

Purdue University Purdue e-Pubs

Purdue University Press Book Previews

Purdue University Press

8-2018

Intellectual Philanthropy: The Seduction of the Masses

Aurélie Vialette

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_previews



Part of the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vialette, Aurélie, "Intellectual Philanthropy: The Seduction of the Masses" (2018). *Purdue University Press Book Previews*. 14.
https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_previews/14

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

INTELLECTUAL PHILANTHROPY

Purdue Studies in Romance Literatures

Editorial Board

Íñigo Sánchez Llama, Series Editor
Brett Bowles
Elena Coda
Paul B. Dixon

Patricia Hart
Gwen Kirkpatrick
Allen G. Wood

Howard Mancing, Consulting Editor
Floyd Merrell, Consulting Editor
Joyce L. Detzner, Production Editor
Susan Y. Clawson, Assistant Production Editor

Associate Editors

French

Jeanette Beer
Paul Benhamou
Willard Bohn
Thomas Broden
Gerard J. Brault
Mary Ann Caws
Glyn P. Norton
Allan H. Pasco
Gerald Prince
Roseann Runte
Ursula Tidd

Italian

Fiora A. Bassanese
Peter Carravetta
Benjamin Lawton
Franco Masciandaro
Anthony Julian Tamburri

Luso-Brazilian

Fred M. Clark
Marta Peixoto
Ricardo da Silveira Lobo Sternberg

Spanish and Spanish American

Catherine Connor
Ivy A. Corfis
Frederick A. de Armas
Edward Friedman
Charles Ganelin
David T. Gies
Roberto González Echevarría
David K. Herzberger
Emily Hicks
Djelal Kadir
Amy Kaminsky
Lucille Kerr
Howard Mancing
Floyd Merrell
Alberto Moreiras
Randolph D. Pope
Elżbieta Skłodowska
Marcia Stephenson
Mario Valdés

PSRL

volume 73

INTELLECTUAL PHILANTHROPY

The Seduction of the Masses

Aurélie Vialette

Purdue University Press
West Lafayette, Indiana

Copyright ©2018 by Purdue University. All rights reserved.

∞ The paper used in this book meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America
Template for interior design by Anita Noble;
template for cover by Heidi Branham.
Cover image by Miguel Ripoll.

Cataloging-in-Publication Data on file at the Library of Congress

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-55753-823-9
ePub ISBN: 978-1-61249-546-0
ePDF ISBN: 978-1-61249-545-3

Donne-moi tes mains que mon coeur s'y forme
S'y taise le monde au moins un moment
Donne-moi tes mains que mon âme y dorme
Que mon âme y dorme éternellement.
Louis Aragon. *Les mains d'Elsa*.

To Jesús R. Velasco
To Miguel V. Vialette

Contents

ix Acknowledgments

1 Introduction

Intellectual Philanthropists and their Weapons of
Mass Seduction

PART ONE

Staging Philanthropy

35 Chapter One

Musical Philanthropy: The Working-Class Spectacle

65 Chapter Two

Archiving Philanthropy

87 Chapter Three

Performing *Los filántropos*: The Theater as the Medium
for a Theorization of Philanthropy

PART TWO

Bibliophilanthropy

111 Chapter Four

The Library Is the City: The Enactment of Democratization
Processes in the Centros de Lectura

137 Chapter Five

Catechism of Industry

PART THREE

Philanthropy and the Female Working Class

169 Chapter Six

The Potential Not to Be: Domesticity, Economy, and
Reading Practices of Women Workers

211 Chapter Seven

The Art of Dying Well: Philanthropy and the Imitation
of Christ as Social Deactivation

233 Conclusion

239 Notes

251 Works Cited

273 Index

Acknowledgments

This book is the final step of an adventure that I started many years ago, at the University of California at Berkeley, where I first set foot in the US to become a PhD student. Between that inaugural moment and now, I have written countless drafts and chapters: as a DEA student at the Université Paris III, Sorbonne-Nouvelle; and as a faculty member at the University of Texas at Austin, Cornell University, The Ohio State University, and Stony Brook University. In all these institutions I have met researchers, colleagues, and students with whom I have had the honor of discussing my project, and from whom I have learned and still have the chance to learn incessantly.

If it all started in California, this project nevertheless stemmed from one singular place where many of the archives I study are held: Catalonia. There, I have received two Premi Sant Jordi to conduct my research and I have met generous scholars without whom I could not have accessed the sources I needed; in particular, Jordi Gargallo and Anna Costal i Fornells. Over the years, I have exchanged ideas with researchers in conferences and with students in my undergraduate and graduate seminars; colleagues and friends have read drafts of specific chapters, providing me with help and insights that have made this project grow. I know that I would not have had faith in my writing without their help. Among them, I would like to particularly thank Carlos Alonso, José Miguel Burgos Mazas, Lou Charnon-Deutsch, Robert Davidson, David Doménech, Françoise Etienvre, Pura Fernández, Francisco Fernández de Alba, Josefa Fernando Ruiz, Joseba Gabilondo, Enrique Gavilán, Maribel Giner, Eduardo Hernández-Cano, Yuri Herrera, Kirsty Hooper, Michael Iarocci, Seth Kimmel, Laurie-Anne Laget, Lily Litvak, Chus Lama-López, Elisa Martí-López, Nuria Martínez de Castilla, Alberto Medina, Cristina Moreiras-Menor, Ana María Ochoa, Ségolène d'Ortoli-Guichard, Carla Palacio Pastor, Gonzalo Pontón, Joaquim Rabaseda (and his students at the Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya), Julio Ramos, Joan Ramón Resina, Eunice Rodríguez-Ferguson, Juanjo Romero, Antoni Rossell, Noël Valis, and Lisa Voigt. Matthew Barrile and Bill Piper have read so many versions of this book that they probably are able to explain it better than I do. Miguel Ripoll is the genius who has designed the cover of this book; I do

Acknowledgments

not have words to thank him for this precious gift. I have found the best editors in Joyce Detzner and Susan Clawson, who have guided me so patiently through the editing of this text: thank you. In addition, two anonymous readers provided thoughtful criticism on my manuscript, for which I am most grateful. My friends are all inscribed here and in my memory; they all know who they are. Finally, the Rodríguez-Velasco family has accompanied me throughout this journey in the most enthusiastic and beautiful way one could dream of.

I have received many fellowships whose generous support has allowed me to visit archives that were in Spain: the Premi Sant Jordi from the Institut d'Estudis Catalans and the Generalitat de Catalunya; the FAHSS Individual Grant at Stony Brook University; the Bourse d'Etudes Casa de Velázquez in Madrid, Spain; the summer research grant of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and the Institute of European Studies Fellowship, both at the University of California, Berkeley; and the Aide pour mission of the École doctorale "Europe Latine, Amérique Latine," Paris-Sorbonne.

The teams of librarians and researchers at many national libraries and private archives have helped me access the primary sources I needed. I am grateful to the Arxiu Nacional de Catalunya (especially Susana, Mireia, and José Luis), the Biblioteca de Catalunya, the Federació de Cors de Clavé, the Associació Musical de Mestres directors, the Biblioteca Popular Bonnemaïson, the Arxiu Històric de la Ciutat de Barcelona, the Biblioteca Nacional de España, the Biblioteca Pública Arús, and the Centro de Lectura de Reus.

Finally, I am thankful to my colleagues in Iberian Studies at The Ohio State University, whose generous conversation was a gift during my two years at the institution. At Stony Brook University, I have been equally happy to be part of an outstanding group of colleagues, whom I thank very much for their support, especially the departmental chair, Kathleen Vernon, and my mentor, Daniela Flesler.

Chapter 2 "Archiving Philanthropy" was previously published in *Catalan Review* under the title "Poetics of the Proto-Archive: Creating the Industrial Worker's Redemption, [*Catalan Review* 24 (2010): 233–41]. Chapter 4 "The Library Is the City," Chapter 5 "Catechism of Industry," and Chapter 6 "The Potential Not to Be:

Acknowledgments

Domesticity, Economy and Reading Practices of Women Workers” draw upon ideas and analysis from articles published respectively in *Siglo Diecinueve* [“La biblioteca es la ciudad: lectura colectiva y democratización para el obrero industrial en la Cataluña del siglo diecinueve,” *Siglo Diecinueve* 20 (2014): 233–50]; *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* [“Peligros de un obrero lector: filántropos, editores y proletariado en la España del siglo XIX,” *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 46.2 (June 2012): 201–22]; and *Hispanófila* [“Literatura e industrialización: potencialidades obreras en la obra de Dolors Monserdà,” *Hispanófila* 171 (June 2014): 269–85. *Project Muse*, doi:10.1353/hsf.2015.0035.]. *Hispanófila* is available online at <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/565335>.

Permission to use Figures 1 and 2 was granted by the Generalitat de Catalunya, Department de Cultura, Arxiu Nacional de Catalunya. The Biblioteca Nacional de España provides access to thousands of digitized documents, including Figure 3. Figures 4 and 5 were located at the Arxiu Històric de la Ciutat de Barcelona.

This book is dedicated to my family. First of all, to my parents, Alain and Dany, and to my brother, Grégory, who have always given me their unconditional support and encouragement. My project would not have existed without my intellectual and life partner, Jesús R. Velasco, with whom I have discussed every line of the manuscript over the years. He probably knows it by heart. Finally, I finished this manuscript when I was pregnant with my son, Miguel V. Vialette. This book is, above all, dedicated to him.

Introduction

Intellectual Philanthropists and Their Weapons of Mass Seduction

Philanthropy and Its Continued Relevance Today

Philanthropy has become a central element of civil society in western democracies. It has permeated social, political and cultural structures, neighborhoods, and all social classes to become an essential part of everyday life. Whether one believes in its effectiveness or not, the pervasiveness of philanthropy prompts the historian to ask questions about how ethics, religion, politics, and culture are intertwined, marshaling a dynamic of power from which the recipient of the philanthropic act can hardly withdraw him or herself to become an autonomous civil subject. Based on a socio-economic system supported by donating and receiving, philanthropy is organized around a symbolic form of communication, which uses words and images, even though the communication occurs in political and economic organizations.¹ Ideally, the philanthropic exchange should include a social relationship of reciprocity, but an analysis of these exchanges reveals the barriers of power that exist between the donor and the receiver (Ostrander and Schervish 70–73). In effect, the act of giving connected to all philanthropic projects is, as Slavoj Žižek has pointed out, a “humanitarian mask” that includes the concealment of economic exploitation (22). The gift does not exist. There is always an expectation of something in return. The philanthropic projects I study in this book show that what intellectual philanthropists expected in return for their gift was of a political order.

In nineteenth-century Europe, specifically, philanthropy was central to the worldview of both bourgeois intellectuals and the government, as both sought to find a solution to the threat of emerging working-class power. The threat came from the fact that the workers were in the process of acquiring not only a political,

Introduction

but also a cultural, presence in the public sphere. This cultural entrance, as Jacques Rancière has argued in *Staging the People: The Proletarian and His Double*, constituted a menace for the social order and for the bourgeoisie because the workers could become producers of culture (181). As a consequence, writers and politicians, simultaneously repelled and fascinated by the working classes, felt the need to guide and educate the working class and persistently wrote and debated their moral responsibility to the proletariat. This is what Catalan writer and politician Ceferino Tresserra expressed in an 1862 essay, “Algunas consideraciones sobre la familia proletaria,” in which he argued,

Cuanto mas sea el amor que estas clases nos inspiren, cuanto mayor sea nuestro contacto con ellas, el conocimiento que de ellas tengamos y aun lo que á ellas debamos, mas de bulto y claramente precisa presentarles las cuestiones que á su bien se encaminen. El hombre peca muchas veces por ignorancia, y en este caso la responsabilidad condigna recae moralmente sobre la cabeza de los que, pudiendo, no han querido tomarse la pena de ilustrarle. ¡Presérveme siempre el cielo de incurrir por esto en el mas leve de los remordimientos! (*El libro del obrero* 155)²

Tresserra underscored the responsibility that intellectuals had to the working class, by using the plural collective “we,” and insisting on their moral duty to educate and enlighten the proletariat. This moral obligation was presented as an open door to social redemption. Indeed, the need to redeem the proletariat from its social and economic, as well as cultural, state was one of the main concerns that bourgeois intellectuals and the government alike had in nineteenth-century Spain. As we will see, this concern was expressed in many publications whose objective was to foster initiatives that would help build what intellectuals and government considered a harmonious society composed of ideal citizens. Philanthropy, in this panorama, was often presented as a platform with social redemptive power.

Philanthropy was not only a reaction against the emergence of the workers’ presence in the public sphere but also a reaction against their presence in religion—a secularization of charity. The philanthropist was the one who initiated and fostered “*philia*,” or political friendship, and who decided to identify and define collectivities in need of love—what Tresserra referred to as “el

amor que estas clases nos inspiren.” I argue that, at that time in Spain, philanthropy was viewed not as a mindset about humanity in general, like charity, but as an outlook on specific and targeted collectivities, and that it was an attitude deliberately taken to facilitate the exercise of power over socially, economically, and/or culturally exploited collectivities. Philanthropy suggested that a certain part of society wanted to provide love and assistance to another part of society. In their rhetoric and justification, the philanthropists expected the recipients to be indebted to their benefactors. The “love,” or better, the illusion of love that philanthropists provided, was actually a capitalist translation of the Christian concept of charity. This approach to the notion and illusion of love is crucial in the present book and will permit me to explain the subtle differences between philanthropy and charity and how Spanish intellectuals navigated these two spheres in the nineteenth century.

Philanthropy—unlike Christian charity, which is ideally a private act—survives on the exhibition and spectacle of both the act of philanthropy and its reception. Paul Schervish explains that “In philanthropic relations the medium for communication needs neither votes nor dollars but the symbolic medium of words and images. In contrast to commercial and political relations, philanthropy thus utilizes ‘affective’ rather than ‘effective’ demand” (601). Nevertheless, these philanthropic relations are not to be separated from the economic and the political because philanthropy is not just the giving of money or time but “a reciprocal social relation in which the needs of recipients—and the recipients themselves—present a moral claim to which donors may choose to respond” (601). In the nineteenth century, the philanthropists’ discourse on love and the desire to morally reform the proletariat were justified as a search for new forms of community bonds for the masses in the public realm. Love became, then, the basis for establishing a coexistence between members of different communities. For all these reasons, studying social practices through this lens will help draw a complex picture of the functioning of the relationship between philanthropists and the working class. The opposition that Schervish mentions between affectivity and effectivity was in fact central to the good functioning of philanthropic structures in Spain, inasmuch as their mere existence was based on the development and application of

Introduction

a theory of the affect as a means to transform social relationships. The affect, as we will see, was the method that allowed philanthropists a better entrance to working-class communities and their subsequent manipulation.

Although there is an important body of literature about philanthropy in the social sciences and other disciplines, such as economics, social psychology, neurology, anthropology, and others, these studies usually focus on contemporary societies, as René Bekkers and Pamala Wiepking have demonstrated (2). The nineteenth century, nevertheless, offers to the field a new and complementary archive on how the philanthropic platform was used to approach one sector of society considered in need of help: the proletariat. I demonstrate that philanthropy in Spain at that time was used as a device to seduce the workers into entering structures of sociality to block the possible emergence of social conflicts and upward mobility. The archive of cultural practices I analyze in this book (music, collective readings, theatrical staging, women workers' education, the publication and distribution of working-class manuals, archival practices), for the most part unedited, shed light on how philanthropy served as a tool to organize communities to be used according to the philanthropists' views of how the industrial cities should be structured socially, economically, and culturally.

I concretely pay attention to the following philanthropic activities: the choruses of workers created by Josep Anselm Clavé (the *Cors de Clavé*), the staging of philanthropy in theatrical representations, the publication of working-class manuals, the creation of *Centros de Lectura* and the practices of collective readings for the workers, women's philanthropy and its particular attention to women workers' education, and the publication of fiction by philanthropists to propose models of conduct for workers. These philanthropic initiatives created structures for social interactions in the public sphere and the publishing industry with the aim of organizing the working class's leisure time and directing the workers' actions into socio-cultural practices that could serve the interests of the industry. In that sense, philanthropy pervaded not only political and social discourses, but also musical and theatrical representations, fiction, and educational practices, as well as everyday activities. I contend that philanthropy has as a principal objective the production of disciples and the

creation of emotional, cultural, and moral bonds between leaders and receivers. As Ignacio Casado Galván asserts, “Philanthropy was the concept that allowed this interference in the individuals’ lives ... without tearing down the entire liberal structure, because it designed a preliminary space of intervention: ‘strategically localized in the circuit from the individual to the State and from the State to the individual’” (5).

The present book advances the concept of intellectual philanthropy as a new category in the study of nineteenth-century industrial society.³ Intellectual philanthropy means that social writers, reformers, sociologists, artists, architects, men and women of letters, and writers in general used the philanthropic platform to address specific social, political, economic, urban, and cultural issues regarding the working class and to communicate directly with the workers. The reason why we must talk about intellectual philanthropy is that even if philanthropy had an impact on the economic situation of the workers, it was not necessarily linked to money alone, but sprang from cultural practices and was initiated by men and women whose areas of action were the arts, literature, architecture, and culture in a broad sense.⁴ The motivations behind intellectual philanthropy could be moral or political; they could be a desire to enhance social status or to acquire a specific influence. As Gordon Stewart Marino explains, “Many philanthropists fervently believed in personal ... obligations that required altering not only the physical conditions of the poor, but also their morality” (44). Intellectual philanthropy is thus closely linked to an imperative to modify moral, economic, cultural, and communal behavior, and it is closely linked to the creation of these diverse forms of capital.

The term *intellectual* is used here to refer to bourgeois or petit bourgeois social reformers who made use of public media (the stage, public libraries, the publishing industry, etc.) to impact the public sphere with their reformist projects. In that sense, the intellectual is one whose actions are engaged with social issues, and who seeks to impact the society in which he or she lives through his or her public performances. It is important to note that the ruling classes, as well as the bourgeois intellectual reformers, were very diverse socially and divided politically in Spain and in Europe in general. However, and in agreement with Edward Palmer “E.P.” Thompson (11), I show that the bourgeois in Spain agreed on a

Introduction

certain cohesion, and resolved their antagonism when faced with the insurgent working class and with the exceptionality of the historical moment of the nineteenth-century workers' revolutions. In addition, I follow Raymond Williams's definition of the term *bourgeois*, that is "a social relationship which we usually call individualism; that is to say, an idea of society as neutral area within which each individual is free to pursue his own development and his own advantage as a natural right" (325). This definition, we will see, matches exactly the kind of actions undertaken by nineteenth-century Spanish intellectual philanthropists. In addition, the bourgeoisie was characterized by a desire for security at home, in their social status, in economics, and in morality. The home was, for them, tantamount to security, whereas the street was instability (Jover 51–53). Finally, it is worth noting that intellectual philanthropists, although preoccupied with constructing collectivizing structures for workers, followed the principles of bourgeois culture based on basic individual ideas and were fundamentally opposed to working-class culture's primarily social and collective habits of thought (Williams 327).

The channels through which the intellectuals expressed themselves can be considered instruments for their activism. I argue that intellectual philanthropy was a reaction to the existing and growing working class's social and political organization and culture. The processes through which philanthropy was deployed aimed at organizing the working class in a more rational way through cultural and educational structures in which the workers could receive a sort of cultural capital constructed and organized by the philanthropists themselves. This cultural and educational rationalizing of the workers would correspond to the rational productivity of capitalism. In order to create this capital, philanthropists used the technique of seduction in presenting themselves as loving a targeted social class. I advance that the rationalization of the working class implied a control of the masses by means of what I call a "discourse of seduction."

The verb "to seduce" comes from Latin *se-ducere*, which means "to draw someone towards one separate specific way." Seducing the masses implies the existence of a leader with the ability to persuade the masses to follow a concrete social objective. In addition, this leadership was highly sexualized and linked to rhetorics of masculinity and femininity. The subtitle of this book suggests the specific

type of relationship between the industrial masses of workers and the emerging group of intellectual philanthropists. In fact, the subtitle “The Seduction of the Masses” also participates in a conversation with a long list of crowd theorists, both modern and contemporary, both Iberian and international, who have explored the relationship between masses and society, especially through the lenses of criminology, psychology, sociology, and collective behaviors. The titles of their books often evoke this challenging dynamic, for example, Gustave Le Bon (1841–1931, *La psychologie des foules*), Charles Mackays (1812–89, *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds*), Gabriel Tarde (1843–1904, *L'opinion et la foule*), Pasquale Rossi (1866–1905, *Animo della folla*), Scipio Sighele (1868–1913, *La folla delinquente. Studio di psicologia collettiva*), José Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955, *The Revolt of the Masses*), Robert E. Park (1864–1944, *The Crowd and the Public*), Sigfried Kracauer (1889–1966, *The Mass Ornament*), Elias Canetti (1905–94, *Crowds and Power*).

My aim in this book is to emphasize the complexity and the heterogeneity of the industrial working class so as to point out the difficulties implicit in theorizing and generalizing its social habits and forms of coexistence. In that sense, I seek to show the strategies through which the intellectual philanthropists dismissed this complexity for ideological purposes. I use the term *masses* to dramatize the way social reformers and society at large talked about groups of workers. Williams has recalled that in the nineteenth century, *masses* was a new word used to refer to mob: “the traditional characteristics of the mob were retained in its significance: gullibility, fickleness, herd-prejudice, lowness of taste and habit. The masses, on this evidence, formed the perpetual threat to culture” (298). *Masses* referred to the massive concentration of workers in the cities, to the mass of workers in the factories, to the massive production of objects in capitalist industry, and to the massive political and social organization of the working class (Williams 297–98). *Masses*, I will explain, were seen as undefined and especially estranged from the rest of society to those who wrote about them, “The masses are always the others, whom we don’t know, and can’t know ... There are in fact no masses; there are only ways of seeing people as masses,” says Williams (299–300).

The concept of masses was thus intimately related to the growing number of workers. However, it is impossible to

Introduction

understand the working class as a fixed category since it has never been homogeneous. It is, therefore, necessary to consider its heterogeneity when using the term itself. The working class, following Thompson's analysis, is a making, meaning that it is an active process. In addition, the formation of a class is a historical phenomenon: "Class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs. The class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born—or enter involuntarily" (9). In Spain, it was after the First Republic of 1873 that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as classes started to become more visible because social inequalities were more perceptible (Jover 68). Nevertheless, according to Thompson, class is not something concrete that can be reduced to a static process, but rather has to be thought of as dynamic, the result of a social and cultural formation. For him, class is defined by people as they live their own history (10–11) and the making of the working class, especially, was not spontaneously done by the factory-system or the industrial revolution itself (194). Finally, it is important to recall that class feeling is not something invariable and homogenized, and, as Williams has noted, a working-class idea is not equivalent to affirming that all workers possess or approve of it (326). In the nineteenth century, the Spanish working class was comprised of not only industrial workers, but also artisans and manual workers. A great number were working in factories, others in workshops, some at home, especially women who would sew in their homes. In addition, the term "working class" was often associated with "obrerismo," which, in the second half of the century, consisted of diverse ideological movements: socialism, the cooperative movement, reformism, international and collectivist syndicalism, or Bakuninist anarchism (Gabriel, "Militància" 8). Likewise, it is difficult to generalize when talking about the cultural processes that took place among the workers. These cultural processes were also in the making and corresponded to moments of exceptionalism that helped in the formation of class-consciousness.

The heterogeneity of the working class, socially, politically, economically, and culturally, was one of the obstacles that intellectual philanthropists encountered in the nineteenth century, as

they wanted to impose projects of reform to insert workers into the capitalist system in a way most suited to the philanthropists' purposes, but were confronted with the heretofore unknown difficulty of the newness of the working class itself and the impossibility of clearly identifying its contours. According to Thompson, the habits of thought and action of the working class (and the persons themselves) were new, and it was this newness that triggered conflict (190). One of the resulting operations to overcome this difficulty can be seen in the language that philanthropists used to refer to the working class.

The linguistic strategies used by intellectual philanthropists in their communication with the working class had significant implications and consequences for the relationship between the two groups. One of these strategies was to consider the working class as a whole, without any complexity. Of course, this could not be farther from the social and political reality of industrialized Spain, or anywhere else in Europe or the world. On the whole, they addressed "the worker"; they talked about "the worker's family," that is, his children and wife, since except when they stipulated it, or in specific female working-class projects, the worker was almost always constructed as male; and they referred to "the worker's life," that is, his economic, cultural, and political life. By doing so, they explicitly refused to recognize the complexities and diversities that all these categories encompassed. They also refused to give legitimacy to the demands that both male and female workers were expressing through different forms of communication—strikes, associations, newspapers, etc. A key objective of this book is to investigate these rhetorical strategies in operation. I am interested, as Williams has done for nineteenth-century England, in investigating how these intellectuals tried to express, interpret, and give meaning to their existence, and to the difficult social conflicts they were experiencing. This is why I pay particular attention not just to the cultural practices themselves, but also to the language used to put them into practice and to justify them socially, culturally and politically among their fellow citizens.

For example, the use of "the worker," in singular or sometimes in a plural collective, and the use of epithet adjectives ("the poor worker," "the defenseless working class") are linguistic supports that intensify the oversimplification of industrial working people

Introduction

that philanthropists put forth in their forms of communication with the general public and, more specifically, the working class. In fact, these linguistic strategies are so powerful that even nowadays, while studying these forms of communication, the critic can fall into their trap. They are intended to prevent us from asking who the workers are, and from keeping in mind that the classes are always in the making. And to a certain degree, those strategies have succeeded. They have erased the diverse voices that form the groups of workers with the intention to create one uniform representation of the working class.

Communicating with the Workers

A key issue facing sociologists, economists, politicians, and theorists was the question of how to communicate with the masses of workers in the moral, the political, the industrial, and the cultural realms in order to foster projects of reform. The growing presence of the working masses in the public sphere is an element that is key to understanding the social, political and cultural reality of the nineteenth century. This situation gave birth to new forms of social and political organizations, to new cultural practices, and to revolutionary processes. As a result of this presence, the workers themselves sought to gain stronger participation in public life and searched for ways to educate themselves. Their quest became a preoccupation and was at the center of many intellectual and political debates. One of the main debates about the working-class problem in modern society was referred to as the “Social Question”; and according to Ira W. Howerth, “the social question is always a question of removing some obstacle to progress” (256).

The European political context was formed by the increase of demands from the working class and by the preoccupation of the governing elite. The likelihood of a rebellion in the public sphere terrorized the bourgeoisie in Europe, a sentiment that intensified after the Paris Commune of 1871, which was heavily discussed and referred to in Spain. After the repression of the Commune of 1871 in Paris, many communards decided to go into exile in Spain, which aroused the interest of the Federalist Intransigent Republicans, as well as many other leftist groups in the country. The influence of the ideals of the Commune and

the presence of the communards in the Spanish territory were perceived as constant threats to the Spanish government, which motivated the anti-socialist repression of 1871, especially against the Internationalists.

The activities and participation of the industrial working class in the public sphere became an obsession of the bourgeoisie throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries until the Spanish Civil War (1936–39). The elites' fear of spreading socialist ideas and revolutionary attitudes intensified as unions began to form. In 1840, the workers in Catalonia created associations to confront adversities and organize themselves. The first such organization, *Associació de Teixidors* of Barcelona, established solidarity funds to help its members in case of strike, illness, or other hardships. It was such a great success that within two years their ranks surged to 57,000 members.⁵ Through their association, the workers sought to pressure their employers and demanded an augmentation of their wages and a shortening of the work day. They went on many strikes throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century in many different parts of the peninsula: in March 1853 and July 1855 in Catalonia; in October 1873, the *Tres Clases de Vapor* union in Barcelona encouraged nine strikes (Piqueras 111); in 1871, a one-month general strike took place in Valencia to ask for a reduction of the work day (Piqueras 122); in 1883 and 1884, a series of strikes occurred in the mines in Asturias (Uría, "Traditional Popular Culture" 159); in December 1901, the strike of the *espadrille* workers in Castellón lasted ten days (Sanz Rozalén 134). The historical moment in which this last particular strike took place:

is the ideal setting in which to observe the increase in working-class protests, the decline of craft trades, the effects of proletarianisation among manufacturing workers, the survival of working practices which conditioned the production processes, the predominance of republicanism in popular urban strata and the roots of class association. (Sanz Rozalén 134–35)

The workers struggled to free themselves from the oppression of the industrialists. Resistance, confrontation (with their employers), and organization (among themselves) are three key words in understanding the significance of the workers' actions at that

Introduction

time. Organizing strikes also meant participation in negotiation processes and the development of skills of communication and persuasion to find reasonable solutions to the conflicts between the demands of the workers and the methods that the employers were using to maximize profit through their employees. The working class became organized, visible, and powerful, and social demands increased. According to José A. Piqueras:

From a situation in which the majority of the population were excluded from political life, which contravened the principle of the universality of rights, there was a transition towards a consciousness of exploitation held by large sections of society and defined in terms of class. Exploitation was seen as the direct consequence of an economic order based on the appropriation of labour by the owners of capital who used the state and the laws of the land to perpetuate their dominance. (126)

The workers' demands took place in a historical context that is also worth mentioning, especially the six-year revolutionary period of 1868–74, during which claims were made for political rights and liberties recognized after the 1868 Gloriosa revolution, however unequally applied across social strata. This set a precedent for the socio-political conflicts of the second half of the century. For example, the First International appeared in Spain after the Gloriosa and, according to Piqueras, included the participation of pre-industrial artisans and tradesmen (109). This historical moment was fundamental in the construction of working-class social coordination:

For most European workers, the decades between 1860 and 1880 represented a period of transition in terms of how they were organized and how their social and political aspirations were expressed. The founding of socialist parties and workers' unions, coupled with the proliferation of labour and co-operative associations, friendly societies, educational and leisure organisations, etc., meant that in general terms, the working class of the 1880s was organised in a way which ... lasted until the second half of the twentieth century. (106)

The organization of the workers, in turn, converted the labor force into a great concern for the governing elite, and their many demands increased conflicts between the industrialists, state apparatuses, and the working class. Craftworkers, for instance,

wanted to gain independent control over the processes of production and commercial transactions of the products they fabricated. The anarchists of the First International, in particular, defended the idea of the workers' having absolute control over their production. The need arose to join forces and associate through federations to face the state of submission that the workers were enduring.

The battle for control of industry and the means of production became a priority. The cooperative movement played an important role in the organization of the working class to claim its rights from the industrialists. This movement appeared in Spain between 1850 and 1860 and allowed workers to enter structures of cooperative workshops to fight competition and resist capital (Piqueras 123). In addition, the mutualist societies to protect workers in Spain were created in mid-century as a consequence of the process of modernization of industry, of the exigencies of the employers, and of the socio-economic malaise suffered by the workers in the cities (Olaya Morales 166). The government reacted early in the century to the very first formation of groups of resistance and workers' societies and to the first social convulsions, which according to Francisco Olaya Morales started in 1821 (101).⁶ Through a Royal Decree on February 28, 1839, the government prohibited workers from negotiating through social organization, and although it allowed mutualist associations, it repressed the liberty of expression and in particular increased its control of the press. Associations were only allowed when the Progressive party was in power between 1840 and 1843 and between 1854 and 1856, and after the Gloriosa in 1868. One year after the revolution, in 1869, there were 195 labor unions (with 25,000 members) in Spain. Barcelona was the city with the most active unions: 28, with 7,000 members (Termes, *Federalismo* 25–26).

In fact, the triumph of the 1868 revolution occurred at the moment when the workers' associations were at their zenith. For them and for the working-class movement, this revolution was the most important of the century because it meant occupation and control of the streets and the right to protest and rebel against authority, concepts completely opposed to the vision of order sought by the bourgeoisie. It is after this revolution that, according to José María Jover, a proletarian conscience started to appear (64). However, after the First Republic, the street

Introduction

became the site of an importantly large number of strikes and demonstrations of massive groups of anonymous workers, but no longer the site of revolution and of its leaders.

The Spanish labor movement was sympathetic to republicanism politically. The Federalist Republican movement aimed at politicizing the workers, which was in opposition to international syndicalism that, close to Bakunin and particularly strong in Catalonia, was in favor of fostering apolitical Anarchism. An entirely new vocabulary referring to these new social demands and battles was adopted directly from French 1789 revolutionary ideas. The federalists who sought to proclaim the Catalan State during the First Republic of 1873 used specific terminology such as “convention,” “capitalist,” and “bourgeoisie” for those who exploited the “proletariat.” The workers started to use ready-made phrases such as “exploitation of man by man” (Termes, *Federalismo* 58). The industrial workers’ resistance and protest often resulted in an increase of control from the capitalists, resulting in a system of “tutelage.” For example, in 1860 in the textile factories in Valencia, the industrialists saw “the need to mould the working classes to adapt workers to the rhythm of work set by the manufacturing system, by large workshops and by new means of dividing work” (Martínez Gallego 92–94, 98).

Culture was not left out of this scenery of social tensions. Theater was one of the media through which criticism of recent political events was performed. Popular culture was a means to oppose the capitalist social structure (Uría, “Popular Culture” 169). For this reason, the authorities and the local bourgeoisie viewed many cultural events with particular hostility because they were perceived as resistance to the essence of capitalism. As a result, according to Jorge Uría, “by means of repressive measures, the history of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century was marked by numerous examples of the strong disapproval of these types of entertainment and by attempts to prevent them or at least replace them with less harmful pastimes” (“Popular Culture” 169). Many cultural groups were formed in the second half of the nineteenth century in which workers could meet to discuss politics and social issues. In addition, the workers’ movements believed in culture as a factor of liberation. Free and secular education was at the basis of the discourse of emancipation of the workers and was part of the socio-political project and

strategy of the different workers' groups (Abelló Güell 14, 52). Revolution was actively being prepared, in the social, economic, political and cultural realms through the different kinds of protests that were taking place in the public sphere, with the help of the many structures in which the workers could start to get organized and, above all, be united in a common fight to liberate themselves from the oppression of the capitalist system and its intervention in every aspect of the workers' lives: "ahora—años del 80 al 98—, las estridencias de la nueva clase alcanzan un volumen extraordinario en la huelga, en el tumulto callejero, en la prensa obrera, que hieren el mundo cultural de los grupos burgueses" (Jover 73).

In this political and cultural panorama, the philanthropist platform offered intellectuals and reformers a way to intervene in working-class neighborhoods by offering structures of education, culture and sociality to the workers. Through them, intellectual philanthropists could gain social power by targeting specific groups of workers. I show that philanthropy was presented as a form of providing assistance to workers, which would help maintain social order and avoid a revolution of the masses. By the same token, it was presented as a useful structure to communicate peacefully with the workers.

The ruling classes wanted to rationalize the presence of the working class in the new urban centers of industrial society and to establish a discourse of social conduct that would correspond to the concept of bourgeois citizenship. Publications about the nature of the urban masses, resulting from massive industrialization, proliferated in Europe as the new subject of industry called "the modern man" became an object of study for sociologists. How to govern the mass of these new subjects? What if the masses wanted to govern themselves? The most important book about the masses published during this time is Gustave Le Bon's *La psychologie des foules*—translated and often reedited in Spanish in the late nineteenth century. In fact, the book was even serialized in the newspaper *La España Moderna* (1889–). Le Bon opens his famous book with the following sentence: "L'âge où nous entrons sera véritablement l'ÈRE DES FOULES ... la voix des foules ... est devenue prépondérante" (3). In this essay published in 1895, Le Bon attempts to convince his readers of the masses' inability to govern by claiming their mental, moral, and ethical inferiority: "Les civilisations n'ont été créées et guidées jusqu'ici que par une

Introduction

petite aristocratie intellectuelle, jamais par les foules. Les foules n'ont de puissance que pour détruire" (6). The French sociologist focuses his analysis on the chaotic and wild behavior of the masses, on their volubility and tendency to succumb to sentiments. A crowd, for him, has an ephemeral character; it binds and unbinds quickly because of the restless motion that defines it.

Lack of reasoning is yet another defining element of the urban masses. Le Bon insists they are moved by "contagions," which are ideas or sentiments, even unfounded ones, spreading rapidly among their members, and proves the dangerousness of the masses, not so much from criminal and social deviation, as Gabriel Tarde would argue in *L'opinion et la foule*, but from an intellectual standpoint. This makes urban masses particularly difficult to govern. An individual joining a crowd leaves behind his intellectual capacities and becomes incapable of controlling his thinking, according to Le Bon. However, urban masses tend to be conformist and conservative and have a strong capacity to respect the oppressive force of a tyrant. This idea, in fact, is further explained by Martin Breaugh in *L'expérience plébéienne* in which he refers to La Boétie's *Le discours de la servitude volontaire* to explain that the desire for liberty can change suddenly into a desire for servitude. Breaugh affirms that servitude is due to neither habit nor fear of death; it is "un enchantement, un ensorcellement qui dénature l'homme en l'éloignant de la liberté" (14).

If, according to crowd theorists, the masses are predisposed to being convinced easily and are unable to think rationally, so rhetoric, affect, and emotion are at the center of their functioning. This is a point that the governing elite wanted to take advantage of, as did philanthropists. As a result, manipulation of rhetoric, affect, and emotion became a core technique the philanthropists used to lead the masses and suppress the threat they represented. Understanding that philanthropists believed in the masses' impressionability is fundamental to the argument this book makes about orators who aim at exploiting a crowd's seducible nature; as Le Bon points out: "Exagérée dans ses sentiments, la foule n'est impressionnée que par des sentiments excessifs. L'orateur qui veut la séduire doit abuser des affirmations violentes. Exagérer, affirmer, répéter, et ne jamais tenter de rien démontrer par un raisonnement, sont des procédés d'argumentation bien connus des orateurs des réunions populaires" (39). The orator considered in the present

study is the philanthropist who, through cultural structures, aimed at convincing the workers to adopt conduct suited to the industrial order and to act according to moral precepts that were opposed to those allegedly held by revolutionary groups.

Intellectual philanthropy is a product of the nineteenth century and has to be considered a key part of the changing social relationships of that period. The social, political, economic, and cultural transformations of the nineteenth century reoriented urban practices and forms of thought, and changed the meaning of important concepts that, according to Williams, are key to understanding the formation of modern societies: industry, democracy, class, art, and culture (xiii). The industrial revolution produced a new society that needed a new vocabulary to describe and interpret socio-political relationships more fully: lower class, middle class, upper class, working class, class consciousness, class conflict, class war (xv). Of course, class divisions were not new, but the social structure was, and it was necessary to interpret this new structure by giving new meanings to categories such as class because of the drastic changes in the political, economic, and social panorama. Spain industrialized later than most of the rest of Europe but its resulting social conflicts were no different and were certainly salient throughout the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.

The Problematic Notions of Working-Class Emancipation and Agency: Where Is the Worker's Voice?

Nineteenth-century Spanish philanthropists participated in one of their time's most important socio-cultural debates: how to avoid the contentious relationship between the working class and the rest of society? They tried to resolve this issue by creating platforms for communication with the workers. This communication attempted to both improve the workers' living conditions and orient their behavior. This twofold communication effort of intellectual philanthropists is noteworthy in that it created structures that would, they believed, improve the moral, economic, and social conditions of the working class and, at the same time, help manage the threat this class represented for society.

Intellectual philanthropy was, within this panorama, a response to the workers' organizing themselves, which was often perceived

Introduction

as a form of urban violence. The rise of industry, and its attendant working-class multitudes, was deemed a social nuisance by an increasingly powerful bourgeoisie, who perceived urban multitudes as physically and psychologically, counterintuitively, undefined and diverse at once. They also conceived of the working class as abnormal and, most importantly, physically omnipresent and disorganized in the cities. This ubiquity of the working class constituted a possible urban threat to those in power, since these workers were present in public spaces traditionally reserved for the elite and their apparatuses of culture; moreover, their presence, to use Elias Canetti's terminology, was often described as a contamination. Mechanization, contamination, and destruction were three of the attributes with which mid-nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sociologists defined the masses and the manifestation of modern man (including Le Bon, Tarde, Canetti, Taine, Park, Kracauer and, in Spain, Ortega y Gasset).

The need to understand the actions of the workers was closely related to the desire to control and reduce the agency that they might acquire in the public sphere. *Intellectual Philanthropy: The Seduction of the Masses* explores intellectual philanthropy as a means of constructing the workers' agency, or the lack thereof, in socio-cultural and educational structures. As I explain, the workers both gained and lost agency simultaneously as these communication platforms were built. The creation of agency is an important aspect of the working-class struggle and it makes all the more relevant the study of how the workers' agency was closely managed through philanthropic structures. But talking about the nineteenth-century workers' agency is problematic because the living conditions of the workers have an impact on the type of agency that they develop. Nicole Stephens, Stephanie Fryberg, and Hazel Markus highlight the predominance of "conjoint" models of agency for the working class: "the material and social conditions of working-class contexts (e.g., low social status, less economic capital, limited choice and control) foster a greater focus on others than on the individual self" (36). What Stephens, Fryberg and Markus point out is that in conjoint agency, concern for others is the norm and takes precedence over individual choice, so it is, in that sense, opposed to disjoint agency in which the focus is on the individual self. One of the experiments that these sociologists made to explain how conjoint agency works is the following:

This study allowed participants to *either* enact conjoint agency by accepting a gift from someone else or to enact disjunct agency by choosing for oneself. We found that working-class, compared to middle-class, participants more frequently accepted the gift when asked to choose. Follow up analyses indicate that this effect occurred, in part, because they had fewer choices at work ... This is the first study to demonstrate how social class differences in life experience can affect choice behavior. (36)

The experiment shows that workers were more prone to accept the first gift presented to them since it had an immediate effect on their life (the possession of the gift). Gift is what is at the center of the philanthropic exchange. However, the acceptance of the gift implied the acceptance of the hierarchical structure inherent in the philanthropic platform in which it occurred. As a consequence, the agency of the receiver was conditioned by the relationship established in this hierarchy. I maintain that belief in workers' conjoint agency is at the core of the philanthropic experience and, in particular, can allow us to understand why the workers entered into the dynamic of philanthropy and accepted the gifts or the benefits that it gave them over other types of emancipatory projects they had access to.

Personal agency is more malleable than immutable and in the individual chapters of this book, I discuss the intent of philanthropists to transform workers' agency through their communication with them. In fact, this process of transformation was quite complex. Through its cultural and educational structures, philanthropy would claim to give workers agency by conferring on them a cultural capital and a habitus, as used by Pierre Bourdieu. One of the ideas was that this capital would serve the purpose of emancipating the workers—an expression that one encounters rather often in social writings about the working class.

However, as I demonstrate throughout the book, this capital was not purely emancipatory—a notion that I put into question—but also a way to restrict the workers' agency in their acquisition of education and culture. Emancipation was one keyword in the philanthropic discourse, as philanthropists saw their initiatives as a way to help the workers free themselves from their underdeveloped socio-cultural state. But the means used

Introduction

to achieve this emancipation are debatable. The social relation created in the philanthropic structure was hierarchical and, I argue, was captured through a logic of domination, which recalls what Bourdieu theorizes in *La domination masculine*, “exercée au nom d’un principe symbolique connu et reconnu par le dominant comme par le dominé, une langue (ou une prononciation), un style de vie (ou une manière de penser, de parler ou d’agir) et, plus généralement, une propriété distinctive” (12). In fact, the domination operates thanks to a symbolic dimension in which, Bourdieu underscores, a person is dominated because he or she does not really know that he or she is being dominated. The intellectual philanthropic experience offered paths of emancipation yet, once having entered a logic of domination, the only possibility for the receivers to emancipate themselves was through submitting to a relationship of power with an intellectual philanthropist. One of the main problems that the dominated-receiver encounters in the process of emancipation is the acquisition of a legitimate language, which allows the existence of an autonomous political voice. This autonomous political voice can fully develop itself if it is speaking with authority, even if it is not authorized to speak—a difference that Judith Butler pointed out: “It is clearly possible to speak with authority without being authorized to speak” (*Excitable Speech* 157). In the philanthropic structures analyzed in this book, we will discern that the workers were not authorized to speak nor were they speaking with authority.

The relationship between emancipation, domination, and the existence of an autonomous voice is complex. Jacques Rancière, for instance, suggests that one enters into submission not because of not being aware of the existence of a relationship of domination (which differs from Bourdieu’s opinion on the question) but because one doubts his or her capacity to fully develop the agency to impact and change society. According to Rancière, the main resulting problem of this relationship is the dependence that the subject who seeks emancipation has on the emancipator, which only creates inequality (*Le maître* 26). This dependence arises from the roles attributed to each of the participants: the emancipator is always considered the one with true knowledge and, consequently, the only one able to guide the others and speak autonomously. This is why Martin Breugh asserts that

the frontier between emancipation and servitude is easy to break (14). One of Rancière's most revealing studies on emancipation is *Le maître ignorant*. Through the example of Joseph Jacotot, the author proves that real emancipation comes from the knowledge that the subjects themselves are able to create from their ignorance. This allows them to access intellectual emancipation, the seed of the access to real emancipation.

Emancipation, agency, and voice were intrinsically linked in any cultural philanthropic project geared at the working class in nineteenth-century Spain. In Chapters 1 and 4, I stress the importance of considering that the workers' voices are absent from the many archives of the philanthropic institutions I have researched, for example, the global archive of the choral associations or the archives of the Centros de Lectura. These two structures were open to and directed at the workers. The workers fully participated in both organizations, yet there is no trace of any particular action that a particular worker or a group of workers might have taken. Their names have disappeared and they remain as one single group that the documents refer to. This is particularly striking when considering that they were diverse associations in which the workers were involved and that, according to Rancière in *Staging the People*, what we find in the nineteenth century is the existence of not a "single 'voice of the people'" but "broken, polemical voices" (12). The non-inclusion of the plurality of voices of the working-class environment is one socio-political strategy that philanthropists put forth so as to better organize the proletariat, a point that I develop meticulously throughout the book.

There is a fascinating contrast between the discourse on creating philanthropic and emancipatory structures and their concrete realization. These emancipatory structures are, in fact, physical locations that consolidate existing power relations. But even more fascinating is the fact that contemporary studies on working-class culture and the relationship between intellectuals and workers have ignored the inherent ambiguity of these projects. In fact, scholarship in the field tends to focus on the emancipatory aspect of these projects while neglecting the complexity of the socio-cultural dynamics that evolve when one social class tries to redeem another through the creation of cultural structures. For that reason, in part, the concept of redemption is one that

Introduction

readers frequently encounter in printed publications (including newspapers), manuscript archives, and literary texts. The concept of redemption must be addressed because it has a fundamental impact on the development of the history of the Spanish working class, as well as on the definition and re-definition of the very concept of emancipation of workers throughout history. Philanthropists often considered that they were invested with the mission of redeeming the workers from their state of prostration. Such is the case of Clavé, who called himself a redeemer and was called by his biographers the messiah of the Catalan working class. This rhetoric of redemption was later rearticulated by biographers and historians alike and became the official discourse about the history of the Catalan working-class choral music in Spain. Cultural emancipation of the workers and redemption worked side by side in the nineteenth-century philanthropist's mind because the workers' emancipation could not take place without someone who would guide them on the correct path. In this sense, they considered the workers unable to control their own emancipation. The philanthropists' actions were seen as magical, almost prophetic, because of the extreme social, economic, and political crisis in which industrial cities were subsumed. The fear of an imminent revolution called for the appearance of someone who would be able to save the country from the dictatorship of the proletariat, someone who, in Walter Benjamin's terms, would bring back the image of happiness by presenting the image of redemption (*Illuminations* 254). Intellectual philanthropists designated themselves as the persons who could do it.

Philanthropy: The Production of Space and of Micro-societies

The urban dimension of philanthropy is crucial to understanding the momentum that intellectual philanthropists gathered among the masses of workers. Indeed, the presence of philanthropy was a response to the social conflict that manifested itself in the cities because of the massive presence of the working class, and became an alternative structure of help in opposition to the structures of solidarity created by the workers themselves. My study of how intellectual philanthropists addressed specific social urban problems helps us understand how the social (that is, everyday

interactions in the economic, cultural, religious, urban, and educational spheres) is constituted and how to interpret the relationships of power between the working class and the rest of society in industrial cities. Since class social movements occurred in the cities, the urban is constitutive to the philanthropic projects I investigate in this book.

Analyzing the conquest and construction of space in nineteenth-century industrial Spain provides a crucial insight into the social tensions and formation of cultural politics and groups. Intellectuals used philanthropy as a strategy to create micro-societies in controlled urban spaces in regions including Catalonia, Madrid, and Asturias. I employ the term *micro-society* to refer to the establishment of spaces and institutions that functioned in a semi-autonomous way within society. The Cors de Clavé is one of the micro-societies analyzed in this book; it was a federative structure organized around a set of rules (statutes) that offered workers the opportunity to perform on stage and participate in cultural activities, reading classes, collective readings, a social security system that protected the workers in case of illness (an access to a collective *caja de ahorros*), and other types of protections that being part of such a community could include. In addition, the group published several newspapers and reviews in which descriptions of both the activity and the ideology of the group's leader were distributed in the public sphere. The Centros de Lectura, analyzed in Chapter 4, were also conceived as micro-societies. Indeed, I demonstrate that the aim of the philanthropists was to create a space in which *civitas* could enact processes of democratization of culture through cultural and educational activities such as literacy classes or collective readings. The Cors de Clavé and the Centros de Lectura considered themselves "sociedades," not only because it was a common designation at that time, but also because their organization and mission exactly matched the definition of a *societas*.⁷ Some questions on this topic that drive my analysis are: how did these spaces function in the city? How visible was philanthropy in these urban spaces? What was the role assigned to intellectual philanthropists in this process? What were the social, cultural, and economic consequences for the working class as a whole?

In order to understand the relevance of these social practices, we must bear in mind that they occurred in spaces that were completely new products of industrialization. For example, the

Introduction

Centros de Lectura were nonexistent before the appearance of the industrial working class. The same is true of the workers' choral groups, the women's libraries, and working-class educational manuals. As a consequence, the production of these cultural spaces is another fundamental aspect to consider. Henri Lefebvre's concepts of *production of space* and *critique of everyday life* will be central to my argument. In *La production de l'espace*, Lefebvre explains that space is political and strategic, and that its production can be compared to that of any other product. He delineates two separate spaces in society: the "ideal" space, linked to mental categories, and the "real" space, linked to social practice. Although these two spaces are separate and distinct, they cannot exist without each other, and according to him, any social change must be accompanied by the production of an appropriate corresponding space (72). *Space* in my book refers not only to physical spaces such as libraries, stages, theaters, and streets, but also to the spaces created by the print industry, such as newspapers, pedagogical manuals, propaganda pamphlets, printed ephemera, and the movement created by their circulation. Printed materials travel and are shared among people, especially through collective readings, creating a limited space that lingers among the readers in the form of ideas provoked by the text. Such collective acts generate a social space specific to an era and contribute to the making of history. But, it must be emphasized, generating a social space is a process. In what follows, I investigate how nineteenth-century philanthropic projects addressed to the Spanish working class attempted to bring the two spaces Lefebvre mentions—*ideal* and *real*—more closely together. The goal was to create a harmonious society, one that would correspond both to hierarchical bourgeois society and to the elites' ideal organization of a citizen's everyday life.

If the working-class struggle can be read in space, then the struggle for the control of space becomes political and acquires social relevance. In nineteenth-century Europe, a fear of the working classes' restructuring and possession of urban space was at the core of bourgeois and capitalist initiatives for controlling space. The Paris Commune, which I already mentioned had a great impact in Spain, was in fact the proletariat's response to Georges-Eugène Haussmann's politics on urban control and triggered a violent response from the governing elite who used space

as an instrument to disperse the organized working class and assign the workers to controlled and neutral spaces (Lefebvre, *La production* xiii).⁸ In Barcelona, for example, the urban structure created a division between the working class and the middle and upper classes. However, some initiatives, such as the construction of the *Eixample*, could have restructured daily urban life by unifying the way different classes interacted with public spaces.⁹ Its promoter, Ildefons Cerdà, a progressive social thinker and parliamentary representative in Barcelona during the First Republic, had imagined a rational urban development in 1859 that would have permitted the demolition of the Raval workers' housing in order to reorganize the entire urban space.

The Raval was a working-class neighborhood in Barcelona that was disease-ridden and synonymous with disorganization and terror:

Cerdà's plan sought urban renewal in the overcrowded and randomly arranged medieval streets of the Ciutat Vella (Old City), which was to be connected to the nearby industrial satellites that lay beyond the city walls. This would be achieved through the construction of an *Eixample* (Extension), which for Cerdà, would become the core of a new socially inclusive, inter-class, functional city in which people from all walks of life would interact amid a new equality and civil unity. (Ealham, *Class, Culture and Conflict* 1)

Nonetheless, the project Cerdà designed was not fully realized because only the middle and upper classes moved to the *Eixample* around 1880, which had become a residential space idealized as the new city of reason. As a result, the segregation of the working class was intensified and the Raval became, in the eyes of the elite, the irrational space occupied by the workers. The existence and social isolation of the *barrio chino* ("Chinese neighborhood"), as the Raval was commonly called, shows how space was instrumentalized to exercise hegemonic power and offers the chance to understand the urban elites and their attitude toward the processes of urbanization during the industrialization period. It was part of a hegemonic battle that permitted the reaffirmation of the state's authority over the workers and allowed urbanization to become an ideological weapon (Ealham "Una 'geografía imaginada'" 58–69). This is one outstanding example of how urban and social practices,

and therefore social divisions, were inscribed in the city space. The philanthropic initiatives I analyze in this book participated in this spatial and urban readjustment of the modern city, and were a response to the bonds of solidarity that were emerging in working-class neighborhoods as a result of the workers' daily practice of city space.

Organization of the Book

In order to investigate the intersections between space and rhetoric in the development of cultural philanthropic projects for the working class, this book analyzes the construction of various urban physical and symbolic spaces in Spain between 1845 and 1915 (the long nineteenth century, 1789–1914, in Eric Hobsbawm's terminology), taking into account the social, political, and cultural evolutions that took place throughout this period. My study makes use of both popular and canonical culture, drawing upon political and music newspapers, archives (including personal, intellectual, and artists' manuscript archives from the nineteenth century), scores, account notebooks, pamphlets, printed ephemera, serialized novels, musical performances, drawings, activity reports from popular libraries and collective readings, and more. This range of sources allows for a better understanding of the social, the political, and the cultural. Perusing both public and private manuscript archives provides a broad perspective that spans both print culture and socio-cultural interactions.

I develop my thesis by analyzing three cultural practices used by philanthropists in Spain. I devote a section of this book to each cultural practice and explain the meaning and role of intellectual philanthropy by focusing on the devices and apparatuses philanthropists devised to help realize their various projects. As I argue throughout the book, intellectual philanthropists considered themselves activists in that they not only aimed to impact social structures but also deployed a rhetoric of affect to convince the masses of workers to join them in their philanthropic enterprise:

1. *Philanthropy must be staged.* Nineteenth-century Iberian intellectual philanthropists enacted their philanthropy through three forms of staging. First, in cities throughout Catalonia and also in Madrid and southern France, the working class was literally put on stage in musical performances under the leadership of

Josep Anselm Clavé. This created an illusion of cultural equality while covertly fetishizing the worker as a cultural subject. Second, philanthropy was also used to exploit both the public sphere and the archive as symbolic stages for its actions. Ironically, this transformed the practice of philanthropy into a spectacle for the working masses. Third, philanthropy itself was staged in theatrical representations to increase the concept's visibility, its practices, and its practitioners.

2. *Philanthropy needs to be available on the bookshelves.* The apparatus of philanthropy infiltrated the publishing market and the spaces for collaborative reading, private reading, and non-formal education. This infiltration constitutes what I call a "bibliophilanthropy," which involved the creation of spaces for collective and participatory readings as well as literacy classes. The shelves of these spaces were also filled with pedagogical manuals specifically published for the masses. The activities that took place in these spaces were based on a socio-political fiction that offered the guise of enlightenment by creating an analogy between library and city, therefore linking readers and citizens. The analogies of philanthropy as enlightenment constitute the grounds for an illusion of democracy for the working class.

3. *Philanthropy needs to be conjugated in the feminine.* Women's incorporation into public and intellectual life was difficult in the nineteenth century. However, this book shows that women intellectuals also participated in the public sphere as agents of socio-cultural change; some of them, in fact, made use of philanthropy as a platform to express themselves and enter into the social debates of industrial society. Women's philanthropy suggested ways to break the traditional boundaries of gender in public life and also explored both philanthropic tenets and the ways in which philanthropy is both staged and put on the bookshelves. I reveal how women philanthropists organized structures such as public libraries or associations in order to respond to the need that the women proletariat faced with their incorporation as workers into the incipient systems of production. The philanthropists, in turn, invested themselves with the capacity to define the potentiality of the female proletariat, influencing women's actions in the private sphere and moderating their impulses for social activism.

The three cultural practices (staging, reading, and gender) around which this book is structured are fundamental to

Introduction

understanding both why philanthropists created cultural and educational structures for citizen welfare and what those structures implied for the construction of society. These questions will also illuminate our understanding of contemporary society, since philanthropy frequently surpasses the state as the main provider of citizen welfare, especially in the United States.

Part One is titled “Staging Philanthropy: Theater and Music” and comprises three chapters. Chapter 1 is titled “The Working-Class Spectacle” and is concerned with musical philanthropy. It analyzes the creation of the workers’ choral groups in Catalonia, the Cors de Clavé, and argues that the composer-philanthropist (Catalan politician and composer Josep Anselm Clavé, 1824–74) presented himself to society as a public tamer. “Instruïos y sed libres, uníos y sed fuertes, amaos y sed felices” was the motto of the Cors de Clavé, one of the most eloquent manifestations of care for the working class in nineteenth-century Catalonia. From their inception, the choruses were united by a rhetoric of communitarian love. I argue that the rhetoric of this motto enabled the philanthropist to control and displace any revolutionary stirrings of a working-class rebellion. The Cors de Clavé staged the male Catalan working class and turned it into a spectacle to create an illusion of cultural equality. I argue that it functioned instead as a fetishization of the worker as cultural subject and a *fiction* that allowed the creation of an entrance of the workers into the public sphere by suspending, through physically staging that fiction on stage, the socio-political existing tensions in the public sphere.

Chapter 2, “Archiving Philanthropy,” takes as its point of departure my analysis of the unedited personal archive of Clavé. His correspondence and manuscripts (preserved at the Arxiu Nacional de Catalunya in San Cugat del Vallès) are of particular interest since those documents purportedly emanate from the private sphere and contain “authentic voices of the past,” an affirmation to which the chapter objects. This chapter questions the mythological discourse built around Clavé’s figure and constructs a theory that reveals the private archive not as a symbol of spontaneous authenticity, but as the place where letters and works were written and compiled for future use. The analysis of the unedited documents shows that Clavé was closely controlling the construction of his archive as a way to achieve his desire to handle his own inscription in the archival memory of Catalan cultural history as

a philanthropist. The chapter defines the personal proto-archive as a set of strategies that construct a conduit between private and public, and between past and present.

Chapter 3, “Performing ‘*Los filántropos*’: The Theater as the Medium for a Theorization of Philanthropy,” focuses on how philanthropy was turned into a spectacle for society in nineteenth-century Iberia. I argue that plays (especially the unedited anonymous manuscript “*Los filántropos*” held by the Biblioteca Nacional de España) and performances were used to communicate both the necessity and the importance of the philanthropic act to the public. In this chapter, I analyze the playwright’s critique of the selfishness, greediness, and hypocrisy of male and female philanthropists, and I show the often misunderstood importance of popular theater in the education of and communication with the working class and society at large on the topic of philanthropy in the public sphere.

Part Two is titled “Bibliophilanthropy” and comprises two chapters. Chapter 4, “The Library Is the City: The Enactment of Democratization Processes in the Centros de Lectura,” considers the biblio-political indoctrination of the working masses through the creation of reading centers (“Centros de Lectura”), the organization of collective readings, and the publication of serialized novels. This chapter specifically investigates the formation of Centros de Lectura and popular libraries for industrial workers in Catalonia and Asturias, as well as reading practices in urban spaces in the nineteenth century. By arguing that the creation of specific spaces for the organization of collective readings and literacy classes, such as Centros de Lectura and popular libraries, is based on a socio-political fiction that establishes an analogy between library and city, and readers and citizens, I demonstrate that what is commonly called the “democratization of reading” is instead a socio-cultural fabrication. A fundamental fiction of the lettered city and of an apparently horizontal cultural exchange was fundamental to the goal of mass pacification.

The central focus of Chapter 5, “Catechisms of Industry,” is the pedagogical manuals published for workers. The chapter examines many working-class manuals such as *Libro del obrero*, *Manual del obrero mecánico del ICAI*,¹⁰ *Catecismo de la doctrina socialista*, *Solución del problema obrero en paz y concordia*, *Manual del obrero Cristiano*, and *El obrero en la sociedad*. The manuals contained

Introduction

educational projects formulated by nineteenth-century intellectual philanthropists for the working class and masqueraded as a way to achieve emancipation. Instead, the manuals taught the workers to conduct themselves in a manner suited to the bourgeois version of social order and were used to silence any possibility of social revolution. Intellectuals used the manuals to protect their own status in the public sphere and as a way to define their philanthropic personality.

Part Three is titled “Women’s Philanthropy” and comprises the last two chapters of the book. These chapters focus on the female intellectuals’ answer to the contentious relationship between working class and society. Chapter 6, “The Potential Not to Be: Domesticity, Economy, and Reading Practices of Women Workers,” investigates the social, economic, and domestic issues that arise from the incorporation of women into the capitalist system of production and analyzes theoretical, social, and literary responses to this critical situation from two female Catalan philanthropists, Dolors Monserdà i Vidal and Francesca Bonne-maison. It also underscores the importance of the networks of female writers they are part of and the impact that these networks had on the Spanish public sphere at the time. The study of their publications and their creation of women’s spaces (working-class association and popular libraries), as well as their public performances, demonstrate that they reacted to these industrial changes by investing themselves with the capacity to define the potentiality of the female proletariat. Throughout the chapter, I reveal how the visibility of women’s culture in the city served the purpose of influencing women’s actions in the private sphere and moderating their impulses for social activism.

Chapter 7, “The Art of Dying Well: Philanthropy and the Imitation of Christ as Social Deactivation,” explores the treatment of death in workers’ literature written for and by women, especially in relation to the Art of Dying Well. In the nineteenth century, through the development of an aesthetic of the Art of Dying Well, the bourgeoisie used the tropological imitation of Christ as a way to impose social, economic, and political resignation on the working masses, whose real liberation would occur in the City of God. As such, these texts were used to silence possibilities of social revolution. In this literature, the workers were emasculated and women workers were used as the model for the whole working

class. This was a strategy commonly used by philanthropists in fiction geared toward the working class and it had profound social and political consequences. I explain that by making the parallel between the male workers' and the female workers' roles in their respective attributed spheres, they explicitly denied the participation of the working class as a whole in public life. In addition, I show that by emasculating the male workers, philanthropists blocked their access to civil citizenship.

Addressing the various issues to which each chapter is devoted will contribute to a better understanding of the complexity of socio-cultural relationships, both in the nineteenth century and the present time. It can illuminate the changing nature of class struggle and also add to our understanding of the uses and development of the concepts of citizenship, love, *agape*, friendship, and by extension, fraternity, compassion, and charity. These concepts are present in any debate about the social and the political. My book makes its historical and theoretical contribution to this debate and to the re-interpretation of these crucial concepts in order to understand socio-cultural relationships in our societies more fully. In addition, despite the many studies on related questions, surprisingly few have addressed the complexity of the philanthropic role in planning structures to improve working-class welfare. There are studies about the creation of Spanish working-class movements, the expression of worker culture, the necessity of establishing urban spaces to empower the masses, and the importance of a journalistic network to disseminate working-class ideology. In addition, many studies have looked at the leaders and opponents of socio-political and cultural emancipation. Few studies, however, have addressed the many nuances of the way philanthropists invested themselves in these ventures. By coining the concept of intellectual philanthropy, I am adding a thorough analysis of the impact and consequences that the use of culture imply in the philanthropic structure geared toward the working class in the nineteenth century.

The study of Iberian cultures is an emerging field. During the nineteenth century, Spain was the stage for an enormous number and wide variety of social movements in ebbing and flowing monarchical and republican political systems. During this period, Spain was invaded by Napoleon, became a dependent state of the French empire, and saw some of its regions, especially Catalonia,

Introduction

affirming their cultural particularities, all while experiencing the end of its transatlantic empire. My study is a contribution to this growing and intriguing field. In addition, many debates such as those about the processes of social secularization and the creation of a set of cultural projects for the working classes are a core part of this project, although they have been frequently left aside. Above all, I examine the emergence and consolidation of the intellectual philanthropist—that multilingual intellectual who revolutionizes the imbalance of social need and aid in modern and contemporary cultures.