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The political and social situation of the Basque people today is most often associated with radical nationalism, terrorist attacks, and a desire for separation from the rest of Spain. The most commonly misunderstood idea about this generalization is that these characteristics do not describe the majority of the people living in the Basque Nation. Rather, they are more appropriately associated with the organization known as Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (abbreviated as ETA). This group is defined as a terrorist organization whose cause is to create an independent homeland separate from the rest of Spain, though in the modern day this is believed to be an impossible undertaking. Since its creation in 1959 until a recent ceasefire in January 2011 ETA was as volatile as any political group that could be imagined in Western Europe as its actions and missions gradually became more shunned by society. The reasons behind the formation of ETA are just as complicated as they are numerous, but it can be argued that one of the main reasons that it was formed was as a response to the dictatorship of General Francisco Franco and his
concentrated attacks on the Basques, which later continued as a way to oppose his Fascist government. The government of Franco targeted those who desired to be acknowledged as separate from the state. Franco would go to such lengths as bombings and oppression to target them and to show his opposition of their desire to be separate. Though there were many other regions in Spain that opposed Franco, none of their responses to his rule continued past his reign nor were they as violent. This particular extremist group of Basque nationalists, however, fought more passionately than anyone else because of their loyalty to their homeland and opposition to conform to a homogeneous country as a part of Spain. Therefore, the combined nationalist sentiments and opposition of these particular Basques to the Fascist regime of General Franco explained the violence of the terrorist group ETA both throughout his rule and into the twenty-first century.

In order to understand the formation of ETA as a response to General Franco, it is important to examine the history of the Basques, their cultural differences from other regions of Spain, and the precursors to this radical organization. Most particularly, the characteristics of the Basques and how they define themselves are very important to consider when discussing their situation during the time of Franco because it contributes to why they were targeted as a threat. There are several characteristics of the Basque background that set them apart from the rest of the Spanish people, and they are important to recognize because these are the reasons why the Basques classify themselves as separate. Primarily, their language is different from any other language on the Iberian Peninsula. “Basque is a rare case of a language which has no known linguistic relations, and that is why it is considered to be unique” (Astrain 10). By having their own ways of being able to communicate without having anyone understanding them, the people knew that they were set apart in a major way. Physically, anyone who is Basque looks slightly
different from regular Spaniards because of their fairer skin (and with a reddish tint in the women), larger foreheads, taller stature and dominant blood type (Gibson 195). This all culminates in the idea of the people being a part of their own race, and it would demonstrate that when Franco first focused on them as targets that they were setting themselves apart (though in a simple way) from the rest of the people that he wanted to rule (Pérez-Agote 72).

After learning that the Basque people have unique characteristics, it is easy to see how the political situation in the region developed and why their ideology would be viewed as a threat to Franco as well as how their response to him would evolve into violence. The Basques ruled themselves separately and were exempt from some of the Spanish laws and taxes because of a separate set of laws that they were granted, which were called *fueros*. These separate laws lasted until the 19th Century and were abolished in 1876, ending their ability to rule themselves separately. Since the Basques saw themselves as separate until such a late date in history and only 60 years before the emergence of a violent dictator, it is clear that they would not want to give up the claim of being independent. It demonstrates that any sort of rule such as fascism (where they would have to give up every sense of independence) would not be accepted by them and would therefore drive a quest for separation. The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines fascism as “a political philosophy, movement, or regime (such as the Fascisti) that exalts nation and often race above the individual and that stands for a centralized autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader, severe economic and social regimentation, and forcible suppression of opposition”. Fascism would be the least appealing form of government for a group as independent as the Basques. The incorporation of the more independent Basques into such a government, which did not accept any cultural differences, caused one of the most explosive rifts between a group of people and a leader in Spain.
Prior to Franco’s emergence as the leader of Spain in 1939, there were several decades where both Spain and the Basque Nation each faced turmoil. Spain was experiencing internal struggles in terms of government, which affected the Basques because they were going to have to follow any new laws that came about. The Basques found themselves to be more directly influenced by the unrest in Spain because of their distinct way of life and because they preferred to take adhere to their cultural heritage rather than follow the central government. The turmoil in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s definitely affected the Basques. One of the most important aspects to focus on in terms of this is the support of Carlism in the region, while many in the rest of Spain opposed this movement. Carlism caused a great amount of tension starting in the mid-nineteenth century which led to the Spanish Civil wars in 1930. Carlism is a term used to define the movement in which people supported the true male heir to the throne rather than recognizing Isabella II as the Queen of Spain when she began her reign in 1833. By choosing to follow a more traditional route rather than accepting a female monarch, the Basques demonstrated that they would not be willing to give up an old way of governing to face a new one, particularly not that of Franco. Along with the movement of Carlism, there were Carlist Wars in which the people resorted to fighting in order to put the true ruler of Spain, the true male heir, on the throne. Combining the Carlist Wars in Spain and the revocation of the *fueros*, the Basques had a difficult time relating to the rest of Spain. They found their traditions and ideologies (such as their conservative nature and their separate way of life) to be too radically different to agree with any form of government that did not match their standards. They fought against the opposing forces throughout the Carlist Wars and into the Spanish Civil War in 1936. The Basques only wanted to support Carlism, and because of that they did not want to be ruled by anyone whom
they did not recognize. For this reason, there were political groups in the Basque country that began to form that would allow the people to express their political beliefs.

In between the First Carlist War and the initiation of the Spanish Civil War, there was a development in the region so important that it would influence the formation of ETA and ultimately the unrest that they cause today. There were several Basques who united to form a party to represent themselves and their traditions as a group so that others would be able to recognize them. Due to the fact that so many families in the Basque nation followed a traditional and conservative way of life, they supported any means to preserve the traditions that they followed, most particularly their own Basque way of life. Sabino Arana y Goiri, a Carlist supporter, was so dedicated to maintaining the Basque way of life that he eventually founded the Basque Nationalist Party to accomplish this.

Sabino Arana y Goiri is one of the most influential Basques in history because of his contributions to the nationalist identification and the creation of el Partido Nacionalista Vasco (also known as the Basque Nationalist Party or PNV). He is, in essence, a representation of the Basque way of life because of his enthusiasm and commitment to preserve their traditions and political beliefs. His conservative nature dates back to his family’s history of being Carlist supporters, and his being raised in this type of household that made him have the belief that Spain should be conservative. Following the tradition of his homeland rather than supporting the centralized government of Spain demonstrates that there was nothing inhibiting him from one day opposing such a government. He eventually led the first national movement to represent his beliefs, which were shared by many Basques at that time. Arana was greatly influenced by his older brother Luis, who taught him the importance of his homeland and why they should be a
separate people. Luis had a very strong argument, and Arana was quickly influenced once he learned the unique characteristics of the Basques:

…Arana began to develop a personal moral code that drew inspiration from an idealization of traditional Basque society… a society with both physical and moral rights, and its only salvation could be achieved through liberation (Watson 49-50).

The information that Luis gave him, particularly when he taught him of the danger of the emerging force of liberals in Spain (such as the anti-Carlists) to the nature of the Basques and their desire to be liberated became the stepping stone that Arana needed to form his own national movement. Aside from this, it is important to note that he was able to further his ideas about nationalist movements after he was sent to Barcelona in order to complete his studies following the death of his father. During this time, he witnessed the Catalan nationalist movement which was equally strong for quite some time as that of the Basques, but for different reasons (Kurlansky, 162). He spent a large amount of time after this devoting himself to learning Euskadi (and even re-creating it in terms of expanding the vocabulary and adding new words) and as much of the Basque history as possible so as to be a strong leader in the fight for his homeland. These two factors combine into Arana’s desire to work towards a Basque nationalist cause, which culminated in the formation of the Basque Nationalist Party in 1895.

The formation of the PNV is significant in several ways. First, it was a concrete and very visible representation of the beginning of the public struggle of the Basques, and, after this point in history, it would not be easy to ignore that there were people in the region who would make their desires visible to the public. Second, the official status of any organization makes it much
easier to be a target because they are unable to keep their political agenda secret anymore. As a result of their public declaration wanting to be separate and remain loyal only to the Basque Nation, the PNV allowed outsiders to evaluate their political and social beliefs and form their own opinions on whether or not these people should be allowed to separate from Spain. The PNV under the rule of Arana advocated several things in particular: remaining faithful to the Catholic Church, following Basque traditions, going back to a rural way of life, shunning those who immigrated to their homeland, and pursuing the idea of a separate nation (Kurlansky 168). The PNV started out as a rather radical group under Arana because of his enthusiasm. Later, they were completely focused on living only according to Basque traditions. The groups of people under Arana dedicated themselves to promoting these traditions and were very strict about them. Furthermore, they would not acknowledge their relationship to Spain. Although the PNV became less extreme after the death of the first leader, it had already had a great amount of influence on the future of Basque relations. For example, ETA was founded on some of Arana’s same ideas. Franco would already be aware of their movement for independence as well as other goals, and the Basques were never be able to deny their desire to be separate from any government forcing them to give up their individuality. The precursor to the struggle between ETA and Franco in the form of the PNV served as a look into the future for an even greater fight to defend the Basques because the PNV was already established at the time of Franco’s emergence, and it gave the people something reliable in terms of support for their desire for recognition as a separate group of people.

This first political party of the Basque Nation was a vehicle used to publicize the peoples’ nationalism. Such an attempt by the Basques to seek independence from Spain was a threat to Spain’s leaders from the time of its creation in 1895 until General Franco took over. It
is important to note that Arana was a man who was radical in his ideologies. He was very critical of those who were not intensely dedicated to following the Basque way of life and did not approve of anyone who came into his homeland (though the region was largely mixed with other groups of people). Arana expected all of the people to fight for their rights as enthusiastically as he did for his movement. He strongly advocated that the Basques were better than the typical Spanish people and that they should all know this and promote it as much as he did (Astrain 27). Arana’s radical nature eventually created the idea that violence and radical thinking would be able to accomplish what the Basques needed in terms of a freer homeland. Also, it allowed for there to be a concrete organization that could be a voice for the people. This would serve to be extremely helpful during the Second Republic when Spain was going through a difficult period of time when its government was less than stable and when its leaders decided to target the Basques for their way of life. However, it would also inspire the next generation of Basques to believe that violence would be acceptable in the search for fair treatment and independence. It would also show General Franco that violence might even be a way to oppress these people once the party evolved.

Arana had an incredible impact on the Basque people in terms of making them realize once again how amazing their culture was. He created the concept of their unique self-image and made many more people proud of being Basque. However, Arana was only the leader of the PNV for several years because of his arrest and later death in 1903, leaving his impact but not being able to move forward with his cause on his own (Conversi 68). The work that Arana left behind was inherited by several fill-in leaders until 1936 when another leader named José Antonio Aguirre appeared. This transition time between the death of Arana and the takeover of Aguirre was exactly when the Basques faced their greatest difficulties yet. Throughout that
period, the PNV was faced with many problems. They were losing credibility and representation in Spain, and were oppressed by a dictator for the first time. The dictatorship of Primo de Rivera from 1923 until 1930 was the precursor of the dictatorship of Franco. It should have given the Basques an idea of the difficulties they were about to face under the General’s fascist regime (Legarreta 4).

“… [T]he Basque nationalists were confronted for the first time in their history by a regime which considered regional separatism as not only bad but actually treasonous. Only a few days after Primo de Rivera was installed in office, in September 1923, he issued a decree which outlawed any act which might tend to undermine the concept of national unity… Six years after the dictatorship fell in 1930, Basque nationalism would be assaulted by General Franco’s rebels in the name of the theories of Primo de Rivera” (Clark 49-50).

In every sense of the word, the Basques were targeted as a threat to any leader who wanted absolute power. For Primo de Rivera to be successful he needed to eliminate any opposition, and even before Franco rose to power the first dictator saw the same threats from the people. Although the Basques did not necessarily oppose the first dictator’s regime openly, their individuality and their desire for independence would threaten any leader wanting absolute power. During this time period the Basques were at the peak of their nationalist movement with many supporters, and this detracted from the support for Spain and its dictator. The actions of Primo de Rivera showed that the Basques were a target, and his rule also exemplified the difference between issuing laws and decrees for the people to follow as opposed to direct attacks and oppression, which Franco advocated. The rule of Rivera showed that although the Basques
were targeted as a group of interest, it did not take great lengths to try to stop them from becoming separate from the rest of Spain. Therefore, Franco’s actions were much more violent than necessary.

During his dictatorship, General Franco dedicated himself to many things, such as uniting Spain and allowing for the state to have relationships with other countries in Europe. In addition, he also focused on oppressing any opposition that he had from groups that desired more independence. The Basques became one of his prime targets, and he became very well-known for his violence towards them. This led to hatred of Franco among the Basques, as well as the creation of opposition groups such as ETA. The eventual formation of ETA was preceded by several personal attacks on the Basques that would provoke violent reactions to those who wished to oppress them. Primarily, General Franco directed much of his energy, even prior to his dictatorship, in order to try to stop the Basques from being a political threat. His fascist ideology called for everyone to be united together under a dictatorship, and he determined everything that he wanted Spain to be even before he was in power. In order for him to take over power of the country during the civil war he needed all opposition out of the way. Having the Basques promoting their desire for separation would not be conducive to his goals for a homogenous state. Franco needed to preemptively attack any enemies that stood in the way of his goals. This, of course, culminated for him in the form of the attack on Guernica. This would prove to be one of the most devastating events in Basque history and is still remembered today as Franco’s first and most destructive attack on the region.

The city of Guernica was a central meeting ground for Basques in many ways; most commonly it was popular as a place for people to go to the market and trade their goods as well
as a political center where laws had been determined by elders for generations. This city was and still is important to the people in the region, and it was known by everyone as the gathering place of the region. The attack on the city of Guernica by Franco was one that was planned out well in advance judging by how effective and calculated it was. During the Civil War, on April 27, 1937 the city was brutally attacked by bombs and destroyed by fires that were set to the buildings. The attacks lasted hours, and the city was particularly populated that day because of all the people who gathered together for the market. Through his alliances with the fascists of Germany under the rule of Adolf Hitler, General Franco was able to negotiate with them and organize the bombing of the city of Guernica. The devastation that came from this was immeasurable. After this attack, the Basques were very aware of how their lives were in danger because of their beliefs. They knew that they were the prime target of Franco even before he became dictator of Spain. However, the greatest tragedy of this situation was when the political aftermath came and neither Franco nor the Germans took responsibility for the situation (Patterson 17).

The fact that no one admitted to the attack on Guernica indicated guilt more than it would have if the fascists had just supported their actions and taken responsibility for the bombings. Even more shocking was when Franco’s forces blamed the attacks on the Basques themselves, stating that “…it had been blown up and burned from within by Basque Republicans and Catalanian anarchists in an attempt to implicate the Nationalist forces in an atrocity” (Patterson 17). If Franco had desired to attack them without blame, then he could have simply said he did not know where the attacks came from. Blaming the victims when he was actually to blame, however, showed that his intolerance of the people who posed such a threat to his ideology was limitless. Patterson also writes of Steer’s article in The Times where he described the attack.
The description clearly stated that the Basques were targeted purposely when he wrote: “‘[t]he object of the bombardment was seemingly the demoralization of the civil population and the destruction of the cradle of the Basque race’” (Patterson 31). This tragic attack was only the beginning of the oppression that the people would face after the Civil War and then throughout the long dictatorship of General Franco, because when he finally took power he was able to further punish the Basques.

The repression that the Basques would face during the reign of Franco would be the cause for ETA’s acts of violence against his government, yet more importantly it was the steps that he took at the very beginning of his regime after the Civil War that caused the organization to form in the first place. Shortly after the attack on Guernica, Franco continued his targeted oppression against the Basque people in many ways. He did everything in his power to weaken the people in all aspects in life, ranging from emotional distress to starvation. He would imprison the men who supported the opposition (many of them fathers who would be the only breadwinners of the family), which therefore led to countless families being physically weakened through starvation and poverty. He also took it one step further and targeted the children whose parents had a role in the Civil War. His oppression of the children and the young adults of the region would ultimately lead to his greatest opposition in what would eventually become ETA, the group that began with the youth who decided to promote the Basque way of life despite the forces going against them. Therefore, it is important to know that the young Basques were oppressed in all of the aforementioned ways and, most importantly, that their education suffered because of the great lengths that Franco took to make schooling nearly impossible. In *The Guernica Generation*, Legarreta lists a number of ways in which the educational system suffered in the nation. Schools were turned into jails because Franco was imprisoning so many people.
In addition, the private schools were so expensive that the impoverished people were not able to afford them. The Basque language was prohibited in the schools, and any students with Basque names would not be allowed to use them (Legarreta 289). All of these reasons led to a realization among the older students that they would need to seek education at home and learn their Basque ways in secret. This desire to rebel instilled a need in them to become as loyal to their homeland as possible and to protest the dictatorship, which finally culminated in the group called Ekin.

Ekin formally began as a small group of students who began publishing their announcements with a newsletter with the same name, and “who wanted to make the Basque cause more dynamic” (Astrain 32). Their nationalism was strong in a way that had not been seen since the days of Arana. They worked for a short time with the PNV until even they found them to be too young, radical, and violent. They only went by the name Ekin before officially forming as Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) on July 31, 1959. This group soon challenged anyone and anything that was not strictly Basque or who did not support their guidelines for nationalism, most particularly Franco and his fascist government. Clearly, these views that they were formed with were very extreme and the complete opposite of what Franco was insisting that they follow. ETA had a very extreme ideology that continues today, which is one of the main reasons that their extremism did not die with Franco.

The ideology of ETA is similar to that of many terrorist groups, meaning that they work to make their cause well known and use attacks as a way of fighting opposition as well as calling attention to themselves. However, their direct relation to Franco demonstrates that they formed specifically against him to seek freedom for the homeland. “Franco had looked upon some of
the Basque provinces in Spain as an enemy, and upon the Basque culture as a target for rigid control and censorship” (Alexander 1). ETA did not want the Basques to be targeted nor to be seen as an enemy. They only wanted to be respected as a separate group, and they took the time to form a revolutionary organization and to study Arana’s philosophy. After forming in 1959, ETA clearly delineated what their ideology was and what their mission would be so that they could be seen as an official group working towards an official cause. They were recognized as a terrorist group by many countries, including those in the European Union and others such as the United States. ETA responded to this label by continuing to stand by their cause, though at times they would also fight against those with a negative view of them. As most terrorist groups do, they promoted their cause before anything else, and used acts of violence to further their goals. They took the time to gather an assembly to lay out their philosophy so that they could do this more efficiently, according to Alexander, Swetnam, and Levine.

“In 1962, ETA held its First Assembly at which the principles and structure of the organization were established:

- ETA is a Basque revolutionary national liberation movement.
- Its goal is the creation of an independent Basque Country.
- ETA proclaims the right of the Basque people to self-rule and the use of the most appropriate means to achieve its goal.
- ETA considers the Basque Country to consist of the three French-Basque provinces, the three Spanish-Basque provinces, and Navarra in Spain.
- ETA requests the disappearance of economic liberalism. It calls for the socialization of basic resources and the development of cooperatives as the basis of the economy of the new Basque state.
- The Basque Country is not a religious entity.
- The way to reach these goals is through ‘armed fight’” (Alexander 4-5).

These goals clearly state what their mission is, as well as how they will accomplish everything. Stating these goals so publicly and agreeing on them in such an official way signified
commitment in continuing on to achieve them, and it also was a way for everyone to read and understand their agenda and why they decided to form ETA. Although it does not directly state in their mission that they formed as a response to Franco, they most definitely opposed him in every sense of the word. Their willingness to fight for self-rule and an independent nation were most definitely a declaration of opposition to the Fascist government of Franco, who stated that even following a different religion was subject to punishment. His oppression would never have allowed the Basques to have the freedom to practice their traditions openly; therefore the oppression deepened their desire to practice them even though he prohibited this. ETA enabled the Basques to maintain their traditions even though they were illegal. The people were also offered a way to oppose the regime if they were willing to follow the organization.

After the birth of the organization it took them some time to put everything in order, such as their mission and their philosophy. Since they clearly stated that they would be willing to use violence to achieve their cause, it was only a matter of time before they would set out for an attack against the Franco regime. Their decision to use violence was most likely inspired by their first attack even before their Assembly in 1962.

“The first attacks carried out in the name of ETA were explosions in the towns of Bilbao, Vitoria and Santander in 1959. Its most remarkable feat was the partly successful attempt, on 18 July 1961, to derail a train carrying Franco’s supporters on their way to San Sebastián. The partial derailment of the train did not result in any deaths but the police took advantage of the sabotage to arrest and torture a number of suspects” (Astrain 32).
Astrain writes that this is in fact the reason why ETA held its assembly. After they realized that they were capable of planning organized attacks and also suffer repercussions for them, they needed a way to protect their organization and to further attack Franco and his supporters. From this date and until the end of Franco’s regime, ETA organized many attacks which “often had some popular support since many people viewed Franco as their enemy” (Alexander 1).

There are several attacks by ETA both after the train derailment and before the death of Franco that are important to note. They are important in showing the growing strength of ETA against his dictatorship and how they directly opposed his rule. ETA began to focus on making stronger attacks towards the last decade when Franco was in power which enforced that they were on a mission to go against him, and Franco was able to see that they worked to oppose and eliminate him. There were two attacks in particular that were important to focus on because they were direct attacks on people working for the General, showing that they were both following their mission as well as only targeting Franco instead of any other people in Spain, such as civilians or businesses as with other terrorist organizations. In 1968, ETA committed its first murder when they killed a secret police officer in front of his wife and daughter in San Sebastian. “When the police commissioner, Melitón Manzanas, a notorious torturer, was about to enter his house on the afternoon of 2 August, he was shot dead…During a ‘state of emergency’, scores of suspected ETA sympathizers were rounded up, illegally detained, beaten and intimidated” (Conversi 99). This attack was significant in showing that ETA was determined in its fight, yet the organization was willing to further place the Basques in harm’s way because they were still not tolerated just in order to make an impact against the opposing side. The government, in illegally detaining these supporters, was demonstrating that they would not distinguish between radical Basques and the average citizens and would consider any one of them an enemy. The
Basques witnessed this indiscriminate and cruel treatment of their people, because Franco considered all Basques as the same and continued to oppress them whether they were directly involved or not. This is why the risk of planning the murder was so significant on ETA’s part, because the organization knew that they were taking the risk of putting the rest of their people in danger just to counter Franco.

“There seemed little doubt that ETA was involved in the killing. Manzanas had acquired a reputation as a sadistic and brutal police official who delighted in torturing Basque nationalists. He had been marked for assassination for some time, but it was not until ETA had its first casualty…that the struggle between ETA and the police spiraled upward in open bloodshed. Following the assassination of Manzanas, Madrid declared a state of exception in the Basque provinces, and began rounding up suspects for questioning” (Clark 182).

Although this attack was successful for ETA in terms of eliminating one of the people opposing their cause, it backfired in such a way that the Basques were further looked upon as untrustworthy people as demonstrated in this quote from Clark. It also shows that ETA was becoming more radical, and that it was risking the reputation of all Basques through their name. They were trying as hard as possible to fight against Franco, yet each time they did their own situation became more difficult. Kurlansky states that the murder of Manzanas made the Basque situation more difficult, especially once Franco “declared a state of siege” against the Basques, going to any means to punish them through intense questioning, torture, imprisonment, and the 1970 Burgos trials (243). This proved that fighting against the dictator was not easy for them, nor was it successful when it caused their own people to be tortured even further. However, it
made them even more passionate in their cause once they realized that they needed to strengthen their response to Franco. While killing Manzanas led to further Basque hardships (such as questioning and torturing them for information about the murder), it was important for them to understand that their mission against Franco needed to be strengthened. ETA found a way to do this in their next attack which targeted one of Franco’s most trusted confidantes.

This attack occurred in response to Franco and took place in December, 1973 when ETA strategically planned the murder of Prime Minister Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco, who was targeted for several reasons. First, they intended to kidnap him in order to have their own prisoners released; second, because he was so close to Franco and, most importantly, because he was the man chosen to rule Spain and continue Franco’s form of government after the latter died (Franco he was nearly at the end of his life at this point). However, instead of kidnapping him, ETA decided to go one step further and decided to kill him instead because “assassinating the man they saw as ‘the symbol of pure Francoism’ would have far-reaching political repercussions” (Kurlansky, 253). On December 20, 1973 ETA finally succeeded in killing the admiral. After figuring out his daily routine of attending morning mass ETA was able to predict his whereabouts that morning and bombed his car. Killing the admiral was more than just a way to get attention for their cause; ETA managed to affect the entire future of Spain through this one action. If they not assassinated Carrero then Francoism probably would have continued on for much longer than it did because he was meant to continue on with the same ideologies that Franco used (Britannica).

ETA was successful with this murder in countless ways. First, they managed to show their strength in their planning abilities, demonstrating that they were able to target a person so
exactly that they were able to attack him without any suspicion from their opposition. Another way in which they were successful with this attack was that they were able to cripple Franco’s vision of what the future of Spain would be because he realized his time was nearly over, and they showed that they were targeting him directly. He had planned for Carrero Blanco, who was his right-hand man in office, to be his successor. Franco was devastated by the murder of his confidante, and this dramatically changed his path of action. “Whatever is the judgment of history, at the time of the assassination it was widely seen as the end of Francoism” (Kurlansky 254). Franco knew that his time was coming to an end because of old age and poor health, and he wanted to make sure that his regime succeeded him. This attack by ETA showed that they were capable of changing his plan of action, proving that they were more powerful than him in several ways, and also that they were in fact successful in personally attacking him when he thought that he was successful in doing the same to them. This attack would not have, in any way, led to freedom for the Basque Nation nor would it have lifted any form of oppression against the people in the region. Therefore, this attack was directly linked to ETA’s desire to oppose Franco.

The mental and physical status of the dictator quickly declined after the death of Carrero Blanco, and it became a rush to reinforce his regime before his death so that it could continue without him. However, the Spanish people knew that there was a chance for there to be democracy afterwards, and it seemed to be a general consensus to humor the Caudillo until his death. The real question for the Basques, on the other hand, would be whether or not to follow the new rule or to continue supporting ETA in hopes of becoming a separate state. Franco’s death came soon enough, allowing them to finally make this decision.
“Franco died slowly, torturing himself and Spain for more than a month, while aides and ministers, the fawning court, tried to get everything signed and readied for the fight to perpetuate their rule without their Caudillo… On November 20, 1975, he died, leaving behind a written statement warning: ‘Do not forget that the enemies of Spain and Christian civilization are on the alert.’ While black armbands were seen on the streets of Madrid, Catalans discreetly uncorked champagne at home, and Basque youth less discreetly danced in the streets of Euskadi” (Kurlansky 267).

Those whom Franco oppressed most directly, the Catalans in addition to the Basques, were those who most enthusiastically celebrated his death. The path for the Basque nationalists had become divided at this point between the less radical Basques and the extremists, because once Franco died then fascism had finally come to pass into a new state with a new government. ETA received the amount of support that it did during Franco’s time because there were no other methods of defense for the Basques, though when he died there was no longer a need for ETA to have as much support. The new government of Spain did not continue with fascism and allowed the people to follow their own individual beliefs rather than being forced to conform to the rules of the old regime. It was a much more accepting form of government. It was understood that life would improve for everyone including the Basques, that the people would be granted new rights, and therefore would be feel more comfortable with supporting the government for the first time after so much time. A division occurred between the people of the Basque Nation and ETA, leaving the terrorist organization to continue on as a group with a suddenly irrational purpose once it had lost its mass group of supporters.
After the death of Franco, it seemed as if the violence would subside especially considering that a new government was in place under the new King, Juan Carlos. However, the violence continued on in the form of random attacks by radical youths in ETA, similar to gang violence in other nations. Being a member of a group, no matter how violent, acts psychologically as a comfort to many young people failing to find their place and when these organizations give them a purpose then they are more willing to do what is asked of them. Once the dictatorship had finally ended, these radical nationalists acted as though nothing had changed and continued fighting against Spain.

“Since they did not believe in a new state of affairs, they continued to behave as before, some practicing violence and others legitimizing it. So their activities provoked state suppression and imprisonment of the perpetrators of violence, as well as its supporters. For those who had accepted the democratic transition continued (and continue) to consider them political prisoners. This intergenerational closed world of radical Basque nationalism constituted a structure of social plausibility that maintained favorable definitions and attitudes about the violence” (Pérez-Agote, 203).

Pérez-Agote perfectly defines the social issues at hand in Spain after the death of Franco. It was as though nothing had changed and the state was still the enemy of the Basques. In certain ways it still was, but only because they caused the antagonistic relationship. It is understandable that Franco was the cause of the violence during his regime because of his oppression of the people, but the fact that they continued to act the same way even after they had a new opportunity for peace shows that his actions had long-lasting effects on the people. The fact that the Basques
even supported the violence at times shows that some of them believed that what ETA was doing was justified. Clearly, everything that Franco did to the Basques damaged their relationship with the rest of Spain.

Towards the very end of Franco’s reign, it was clear that the Basques were still a target. Although he knew that his time was almost over and that the Basques were not going to be suppressed, he still did his best to try to make them comply with everything he tried to impose. The change was clear, however. The rest of Spain began to see that the division between the Basques and Franco’s Fascist government would have no clear winner and that the next ruler of Spain would not allow for a separation to succeed. This was the turning point for ETA; either it would cease its struggle because Franco was no longer alive or it would continue to pursue its cause to create an independent Basque state even though it seemed impossible to accomplish. Due to ETA’s continued fervent nationalism they decided not to give up their fight for independence.

ETA did not abandon their cause because it had been a part of the members’ lives as well as those of the nationalists for so long. Not only was their mission to fight against Franco, but it was also to represent the Basques as a group of people unique from everyone else. They wanted to demonstrate that their group was still unique, and after Franco’s death they decided to continue defending their individual nature even though their primary goal, the overthrow of Franco, was no longer an issue. It was even predicted in many books documenting the struggle of the Basques that ETA would continue on with the violence that they had introduced, and Robert P. Clark even noted “there are obstacles to Basque nationalism that are deeply rooted and will not dissolve soon, and perhaps not for a number of years, if at all” (Clark 381). This was
written only three years after the death of Franco, and even then there was a general consensus among scholars that there were too many issues that ETA was struggling against to abandon their work. Clark’s reflections about the terrorist nature of this group were also noted, and it is interesting to see that so long ago and so soon after the death of Franco that there were already predictions that ETA would be determined in remaining radical.

“Nothing seems to daunt of blunt ETA’s revolutionary ardor. Counter-violence seems futile; efforts at negotiation never reach fruition; condemnation by non-violent Basque political groups apparently masks continuing real support for ETA by the average Basque citizen. It appears as if the suppression of the Franco years bred a generation of revolutionary youth who combine a commitment to both socialist change and nationalist liberation with a hardened willingness to kill to achieve their goal… The ill effects of these policies will be around for a long time to come” (Clark 382).

Clark’s predictions were extremely accurate in terms of targeting the use of violence by ETA to accomplish their goals, and particularly when he stated that they would be around for a long time to come. ETA, although currently stated that they are in a ceasefire, had active members until January 10, 2011 when they said that they were going to give up arms. However, there are still 36 years of active violence that are evidence that ETA is still adamant in achieving its cause.

There are several reasons why the violence continued to be so extreme. Primarily, when the organization was founded it stated that violence would be used to achieve its goal. Another reason was that violence had been very successful for them. They had gained publicity, recruited dedicated members, and achieved success, particularly after proving that they were able to affect
the government that they opposed. In continuing on with their nationalist movement, there were several changes that perhaps kept ETA from becoming more neutral and instead perpetuated their terrorist mentality.

“In the 1970s a familiar pattern in ETA’s evolution began to acquire a quicker tempo: as the more experienced and mature leaders of ETA were killed or forced into exile, younger and more radical ones quickly replaced them in a process that continues…It clearly appears, especially during the ‘Transition’ phase, that violence has become a self-generating mechanism, a vicious circle very difficult to stop” (Conversi 250).

Just as ETA formed as a group of young radicals after separating from the more mature members of the PNV, the younger members became more radical and dedicated once ETA had to survive after the death of Franco. This shift to handing the power over to the less experienced and more radical members is the reason that the violence continued for so long. As in other terrorist organizations, the young members find that they have more purpose in their lives following a cause than being part of a lost group of people. This is what culminated in the attacks that continued on into the new government of Spain.

Not long after Franco’s death, ETA continued to cause problems in Spain. Primarily, ETA acted to promote its cause and to get attention. In other ways, they also had issues with Madrid beginning almost immediately after the Caudillo’s death. When Juan Carlos was appointed king, he knew that he would have to take the Basque situation into consideration.
“One of the new king’s first acts was sending a representative to French
Basqueland with the task of contacting ETA, assuring them things were going to
be very different, and inviting them to negotiate peace. But nothing about Juan
Carlos’s demeanor, public image, or initial public acts had given ETA cause to
trust him, and they dismissed the offer as insincere” (Kurlansky 268).

This reaction by ETA was not surprising, considering how long the government had mistreated
the people and how harsh the mistreatment was. Also, since Juan Carlos was chosen by the
dying dictator it seemed to be a less than genuine proposal to the Basques especially when so
many years of damage had already taken place. This attempt to make peace was a failure, and in
the following years ETA began once again to attack the government of Spain, although this time
it was the government of a new and independent Spain.

The most important attacks to note in the early years of the new government were to
show that ETA was not going away and would not give up its violent nature in any sense. They
were very extreme and very disturbing to see knowing that there was no remorse and also, from a
non-Basque perspective, rather unnecessary seeing that ETA would not be gaining any freedom
for their people. The year 1980 was the year in which ETA killed the most people, with numbers
ranging from 100 to 120 victims (BBC News, Reuters). They were trying as hard as possible to
make themselves heard, and it was clear that in this year that they made their point. However,
their intense nationalism was not seen as rational, rather it was seen as insane and something to
be condemned. In trying to fight for a cause, they managed to gain more attention for being
dangerous than for working hard and doing something honorable for their people. Another
attack in 1987 showed just how few limits ETA had when they attacked Civil Guard houses in
Zaragoza, Spain (Alexander 27). They killed eleven people, five of which were children. There was no way that killing children would ever help their cause, demonstrating that ETA had moved past a nationalist group to a ruthless organization that had exceeded the point of being constructive in achieving their goals. After the 1980s, ETA would only be known as a terrorist group and not as the group that sought Basque separation. They had lost most of their support, particularly that of the PNV and many Basques, as well as the rest of Spain which began to fear the terrorists. It became a difficult situation for many years because there was always the question of if and when the next attack would occur.

The attack of the Civil Guard barracks demonstrated the struggle against authority figures, though later on they demonstrated that they would be willing to attack anyone. In December of 2000, ETA was responsible for killing a counselor for the Popular Party in Barcelona. They placed a bomb in his car, which exploded while he was tending to duties in his neighborhood and killed him.

“Jaime Mayor Oreja, the Interior Minister, said: ‘By this action, ETA has revealed its strategy of targeting simple people and has achieved nothing more than to sow grief in a family. The terrorist gang will not change government policy through death and blackmail’” (Nash).

This quote, written in the London newspaper The Independent World supports the fact that ETA was not successful in achieving their original goal and only hurt innocent people by attacking prominent figures. The motivation behind the attack was to oppose the anti-terrorism pact signed by the Prime Minister, Jose Luis Zapatero, which stated that they wanted ETA to be destroyed (Nash). With opposition from the government and public opinion, ETA was not
supported in any of its actions, making it clear that they would never achieve their goal of a separate Basque Nation. The violence that they had used in the Franco years was still visible, although they no longer had to resist the oppression that they once faced.

One of ETA’s most famous attacks in the past decade was the bombing of the Madrid subway on March 11, 2004. Reports said that around 200 people were killed, with between 1,800 and 2,000 people being injured (BBC News). The attack came only a few days before Spanish elections, evidence that there was a political motivation behind the attack. Although some at the time argued that it could have been the responsibility of other terrorist organizations, it was the general consensus of many that ETA was responsible and that they were the only ones with enough cause to do it. The fact that the Basque group was blamed is enough to confirm the opinion of the Spanish people about the terrorists and that they could no longer tolerate the violence (Stein, Ing). Stein also wrote of the protests of the Spanish against ETA after the bombing. Even if the attack was not the fault of ETA, the people were infuriated that they would even think to hurt so many innocent people. This was just another example of how ETA was losing support and gaining opposition, and that they were hurting their own chances of ever gaining the support they wanted from the government.

Besides these three attacks, ETA also succeeded in planning over two hundred attacks since they first became an organization. On top of that, ETA has killed more than 800 people over that time span, with that being remembered as their major accomplishment. ETA has not in any other way made an impact on Spain, and they are not any closer to making any sort of change in their political situation. The majority of the people in the Basque Country are not actually Basque; the number of people who are 100 percent Basque are few, and the remainder
are people who moved into the region for work in the industrial cities and other productive areas. The desire for a separate Basque nation has lessened, which was one of the main reasons behind the formation of ETA, and they no longer have to fight against oppression for having cultural and linguistic differences in their region. Franco did oppress them terribly, and it was understandable that the Basques wanted to fight back. However, he also oppressed all other people in Spain who did not follow the laws that he imposed. Since the death of the dictator, Spain has become a very open and accepting country where Spaniards embrace the culture of their region and show pride for having unique qualities. ETA is no longer fighting against a dictator, nor is it fighting against anyone else oppressing the Basques. The only real reason for them to continue on with any sort of mission would be to fight for a separate Basque nation, but with the population of Basques being so low it is no longer the desire of the majority of the people to continue on as a separate state. However, ETA is still determined to gain some kind of recognition, and over the years there were times when they realized that violence would not be the best way to work with the central government in Madrid. They saw that appealing to the government would help their cause and to change the way they were perceived.

After the death of Franco, ETA tried to work towards negotiations as well as to prove that they were capable of being responsible by declaring several ceasefires. In doing so, they showed that they were willing to give up the violence that they had used to achieve their means and instead work towards their goals by political means. The ceasefires showed that ETA was capable of being rational and would work towards an agreement, rather than take the lives of innocent people or make threats. ETA has made several attempts at ceasefires that demonstrate that ETA was capable of considering that peace was more constructive than violence. It also showed that ETA could abandon the attacks and possibly work towards building a positive
relationship with the people of Spain. However, the fact that there were several attempts at ceasefires showed that ETA was never serious about any of them and that any future ones might also lack of credibility.

ETA has had several ceasefires, which spanned over a twenty year time period and which only occurred after Franco had already died. There have been a total of five ceasefires, with the first one in 1989. It only lasted around two weeks, with the ceasefire being officially cancelled several months later after an assassination by the group. The second one came seven years later in 1996 and lasted for one week, again letting down Spain and doing nothing to alleviate the stress of the people who always worried about when the next attack would occur. In 1998 ETA declared a ceasefire a third time. For two months it seemed as if they were staying true to their word, but ETA planned another attack and killed an army officer with a car bomb. Their longest lasting ceasefire came next, in the year 2006, and lasted from March until December (The Economist). There was a bombing at the Madrid airport on December 30, 2006 which consisted of a car bomb at the airport. The Prime Minister, Jose Luis Zapatero, said that the attack clearly did not go along with the terms of their ceasefire (CNN). It seemed after this last attempt at a ceasefire that ETA would never be able to commit to peace between themselves and the rest of Spain. However, as of January 10, 2011 ETA made the ceasefire that they declared in December 2010 permanent (The Economist). There is no word of whether or not ETA plans to keep their word but if they did then it would be the last remaining way for them to remove themselves from the violent connection that they had with General Franco during his rule.

The relationship that ETA has with Spain has changed in many ways since the bombing of Guernica, mostly because the rest of Spain has been progressing while ETA has continued as
a terrorist organization. There were many opportunities for ETA to become a positive representation of the Basque nation, yet they never managed to do that. The effect of General Franco on the Basques during his rule was so strong that it is still felt today. The anniversaries of his attacks, the stories from grandparents, and the written history will continue to be passed down to each coming generation and will never be forgotten. The activities of ETA are also remembered for many of the same reasons. The memories of what had happened to the Basques were enough to make them want to continue fighting for what they believed in as well as for Basque independence. They continued to have an intense sense of nationalism and patriotism for the Basque nation long after anyone else did. However, the violent nature of the group continued on for much longer than it should have because they had received so much support during their early days as an organization. If they had never had to be violent and fight against Franco in the first place, then perhaps the outcome would have been very different in terms of how they dealt with things politically. Therefore, the combined nationalist sentiments and opposition of these particular Basques to the Fascist regime of General Franco explained the violence of the terrorist group ETA both throughout his rule and into the twenty-first century.
Endnotes

1. Fueros

The *fueros* of the Basque Nation were instituted as a way for them to be able to have the freedom to make certain political decisions independently from the rest of Spain. Although *fueros* were not unique to the Basques and were available to other institutions (such as the Church, military, organizations, or other regions of Spain), the people were famously attached to these laws because it exempted them from so many of Spain’s traditional laws. The Basques, for example, enjoyed the freedom of being exempt from certain taxes and to function mainly according to its own rule (Conversi 45). This was done as a way to gain support from the Basques in the 16th Century so that they would support the government of Spain rather than trying to further separate themselves. After more than 200 years of enjoying these separate laws, the *fueros* were abolished. The civil wars in Spain led to unrest within the government, and these separate laws were revoked to try to make the government seem more unified (Conversi 46).

2. Carlism in Spain

The effect of Carlism in Spain was very prominent. Carlism began as a reaction of supporters of Carl, the brother of King Ferdinand VII, who should have been the heir to the throne after the king’s death. However, King Ferdinand changed the law that said Spain could only be ruled under a male heir so that his daughter, Isabella II, would be able to rule. This became an issue when the more traditional Spaniards, such as those in the Basque Nation, were unsupportive of this change of law. For many years, there was a
large amount of conflict in Spain over this divide of support, leading to three wars from 1830-1876. The more conservative people supported the Carlists, while the more liberal people wanted to see Spain move in a more progressive direction. This broke Spain apart politically, making it easy to overtake by future dictators (Conversi 12).

3. Catalan Nationalist movement

The sense of nationalism in the Catalan region of Spain is very strong, and nearly as extreme as that of the Basques at certain times in the past. The Catalans had a nationalist movement in the late 19th to early 20th centuries, trying to establish their independence. They wanted their own separate government, as well as recognition of their language and their traditions (Chaytor 256). This was very similar to that of what the Basques tried to do later on, and it served as an inspiration to them. However, the Catalans were not as successful and were not able to continue on with their movement. This serves as an important impact on the development of the radical Basques movements, particularly that of Sabino Arana y Goiri. He witnessed this nationalist movement while studying in Barcelona, and it showed him that his own people should fight for their independence in the same way (Kurlansky 162).

4. Primo de Rivera’s regime

The regime of Primo de Rivera was monumental in Spain because it was the precursor of the dictatorship of General Franco. He was in power from 1923-1930.
Much like General Franco, he rose to power because of his strong military background (Payne 4-5). He made sure that the influence of the military was prominent in his government, appointing many other high-ranked officers as his fellow leaders. He also oppressed those who wanted to separate themselves, such as the Basques and Catalans because it would hurt Spain as it was trying to repair itself from the many Carlist and Civil wars. He was a very patriotic man, hoping to re-establish unity after so many years of turmoil in the state. Therefore, his oppression of those wanting to be separate was an attempt to keep the state of Spain united for several years in order to keep order (Payne 5).

5. City of Guernica

The city of Guernica is a city of great importance for the Basques. It was established as a main gathering place, first for trading and then later for political reasons. They would meet under the Tree of Guernica in order to discuss the laws of the city, as well as the events that were happening. It was a place where elders would meet to continue on their form of democracy, as well as to discuss their *fueros* and how they would maintain the rights of their people. Bombing this city was a great tragedy to the Basque people because of how important it was politically, though their famous tree was somehow spared by the bombing (Legarreta 2).

6. 1970’s Burgos Trials
The Burgos Trials were held in 1970. They were a way in which to charge ETA members with the crimes that they committed, such as the attacks that they planned and the deaths stemming from them. During these trials, several members of the organization were charged with these crimes and sentenced to death (Conversi 100). The police commissioner, Melitón Manzanas, played a key role in these trials which helped ETA make the decision to target him (Kurlansky 243).
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