability to establish moral principles apart from the Church. Baroja's protagonist argues that the impossibility of collectively agreed upon norms necessarily implies the impossibility of an objective morality. In this, Baroja's protagonist shares Nietzsche's concept of the *Übermensch*, introduced in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. These literary figures have more in common than merely a distrust in the Church's morals, as they embody a similar ethic that condemns a lack of energy and force in the face of life. Although Baroja's depiction of César is not a complete embrace of the Nietzschean ideal, it represents a specific call for societal upheaval through fierce individualism.

César o nada, published in 1910, presents the figure of César, a descendant of a family with many strong-willed individuals. César and his sister Laura are introduced having a conversation with Pío Baroja himself, a conversation in which César and Baroja discuss the protagonist's plan. Baroja and César discuss morality, and the novelist offers a distinct view of this notion. He asserts that his notion of morality is more closely related to the idea of pity rather than force, but that the correlation of pity with morality can be destructive. Inherently, Baroja's conception of morality appears as a working definition, able to be reconsidered and redefined with adequate convincing.

The first section of *César o nada* can be understood as the working out of César philosophical plan of action, as the protagonist determines his outlook, networks with other high-profile individuals in Italy and Spain, and takes inspiration from Cæsar Borgia. Known for the rapidity of his decision, and old enough to engage in serious conversation, but too young to be considered for his political pursuits, César's early interactions garner a reaction, either respect or disgust, from most with whom he engages. He spends considerable time in Italy with his sister,

observing others and working out his personal objectives. An expert in finance, César's philosophical ruminations are rooted in practicality, bent always toward the modern moment. Having a thought to pursue politics, César takes daily walks to consider his goals and philosophy. He works out a philosophical system to guide his ambitions, stating that he will move from nature to life[118].

In a foundational conservation with a friend, Alzugaray, that would impact him for the remainder of his life, César firmly determines his philosophy and establishes a plan that guides him: "-Bien -siguió diciendo César-. Voy a pasar de la naturaleza a la vida; voy a suponer que la vida tiene una determinación. ¿En dónde puede hallarse esta determinación? No la sabemos. ¿Pero cuál puede ser el mecanismo de esta determinación? Sólo el movimiento, la acción. Es decir, la lucha. Hecha tal afirmación, yo voy o[sic] colaborar a su finalidad. Las cosas que llamamos espirituales son también dinámicas. Quien dice algo dice materia y fuerza; quien dice fuerza, expresa atracción y repulsión; atracción y repulsión son sinónimas de movimiento, de lucha, de acción" (43). In this, César establishes that he will seek to enact his plan of action through the gratification of *doing* and *seeing*. He will impose his will on the world through the violent mode of force, carrying out his plan without remorse.

Effectively, he determines the validity of his plan by highlighting its morality. He argues that morals should be merely the nature of man, enacting his personal will on his environment: "-Sí; la moral no debe ser mas[sic] que la ley verdadera, propia y natural del hombre. ¿Considerado únicamente como máquina espiritual? No. ¿Considerado como un animal que come y bebe? Tampoco; considerado de una manera íntegra. ¿No es eso?" (43). Affirming this position, César rejects the traditional norms of morality established by the Church, replacing the principles of the

[118] "-Sí, voy construyendo mi plan - siguió diciendo César-, un plan dentro de lo relativo. Es claro" (42).

Church with the statutes of man. His action, then, could be personally determined, including even the action of lying in bed[119]. Having firmly established this new ethic, César works to employ it practically, moving up politically to achieve a goal not concretely established. His goal, first and foremost, is to be heroic and influential, even in the face of the risk of losing everything. Aiming to take advantage of a familial connection to power, César networks to secure a position of influence in Spain. Despite his uncle's role in the Church, César rejects his collaboration with the Church, valuing the religion merely for its organizational properties.

During one of his adventures, César comes to learn of Cæsar Borgia, a figure that impacts the protagonist immensely. César finds great intrigue in this past figure, especially so for an individual that continually rejects the value of history. His interest stems from the historical figure's relentless domination of Rome and the phrase *Aut Caesar, Aut nihil*, which has come to mean *all or nothing* on account of this influential figure. César found the historical figure's purpose, complete dominance for both personal gain and the community, to be almost moral, inspiring the modern César to carry out his self-determined goal. In this, Baroja establishes a connection between the notion of action and that of morality, a theme that César seeks to live out practically for both his own betterment and that of the Spanish nation. Furthermore, Baroja utilizes César to reject all modern socially proposed attempts at utopia, namely spirituality, politics, and even finance. His objection to spirituality is clear, but his denial of politics requires further attention, much like his rejection of finance.

Baroja's characterization of César Moncada, a figure that seeks both political power for Spain and personal gain, twists the concept of politics for the betterment of mankind on its head. César's philosophical program is established and confirmed by its creator as being on a higher

[119] "-¿Y tú llamas acción a estar tendido en la cama, leyendo?
-Sí, cuando se lee con las intenciones que leo yo" (52).

moral ground, effectively replacing merely collective betterment for individual motives. César aims to subjugate towns and their citizens to his will, knowing that his will is best for this hesitant nation. This is not to say it is a purely selfish desire, but rather a careful balance between his personal arrogance and his belief in his philosophical program. Regardless of the possibility that his motives could improve their lives, his individualistic goal is inherently a mockery of Spanish politics of that day, namely the rising movements of socialism and anarchism.

With respect to finance, Baroja likewise utilizes César, an expert in this field, to reject the role of economics in both establishing the individual and creating wholeness of being. Although he is capable of understanding the markets, he comprehends money as merely a means to an end[120]. Baroja depiction of César thus represents the rejection of another proposition of his time, that of financial regeneration. César's societal plan includes financial gain, but money alone is incapable of satisfying the people.

Following a networked connection with an influential government figure, Don Calixto, Baroja details the practical implementation of César's philosophy as a national deputy for Castro Duro. The protagonist's talent in the stock market provides an influx of money for a declining town, representative of Spain's national decline. The citizens of Castro Duro, having been ruled primarily by the Church, immediately embrace César due to his financial success and the new projects he implements. He enacts a number of educational programs in the city, aimed at stimulating the mind and workmanship of the townspeople, which simultaneously exasperate the clergy in the town. César's plans initially have immense success, as he begins to work with the Spanish Minister of Finance. The practicality of César's philosophical program reaches its pinnacle in his dealings with this powerful figure.

[120] "-El dinero es una porquería. ¡Si fuera posible suprimirlo!" (79).

Foreseeing a bear market in France, the Minister of Finance had planned on removing Spain's capital in the foreign market to gain notoriety for his financial exploits. Underestimating César's capabilities, the Minister of Finance sends César to France to carry out his plan, unknowingly sending out a viper bent on attaining power by any means possible. César invests almost all of the Minister's money into the French market, and simultaneously bets against the market personally, effectively causing the ruin of all parties except himself. The Minister of Finance immediately submits his resignation and César returns to Spain with roughly half a million francs. Although calculations and inflation calculators are merely estimations and make the purchasing power of certain goods irrelevant at alternate moments in European history, it is safe to say that one franc was equal to over two US dollars in 1910, effectively making half a million francs well over a million dollars. Put simply, César became one of the wealthiest individuals in all of Europe due to his financial acumen. When questioned by Alzugaray, César calls himself *sinagaglia* in reference to Cæsar Borgia's nickname. Nevertheless, César does not attain this wealth for economic comfort, but rather to destroy those who represent the status quo.

In fact, the comfort achieved by this wealth, coupled with that of his marriage to a woman who understands him, deters him from accomplishing the goals he had forcefully pursued. He notices that his violent personality is tamed more day by day, as his love for his wife grows stronger. He lacks the ferocious desire to enact his philosophical ruminations, preferring tranquil time spent with his love[121]. César's life of comfort provided him with a mixed sense of satisfaction, one that both stabilized his restlessness and destabilized his mind: "Esto es, sin duda, lo que se llama ser feliz – se decía -. Y el ser feliz le daba la impresión de un limbo, sentía como si su antigua personalidad fuera muriendo en él. Ya no podía encontrar su manera de ser antigua, todas sus

[121] "César fue[sic] abandonando todos los asuntos del distrito que le preocupaban, y ocupándose únicamente de su novia" (313).

inquietudes habían desaparecido; se sentía con aplomo, sin aquellos vaivenes de valor y de cobardía que antes en él constituían lo característico" (317-318).

For a brief moment, he is inspired once more to continue his philosophical program, moved by the idea of defeating the powerful Father Martín, a priest whose ruthlessness surpasses even César's. In the end, however, César is shot dead and embodies the latter half of Cæsar Borgia's famous saying A*ut Caesar, aut nihil*[122]. The traditional Institution of Catholicism reassumes power over the town of Castro Duro, returning to its way of life before César Moncada.

In this, Baroja's protagonist proves incapable of successfully embodying the ideal 'man of action' to its complete realization. He is philosophically competent, but the comforts of life weigh on him and weaken his psyche. Primitively introduced in Zalacaín, demonstrated briefly in Roberto, awakened in Manuel, César nevertheless represents the greatest example of Baroja's individualistic program to address modern ills. Baroja highlights the merit in his Nietzschean persona and stark individualism, constituting an affront to the entrenched mode of the day. Marsha Suzan Collins's words epitomize the reality to which Baroja takes aim: "The unique vision of reality present in Baroja's novels also grows out of a major philosophical shift that came to the forefront just as he was beginning his career as a writer. Around the turn of the century, positivism and its faith in progress through science gave way to a more skeptical, ironic worldview that emphasized subjectivity instead of objectivity, man's will and irrational forces as opposed to his rational powers" (21). Although César primarily takes aim at traditional belief systems in Spain, his manner of being simultaneously exhibits an attack on all distinct programs. By its very nature, Baroja's proposal, partially embodied in César, demands complete adherence, as César's will determines the self apart from others or institutions. There is no other way by which one must

[122] Although multiple endings to the novel have been published, the most widely accepted version of Baroja César o nada reveals the assassination of Cesar and the depiction of Castro Duro, still adhering to traditional values.

confirm the self, as Baroja does not leave room for such a possibility. Rather, the figure of César demonstrates an almost moralistic superiority, destructive and self-centered, calling to memory the Nietzschean figure of Zarathustra. The comprehension of this literary figure, Zarathustra, is necessary to fully comprehend Baroja's proposal epitomized in César Moncada.

Friedrich Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, published in 1896, introduced the figure of the *Übermensch*, also called the "beyond-man," "Superman," "Overman," "Uberman," or "Superhuman" in English. The difficulty with this translation lies not only in the German language, but also with scholars' interpretation of Nietzsche's ideal. Written in poetic language, Nietzsche utilizes his immense knowledge of Greek mythology to propose a new ethic, embodied in the figure of the *Übermensch*. Nietzsche's Zarathustra, inspired by the Persian prophet Zoroaster, known for defining the struggle between good and evil, is charged with teaching humankind to overcome these statutes. The literary style of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* has been described as almost religious, as Nietzsche's prophet recounts parables, shares his knowledge, and attempts to spurn humankind to reach a higher ideal.

Nietzsche introduces Zarathustra returning from an extended self-inflicted expulsion from humankind, high up on a mountain. Despite his solitude, Zarathustra is content, only returning to humankind to help them reach their potential, believing himself personally capable of such a feat. When Zarathustra reaches a town, he begins to prophecy to the people about the *Übermensch*, a figure that he argues mankind is determined to uncover due to the inadequacy of man. He argues that humankind is merely a bridge to the ideal *Übermensch*, simply a link in the evolutionary process. Despite his prophesying for the town's betterment, Zarathustra is ridiculed and rejected for his ideas. He does not force the citizens to listen to his message, but rather educates those for whom his message finds meaning.

Nietzsche's Zarathustra refers to himself as godless and emphasizes the crookedness of government[123], aiming to tear down the reasoning of the townspeople. He seeks to deconstruct religious morality and traditionalism[124], as he argues that the *Übermensch* is beyond notions of good and evil, ready to move humanity to its determined potential. He rejects any other human created purpose as merely forms of escapism, as Zarathustra argues that society's last man stands in the way of the overcoming to reach the *Übermensch*. The last man stands for comfort, and merely weakly accepts values placed in his life, reinforcing the herd mentality. Accordingly, Zarathustra is at odds with this final man, forcefully pushing the last man toward a greater self-determined purpose, to improve humanity. Zarathustra comes to embrace the notion of eternal recurrence, which causes him a great deal of despair, as the last man must therefore reinforce a never-ending cycle of mediocrity. Nevertheless, the conclusion of Nietzsche's poetic work, Zarathustra embraces eternal recurrence and urges those interested in his message to put off traditionalism and embrace the *Übermensch*.

Both Nietzsche and Baroja share a number of commonalities with respect to their enemies, as Nietzsche's hate of institutions, be they religious or governmental, is likewise evident in Baroja's work. Baroja's disgust for religious institutions is evident in all of his work, but *César o nada* highlights an abhorrence for political parties as well, as César views these entities as merely modes that the individual should exploit for oneself. The disgust for these parties can be understood as a loath of all that imposes a structured ideal on the individual. Nietzsche's Zarathustra, likewise, rejects any imposition, demanding pure individualism to bring forth a new

[123] "And especially do their teachers of submission shout this; - but precisely in their ears do I love to cry: "Yes! I am Zarathustra, the godless!" "Honor to the government, and obedience, and also to the crooked government! So desires good sleep. How can I help it, if power likes to walk on crooked legs?"
[124] He is not opposed to tradition, as Greek mythology is a return to tradition, but rather takes issue with traditionalism in the nationalistic sense.

day. It is clear, then, in both César and Zarathustra that freeing oneself from traditions, be they religious, historical, or even naturalistic, is an ethical imperative for both Nietzsche and Baroja. With respect to religion, both César and Zarathustra seek to tear down the false veil of morality instituted by the Church and replace it with a program of action. Concerning history, both César and Zarathustra reject nationalistic tradition for the sake of both personal and societal gain, seeking to bring forth a new society. With reference to the nature of man, Zarathustra and César share a preference for man's violent and dominating nature as opposed to the natural desire for comfort. In fact, both view comfort and passivity as an impediment to progress and personal satisfaction. Gonzalo Navajas argues that Baroja's program encompasses the need for the overcoming of that passivity: "La incitación de Baroja a la ruptura de la pasividad y la aceptación resignada del mundo constituye todavía hoy una llamada a la orientación del sujeto individual hacia fines de superación y de exploración de lo desconocido y lo nuevo que pueden expansionar su desarrollo personal y mejorar la condición humana en general" (104). Nietzsche's Zarathustra likewise demonstrates this rejection of passivity, actively demonstrating that the accepted religious ethic is amoral, a sentiment shared by Baroja, leading both to propose an ethic inspired by the violent nature of man.

Baroja's characterization of the value of the will, expressed through César, closely resembles the proposed Nietzschean ethic, namely that of a rejection of the Catholic views on morality. Both César and Zarathustra share their disgust for the religious ethic, as they seek to maximize and seize life. Both seek to emphasize that the only amoral notion is, in fact, a lack of force and energy, generating submission to the powers that be. In effect, this would include any apathy toward the idea of domination, one that constitutes both César's behavior and that of the *Übermensch*. In César's case, Navajas argues that the concept of inequality is merely a reality that he accepts: "Para César el dominio de unos sobre otros constituye la naturaleza última de la

condición humana. La desigualdad es la relación social determinante" (13). This notion, while Baroja points out is not adhered to by the clergy, is at odds with the Catholic teachings[125]. Likewise, Zarathustra rejects this notion of equality, arguing that mankind is a bridge for the *Übermensch*, an enhanced being that must carry out his will. Both Zarathustra and César are willing to reject personal satisfaction for this ideal, demonstrating the value that both Nietzsche and Baroja place on the will, correlating it closely with moral good. For their philosophical positions, both protagonists work to adhere to this new ethic, changing their reality despite the personal hardship. This new ethic, while not comprehensively detailed, emphasizes the rejection of comfort, tradition, and apathy in favor of ferocity, energy, and the unmitigated pursuit of one's desires. However, both Baroja and Nietzsche's protagonists recognize that the establishment of this new ethic will necessarily destroy the ethic of the Catholic Church.

Both Nietzsche and Baroja highlight through their "men of action" that destruction is a necessary path to the creation of their new ethic[126]. Marsha Suzan Collins, referencing Walter Kaufman, emphasizes that both authors aim to bring about advancement through suffering: "Finally, Nietzsche and Baroja have the ironist's view that an emphasis on negative aspects of life

[125] NIV James 2:1-13 forbids any favoritism: My brothers and sisters,* do you with your acts of favouritism really believe in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ?* 2For if a person with gold rings and in fine clothes comes into your assembly, and if a poor person in dirty clothes also comes in, 3and if you take notice of the one wearing the fine clothes and say, 'Have a seat here, please', while to the one who is poor you say, 'Stand there', or, 'Sit at my feet',* 4have you not made distinctions among yourselves, and become judges with evil thoughts?5Listen, my beloved brothers and sisters.* Has not God chosen the poor in the world to be rich in faith and to be heirs of the kingdom that he has promised to those who love him? 6But you have dishonoured the poor. Is it not the rich who oppress you? Is it not they who drag you into court?7Is it not they who blaspheme the excellent name that was invoked over you?
8 You do well if you really fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself.' 9But if you show partiality, you commit sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors. 10For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become accountable for all of it. 11For the one who said, 'You shall not commit adultery', also said, 'You shall not murder.' Now if you do not commit adultery but if you murder, you have become a transgressor of the law. 12So speak and so act as those who are to be judged by the law of liberty. 13For judgement will be without mercy to anyone who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgement.

[126] Although their ethic is not a mirror image, they glorify similar aspects of the human will and ferocity.

can bring about positive change; they hope to heal by wounding. Just as Zarathustra strives to create new values by destroying the old concepts of good and evil, Baroja wishes to stimulate the moral reform of the individual by subverting the ordinarily mythified and heroic vision of Spanish national history" (Collins). Both works emphasize that destruction is not necessarily evil, but rather a trial on the road to something positive. Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and Baroja's *César o nada* embody the aim to strip society of surface illusions and produce a novel ethic.

IV. The Novel's Purpose

Baroja's Ideology in *Juventud, egolatría*

Although *Juventud, egolatría* does not constitute a novel, but rather a series of philosophical, political, artistical, and sociological essays by Baroja, it confirms many of themes emphasized in the author's novels. Written in 1917, when Baroja had reached the age of forty-three, the work represents a personal turning point. *Juventud, egolatría* addresses Baroja's personal beliefs, the notion of morality, institutions and anarchism, and his personal program. Although it has been said that the work does not flow coherently, it is neither the purpose nor the desire of Baroja[127]. The goal, rather, is the working out of his personal belief system, a cleansing and revelatory process manifested only through the action of writing. This work confirms much that has been discussed in his novels, but reveals new aspects pertaining to his intentions as well.

In defining his personal beliefs and thoughts, Baroja emphasizes his oppositional stance to all institutional forms. Despite his involvement with political activity in Spain, he unsuccessfully ran for office twice, he emphasizes that he is an enemy of both the Church and the State: "Yo he sido siempre un liberal radical, individualista y anarquista. Primero enemigo de la Iglesia, después del Estado; mientras estos dos grandes poderes estén en lucha, partidario del Estado contra la

[127] "Estas cuartillas son como una exudación espontánea. ¿Sinceras? ¿Absolutamente sinceras? No es muy probable" (19).

Iglesia; el día que el Estado prepondere, enemigo del Estado" (289). Baroja's adversarial stance to the Church is evident throughout his work, perhaps most clearly in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística*) and *El árbol de la ciencia*. Fittingly, his attack on the Church aligns with this statement from *Juventud, egolatría*, as he saves his sharpest critiques for the Church and those that represent it, namely the clergy. Although many of his characters experience mystical passions and longings, Baroja presents these as merely trials and tribulations that the individual must overcome in the process of becoming a more mature human being. This becoming, often correlated with an outright rejection of society and the State, the two intrinsically intertwined due to the propagation of social values by the nation, was often a hindrance to individual expression. Baroja stresses this issue in *Juventud, egolatría*: "Muchos dicen que el interés del individuo y los de la sociedad son comunes. Nosotros, los del individuo contra el Estado, no lo creemos así" (85). With respect to individual progress, Baroja describes his own nation as behind among other European nations, in part due to the effect society had had on the individual: "La sociedad ha hecho del hombre un producto exclusivamente social, alejado de la naturaleza" (88). As emphasized in *César o nada*, this distancing from one's nature represented an ethical issue for the individual according to Baroja. As a result, Baroja focuses primarily on the Institution of the Church in his novels, attacking both the belief system and its morality.

Baroja clearly states his position in *Juventud, egolatría*: "La moral de nuestra sociedad me ha perturbado y desequilibrado" (83). This position is clearly perceived in Baroja's novels, often representing the final hurdle that must be overcome on the characters' journeys[128]. In the face of this hurdle, Baroja provides a multitude of responses with respect to the manner in which his characters respond to this nihilistic quandary. Baroja himself reiterates his nihilistic positions,

[128] This is clearly visible in the cases of Fernando Ossorio in *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* and Manuel in *La lucha por la vida*.

citing the intrinsic relationship between an objective ethical code and life: "Yo estoy convencido de que la vida no es buena ni mala, es como la Naturaleza; necesaria" (58-59). Because of the notion of life's meaninglessness, Andrés Hurtado chooses death, Fernando Ossorio chooses reeducation of the next generation, Manuel chooses to throw himself at his work[129], and César strives to dominate life without an external ethical code to weigh him down. The characters that attain personal wholeness of being and individual satisfaction are those that reject society's proposals, opting instead for a life of action. They fall into alignment with Baroja's self-description, citing himself as a liberal radical, individualist, and anarchist (289). However, it is clear that Baroja does not act on his anarchist tendencies, but rather limits himself to adherence to the philosophical principles on which anarchism is based. This represents a contradiction that reaches his novelistic characters as well, as each battles the internal and external forces within. For Baroja, the internal man, plagued by the rationality of his mind, must choose to act or remain within himself. As mentioned, those who find success do so through the removal of societal traditions and the decision to reject internal rationality.

Yet, Baroja is keenly aware that the remedy of action is merely a temporary fix, as he denies any true remedy for mankind's ills: "Como todos los que se creen un poco médicos preconizan un remedio, yo también he preconizado un remedio para el mal de vivir: la acción. Es un remedio viejo como el mundo, tan útil a veces como cualquier otro y tan inútil como todos los demás. Es decir, que no es un remedio" (91). The lack of long-term success is easily visible, ending in death for Andrés Hurtado, a foreshadowing of failure for Fernando Ossorio, Zalacaín's final anonymity, and César's political demise. Having briefly experienced satisfaction through action, these characters epitomize Baroja's rejection of enduring redemption. Nevertheless, the

[129] This occurs primarily in *Mala hierba*.

hallmark of Baroja's characters is their duality, as the struggle to overcome, if successful, would lead to the realization of their potential. Juan Navarro de San Pío, in "Pío Baroja: anatomía del hombre-circunstancia," highlights this duality of the Baroja's characters: "En todos ellos acaba triunfando, imponiéndose, la voluntad existencialista e irracional frente a la inteligencia científica y metódica" (111). The Barojian character is only capable of attaining wholeness of being outside himself, as Baroja stresses that scientific rationality and mysticism lead to merely inaction and the degradation of life. In a very Nietzschean way, the health of the individual is related to his ability to act for the sake of action. Baroja confirms this position in *Juventud, egolatría*: "La fuente de la acción está dentro de nosotros mismos, en la vitalidad que hemos heredado de nuestros padres. El que la tiene la emplea siempre que quiere; el que no la tiene, por mucho que la busque, no la encuentra" (91). Baroja's program emphasizes action for the sake of action, subsequently confirming one's being, yet the notion of spiritual distress and longing remains prevalent in many of the characters in his novels, bringing to mind the internal distress relevant in other novelists of the psyche, namely Fyodor Dostoevsky.

In the first few sections of *Juventud, egolatría*, Baroja mentions Dostoevsky multiple times, eulogizing him as one of the few writers Baroja enjoys reading: "Haría que estuviera Dostoievski un español porque es un genio" (72). This is high praise for Baroja, as the vast majority of the work details his pointed criticisms of other writers and their works. Furthermore, Dostoevsky's novels emphasize the notion of Christian redemption, a notion that Baroja aims to erase due to its focus on the afterlife. Despite their oppositional programs, Baroja confirms his respect for the Russian novelist once again: "Dentro de cien años se hablará de la aparición de Dostoievski en la literatura como de uno de los acontecimientos más extraordinarios del siglo xix. En la fauna espiritual europea será algo como el Diplodocus" (139). Baroja's respect for

Dostoevsky is due to the Russian's ability to communicate the internal psyche of the individual, with Baroja saying as much: "Una de las ciencias que me gustaría conocer es la psicología. Con este fin he leído a saltos el libro clásico de Wundt y el de Ziehem. Después de leerlos he comprendido que la psicología que yo busco, hoy por hoy, no está en los tratados. Está más en los libros de Nietzsche y en las novelas de Dostoievski" (149). Baroja's interest in Dostoevsky's novels is not merely limited to his ability to convey the troubles and sufferings of the human psyche, but also the common ideological enemies that they share.

Faced with the rise of scientific positivism at the turn of the century, both novelists utilize their works to point out the problems with this ideology, effectively emphasizing the often overlooked significance of the acceptance of such a cosmovision. Stated clearly, the acceptance of scientific positivism as the sole definer of life ignores the reality of individual internal distress. Although they reach distinct conclusions with respect to their proposed programs, they both recognize the grave danger in embracing European society's movement toward positivism. Both utilize the novel to strip the world of surface illusions and the possibility of collective utopia, presenting the most wretched human conditions as they are, in the open for all to see. Their characters resist society's push for conformity, but they are never capable of fully transforming their social environment. These two novelists, both philosophically oriented toward anarchism and the powers of the individual mind, find a common instrument – the novel -- with which to confront society.

Chapter IV

Guilt and Redemption in Dostoevsky

I. The Crisis of the Inner Man

A Loss of Faith in *The Gambler*

The novel *The Gambler*, written by Dostoevsky in 1867, is hypothesized to be a semiautobiographical novel related to Dostoevsky's personal experiences with his gambling addiction. The novel, written shortly after his major work *Crime and Punishment,* was conceived with the intention of personally liberating Dostoevsky's from issues related to gambling, as the novelist found himself in considerable debt to the publisher F.T. Stellovsky[130]. As a result, it is an excellent commencement point to comprehend the nature of Dostoevsky's novel, as it serves as both a conveyer of the novelist's thought and a reflection of his personal life. The novel's protagonist, Alexei Ivanovich, maintains stark similarities to Dostoevsky, although some have claimed too much has been made of Dostoevsky's addiction[131]. Nevertheless, Alexei, along with Mr. Astley[132], acts as the author's mouthpiece on occasion to communicate his message regarding both the Russian individual and Russian society during the 1860's. Likewise, his insatiable passion and obsession for his love interest, coupled with the depiction of his vice, allows for the contemplation of individual escapism due to a loss of personal faith, both in religion and mankind.

---

[130] "The events of Dostoevsky's disorderly life in the early 1860s have provided irresistible bait for interpreters of *The Gambler*, which he wrote within a single month under crushing pressure. In 1865, Dostoevsky had obligated himself to the notorious publisher F.T. Stellovsky to produce a novel by November 1, 1866, under the threat of losing the income from any future works for a period of nine years afterward" (Flath 43).

[131] "Much – far too much – attention is usually devoted to these gambling interludes in standard accounts of his life; one would think that no other Russian writer in equal stature had ever indulged a similar propensity. In fact, Tolstoy was a madcap plunger as a young man, and Nekrasov won and lost huge amounts (he mostly won) on the turn of a card. Dostoevsky differed from them only in not being able to afford his losses (he could not sell an estate like Tolstoy, including all its "souls," to pay off a debt) and in always losing rather than gaining a fortune as did Nekrasov" (Frank 259).

[132] Mr. Astley's distance from the situation, typically that of an outside observer, make him the closest thing to an objective viewer, much in the same vein as Juan in *Aurora roja*.

Simultaneously, Alexei's character allows Dostoevsky to develop the protagonist's nationalistic position within the unique European context of the time.

Dostoevsky introduces the protagonist Alexei Ivanovich as a poor tutor in the service of an esteemed general. Lodging at a luxurious casino in Roulettenberg, Germany, Dostoevsky introduces the characters. Beginning with Alexei, the protagonist's vice is introduced through his interaction with the General, as the superior determines Alexei cannot be trusted with all his earnings at once[133]. In typical Dostoevsky fashion, the psychological development of each character is complex, the primary characters consisting of Alexei, Polina Praskovja, the General, Madame Blanche, Marquis des Grieux, Mr. Astley, and the wealthy grandmother Antonida Vasilevna Tarasevitcheva. Alexei is pathologically enamored with Polina, exhibiting his delirious passion from the onset of the narrative. She, often indifferent to his delirium[134], finds herself in a desperate situation, as she petitions him to win at roulette to save her from her debts. Alexei agrees to wager the money Polina has given to him, making it known that he too believes roulette will be his financial salvation[135].

The General, in considerable debt to the Frenchman Marquis des Grieux, had moved the party to a German hotel, as he anxiously awaited a telegram informing him of his forthcoming inheritance. His grandmother Antonida Vasilevna Tarasevitcheva, or rather his aunt although she is affectionately referred to as his grandmother, had fallen ill in Moscow. This money, the only mode to liberate the General, had the secondary purpose of securing Madame Blanche's[136] hand in marriage. Alexei becomes conscious of their precarious financial state later in the novel, as the

[133] The insinuation here is that he will waste all his money at the roulette table.
[134] Alexei goes so far as to even threaten Polina in his mad discourse regarding his love.
[135] When asked by Polina if he believed roulette would alleviate the group from their struggles, Alexei replies affirmatively. "I said very seriously, "Yes," and then added: "Possibly my certainty about winning may seem to you ridiculous; yet; pray leave me in peace" (*The Gambler* 11).
[136] Madame Blanche is another French character.

arrival of a significant figure generates considerable tension among the party. However, long before this arrival, Alexei's tumultuous relationship to gambling is made known. Having accepted Polina's money, he wins a considerable amount and subsequently loses it all. This mere fact, however, is relatively inconsequential, as Dostoevsky emphasizes the reckless and animated manner that Alexei plays: "At one moment I must have had in my hands – gathered there within a space of five minutes – about 4000 gulden. That, of course, was the proper moment for me to have departed, but there arose in me a strange sensation as of a challenge to Fate – as of a wish to deal her a blow on the cheek, and to put out my tongue at her. Accordingly I set down the largest stake allowed by the rules – namely, 4000 gulden – and lost" (15). Following the incident, Alexei cannot bring himself to account for his actions, as though he had entered a state of subconscious escapism.

Later, an impassioned oversight on the part of the protagonist, having agreed to Polina's request to prove his unhinged loyalty by undertaking an especially embarrassing task in the presence of a German couple, causes Alexei to lose his position with the General. Dismissed from the General's service, and with relatively few opportunities, Alexei is saved by the surprise visit of the grandmother Antonida Vasilevna Tarasevitcheva. Believed to be on her death bed, the grandmother's arrival shocks the debtors and the indebted equally. An eccentric individual, Antonida tells the General that he will not receive any of her money and enlists Alexei to teach her how to play roulette. Like Alexei, she initially wins a considerable amount of money, between seven-thousand and eight-thousand rubles, but loses her entire fortune in just three days. This blow ruins the General, simultaneously causing the party to reveal secrets hidden throughout the novel.

Most notably, Polina reveals she was Marquis des Grieux's mistress, which sends Alexei into a tailspin. In a fit of madness, the protagonist enters a state of stupefaction while gambling at

the casino. "After that, I remember, I again staked two thousand florins upon twelve middle numbers, and lost. Again I staked the whole of my gold, with eight hundred gulden, in notes, and lost. Then madness seemed to come upon me, and seizing my last two thousand florins, I staked them upon twelve of the first numbers – wholly by chance, and at random, and without any sort of reckoning. Upon my doing so there followed a moment of suspense only comparable to that which Madame Blanchard must have experienced when, in Paris, she was descending earthwards from a balloon" (85). In a comically short amount of time, Alexei becomes exceedingly wealthy, gambling without strategy and winning over two-hundred thousand florins. He returns to Polina to give her the money, yet she accuses him of trying to buy her like Marquis des Grieux did and leaves with the Englishman Mr. Astley. For the next month, Alexei is convinced by Madame Blanche, who had recently left the General, to follow her to Paris. He allows her to spend all the money he attained gambling, as he is unconcerned with maintaining his riches, and subsequently returns to Roulettenberg where he converses with Mr. Astley. This conversation, the final proceeding of the novel, represents Dostoevsky's strongest critique of both modern-day Russia and the Russian individual. However, to comprehend this viewpoint, it is imperative that one recognize Dostoevsky's unique authority to speak on these matters, with special attention paid to the notion of escapism and the reason for this pursuit.

As mentioned, Alexei's actions draw close parallels with Dostoevsky's personal life, namely with respect to his gambling addiction. Sigmund Freud's article, "Dostoevsky and Parricide," delves into what he considers to be Dostoevsky's preferred method of escapism: gambling. Freud, known for associating many of his patients' vices to their childhood, argues that the Russian author's addiction to gambling stemmed from his childhood trauma, particularly

relating to his father's death[137]. As a result, he asserts that Dostoevsky's personality became multifaceted: "Four facets may be distinguished in the rich personality of Dostoevsky: the creative artist, the neurotic, the moralist and the sinner. How is one to find one's way in this bewildering complexity?" (177). Although the traits of the moralist and the sinner are often clear in his work, Freud argues that the Russian novelist exhibits character traits typically correlated with criminals, yet he does not act on these impulses like the prototypical lawbreaker[138]. This creates a contradiction with respect to the manner that he deals with these significant urges. "The contradiction is resolved by the realization that Dostoevsky's very strong destructive instinct, which might easily have made him a criminal, was in his actual life directed mainly against his own person (inward instead of outward) and thus found expression as masochism and a sense of guilt" (178). In this, the psychoanalyst expresses the belief that Dostoevsky's addiction to gambling, and subsequently a very personal portrayal in *The Gambler*, represents a form of guilt transference,[139] expressed through the mode of procuring debt. Thus, the irrational behavior or Dostoevsky manifests itself through personal correction through suffering. He must bear a personal cross of pain to forgive himself for his misbehavior.

---

[137] Although the circumstances pertaining to Mikhail Dostoevsky's death are unconfirmed, with more recent speculation asserting that he died from stroke, Dostoevsky believed that his father was murdered by his serfs.

[138] "Two traits are essential in a criminal: boundless egoism and a strong destructive urge. Common to both of these, and a necessary condition for their expression, is absence of love, lack of an emotional appreciation of (human) objects. One at once recalls the contrast to this presented by Dostoevsky – his great need of love and his enormous capacity for love, which is to be seen in manifestations of exaggerated kindness and caused him to love and to help where he had a right to hate and to be revengeful, as, for example, in his relations with his first wife and her lover" (Freud 178).

[139] "The publication of Dostoevsky's posthumous papers and of his wife's diaries has thrown a glaring light on one episode in his life, namely the period in Germany when he was obsessed with a mania for gambling (cf. Fülöp-Miller and Eckstein, 1925), which no one could regard as anything but an unmistakable fit of pathological passion. There was no lack of rationalizations for this remarkable and unworthy behavior. As often happens with neurotics, Dostoevsky's sense of guilt had taken a tangible shape as a burden of debt, and he was able to take refuge behind the pretext that he was trying by his winnings at the tables to make it possible for him to return to Russia without being arrested by his creditors. But this was no more than a pretext and Dostoevsky was acute enough to recognize the fact and honest enough to admit it. He knew that the chief thing was gambling for its own sake – *le jeu pour le jeu*" (190).

Freud argues that Dostoevsky does not relent until he loses all his money and disappoints his wife entirely, only at rock bottom allowing himself the gift of mercy: "When his sense of guilt was satisfied by the punishments he had inflicted on himself, the inhibition upon his work became less severe and he allowed himself to take a few steps along the road to success" (191). This form of guilt transference and escapism is also found in another Russian novelist and philosopher's existential query during the same timeframe as Dostoevsky. Leo Tolstoy's *A Confession* allows for a more satisfactory philosophical conception of the notion of escapism and the inability of certain sectors of society to attain contentment, particular pertinent to Russian society in the late nineteenth century. This lack of contentment, a foundational element of Tolstoy's philosophy, represents a catalyst to comprehend Alexei's return to the game of roulette.

Published in 1882, Leo Tolstoy's *A Confession* provides readers with the contemplations of a man hopelessly weighed down by the existential question related to the meaning of life. Furthermore, the short work provides the literary scholar with the foundational groundwork to comprehend Tolstoy's personal utilization of the novel[140]. Tolstoy's meditations on life's meaning emanate from a sort of 'mid-life crisis,' as the novelist believed his best years were behind him. Coupled with the realization of the life's fleetingness, he was unable to comprehend the meaning of life within the scope of a personal belief in the non-existence of God and the knowledge of the imminence of death. Cast into a pitiful state of despair, Tolstoy considered committing suicide to remedy his situation, believing suicide to be the only viable option to life's ills. However, before

[140] Tolstoy utilizes the novel as a form of inquiry with respect to life's most important questions. The deep psychological dive that Tolstoy takes into the minds of his protagonists allows him to pose profound questions related to life's meaning. Tolstoy seeks to mingle science, philosophy, reason, and faith in his novels, inherently demonstrating the necessity of all these fields in order to find life's meaning for the intellectual. Consequently, Tolstoy insinuates that the notion of meaning is far beyond the capability of one single field for the intellectual, but instead rather simple to attain for the common person. This common individual need only maintain faith to obtain meaning.

ending his life, he dedicated himself to the study of philosophy and science to ascertain any possible solution to his existential issue.

With respect to science, Tolstoy determined this field inappropriate to answer the primary inquiry of life: What is the meaning of one's life beyond time, cause, and space? Having probed into the capabilities of science to provide solutions for such an inquiry, he determined that science avoided the question altogether. Instead of addressing the question head on, science asked itself questions that it knew it could answer, effectively avoiding the issue altogether: "The task of experimental science is to determine the causal sequence of material phenomena. If experimental science should run into a question concerning an ultimate cause, it stumbles over nonsense. The task of speculative science is to discover the essence of life that lies beyond cause and effect. If its investigations should run into causal phenomena, such as social and historical phenomena, speculative science also stumbles over nonsense" (39). In this, Tolstoy asserts that the introduction of the inquiry of an ultimate cause makes empirical science nonsensical. Likewise, abstract science is only sensical when the ultimate cause is related to man. Disheartened, Tolstoy realized he would have to look elsewhere to answer the questions affecting his inner being.

Leo Tolstoy turned to philosophy to answer these questions. As an initial premise to comprehend his conclusions, he claimed that reason for him was the creator of life, as he viewed reason supreme in the process of solving such questions. Nevertheless, Tolstoy determined that philosophy's primary goal was not to answer the question regarding life's meaning, but rather frame the question in such a way as to make it incomprehensible. He asserts that one is unable to obtain an answer through philosophy, instead procuring the asked question with additional complexity. Frustrated by the inability of both science and philosophy to address life's biggest question, he wrote that mankind fell into one of four methods of escapism. The first, ignorance,

was comprised of a purposeful lack of understanding with respect to the meaningless of life. The second, epicureanism, focused on the relatively miniscule positive moments and experiences of life, but the suffering of life would not allow this option to be viable forever. The third, strength and energy, is comprised of acting swiftly and decisively to end one's life before decline begins. The fourth, weakness, is the most repulsive of all options, consisting of the knowledge of the meaningless of one's life and yet to continue living in that wretched state (*A Confession*, 49-51). Tolstoy claimed that he, Solomon, and Schopenhauer all lived in this perpetually unbearable state.

Curious as to why he could not end his life, Tolstoy turned to the common people of Russia to comprehend their collective sense of satisfaction at the horrors of life. Having spent his life in idleness and among the aristocracy, much like the members of the party described in *The Gambler*, those who Tolstoy believed wished to kill themselves, he sought to learn from the peasantry. He found that the common folk did not fall into the four categories he suggested, but rather held knowledge of the meaning of life. After much observation, he determined that the knowledge he had attained through reason had, in fact, despised life. He discovered that his reason, influenced from western thought, regarding his existential inquiry was in error, as it sought to answer the finite with the infinite and the infinite with the finite[141]. The discovery of this truth led him to declare that rational knowledge could not provide an answer to life's meaning.

Therefore, Tolstoy concluded that rational knowledge was incapable of answering the inquiry posed by the novelist related to life's meaning with God and with the guarantee of death: "As presented by the learned and the wise, rational knowledge denies the meaning of life, but the huge masses of people acknowledge meaning through an irrational knowledge. And this irrational

[141] "It was obvious that the resolution of all the possible questions of life could not satisfy me because my question, no matter how simple it may seem at first glance, entails a demand to explain the finite by means of the infinite and the infinite by means of the finite" (58).

knowledge is faith, the one thing that I could not accept. This involves the God who is not one and three, the creation in six days, devils, angels and everything else that I could not accept without taking leave of my senses" (19)[142]. As a result, Tolstoy proposed that man must either ignore the infinite altogether or have faith in something that will provide his life with meaning and thus intertwine the finite and the infinite. Without faith, one is unable to discover meaning for their life. In opposition to the intellectuals and rationalists of his circle, Tolstoy argued that the common people find true satisfaction in their lives. Dostoevsky's intentions for *The Gambler*, linked to the protagonist, highlight this aristocratic lack of faith.

Renowned Russian scholar Joseph Frank brings to light these intentions, expressed in Dostoevsky's personal letters[143], with respect to Alexei's grievances of his inner being. "The subject of this story is the following: a type of Russian man living abroad. Just remember: the newspapers this summer have often raised the question of Russians abroad. All this will be reflected in my story. It will be the mirror of the national reality, so far as possible, of course. I imagine an impulsive character, but a man very cultivated nonetheless, incomplete in all things, having lost his faith *but not daring not to believe*, in revolt against the authorities and fearing them. He consoles himself by saying that he has nothing to do in Russia; at this point, a severe criticism of people in Russia who resemble our Russians abroad. But it is impossible to tell you everything …. The essential is that all his vital powers of life, his violence, his audacity are devoted to roulette" (275). Dostoevsky's aim parallels Tolstoy's assertion that western rationalism gives way to a lack of contentment, thus forcing the individual to seek refuge in escapism, specifically in epicureanism in Alexei's case. The fleeting moments of pleasure, both heightened and compressed

[142] However, Tolstoy, through reason, determined that faith is not limited to simply one single religion, but that one must live for something in order to survive.
[143] These letters were annotated and edited by A.S. Dolinin.

in the case of roulette, reflect the protagonist's need to remove himself from his typical frame of consciousness[144]. Furthermore, Dostoevsky emphasizes the character's loss of faith, a faith he constantly asserts is necessary to life and contentment. This loss of faith, however, is accompanied by the statement "*but not daring not to believe,*" simultaneously coinciding with Tolstoy reflections on the westernized rational thought that had permeated the Russian state: "These ideas are no longer those that prop up the Russian bureaucratic system, but rather the essential tenants of the Western European ideologies that have invaded and reshaped the Russian moral-social psyche" (Frank 276). Dostoevsky's common sentiments are exhibited through Mr. Astley and Alexei's final conversation, in which they discuss the protagonist's renunciation of life and the Russian problem.

Over one year and eight months following his final interaction with Polina, Alexei and Mr. Astley engage in a dialogue in which the protagonist is reprimanded for his rejection of life. Having written early in the novel that his notes acted as a mode to relieve his heavy conscience[145], Alexei subsequently recognizes that he had been driven by an immoral force. This force is the focus of their conversation, as Mr. Astley, when Alexei confirms he will not give up gambling, unleashes an immensely powerful admonishment. "You are growing blasé," he said. "You have not only renounced life, with its interests and social ties, but the duties of a citizen and a man; you have not only renounced the friends whom I know you to have had, and every aim in life but that of winning money; but you have also renounced your memory. Though I can remember you in the strong, ardent period of your life, I feel persuaded that you have now forgotten every better feeling of that period – that your present dreams and aspirations of subsistence do not rise above pair,

[144] As mentioned, Freud believes this is due to Dostoevsky's guilt, thus he would assert that Alexei acts as a mirror reflection to the author.
[145] "As for my secret moral views, I had no room for them among my actual, practical opinions. Let that stand as written: I am writing only to relieve my conscious" (9).

impair rouge, noir, the twelve middle numbers, and so forth" (96). Alexei's inability to regain self-control represents the cause of Mr. Astley's rebuke, as Dostoevsky utilizes the protagonist's rabid passion for his vice as a reflection of the individual's inability to subject himself to reason and self-control. Joseph Frank argues that Dostoevsky sought to raise the individual above the level of human through gambling, supplanting the conscience with moral reasoning. "Gambling may thus also be regarded as a continual testing by Dostoevsky of his overriding conviction of the power of the irrational in human existence; he was not only seeking to relieve his guilt feelings, but also, at the same time, engaged in deciding whether his deepest beliefs about human life were justified. As a result, he could not win without losing (since his success negated his own highest values), or lose without winning (since his defeat confirmed the ultimate roots of his view of man and human life)" (263). Like Tolstoy's conclusion to prioritize irrational faith, Dostoevsky thus emphasizes the effect of a life without faith through Alexei's animal-like[146] return to gambling.

Mr. Astley continues his reproach, arguing that Alexei's case is not unique to the Russian nation, inherently acting as a reflection of Dostoevsky's preoccupation: "Yes, you have ruined yourself beyond redemption. Once upon a time you had a certain amount of talent, and you were of a lively disposition, and your good looks were not to be despised. You might even have been useful to your country, which needs men like you. Yet you remained here, and your life is now over. I am not blaming you for this – in my view all Russians resemble you, or are inclined to do so. If it is not roulette, then it is something else. The exceptions are very rare" (99). In this, Dostoevsky asserts that Alexei's problem, a lack of faith causing dissatisfaction and escapism, had spread throughout the nation. Although this is certainly a generalization, it nevertheless represents

[146] He lacks any sort of self-control for personal gain.

Dostoevsky's view of the grievances of the Russian nation, devastated by debauchery, madness, and addiction.

Alexei's inability to renounce his gambling addiction, and thus become a serviceable member of Russian society, maintains similar attributes to the "superfluous man." The protagonist of *The Gambler* contains some aspects of this description[147], as he is both talented and capable, but unable to constructively engage with society due to his vice. "For Dostoevsky, on the other hand, the time had come for the "superfluous men," those fine flowers of the Russian intelligentsia (among whom he would later number Herzen himself), to abandon their pride and egoism once and for all and devote themselves wholeheartedly to the humdrum task of bettering the lot of their fellow Russians through the patient reconstruction of Russian life" (Frank 62-63). Although Alexei is not a member of the intelligentsia, he nevertheless exhibits a commonality with these individuals due to his education and westernization. Dostoevsky correlates the increase in number of these individuals to the inundation of western values, primarily attributed to Peter the Great. "The "separation" or "segregation" of what has come to be known as the "superfluous man" from his foundations, his rootlessness, was seen by Dostoevsky as the direct result of the efforts of Peter the Great to introduce into Russia European ideas, technology, and institutions" (Midgley 56). The removal of the Russian individual from his cultural roots, primarily those interested in liberal and new ideas[148], demonstrates the problem of the Russian nation. Dostoevsky assertion in this is that, while western rationalism may be pertinent to the western European nations from which it originates, although he doubted it, these philosophical ideas were unable to be broadly accepted

[147] A "superfluous man, Russian Lishny Chelovek, [is] a character type whose frequent recurrence in nineteenth century Russian literature is sufficiently striking to make him a national archetype. He is usually an aristocrat, intelligent, well-educated, and informed by idealism and goodwill but incapable, for reasons as complex as Hamlet's, of engaging in effective action" (Encyclopedia Britannica 1).

[148] "Dostoevsky is never tired of stressing the superficiality, the shallowness, and the ineffectual nature of liberalism" (Midgley 60).

due to the unique Russian situation. Dostoevsky's belief asserted that Europe's culture was in a state of decay due to these new ideas[149], a reality from which he hoped to spare Russia.

Like Tolstoy, who attributed the cause of his resentment toward life to rationalism, Alexei's social situation, albeit financially aristocratic, generates significant personal dissatisfaction and an inclination toward escapism. Thus, Dostoevsky emphasizes that the western reconfiguration of the Russian moral and social psyche generates a lack of contentment, simultaneously creating a nation of "superfluous men" lacking ethical strength through action. Dostoevsky does not claim that the influx of western rationalism had been the sole cause of the issue of the Russian individual, as this problem is certainly too complex to be attributed to one sole cause. Rather, he highlights its role as a determining factor in the lack of contentment for the Russian individual, highlighted by the grievances of the lower, middle, and even upper Russian classes[150]. This growing sense of national discontentment, nevertheless experienced at the individual level, was recognized as a significant issue in the late nineteenth century. This sentiment is shared in Baroja's work, as the trilogy *La lucha por la vida*, among other works, exhibits a deep internal turmoil in his protagonist Manuel, serving as a reflection of both individual and national discontent. His reflections of Spanish life detail the social degradation that had been inflicted on Spain at the turn of the century, highlighting a miserable urban space. In Russia, multiple theories and propositions to address this turmoil, particularly prevalent in the late 1860's, made their way to public thought. Two primary propositions advanced by philosophers and writers of the epoch, social revolution and Catholicism, led Dostoevsky to write in opposition. One such case, social revolution and western rationalism,

[149] "Long before he departed on his journey, Dostoevsky had been persuaded that Europe was a dying culture - a culture that had lost the spiritual bond of unity it once possessed. He firmly believed that Russia and the Russian people represented a fresh source of moral-social inspiration through whom a new world order would come to birth" (Frank 234).

[150] Tolstoy is an example of this grievance, even asserting that many within the aristocracy wish to commit suicide.

present Dostoevsky's unique view of the possibility of perfecting his representation of the Russian citizen presented in *The Gambler*.

II. The Impotence of Socialism and Utopia

The Rejection of Socialism and Utopia in *Notes from Underground*

Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* presents, as is typical of him, a psychologically stimulating character. The man of the underground, as he calls himself, presents a curious case to the reader. There appears to be no rhyme or reason for his actions[151], initially leading one to assume insanity, but Dostoevsky's carefully crafted character serves as a rationalizing figure to address what Dostoevsky considers the dangerous ideology of socialism. Understood within the context of a turbulent Russian landscape[152], heavily influenced by the western ideologies of positivism and utopia, Dostoevsky foresaw the dangers of these movements for the Russian nation. Likewise, Baroja recognized this same danger in fully adhering to these movements for Spain, as evidenced by his depiction of Andrés Hurtado in *El árbol de la ciencia*, in which the protagonist restlessly deals with the conflict between vitality and positivism. *Notes from Underground* represents Dostoevsky's literary and artistic argument in opposition to Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be done?*, a novel that had inspired the Russian *intelligentsia*. Dostoevsky's utilization of the man of the underground is curious, but depicts the realization of Chernyshevsky's ideas in a practical sense. The man of the underground presents his argument in the first part of the novel, solidifying this position through his life and recollections in the second part of the work.

[151] Joseph Frank, in *Dostoevsky: The Stirs of Liberation 1860-1865*, argues that many of Dostoevsky's readers did not understand the purpose of the work during his time.

[152] "All the ideals on which previous Russian life had been founded were called into question; influential voices were heard proclaiming that an entirely new moral basis must be sought on which to construct human society" (Frank 6).

The first part briefly introduces a deeply satirical figure, one who immediately assumes a comic role[153]. He presents himself as intellectually developed, a point he is not ashamed to make, with a curious relationship to pain. He begins his notes by discussing his relationship to suffering, specifically his physical suffering: "My liver hurts; well, then let it hurt even worse" (4). Having been a civil service worker, who lorded his position over others, he emphasizes that his intellectual state has been the cause of significant grief. "I swear to you, gentlemen, that to be overly conscious is a sickness, a real, thorough sickness" (6). In this, the man of the underground highlights the difficulty he has found in living out his rational ideas, namely the notions of rational egoism and socialism. He solidifies his ideology before making his argument, arguing that this rationality, the laws of nature, demands selfishness. "Well, of course, the laws of nature, the conclusions of natural science, mathematics. Once it's proved to you, for example, that you descended from an ape, there's no use making a wry face, just take it or what it is. Once it's proved to you that, essentially speaking, one little drop of your own fat should be dearer to you than a hundred thousand of your fellow men, and that in this result all so-called virtues and obligations and other ravings and prejudices will finally be resolved, go ahead and accept it, there's nothing to be done, because two times two is – mathematics. Try objecting to that" (13). In this, Dostoevsky prefaces the man of the underground's argument, simultaneously introducing the pleasure that the narrator experiences through suffering[154]. This complex idea, finding pleasure through pain, causes the man of the underground to write, as he fears his superior intellect has led him to consider too carefully the popular rationalistic ideas of his time.

[153] "I have the right to speak this way, because I myself will live to be sixty! I'll live to be seventy! I'll live to be eighty! … Wait! let me catch my breath …" (5).

[154] He writes, "… and I would gnaw, gnaw at myself with my teeth, inwardly, secretly, tear and suck at myself until the bitterness finally turned into some shameful, accursed sweetness, and finally – into a decided, serious pleasure! Yes, a pleasure, a pleasure! I stand upon it" (8).

The man of the underground speaks to his readers, although he is conscious that they do not exist, anticipating their would-be arguments and responding before they call into question his theories. He argues that he is apt to respond to their hypothetical questions because he has heard humankind from the underground, listening to their words and their rationality through a crack in his door. He recognizes, however, the unlikelihood of the publication of his notes, instead giving them the therapeutic role of recounting painful memories to work through them. His work is, then, a personal process to make sense of his pleasure in pain, carried out in a manner that is to his personal liking: "I will not introduce any order or system. Whatever I recall, I will write down" (40). And with this, the man of the underground commences Part II, recounting a number of humiliating circumstances that have driven him into the underground.

The narrator begins his recollections, pointing out the loathsome conditions of his former job, reminiscing about a time in his mid-twenties, some fifteen plus years beforehand, in which he worked as a civil service worker. Having never fully excelled in social interaction, the man of the underground had fallen deep into solitude, finding respite from his social inadequacies through literature. The more pain and scorn he attracted from his co-workers, the more he shelled up in the underground, growing to hate others due to his own ineptitude. However, his solitude offers his worried mind no solace, as his inaction generates a hate of his own perceived cowardice. Having witnessed a man being thrown out of a window, he determines that the imitation of this action, with himself as the victim, would serve as proof to his true bravery. Nevertheless, having identified the perfect individual to carry out his plan, to irritate to the point of a fight, he discovers he is too much of a coward to go through with his plan. This internal humiliation drives him mad, and he subsequently obsesses over the man who he was incapable of irritating. The man of the

underground goes to great lengths to enact his revenge, learning the man's name, finding out where he lived, and often encountering him while walking near a street called Nevsky.

The underground man determines he will bump the shoulder of the man tormenting his mind when passing him, this being an action he believes will solidify his equal social footing. He goes to great lengths to enact this ridiculous plan, taking out a loan to purchase clothes so that he will be perceived as high class to those at the Nevsky. He walks by the man many times, and one day he finally completes his task. The man barely notices the bump and continues on his way, but the man of the underground feels a supreme sense of accomplishment. He has completed his task and 'earned' the respect of the man. "I did not yield an inch and passed by on a perfectly equal footing! He did not even look back and pretended not to notice: but he only pretended, I'm sure of that!" (55). In his reflection of the incident, the narrator calls this memory a moment of debauch, as he would repent of his foolishness and the time wasted to prove his bravery and social fortitude.

Nevertheless, the man of the underground goes on to recount two other humiliating experiences from the same epoch. The first, his complete and purposeful humiliation with his former schoolmates, and the second, his humiliating dealings with a prostitute that he sought to embarrass. In both cases, the man of the underground actively seeks humiliation, as he is drawn to it. He presses individuals in order to become an object for their scorn, finding pleasure in this humiliation. "For a man to humiliate himself more shamelessly and more voluntarily was really impossible, I fully, fully understood that, and still I went on pacing from the table to the stove and back" (79). His second experience is related to the first, as his great humiliation brought him into contact with a prostitute, one that he sought to humiliate, reeducate, and save from her woeful conditions. In the end, however, it is he that is once again humiliated, concluding his notes with a final reference to his suffering. "At least I've felt ashamed all the while I've been writing this

story: so it's no longer literature, but corrective punishment" (129). Dostoevsky highlights the man of the underground's attraction to his suffering to carry out his argument, an argument that must be understood within the unique context of an influx of western ideals introduced in Russia.

Notes from Underground was written in 1864 within the context of heightened radicalism in Russia, led in part by Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is to Be Done?*. The *raznochintsy*[155] and the *intelligentsia* had found Alexander II's reforms inadequate, generating an insatiable agitation among this middle class. The Chernyshevsky novel would have a considerable impact on both Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin, with Lenin naming his political pamphlet, "What Is to Be Done?," after the novel. "The novel's appeal for Russian readers is clear. In it, Chernyshevsky provides simple solutions to problems facing the rising class of *raznochintsy*, couched in a facade of scientific certainty. He also merges Western European theories with traditional Russian cultural ideas, such as one might find in the Russian Orthodox Church" (McCarthy 15). Written during Chernyshevsky's time in prison, Russian readers, a growing number of individuals due to the increase in literacy, found inspiration in the author's portrayal of the potential of the *raznochintsy*. Russian scholar Mark McCarthy highlights that not all Russian parties recognized the novel's merits, with Dostoevsky being a primary opponent[156]. "Dostoevsky's main point of contention with Chernyshevsky and other radical Western thinkers was their destruction of traditional moral, cultural, ethical, and religious ideals that, in Dostoevsky's opinion, set Russia apart from Western

[155] "Russian culture has labeled this latter group, whose leading representatives were Nikolay Chernyshevsky and Nikolay Dobrolyubov, the *raznochintsy* – those without fixed status or rank (*chin*) in the Russian caste system" (Frank 6).

[156] "Not everyone, however, was impressed with such grand predictions. They wrote responses to Chernyshevsky's work in the form of anti-nihilist novels throughout the 1860s, '70s, and '80s. One of the best responses was Fyodor Dostoevsky's short 1864 piece *Notes From Underground*. Unfortunately, Russian literary society hardly noticed Dostoevsky's work and only much later began to understand his argument or its parody of Chernyshevsky's original work" (McCarthy 15).

Europe" (15). To comprehend Dostoevsky's contrarian position, it is necessary to briefly detail Chernyshevsky's novel.

Written the year before Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground*, Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is to Be Done?* introduces an all too common Russian situation. The protagonist Vera Pavlovna is destined to live a life in accordance with her social standing, as her oppressive mother seeks to marry her off. Vera's life, like many women in Russia during the late nineteenth century, is determined, as she is destined to be given in marriage to another oppressor, serve her husband, and tend to the home. However, a medical student, Dmitry Lupokhov, who had been tutoring her brother, falls in love with her and proposes that they marry to liberate Vera from her impending bondage. Vera agrees to the proposal, not out of love, but in order to save herself from her destiny. They create a socially equitable environment, one that grants Vera privacy, freedom, and autonomy[157]. This situation is advantageous for Vera, as she is able to create a sewing business with other women. This business is run as a cooperative, one in which the women share the profits of their considerable success.

A man named Kirasanov begins to frequent their home, and Vera soon falls in love with him. Lupokhov recognizes this fact, but does not immediately act upon it, subconsciously acting in his own self-interest, as he enjoys living with the woman he loves, even if the feelings are not reciprocated. Lupokhov becomes conscious of his own hesitancy to remove himself from the situation, revealing one of Chernyshevsky's more prominent themes, *rational egoism*. The notion of rational egoism asserts that humanity will always act in its own best interest. Lupokhov's decision to remain married to Vera is an example of this idea, but he communicates his errors to Vera when asked about humanity acting according to calculated advantage. "Yes, they are telling

[157] There are even certain rooms that are off limits to Lupokhov.

the truth. What we call sublime emotion or ideal aspiration—all that, in the general course of life, is completely insignificant in comparison with each person's pursuit of his own advantage. And in essence these things constitute the same pursuit of advantage" (115). Their conversation then details the case of advantageously using one's hand, the one closest to the object in question, to turn the pages of a music sheet while playing a piano, an image that Dostoevsky satirically references in *Notes from Underground*. In this, Chernyshevsky asserts that rational action always maximizes self-interest, with the societal goal being the synthesis of individual and social self-interest, aiming to prioritize the common good.

Chernyshevsky introduces the character of Rakhmetov, a symbol and vision of the seemingly preeminent Russian revolution[158], who helps Lupokhov fake his death to act in Vera's best interest. Lupokhov moves to America, gains considerable wealth, changes his name to Charles Beaumont, and marries a woman. He and his wife return to Russia, and Kirasanov, Vera, and Lupokhov and his new wife live together in a social agreement. The remainder of the novel highlights Vera's four dreams, the focus being the final dream in which she sees the figure of a completed crystal palace. "Chernyshevsky used it, however, in Vera Pavlovna's fourth dream, as a symbol for the perfect society transformed by science, technology, reason and logic that humanity would construct here on earth …" (McCarthy 21). The crystal palace represents social utopia, attained through the embrace of rational egoism and equality, allowing man to live according to the laws of nature. The primary themes of the novel, those embraced by the *raznochintsy*, include the notion of rational egoism, gender equality, social utopia, and personal liberation. Vera describes her life before these ideals as one lived in a cellar, inspiration for Dostoevsky's man of the underground.

[158] Rakhmetov sleeps on nails, rejects women, and mysterious disappears in order to return when his services are more necessary for Russia.

Chernyshevsky's ideas regarding rational egoism and social utopia worried Dostoevsky. Coupled with the rising popularity of positivism in Russia, Dostoevsky worried Russia would lose its defining features. Like many western ideals in the late nineteenth century, positivism, specifically the philosophy proposed by August Comte[159], was of special interest to the Russian context. "Positivism in Russia was not a separate, well-defined philosophical school but, rather, a broad, multidisciplinary current of thought, characterized by a cult of 'positive science', commitment to scientific, empirical methods and rejection of the metaphysical tradition in philosophy" (Walicki 1). In Russia, many thinkers believed that science would usher the nation toward a scientifically oriented advancement. They argued that this philosophic science would bring about objective laws of nature, inherently creating objective social laws, capable of being applied to society and politics. Dostoevsky saw the writing on the wall with respect to positivism and the supremacy of rationalism, eventually inspiring the movement toward social revolution in Russia. Chernyshevsky's work significantly impacted the *intelligentsia*, but it also had an effect on two of the most revolutionary figures in Russia's history, Vladimir Lenin[160] and Karl Marx[161]. Dostoevsky was aware of the power of these western ideologies, subsequently writing *Notes from Underground* to satirically address these principles.

Dostoevsky's most emphatic and comprehensive argument is presented by the man of the underground long before he reveals himself through his lived experiences. He points out his former role and emphasizes his intellectual superiority to those with whom he had come into

[159] See chapter two for more information regarding Comte's positivism.
[160] "Vladimir Lenin himself would call Chernyshevsky "the great and most talented representative of socialism before Marx," poring over *What Is the Be Done?* "not for several days but for several week" in his youth, recalling it as a story "that supplies energy for a whole lifetime." Forty years later, he would borrow the title "*What Is to Be Done?*" for a famous political tract on Russian socialism" (Kaufman 68-69).
[161] "Marx had a high opinion of Chernyshevsky's writings on economics. Lopatin wrote: "Marx told me several times that Chernyshevsky was the only contemporary economist who had really original ideas, while all the others were in fact only compilers; that his works were rull of originality, force and depth and were the only modern works on that science which really deserved to be read and studied" (Henderson 705).

contact. He is, before the detailing of his argument, a mystery to the reader, mixing vague references and comically strange assertions throughout. He appears disorganized and unsystematic, but then, out of seemingly nowhere, he dispenses one of the most calculated and relentless arguments presented against positivism and socialism. In this, the man of the underground does not explicitly mention Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?,* but rather utilizes the themes of a piano and a crystal palace to satirically poke holes in its positivist argument. Dostoevsky intertwines artistic expression and positivist rationality to deconstruct its own argument, taking it farther than any other dared to do (*Notes from Underground* 128-129).

The man of the underground centers his primary issues with positivist ethics, indicating the faulty reasoning in the notion that man does wrong merely because he does not know his real interests, taking aim at Chernyshevsky's rational egoism. He emphasizes that the socialist position of individual and societal amelioration through enlightenment is faulty, ignoring the historical data that man often acts in absurd and unreasonable ways[162]. He then references Chernyshevsky's notion of profitability, namely the attainment of wealth, peace, prosperity, and freedom. In their positivist approach to this profitable realization, the rationalists often miscalculate one element of profitability: "But here is the surprising thing: how does it happen that all these statisticians, sages, and lovers of mankind, in calculating human profits, constantly omit the profit?" (21). He points out that these theorists believe that the realization of enlightenment, specifically of that which is

[162] "Oh, tell me, who first announced, who was the first to proclaim that man does dirty only because he doesn't know his real interests; and that were he to be enlightened, were his eyes to be opened to his real, normal interests, man would immediately stop doing dirty, would immediately become good and noble, because, being enlightened and understanding his real profit, he would see his real profit precisely in the food, and it's common knowledge that no man can act knowingly against his own profit, consequently, out of necessity, so to speak, he would start doing good? Oh, the babe! oh, the pure, innocent child! and when was it, to begin with, in all these thousands of years, that man acted solely for his own profit? What is to be done with the millions of facts testifying to how people *knowlingly*, that is, fully understanding their real profit, would put it in second place and throw themselves onto another path, a risk, a perchance, not compelled by anyone or anything, but precisely as if they simply did not want the designated path, and stubbornly, willfully pushed off onto another one, difficult, absurd, searching for it all but in the dark" (20-21).

profitable, will thus cause the individual to act for the betterment of both himself and others. In this, the individual will recognize that he is merely a piano key in an organ, thus falling into place within his expected role in society and adhering to the laws of nature predetermined long before him[163]. Once identified, the laws of nature that is, the individual will not be responsible for his decisions and actions, as these are merely facts of nature. All actions are therefore calculated based on the laws of nature, removing all human liability and creativity. Subsequently, the man of the underground takes aim at Chernyshevsky's argument for revolution and optimism related to this theory: "And it is then - this is still you speaking - that new economic relations will come, quite ready-made, and also calculated with mathematical precision, so that all possible questions will vanish in an instant, essentially because they will have been given all possible answers. Then the crystal palace will get built" (24-25). This crystal palace is a reference to Vera's fourth dream, as it represents the notion of utopia brought about by social revolution.

The man of the underground, having satirically detailed Chernyshevsky's positivist and socialist utopia, rejects this theory on the grounds of the element of profitability that he argued that the statisticians, sages, and lovers of mankind had missed. This element, he emphasizes, is the single more profitable element for mankind: it is the notion of free will. "I, for example, would not be the least bit surprised if suddenly, out of the blue, amid the universal future reasonableness, some gentleman of ignoble, or, better, of retrograde and jeering physiognomy, should emerge, set his arms akimbo, and say to us all: "Well, gentlemen, why don't we reduce all this reasonableness to dust with one good kick, for the sole purpose of sending all these logarithms to the veil and

[163] "Moreover: then, you say, science itself will teach man (though this is really a luxury in my opinion) that in fact he has neither the will nor caprice, and never did have any, and that he himself is nothing but a sort of piano key or a sprig in an organ; and that, furthermore, there also exist in the world the laws of nature; so that whatever he does is done not at all according to his own wanting, but of itself, according to the laws of nature" (24).

living once more according to our own stupid will!" That would still be nothing, but what is offensive is that he'd be sure to find the followers: that's how man is arranged" (25). The man of the underground asserts that man would choose his own will, as freedom of choice is more valuable to the individual, than societal betterment if that betterment relegates man to an instrument or, more specifically, a piano key[164]. Although the narrator emphasizes that this is not a reasonable desire, it nevertheless has been played out countless times in history, with man always desiring to control his own destiny. "One's own free and voluntary wanting, one's own caprice, however wild, one's own fancy, though chafed sometimes to the point of madness-all this is that same more profitable profit, the omitted one, which does not fit into any classification, and because of which all systems and theories are constantly blown to the devil" (25). He asserts that man chooses independent wanting, or the freedom of choice, over reasonably profitable wanting[165]. He emphasizes that man does this merely to spurn the notion that he is a piano key, or a cog in the wheel of life.

The man of the underground targets positivism and rational egoism and asserts that these notions leading to utopia are an impossibility because they remove man's free will and individuality. They reduce man to merely a law of nature working to attain profitability. This reduction is offensive to man because it relegates him to insignificance and removes the attributes that are most dear to him, his personality and his individuality. In this, the man of the underground argues that the supremacy of positivism overemphasizes the value of reason to man. "You see: reason, gentlemen, is a fine thing, that is unquestionable, but reason is only reason and satisfies

[164] Dostoevsky's beliefs regarding this idea of suffering stem from his experiences in captivity in Siberia, as Joseph Frank highlights his reflections on his fellow prisoners. "Moreover, the behavior of his fellow convicts also revealed, with terrible starkness, not only the egoistic drive of the human personality to satisfy its basic instincts, but also, far more unexpectedly, the irrational and self-destructive lengths to which the personality would go if deprived of a sense of its own autonomy" (Frank 5).

[165] This profitable wanting includes the aforementioned attainment of wealth, peace, prosperity, and freedom.

only man's reasoning capacity, while wanting is a manifestation of the whole of life-that is, the whole of human life, including reason and various little inches" (28). The individual desires even that which is not profitable to remind himself that he is not merely a piano key, even if that involves personal suffering. The man of the underground, however, recognizes that those of opposing beliefs might question the opposition between free will and the laws of reason. He argues that the laws of nature necessarily remove man's free will, arguing that they must exist outside of human will to be laws in the first place[166]. "Eh, gentlemen, what sort of will of one's own can there be if it comes to tables and arithmetic, and the only thing going is two time two is four? Two times two will be four even without my will. As if that were any will of one's own!" (31). In this, the narrator proposes another issue with the laws of nature, namely the idea that they deprive humanity of purpose.

The man of the underground makes this correlation based on the notion that the striving of man is his purpose, highlighting the Dostoevsky ideal that one must strive beyond this life. Nevertheless, man is fascinated by destruction for this very reason, as it impedes him from accomplishing his goal and thus having nothing for which he may strive. The laws of nature, therefore, assert that man's striving is not personal, but rather for his own rational profitability. The striving is merely the path to attain utopia. He writes, "… and two times two is four is no longer life, gentlemen, but the beginning of death" (33). The completion of the laws of reason thus indicate the purposelessness of man, fulfilling a destiny that relegates him, without will and without striving, effectively losing purpose[167]. Once again, the man of the underground takes aim

[166] "The underground man's argument, found in the first part of his work, is humanity's need for free will. A primary idea in Chernyshevsky's philosophy is absolute determinism: People make the choices they do, not by free will but by the influence of their environment and natural physical laws" (McCarthy 18).
[167] "Chernyshevsky, on the other hand, propounds a simple-minded materialism that sees man as a being totally subservient to the laws of nature (as defined in terms of the sciences of the day, particularly chemistry and physiology) …" (Frank 32).

at Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?*, questioning whether man would even be satisfied with utopia[168]. "You believe in a crystal edifice, forever indestructible; that is, in an edifice at which one can neither put out one's tongue on the sly nor make a fig in the pocket. Well, and perhaps I'm afraid of this edifice precisely because it is crystal and forever indestructible, and it will be impossible to put out one's tongue at it even on the sly" (35). The man of the underground finds the crystal palace terrible because it is completed, representing the fulfillment of utopia and the completion of the mathematical equation of two times two, thus giving man nothing for which he may strive. The completion of the crystal palace, socialism's utopia, renders man a cog in the wheel of life, or more aptly a piano key. In this, the individual's will is relegated to the will of society, determined by the laws of nature that govern all humankind.

Thus, Dostoevsky utilizes the man of the underground to carry to an extreme that which others merely take halfway (129). A rational egoist[169], the man of the underground highlights what Dostoevsky considers the irrationality of Chernyshevsky's proposal. In this, Dostoevsky calls for patience when considering new westernized philosophies, with careful attention to the dangers of humanism. Chernyshevsky, on the other hand, believed that Russia's traditional religious and cultural values held back national progress[170], a sentiment shared by both Vladimir Lenin and Karl Marx. For Marx, this socialist utopia was achievable through communism, both his and Lenin's embodiment of the crystal palace. Although Chernyshevsky's ideas do not lead directly to communism, Dostoevsky recognizes their power to inspire revolution, the primary movement toward enacting Marx's ideas expressed in *The Communist Manifesto.*

[168] "For man sometimes loves suffering terribly much, to the point of passion, and that is a fact" (34).
[169] "No. I was so great an egoist …" (127).
[170] "For Chernyshevsky, traditional values presented a warped ideal of human nature, which in turn distorted humanity's understanding of reality and humanity's vision of itself. Religious institutions, such as the Church, added to this distortion in their attempt to preserve their power and position (Katz 16)" (McCarthy 16).

An anti-traditionalist himself, Marx argued in *The Communist Manifesto* that the proletariat would eventually need to overturn the unhinged economic and political system, subsequently abolishing the concept of private property[171]. The result of the termination of private property would inherently be the end of all class distinctions. Marx argued for a revolution of the proletariat, asserting that such a revolt would move in alignment with the course of history. However, distinct from previous revolts, the system previously instituted by the bourgeoisie had been to their own detriment. They had created classes, with the proletariat being by far the largest, subjugated to work in factories with one another. "What the bourgeoisie therefore produced, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable" (21).

In accordance with this view, he argues that the movement of communism would destroy all classes, adhering to the destiny of history. Throughout *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx emphasizes that communism offers a superior system for the layperson and society at large, effectively offering a temporal form of redemption from the struggles of the Industrial Age, this falling in accordance with Chernyshevsky's socialist utopia. Marx writes, "[c]ommunism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation" (24). In this, Marx implies that communism would create a more equal society than capitalism, and therefore all would have the opportunity to partake in the benefits of society's labor. Consequently, Marx provides a system of temporal resolution that vies for the attention of the religious layperson, calling mankind to reject traditionalist notions and focus on the present.

Dostoevsky's man of the underground acts as an embodiment of the socialist and utopian ideals introduced and carried out by Chernyshevsky, Marx, and Lenin. For the nihilists and

[171] This is very pertinent to the Russian case of land ownership following the abolition of serfdom.

Chernyshevsky, the subjection of humankind to unquestionable laws effectively removed humankind of responsibility. The implication is that humankind merely needed to be trained to behave in a manner that would be both individually and societally beneficial. Thus, social and political programs enacted with this philosophical position attained an almost redemptive power[172], a position to which Dostoevsky is fiercely opposed. The underground man does not reject rationality, but recognizes its limited power, incapable of fully satisfying mankind through laws of nature or political programs, as it removes mankind's humanity. "The underground man, with his superior intellect, knew that the only way to be truly human in a world dominated by rationality, reason, and self-interest was to act in opposition to that self-interest. Thus, there was a perverse pleasure to be derived from a slap in the face, or from being run into on the street" (McCarthy 19). In this, Dostoevsky effectively questions whether mankind would even find contentment in something so incredible as utopia, as it would remove human individuality for the greater good. The man of the underground's argument insinuates a potential dissatisfaction with utopian ideals, as he asserts that the pursuit of the unattainable provides meaning for life. Thus, Dostoevsky utilizes the man of the underground to reject Chernyshevsky's utopian crystal palace, and all politically revolutionary programs to follow, for two primary reasons. First, he rejects the notion that mankind would not be responsible for his actions due to his belief in primary sin. Second, he rejects social and political programs on the basis of the devaluation of human individuality and their claim to create what he considers pseudo redemption[173]. Dostoevsky's man of the underground rejects the automation of mankind, the adhering to Chernyshevsky's laws of

[172] This is not redemption in the religious sense, with its connotation of an afterlife, but rather societal and individual amelioration from suffering.

[173] "Thus, while Chernyshevsky had wanted to show how nihilism built people up and gave them more self- respect, Dostoevsky, through the example of the underground man, showed how the determinist philosophy leads to a loss of self-respect. As the underground man asks, "Well, ... is it really possible for a man to have self-respect if he finds enjoyment in his own degradation?" (462)" (McCarthy 19).

nature or Marx's communism, rather wishing that which is not profitable for himself to define his innate individuality.

III. The Inadequacy of Religion

The Great Void in *The Brothers Karamazov*

The Brothers Karamazov has been called by renowned thinkers one of the most exceptional novels in history. Albert Einstein claimed the novel was one of the most wonderful works he had laid his eyes on, while Sigmund Freud argued the novel was one of the best literary pieces ever written[174]. The narration of the novel is accomplished in a plethora of modalities, as the novel contains poems, dialogue, philosophical ruminations, and even the insertion of the author's opinions. Many chapters could stand alone as short stories, masterfully establishing a link spanning Dostoevsky's notion of utopianism, guilt, Catholicism, and Russian social issues. The novel's successions are of the utmost importance to comprehend the philosophical and social implications made by Dostoevsky, but the sheer length of the novel[175] demands careful consideration of those events most apt to deliver said message. Furthermore, the novel's characters represent different ideals common to the epoch.

To comprehend the novel's events, it is particularly important in *The Brothers Karamazov* that one recognize the role that the primary characters play. The work revolves around three brothers named Dmitri, Alyosha, and Ivan. Their father, Fyodor Karamazov, is a wealthy individual lacking respect or regard for anyone but himself. He pursues his selfish passions, neglects his children, and causes significant damage to others. His eldest, Dmitri, represents the individual led by emotion and lacking self-control. He is a man of action, yet he is in constant

[174] "*The Brothers Karamazov* is the most magnificent novel ever written; the episode of the Grand Inquisitor, one of the peaks in the literature of the world, can hardly be valued too highly" ("Dostoevsky and Parricide" 177).
[175] The novel is over 800 pages in most editions.

battle to overcome his nature and attain religious redemption. The second, Ivan, is a philosophically inclined individual, as he exhibits qualities pertinent to the rational people of Russia. One of his primary battles is his inability to accept belief in a God, at least a moral God, due to the suffering he has witnessed in the world. Alyosha, the third, is a kind and loving individual who contrasts his father's selfish personality. His life is characterized by love, as he makes it clear that he loves God and loves those with whom he comes into contact, serving as a mentee to an established Priest Zossima. Pavel Smerdyakov, Fyodor's most neglected son and potentially illegitimate son, is an epileptic who is highly influenced by Ivan's philosophical discussions. These characters, although only a few within Dostoevsky's most exhaustive work, represent the conflicting social ideologies of the Russian state.

When Dmitri comes of age, raised apart from his negligent father like his brothers, he discovers that his father had acquired a great deal of wealth. Conscious of an inheritance, he seeks out his father to claim what he believes to be rightfully his. His father, a selfish individual as previously mentioned, swindles his eldest out of his inheritance, generating a significant conflict between these two characters. Engaged to a woman named Katerina, Dmitri immediately falls in love with a young woman named Grushenka, who happens to be the love interest of his father. This love triangle, coupled with Dmitri's sentiment of wrongdoing on the part of his father, sends the eldest son into a fit of rage. It is made known throughout the novel that Ivan likewise is disgusted by his father's baseness, while Alyosha recognizes his father's issues as the trappings of sin and wishes to convert not only his father but his entire family.

Later, in accordance with his personality, it becomes clear that Fyodor likely engaged in sexual relations with an impaired woman, the result being the birth of Smerdyakov, who works in a service role for his father. Smerdyakov is a generally vile individual, finding great

comfort in Ivan's philosophical ruminations, particularly the notion of morality. Ivan, skeptical of God, argues that the removal of God would generate both an immoral world, and that all things would thus be permissible. Inherently, he asserts that morality is not collectively determined, as that would require complete unity of thought. Instead, he argues that if God, or a higher power, is removed from the equation of life, then claims regarding morality are merely opinions or beliefs of individuals. As a result, without a higher power to determine which claim is superior to another, humans are left in a sort of moral limbo, unable to rationally assert that one's morality is more justified than another's. Ivan's position is clearly a juxtaposition of both the social principles discussed in *Notes from Underground* and Darwinian ideology regarding the establishment of morality. Darwin, eight years prior to the publication of *The Brothers Karamazov*, claimed that morality had been established due to the evolution of society in *The Descent of Man*: "If, for instance, to take an extreme case, men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unmarried females would, like the worker-bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters; and no one would think of interfering" (122). Darwin's argument, based on Dostoevsky reasoning regarding morality, would imply that all morality is subjective due to the idea that it would be dramatically changed had society evolved in a distinct manner. As such, an individual that simply does not adhere to the subjective morality upon which society has subconsciously agreed would not be in the wrong from an objective standpoint. Dostoevsky uses Ivan to communicate this point, as his rejection of a higher power causes him to wrestle with the concepts of communal morality. Smerdyakov is greatly intrigued by Ivan's notions of morality, and acts upon these ideas.

Furthermore, Ivan's role in the novel is foundational, as he represents the most intelligent character in the novel, yet simultaneously represents the antithesis of Dostoevsky's beliefs. As is

common of the Russian novelist's works, the oppositional point of view is often enhanced to avoid the accusation, on the part of critics, of the creation of a strawman argument. Despite their differences of opinion, Ivan's disgust of the Catholic Church, like Dostoevsky's own, is put on full display, evidenced by the novel's most famous chapter "The Grand Inquisitor." This chapter represents a scathing attack on Catholicism, even briefly correlating Catholicism to the popular form of socialism in Russia at the time. Meanwhile, Alyosha's mentor, Father Zossima, passes away, causing the ministry inclined protagonist to suffer through a personal trial, one that eventually strengthens his faith. He begins to mentor a young believer named Ilyusha, who is very sickly.

One day, Fyodor is found murdered, and the circumstantial evidence points to Dmitri, who had the most to gain. The death of his father would not only imply the attainment of his inheritance, but also the ability to pursue Grushenka without his rival standing in his way. Dmitri maintains his innocence to the murder, but the police disregard his claim of inculpability and incarcerate him. Smerdyakov informs Ivan that he committed the murder, claiming that he was merely Ivan's instrument and that, as a result, Ivan was an accomplice. In this, Smerdyakov argues that Ivan's ideology led him to commit the murder, as he believed that the nonexistence of God permitted this action. Ivan is gripped with guilt[176], subsequently causing him to fall into a steep psychological decline toward madness. This decline, perhaps best encapsulated in the chapter "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare," reveals a significant Dostoevsky assertion, namely, that the rejection of God creates a void that must be faced alone, an assertion faced by many philosophers of the nineteenth century. Ivan eventually takes responsibility for the murder in court, but is saved by Katerina, who presents a letter to the court demonstrating Dmitri's willingness to murder his father. Dmitri is convicted

[176] Smerdyakov's own guilt causes him to commit suicide.

of the murder and sent to Siberia. In the end, Alyosha attends the funeral of his mentee, convincing the boys in attendance to follow God.

The length of *The Brothers Karamazov* permits the reflection of primary chapters to focus on Dostoevsky's thought, particularly his fierce attack on the institutions of Catholicism and socialism. As mentioned in Chapter II, Dostoevsky's participation in the Petrashevsky Circle and subsequent exile to Siberia had a significant impact on his novels. Dostoevsky's rejection of feudalism, focus on peasant social issues[177], and support of Alexander II's liberation of the peasantry is paramount to comprehend his work. Although he began to focus on socialism and Catholicism as his career progressed, he never lost a passion for aiding the Russian peasantry. "Such a metamorphosis indubitably took place for Dostoevsky, who, while refusing to gloss over for an instant the manifest harshness, brutality, and backwardness of Russian peasant life, nonetheless became convinced that at its center were preserved the sublime Christian virtues of love and self-sacrifice" (Frank 5). The chapter "The Grand Inquisitor" permits the correlation of the institution of Catholicism with the institution of feudalism, both of which Dostoevsky vehemently opposes on the basis of his Eastern Orthodox Christianity conception of morality. Dostoevsky's oppositional position toward Catholicism is reflective of the schism between Catholicism and Eastern Orthodox Christianity in the Russian nation[178].

---

[177] Dostoevsky recognized social issues within the peasantry as worthy of his attention. He believed that literacy would remove social inequities among this social class, simultaneously lifting the peasantry from their lowly position. "The remedy is to make education available as quickly and as universally as possible; only the growth of literacy will remove the abnormal prestige that literate peasants acquire, and which sometimes leads to the most harmful results both for themselves and for society" (Frank 61).

[178] Rodney Delasanta highlights the conflict between these two entities the following way: "Notwithstanding these and countless other reasons for friction, there are no two forms of Christianity that are at their base more theologically compatible than Catholicism and Orthodoxy because — need it be said? — the doctrines they share were already in place long before the schism in 1054. To name only a few: God as a Trinity of Persons (despite the filioque flap); Christ the Redeemer as the Incarnate Son of God (no mere ethicist he); the centrality of the sacraments to divine worship, especially the Eucharist; the claim of ecclesial authority through apostolic succession (despite Orthodox refusals to accept Petrine authority); and the veneration of the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God. Also instructive is Catholicism's own perception of its separation from Orthodoxy on the one hand and

"The Grand Inquisitor" is a poem recounted by Ivan to his brother Alyosha, cementing Ivan's rejection of the Church's proposition of morality in almost comedic fashion. Set in the sixteenth century during the Spanish Inquisition in Seville, Ivan opens his poem by mentioning that one-hundred heretics had been burnt the day before the commencement of the events. Jesus Christ returns, discordant with the manner he said he would in the Bible, but rather in human form again and for merely a short period of time. "He came softly, unobserved, and yet, strange to say, every one recognized Him. That might be one of the best passages in the poem. I mean, why they recognized Him. The people are irresistibly drawn to Him, they surround Him, they flock about Him, follow Him. He moves silently in their midst with a gentle smile of infinite compassion. The sun of love burns in His heart, light and power shine from His eyes, and their radiance, shed on the people, stirs their hearts with responsive love" (312). Ivan's literary and poetic prowess on display, he points out that Jesus even rose a young girl from the dead, drawing the Cardinal's attention. A man of almost ninety years, he calls on his guards to apprehend Jesus Christ and put him in jail. "And such is his power, so completely are the people cowed into submission and trembling obedience to him, that the crowd immediately makes way for the guards, and in the midst of deathlike silence they lay hands on Him and lead Him away. The crowd instantly bows down to the earth, like one man, before the old Inquisitor" (313). Despite the miracle, the crowd assents to the Cardinal's decision to seize Jesus.

The Cardinal approaches Jesus Christ in his cell, confirming his knowledge of the present situation. The priest tells him, "I know not who Thou art and care not to know whether it is Thou or only a semblance of Him, but to-morrow I shall condemn Thee and burn Thee at the stake as

---

Protestantism on the other. Catholic catechetics before Vatican II, for example, would routinely distinguish between Orthodox and Protestant Christianity by declaring the former to be only in schism from Rome while describing the latter as heretically separated" (Delasanta 2).

the worst of heretics" (314). The Cardinal goes on to say that Jesus, due to Jesus's value placed on the notion of free will, will not add anything to convince others to believe him to be the God incarnate[179]. Alyosha, shocked that his brother would create such a poem, interrupts his brother to inquire as to the validity of such a sequence of events. Ivan responds: "One may say it is the most fundamental feature of Roman Catholicism, in my opinion at least. 'All has been given by Thee to the Pope,' they say, 'and all, therefore, is still in the Pope's hands, and there is no need for Thee to come now at all. Thou must not meddle for the time, at least.' That's how they speak and write too—the Jesuits, at any rate. I have read it myself in the works of their theologians" (315). In this, Ivan confirms Dostoevsky's own position with respect to the Catholic faith, arguing that it had rejected Jesus Christ in favor of social power and hypocrisy.

The Cardinal continues, Jesus silently listening throughout, that Jesus had placed the impossible burden of freedom on people, the weak being too feeble to patiently bear this spiritual freedom of choice. Rather, he argues it would have been better to provide them with physical bread, opposed to sacred, a resource he claims the Catholic Church had provided to the people. In this, he asserts that the Catholic Church, which he represents[180], had replaced their spiritual freedom with temporal contentment. "But let me tell Thee that now, to-day, people are more persuaded than ever that they have perfect freedom, yet they have brought their freedom to us and laid it humbly at our feet. But that has been our doing. Was this what Thou didst? Was this Thy freedom?'" (315). The clergyman states that the Catholic Church, recognizing the cleverness of Satan in the biblical temptation of Jesus, followed suit with the same temptations to the common

[179] "Whatsoever Thou revealest anew will encroach on men's freedom of faith; for it will be manifest as a miracle, and the freedom of their faith was dearer to Thee than anything in those days fifteen hundred years ago" (315).
[180] "There is no escaping the conclusion that the Grand Inquisitor *is* the Catholic Church: the passage in which the Inquisitor speaks of the "800 years" of serving "the wise and dread spirit" (Satan) makes it perfectly clear that Dostoevsky intended this to be a real *j'accuse*, a total condemnation" (Thompson 411).

people, thus pledging allegiance to this evil being. He argues that Jesus had rejected the first question, to miraculously create bread from stone, so as not to attain the obedience of mankind by means of provisions for the trials of life. Instead, he had allowed mankind to fall into hunger: "Dost Thou know that the ages will pass, and humankind will proclaim by the lips of their sages that there is no crime, and therefore no sin; there is only hunger? "Feed men, and then ask of them virtue!" (317). Effectively, the clergyman forewarns of the coming movement of socialism, emphasizing that mankind commits foul acts against the other due purely to issues of environment. Ivan, and as such Dostoevsky, denies the remediating power of socialism in this assertion.

Jesus, silent as before, listens as the Cardinal points out that Jesus's rejection of the first temptation provided fertile ground on which the Catholic Church could attain power over these individuals. Furthermore, the Church had deceived the people into believing it was serving God. The fear of free choice, due to its relationship with suffering[181], had led millions to subjugate themselves to the Church. The clergyman emphasizes that Jesus had asked for too much of people, allowing the Catholic Church to take advantage of the individuals' weakness. "Just eight centuries ago, we took from him what Thou didst reject with scorn, that last gift he offered Thee, showing Thee all the kingdoms of the earth. We took from him Rome and the sword of Cæsar, and proclaimed ourselves the sole rulers of the earth, though hitherto we have not been able to complete our work" (323). Comparing the Catholic Church to the prostitute of Babylon in Revelation 17, he points out that the weak would renounce their freedom to the Catholic Church for temporary contentment. These individuals would obtain the earthly pleasures from the Church, such as bread, yet have the false reassurance of eternal life. In his conclusion, the Cardinal asserts that he will

[181] "Didst Thou forget that man prefers peace, and even death, to freedom of choice in the knowledge of good and evil? Nothing is more seductive for man than his freedom of conscience, but nothing is a great cause of his suffering" (320).

burn Jesus the following day and provides Jesus with the opportunity to respond. Jesus kisses the clergyman, an action that shocks the Cardinal, causing him to release Jesus and leave immediately. Ivan and Alyosha discuss his poem, as Ivan effectively asserts that "all is lawful" for those who do not believe. Alyosha is perplexed by Ivan's philosophical position and mimics Jesus's response to the clergyman with a kiss. As Ivan leaves, Alyosha notices a strange happening to his brother, physically reflecting his inability to carry out his ideal: "He suddenly noticed that Ivan swayed as he walked and that his right shoulder looked lower than his left" (333). In this, Dostoevsky foreshadows the psychological and physical burden of Ivan's position.

Dostoevsky's notion of freedom, namely the Inquisitor's claim that the weak had willingly given up their freedom, is reminiscent of the man from the underground's position regarding free will. The man of the underground, too intelligent to suppress his moral awareness and blindly accept a supposedly remediated nature conferred upon him, emphasizes that the individual would rather suffer to validate his or her individuality than subserviently adhere to the laws of nature like the rest of humanity. The man from the underground's inability to suppress his rationality to accept socialist dogma is akin to Fernando Ossorio's inability to suppress his mystical passions until the conclusion of *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, as they are ingrained in him. The narrator in *Notes from Underground* argues that the proposed laws of nature infringe on his personal freedom of choice, while Dostoevsky's Inquisitor takes an alternative approach, one that proposes humanity is wearied by the freedom of choice. The Inquisitor believes that freedom, or accepting the moral responsibility for one's conscience, is an impossible ideal. Freedom is a torment for the weak, as they are not strong enough to be faithful to Jesus Christ.

In his article *Freedom by Necessity*, written by Terry Eagleton, the literary critic argues the Inquisitor supposes the weak are incapable of withstanding a self-destructive pattern of idealism.

"Ideals have the stiff-necked implacability of the Freudian superego, a faculty which encourages us to aspire beyond our powers, fail miserably, and then lapse into self-loathing. Idealism is the accomplice of violence and despair, not an antidote to them" (2). The Inquisitor claims that humankind, primarily those not strong enough to maintain faith in God, are unable to bear this self-loathing. "It is against this high-minded fury, this self-destructive cycle, that the Inquisitor seeks to protect the common people. If we do not expect too much of others, we will not fall into postures of tragic despondency when they inevitably fall short. Cynicism or nihilism is the other face of idealism" (Eagleton 2). In opposition to this, Eagleton proposes that mankind requires the realist ideal of forgiveness because it has reconciled the horrors of the offense. Forgiveness demands a measure of freedom, the ability to recognize one's errors and confront them honestly. The Inquisitor intends to keep the Church's followers in a perpetual state of ignorance, thus damning them eternally. Dostoevsky's position is also damning, but the culpable party is the Catholic Church.

Although Dostoevsky argues against the vast majority of the Ivan's philosophical positions through the novel's successions, Ivan's poem conveys the author's personal sentiment toward Catholicism. A devout Eastern Orthodox Christian, even if he maintained his own version of this religion, Dostoevsky's personal opposition to Catholicism has been hypothesized as a result of a juxtaposition of both theological objection and negative personal experiences with the religion. In *Dostoevsky and the Catholic Underground (Studies in Russian Literature and Theory)*, Elizabeth Blake hypothesizes the Russian novelist's personal disgust of Catholicism, long before his conversion to Eastern Orthodox Christianity, arose from his imprisonment with a collective of Polish Catholics. She points out that he had been suspicious of these individuals due to their loyalty to the Jesuits, whose organizational structure was akin to that of a political institution. She

argues that the representation of Catholic believers, along with the correlation of religious torture and political repression, clearly demonstrates Dostoevsky's sentiments toward Catholicism. "Dostoevsky presents an array of Catholic types from avaricious and seditious priests to the stalwart church-going bourgeois whose 'code of morality' includes the accumulation of wealth, as defined by the 'catechism'" (54). Dostoevsky's presentation of Catholicism in *The Brothers Karamazov* reflects a lack of spirituality for this Church, akin to a political organization[182].

This portrayal strikes a harmonious chord with the political organization of feudalism, an apt comparison in Dostoevsky's time. Dostoevsky does not assert that Catholicism is a function of feudalism, but rather he depicts the Catholic organization as an extension of feudalism, maintaining power over the same serfs, now peasants, once ensnared in this repressive system. Dostoevsky's primary focus, particularly during the time period in which he wrote *The Brothers Karamazov*, is on the inner man, but his scathing attack on the material nucleus of Catholicism highlights a continuation of the feudal system. This continuance demonstrates a static social structure in Russia, one maintained and preserved by the religious institution. The protagonist of the "The Grand Inquisitor," the Cardinal, develops a number of points in his monologue that convey this idea. He underscores the repressive nature of the Church, the organizational power it maintains over the weak, and the exchange of freedom for protection. Furthermore, he depicts the Church as an Institution, runs by a group of elite religious figures directing the masses according to their bidding. The fear of freedom on the part of the weak generates a power vacuum, necessitating the leadership and direction of a more powerful force, one that the Church quickly

[182] In *The Idiot*, Dostoevsky utilizes Prince Myshkin, in Part VII, to convey the idea that Catholicism's lack of spirituality gave way to the need for a political organization like Socialism. ""Oh, no; oh, no! Not to theology alone, I assure you! Why, Socialism is the progeny of Romanism and of the Romanistic spirit. It and its brother Atheism proceed from Despair in opposition to Catholicism. It seeks to replace in itself the moral power of religion, in order to appease the spiritual thirst of parched humanity and save it; not by Christ, but by force"" (Part VII).

fills and solidifies with its mandates. These mandates, fealty to the clergy, service to the Church, and adherence to the Pope's statutes, act as a mode of cultural production, simultaneously highlighting a degraded social structure. In effect, those who determined cultural modes during the time of feudalism maintain the same power, influence, and honor, subjecting the masses to a life of servitude. But why would the masses subjugate themselves to these elites? They would do so for freedom from an ideal, but not from the freedom highlighted in *Notes from Underground*. Rather, they would subjugate themselves in order to free themselves from facing the void.

In *The Gay Science*, Friedrich Nietzsche provides a parable that avows dreadful implications for a godless society. "The Parable of the Madman"[183], a short work, powerfully addresses the void generated by society's disbelief in a God. The madman ran to a marketplace filled with people and when he arrived, he loudly repeated himself, "I seek God". Laughed at and ridiculed, the madman responds that society's disbelief had killed God, creating a void not yet understood by the scoffers. "How could we drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the entire horizon? What were we doing when we unchained this earth from its sun? Whither is it moving now? Whither are we moving? Away from all suns? Are we not plunging continually? Backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there still any up or down? Are we not straying, as through an infinite nothing? Do we not feel the breath of empty space? Has it not become colder? Is not night continually closing in on us? Do we not need to light lanterns in the morning?" (181). His discourse inherently correlates God with a value system that prevents mankind from facing the abyss, a philosophical vacuum of confusion. The apathetic attitude of mankind's disbelief is due to its ignorance of the removal of the moral system established by a God-believing society. All must be redefined with this new cosmovision, all must be replaced according to the nihilist

[183] This parable has been previously referenced in Chapter II.

mode. The madman questions the townspeople regarding their process of atonement for God's death, an additional process not yet established by this new God-denying society. "Is not the greatness of this deed too great for us? Must we ourselves not become gods simply to appear worthy of it?" (181). The madman leaves the market without any response, stating, "I have come too early" (181). Nietzsche recognizes the immensity and gravity of disbelief, as it requires one to face the reality of life's great void, a notion that Dostoevsky acknowledges.

Dostoevsky's Inquisitor seeks to keep Catholic believers from facing the void through traditional modes, his form being that of religion. Although the Catholic followers may believe in the existence in God, this is irrelevant, as they have exchanged their freedom of belief in Jesus Christ for physical bread, the miraculous, and submission to power. In effect, Dostoevsky asserts that Catholicism, both within Russia and internationally, acts as a fraudulent crutch to prevent individuals from facing the reality of their great emptiness. In the same way, the man of the underground asserts that socialism and notions of utopia fill individuals' spiritual chasm. As a result, Dostoevsky proposes that humans are either incapable of recognizing the meaningless of their lives or simply replace this meaninglessness with artificial solutions. Ivan, a man at a crux between belief and complete rejection, epitomizes the gravity of facing the void. For Dostoevsky, therefore, there are only two options, one may accept objectivity, God in his case, or face the void straight on, like in the case of Nietzsche. Ivan chooses the latter, the effects of which are most adequately observed in the chapter "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare."

Dostoevsky commences the chapter by inserting his personal belief on the nature of Ivan's illness, briefly alluded to at the conclusion of "The Grand Inquisitor." "Anticipating events I can say at least one thing: he was at that moment on the very eve of an attack of brain fever" (822). Ivan, suffering both mentally and physically, had hoped to retain his wits and strength to uphold

his philosophical position. Having been forewarned by a doctor about the possibility of hallucinations, Ivan disregarded the warning to rest. In a moment of solitude, Ivan sees the figure of a Russian gentleman sitting across from him, one whose attire Dostoevsky describes in detail. Russian scholar Matthew Raphael Johnson claims that the attire chronicled has a significant purpose: "Russian nationalist historians will immediately see what Dostoevsky is driving at, and who the Devil truly represents (other than Satan himself). Satan here is presented as a westernizer of the 1840s. That is very obvious from the context. The appearance of the Devil here is saturated with ideological symbolism" (Johnson). Dostoevsky, thus, off-handedly correlates the devil with socialism, a minor point in the chapter.

Ivan upholds the idea that the existence of the gentleman in his room is merely a figment of his ailing consciousness, yet the gentlemen claims to be the devil. The devil discusses the idea of belief, arguing that material proofs do not encourage belief and will not help Ivan. "And if you come to that, does proving there's a devil prove that there's a God? I want to join an idealist society, I'll lead the opposition in it, I'll say I am a realist, but not a materialist, he he!" (825). The gentleman uses a number of reverse psychology techniques to convince Ivan of his existence and thus gain his support. The discourse is heavily one-sided, with Ivan lashing out in anger only to critique the devil's monologue, even threatening to kick him. Hearing this, the devil seizes the opportunity to retort that such a lashing would imply Ivan does believe in his existence. Ivan, agonizing to retain his mental strength, argues that the devil is merely a hallucination representing his most depraved thoughts, until the devil says something novel:

""Why not, if I sometimes put on fleshly form? I put on fleshly form and I take the consequences. Satan *sum et nihil humanum a me alienum puto*."

"What, what, Satan sum et nihil humanum ... that's not bad for the devil!"

“I am glad I've pleased you at last.”

“But you didn't get that from me.” Ivan stopped suddenly, seeming struck. “That never entered my head, that's strange.””

Ivan’s reaction to this saying, a play on the saying ‘*Homo sum et nihil humanum a me alienum puto*,’ attributed to the Roman playwright Publius Terentius Afer, marks a shift in Ivan’s thoughts regarding this figure, now immersed entirely in a state of discomposure. The devil recounts Ivan’s philosophical theories in comedic fashion, going so far as to claim agreement with many of them. Ivan listens in distress, unable to endure his own ideas due to the guilt he feels from a sense of personal culpability from his father’s death. When the devil refers to his poem, “The Grand Inquisitor,” Ivan threatens to kill him. In response, the devil embarks on one of the most profound lectures found in Dostoevsky’s work, simultaneously taking responsibility for many of socialisms ideas and affirming the void: “You'll kill me? No, excuse me, I will speak. I came to treat myself to that pleasure. Oh, I love the dreams of my ardent young friends, quivering with eagerness for life! ‘There are new men,’ you decided last spring, when you were meaning to come here, ‘they propose to destroy everything and begin with cannibalism. Stupid fellows! they didn't ask my advice! I maintain that nothing need be destroyed, that we only need to destroy the idea of God in man, that's how we have to set to work. It's that, that we must begin with. Oh, blind race of men who have no understanding! As soon as men have all of them denied God—and I believe that period, analogous with geological periods, will come to pass—the old conception of the universe will fall of itself without cannibalism, and, what's more, the old morality, and everything will begin anew. Men will unite to take from life all it can give, but only for joy and happiness in the present world. Man will be lifted up with a spirit of divine Titanic pride and the

man-god will appear" (841-842)[184]. Ivan begins to tremble, as he is unable to physically, emotionally, or mentally bear the presentation of his ideas. The devil then asks him one simply question, which causes Ivan to lash out physically against this gentleman he previously believed was merely a figment of his subconsciousness. "That's all very charming; but if you want to swindle why do you want a moral sanction for doing it?" (843). In this, Dostoevsky argues that the need for moral justification, apart from the objectivity of God, is merely an excuse to commit evil.

Thus, years before Friedrich Nietzsche would propose a similar ideal in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Dostoevsky presents the need to confront the void in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Ivan seeks to reject objectivity through his disbelief in God, effectively facing the void. This decision rejects the abandonment of God through existentialism and the embrace of a new ethic. Confronted with his own ideology in practice, and taking into account the personal sense of culpability related to the enactment of his philosophical theories and the death of his father, Ivan is incapable of overcoming the void. Dostoevsky utilizes the devil, giving Ivan an opportunity to affirm his philosophical theories, to demonstrate the meaninglessness of life. Ivan's plunge into madness is clear, Dostoevsky argues that the modern man is incapable of facing this void. Consequently, *The Brothers Karamazov* represents Dostoevsky's great exposition of the reality of the human condition. Two primary movements, Catholicism, highlighted in "The Grand Inquisitor," and socialism, emphasized in "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare," demonstrate paths for humankind to escape the reality of the void. These methods, fraudulent in Dostoevsky's eyes, are merely ideological stand-ins for an intolerable reality.

[184] Cannibalism in this sense refers to the Nietzschean metaphysical cannibalism in which the individual consumes all as necessary fuel for his will to power.

Furthermore, Matthew Raphael Johnson, in "Fyodor Dostoevsky: The Complete Lecture Series," argues that the filling of this void with artificial ideologies is representative of the will to dominate society. In this, Catholicism's focus on submission and dogma, and the Inquisitor's acceptance of the third temptation, is evidence of the void's creation of a power vacuum. Likewise, the socialist proposition to strive toward the 'nature of man' and unify all men through the satisfaction of physical needs exhibits the ploy of socialists for power. Dostoevsky proposes, rather, the need for punishment and guilt to restore the inner person. One must pay the price, or accept forgiveness for sins, in order to create internal balance. Ivan's psychological and physical struggles are indicators of the inability to satisfy either of this criterion. "For Dostoevsky, as is very well known, the wages of sin are insanity, or, more philosophically, that sin is an all-encompassing entity. A sinful man has a physical makeup different from the virtuous man; the brain more troubled and more unbalanced" (Johnson). This point demonstrates Dostoevsky's antithesis to the common modes of Russian society, socialism and Catholicism, the latter of which he asserts is a continuation of feudalism, revealing both a societal and individual crisis for Russian society. Ivan's madness emerging from confronting the void, further cemented through the figure of Raskolnikov in *Crime in Punishment*, reveals Dostoevsky's key to the restoration of the inner person and, consequently, Russia's salvation.

IV. God or the Void

Guilt and Regeneration in *Crime and Punishment*

Dostoevsky, having emphasized the inability of ideologies, both religious and political, to address the crisis of the inner man, he thus proposes that there are only two viable options for the individual with respect to morality. One must affirm that there is an objective truth that is established by a higher being, the Christian God in his case, or one must face the chaos of

subjectivity. This void, or abyss of morality, is often overlooked, but Dostoevsky argues that it must be confronted for the logical mind. The novelist's protagonist Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment*, an individual that has rejected both political and religious ideologies, resolves to confront this void, simultaneously confirming himself as a superior being and defining his own ethic. The representation of the dark chaos of his guilt is reflective of Dostoevsky's position regarding the confrontation of this void.

Raskolnikov considers a potential crime, unknown to the reader during the first pages of the novel. The thought of the crime clearly weighs on the protagonist, as his behavior reflects a complete disregard for the social norms and customs of Russia[185]. One eventful day, Rodion, as he is often referred to, goes to the home of a pawnbroker named Alyona Ivanovna. Alyona is depicted as a heinous individual, a portrayal that is confirmed when she takes advantage of Raskolnikov due to his financial situation, taking his watch for a fraction of its worth. Despite his fiscal difficulties, the protagonist immediately enters a tavern where he spends the little that he has on an alcoholic beverage. In the tavern, he converses with a man named Marmeladov, in the midst of a multiday alcoholic binge due to his shame. He recounts his story to Rodion, who learns of Marmeladov's poor financial state, his ill wife, and his daughter who had turned to prostitution to support the family.

In the midst of this state, Raskolnikov obtains news from his mother, who was a strong religious believer, that his sister had become engaged. Despite his mother's encouragement, Raskolnikov outright rejects Christianity and religious thought. Reeling from the news of his sister's engagement and her future move to St. Petersburg, where he lives, he enters a tavern and overhears a conversation that is too odd to be coincidental. Another individual at the tavern

[185] He is dressed in rags and talks to himself openly in public.

discusses, loud enough for the protagonist to hear, how the killing of the pawnbroker Alyona Ivanovna would improve society. Shortly after discovering a moment when Alyona Ivanovna would be alone, Raskolnikov's potential crime becomes reality, as he murders the pawnbroker with an ax. Following the murder, Alyona's sister Lizaveta enters and sees that Raskolnikov had murdered her sister. Rodion determines that he must murder her as well so as not be deemed guilty, although this action does not adhere to his personal philosophical justification.

Raskolnikov's murder has philosophical bearing, as he has justified that the murder of an individual, who he believes unnecessary to society, would affirm his position regarding the illogical nature of traditional morality. Maintaining a compassionate side toward his family, he argues that the money he could gain from a useless individual would allow him to help those who he considers valuable, his sister and his mother. While his own removal from poverty is an afterthought, it is not altogether irrelevant, as Alyona Ivanovna is very wealthy due to her exploitation of the poor. As a result, there is a practical element to Rodion's murder, but his underlining cause stems from the need to confirm his nihilist beliefs. The murder, along with the absence of guilt, would demonstrate Raskolnikov's ability to assert his own ethic, effectively making him superior to other beings[186]. In this, Raskolnikov seeks to face the void of reality and overcome it.

Summoned to the police station due to issues with collection at his apartment, he faints at the mention of the murders of Alyona and Lizaveta. He returns to his apartment and falls into a four-day delirium, of which he recalls relatively little. To his surprise, he had uncomfortably discussed the murders with an investigator named Zamyotov. Later, still in a delirium-like state, he comes close to divulging his guilt to Zamyotov, who has suspected Raskolnikov since the

[186] He considers this act to be that of superiority because he would not need to depend on the morality of the weak, namely religious morality.

beginning. Throughout the novel, Raskolnikov struggles to adhere to logical thought, as he believes he should not feel guilt for the murder of the pawnbroker, although he struggles to justify her sister's murder. His guilt is unbearable, as Dostoevsky conveys an intense psychological agony in Raskolnikov.

Later, Rodion discovers that Marmeladov had died and pays a visit to the family. Filled with compassion and ignoring his logical impulses, he offers the family the little money he was given by his family to pay his expenses. He meets Sonya, the daughter Marmeladov had told him was prostituting herself for the family's benefit, who he discovers is a devout Christian. Although the novel is littered with numerous interactions and side stories, Raskolnikov, having grown close to Sonya, confesses that he has committed the murders. His guilt, along with his psychologically draining interaction with the police officer Porfiry Petrovich, intensify his internal torment. In the end, Sonya gives Rodion a cross and convinces him to admit to his crime and repent to God. Raskolnikov consents to the first, sent to Siberia to complete eight years of hard labor. In a gradual process during his term, he begins to eliminate his previous philosophical positions, coming to peace with his inability to face his existential void. When considering the reason he could not commit suicide to relieve himself from his misery, he demonstrates an inclination toward religious conversion. "In misery he asked himself this question, and could not understand that, at the very time he had been standing looking into the river, he had perhaps been dimly conscious of the fundamental falsity in himself and his convictions. He didn't understand that that consciousness might be the promise of a future crisis, of a new view of life and of his future resurrection" (573). Although not complete, his psyche is finally relieved, yet he recognizes the necessity of his suffering to continue this process[187].

[187] "He did not know that the new life would not be given him for nothing, that he would have to pay dearly for it, that it would cost him great striving, great suffering" (575).

Raskolnikov's inability to practically overcome the void through the affirmation of the self is telling of Dostoevsky's notion of being. The protagonist, in an effort to define and confirm the self, takes on the role of the Nietzschean *Übermensch*[188], in an effort to live beyond God and social impediment. In this, Raskolnikov seeks to make himself god-like, defining both a personal ethic and himself in the process. His inability to carry out this plan, despite his superior intellect, is revelatory of Dostoevsky's notion of the self. Effectively, Dostoevsky asserts that one is incapable of assuming a god-like role in construing the self, thus affirming a supposition that one's relation to God defines the self. To comprehend this characterization, one must understand Thomas Aquinas's position in *Summa Theologica*.

Thomas Aquinas's principal theological work *Summa Theologica* is both a philosophically and theologically dense book. He argues that both logic and theology allow for the full comprehension of the self. However, the primary focus of Aquinas's work is not necessarily the defining of being or the essence of mankind, this is surely an outcome, but instead it is God-centered. "The relationship to God is the primary relationship that Aquinas acknowledges for human beings. It is a relation which is disturbed by sin, by turning away from God" (Schoot 36). The primary impediment to the defining relationship of the self, an implication of dependency in determination, is one's relationship to God. Aquinas asserts that this proposition is consistent with biblical texts, namely Genesis 1:27, in which God creates man in His image or likeness. The notion of image is key in the characterization of the individual. "Aquinas's primary explanation of the idea of an image of God in human beings is aimed at establishing a certain balance; 'image' does add something to 'likeness,' because not anything which is like something else can be called an image of that something else; to be an image of something the thing must have a certain imprint

[188] Although Raskolnikov lives out the ideal of the *Übermensch,* Nietzsche's work was written after *Crime and Punishment.*

of expression of the thing imaged; there must be a certain imitation. So image is more than likeness" (Schoot 40). The imprint, as it is referred to here, represents the crucial attribute of one's being.

The human self is not a god, but rather an expression of the imprint of God. However, Aquinas argues that original sin, understood as not merely specific acts of an unethical nature, but a consistent spiritual piercing of the human equation present in all mankind, alters the self's likeness to God. "The image which is primary, in which men and women are one, does have different forms of stages. For a human being who gravely sins, does something which affects his likeness to God. He loses in a sense the image of God he is; he does not lose the natural aptitude for understanding and loving God, but he does lose his actual knowledge and love of God" (Schoot 42). In this, Aquinas asserts not only that the self is defined by its relationship to God, but that the relationship may affect the state of the self, a notion observable in the character of Raskolnikov.

Although the figure of Raskolnikov has been treated in all sorts of manners to convey Dostoevsky's artistic and philosophical intentions, the creation of an elevated psychological complexity for the protagonist allows for this, the primary representation is Raskolnikov's need for Christ. His relationship to God, emphasized from the start of the novel as a basis for auto-determination to assume a god-like role, is carried out throughout the work. Raskolnikov's failure demonstrates his inability to attain inner peace without the existence of God to offer an objective characterization. As a result, Dostoevsky assert that Raskolnikov's primary relationship, in accordance with Aquinas, is with God. His closeness and dependency on Sonya are merely a precursor for this fact, as she offers him moments of respite, but is unable to provide him complete contentment. Raskolnikov's journey[189] is akin to Aquinas's proposition that one must return to

[189] "But that is the beginning of a new story—the story of the gradual renewal of a man, the story of his gradual regeneration, of his passing from one world into another, of his initiation into a new unknown life" (575).

God to attain wholeness of being. The protagonist's transgression, the murder of two women and, thus, the placement of the self on equal footing with God, causes a plunge into guilt and madness. "For Dostoevsky, as is very well known, the wages of sin are insanity, or, more philosophically, that sin is an all-encompassing entity. A sinful man has a physical makeup different from the virtuous man; the brain more troubled and more unbalanced" (Johnson). Accordingly, Dostoevsky adheres to the Aquinas notion that one's sins affect one's likeness to God. Raskolnikov rejects God in the belief that he may define the self through confrontation of the void, but his inability to do so reveals the need of remediation to endure guilt. Dostoevsky highlights the necessity of this mode both for the Russian situation of his time and for humankind in every age, an aggressive undertaking for the writer. Effectively, he endeavors to propose a remedy outside of the constraints of his time, culture, and politics, a pursuit reminiscent of the writer's role according to Jean-Paul Sartre.

In "*What is Literature?*," Jean-Paul Sartre proposes that the writer of his or her time need not describe extensively in his work a cultural scene and geopolitical environment with which his or her readers are familiar. A writer of his time, such as Dostoevsky with respect to the unique social, political, and philosophical environment of Russia, which requires some external information to attain general comprehension of his purpose for his era, takes a number of facts and references as givens for his readers. "The same with reading: people of a same period and collectivity, who have lived through the same events, who have raised or avoided the same questions, have the same taste in their mouth; they have the same complicity, and there are the same corpses among them. That is why it is not necessary to write so much; there are key-words" (Sartre 68). Yet, Dostoevsky's messages, directed at the soul of the human[190], can be understood

[190] Dostoevsky clearly believes in the notion of an individual soul for each person created by God.

outside the bounds of the Russian context. Accordingly, Sartre argues that a writer must aspire to surpass the tendency to appeal solely to the current mode. "One must win an inner victory over his passions, his race, his class, and his nation and must conquer other men along with himself" (67). Sartre's focus is freedom, asserting that man is inherently free, a notion promoted by the act of writing[191]. The freedom to which Dostoevsky invites his readers is that of forgiveness for the sins that weigh one down.

The Russian novelist attacks the socialists of his day, undoubtedly, but his aim is to propose a remedy for the strife, the agony of the inner man, that will surpass modern institutions, popular philosophical movements, and western customs. Thus, he employs various modes in the pursuit of this goal. He utilizes addiction and apathy in *The Gambler*, reason and intelligence in *Notes from Underground*, religion and philosophy in *The Brothers Karamazov*, and will and power in *Crime and Punishment*. Dostoevsky attempts to make his remedy available to any potential reader, from his time or in the future. He goes beyond the domain of midcentury Russia, yet nevertheless addresses this crisis in accordance with Sartre's theory of the writer: "One cannot write without a public and without a myth without a certain public which historical circumstances have made, without a certain myth of literature which depends to a very great extent upon the demand of this public. In a word, the author is in a situation, like all other men. But his writings, like every human project, simultaneously enclose, specify, and surpass this situation, even explain it and set it up, just as the idea of a circle explains and sets up that of the rotation of a segment" (150).

[191] "Authors too are historical. And that is precisely the reason why some of them want to escape from history by a leap into eternity. The book, serving as a go-between, establishes a historical contact among the men who are steeped in the same history and who likewise contribute to its making. Writing and reading are two facets of the same historical fact, and the freedom to which the writer invites us is not a pure abstract consciousness of being free. Strictly speaking, it is not; it wins itself in a historical situation; each book proposes a concrete liberation on the basis of a particular alienation" (Sartre 70).

Dostoevsky's novels endeavor to surpass the Russian situation with the message of Christianity, certainly an Eastern Orthodox version, but not without a number of unique Dostoevsky attributes.

As mentioned, Dostoevsky's work is significantly influenced by his Eastern Orthodox Christianity, acting as a premise for his conservative views regarding the influence of western ideas and western Christianity. Although Eastern Orthodox Christianity in Russia during Dostoevsky's epoch maintained significant differences from Catholicism, Dostoevsky's greatest trifle with Catholicism rested in the figure of Jesus Christ[192], who the Russian author believed was not central for the Church of Rome due to the power of the clergy. Although Dostoevsky affirmed many of the Eastern Orthodox beliefs, namely the resurrection of Christ, belief in Christ's deity, and the possibility of forgiveness of sins, he nevertheless adhered to a personal form of Christianity. Joseph Frank argues that the novelist recognized an issue, affecting Russia in his moment, but also throughout all of history. "The highest aim of Dostoevsky's Christianity, though, is not personal salvation but the fusion of the individual ego with the community in a symbiosis of love and the only sin that Dostoevsky appears to recognize is the failure to fulfill this law of love. Suffering arises from the consciousness of such a failure; and Dostoevsky's words help us to grasp not only why suffering plays such a prominent role in his works, but also why it is totally misleading to infer that he believes *any* kind of suffering to be necessarily good" (Frank 307). In this, Dostoevsky viewed ethical egoism as a primary detriment to one's affirmation of the personality, founded in the individual's relationship to Christ. As a result, Dostoevsky's novels take aim at this ideal of self-interested morality, arguing that it was not a new development, but as old as the devil. "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare" is evidence of this idea, as the devil assumed the attire and attitude of the Russian socialists, but this external garb represents merely the novel

[192] Eastern Orthodox Christianity emphasizes the supremacy of Jesus Christ alone to forgive sins, while it had been a practice for priests to absolve sins within Catholicism.

façade in a long line of deceptions. Dostoevsky, therefore, in a similar vein to Baroja, argues for the inability of ideologies, be they religious or political, to address the crisis of the inner man.

Furthermore, Dostoevsky and Baroja share the belief that mankind is incapable of complete internal remediation in life. Baroja, like Dostoevsky, proposes a mode to provide temporary contentment to attain wholeness of being. However, Dostoevsky and Baroja diverge in that the Russian novelist argues one may attain redress, although spiritual, after life. One merely needs to embrace the suffering of this world, which subsequently affirms one's personality. "Life for Dostoevsky was, as it had been for Keats, "a value of soul-making," into which Christ had come to call mankind to battle against the death of immersion in matter and to inspire the struggle toward the ultimate victory over egoism" (Frank 308). Human egoism, necessarily in antithesis to Christ, required the suffering of mankind[193]. "Only in eternity would the law of personality be finally overcome; and this is surely why Dostoevsky could never effectively imagine such a triumph within the realistic conventions of the nineteenth-century novel to which he remained faithful" (Frank 309). Thus, the novel for Dostoevsky acts as a modality to convey this notion, along with the idea that the genre is more apt to deliver practical philosophical messages. The man of the underground seeks to satisfy his rationally troubled spirit, Alexei writes to exonerate himself from the suffering of addiction, and Ivan and Raskolnikov strive to procure respite from their guilt. Consequently, the Dostoevsky novel proposes that the crisis of the inner man, particularly applicable to Russia, is only satisfied in its agonizing quest of Christ, life being simply a transition to the perfect state.

[193] "… [A]nd since human egoism will always prevent the ideal of Christ from being fully realized on earth, this type of suffering will not (and cannot) crease before the end of time" (Frank 307).

Chapter V

Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky's Regenerative Programs

I. Introduction

This chapter will conclude the study by encapsulating the principal findings relating to the research goals and research questions, along with its utility and contribution to the present field. It will establish a research overview to identify the rationality for the proposed conclusions, along with an abbreviated review of the key discoveries found in Baroja and Dostoevsky's work. The following section will address the research questions and aims, outlining their contributions to the field of Spanish literature. The remainder of the chapter will identify options for future research.

II. Research Overview

Chapter I established a general overview of the research study and aims, focusing on the Baroja and Dostoevsky novels and their connections. This section proposed research questions, the value of the study, and its limitations. Additionally, the introduction provided an outline of the subsequent chapters relating to the historical and philosophical context, the Baroja novel, the Dostoevsky novel, and the ensuing conclusions therein.

Chapter II provided the historical background and basis for the Baroja and Dostoevsky novels, situating both authors within the unique national contexts within which they wrote. The late nineteenth century represented a period of transformation socially, politically, and philosophically that drastically changed the trajectory of the entire world the following century. In Spain, the seeds of change blossomed in the form of *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, spearheaded by Krausism, increased international contact, and the resulting philosophical and cultural growth. This flowering and sharing of philosophical ideas, primarily those of European thinkers mentioned in our study such as Auguste Comte, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Karl Christian

Friedrich Krause, provided Baroja with fertile ground to analyze the pedagogical and cultural renovation in Spain in a time of crisis. The philosophical ideas of these European thinkers influenced education, politics, and culture throughout the nation. In Russia, many of these ideas played an equally significant role within the tumultuous state. Following the cultural inheritance of serfdom, its disintegration, and the influence of westernization, Dostoevsky's work is situated within the context of a society unhinged. These equally distressing conditions in Spain and Russia allowed Baroja and Dostoevsky to utilize the novel to provide both individual and societal critique and the possibility of regeneration.

Structurally, Chapter III highlighted the work of Pío Baroja within this tempestuous context, pertaining to his novels in addition to his work of essays, *Juventud, egolatría*, and analyzed his proposal for societal restoration. The first two sections of the chapter, "Institutions and Vitality in Spain" and "Catholicism and Anarchism," which analyzed the novels *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)*, *Aurora roja*, *El árbol de la ciencia*, and *Mala hierba*, focused on the issue of the individual in Spain, weighed down by the social, political, and religious programs of the time. Both sections emphasized the individual, but the second section demonstrated the extension of this problem to the Spanish nation as a whole. The third section, "Baroja's Man of Action" detailed Baroja's philosophically anarchist proposal to spurn institutionalism and exalt the 'man of action'. The final section, "The Novel's Purpose," represents a closer inspection of this idealized individual and the novel's role as a cleansing and revelatory vehicle for Baroja.

"Institutions and Vitality in Spain" emphasized Baroja's *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística)* and *Aurora roja*, two novels that address religion in Spain, primarily Catholicism, and national pedagogy. These themes drew on the Nietzschean notion of the individual will presented in *On the Genealogy of Morals* and José Ortega y Gasset's proposed need to generate harmony

between reason and vitality in *El tema de nuestro tiempo*. The pursuit of this individual will, epitomized in Fernando Ossorio, and the harmony between reason and vitality, demonstrated in Manuel, in pursuit of completeness of being, reflect the value of individuality for Baroja. Furthermore, the Spanish novelist establishes the merit of individual innate creativity and vitality, themes reflected in his own personal philosophical anarchism. However, his disdain for all institutions in general, addressed in "Catholicism and Anarchism," reveal his inability to wholeheartedly adhere to anarchism in the political realm. This second section further cemented his identification of crisis for the individual in *El árbol de la ciencia*, while simultaneously demonstrating its extension to collective decadence in *Mala hierba*. The analysis of the former demonstrated the mode that Baroja utilized Andrés Hurtado to epitomize the inability of existing institutions to satisfy the new generation, revealing Baroja's disdain for dominant structures. *Mala hierba* reflected national decay through both individual and societal inaction, a notion highly correlated to Baroja's conception of being. This Barojian notion of being was investigated with relation to the Krausist conception of being, identifying a link between their shared postulation of self-realization occurring through one's activities.

The third section, "Baroja's Man of Action," studying both *Zalacaín el aventurero* and *César o nada*, continued with Baroja's notion of being and identified his proposition to address both individual and societal crisis in Spain. Baroja's depiction of Martín Zalacaín, a figure who, while rational, predominantly adhered to his individual nature, reflects the Spanish novelist's proposal to prioritize action over rationality at the individual level. Zalacaín's actions cement his personal identity through nonconformity, a notion further emphasized in *César o nada*. César Moncada, the ideal protagonist to represent Baroja's proposal at the individual and societal levels, subverts the notion of the supposed grandeur of historical Spain through his nonconformity and

the imposition of his personal will. In this, Baroja, much like Nietzsche, suggests that destruction is necessary for creation, namely, the creation of a new ethic. César is this destruction, as he recognizes that the established order, both political and religious, must be replaced with a new model. Despite his failure, César's example represents the need for destruction and suffering to rid both the individual and society as a whole from traditional ideals. The fourth section "The Novel's Purpose" examined the only Baroja work not considered a novel, *Juventud, egolatría*. This collection of essays allowed for the confirmation of Baroja's novelistic goals, as well as a window into his connection with Dostoevsky. This final section confirmed Baroja opposition to institutions, the temporality of his proposal for action, and his position regarding Spain's philosophical and social decline with respect to other European nations. In this, the Spanish novelist recognized that his resolution for the individual and for society, action, was not apt to permanently address society's ills, but rather a form of momentary restoration. Furthermore, this section highlighted Baroja's references to Dostoevsky in *Juventud, egolatría*, highlighting their common enemy in utopian and positivist programs for their respective nations.

Structurally, Chapter IV examined Fyodor Dostoevsky's novels within an analogously turbulent social situation in Russia, highlighting his proposal for societal and personal restoration. The first section "The Crisis of the Inner Man," focusing on *The Gambler*, introduced the unique dilemma facing both the Russian nation and the Russian individual. The second section "The Impotence of Socialism and Utopia," examining *Notes from Underground*, revealed Dostoevsky's position regarding the unsatisfactory responses proposed by western thinkers to address a very uniquely Russian situation due to its history. The third section "The Inadequacy of Religion" emphasizing *The Brothers Karamazov*, investigated Dostoevsky's depiction of a life without morality and the subsequent proposal of a void. The final section "God or the Void" further

analyzed this notion of a void in *Crime and Punishment*, offering a look at Dostoevsky's proposal to confront this crisis facing the inner person.

The analysis of *The Gambler* examined Dostoevsky's depiction of Alexei Ivanovich, a man without faith, a notion presented in conjunction with Leo Tolstoy's *A Confession*, dealing with the same notion of faithlessness. Dostoevsky's portrayal of Alexei's faithlessness, along with his return to gambling, epitomizes his views of the Russian nation pertaining to national devastation from the practices of addiction, madness, and debauchery. The protagonist pursues escapism to avoid confronting his life, exhibiting an internal turmoil also present in Manuel in the trilogy *La lucha por la vida* by Baroja. Dostoevsky utilizes Alexei to represent the problem not only of the individual, but the infiltration of western ideas and customs in Russia. The proposals presented by these westernized ideas were addressed in the second section "The Impotence of Socialism and Utopia," as Dostoevsky's man from the underground confronts Chernyshevsky's socialism introduced in his novel *What Is to Be Done?*, Comte's positivism, and the concept of utopia. The man of the underground rejects these proposals due to his intelligence, effectively serving as a mouthpiece for Dostoevsky to dismiss revolutionary political programs due to their negation of personal responsibility and the devaluation of human individuality.

The third section dealing with *The Brothers Karamazov* studied Dostoevsky's revelation of an existential void that all must confront, effectively proposing that humanity must recognize the acceptance of a superior Being or embrace a new ethic, much in the same way that Friedrich Nietzsche proposed in "The Parable of the Madman." Ivan's attempt to reject Catholic morality contributes to his physical and psychological decline. Dostoevsky's chapters "The Grand Inquisitor" and "The Devil. Ivan's Nightmare" demonstrate the Russian novelist's position regarding the practice of westerners when confronted with the void: they fill the void with artificial

ideologies such as socialism or philosophy. Ivan's crisis is a demonstration of an internal imbalance due to the recognition of the gravity of the void and his inability to cope with the guilt as a result. The final section focused on *Crime and Punishment* investigated Dostoevsky's two remedies to confront the void with relation to truth: There is an objective truth, God, or there is no objective truth and one must face the chaos of subjectivity. Raskolnikov's inability to adhere to the latter reveals Dostoevsky's proposal for the value of human suffering during life and the need for faith in Jesus Christ in accordance with the author's personal practice of Eastern Orthodox Christianity. Dostoevsky's proposal, therefore, is a regeneration of the individual in accordance with a uniquely Russian tradition. His novels, analyzed in conjunction with Baroja's, lead to a number of conclusions that we will discuss in this final chapter.

This final chapter, Chapter V, provided a general overview of the research findings. The remainder of the chapter will address the research questions directly, propose conclusions related to Baroja and Dostoevsky's novels, and discuss how this research can be expanded upon in the future.

III. Research Questions and Conclusions

This research overview intends to establish an impression of the study's primary points in order to provide pertinent information to address the research questions. The following section will address the research questions proposed in Chapter I.

How do Baroja and Dostoevsky utilize the novel to address national distress? Baroja and Dostoevsky utilize the novel to address national distress by identifying societal issues at the individual level. The identification of these problems, affecting protagonists who serve as exemplars of their respective nations, allows for the exposition of their proposals for individual resolution. The contexts of both novelists were similar, as their work contained a plethora of

philosophical and religious programs advanced to address the issues of the day at a societal level. Baroja's novels indicate that he opposed complete adherence to political programs such as political anarchism or positivism, and he outright rejected Catholicism. Likewise, Dostoevsky's novels indicate a spurn of Chernyshevsky's socialism and any other form of political devotion to remediate society, while also rejecting Catholicism. Each of these programs focused on the nation as a whole, regarding the individual as a member of the collective. Distinctly, Baroja and Dostoevsky employ the novel as a mode to convey individuality and prioritize the individual over the collective. In Baroja's case, the individual confirms his or her being through nonconformity to institutions and independent action, elements that are inherently individual. In Dostoevsky's case, the individual must recognize the inability of social programs or Catholicism to equip him or her to face the void. The void must be confronted alone to allow oneself to make amends with his or her guilt.

What ideological and hallmark common traits and differences exist between each author related to their novelistic characters? A number of ideological common traits exist between the primary protagonists in Baroja and Dostoevsky's novels, including, in particular instances, a heightened sense of critical analysis toward life, general apathy towards life's succession, extreme guilt, and a fierce pursuit of self-realization. Both the man of the underground from *Notes from Underground* and Andrés from *El árbol de la ciencia* exhibit a heightened sense of critical analysis, particularly pertaining to the absurdity of life. For the man of the underground, this acute critical mind consigns him into solitude, while it is the cause of Andrés's suicide. A general sense of apathy toward life is found in both Alexei in *The Gambler* and Manuel in *Mala hierba*. This apathy is representative both of their individual characteristics, and also their respective nations. Both Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment* and Fernando Ossorio in *Camino de perfección*

(Pasión mística) convey severe guilt, as both experience this feeling to the point of physical and psychological harm. And finally, both Ivan in *The Brothers Karamazov* and César in *César o nada* epitomize the fierce pursuit of self-realization. Interestingly, both are incapable of attaining their goal.

In addition to these common traits, Dostoevsky and Baroja's novels contain a number of differences with relation to their characters, as political activism, ferocity, and genuine religiosity correspond to both novelist's proposition for internal remediation. Juan, in *Aurora roja*, is utilized to reveal the futility of political activism, and no character reaches the magnitude of Juan's involvement in the four referenced Dostoevsky novels. Pertaining to their proposals for individual remediation, Baroja's César and Martín Zalacaín of *Zalacaín el aventurero* convey Baroja's unique proposal for 'the man of action'. In Dostoevsky's case, Alexei Karamazov of *The Brothers Karamazov* epitomizes the ideal for the Russian novelist's conception of wholeness of being.

What is the proposal for each author to remediate the crisis of the inner being and attain wholeness of being? Although the utilization of the novel for Baroja and Dostoevsky is addressed at the individual level, the proposals for remediation for the crisis of the inner being is vastly different. For Dostoevsky, wholeness of being is indeed attainable, but not during life. Dostoevsky's novels indicates that the individual must confront the void, either accepting the objective morality of a superior Being, God in his case, or wade the chaotic waters of subjective morality. In this, Dostoevsky proposes that one accept Jesus Christ as a redeemer, recognizing that life is a transition toward the afterlife and the subsequent attainment of wholeness of being. During this transition, one must embrace suffering to inherently confirm individuality. Baroja's novels outright reject this proposal, as he argues that one must remove all religious, political, and social traditionalism to attain individuality. His novels suggest that one must accept an

amalgamation of reason and vitality, prioritizing vitality, or action, above rationality. In effect, the only way for the individual to remove him or herself from the absurdity of life is to adhere to a life of action. Although Baroja and Dostoevsky's programs advocate for different modes to remediate the crisis of the inner person, they share the proposal for the impossibility of attaining wholeness of being in this life.

IV. Research Aims and Contributions

The research goal for this study was to address the gap in existing literature with respect to Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky, pertaining primarily to their novels. The research aim was to identify and evaluate the similarities and differences between the two European authors with special attention paid to individual and national crisis. Furthermore, I sought to identify their proposals for regeneration within the abundance of philosophical programs proposed to undertake the existing problems plaguing humankind during the late nineteenth century. Although the number of philosophical programs in the late nineteenth century far exceeded the scope of this particular study, references are made to philosophers relevant to Baroja and Dostoevsky's work. These include Friedrich Nietzsche, Auguste Comte, Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, José Ortega y Gasset, Miguel de Unamuno, Mikhail Bakunin, Karl Marx, and Karl Jaspers.

Within a context that necessitated these programs, Baroja and Dostoevsky's regenerative plans find their effectuation and development in the novel. Their similarities and distinctions have been analyzed and compared, providing new research on the collective novels of Dostoevsky and Baroja in conjunction. As mentioned in Chapter I, although research on the Russian novelist's work abounds, Baroja has not been analyzed to the measure of his literary greatness. Furthermore, the connection between these two authors has not been adequately studied, an aim that this study has sought to address. The identification of commonalities and differences to address wholeness

of being in times of crisis is valuable for two primary reasons: In human history, there has never been a shortage of crisis at the individual and societal level and furthermore, Baroja and Dostoevsky utilize the novel to reflect and penetrate the façades of dominant structures to convey programs of regeneration that will stand the test of time. They use the novel to address the human condition, a condition that is in a perpetual state of crisis.

V. Future Research and Recommendations

Although the study has achieved its research aims, significantly more research is necessary to fully encapsulate both Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky's regenerative plans. Furthermore, due to time constraints, this particular study was limited to the examination of both authors' novels[194]. There is a large body of supplemental work that would aid in the increased comprehension of their plans and the similarities therein. Furthermore, although Chapter III and Chapter IV highlighted both authors' positions on Catholicism, correlating this religion to a feudal institution in Dostoevsky's case and obstructing Spain's growth in Baroja's, more research to examine the relationship between both would be productive.

VI. Closing Comments

This chapter has provided a research overview, addressed the research questions, proposed contributions in reference to the study's aim, and identified areas of future research. Given the effects of the late nineteenth century on the following century, the novels of Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky have been studied to emphasize their regenerative programs in times of societal and individual crisis. This study has highlighted Dostoevsky's and Baroja's common rejection of programs for societal restoration, a shared focus on the crisis of the internal person, common and distinct ideological attributes of their protagonists, and distinct proposals to attain wholeness of

[194] The exception to this statement is *Juventud, egolatría*, which established a connection between Baroja and Dostoevsky.

being, but with the shared position that one cannot reach wholeness of being in this life. This study addresses the gap in existing literature with respect to the connection between Pío Baroja and Fyodor Dostoevsky, emphasizing their literary relation and proposals.

Index

Bibliography

Abellán, José Luis. "La dimensión krauso-positivista en Eugenio María de Hostos." *Cuadernos Americanos*, vol. 3, no. 16, 1989, pp. 58-66.

Alexander, Robert J. *The Anarchists in the Spanish Civil War*. Janus Publishing, 1999.

Ascarza, Victoriano F. *Lecturas ciudadanas: (educación cívica)*. Editorial Magisterio Español, 1931.

Bakunin, Mikhail Aleksandrovich. *God and the State.* Modern Publishers, 1946.

Bambach, Charles. "Nietzsche's Madman Parable: A Cynical Reading." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 84, no. 2, 2010, pp. 441–456.

Baroja, Pío. *Aurora roja.* Booklassic, 2015.

---. *Camino de perfección (Pasión mística).* Ulan Press, 2012.

---. *César o nada*. Alianza de Novelas, 2006.

---. *El árbol de la ciencia.* Alianza de Novelas, 1967.

---. *Juventud, egolatría*. Wentworth Press, 2019.

---. *La lucha por la vida (La trilogía)*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2016.

---. *Los pilotos de altura*. Anaya Infantil y Juvenil, 2017.

---. *Mala hierba*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2017.

---. *Zalacaín El Aventurero.* Vicens-Vives Editorial, 2004.

Blake, Elizabeth A. *Dostoevsky and the Catholic Underground*. Northwestern University Press, 2014.

Bloom, Harold, and Fyodor Dostoevsky. *Fyodor Dostoevsky's The Brothers Karamazov: Edited and with an Introduction by Harold Bloom*. Chelsea House, 1988.

Blum, Jerome. *The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe.* Princeton University Press, 1978.

Bourdeau, Michel, "Auguste Comte." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2021 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/comte/>.

Castellarín, Teresita Mauro. "El anarquismo en las novelas de Baroja." *Ensayos: Revistas de la Facultad de Educación de Albacete*, no. 1, 1987, pp. 11-30.

Chelovek, Lishny. "superfluous man." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 28 Jan. 2015, https://www.britannica.com/art/superfluous-man. Accessed 12 Jan. 2022.

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai. *What is to Be Done?*. Translated by Michael R. Katz, Cornell University Press, 1989.

Colin, Vera. "Baroja's approach to anarchy in "La mala hierba" and "Aurora roja."" *Caligrama: Revista insular de filología*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1987, pp. 111-22.

Collins, Marsha Suzan. *Pío Baroja's 'Memorias de Un Hombre de Acción' and the Ironic Mode: The Search for Order & Meaning*. Tamesis Books, 1986.

Curtis, Glenn E. *Russia: A Country Study*. E-book, Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1996.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man.* Prometheus, 1997.

Davies, Brian. *Thomas Aquinas's Summa Theologiae a Guide and Commentary*. Oxford University Press, 2014.

Delasanta, Rodney. "Dostoevsky Also Nods." *First Things*: *Institute on Religion and Public Life*, 2002, https://www.firstthings.com/article/2002/01/dostoevsky-also-nods.

De Jonge, Alex. *Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity.* St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Docampo Jorge, Daniel. “El Tiempo Histórico de La Lucha Por La Vida (1904) de Pío Baroja: De Una Cronología Lineal a Una Paradoja Temporal.” *Revista de Literatura*, vol. 83, no. 166, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2021, pp. 469–501, https://doi.org/10.3989/revliteratura.2021.02.018.
Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Translated by Constance Garnett. Modern Library, 1994.
---. *Notes from Underground*. Translated by Richard Peace, Bristol Classical Press, 1993.
---. *Pisma*, edited and annotated by A.S. Dolinin, Moscow, 1959.
---. *The Brothers Karamazov*, edited and translated by Harold Bloom, Chelsea House, 1988.
---. *The Idiot*. Translated by Constance Garnett, Bantam Classics, 1983.
---. *The Gambler and Other Stories*. Translated by Ronald Meyer, 1st ed., Penguin Classics, 2010.
Eagleton, Terry. “Freedom by Necessity.” *Lapham’s Quarterly*, 2021, https://www.laphamsquarterly.org/religion/freedom-necessity. Accessed 18 Jan. 2022.
Elizalde, Ignacio. *Personajes y temas barojianos: personalidad humana, personalidad literaria, el problema de España, los curas, los anarquistas, la mujer vasca, Navarra en su obra*. 2nd ed., Universidad de Deusto, 1986.
Feirl, Herbert. "Positivism." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 28 Sept. 1998, https://www.britannica.com/topic/positivism. Accessed 11 Jan. 2021.
Flath, Carol A. *Dostoevsky’s Secrets: Reading Against the Grain (Studies in Russian Literature and Theory*. Northwestern University Press, 2009.
Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky: (The Stir of Liberation, 1860-1865)*. 3rd ed., Princeton University Press, 2020.
Freud, S. “Dostoevsky and Parricide.” *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 26, 1945, pp. 1–8.
Fundación Francisco Giner de los Ríos. La Institución Libre de Enseñanza, https://www.fundacionginer.org/virtual.htm. Accessed 12 Dec. 2021.
González Echevarría, Roberto, and Enrique Pupo-Walker. *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature, Volume 1: Discovery to Modernism*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
García Cabellero, Vicente. “La educación en la España de finales del siglo XIX.” *Iberian*, no. 7, 2013, pp. 35–50.
Garrido, Daniel R. “Krause, Spanish Krausism, and Philosophy of Action.” *Idealistic Studies*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2019, pp. 167–88.
Garrido Palacios, Manuel. “Historia de la Educación, una visión hasta lo local.” *Contraluz: Revista de la Asociación Cultural Arturo Cerdá y Rico*, no. 2, 2005, pp. 89–146.
Göcke, Benedikt Paul. *The Panentheism of Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781-1832): The Transcendental Philosophy to Metaphysics*. Peter Lang International Academic Publishing Group, 2018.
Gómez Moreno, A. "La enseñanza primaria en España entre 1846 y 1856: Apuntes de estudio." *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, no. 1, 1988, pp. 41-47.
González Rodríguez, Carmelita. “Ideología y Educación Religiosa En Los Libros de Lectura de La Escuela de La Restauración Española (1875-1902).” *Historia de La Educación*, vol. 17, 2013, pp. 233–49.
Hampson, Norman. *The Enlightenment.* Penguin Books, 1991.
Hannah, Barbara. *Striving Towards Wholeness.* Chiron Publications, 2001.

Hibbs, Solange. “La ciudad como espacio de transgresión y decadencia en la novela finisecular (la trilogía “La lucha por la vida” de Pío Baroja).” *Anales de literatura española*, vol. 24, no. 24, 2012, pp. 281–306.
Hilton, Rodney. *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381.* Routledge, 2003.
Jaspers, Karl. *Philosophy of Existence*. Translated by Richard F. Grabau, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.
Johnson, Mathew Raphael. “Fyodor Dostoevsky The Complete Lecture Series.” *YouTube*, uploaded by Yanni McQueen, 4 June 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LGumhl8-kiY.
Johnson, Matthew Raphael. “The Curse of Modernism in Russia: Dostoevsky's Religious Psychology in Four Short Works.” *The Russian Orthodox Medievalist*, 2019, https://www.rusjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Dostoevsky_3.pdf. Accessed 18 Jan. 2022.
Kaufman, Andrew D. *The Gambler Wife: A True Story of Love, Risk, and the Woman Who Saved Dostoevsky*. Riverhead Books, 2021.
Kimball, Alan. “Intelligentsia [SAC]*”*. *University of Oregon*, 2018, https://pages.uoregon.edu/kimball/ntg.htm. Accessed 11 Jan. 2021.
Knight, Nathaniel. “The Abolition of Serfdom.” *Dostoevsky in Context*, edited by Deborah A. Martinsen and Olga Maiorova, Cambridge University Press, 2016, Summary.
Krause, Karl Christian Friedrich. *Ideal de la humanidad para la vida, con introducción y comentarios*. Translated by Julián Sanz del Río, Imprenta de F. Martínez García, 1871.
Lissorgues, Yvan. "Filosofía idealista y krausismo. Positivismo y debate sobre la ciencia." *Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes*, https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra-visor/filosofia-idealista-y-krausismo-positivismo-y-debate-sobre-la-ciencia/html/01faafb6-82b2-11df-acc7-002185ce6064_2.html#PagFin. Accessed 12 Jan. 2020.
Longhurst, Carlos. *Las novelas históricas de Pío Baroja*. Guadarrama, 1974.
Luchte, James. *Nietzsche’s Thus Spoke Zarathustra: Before Sunrise*, edited by James Luchte Continuum, 2008.
Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto; Principles of Communism*. Translation by Paul M. Sweezy, Monthly Review Press, 1964.
McCarthy, Mark. "What is to be Done with the Underground Man: A Comparison of N.G. Chernyshevsky and F.M. Dostoevsky." *Pro Rege*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 15–24, https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol46/iss4/2. Accessed 12 Dec. 2021.
Midgley, Louis C. “Dostoevsky on Crime and Revolution: A Study in Russian Nihilism.” *Brigham Young University Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1961, pp. 55–73.
Moon, David. *The Abolition of Serfdom in Russia: 1762-1907*. Routledge, 2001.
Morson, Gary Saul. "Russian Literature." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/art/Russian-literature. Accessed 11 Jan. 2021.
Moretti, Franco and William Mills Todd. “The Ruse of the Russian Novel.” *The Novel: Volume 1: History*, Princeton UP, 2006, pp. 401–23.
Morillas, Jordi. “Dostoevsky in Spain: A Short History of Translation and Research.” *Dostoevsky Studies*, vol. 17, 2013, pp. 121–43.
Navajas, Gonzalo. *Pío Baroja: El escritor y su literatura.* 1st ed., Teide, 1990.

Navarro de San Pío, Juan. "Pío Baroja: anatomía del hombre-circunstancia." *La Torre del Virrey: revista de estudios culturales*, no. 11, 2012, pp. 105–13.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, Vintage Books, 1969.
---. *The Gay Science: With a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, 1974.
---. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Translated by Stephen Metcalf, Modern Library, 1995.
Nguyen, Nam T. *Nature's Primal Self: Peirce, Jaspers, and Corrington.* Lexington Books, 2011.
Ortega y Gasset, José. *El tema de nuestro tiempo*. Austral, 2003.
Parravicini, L.A. *Juanito*. RBA, 2007.
Rubio, Christian. *Krausism and the Spanish Avant-Garde: The Impact of Philosophy on National Culture.* Cambria Press, 2017.
Ruíz, Alfonso Pozo. *Programa de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*. Universidad de Sevilla, https://personal.us.es/alporu/legislacion/programa_ILE.htm. Accessed 11 Jan. 2021.
Sadler, Gregory B. "Friedrich Nietzsche | Genealogy of Morals (Part 1) | Existentialist Philosophy & Literature." *YouTube*, 12 Jan. 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlojPJr4-Vo.
Sartre, Jean-Paul. *"What Is Literature?" and Other Essays*. Harvard University Press, 1988.
Schoot, Henk. "Thomas Aquinas on Human Beings as Image of God." *European Journal for the Study of Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2020, pp. 33–46.
Seró Sabaté, Joaquín. *El niño republicano*. Edaf Antillas, 2000.
The Bible. New International Version, Biblica, 2011.
Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession.* Translated by Anthony Briggs, Hesperus Press, 2010.
Tolstoy, Leo. "On Anarchy." Pamphlets Translated from the Russian. https://archive.org/stream/pamphletstransl00tolsgoog#page/n250/ mode/1up. Accessed 12 Dec. 2021.
Unamuno, Miguel de. *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida.* 1a ed., Renacimiento, 1931.
Unamuno, Miguel de. *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*. Espasa-Calpe, 1991.
Henderson, W.O. *Friedrich Engels*. Routledge, 2008.
Walicki, Andrzej. "Positivism, Russian", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 1998, https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/positivism-russian/v-1.
White, Matthew. *Atrocities: The 100 Deadliest Episodes in Human History*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2013.