

Alfred de Gracia and Juan Lina

A number of problems recur in political systems regardless of their formal structure and type of legitimacy: the allocation of power, ideological and interest conflicts, the recruitment of elites, the control of deviance, problems created by economic development, and so on. How an authoritarian regime confronts and manages these problems - by what doctrines, institutions and practices - is the major question posed for this research. We conceive the study of the Spanish political system - although of great interest in itself - as part of an attempt to develop a number of propositions about authoritarian regimes that may be used to compare authoritarian with democratic and totalitarian systems.

The central concern of the study will be a description and analysis of political pluralism within an authoritarian setting. There are several reasons for this approach. One reason is that authoritarian systems, although they lack the institutional structure given to pluralism in constitutional democracies, allow for the existence of a certain number of somewhat independent political forces and interest groups. In this respect, they also contrast with the fairly successful attempts at total control of the Nazi regime in Germany and the Soviet system of Russia. Hence pluralism in Spain can be compared with the actual degrees of pluralism in democracies and communist countries.

Secondly, a juridical and formal study of constitutional norms is perhaps nowhere less useful for understanding a political system than in Spain. Their legal training makes the authors aware of the juridical aspects of political institutions, but they feel that it would be a mistake to formulate their study in the legal terms that are sometimes useful elsewhere.

Furthermore, a historical approach is not contemplated. Though an understanding of the Spanish Civil War is indispensable to the study of Spain today, the present proposal aims at the analysis of the current operation of the Franco regime.

In addition, the authors believe that a study purely of ideologies would leave too many of the fundamental questions about Spanish political behavior unanswered.

Finally, the authors feel that socio-economic considerations in Spain should have equal emphasis with, if not more emphasis than, the psychological and cultural-psychological approaches. Class structure, monopoly conditions, in industry and agriculture, and economic underdevelopment generally, offer striking subjects for study in this Western European society.

Both authors are at home in the field of political sociology. Group theory (and particularly the "structural-functional" approach) seems to fit their interests best. This same approach is being used with greater frequency in studies of the American, Soviet and continental systems, and in studies of underdeveloped countries. Hence, studies in this tradition will be available to serve as models for the contemplated Spanish study and to provide continuous sources of comparisons.

As indicated, the existence of a pluralism of directly or indirectly political groups, in contrast to the monopolistic or at least seriously dominant position of one political group in totalitarian systems, would seem the most significant and distinctive characteristic of authoritarian regimes. This pluralism makes them more like the democracies of the West, but the type of groups allowed to exist and the ways in which they operate in an authoritarian system would constitute the decisive difference from the democracies. The ways in which these various groups are formed,

their composition, their activities, how they share power and influence decisions, their conflicts and compromises, the processes of co-optation that link them and thereby maintain the "coalition of forces" on which the regime rests, their relation to its head (Franco) - subordinate to him to a large extent but also endowed with strong veto power - are some of the important problems to be treated.

These groups cannot be reduced to such simple catchwords as "the Church, the Army, and the Falange," to which some commentators would add "the landlords," and others, less focussed on the past, "big business." Even less, without validating research, can it be assumed that these groups are recruited from the same social stratum and that their outlook is very much the same. For example, one may distinguish in the church the hierarchy (and tendencies in it), the religious orders, Catholic Action, and various lay groups with quite distinct ideological tendencies; in the Army the position of various ranks, "generations," and cliques; in "big business" the different financial groups; in the Falange, the "young left" and the bureaucratic leadership; etc.

Moreover, typical stereotyped accounts miss completely some of the new power centers created by the regime; the government-falangist Sindicatos (with their economic control and planning functions, and their activities that resemble those of the trade unions in other countries), and the large number of government enterprises created in the process of industrialization (the new managerial elite of such enterprises is playing an increasingly important role).

Also generally ignored in writings on Spain is the role of the traditional and new bureaucracies of the government; though they overlap in part with the groups mentioned, they also constitute an independent force. In this respect the role of socially distinct, numerically limited, self-conscious, and high-status professional groups, such as the various engineering corps, becomes especially interesting when we consider their decisive role in many agencies that formulate policies of social, economic and technical change (e.g. in the Ministry of Agriculture in relation to problems of "agrarian reform"). The problems of an authoritarian regime - as distinct from a totalitarian one - in facing its bureaucratic machine and the vested interests of a self-conscious professional and other groups are considerable.

Another common misconception, both in and out of Spain, may be called "Madridcentrism," which perceives only the national power structure, as manifested in Madrid, and fails to see significant local and regional power complexes, as, for instance, in Barcelona. Some attention will be given the problem.

Also the "single party" of Spain, the Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalistas, is quite different from the C.F.S.U. or the N.S.D.A.P. If we recall Sigismund Neumann's characterization of the totalitarian party (*The Permanent Revolution*, p.126) we can say that today the Falange does not perform (if it ever did to any considerable extent in the past), and even less monopolize, any of these three functions: 1) to create the political elite, 2) to control and educate the masses, and 3) to maintain communication between state and society (functions, incidentally, that are clearly stated in the preamble to the founding decree of the unified party imposed by Franco in 1937). Why, despite the close and sympathetic model of the real totalitarian parties, the Falange should never have grown to be like them is an important question that may uncover significant differences between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes.

However, it would seem impossible to evaluate correctly the role of groups in this pluralistic structure without some attempt to relate the role of the mass to that of the elite. The perception of politics held by the people conditions the scope, intensity, and character of the operations of the elite, even in a regime like the Spanish. We expect to find that the number of politically aware and interested persons is smaller than the admittedly small group of such people in democratic countries.

Moreover, institutional channels of communication between the people at large and the regime are almost completely absent. Even those groups which have potentially sizeable constituencies are likely to have only limited communication with them. Voluntary associations are few in kind and have almost always been regarded apathetically. The role of friendship and family is probably as great in politics as in other spheres of Spanish society and culture. Particularistic arrangements frequently take precedence over the application of universalistic rules, as the approach to interpersonal problems; this condition should be expected to "depoliticise" many aspects of life and to impede the fulfillment of most rationalizing schemes, whether in the bureaucracy, economic institutions, or the representative structure of the government. They probably represent a serious obstacle to incipient totalitarian tendencies, but also conflict with the system of legal authority (rule of law) in a democracy.

The approach and emphasis of the study may be implied from a preliminary subject-matter outline:

PART I. THE BASIS OF POLITICS IN SPANISH THOUGHT AND CULTURE

- A. Non-political but politically relevant belief-systems and value orientations.
- B. The political "ecology" of Spain.
- C. The socio-economic structure. (Class and status structure, occupational composition and its changes, concentration of wealth and economic power, etc., depicted to the extent necessary to understand the political and politically significant groups.)

PART II. THE PEOPLE AND POLITICS

- A. The political outlook of the population in various strata and subgroups (especially as it affects the operation of the present political system)
- B. Uncontrolled political activities and capabilities of groupings existing within the regime.

PART III. POLITICAL PLURALISM

- A. Composition of the elites: functional and geographic components, etc.
- B. Origin, stability, circulation and replacement of elites during the two decades of the regime.
- C. Coalitions and schisms in the elite.
- D. Franco as "compulsory arbiter."

PART IV. DEVELOPMENTAL CONSTRUCTS

- A. Generational cleavages as a source of strain (especially in the context of higher education and the professional groups).
- B. Industrialization and economic development and their implications for the power structure.
- C. The emergence of counter-elites under an authoritarian system and the attempts to institutionalize the regime to face the crisis of succession.

PART V. THE IMPLICATIONS OF AUTHORITARIAN GOVERNMENT AND ITS CONTRAST WITH DEMOCRATIC AND TOTALITARIAN SYSTEMS.

The broad and complex nature of the study demands reliance upon a battery of techniques, many of which are described and exemplified in A. De Grazia's manual of methods for the study of leadership (Elites Target Analysis, mimeo, USIA, 1954) and in "The Social Basis of Democratic Politics" by S. M. Lipset and J. Lins (mimeo, 1956). Every effort will be made to find and use objective, precise and systematic indicators of conditions and trends on which to base conclusions, describe changes, and make comparisons, especially with other societies. Thus, when the ideology and mentality of the elites are to be presented they will be dealt with as systematically and representatively as possible, using "content analysis" if it should prove fruitful. Also, when shifts in the composition or in the power distribution of the elite are described, they will be recorded as tangible and objective variations in a defined universe of elite members (such as the Cabinet, the Cortes, the provincial governors, army generals, etc.) When dealing with distributions and concentrations of wealth and economic power, objective indicators -- such as are available in certain studies of interlocking directorates in finance and industry that have already been published in Spanish scientific journals -- will be employed in preference to impressionistic judgments. Standardized, or at least focussed, interviews will be preferred to completely open-ended ones, wherever they are conducted in any number. Thus, as far as conditions in Spain at the time of the study permit, systematic, objective and quantitative methods will characterize the collection and analysis of data. Intensive library research in Spain -- and to a minor extent abroad, on materials not available for political or other reasons in Spain -- will form the basis for the subsequent observational and interviewing phases of the project. Whatever techniques are used, an attempt will be made to present the data in a manner allowing comparison with similar data regarding other countries.

Financial limitations will curtail some of the more ambitious early plans of the applicants to undertake sample surveys, but, should field conditions be propitious and the expenses low, attempts will be made to interview samples of distinctive groups in line with the focus of the study.

Consideration has been given to preparing a number of intensive case studies that would penetrate deeply into the operation of the regime as it works in a bureau, a community, the legislature, etc. But a commitment to carry out such penetration in depth cannot be safely made without knowledge of the opportunities and difficulties which may be encountered in the field.

Mr. de Grazia would commence work on the project in March, 1957, at Stanford University, combing the files of the Hoover Library on Spain and going through general publications on Spain not available (often for political reasons) in Spain. Mr. Lins would go to Spain in the Summer of 1957 to work for the subsequent eighteen months on the project. After the collection of basic published data and problem formulation advanced far enough to start the field work proper, Mr. de Grazia would join him and work particularly in the role of an interested and "uninformed" sympathetic foreign observer. The interrogations would be directed along lines suggested by the data gathered through other means. The aim is to complete the writing of the study by June, 1959, somewhat over two years after its initiation.

B.

Three years ago, Mr. de Grazia prepared a prospectus for a Comparative Survey of European-American political behavior which he discussed with a number of scholars in Europe and America. After a meeting with Professor Antonio de Luna, Director of the Institute of International Law of the University of Madrid, he included Spain as a country where a field survey might be important and possible. A year later he visited Spain in connection with a research contract with the U.S. Information Agency and became acquainted with a group of Spanish scholars who encouraged his ideas of doing live research in Spain. A little later he published a manual of methods of studying elites in a foreign country. When Professor Javier Conde, Director of the Institute of Political Studies, a para-governmental research agency, also connected with the University of Madrid, visited America, he and Mr. de Grazia again conferred on the possibilities of extending modern social science studies to Spain. At the same time, Mr. de Grazia and Mr. Lins met and discussed their mutual interests in political sociology and the feasibility of a field project in Spain. Mr. Lins has been working with Professor Lipset on the Political Behavior Inventory at Columbia and the Center for Advanced Studies (and now at Berkeley); he consequently has an unusually thorough acquaintance with the published and unpublished comparative empirical research on European as well as American political systems. Both men, then, were on the alert for a chance to join forces on a Spanish study and believed that the new SSRC program represented the opportunity being sought. They feel the moment is right for a study of the Spanish authoritarian regime, that they have excellent sources of cooperation and support in Spain, and that the Spanish situation is sufficiently liberalized at this time to permit the fairly extensive intrusions that their scholarly investigations of the Spanish scene would require.

C.

a) Alfred de Grazia is Associate Professor of Political Science and Research Associate in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University. He taught previously at Brown University and the University of Minnesota. During World War II he was engaged in psychological warfare in North Africa and Europe, and visited Europe before the War and in 1954, spending a week in Spain on the latter occasion. His work with research groups involved him with the Laboratory for Research in Social Relations at the University of Minnesota, the Political Behavior Research Committee of the SSRC, the Field Research Center of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University, and the Committee for Research in Social Sciences at Stanford University. He has been consultant on communications research to the army and the USA.

b) Juan Lins is a citizen of Spain, who has travelled extensively in Western Europe. He studied principally in Spain before coming to America and was Professor Ayudante in Teoria de la Sociedad on the Law faculty at the University of Madrid from 1947-50. In 1948-49 he was a research fellow in the Instituto Nacional de Estudios Juridicos and from 1948-50 also on the staff of the Instituto de Estudios Politicos, doing legislative reference work. He has studied at Columbia University under a Spanish government scholarship and a Columbia University scholarship, and has there completed his doctoral work with the exception of his dissertation on the social bases of political parties in West Germany, which he is now finishing. He worked briefly with Professor Hofstadter on the program of research into academic freedom, and for the past two years with Professor Lipset on the "Inventory of Propositions about Political Behavior." He is presently Research Assistant at the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Berkeley, where he is working on the Inventory and on a research project with Professor Bandix concerning middle-class ideology in Germany during the Industrial Revolution. He is scheduled to lecture in the Department of Sociology at Berkeley in the Spring.

D.

a) Alfred de Gracia is author of Public and Republic, The Elements of Political Science, The Western Public, and various articles in professional journals. He edited and translated Roberto Michels' First Lectures in Political Sociology. He also wrote A Comparative Survey of European-American Political Behavior (Mimeo., Committee for Research in Social Sciences, Stanford), and, with the assistance of others, Elites Target Analysis, a manual of methods of studying foreign leadership (USIA, mimeo.) and Target Analysis and Media in Propaganda to Audiences Abroad (ORO, multilithed). Copies of these can be loaned to the Committee on Request.

b) Juan Lins has published book reviews and translations of materials from the German in the Revista de Estudios Politicos. He is co-author of "The Psychology of Voting," in G. Lindzey, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology, and "The Social Basis of Democratic Politics," with S. M. Lipset, the first volume of a study to be published in the near future.