palgrave▸pivot

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE SPANISH TRANSITION

Building Citizenship in Parishes, Neighbourhoods, Schools and the Countryside

Tamar Groves
Nigel Townson
Inbal Ofer
Antonio Herrera

Palgrave Studies in the History of Social Movements

Around the world, social movements have become legitimate, yet contested, actors in local, national and global politics and civil society, yet we still know relatively little about their longer histories and the trajectories of their development. This series seeks to promote innovative historical research on the history of social movements in the modern period since around 1750. We bring together conceptually-informed studies that analyse labour movements, new social movements and other forms of protest from early modernity to the present. We conceive of 'social movements' in the broadest possible sense, encompassing social formations that lie between formal organisations and mere protest events. We also offer a home for studies that systematically explore the political, social, economic and cultural conditions in which social movements can emerge. We are especially interested in transnational and global perspectives on the history of social movements, and in studies that engage critically and creatively with political, social and sociological theories in order to make historically grounded arguments about social movements. This new series seeks to offer innovative historical work on social movements, while also helping to historicise the concept of 'social movement'. It hopes to revitalise the conversation between historians and historical sociologists in analysing what Charles Tilly has called the 'dynamics of contention'.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/14580

Tamar Groves · Nigel Townson
Inbal Ofer · Antonio Herrera

Social Movements and the Spanish Transition

Building Citizenship in Parishes, Neighbourhoods,
Schools and the Countryside

palgrave
macmillan

Tamar Groves
Science Education Department
Universidad de Extremadura
Cáceres, Spain

Nigel Townson
Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Madrid, Spain

Inbal Ofer
Department of History, Philosophy
    and Judaic Studies
The Open University of Israel
Raanana, Israel

Antonio Herrera
Department of Geography, History
    and Philosophy
Universidad Pablo de Olavide
Sevilla, Spain

Cover illustration: Pattern adapted from an Indian cotton print produced in the 19th century

Printed on acid-free paper

FOREWORD

Scholars have traditionally approached the social movements of the late Franco dictatorship and the subsequent transition to democracy in terms of the forces that made up the mainstream political opposition: the workers, students and regional nationalists. Over the last decade, however, scholars have identified and researched very different types of social movements. Many of these, notably the neighbourhood associations, represented a response to the everyday challenges thrown up by the helter-skelter modernization that engulfed Spain in the 1960s and 1970s. Some were also influenced by transnational phenomena, as in the case of the Catholic community, which was galvanised by the Second Vatican Council of 1962–65. Some were moved by vocational concerns, such as the teachers in the State sector, while in the rural areas, protest arose in response to a desire for transparency in relation to state subventions and the workings of local government. Yet all of these movements shared the common goal of fighting for a democratic citizenship. Consequently, the *raison d'être* of this extensively-researched study is to explore four different social movements—the Catholics, the teachers, the neighbourhood and the rural activists—which have received little attention so far, but which, along with the political opposition, did much to shape the transition in Spain from dictatorship to democracy.

What is striking to an historian of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries such as myself, are the divergences between the social movements that ushered in Spain's second democracy, that of the Transition of 1975–1982, and those of its first, the Second Republic of 1931–1939. The dominant left-wing movements of the 1930s were the anarcho-syndicalists,

the socialists and, during the Civil War (1936–1939), the communists, all of which supported revolutionary programmes designed to supplant reformist 'bourgeois' politics. Unlike the great majority of the movements of the late Franco era and the Transition, those of the 1930s largely disdained the politics of inclusion, compromise and integration—as opposed to those of ideological dogma, 'revolutionary' violence, and exclusion. As a result, their participation in reformist projects rooted in negotiation and consensus-building, and drawing on different social and political forces, was limited. Further, the revolutionary movements of the Republic did not grasp that the most important objective was not so much to change the social and economic structures, as to open the political system to popular participation. Only during the Civil War did they finally acquire what I would term a 'political' conscience. It was a lesson derived from the destructive and divisive revolutionary experience of 1936, which proved to be a devastating setback to the cause of the Republic in its fight against the insurgents.

By contrast, the movements of the 1960s and 1970s generally pursued reformist goals by means of peaceful, transactional change, even though many of them sought to establish a regime that was more radical in democratic terms than the executive-led parliamentary regime which eventually emerged. *Taking Citizenship Personally* thereby reveals that it was not just the political opposition that struggled for a democratic citizenship in Spain, but also the unheralded grassroots activists brought vividly to life in this study.

Vielha e Mijaran, Spain   José Álvarez Junco

SERIES EDITOR PREFACE

Around the world, social movements have become legitimate, yet contested, actors in local, national and global politics and civil society, yet we still know relatively little about their longer histories and the trajectories of their development. Our series reacts to what can be described as a recent boom in the history of social movements. We can observe a development from the crisis of labour history in the 1980s to the boom in research on social movements in the 2000s. The rise of historical interests in the development of civil society and the role of strong civil societies, as well as non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in stabilising democratically constituted polities, has strengthened interest in social movements as a constituent element of civil societies.

In different parts of the world, social movements continue to have a strong influence on contemporary politics. In Latin America, trade unions, labour parties and various left-of-centre civil society organisations have succeeded in supporting left-of-centre governments. In Europe, peace movements, ecological movements and alliances intent on campaigning against poverty and racial discrimination as well as discrimination on the basis of gender and sexual orientation have been able to set important political agendas for decades. In other parts of the world, including Africa, India and South East Asia, social movements have played a significant role in various forms of community building and community politics. The contemporary political relevance of social movements has undoubtedly contributed to a growing historical interest in the topic.

Contemporary historians are not only beginning to historicise these relatively recent political developments; they are also trying to relate them

to a longer history of social movements, including traditional labour organisations, such as working-class parties and trade unions. In the *longue durée,* we recognise that social movements are, by no means, a recent phenomenon and are not even an exclusively modern phenomenon, although we realise that the onset of modernity emanating from Europe and North America across the wider world from the eighteenth century onwards marks an important departure point for the development of civil societies and social movements.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the dominance of national history over all other forms of history writing led to a thorough nationalisation of the historical sciences. Hence social movements have been examined traditionally within the framework of the nation state. Only during the last two decades have historians begun to question the validity of such methodological nationalism and to explore the development of social movements in a comparative, connective and transnational perspective taking into account processes of transfer, reception and adaptation. Whilst our book series does not preclude work that is still being carried out within national frameworks (for, clearly, there is a place for such studies, given the historical importance of the nation state in history), it hopes to encourage comparative and transnational histories on social movements.

At the same time as historians have begun to research the history of those movements, a range of social theorists, from Jürgen Habermas to Pierre Bourdieu, and from Slavoj Žižek to Alain Badiou, as well as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe to Miguel Abensour, to name but a few, have attempted to provide philosophical-cum-theoretical frameworks in which to place and contextualise the development of social movements. History has arguably been the most empirical of all the social and human sciences, but it will be necessary for historians to explore further to what extent these social theories can be helpful in guiding and framing the empirical work of the historian in making sense of the historical development of social movements. Hence, the current series is also hoping to make a contribution to the ongoing dialogue between social theory and the history of social movements.

This series seeks to promote innovative historical research on the history of social movements in the modern period since around 1750. We bring together conceptually-informed studies that analyse labour movements, new social movements and other forms of protest from early modernity to the present. With this series, we seek to revive, within the context of historiographical developments since the 1970s, a conversation between

historians, on the one hand, and sociologists, anthropologists and political scientists on the other.

Unlike most of the concepts and theories developed by social scientists, we do not see social movements as directly linked, a priori, to processes of social and cultural change and therefore do not adhere to a view that distinguishes between old (labour) and new (middle-class) social movements. Instead, we want to establish the concept 'social movement' as a heuristic device that allows historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to investigate social and political protests in novel settings. Our aim is to historicise notions of social and political activism in order to highlight different notions of political and social protest on both left and right.

Hence, we conceive of 'social movements' in the broadest possible sense: encompassing social formations that lie between formal organisations and mere protest events. But we also include processes of social and cultural change more generally in our understanding of social movements; this goes back to nineteenth-century understandings of 'social movement' as processes of social and cultural change more generally. We also offer a home for studies that systematically explore the political, social, economic and cultural conditions in which social movements can emerge. We are especially interested in transnational and global perspectives on the history of social movements, and in studies that engage critically and creatively with political, social and sociological theories in order to make historically grounded arguments about social movements. In short, this series seeks to offer innovative historical work on social movements, while also helping to historicise the concept of 'social movement'. It also hopes to revitalise the conversation between historians and historical sociologists in analysing what Charles Tilly has called the 'dynamics of contention'.

By focusing in on a well-known episode of contention in Spain and taking social activism seriously, *Social Movements and Spain's Transition* makes an important contribution not only to the debate on Spain's transition to democracy; it also offers conceptual insights on similar phenomena elsewhere. In this short primer, Tamar Groves, Nigel Townson, Inbal Ofer and Antonio Herrera critically discuss the question of the passivity of the Spanish population during the Spanish transition to democracy from the late 1960s into the early 1980s. They position their work between those who argue that it was precisely the lack of grassroots civil activism that allowed for a relatively smooth and negotiated transition at the level of the central Spanish state, and bottom-up approaches which claim that it was

the growth of civic activism already under the Franco dictatorship that enabled this transition. They focus on four case studies (some of them neglected in most current scholarship) and examine their impact on the transition to democracy: Catholic civic activism, neighbourhood associations, teachers' movements, and civic activism in the countryside.

These case studies allow the authors to shed explanatory light on two processes that are often viewed in isolation from each other: 'the pressures exerted by social protest on the process of negotiation between the elites' and the local embeddedness of civic activism that 'created spaces independent from the state where alternative practices and ideas were forged'. These spaces, they argue, 'fomented democratic learning by facilitating citizens' engagement in deliberation, association and collective actions'. Through this conceptual move, the authors are able to bring out a key paradox: the vibrancy of social activism and its local relevance on the one hand and the relative lack of sustained impact of social activism at the national level. More broadly, therefore, they bring out 'the tensions between [movements'] perception of democratic citizenship and the version of it that was finally adopted by the state'. In doing so, Groves, Townson, Ofer and Herrera innovatively connect research on transitions to democracy and social movement scholarship. This is a fruitful connection that we hope will influence scholarship for other cases of democratic transition in a global context as well.

Bochum, Germany	Stefan Berger
Stirling, UK	Holger Nehring

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Tamar Groves is a Senior Lecturer at Extremadura University. She is the author of *Teachers and the Struggle to Democracy in Spain*, as well as articles in leading journals such as the *Journal of Social History, History of Education, European History Quarterly*, etc. She has edited works on citizenship, teacher training and Spanish history. Her areas of research include Women and Higher Education, Social Transformation in Conflict Settings and Transnational Education.

Nigel Townson is a Senior Lecturer at the Complutense University of Madrid. He is the author of the award-winning *The Crisis of Democracy in Spain: Centrist Politics under the Second Republic, 1931–1936* and editor of numerous works, including *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959–1975 and Is Spain Different? A Comparative Look at the XIX and XX Centuries.*

Inbal Ofer is a Senior Lecturer in Modern European History at the Open University of Israel. She specializes in twentieth-century Spanish History. Her work focuses on issues of migration and urban history, gender and political mobilization. She has recently published *Claiming the City and Contesting the State*. (Routledge, 2017)

Antonio Herrera is Associate Professor in Contemporary History at Universidad Pablo de Olavide (Seville, Spain), Visiting Scholar at LSE and

the University of Pittsburgh and the author of books and articles about peasant conflicts in Spain. His field of study is rural social history and he has analysed the role of peasants in democratization processes. He is currently leading a research project on Social Movements and Democracy in the Spanish Countryside.

List of Tables

Citizenship and Democracy in the Spanish Countryside

Introduction

Abstract The introduction looks at contemporary debates concerning the Spanish transition to democracy and how they evolved in the last decades. It explores the historiographical and theoretical challenges related to the inclusion of civic movements in the explanation of the process of democratisation. It presents the implications of new social movements and prefigurative politics literature to the Spanish case, attempting to overcome the traditional "bottom up-to down" debate. It also examines the concept of citizenship that emerged in Spain in those years that was not necessarily associated with liberal, representative democracy, but with a more participative model that maintained vertical interactions with the State as well as horizontal ones with other citizens through the professional, spiritual or communal spaces of everyday life.

Keywords Spanish transition to democracy · Citizenship · Social movements

Passive witnesses or active citizens? The role of civic participation in the democratisation of the Spanish dictatorship is still a hotly debated issue. It is at the heart of a clash of interpretations between researchers who emphasise the importance of the consensual pact reached by politicians "from the top down" and those who look at the pressures exercised by civil society, in general, and social movements, in particular, "from the bottom up". While, in the 1990s, the first posture clearly dominated academic

research[1]; from the beginning of the Twenty-First-Century onwards, the focus on political leaders and institutions was supplemented by contributions on different civic initiatives and collective actions.[2] Many specialists came to agree that as political elites do not act in a vacuum, social protest and activities influenced the process, and that "top-down" and "bottom-up" are actually different dimensions of the same phenomenon.[3] In addition, although historians were already investigating social mobilisation, the economic and political crisis at the end of the first decade of the Twenty-First-Century gave this issue special resonance, as public debate was sparked by the question of the quality of Spanish democracy.

In any case, a multifactorial explanation of the Spanish transition to democracy gradually gained dominance as other aspects were also included, such as the favourable geo-political conditions and the dynamic civil society that emerged in Spain during the 1960s. Reconciling the "top-down" and "bottom-up" explanations led researchers to examine the interactions between the political crafting of the small circle of leaders and the popular expressions of protest during the crucial years of the transition. They showed how, with the dictator's death in November 1975, and the passing of the democratic constitution in December 1978, the waves of social protest and the voting patterns of the public forced the negotiators to renounce their own agendas in favour of a moderate consensus.[4] Although, previously, the agreement that underpinned the Spanish transition to democracy was presented as a premeditated plan of the national political leaders, executed behind closed doors, it thereby became clear that it was actually a chaotic sequence of actions in which all actors had to adapt their postures in order to defend their interests.

The authors of this book accept the complexity and density of the factors which contributed to a relatively swift transformation from a dictatorial regime to a democratic state. We are also conscious of the fact that contemporary interpretations of the process are often strongly shaped by current political disputes. Generally speaking, the Spanish public is still proud of this episode in its history, although it has recently become fashionable to attribute to it the shortcomings of Spanish democracy today. Nevertheless, we feel there is a need to tackle the historiographical and theoretical challenges related to the inclusion of civic movements in an explanation of the process of democratisation.

Research focusing on the Spanish model of elite settlement implies, and sometimes explicitly declares, that the successors of the dictatorship managed to reach an agreement with the representatives of the illegal political

parties, due, among other factors, to the passivity of the Spanish populace.[5] That is to say, that the lack of social mobilisation freed the elite from popular pressures and facilitated the negotiation. This affirmation regarding civic passivity is supported by statistics regarding the low percentages of what can be classified as purely political collective actions such as political demonstrations, and the relatively low membership of unions and political parties. There are even researchers who have declared that the example of Spain proves that civil society is not relevant to processes of democratisation.[6]

In contrast to this data, we find convincing evidence that Spanish society in the 1970s was far from passive.[7] The research on the workers' movement shows that, in addition to continuous labour-related conflicts, an illegal network of representatives emerged whose members penetrated the state-controlled official union, effectively bringing about its disintegration.[8] Residents of the rapidly expanding cities organised and initiated collective actions in order to solve problems relating to their daily lives, such as deficient infrastructures or lack of basic services. The protests which emerged in Spanish cities in the 1970s are, in fact, considered by specialists to be the most dynamic urban movement in Europe at the time.[9] These struggles may not fall into the strict category of political protest—a fact which has been used to downplay social mobilisation during the transition. Nevertheless, as they emerged and developed in a political context in which overt criticism and collective actions were monitored and punishable, they had clear political implications. The protests that were characteristic of Spanish universities at the time were visibly more political, as students openly demanded basic civil rights and overthrow of the dictatorship.[10] The fact that the students' continuous protests did not directly endanger the stability of the regime has been taken, by some, to mean that it was irrelevant. Nevertheless, their inability to destabilise the regime does not mean that their collective actions did not have social and political implications. On the contrary, there is general agreement that a subculture of dissidence emerged in the campuses, affecting broad sectors of society.[11] One of the important knock-on effects was that, after finishing their studies, students involved in protests continued to engage in such activities, as is clearly shown by the examples of lawyers, architects, teachers and doctors.[12] With regards to evaluating associational life in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s, it has been suggested that one should concentrate not

on the absolute numbers, but on their spectacular growth and vibrancy in comparison to previous decades.[13]

Thus, research on these kinds of phenomena has been integrated into the narrative of the transition, producing, as a result, two new paradigms. The first, as we have seen, sheds light on the pressures exerted by social protest on the process of negotiation between the elites. While recognising not only their mere existence, but also their importance, this new paradigm still leaves the main focus on the elites. The second paradigm, based mainly on local research into a wide variety of associations, mobilisations and protest actions demonstrates the extent of social mobilisation, claiming that these initiatives created spaces independent from the state where alternative practices and ideas were forged. In some cases, it is claimed that these spaces fomented democratic learning by facilitating citizens' engagement in deliberation, association and collective actions. The contribution of social mobilisation, according to this view, is not so much due to its direct influence on the negotiation at the elite level, but due to the creation of a civil society that provided Spain with a democratic citizenship that could sustain the formal political arrangements achieved by the politicians. However, the nature of the democracy which emerged in these processes has not been explored hitherto. It has been assumed that the appearance of social movements was another sign of the recovery of civil society in Spain, and that this fact was sufficient to explain their importance. Their particular dynamics interrelated with other movements, while their real-world experiences of democratic citizenship were mainly obscured. Nevertheless, there have recently been indications of the gap that existed between the experiences and aspirations of many civic initiatives and the limited role the new democratic state assigned to its citizens. The primary goal of this book is to re-examine social mobilisation during the Spanish transition in order to discuss the complex interaction between social movements and democratisation. The detailed analysis of four specific struggles in this volume serves to elucidate their impact on particular political procedures and the development of shared notions of citizenship across different social groups. At the same time, it highlights their weakness with regards to national politics and the tensions between their perception of democratic citizenship and the version that was finally adopted by the state.

The Cycle of Social Protest
and Its Significant Margins

A new wave of social protest under the Franco regime emerged in the late 1950s. While, at this early stage, protests were short lived and isolated, they symbolised the beginning of a new cycle of mobilisation that expanded gradually and reached its apogee in the 1970s, before decreasing during the 1980s. This cycle of mobilisation was initially led by the workers grouped within the semi-clandestine trade union, "the Workers' Commissions".[14] Industrial workers in the big cities were a prominent actor in these early conflicts, although labour conflicts also emerged in rural areas and in the mines of the north.[15] These conflicts were mostly framed in classical class terms and revolved around the struggle for better wages and working conditions. Much of the research on social movements under the Franco regime, and during the transition to democracy, focuses on the labour movement, as it posed the greatest threat to the stability of the dictatorship.

Another leading source of social mobilisation in the 1960s and 1970s, which has attracted the attention of researchers, was the universities. Even in the second half of the 1950s, we find signs of students protest, but from the mid-1960s onwards, Spanish universities became arenas of continuous conflict. Middle-class students forced the regime to dissolve its own student organisation, with alternative, non-regime ones taking its place. However, the students were unable to make use of this opportunity very efficiently, and their protests were characterised by fragmentation.[16]

The third important kind of social movement under the dictatorship, which has also been widely studied, was regional nationalism. In keeping with the dictatorship's centralising policy, the autonomous political systems of Catalonia and the Basque Country were suppressed, and any public display of signs of regional identity—in particular, the use of local languages—was banned. Nevertheless, from the 1950s onwards, civic, artistic, educational and sporting organisations did much to foment a specifically Catalan identity. In the Basque Country, there were similar initiatives, though less extensive, and the terrorist group ETA became the symbol of regional nationalism.[17] The regional movements were complex networks of a wide variety of initiatives ranging from popular culture to political parties. They were able to unite very different political tendencies and became prominent actors during the transition to democracy.[18]

These were the most important social movements under the dictatorship. They contributed to its destabilisation and pressured Franco's successors to move towards liberalisation. Nevertheless, the authors of this book maintain that social mobilisation ran much deeper than is usually acknowledged. The initial phase of worker mobilisation provided a model for other sectors of Spanish society. As the workers were the best organised and most visible group to mobilise under the Franco regime, their class discourse shaped many of the other groups' collective actions, even among the middle classes.[19] However, as the circle expanded, new notions and collective actions were integrated into the conflict, making it a much more complex struggle.

In the later stage of the cycle of social mobilisation, the initiatives of neighbours, housewives and the young came to be labelled the Citizens' Movement. It was a powerful, primarily urban, social movement. However, we believe that it was part of a much wider and more diverse phenomenon, including many groups which have, thus far, been studied separately: a great variety of professional and civic associations and various pressure groups, in both urban and rural areas. While all these bodies strove to bring about political change, many of them were not directly affiliated with the parties of the clandestine opposition, such as the Spanish Socialist Party or the Spanish Communist Party.

The political opposition was certainly present in many, if not most, foci of social mobilisation, not only in the big metropolises but also in the provinces. Nevertheless, it was only part of the story of the social movements at the time. While the clandestine political activists were an especially important element, the impressive feature of social mobilisation during the transition was its diversity across much broader sectors and groups. Since the transition to democracy, research on the resistance to the Franco regime and democratisation has focused mainly on the clandestine political parties and the initiatives of their militants in wider social circles. Due to this kind of research, the mere existence of social and political mobilisation was recognised and accepted as part of the narrative of the transition. At the same time, this research obscured the variety of civic activities, social organisations and political ideas which existed alongside the political activists. The authors of this book maintain that the concepts of democracy and citizenship, which were forged and acted upon among the various movements, initiatives and associations, were not only the result of the actions of the clandestine political parties, but also of other kinds of much less well-known movements and social convictions. These did not find a

place in the political arrangements that emerged from the process of democratisation, and were thus doomed to oblivion.

In order to explore the nature of citizenship that was forged during the period of conflict and mobilisation that characterised Spain from the late 1950s until the late 1980s, this book offers a two-pronged exploration of social movements at the time. On the one hand, it provides a detailed analysis of four very different cases of social mobilisation: among Catholics, residents, farmers and teachers. It discerns processes of organisation, repertoires of action, collective meaning, and interactions with communities and local political actors. On the other hand, it reflects on how the fight over specific issues and the use of similar tactics generated shared interpretations of what it meant to be a citizen in a democracy.

Among the four movements, the best-known case is that of the Catholics. In fact, the distancing of many sectors of the Catholic Church from the Franco regime is considered a crucial factor in the gradual process of delegitimisation of the dictatorship. Research on the Church shows that, as early as the 1950s, there were sectors which took advantage of its relative autonomy to level criticism at the regime. However, these organised initiatives were dismantled, and the process of official disengagement from the regime took place much later. The presence of Catholic activists in labour conflicts and students' protests is also a recurrent theme. Nevertheless, there is very little research on rank-and-file Catholic activists which looks at their community-based efforts to reconstruct civil society and to develop a democratic citizenship, thereby transforming the relationship between society and the state. This book, therefore, opens with the case of non-conformist Catholics, as their activities emerged during the early stages of the cycle of mobilisation. Moreover, they reappear in all of the other cases, playing an important role, in the worker, student, and regional nationalist movements.

Our second case study deals with neighbourhood associations, which are, perhaps, the most clearly identified with what came to be known as the Citizens' Movement. In the late Franco period, and especially during the years of the transition to democracy, neighbourhood associations fought to improve urban infrastructure and services. These struggles are considered, to a certain degree, to be an extension of the labour conflicts into residential areas. They are used to show the extension of social mobilisation from the factories to broader social circles. They are also interpreted as a vehicle for dealing with the crisis of migration from the rural areas into the big cities. The chapter in this book, though, focuses on how urban issues

shaped wider views with regard to the relationship between the residents and the authorities, and their implications for the idea of democracy.

The third case deals with teachers whose activism and vocational identity, similar to that of nonconformist Catholics, albeit in the later stages of the cycle of conflict, made their presence felt in both rural and urban communities. The teachers' mobilisation was neither as extensive, nor as visible, as the more prominent examples of students, workers or even residents. As a result, it is little known to researchers and is not considered especially important. However, it was familiar in the education system at the time, and as the chapter shows, the fact that a professional group mainly employed by the state was actively fighting for new professional procedures had a clear impact on civic perceptions of such a crucial social service.

The fourth case study focuses on rural areas and explores the emergence of the Citizens' Movement outside the urban context. This last case study looks at the later stages of mobilisation, after the new democratic state had been created. There has been less research done on this topic, and it is not considered crucial in the transformation of Spain. However, as this chapter shows, most of Spain was still rural during the transition, and the processes of negotiating the new meaning of democracy were also unfolding in the smallest villages.

The choice of these specific movements as case studies stems from the authors' desire for this book to contribute to the re-examination of the Spanish transition. It does so by reflecting on four cases that are not traditionally associated with mainstream political resistance to the Franco regime (the workers' movement, the student unions, and the regional nationalists). By analysing four cases on the margins of the political opposition, we underline the fact that the processes of citizenship-building were prevalent in Spanish society at the time. Thus, the volume makes a very strong case in favour of interpretations of the Spanish transition to democracy which attribute its success to broad socio-economic processes and social mobilisation, and less to top-down political deal-making. While many studies reveal the activism of certain sectors of Spanish society, this book represents one of the first attempts to address how everyday concerns were transformed by mobilisation into perceptions of democracy in four distinct social contexts. We discuss the limited effect of the movement at the national level at the time, but also show that it changed professional and municipal practices in ways which are still relevant for Spanish democracy today.

The Networked Nature of Social Mobilisation

The prolonged cycle of social mobilisation under the dictatorship had clear national triggers. The opening up of the economy in the late 1950s led to far-reaching social change. The regime responded by attempting to channel and control the process through reform. The new laws governing areas, such as labour relations (1958), civil society organisations (1964), the media (1966) and education (1970) are obvious examples of this. While the regime continued persecuting those who demonstrated political dissent, a range of new opportunities[20] emerged as a result of economic growth, social modernisation, and the attempts to integrate Spain into regional and international organisations. The growing tension between the rigid political structure and a dynamic consumer society became more obvious, as social mobilisation expanded from the traditional foci of conflict—the factories and the universities—and reached neighbourhoods, women's and consumers' associations, professional sectors, artists and other groups of the middle classes. The mobilisation also expanded to the big urban centres, the provincial capitals and the rural communities.

As this book clearly shows, each and every one of these manifestations of unrest had its own dynamics. In the first case discussed, Catholic non-conformist priests, embedded in faith-grounded networks, took it upon themselves to redefine their role in society by empowering their parishes to engage in participative democracy, thus introducing new forms of citizen–state relations. In the second case—that of the residents of a Madrid neighbourhood—the struggle against forced eviction evolved into a campaign to participate in the process of urban planning. The Spanish teachers' campaign is the third case included in this book. In this case, an effort to improve the working conditions of teachers in schools turned into a professional agenda with clear implications for citizens' rights and obligations. Lastly, in the study that completes the book, in the rural areas of Andalusia, the fight for employment and unemployment subsidies became a call for the fair distribution of resources and transparent decision-making. Even though these movements were fighting for different goals, in all of them we can detect a common alternative democratic agenda based on civic participation in decision-making processes at all levels.

While paying close attention to the peculiarities of each of these struggles, one of the important contributions of this volume is its attempt to place them within their wider national and international contexts, highlighting both their distinct trajectories and their common traits with

regard to a broader range of social movements. Generally speaking, we witness few attempts to systematically analyse popular mobilisation during the transition as a single, complex phenomenon.[21] There is a tendency to study them in isolation and merely list them. This is a result of the nature of academic research, which tends to focus on specific groups as part of the process of defining the object of research. It is also partially the consequence of the perceptions of the social actors at the time. While most movements tended to identify themselves as part of a wider struggle for democracy, their collective identities were mainly tied to their own struggles. Collaborators belonging to the closest circles of mobilisation were identified as allies, so we find declared bonds between residents and professionals, or between priests and farmers, for example. Nevertheless, these social actors did not have a panoramic view enabling them to appreciate the complexity and interconnectedness of the network of protests. "…the interaction processes through which actors with different identities and orientations come to elaborate a shared system of beliefs and a sense of belonging, which exceeds the boundaries of any single group or organisation, while maintaining at the same time their specificity and distinctive traits".[22] In fact, this network worked on various levels, across areas, cities, regions, the Spanish state, and even beyond its borders.

Another important claim of this book, therefore, is that the expansion of social conflict in the mid-1970s implied a process of transformation that obliges us to analyse it not only with regard to the national structure of opportunities, but also in relation to the global cycle of mobilisation which commenced in the late 1960s. The class discourse that characterised the initial phase of social mobilisation in Spain was modified by practices and concepts identified by the new social movements (NSM) theory as symbolising the emergence of a new style of social movement.

In line with much of the literature on new social movements, this book demonstrates that popular social mobilisation during the transition operated as a network whose different "command centres" shared similar discourses regarding the desired meaning of citizenship, and engaged in common practices of communication and decision-making. While many of the movement's leading activists belonged to the working class, or identified with it, most were not members of the Spanish workers' movement. This did not prevent the different movements from presenting similar demands regarding the need for the distribution of communal and national assets. At the same time, these demands were not formulated in conventional class terms. Another famous claim associated with NSM theory

relates to the cultural democratisation of daily life[23]: everyday life as a centre of mobilisation, instead of the classical contentious dynamics identified with 'old' social movements. The four cases included in this book show how struggles related to attaining basic services and to redefining vocational roles in society involved the forging of new cultural identities with political implications closely tied to everyday experiences. This was partly a result of the fact that the civic and professional associations involved presented a mixed class profile and partly due to the effort to "democratise democracy" in new ways. These efforts clearly demonstrate the relationships between the social movements in Spain and in other parts of the world, where, from the late 1960s onward, many social initiatives expressed strong nonconformity with constitutional and liberal democracy.

This political commitment is related to another important feature identified by NSM theory. It has to do with a general critical posture towards the existing social order and politics, and the conviction that representative democracy should be substituted with more participative models.[24] As this book shows, despite the authoritarian nature of the Franco regime, this posture can also be traced to 1970s Spain. Common to the diverse projects that were promoted by many sectors of the movement was the call for a more egalitarian and transparent relationship between civil society and the state.

Transformative Movements, Citizenship and Democracy

The analysis of how farmers, Catholics, teachers and local residents perceived democracy and attached meaning to a concept of citizenship that was derived directly from daily experience also contributes to current debates on citizenship. Citizenship is presently understood both as a set of rights and obligations (civic, political and social) and as a set of practices (cultural, symbolic and economic).[25] These two understandings are obviously not mutually exclusive: in fact, they are inter-related and influence each other continuously. Citizens' rights and obligations shape and limit their actions, and these actions can extend and enhance these rights and obligations. In addition, people act in accordance with these two perceptions of citizenship, assigning new meanings to the term through their own initiatives, or demanding that the state acknowledge what they consider to be their rights. In this book, we argue that social mobilisation functioned as

an arena in which the meaning of democracy and citizenship was discussed in relation to everyday interests, and then acted upon. While there were groups, especially among political activists, which were debating democracy as a future common project for Spain,[26] in many cases, the concrete and the immediate had more weight than long-term political thinking. We believe that both processes contributed to the transformation of Spain's political system. Nevertheless, as the less institutionalised form of negotiation has been less analysed, we look at how the local ramifications of understanding and practising social citizenship related to imagining, perceiving and locating the state in people's everyday lives.[27] Very often, these notions evolved eventually into wider, common projects for society, interacting with ideas from political parties and unions. This occurred on different scales, from local to regional to national, and sometimes even had global implications.

In addition, we believe that these four cases represent both a unique situation in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s and a wider change in the understanding of the nature of citizenship. The new social movements no longer viewed the state as the sole addressee of their demands. These movements addressed a variety of locally based institutions as well as those operating "above" or beyond the boundaries of the nation-state.[28] We therefore witness a process in which activism within specific professional, geographical and legal contexts reshaped the relationship between citizens, their communities and the state.[29] In Spain, this process first began to take shape under the Franco dictatorship. The demand for democratisation was a clear characteristic of this cycle of mobilisation. However, the concept of citizenship that emerged was not necessarily associated with liberal, representative democracy, but with a more participative model that maintained vertical interactions with the state as well as horizontal ones with other citizens through the professional, spiritual or communal spaces of everyday life.

As can be appreciated in the four case studies, we can detect in all of them different levels of what has become known as prefigurative politics.[30] That is, the attempt to establish alternative social relations in the present as part of the ongoing struggle. In some cases, it formed part of the protest as a result of the organisation of open and horizontal assemblies; in some, it involved the direct participation of citizens in influencing the policies that concerned them; and in others it was expressed through the demands of a community of residents or believers. These were all seen as more "democratic" than a representation-based system. In this sense, many of

the groups adopted a much more radical vision of democracy, based on participative citizenship in contrast to the party-based model negotiated by the politicians. In any case, it constituted both the means and the ends of the protest: a type of mobilisation that is also known as transformative.[31] The participants embody in their own organisation and lifestyle the political vision they are trying to make a reality. These tendencies were not hegemonic in the social mobilisation we are examining, as there was a mixture of various political stances, including liberal conservatives, Christian-democrats, socialists and communists, among others. Still, the palpable presence of these ideas among the many sectors which participated in these collective endeavours is surprising. The four cases dealt with in the book were certainly limited efforts to change the immediate social and political reality, but looking at them together reveals the extent of their shared ideas, the impact of their struggle, and their inability to find a place in the new democratic order.

There are many discussions about which parameters can be used to quantify the quality of democracy. It has become clear in recent years that beyond the existence of elections and the country's Gross Domestic Product, something more should be taken into account. There appears to be a certain degree of consensus around the idea that the quality of democracy is linked to the involvement of civil society in public affairs. As stated by Erik Olin Wright, democracy does not depend on the balance between the three spheres on which our modern-day societies rest—civil society, the (capitalist) market and the state—but rather on the capacity of the latter two to serve the former (civil society).[32] This requires the development of a series of participative mechanisms that are linked to the very process of building a democracy. In all the cases examined in this book, we can clearly see their contribution to citizen empowerment and a commitment to public affairs. Nevertheless, as the final result of the transition to democracy in Spain was very similar to the constitutional democracies characteristic of Western Europe, Spanish democracy fell short of the alternative, horizontal and communal ideals that these movements embodied. The obstruction of their political projects led to the alienation of large sectors from the new democratic state. This dissatisfaction, fed by wider transnational social movements, is clearly identifiable in the wave of protest since 2011 against the Spanish party-based democratic system.

This book, then, presents the Spanish transition to democracy as a struggle over different visions of democracy: visions that enjoyed undeniable support within the Spanish society of the 1970s, but whose

fundamental ideas were suppressed during the following two decades. These visions were parallel to that of a constitutional parliamentary democracy, though they did sometimes shape specific policies. Still, in general terms, not only were they denied any space at the national political level, but their very history was also questioned.

NOTES

1. For a critical review of this kind of historiography, see: Manuel Ortiz Heras, "Historiografía de la Transición," in *La transición a la democracia en España* (Guadalajara: Asociación de Amigos del Archivo Histórico Provincial, 2004).
2. There are examples of authors who spoke about the importance of both processes from an early stage. For example: José María Maravall, *Dictadura y disentimiento político: obreros y estudiantes bajo el franquismo* (Madrid: Ediciones Alfaguara, 1978); Joe Foweraker, *Making Democracy in Spain: Grass-roots Struggle in the South, 1955–1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Víctor Pérez Díaz, *The return of civil society: The emergence of democratic Spain* (Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press, 1993); Carme Molinero and Pere Ysàs, *Productores disciplinados y minorías subversivas. Clase obrera y conflictividad laboral en la España franquista* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1998).
3. Diego Muro and Gregorio Alonso, eds. *The politics and memory of democratic transition: the Spanish model* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
4. Santos Juliá, "En torno a los proyectos de Transición y sus imprevistos resultados," in *La Transición, treinta años después. De la dictadura a la instauración y consolidación de la democracia,* ed. Carme Molinero (Barcelona: Península, 2006), 59–80; Manuel Ortiz Heras, José Antonio Castellanos López, and Oscar Martín García, "Historia social y política para una transición. El cambio desde abajo y la construcción de una nueva autonomía: Castilla-La Mancha," *Historia Actual Online* 14 (2007), 115–126.
5. Cayo García Sastre, *Transición y desmovilización política en España (1975–1978)* (Valladolid: Secretariado de Publicaciones Universidad de Valladolid, 1997).
6. Omar Encarnación, *The Myth of Civil Society: Social Capital and Democratic Consolidation in Spain and Brazil* (New York: Palgrave, 2003).
7. For an analysis that incorporates the different sources of conflict see: Pere Ysàs, "¿Una sociedad pasiva? Actitudes, activismo y conflictividad social en el franquismo tardío," *Ayer* 68 (2007), 31–57. For an analysis of the origin of mobilisation in the 1960s and its role in the 1970s, especially with regard to the workers' movement, see: Xavier Domènech Sampere, "El cambio

político (1962–1976). Materiales para una perspectiva desde abajo," *Historia del presente* 1 (2002), 46–67.

8. Molinero and Ysàs, *Productores disciplinados y minorías subversivas.*

9. Pamela Radcliff, "Associations and the Social Origins of the Transition during the Late Franco Regime," In *Spain Transformed*, ed. Nigel Townson (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007).

10. Elena Hernández Sandoica, Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer and Marc Baldó Lacomba,. *Estudiantes contra Franco (1939–1975): oposición política y movilización juvenil* (Madrid: La esfera de los libros, 2007).

11. Maravall, *Dictadura y disentimiento político.* Eduardo González Calleja, *Rebelión en las aulas: movilización y protesta estudiantil en la España contemporánea, 1865–2008* (Madrid: Alianza editorial, 2009).

12. Manuel Pérez Ledesma, *Estabilidad y conflicto social. España, de los iberos al 14-D* (Madrid: Nerea 1990); Encarna Nicolás, *La libertad encadenada: España en la dictadura franquista 1939–1975* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2005), 363–394.

13. Pamela Radcliff, *Making Democratic Citizens in Spain: Civil Society and the Popular Origins of the Transition, 1960–78* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011).

14. David Ruiz González, *Historia de comisiones   (1958–1988)* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1994). Xavier Domènech Sampere, *Clase obrera, antifranquismo y cambio político: pequeños grandes cambios, 1956–1969* (Madrid: Los Libros de la Catarata, 2008).

15. Sebastian Balfour, *Dictatorship, Workers, and the City: Labour in Greater Barcelona since 1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Robert Fishman, *Working Class Organization and the Return to Democracy in Spain* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990); José Antonio Pérez, *Los años del acero. La transformación del mundo laboral en el área industrial del Gran Bilbao (1958–1977). Trabajadores, convenios y conflic-tos* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2001); Antonio Herrera and John Markoff, "Rural Movements and the Transition to Democracy in Spain," *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 16, 4 (2011), 455–474; Ana Cabana and Daniel Lanero, "Movilización social en la Galicia rural del Tardofranquismo (1960–1977)," *Historia Agraria* 48 (2009), 111–132; Alberto Sabio, "Cultivadores de democracia: politización campesina y sindicalismo agrario progresista en España, 1970–1980," *Historia Agraria* 38 (2006), 75–102.

16. José Álvarez Cobelas, *Envenenados de Cuerpo y Alma: La oposición universitaria en Madrid (1939–1970)* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, Madrid, 2004); González Calleja, *Rebelión en las aulas*; Sandoica, Ruiz Carnicer, and Baldó Lacomba, *Estudiantes contra Franco.*

17. In Catalonia, a unitary movement was founded in 1971 called The Assembly of Cataluña (Asamblea de Cataluña). Montserrat Guibernau, "Nationalism and Intellectuals in Nations without States: The Catalan

Case," *Political Studies* 42 (2000), 989–1005; Andrew Dowling, "The Reconstitution of Political Catalanism 1939–75," *International Journal of Iberian Studies*, 14, 1 (2001), 17–25. For interesting comparisons between the Catalan and Basque national movements, see: Daniele Conversi, *The Basques, the Catalans and Spain: Alternative routes to National Mobilization* (Reno and Las Vegas: Nevada University Press, 1997); Laura Desfor Edles, "A Culturalist Approach to Ethnic Nationalist Movements: Symbolization and Basque and Catalan Nationalism in Spain," *Social Science History* 23, 3 (1999), 311–355.

18. Scott L. Greer, "Who negotiates for a nation? Catalan mobilization and nationhood before the Spanish democratic transition, 1970–1975," *Democratization* 23, 4 (2016), 613–633.

19. Manuel Pérez Ledesma, "'Nuevos' y 'viejos' movimientos en la transición," in *La Transición, treinta años después*, ed. Carme Molinero (Barcelona: Península, 2006), 117–152.

20. Sidney Tarrow, *Power in movement: Social movements, collective action and mass politics in the modern state* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

21. Among the few attempts to look at more than one case are: Teresa María Ortega López, "Obreros y vecinos en el tardofranquismo y la transición política (1966–1977): una 'lucha' conjunta para un mismo fin," *Espacio, tiempo y forma. Serie V, Historia contemporánea* 16 (2004), 351–370; Maravall, *Dictadura y disentimiento político:* Ortiz Heras, Castellanos López, and Martín García, "Historia social y política para una transición", 115–126.

22. Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, *Social movements, an introduction*, second edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 25–26.

23. Alberto Melucci, *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the information age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

24. Claus Offe, "New Social Movements: Changing Boundaries of the Politica," *Social Research* 52 (1985), 817–868.

25. Engin F. Isin and Patricia K. Wood, *Citizenship and Identity* (London: Sage Publications, 1999).

26. Margaret Somers, *Genealogies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness, and the Right to Have Rights* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

27. Lale Yalçın-Heckmann, "Introduction: claiming social citizenship," *Citizenship Studies* 15, 3–4 (2011), 433–439.

28. Kim Voss and Michelle Williams, "The local in the global: Rethinking social movements in the new millennium," *Democratization* 19, 2 (2012), 352–377.

29. Bryan S. Turner, "The erosion of citizenship," *The British Journal of Sociology* 52, 2 (2001), 189–209.

30. Luke Yates, "Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements," *Social Movement Studies* 14, 1 (2015), 1–21.

31. Paul Haber, "Pink Tide Governments, Radical Social Movements, and the Practice of Citizenship in Twenty-First-Century Latin America," in *Performing Citizenship*, eds. Inbal Ofer and Tamar Groves (New York: Routledge, 2015).

32. Erik Olin Wright, "Real utopias," *Politics & Society* 41, 2 (2013), 167–169.

Catholicism and Citizenship Under the Franco Dictatorship

Abstract This chapter looks at the contribution of transnational Catholic networks to the recovery and reconstruction of citizenship within the dictatorial context of Franco's Spain. The scarcely-studied contribution of nonconformist Catholics to the revival of citizenship under Franco was fomented above all by a transnational phenomenon: the Second Vatican Council of 1962–1965. This chapter explores how Catholic activists redefined their religious leadership in terms of social and political activism. They used the cultural, economic and symbolic resources emanating from their position in order to empower their communities and diffuse models of participative democracy not only in their churches, but in much wider circles as among students and workers.

It is no coincidence that the words 'citizens' and 'citizenship' barely passed Franco's lips during his many years in power. The dictatorship that dominated Spain for nearly four decades indicated its profound hostility to the very idea of citizenship from the outset through its rejection of liberalism, parliamentarianism, democracy and civil society. A foremost ally in the construction of Franco's New State was the Catholic Church. No official ceremony in Francoist Spain, whether civil, military or even Falangist, was complete without the legitimising and sanctifying presence of the Church.

In return, the Church amassed a power and presence within Spanish society that was virtually unparalleled within post-war Europe. The recovery of citizenship under the dictatorship in the 1960s and 1970s is therefore associated not with the Church, but with the workers' movement, the student unions and the regional nationalists: what is traditionally referred to as the 'anti-Franco opposition'. However, recent research has drawn attention to the rebuilding of citizenship by very different groups, which not only included professional associations, such as doctors and teachers, but also groups which—paradoxically—were actually created by the regime itself: the neighbourhood-, family- and housewives' associations. Still, there was another source of opposition during the late Franco regime that represented an even greater paradox for the dictatorship: the Catholic Church.[1]

The aim of this chapter is to analyse the little-studied contribution of nonconformist Catholic clergy and laity to the revival of citizenship under the Franco regime, drawing primarily on interviews with the activists themselves. Dissident Catholicism provided an apprenticeship in citizenship for activists from a wide range of networks, including journals and other publications; the youth and worker sections of *Acción Católica Especializada* (ACE, Specialised Catholic Action); Catholic trade unions; and the worker-priest movement. In terms of participatory practices, discourses of empowerment, and engagement with the marginalised and the working class, faith-based networks had a good deal in common with their secular counterparts. In addition, Catholics were heavily involved with organisations other than their own: political student groups, left-wing parties, neighbourhood associations and secular trade unions. All in all, nonconformist Catholicism not only made a substantial contribution to the struggle for citizenship under the dictatorship, but also provided considerable—if largely ignored—support for the citizens' movement that underpinned the Transition.[2]

The New State and the Church Under Early Francoism

One of the defining features of the Second Republic (1931–1939) that the Francoist counterrevolution was determined to destroy was civil society. It had flourished under Spain's first democracy, while representing a threat to myriad conservative interests, including both the army and the Church.

This was especially true after the left-wing Popular Front coalition won the general election of February 1936. The military insurgents of July 1936 correspondingly banned the political parties, trade unions, student bodies and other groups that had made up civil society under the Republic. The only remnants of civil society that were permitted under the New State were pro-regime business groups, cultural associations, sports clubs, and bullfighting fraternities. Political activists who had fought for the Republic during the Civil War (1936–1939)—whether republicans, socialists, anarchists, communists or regional nationalists—were ruthlessly repressed, both during and after the conflict. A panoply of special courts, prominent amongst which was the Special Court for the Repression of Freemasonry and Communism, was set up to root out and punish the losing side. Hundreds of thousands of republicans spent time in jail. Up to 30,000 were shot. New administrative, professional and penal codes were passed that deprived many thousands of republicans of their jobs, professional qualifications and possessions. This vindictive division of society into the victors and the vanquished—the principal pillar of the New State's legitimising discourse—was even extended to the fiscal sphere: the pro-insurgent provinces of Alava and Navarra retained their pre-civil war fiscal privileges, whereas those of the 'traitorous provinces' of Guipúzcoa and Vizcaya had them eliminated.[3] This vengeful spirit was embodied by the leading Falangist publication *Arriba*, which declared that "our irresponsible enemies" should be considered "irredeemable, unforgiveable and criminal" and should suffer "irrevocable exclusion, without which the existence of the Motherland would be threatened".[4]

The alliance between the Catholic Church and the Francoist New State was forged during the Civil War (1936–1939). They were brought together not only by their shared anti-liberal, anti-democratic and anti-secular values, but also by the unprecedented persecution suffered by the Church in the republican zone. Hundreds of churches, monasteries and convents were desecrated, ransacked and torched during the conflict. Worse still, more than 6700 members of the clergy, including 13 bishops, were massacred by the republicans. There is no comparable wave of anticlerical violence in modern Western European history.[5] The Church's support for the cause of the self-proclaimed 'Nationalists' constituted an overwhelming coup for the insurgents: it enormously enhanced their legitimacy, both at home and abroad, and provided their divergent forces with a powerful common denominator.

The triumph of the counterrevolutionaries in 1939 was also a victory for the Catholic Church. All the anticlerical and secularising measures of the Second Republic were reversed by the new regime. This unyielding backlash contrasts vividly with that of Spain's neighbour, Portugal. Upon the establishment of the Salazar regime in the aftermath of the First Republic (1910–1926), the dictator, despite his own deeply-held religious convictions, retained certain republican reforms, including civil marriage, divorce and, most strikingly, the separation of Church and State. Clearly the Civil War had produced a far more profound rift within Spanish society than the overthrow of the First Republic had in Portugal.

The relationship between the Church and the New State was succinctly spelled out in the *Fuero de los Españoles* (Charter of the Spaniards) of 1945: "the profession and practice of the Catholic Religion, which is that of the State, will benefit from official protection". In practice, this meant that the Church, with the robust backing of the dictatorship, did not merely recover its educational, business and media interests, but greatly expanded them. Illustrative of the new situation was the *recatolización* (conversion) campaign of the 1940s. The city of Valencia, to take one example, was divided up between 81 conversion centres. 1500 members of the laity, and 250 missionaries, were then unleashed on the local populace in an effort to 'reclaim' them for the faith. In national terms, the campaign of *recatolización* was without parallel in the history of modern Spain. Under Franco, the Church reached the apogee of its social, economic and cultural power in the twentieth century. Still, the Church's presence was not limited to these spheres alone. It also accrued far-reaching political power. During the Second World War, the *Movimiento* (Movement), which was dominated by the Falange, was the leading political force within Franco's Spain as a result of the dictatorship's alignment with Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. Accordingly, in 1945, following the final defeat of the Axis, the regime found itself dangerously isolated. In an effort to appease the Allies, it downplayed its fascist trappings or, in some cases, ditched them altogether. Above all, the New State was redefined as a 'National-Catholic' regime. The new-found ascendancy of the Catholics over the Falangists was reflected in the major Cabinet reshuffle of 1945. The political influence of the mainstream Catholics would remain formidable until the rise of the Opus Dei 'technocrats' in the late 1950s. During this period, Catholicism in Spain enjoyed a political power that was unmatched in Europe, with the possible exception of the Catholic Church in Ireland.

The dictatorship's international ostracism in 1945 led it to replace the fascist-inspired *El Fuero del Trabajo* (Labour Charter) of 1938 with the *Fuero de los Españoles* in July 1945. It was apposite that the document which enshrined the relationship between Church and State should also set out the limits to citizenship in the 'new Spain'.[6] The *fueros* referred not to 'citizens' or 'citizenship' but to 'Spaniards', and their 'obligations' were placed firmly above their 'rights'. In theory, the list of entitlements was not insubstantial, but, in practice, these rights were almost completely invalidated by the proviso that 'the Cortes will pass the necessary laws for the exercise of the rights recognised in this bill'. Hardly any of these rights became a reality. The joke at the time was that Spain enjoyed the greatest number of rights in the world: in addition to the conventional liberal rights, it also boasted 'the right to arrest', 'the right to torture', 'the right to carry out surveillance', and so on. In short, Spaniards suffered "the loss of the condition of citizens under Francoism",[7] or, as a Spanish socialist leader told President Eisenhower, they were now "ex-citizens".[8] Spaniards were no longer citizens of a democratic State, but subjects of an authoritarian one.

The centrality of the Catholic Church to Spanish life under the dictatorship was illustrated by the fact that the main institutional channel for sociability during the 1940s and 1950s was, in fact, the Church—especially the local parish. The parishes dedicated themselves to traditional ceremonies and other activities that did nothing to challenge the authoritarian precepts of the regime: an approach that was entirely in accordance with the outlook of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. This overwhelming conformity notwithstanding, there were nonconformist strains within the Church. The first one was ACE. Established in the wake of the Second World War as a product of the nascent National-Catholic State, the apostolic associations of the ACE were designed, like the Movement's *Sindicatos Verticales* (SS. VV., Vertical Syndicates), to replace the left-wing worker organisations of the 1930s. Thus, the *Juventud Obrera Católica* (JOC, Catholic Worker Youth) aimed to indoctrinate working class youth; the *Hermandad Obrera de Acción Católica* (HOAC, Workers' Brotherhood of Catholic Action) was intended to fulfil the same function in relation to rural workers; while the *Juventud Estudiantil Católica* (JEC, Catholic Student Youth) was meant to win the hearts and minds of students, both in schools and universities.[9]

The ACE enjoyed a notable degree of autonomy within the dictatorship, partly because of the nature of the pact between State and Church,

which gave the latter even more leeway following the Concordat of 1953. Another reason was that the ACE was led by the formidable Enrique Plá i Deniel, who, despite his own conservative views, was fiercely protective of the apostolic associations right up until his death in 1965. The relative autonomy of the ACE was also of its own making: a result of the way in which it was organised. Rather than the ecclesiastical authorities exercising tight, top-down control of the associations, as had often occurred in the past, the workers themselves were largely allowed to run them, making the associations much more sensitive to their needs. As a result, they were much more radical than traditional working-class Catholic bodies. Both the workers and the clerical cadres of the ACE were further radicalised by the wretched living and working conditions of the 1940s and 1950s, along with the harsh repression of those years. The upshot was that the ACE developed a momentum of its own. In no time at all, HOAC and JOC became outspoken critics of the Movement's trade unions—the Vertical Syndicates—and outright proponents of the right to strike, freedom of the press, and even workers' control of industry. The two associations not only supported the illegal strikes of 1951, 1956 and 1958, but also helped to found most of the clandestine trade unions that emerged prior to the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), such as the *Federación Sindical de Trabajadores* (1958) (Syndical Federation of Workers); *Acción Sindical de Trabajadores* (1960) (Syndical Action of Workers); and the *Unión Sindical Obrera* (1960) (Syndical Workers' Union). The last two unions, in particular, were the result of JOC's national congress in 1960, which brought together up to 10,000 delegates. The radicalism of the ACE was also a product of its transnationalism. All of the associations of the ACE belonged to worldwide apostolic bodies, which, through their congresses, seminars and other activities, not only provided the ACE with material support, but also exposed it to ideas and values that were very different from those espoused by the Spanish Church hierarchy. In sum, the international apostolic associations of the Catholic Church enhanced the nonconformist outlook of the ACE.

During the early Franco years, the ACE offered workers the only relatively free space for debate and organisation. From this perspective, the ACE was very different from the Movement, its official rival in terms of mass organisation. Whereas the Movement strove to control and indoctrinate the workers, the ACE sought to enable and empower them. Much the same could be said for their respective student bodies: whereas the Movement's *Sindicato Español Universitario* (SEU) (Spanish University

Union) aimed to keep students in line with regime orthodoxy, the JEC engaged with clandestine unions. Hardly surprisingly, the SEU became increasingly out of touch with students' aspirations—it was to suffer the indignity of being the only Francoist institution to be dissolved during the dictator's lifetime—while the JEC aligned itself with the burgeoning anti-Francoist movement. On the other hand, the Movement was a far bigger organisation than the ACE. Millions of industrial and other workers were obliged to sign up to the Vertical Syndicates, whereas membership of the ACE was never that high: the HOAC and JOC estimated that they had a strong presence amongst only 150–180,000 workers in the 1950s. Still, there is no question that the ACE did, in part, fill the vacuum created by the repression of the left-wing parties and unions of the Second Republic, though not as either the dictatorship or the Church hierarchy had envisaged.

The transnationalism of the JOC, HOAC and JEC was a result not only of the international organisations to which they belonged, but also of other tendencies within the worldwide Catholic Church. Firstly, there were the new currents within post-war European theology, especially in France and Germany. These initially found expression in Spain in the 'National Catholic Conversations' of 1951 in San Sebastián. These 'Conversations' introduced new perspectives into the arid theological terrain of the Spanish Church. The principal figure in the 'Conversations' was the philosopher José Luis Aranguren, who not only defended Catholic thinking that was independent of the Church, but also called for far greater emphasis on individual contemplation, as well as advocating a more tolerant approach to Protestantism. Such liberalism was regarded by the Spanish Church hierarchy as unsound, if not actually heretical. However, the introduction of these innovative ideas into Spain made dissident Catholics feel part of a wider movement, and therefore less isolated. A second transnational phenomenon that was encouraging to nonconformist Catholics in Spain was the worker-priest movement that emerged in Western Europe after WWII. In repudiating the financial support and traditional evangelisation of the Church, the worker-priests signalled a radical break with the *modus vivendi* of the Catholic priesthood. They were a source of inspiration to the apostolic associations in Spain because they eliminated virtually all barriers between clergy and laity, and, more than any other group, embodied the empowerment of the rank-and-file clergy. Indeed, the worker-priests could be regarded as the most uncompromising expression of the approach

undertaken by the apostolic associations. Banned by the Pope in 1954 as a result of the ideological tensions generated by the Cold War, the movement was revived eleven years later.

THE REVOLUTION OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

The struggle for citizenship by Spanish Catholics was revolutionised by the Second Vatican Council of 1962–1965.[10] The ideas and reforms approved by the Council, in its quest to adapt the Church to the challenge of modernity, turned the Catholic world upside down. It transformed relations within the Church by abolishing the clergy's monopoly on the liturgy, by embracing 'the apostolate of the laity', and by envisioning an institution that was made up not of the clergy alone, but of all believers: 'the people of God'. In other words, the Council undermined the traditional hierarchical matrix of the Church by empowering both the rank-and-file clergy and the laity. This had far-reaching ramifications not only for relations within the Church, but also for those outside of it. The Church's relationship with society at large was also radically altered by the Council's embracing of parliamentary democracy and its corresponding acceptance of the freedoms of expression, association and conscience. Indeed, the Council reached out, in an unprecedented move, to other faiths and even political philosophies, such as Marxism, which had hitherto been regarded as innately hostile to Catholicism. In fact, it was out of the dialogue between Catholicism and Marxism that a radical new theology was born: liberation theology. In more concrete terms, the Council vigorously defended civil liberties and human rights—especially those of the most vulnerable and exploited. Accordingly, a new language of social justice and human rights emerged within the Church, along with a vision of the Catholic community that made it compatible with democracy. As a result, the Church became a champion of citizenship, advocating social and political activism in defence of the underprivileged. In short, the Council had opened up the Catholic Church as never before to the poor and marginalised within both the developing and developed worlds.

This revolution within Catholicism obviously represented a direct threat to the long-standing alliance between the Spanish Church and the Francoist State. This was made evident by the mobilisation of Catholics throughout Spain—not just those in the ACE—in an effort to realise the changes proclaimed by the Second Vatican Council, as reflected in a torrent of new journals, study groups and communities. Conciliar Catholics

drew on the ideas, practices and experiences of the student and worker movements, as well as radical reappraisals of Catholic thought, such as liberation theology. All of this made progressive Catholics feel part of a much broader, transnational movement of protest. For many Catholics in Spain, the Council constituted a watershed, either persuading them to become activists or else strengthening their existing militancy. The result was a Catholic activism that went far beyond the relatively restricted circles of the 1940s and 1950s. Francisca Sauquillo followed an unusual path for a scion of the Madrid upper classes insofar as she embarked on a law degree having attended an elitist Catholic school. However, her first year at university was to change her further still:

> The change, for me, came about in the year in which I arrived at the university, where I immersed myself in the Christian communities. (…) I'm talking about 1961, right when the Second Vatican Council begins (sic), which affected me deeply. The two encyclicals: the encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, because it opened up a new horizon for me in terms of the subject of labour relations, and the encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, because it also changed my mentality. (…) During the university years I believed deeply in the Church that was emerging from the Second Vatican Council, which I believed was a Church that wanted to liberate the world from injustice.[11]

'INTERNAL' ACTIVISM

The evangelisation of the Second Vatican Council transformed relations within the Church. A first step in the new evangelisation was the removal of the outward signs of ecclesiastical authority in an attempt to reduce the distance between the clergy and the laity. Thus, liturgical vestments were abandoned, as were the habitually formal modes of social address. Spanish priests would drop the use of 'Don' and adopt the colloquial version of their name: for example, 'Don Pedro' became 'Perico'. The third-person form of address—*usted*—was replaced by the informal *tú*. The use of *tú*, one priest recounts, "knocked down many barriers".[12] Hence, language became a means by which the gulf between the clergy and the faithful was diminished.

Another important change involved the use of space: above all, the presbytery and the parish church. Nonconformist clergy made themselves more accessible to the congregation by opening up the presbytery or even by moving out of Church property. Making the presbytery available to parishioners, such as by turning it into a space in which community projects could be planned and pursued, naturally brought the clergy and the laity closer together. Lay perceptions of the clergy were changed even more when a priest chose to live outside Church property. Julio Pérez Pinillos, a priest in the working-class district of Vallecas in Madrid, discovered as much when he moved into "a normal house (…) where ordinary people live":

> Your mental make-up is clerical, from the clergy, from a clergy that is removed from society, isn't it? So, when you go in there, logically, you go in to become just one more person.[13]

The barriers that separated the clergy from the faithful could also be lowered by altering the way in which the priest addressed his congregation. In accordance with the Second Vatican Council, the altar in many churches was reversed so that the priest would face his parishioners instead of having his back to them. A far more radical step altogether was for the priest to *build* his very own church. This marked a complete rupture with tradition: instead of occupying an extant church, the priest relied on the commitment, endeavour and support of his parishioners to construct the building. Not even the Vatican Council itself had foreseen such an empowerment of the laity. The church of Pérez Pinillos in Vallecas was:

> built (in the 1960s) by the people from the area. This was amazing because they felt that they were the builders of their own church.

This particular construction had a very simple structure because the parishioners, as builders of the church, decided that 'the school has needs, and so does the area, which should be prioritised over the needs of the church'.[14] The very name of a church could reflect the shift towards a much more egalitarian and empowering environment. The sign over the entrance to Mariano Gamo's church in the neighbourhood of Moratalaz just outside Madrid read: *Casa del pueblo de dios*—'House of the People of God'. This ostensibly referred to the Vatican Council's definition of the Church as 'the people of God', but it was also a subversive reference to the

'*Casa del pueblo*': the name given to a local branch of the socialist movement before the dictatorship.

The sacraments were also handled by dissident priests in a more open manner in an effort to involve the laity. Priest Pedro Requeno, whose parish was in the working-class town of Getafe on the outskirts of Madrid, broke with tradition by going to the homes of his parishioners in order to explain a sacrament such as baptism. This was to foster a greater "closeness":

> When we went to people's homes, the people felt that they were 'playing at home' more, and that therefore they had more freedom to express themselves, to say what they felt about the Church, negative experiences that they'd had.[15]

The words of a catechismal song written by the priest Mariano Gamo—yet another example of rank-and-file empowerment—captured the spirit of the Second Vatican Council:

Poor of the World

Join in Fellowship

Make the Earth the Kingdom of the Lord

Make the Earth the Kingdom of Love

The fact that these lyrics were sung to the melody of The International was probably less in tune with the spirit of the Council. Still, such was the impact of this new catechismal song that, after Franco's death in 1975, the youngsters who had attended Mariano Gamo's classes were affronted to discover that "they've copied our catechism song".[16]

The new evangelisation, therefore, did much to break down the traditional, top-down relationship between priest and parishioner. Many progressive priests, drawing on the worker and student movements of the 1960s, took the process a step further by actively engaging in forms of participatory democracy. An important means of empowerment was study and discussion groups. Parishioners were encouraged to speak out and pose their own questions: something for which neither the educational system nor the Church had prepared them. Unsurprisingly, this type of open discussion was an entirely new experience for the large majority of believers. Not content with democratising traditional activities, some priests took the process further still by introducing their congregation to the popular

assembly. In Franco's Spain, where even relatively small gatherings required a special permit, the holding of a popular assembly was an overtly subversive act. Still, Mariano Gamo organised an assembly every Sunday once the main Mass was over. The parish council would choose the subject for the assembly, the priest would provide an introductory talk, and then the topic would be publicly debated. These assemblies, recounts Gamo, were "open to everyone", both non-believers and believers, and they would "try to tackle all problems, absolutely all", ranging from ecclesiastical issues, such as the celibacy of the priesthood, to local ones, such as the failure of a housing scheme, to national matters, such as the declaration of a state of emergency, or international concerns, such as the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Gamo regarded these collective exchanges as "a Christian response" to "the country's political and social situation". These responses were, by definition, collective in nature because the Church "had defined itself as a community, as a collective, to which the Council had given the name of 'people of God'". From this perspective, the 12 o'clock mass "was the culmination, the most important act, of the entire week".

The relative autonomy of the Church under the dictatorship meant that the police were reluctant to act against these assemblies, even though they represented a clear and unequivocal challenge to the regime's power and legitimacy. Still, an assembly that debated the bankruptcy of a building firm which wiped out the savings of many local people prompted the police to surround the church. Even more seriously, an assembly in April 1968 that broached the subject of the original meaning of 1 May, or Labour Day, led to the church being surrounded by the police's white vans (commonly known as the 'milkvans'). As Gamo recounts, those present discussed the question thus:

> What do we do? So people intervened etc., 'No, we stay here'. The dominant feeling is that 'we remain here until the Bishop comes to get us out'. (…) After half an hour, the Auxiliary Bishop appeared, having already spoken to the police, of course (…) And when we left, the Bishop led from the front.

Those observing events from the plaza outside burst into applause when they saw the people leaving the church unharmed. "Never have I seen such spontaneous and generous public applause", recalls the priest.[17] This incident not only offers an outstanding example of the autonomy of the Church under the Franco regime—a workers' assembly on the same issue would have been swiftly quashed by the police—but the congregation of

the La Montaña church also became aware of their own power. In other words, these assemblies provided people with a sense of their own capacity for change through collective means. Thus, participatory practices, such as the popular assembly, tested the boundaries of the regime, as well as contesting them. In short, these activities contributed to the development not only of a citizens' consciousness, but also its praxis, even within a dictatorial setting such as that of Spain.

'EXTERNAL' ACTIVISM

The most extreme form of new evangelisation was that of the worker-priests. The movement had its origins in France during the Second World War. The JOC-associated chaplain Henri Godin aimed to halt the de-Christianisation of working-class France by redefining its workplaces and communities as missionary territory. Priests took up employment in factories and other manual occupations, undertaking their mission by living and labouring alongside workers who had left the Church (many of whom had joined the Communist Party). However, the advance of the Cold War meant that the worker-priests were regarded with ever greater suspicion by the ecclesiastical hierarchy: the very act of 'going to the people' often meant that worker-priests operated in strongholds of the Communist Party. By the early 1950s, the upper echelons of the Church were alarmed by the sympathy of many worker-priests for the cause of Communism. The upshot was that Pope Pius XII banned the worker-priest movement in 1954, thus bringing its first wave to a close.[18]

The second wave of worker-priests did not emerge until the mid-1960s. This was made possible by the decision of the Second Vatican Council to lift the ban in 1965. The relatively high number of priests in Spain who chose to become workers was partly due to the ground-breaking evangelisation of the Council and partly to the rapid urban expansion of the 1960s —in particular, that of the working-class neighbourhoods that were struggling to absorb the influx of rural migrants in search of work.[19] The second wave of worker-priests, like the first, inverted the traditional profile of a priest by rejecting the ecclesiastical vestments, adopting an informal language, living outside Church accommodation and by foregoing an institutional salary. Renouncing the income, status and privileges of a normal priest for the life of a manual labourer was a matter of principle for a worker-priest. "Something which is fundamental to evangelisation", stresses Pedro Requeno, who became a worker-priest after six years as a

conventional parish priest, "is the incarnation: living with, and like, the people".[20] The commitment of a worker-priest had to be absolute. As Julio Pérez Pinillos, who also became a worker-priest, insists:

> No evangelisation is serious if it doesn't start with how one lives one's life. (…) And we discover God by discovering the human being. That's the way forward. Don't get sidetracked. It's not a question of reading many more things; it's not a question of much more study. (…) This is the change that takes place and the reference, the reference, is the working-class world, which I didn't know. So, get immersed in the world of the working-class.[21]

The integration of the worker-priests into the life of the working class, together with the rejection of all ecclesiastical support, made them at once part of, and separate from, the Church. Their determination to remove all distinctions between themselves and the laity made them the personification of the anti-hierarchical and collective values with which so many progressive Catholics identified. The worker-priests' promotion of a social type of citizenship was also reflected in their commitment to the goals of their fellow workers, such as the right to hold large gatherings, to strike, and to form independent trade unions. The individual example set by the worker-priests did much to foment the egalitarian ideals and participatory practices that underpinned the construction of a social citizenship.

As the above examples demonstrate, the language of social justice and citizenship adopted by the Second Vatican Council furnished Catholics with a much stronger and more inclusive 'external' vision of activism; that is to say, it encouraged them not just to concentrate on the 'internal' life of the Church, but to look outward at the 'external' world. In practice, this meant that progressive clergy attempted, at the community level, to rebuild the civil society that had been devastated by the dictatorship. Pedro Requeno was closely involved in the effort to establish a neighbourhood association in Getafe:

> It was born within the church itself. (…) It was run, directed completely by the neighbours themselves, who appointed their own committee (…) (but) until the association established itself and had its own place, it operated from our premises or from our own house. (…) Anything that boosted the civil fabric, whether neighbourly, trade unionist or political, had to be supported.[22]

Yet activism in the neighbourhood associations was not limited to the clergy alone. José Molina, a Catholic in the Maoist *Organización Revolucionaria de Trabajadores* (ORT) (Revolutionary Organisation of Workers), helped establish the first neighbourhood association in the working-class district of Vallecas in Madrid. The founding aim of the association was to fight an expropriation order on 12,000 dwellings. "From that moment on", he relates:

> a neighbourhood association movement was launched. We saw that there were some extraordinary possibilities there to organise people, to introduce ideas, to create struggle, social movements, etc.

However, this was not due to the commitment and endeavour of the ORT alone, as Molina readily admits:

> The Church was fundamental for the development of certain social movements, certain movements and struggles (…) because it gave us legal cover, because it lent us the churches, because it provided resources. Yesterday a priest was telling me that he had had very compromising documents in his sacristy, for example, hidden there to avoid a police search, because you knew that the police were not going to go in there, didn't you?[23]

As these testimonies show, dissident Catholics not only took part in the 'internal' activism of self-reflection and Church-orientated reform, but also in the 'external' activism of the broader movements and struggles of the 1960s and 1970s, even joining groups with an anti-religious outlook, such as the ORT, or the *Partido Comunista de España* (PCE) (Communist Party of Spain). Catholic activists were therefore to be found in neighbourhood associations, student groups, trade unions and other forms of 'external' activism that struggled to give disenfranchised people a voice and to provide them with a meaningful role in the decision-making processes. In short, both 'internal' and 'external' activists aspired to make people aware of their rights as citizens and to act upon them.

Opportunities for activism in the rural domain were much more limited than in urban settings such as Getafe, Moratalaz and Vallecas, due mostly to the greater control exercised by the authorities over the much smaller and scattered communities. This also entailed far more acute logistical problems in terms of the organisation of anti-system or clandestine

activities. Nevertheless, Catholics in rural areas did try to revive civil society by educating the laity in the values of citizenship, even in remote parts. An example can be seen in the province of Albacete.[24] The *Movimiento Rural de Adultos* (MRA, Rural Adult Movement), an offshoot of the ACE, was specifically set up to educate the rural populace on the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. Young priests from the MRA and HOAC, for example, journeyed to the impoverished Sierra del Segura to spread the conciliar message amongst the day labourers there, who often had to travel to other parts of Spain and France in search of work. These priests involved the workers in parish activities, such as picnics and spiritual exercises, in an attempt to overcome their social isolation and political inertia. Training centres, rural schools and boarding schools were set up with the objective of presenting the workers, both male and female, with an alternative vision to that of the regime. At the JOC's School of Housekeeping and Women's Education in the provincial capital, young female workers, relates Encarna Calero, "took decisions, gave their opinions and ran the centre".[25] Popular Culture Courses for women, organised by Christian base communities, aspired to "open the mind and the heart to the world beyond the house and the family". A more general aim of the centre at Fuensanta, where these courses were held, was to help "the people of our villages to participate responsibly in civic-political tasks". In the Sierra del Segura, the priests of the MRA tried to develop the social conscience of the workers by discussing not only daily issues, but also broader, political ones, as well as by holding clandestine assemblies. According to a Guardia Civil report, the priests criticised 'the authorities, the official norms, laws and orders, and the regime, in an effort to illuminate the ignorant'.[26]

Another means of fomenting social citizenship that was pursued by the MRA was to get people to take part in the organisation of the *fiesta* (annual holiday) of a locality rather than let it be 'organised from above'. The laity of *pueblos* in Albacete were encouraged by dissident priests to contribute to the drawing up of the *fiesta*'s programme of activities and its organisation. Progressive clergy helped provide a 'democratic alternative' to the traditional hostelry in one locality and a 'democratic picnic for the working class and peasantry' in another.[27] These types of initiatives helped revive popular participation in communal events as well as boosting associational life.

Yet another means of rejuvenating civil society was that promoted jointly by Catholics and Communists in the agricultural co-operatives. Certain co-operatives were mobilised in order to provide community services and hold cultural events. In the co-operative of Villagordo del Júcar, the police believed that there were "some Communists and the priest [was] linked to the workers".[28] The most militant co-operative of all was that of San Antonio Abad de Villamalea. Run by left-wing priests together with Communist activists, the co-operative, according to Óscar Martín and Damián González, "created a dense local network of cultural and social services, while at the same time channelling the most heartfelt social claims of the residents, thereby contributing to a broad anti-Francoist politicisation".[29]

The levels of mobilisation and organisation achieved in rural areas may not have been comparable to those in the urban arena, but there was still a transnational dimension to its Catholic activism. After all, the MRA was itself a product of the Second Vatican Council. More specifically, the centre at Fuensanta brought together Catholics from Spain and France in order to discuss the problems of migratory workers. Thus, progressive Catholics in the countryside, like those in the city, fought to rebuild civil society from the bottom up.

Dissident clergy in the province of Albacete had to contend not only with the hostility of the police and other State authorities, but also with that of their very own bishops. At the national level, the Church hierarchy defended the alliance with the Francoist dictatorship almost to the very end. It was illustrative of the situation that following the death of Enrique Plá i Deniel, head of the ACE, in 1965, the long-standing tensions between the apostolic associations and the upper echelons of the Church, which had been greatly intensified by the Second Vatican Council, came to a head. There was a tremendous backlash against the ACE in the late 1960s.[30] Leonardo Aragón, who joined the JEC in 1964 and would later become its European and then worldwide President, recounts the hierarchy's determination to bring the apostolic associations to heel. The bishops who oversaw Catholic Action:

declared us, we could say, 'undesirables'. We no longer had any judicial status. The Church ceased to recognise us. But we carried on. We would meet where we could. The situation, as a result, was a much more difficult one, but this occurred in Madrid and at the national level. The JEC practically exploded, disappeared, because they wouldn't accept the type of

approach that we had. So we kept going and even held a semi-clandestine national meeting or two. We held a meeting in Murcia, I remember, because we thought it was the safest place.[31]

The backlash was successful insofar as many ACE activists not only resigned from their positions, but also left the Church altogether and joined the secular currents of the anti-Francoist opposition. Feliciano Montero, a JEC activist, recalls that:

Many activists reach the conclusion that their option is a fundamentally political and trade-unionist option, and that the least important thing is Catholic Christian identity or living it. If, furthermore, it's rejected within the Church itself, well then 'goodbye and good riddance'.[32]

Despite the hierarchy's purge of the ACE, and the flood of desertions from it, the Church did not officially break with the dictatorship until 1973.

The individual paths traced in this chapter should not obscure the larger picture of the contribution made by Catholic activists to the rebuilding of civil society at the national level. A Catholic diplomat, Julio Cerón, founded the *Frente de Liberación Popular* (FLP) (Popular Liberation Front) in 1956. Popularly known as the 'Felipe' or 'el Frente' (The Front), in the 1960s, this became the second-largest clandestine student organisation in the land. HOAC activists also founded two illegal trade unions in the 1960s: *Solidaridad de Obreros Catalanes* (Solidarity of Catalan Workers) and the *Federación Sindical Democrática* (Democratic Union Federation). However, the Catholics' greatest contribution of all to the mobilisation of civil society under the Franco dictatorship was the creation, alongside other activists, of what became the principal force of the anti-Francoist opposition: the *Comisiones Obreras* (CC.OO.) (Workers' Commissions).[33] This was not a Catholic union, but Catholics constituted the core of the *Comisiones* in the Basque country and Catalonia between 1962 and 1966. They also played a major role in the Madrid organisation, a delegation of priests petitioning the Archbishop of Madrid, in 1967, to permit the capital's parishes to be used as meeting places for the *Comisiones Obreras*. As late as 1973, the presence of Catholics within the *Comisiones* at the national level was, as Guy Hermet underlines, "significant".[34] Catholics were prominent, too, in the struggle for regional rights, both Basque and Catalan. To take the most outstanding example, the most violent of all the anti-Francoist forces, *Euskadi ta Askatasuna* (ETA, Basque Fatherland and

Freedom), was not only founded in 1959 in a Catholic seminary, but also enjoyed considerable support from the Basque Church thereafter. The Catalan Church was also heavily committed to the regionalist cause, as shown by the expulsion from Spain, in 1965, of the head of Monserrat Abbey—the foremost symbol of Catalan identity—as a result of his championing of Catalan culture.

Thus, Catholics, both clerical and lay, were heavily involved in the neighbourhood associations, the clandestine trade unions, the illegal student groups, and the regional nationalist movements that did so much to reconstruct the civil society that had been devastated by the Francoist State. In so doing, they recovered and rebuilt the ideals, values and practices of social citizenship which the dictatorship had, for so long, denied the Spanish people.

Conclusions

Under the Franco regime, citizenship was overwhelmingly reconstructed from the 'bottom up' through popular organisation and collective mobilisation. This grassroots battle was not confined to what is traditionally regarded as the anti-Francoist opposition, but included a number of other currents which advanced discourses and practices in defence of a culture of citizenship. Catholics were prominent within this struggle, whether by means of faith-based or secular networks, providing a training ground for activists in the apostolic-, labour-, student- and neighbourhood movements. They contested the authoritarian outlook and structures of the dictatorship, not only through their new evangelisation, but also their associational activism, as well as through the propagation of a new language of community, social justice, and human rights. In this way, clerical and lay Catholics alike made a major contribution to the citizens' movement that provided much of the popular impetus for the transition from dictatorship to democracy.

Notes

1. On the Church under the dictatorship, see Feliciano Blázquez, *La traición de los clérigos en la España de Franco. Crónica de una intolerancia (1936– 1975)* (Madrid: Trotta, 1991); William J. Callahan, *The Catholic Church in Spain, 1875–1998* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press,

2000); Guy Hermet, *Los católicos en la España franquista*, 2 volumes (Madrid: C.I.S.-Siglo XXI, 1985 and 1986); and Frances Lannon, *Privilege, Persecution and Prophecy: The Catholic Church in Spain 1875–1975* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). On the later Franco regime in particular, see William J. Callahan, "The Spanish Church: Change and Continuity," in *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959–75*, ed. Nigel Townson (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2007) and Feliciano Montero, *La Iglesia: de la colaboración a la disidencia (1956–1975)* (Madrid: Encuentro, 2009).

2. On the contribution of progressive Catholicism to the rebuilding of civil society in the 1960s and 1970s see, in addition to the general works cited above, Péter Apor, Rebecca Clifford and Nigel Townson, "Faith," in *Europe's 1968: Voices of Protest*, eds. Robert Gildea, James Mark & Anette Warring (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Rebecca Clifford and Nigel Townson, "The Church in Crisis: Catholic Activism and '1968," *Cultural & Social History*, 8, 4 (2011); Pamela Radcliff, "La Iglesia católica y la transición a la democracia," in *Religión y política en la España contemporánea*, ed. Carolyn Boyd (Madrid: CEPC, 2007), and, more broadly, "Associations and the Social Origins of the Transition during the Late Franco Regime," in *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959–1975*, ed. Nigel Townson (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2007), 140–162.

3. On the repression, see *Víctimas de la Guerra Civil*, ed. Santos Juliá (Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1999); Paul Preston, *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth Century Spain* (London: Harper Press, 2012); and Julius Ruiz, *Franco's Justice: Repression in Madrid after the Spanish Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

4. *Arriba* 3 April 1941. Cited by Juan Pan-Montojo, "Ciudadanos y contribuyentes," in *De súbditos a ciudadanos: Una historia de la ciudadanía en España*, ed. Manuel Pérez Ledesma (Madrid: CEPC, 2007), 512 note 73.

5. The classic study on the religious persecution is Antonio Montero Moreno, *Historia de la persecución religiosa en España, 1936–1939* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1961).

6. On citizenship under the dictatorship, see *De súbditos a ciudadanos: Una historia de la ciudadanía en España*, ed. Manuel Pérez Ledesma (Madrid: CEPC, 2007), especially the chapters by Marcello Caprarella, "La ciudadanía secuestrada. La etapa franquista," Pamela Radcliff, "La ciudadanía y la transición a la democracia," and Juan Pan-Montojo, "Ciudadanos y contribuyentes".

7. Manuel Pérez Ledesma, "Presentación," in *De súbditos a ciudadanos: Una historia de la ciudadanía en España*, ed. Manuel Pérez Ledesma (Madrid: CEPC, 2007), 16.

8. The quote is from Indalecio Prieto in his *Carta de un ex-ciudadano español al Presidente de los Estados Unidos Dwight D. Eisenhower* (1959), cited by Manuel Pérez Ledesma, "El lenguaje de la ciudadanía en la España contemporánea," in *De súbditos a ciudadanos: Una historia de la ciudadanía en España*, ed. Manuel Pérez Ledesma (Madrid: CEPC, 2007), 474 note 66.

9. On the ACE, see Feliciano Montero, *La Acción Católica y el franquismo: Auge y crisis de la Acción Católica Especializada en los años sesenta* (Madrid: UNED, 2000). On the specific apostolic associations, see José Castaño Colomer, *La JOC en España (1946–1970)* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1978); Javier Domínguez, *Organizaciones obreras cristianas en la oposición al franquismo* (Bilbao: Mensajero, 1975); and Feliciano Montero, *Juventud Estudiantil Católica 1947–1997* (Madrid: JEC, 1998).

10. On the impact of the Second Vatican Council in Spain, see Blázquez, *La traición de los clérigos*, Chaps. 6 and 7; Callahan, *The Catholic Church*, 501 and 509–534; Hermet, *Los católicos en la España franquista. II.*, Chaps. 6 and 7; and Lannon, *Privilege, Persecution, and Prophecy*, 224–225 and 246–253.

11. All the interviews in this chapter were conducted by Nigel Townson as part of the international research project, 'Around 1968: Activism, Networks, Trajectories' (2007–2011), which was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the British Academy, and the Leverhulme Trust. The interview with Francisca Sauquillo Pérez was conducted by Nigel Townson (henceforth 'NT') in Madrid on 1 September 2009.

12. Interview with Mariano Gamo Sánchez, conducted by NT, Moratalaz (Madrid), 26 July 2009.

13. Interview with Julio Pérez Pinillos, conducted by NT, Rivas Vaciamadrid, 19 April 2010.

14. Interview with Julio Pérez Pinillos.

15. Interview with Pedro Requeno Regaño, conducted by NT, Getafe, 28 August 2009.

16. Interview with Mariano Gamo Sánchez.

17. Interview with Mariano Gamo Sánchez.

18. On the first wave of worker-priests, see Oscar L. Arnal, *Priests in Working-Class Blue: The History of the Worker-Priests (1943–1954)* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990) and Emile Poulat, *Les Prêtres-ouvriers. Naissance et fin* (Paris: Cerf, 1999).

19. On the worker-priest movement in Spain, see Jaime Botey, *Curas obreros: Compromiso de la Iglesia con el mundo obrero* (Barcelona: Cristianisme i Justicia, 2011); José Centeno García, Luis Díez Maestro and Julio Pérez Pinillos, eds. *Curas obreros: Cuarenta y cinco años de testimonio 1963–2008* (Barcelona: Herder, 2009); Julio Pérez Pinillos, *Los Curas Obreros en España* (Madrid: Nueva Utopía, 2004); and Esteban Tabares Carrasco, *Los Curas Obreros, su compromiso y su espíritu* (Madrid: Nueva Utopía, 2005).
20. Interview with Pedro Requeno Regaño, conducted by NT, Getafe, 26 July 2009.
21. Interview with Julio Pérez Pinillos.
22. Interview with Pedro Requeno Regaño, conducted by NT, Getafe, 28 August 2009.
23. Interview with José Molina Blázquez, conducted by NT, Madrid, 1 June 2010.
24. On nonconformist Catholicism in the province of Albacete, see Óscar J. Martín García, *A tientas con la democracia: movilización, actitudes y cambio en la provincia de Albacete, 1966–1977* (Madrid: Catarata, 2008); Damián A. González Madrid and Óscar J. Martín García, "'Cristianos conscientes en el mundo rural'. El movimiento de curas rurales en la diócesis de Albacete (1965–1977)," in *De la cruzada al desenganche: la Iglesia española entre el franquismo y la transición*, eds. Manuel Ortiz Heras and Damián A. González Madrid (Madrid: Sílex, 2011); and Óscar Martín García and Damián González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos, ciudadanía y construcción de enclaves democráticos en la provincia de Albacete durante el franquismo final," *Ayer*, 91, 3 (2013).
25. Citation from Martín García and González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos", 201.
26. Quotes from Martín García and González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos", 200–202.
27. Quotes from Martín García and González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos", 203.
28. Quote from Martín García and González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos", 204.
29. Martín García and González Madrid, "Movimientos católicos", 204.
30. On the bitter conflict between the Church hierarchy and Catholic Action, see Blázquez, *La traición*, 165–166; Callahan, *The Catholic Church*, 519–523; Hermet, *Los católicos en la España franquista. II,* 344–347; Lannon, *Privilege,* 235–237; and Montero, *La Iglesia*, 168–170 and 229–239.
31. Interview with Leonardo Aragón Marín, conducted by NT, Madrid, 14 April 2008.

32. Interview with Feliciano Montero García, conducted by NT, Madrid, 15 December 2008.
33. See Blázquez, *La traición*, 131, 140, and 179–180; Callahan, *The Catholic Church*, 505; Hermet, *Los católicos la España franquista. I.*, 299–302 and *Los católicos la España franquista. II.*, 409–410; and Lannon, *Privilege, Persecution, and Prophecy*, 235.
34. Hermet, *Los católicos en la España franquista. I.*, 301.

The Right to the City and the Right to the State: Neighbourhood Associations and the Negotiation of Citizenship

Abstract This chapter analyses the role played by squatters' associations in shaping notions of entitlement and citizenship in Spain: from the final years of the Franco dictatorship and through the period of democratic transition and consolidation. Specifically, the chapter focuses on the case of Orcasitas —one of the largest shantytowns that formed on the outskirts of the city of Madrid in the mid-1950s. The patterns of squatting and of community life in Orcasitas were representative of hundreds of other shantytowns all over Spain. The chapter shows that as the struggle for urban renovation merged into a process of political transition, local experiences of self-management and grass-roots activism interacted with an evolving discourse on democratic citizenship and with other forms of collective mobilization.

Keywords Squatters · Orcasitas · Neighbourhood association · Spanish transition to democracy

This chapter analyses the role played by neighbourhood associations (*asociaciones de vecinos*) in shaping notions of entitlement and citizenship: from the final years of General Franco's dictatorship through the period of democratic transition and consolidation. The attempts to define, manage and appropriate urban space led the Franco regime to implement spatial practices aimed at maintaining strict separation between the worlds of production and reproduction, reflected in spatial segregation (in both political and class terms), based on functional zoning and the intentional

creation of urban peripheries.[1] These practices were legitimised through corresponding references to space as being hierarchical and organic in nature, and being produced by technical knowledge (as opposed to knowledge derived from the experiences of its users).

The late Francoist period saw the re-emergence of the users of urban space, alongside socially committed professionals (architects, lawyers etc.), as central actors in its production. Neighbourhood associations across Spain played a major role in this process. In the years immediately prior to Franco's death in 1975, individual associations all over Spain started to establish mechanisms of cooperation and information-sharing, while expressing similar goals in relation to specific urban renovation projects within their respective *barrios*. During 1976, most associations merged into what would come to be known as the Citizens' Movement. At this point, local projects of consensual self-management were gradually reframed in relation to the larger political project of direct/radical democracy.

In his classic essay *The Urban Question,* sociologist Manuel Castells proposed a new definition of the "urban problem" based on the theory of collective consumption of goods and services. Based on case studies from the USA, France, Canada and Chile, Castells concluded that in the struggle to get their share of those goods and services, urban social movements became the catalyst for the transformation of social relations. According to Castells, these movements triggered much-needed processes of 'social readjustment' following periods of rapid urbanisation.[2] In Spain in the 1960s, mobilisation associated with issues of collective consumption and everyday neighbourhood life could be presented as supposedly apolitical in nature. However, this type of mobilisation had far-reaching effects on popular notions of citizenship and entitlement. The following quotes, taken from interviews conducted with well-known neighbourhood activists in Madrid (Félix López Rey and Antonio Villanueva Agüero) a few months before General Franco's death, reflect this link:

> I can only explain how I see Spain's political future with reference to the actual experiences in our *barrio* and to the ways in which we went about solving our problems. I hope that our future holds a full-scale, complete democracy, with no qualifications (…). The most essential rights from my point of view are the right of assembly, the right of expression and the right of association. And direct elections of course.[3]

> Faced with the current state of affairs, Spanish citizens are waking up. They know that in order to protect themselves and solve their problems, they need

to unite in neighbourhood associations, housewives' associations and so forth. The city council is an entity (…) that does not represent anyone anymore.

We (united within neighbourhood associations) constitute truly representative (entities). We hold assemblies that include thousands of neighbours—this is much more than the city council (of Madrid) ever managed to do.[4]

In their interviews, the two activists explained the ways in which engagement with civic associations shaped people's views of the political change that was needed in Spain. Through the experiences of everyday public activism, democracy as a concept gained meaning.

In this chapter, we reflect on the nature of this process: what could be learned from the experiences of individual neighbourhood associations in terms of the ways in which specific concerns for the redistribution of goods within the urban sphere interacted with more generalised concerns regarding democratisation? How were individual neighbourhood associations integrated into the Citizens' Movement? What type of working relations and exchange of ideas did they have with other socio-political actors during the transition?

In order to shed light on these questions, the chapter is divided into four sections: The first section briefly examines the dictatorship's urban planning schemes and points to the ways in which they reflected the consolidation of political and economic power relations. The second section explores the nature and workings of neighbourhood associations under the dictatorship. It focuses on the participatory structure of many of the associations, on their understanding and use of the concept of self-management (*autogestión*), as well as on the nature of their relationship with other protest organisations during the final years of the dictatorship. The third section analyses the way in which the struggle for urban remodelling merged into a process of democratic transition. It focuses on one of the more radical and participatory experiences in Madrid, in the *barrio* of Orcasitas. In the final section of the chapter, we reflect on the nature of Spanish democracy and its ability to integrate or absorb the experiences and visions of democracy that emerged within neighbourhood associations. Our argument is that during the transition, neighbourhood associations operated within a relatively short window of opportunity. Administrative transparency and consensual decision-making were prerequisites for the creation of a different kind of city. For a brief period, they were also useful tools in the fight to dismantle the remaining structures of

the dictatorship. However, the new political regime, which evolved from the Spanish transition, was a far cry from the plan for radical participatory democracy that many of these associations strove to implement.

URBAN PLANNING REGIMES UNDER THE DICTATORSHIP: SOCIAL CONTROL THROUGH SPATIAL SEGREGATION

Between 1936 and 1939, Spain was torn apart by a civil war that took the lives of more than 400,000 soldiers and civilians. The war severely damaged national and urban infrastructures all across the country. The implementation of an autarkic economic system in the two decades following the war also slowed down reconstruction and economic recovery. During the decade following the Civil War, Spanish architects and urban planners faced the enormous task of rebuilding. Reconstruction, however, was not viewed by the Franco regime solely in material terms. The process of material reconstruction went hand-in-hand with the call to reform the State and revive the nation in moral terms. The National Plan for Reconstruction (published in late 1939) expressed a highly organic vision of the State. According to the Plan, the 'body of the nation' was made up of different organs or centres of gravity, each with its own defined functions and concentric sphere of influence: from the national capital to provincial capitals and their surrounding metropolitan areas, and on to small towns and villages scattered throughout the Spanish countryside.

Against this background, some cities that were identified with the new regime, such as Salamanca, Burgos and Madrid, fared better than others.[5] The *Junta for the Reconstruction of Madrid* was created as early as 1940. Its technical committee was headed by the well-known architect Pedro Bidagor (who was also head of the department of Urbanism within the National Architecture Service). Bidagor's goal was to formulate a series of General Plans as platforms for the reconstruction of Spain's major cities, starting with the capital.

The General Plan of Madrid (1941) divided the city into three concentric circles and five zones, each with a distinct function. The first circle included the historical centre of the capital. This space comprised a mixture of small residential and commercial areas but was dedicated, for the most part, to national monuments and administrative spaces. The second circle (*extrarradio*), bordering on the historical centre of the city, included residential zones built mostly during the last decades of the nineteenth

Century, and additional commercial zones. Finally, the outer circle (which, in 1941, was mostly made up of undeveloped land and half-destroyed villages) was to be dedicated to residential and industrial use.[6]

The residential nuclei within the outer circle were called Satellite Suburbs—a term that reflected their ambivalent relationship with the city. The neighbourhoods of the *extrarradio* were connected to the historical centre of Madrid via a series of roads. The Satellite Suburbs, on the other hand, were isolated both from the centre and from each other. According to the Bidagor Plan, Satellite Suburbs were supposed to exist as self-sufficient units. How this was supposed to happen was never made clear, as none of the neighbourhoods was to have commercial spaces or basic health or educational services.[7]

The General Plans published in Spain throughout the 1940s and early 1950s relied heavily on the concept of functional zoning.[8] All General Plans considerably restricted the number and size of communal spaces, especially on the periphery of large urban centres. Green zones and recreational spaces were praised for their healthy and calming effects on the population. However, as the General Plans were translated into Partial Plans, most of these spaces, as well as other communal spaces set aside for commercial and cultural uses, disappeared. According to the regime, this was the unfortunate result of limited financial resources. In reality, it was mostly due to the authorities' fear that such spaces would provide an opportunity for subversive congregation.

Abelardo Martínez de Lamadrid—an industrial engineer who worked alongside Pedro Bidagor on the formulation of the Madrid General Plan—reflected on the social and economic function of zoning in Spain:

> The division into zones went hand in hand with the accepted planning criteria of the time: facilitating access to primary material; enabling the distribution of products; and minimising the drawbacks of industrial production. Also, though, zoning facilitates the location of a mass population of workers in Satellite Suburbs—spatially independent of the city itself and with easy access to the countryside. Thus, the green zones and industrial zones provided a bulwark against the invasion of the masses (…).[9]

This quotation implies that in Spain, functional zoning acquired two central goals: to meet the needs of industry and to ensure social segregation. Workers, essential as they were to the process of production, had to

be excluded from the heart of the city and relegated to suburbs that minimised their ability to create supportive communal structures and social networks.[10]

The ways in which the general plans were implemented generated extraordinary imbalances during the first two decades of the dictatorship. Such imbalances were most notable in relation to the housing market and the construction of infrastructure. This situation, in turn, brought about an increase in illegal self-building all over Spain. In the case of major urban centres such as Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao, self-construction took place mostly within the outer industrial belt that was supposed to limit the city's expansion. This area was especially attractive for squatters who came seeking work in the city due to its proximity to the industrial complexes and because it was still sparsely inhabited in the wake of the Civil War.

In a delayed response, the dictatorship attempted to adjust its urban planning regime by passing a new Law of Land (*Ley de suelo*) in 1956, followed by the Social Emergency Plan (*Plan de Urgencia Social*—PUS) in 1957. The aim of the Social Emergency Plan was to speed up the construction of housing units in general, and of low-cost housing units specifically, through cooperation with private developers. In doing so, the regime hoped to both clear the space taken up by illegal settlements and offer support to the growing construction industry. The plan called for the construction of 60,000 new housing units in Madrid, 50,000 units in Bilbao and 51,000 units in Barcelona, all within five years. However, the economic conditions under which the PUS was implemented meant it was unable to accomplish its declared goals: of the 58,000 shanty homes in the Spanish capital in 1961, 35,000 homes had still not been cleared a decade later.

A second Law of Land, which was passed in the final months of the dictatorship, reflected the understanding of architects, planners and the authorities that a radical change of perspective was needed. The 1975 Land Law was the first piece of legislation in four decades to go beyond the functional framework. Concerned with the need to increase the supply of developed land, it encouraged local authorities to come up with "open plans, without a fixed time of validity, evolutionary and non-homogeneous (…)."[11] In organisational terms, the new law placed the supervising planning bodies at the regional level. It also allowed for greater flexibility at the municipal planning level, which made the authorities more susceptible to popular pressure and to the view that local people should be involved in

decision-making processes in urban areas. At the same time, it acknowledged the inability of the state to shoulder the financial burden of planning and construction. It therefore called for the accelerated incorporation of private capital and enterprises into urban planning processes.

The more flexible and socially orientated Land Law in Spain was a quiet echo of ideas that had been heard in French and Italian planning circles since the early 1960s. However, the adoption of a more critical discourse (which took account of the community's sociological makeup and the historical background and value of space) was still adopted within a strict technical framework. Fernando Terán, who was involved in the implementation of the new Land Law, wrote: "It is interesting to note that most of the criticism directed against the law was derived from the fact that its authors recognised the authorities' impotence when it came to implementing previous (legislation)."[12] According to Terán, despite the fact that the law was published only months before the dictator's death, it did not take into account the possibility of a radical political change.

CONDITIONAL VISIBILITY: NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATIONS UNDER THE FRANCO REGIME

The growing body of literature on the history of neighbourhood associations in Spain can be divided into two interpretations: the first centres mostly on the years after 1975 and emphasises the role of outside actors (such as parties of the democratic opposition; socially-minded parish priests and members of the lay organisation *Acción Católica*; and members of the Spanish workers' movement) in politicising the urban question in Spain. According to this view, while neighbourhood associations existed from the late 1960s, it was outside influences that drove their members to move from localised protests against poor living conditions and inadequate infrastructures to coordinated mass mobilisations that called for a more democratic political system.[13] The second current emphasises the evolution of the neighbourhood associations during the years of the dictatorship. However, it, too, highlights the presence of members with a double militancy and their role in aiding their own communities to reframe concrete material demands within the context of a more general debate on the future of Spain's political system.[14]

As this chapter contends, during the final decade of the dictatorship, some neighbourhood associations already functioned as platforms that

enabled a growing number of men and women (who lacked prior experience in public activism) to enter into a dialogue with the local authorities and government agencies. This dialogue made explicit in the minds of many, the fact that the relationship between citizens and the state should be reinforced by a set of mutual rights and obligations. Precisely because the right to vote could not be discussed officially by any of the civic associations prior to 1975, their members focused their energy on obtaining other rights that were just as fundamental for popular participation, such as the right to information and the right to demand open and transparent policy formulation. The associations, which were often pushed into public action by what sociologist Igor Ahedo Gurrutxaga called a "triggering" event (*detonante*), accrued a substantial body of knowledge concerning the reality experienced by their members.[15] However, the ability to make use of such knowledge as part of an effective dialogue with the authorities depended, to a large extent, on a structure of opportunities that developed outside the associations' direct area of action.

The most significant change in the structure for associations under the dictatorship came with the publication of the 1964 Law of Associations. The new associations were granted a specific legal standing, and as such, could petition the authorities on behalf of their members. While, in 1968, neighbourhood associations made up less than 1% of all existing civic associations in Spain, by 1979 this number had risen to 17%.[16] By 1977, 60,000 people in the capital alone were involved, in one way or another, in the activities of neighbourhood associations.[17] It is important to bear in mind, however, that just as the needs of the communities, from which neighbourhood associations arose, differed widely, so did the profile of the associations themselves. In certain *barrios* (such as *Recalde* in Bilbao or *El Pozo del Tío Raimundo* in Madrid), the associations formed as a result of aid provided by local church members and priests. In some neighbourhoods, the formation of the association was the result of action taken directly by members of the clandestine opposition. In these cases, the activity of the associations was accompanied, almost from the start, by that of Communist-backed neighbourhood commissions (*comisiones del barrio*).[18] In other cases, such as that of Orcasitas in Madrid, neighbourhood associations emerged from a complex process of trial and error that was led by men and women who had no prior experience of political activism.

In all types of associations, however, the concept of double militancy gained ground in the early 1970s. The presence of militants with a twofold affiliation allowed neighbourhood associations to capitalise on their

previous experience and organisational capabilities. The clandestine opposition, on the other hand, capitalised on the growing disaffection for the regime among diverse sectors of the population by creating new channels for collective protest. The Spanish workers' movement, and especially the Communist-led *Comisiones Obreras* (CCOO) continued to operate within a rigid organisational structure, centred on the link between workers and the workplace, until the second half of the 1960s. In 1967, Santiago Carrillo published an article titled "Salir a la superficie" (Surfacing). In the article, he officially welcomed a practice called "*entrismo*" (entryism), which encouraged the infiltration of legally-recognised entities, such as the Falange's worker and student unions or the newly emerged civic associations, in order to use them as platforms for opposition strategies.[19]

Yet the idea of double militancy—in this case, militancy in the contexts of the workplace and the neighbourhood—was not without problems. The contradictions between the two forms of mobilisation—one popular and inclusive, and led by ordinary citizens; and the other more selective by nature and carried out by "professional" revolutionaries—generated continuous tension between the representatives of the clandestine opposition and some neighbourhood activists. While borrowing from the discourse and practices of the workers' movement, many neighbourhood associations refused to adopt identifiable political labels. Their aim was to make the local people, whatever their socio-political identity, into partners in a dialogue with the authorities. The central meaning of this partnership was that despite their lack of formal education, their inability to express themselves in legal and professional terms and their presumed ignorance in matters of politics and public finance, the authorities had to acknowledge that the local people played a valuable role in the process of policy formulation.

The internal structure of the associations directly contributed to this process. The work of the associations was carried out within small, topic-based working groups (*vocalías*). The *vocalías* collected and processed information regarding specific issues (housing, education, sanitation, etc.) and were in direct contact with the local people concerned, such as women, the elderly, heads of household, etc. At the heart of associational life, however, was the general assembly. *Asambleismo* was a means of action with a long history. By 1970, assemblies had mushroomed across Spain. In the case of neighbourhood associations, the assemblies' most characteristic feature was the interaction between professionals and ordinary citizens. When a problem arose, the association would call all the

neighbours together to discuss the situation. The people themselves would formulate one or more demands, or suggest forms of action *vis-à-vis* the administration, and then deliberate on the matter to try to reach a consensual decision. The neighbours would then elect a group of representatives who were responsible for conveying their demands to the administration or organising the collective action that had been decided upon. The assemblies were open assemblies: that is to say, they were open to all who lived in the *barrio*. In times of acute crisis (when forced evictions were carried out in violation of previous agreements, for example, or when neighbours were arrested by the police), the assemblies would become "permanent" ones: that is, they would maintain a certain level of involvement until the problem had been resolved.

The procedures described above functioned as a model for many neighbourhood associations. Most of the associations, however, were faced with alternating periods of great activism during which mass mobilisation of local people proved relatively easy, with times when the social base for decision-making would shrink in numbers, sometimes to the point where only the association's executive committee was involved. Nonetheless, the very existence of the assembly encouraged participation by offering opposition (theoretical, at least) to the patriarchal model that designated leaders who had better access to information and complete influence over the decision-making process. While not all neighbours felt comfortable expressing their opinions in front of the entire assembly, the great emphasis that was placed on the need to reach a consensus forced those who did speak to try to explain themselves clearly and consider the needs of the entire audience—women and men, working people and housewives, the young and the old.

The work of the assemblies and their respective committees constituted a core element in the concepts of direct democracy and self-management, as these notions were understood by neighbourhood activists. The concept of direct democracy regained prominence throughout Europe in the second half of the 1960s. Students, workers, feminist activists, neighbours and consumers in countries such as Germany, France and Italy merged different cultural projects combining their everyday life experiences with radical critiques of the existing power relations. The various projects that were grouped under the heading of 'direct' or 'radical' democracy advocated the use of deliberative procedures at most levels of policy formulation.[20] They highlighted the diversity of human experience, while at the same time striving to overcome the social fragmentation that characterised life in

late-capitalist societies. They did so by calling for unity of action between people from different backgrounds and with different viewpoints, and encouraging people to critically examine the relationship between established social categories such as class or gender and their own identifications.

At the heart of the plan for direct democracy during the Spanish transition was the concept of self-management. The Greek philosopher and psychoanalyst, Cornilius Castoriadis, defined a self-managed society as:

> (…) a society in which all decisions are taken by the collective that is directly affected by these decisions. A society in which all those who are engaged with achieving a certain goal decide collectively what it is that they wish to do, and how they wish to do it. (…) Self-management requires co-operation between those who possess knowledge, or a specific competence, and those who perform the productive process itself.[21]

Castoriadis believed that there were two preconditions to the successful functioning of a self-managed society: the first was full access to information on the part of those taking part in decision-making processes; the second was flexibility in the assignment and/or redistribution of resources (both natural and produced) so that decisions, once reached, could be implemented effectively.

In Spain, many neighbourhood associations adopted certain forms of deliberation and decision-making that were associated with the idea of self-management.[22] In the early stages of their development, however, neighbourhood associations did not always adopt practices of self-management with a clear ideological vision in mind. In many cases, such practices were first assimilated because they enabled neighbourhood activists to mobilise large segments of the population in their *barrios*. Through their cooperation with different professionals, the neighbours learnt where to seek, and how to process, information concerning their living and working environment. They became more proficient at expressing their needs and navigating the existing political system in search of solutions.[23] Self-management, as we shall see in the following section, was an effective mechanism in the everyday struggle for better living conditions. At the same time, by its very nature, it was destined to have empowering effects on both individuals and the community at large.

THE STRUGGLE IN ORCASITAS, RE-CONCEPTUALISING URBAN SPACE

What is known today as the *barrio* of Orcasitas was originally made up of three different neighbourhoods: *Meseta de Orcasitas*, *OrcaSur* and *Poblado Dirigido de Orcasitas*. The first two were formed between 1955 and 1962 as a result of illegal self-construction. The third was built as a temporary dormitory suburb in 1958 and never dismantled. This section of Madrid was the embodiment of urban alienation for many years. By the early 1970s, the *barrio* expanded to include more than 10,000 inhabitants (mostly newly-arrived migrants from Castilla la Mancha and Andalusia), all of them living in dire conditions and in an extreme state of social marginalisation.

The patterns of squatting and of community life in Orcasitas were representative of hundreds of other shanty towns all over Spain. The uniqueness of Orcasitas lies in the ways in which its inhabitants fought against eviction and challenged legal forms of entitlement as early as 1973. By forcing the local authorities to acknowledge their claim to the land they had occupied and their status as a community of residents, the inhabitants set a legal precedent. They also established their right to take an active part in any process of urban renovation pertaining to their *barrio*.

Throughout the 1960s, the authorities turned a blind eye to the illegal construction in and around Orcasitas. During that decade, however, new neighbourhoods formed within the space that separated the *barrio* from the centre of Madrid. By early 1970, the district of Villaverde (which included Orcasitas) was fully integrated into the capital, and land prices in the area rose considerably. Partly as a result of this, in April 1971, the Ministry of Housing approved a *Plan for Re-structuring the Municipal Area of Orcasitas*. The preamble to the Plan stated:

> The specific characteristics of the area, and the existence of over 600 shanty homes, calls for progressive action. Such action should enable us to expropriate some of the land and build on that land, (…) thereby avoiding temporary resettlement'[24]

The neighbours took the statement to mean that their right to remain "on the land" was guaranteed. However, they were soon to learn that the administration did not view the preamble to the plan as legally binding. The reconstruction plan was to be carried out in cooperation with private

developers. While the authorities intended to reserve some of the housing units in the new *barrio* for the original inhabitants (the number was never made explicit; it could be that the 600 shanty homes or *chabolas* mentioned in the preamble constituted the base-line for any future calculation), the majority of housing units were destined to be sold by the construction companies to newcomers. The "New Orcasitas" was destined for a new population. Faced with forced eviction and complete uncertainty about their future, the inhabitants hesitantly began exploring the possibility of resistance.

The fight against the reconstruction plan was led by the local neighbourhood association. The association (founded in 1970) was one of the first to be legalised under the dictatorship. By April 1973, the Planning Committee of Madrid made it clear it was not going to consider the neighbours' concerns. The neighbourhood association held a general assembly at which it decided to make an appeal to the Territorial Court of Madrid (*Audiencia Territorial de Madrid*). From that moment on, neighbourhood associations across Spain started to follow the events in Orcasitas. The weekly *Sábado Gráfico* declared in May 1973: "The issue of Orcasitas goes before the Supreme Court."[25] The Catholic periodical *YA* followed suit by asking:

> What can be achieved by appealing to the courts? One can only hope that the administration explicitly expresses its commitment to maintain the [social fabric] that has emerged out of a life lived together. Furthermore, we urge the authorities to implement the [reconstruction] plan by following a process of expropriation based on an exact census of the houses in this sector.[26]

Within two years, the Court made its decision, supporting the neighbours' demand to be resettled in the renovated *barrios*. The verdict declared the preambles of all Re-construction Plans to be legally binding, thereby paving the way for numerous court cases all across Spain.

In their petition to the Court, the neighbours were aided by a professional living outside Orcasitas: a professor of civil law, Eduardo García de Enterría: one of the many professionals who assisted neighbourhood associations during the final years of the dictatorship. Experts such as García de Enterría had a twofold commitment: politically, most wished to see a change in the regime's administrative structures. As lawyers and architects, many also embraced the concept of "advocacy planning", which encouraged experts to identify the citizens (in their capacity as neighbours,

consumers and parents) rather than the authorities as the beneficiaries of their work.[27]

This contribution of the professionals involved, in their capacity as translators who took it upon themselves to "frame" the knowledge, arguments and demands of the neighbours into formally recognised legal and technical terminology, was especially apparent in the case of Orcasitas. The legal exchange that took place between the neighbours and administrators following the 1973 court case centred on one issue specifically: García de Enterría's main argument was that ownership in itself could not take precedence over actual use of the land. By virtue of having lived "on the land" for over 20 years and left their mark on it, the neighbours had increased its value. They were therefore entitled to be resettled on it. This claim acknowledged two distinct sets of rights: those of landowners (*propietarios*), who did not necessarily reside in Orcasitas, and those of the neighbours (*vecinos*). Since over half of the *barrio*'s population consisted of rental tenants, the neighbourhood association also demanded that all forms of lease (with or without a contract, sub-letting and/or sharing) should be acknowledged by law so as to render the entire "community of neighbours" eligible for resettlement in the renovated *barrio*.

In late 1975, the Orcasitas neighbourhood association rejected a second remodelling plan that was presented by the City Planning Commission. A third and final plan was finally approved in 1976—a plan that was formulated jointly by the neighbours, the technical experts who assisted them (the architects José Manuel Bringas, Eduardo Leira, Ignacio Solana and Javier Vega), and the authorities. The plan included three phases: the first phase included 824 apartments that were completed in 1974, but were built in much the same style as the old dormitory suburbs, and lacked any substantial infrastructures. The second phase included 1516 apartments that were completed in 1980, built as part of the new plan whereby the *barrio* was considered a complex spatial unit that had social, communal and commercial functions. The third phase of construction started in 1980. After many delays, it was completed in 1986 and included 760 additional apartments.

In the case of Orcasitas, the neighbours determined both the internal structure of their flats and the structure of the entire *barrio*. How was this done? In 1976, the architects working with the association carried out a consultation that was intended to verify the priorities of the residents of the future neighbourhood. They entered the existing *chabolas* and interviewed the local people, recording and analysing the information. One set of

questions was intended to collect information about the socio-economic profile of a family and its makeup (the family's combined income, the number of people in the household, whether the family owned a car, etc.). The second set included questions that were meant to give the architects a sense of the ways in which each family used its living space. People were asked if they wished to live in a house with a single or multiple floors, and whether they would prefer to live in a four-storey building without a lift, or a seven-storey building with one. They were asked how far away from the building they were willing to park their cars, and what would be considered a safe pedestrian route for their children. The preamble to the plan stated accordingly:

> We wish to reproduce the [atmosphere] experienced by the neighbours of Orcasitas, who presently live in a *barrio* made up of low-rise houses, where the street is used and valued in its original form. (…) We wish to mix housing spaces with other spaces—mostly commercial. (…) Finally, we wish to reduce the height of the buildings to a minimum. This is the preference expressed by all the neighbours, who indicated they did not want to live in high-rise apartments or be surrounded by high buildings.[28]

The architects processed the information and constructed two sets of model flats, which were presented as options to the neighbours. The new *barrio* was divided into six nuclei that included a mix of four-, eight- and ten-storey buildings and the Civic Centre, which to this day serves as the heart of community life in Orcasitas and the headquarters for the neighbourhood association. Each nucleus was made up of eight—ten buildings, arranged around a small courtyard and a commercial space. The ground floor of each building included a nursery and a playroom for children. The aim was to create multi-scalar spaces for socialising—from the playrooms in each building to the courtyard that united several buildings, and to the Civic Centre and its large plaza.

José Manuel Bringas, who was the first architect to join the technical advisory team in Orcasitas, wrote about the process of informed choice that culminated in a plan for the new *barrio*:

> (…) there are those who speak negatively of architects (turned) activists. I did not infiltrate the association under the pretext of advising the people in order to stir them up and propel them into a struggle against those in power. Anyone who knows the story of the struggle in Orcasitas personally would

burst out laughing at hearing these accusations. In the *Meseta* no-one had to stir them up—no-one! Not the president [of the association], not the members of the directive committee, not the technical advisors. The entire *Meseta* rose up though the people had been made aware that something threatened **their** re-modelling project. (…) In this type of work, the "technical advisor", in his capacity to offer technical or academic solutions, cannot be replaced by a neighbour. At the same time, it is important that he or she understand that their job is to guide the neighbours through the process of managing (and assessing) the solutions that are being offered to them. Nothing more and nothing less.[29]

The approval of the remodelling proved to be a turning point in the history of Orcasitas; however, its implementation was long and torturous. As the process got underway, new problems arose. The first matter put the very fabric of the community to the test: who would have priority on the first flats? This was decided in a general assembly that took place in Orcasitas in early 1977. While some suggested that priority should be given to those who lived in the worst conditions, the majority agreed that the first to be resettled should be those whose *chabolas* would leave the most space for effective construction.[30]

On 16 January 1979, the government published new legislation regarding the construction of Protected Housing Units. Given the complete lack of interest from private investors in shouldering the burden of construction (a new decree on the subject was published in 1976, but by late 1977, not a single Social Housing Unit had been constructed in the Madrid area), the government attempted to boost the social housing programme by readjusting the price and size of the flats.[31] The publication of the decree gave rise to a wave of demonstrations by neighbourhood associations who were already engaged in a remodelling process. The neighbours protested that the new decree limited the size of the flats, increased their price and worsened the payment conditions. Neighbourhood activists were especially outraged that the decree was approved with no objection from any of the political parties. On 19 January, the Orcasitas Neighbourhood Association undertook a 15 km march that passed through all the *barrios* on the southern periphery of Madrid. In each *barrio*, members of the local association called the neighbours to an open assembly, where they explained the disadvantages of the new decree.[32] At each stop along the way, the local residents were asked to join the human chain that made its way to the *Plaza de la Villa* in the centre of Madrid and, later on, to the Ministry of Public Works.[33]

In early 1980, the Ministry of Housing announced that neighbourhoods that were already in the middle of a remodelling process based on an approved partial plan, would be excluded from the new decree. However, by 1982, cutbacks in the budgets of municipalities all over Spain due to the economic crisis generated corresponding cutbacks in the budgets allocated for remodelling. This, in turn, sparked another wave of protests. Only in 1986, did the neighbours finally get the keys to their new flats.

In 1986, the inhabitants of Orcasitas celebrated the inauguration of the new *barrio* with an exhibition about their 15-year fight, which was housed in the new headquarters of the neighbourhood association within the civic centre. In a final act, which symbolised their control over their renovated living space, the residents named the streets. The action of naming the streets also symbolised a shift from a point when they fought for their neighbourhood to a point where they were keeping memories of the neighbourhood alive by naming the streets themselves. *Calle de la Remodelación* (remodelling), *Calle de los Encierros* (lockdowns), *Plaza del Movimiento Ciudadano* (Civil Movement), *Plaza de la Memoria Vinculada* (linked memory) are just a few of the street names in present-day Orcasitas. The neighbours recorded this process with great pride:

> Let us talk for a moment about the *plaza*, which is today named *Plaza de la Memoria Vinculada*. It commemorates the decision of the courts to uphold the preamble of the first Partial Plan as legally binding. This is not a common name—no other *plaza* or street is so named. In the old centre of Madrid, there are streets whose names are repeated: streets named after lords and generals.

> Who decides on those names? In Orcasitas we named our own streets. We are the ones who live here. We get our mail delivered to those addresses. There is no greater testament to our sovereignty.[34]

These street names do not serve only to testify passively to struggles of the past; they prompt questions by visitors and by the *barrio*'s younger population, which, in turn, allows the story of Orcasitas to be told and retold. The act of naming space invests it with meaning, which, in some cases, had the potential to outlive the people who created it. The generation of new representations of space took different forms within different associations: the production of temporary exhibitions; collective conservation of personal photos and newspaper clippings testifying to the transformation of

the *barrios*; and the publication of neighbourhood newspapers and collectively edited books (such as *Del Barro al Barrio* in Orcasitas or *el Libro Negro de Rekaldeberri* in Recalde, Bilbao). Through all these methods, different communities across Spain worked to place their respective histories at the centre of a more generalised and complex narrative: that of Spain's transition to democracy. They attempted to turn their own narratives into a reference point for future generations.

THE FAILED DREAM OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY: MUTED NARRATIVES OF THE TRANSITION

The contribution of neighbourhood associations to the process of democratisation in Spain extended beyond the boundaries of their respective *barrios*. In his study of the mobilisations in Madrid from 1975 onwards, sociologist Ramón Adell concluded that over 70% of all the demonstrations in the capital between 1975 and 1982 were initiated by the Citizens' Movements.[35] The extensive press coverage of these demonstrations reflects the fact that, during the final months of the dictatorship, the strategies adopted by neighbourhood associations changed significantly. The general assembly continued to be the main mobilising framework within the *barrios*, but the forms of action which the assemblies initiated became more varied in nature. In cities across Spain, neighbourhood activists moved from requesting meetings with municipal functionaries and presenting petitions to holding mass demonstrations, collective sit-downs and lock-outs.

For the purposes of this chapter, 40 street demonstrations that were instigated by neighbourhood associations in the Madrid area between 1975 and 1979 were analysed.[36] Of these, the majority began as a protest about various demands. Small scale, single-issue demonstrations were often sparked by the opposition to land expropriation, or in response to the authorities' inability to carry out the urban remodelling within a reasonable timeframe. Large-scale demonstrations were often started for specific reasons, such as the call for amnesty or to protest the rising cost of living, but were often used by individuals and groups in order to raise further demands. A demonstration that took place in Moratalaz in September 1976, for example, included more than 100,000 participants—men, women and children. The demonstration was called in order to demand that the government curtail rising prices. At the same time, many

participants also held banners, which read: "democratic city-councils", "No more prohibitions! No more repression!", and "Legalisation of all democratic associations".[37]

The change in tactics following November 1975 had clear spatial implications: it shifted the associations' sphere of action from the neighbourhoods on the periphery into the centre of the capital. Large-scale demonstrations literally occupied (even if only for a short time) the streets of Madrid. Collective sit-downs, on the other hand, were usually staged in front of government ministries and council buildings, while lock-outs usually occupied medium-sized community buildings such as local churches, schools and, at times, market places. Protestors centred these acts of occupation on fixed protest sites, while also employing a range of mobile and flexible spatial strategies. Lock-outs were most often carried out at sites that were part of the community's everyday lives. While not entirely improvised, they were organised within short timeframes and made use of the *barrio*'s most readily available residents: women and children. Sit-downs often took place outside the *barrio* at sites that symbolised the interaction between the demonstrators and the authorities. Demonstrations were more mobile in nature, often producing interactions between groups of protesting citizens, sympathetic crowds, neutral observers and the intervention of the forces of law and order.

While sit-downs and lock-outs were not necessarily authorised acts, large-scale demonstrations had to be approved by the authorities beforehand. In such cases, negotiations often took place: the associations would request that the demonstrations take place in one of the *plazas* at the centre of Madrid. The ability to temporarily take over a space, such as the *Plaza de Colón* or *Plaza de Cibeles*, which were not open to popular demonstrations during the years of the dictatorship, had clear symbolic implications. For this reason, the requests were often refused by the authorities during the initial stages of the transition. In the days prior to the massive demonstration that took place in Moratalaz in September 1976, for example, the organisers asked to occupy *Plaza de Cibeles* and were refused.[38] Instead, the demonstration was rerouted to the streets of the working-class neighbourhood of Moratalaz. While the *plaza* was not conquered, the demonstrators' visibility and their ability to block the circulation of traffic into the centre of the capital probably had equal impact.

By mid-1976, the regime was clearly losing its ability to keep different urban populations segregated from one another. Neighbourhood associations could no longer be contained within the periphery of the capital, and

their interactions with other protest organisations became more sustained. During the first year of the transition, neighbourhood associations initiated 22.1% of the 145 demonstrations and public gatherings that took place in the capital. They managed to mobilise 208,000 people. Labour unions affiliated with parties of the democratic opposition initiated 43.1% of the acts that year, but mobilised only 79,000 people.[39] These numbers indicate that neighbourhood associations were a driving force behind large-scale popular mobilisations. While fully embracing the call of other protest groups for amnesty for all political prisoners and for the complete restitution of democratic liberties, they had further demands on their agendas. The ability to bridge the gap between local and more universal experiences of the struggle was crucial to their ability to interact with, and mobilise, other entities within the Citizens' Movement.

Diani and Della Porta defined the dynamics of new social movements in the following terms:

> We have a social movement dynamic when single episodes of collective action are perceived as components of a longer-lasting action, rather than discrete events; and when those who are engaged in them feel linked by ties of solidarity and of ideal communion with protagonists of other analogous mobilisations.[40]

We find the above definition useful for an analysis of the relationship between the core organisations that made up the Citizens' Movement. Neighbourhood associations had their own agendas and functioned as independent entities in order to realise them. At the same time, their members saw themselves as part of a large-scale dialogue with the authorities regarding a series of core issues common to other civic entities. Throughout the first year of the transition, they developed what Mark Granovetter defined as networks of 'weak ties' in relation to other entities of the democratic opposition.[41] These networks connected neighbourhood activists with the wider political field. They allowed for the circulation of information and pooling of resources. They also provided activists with the collective know-how that enhanced their own position *vis-à-vis* the authorities and allowed them to act as part of multi-actor campaigns.

During the second half of 1976, neighbourhood associations developed firmer working relations with other civic entities, such as the Housewives' Associations. Simultaneously, the appointment of Adolfo Suarez as Prime Minister raised the expectations for a faster political transition backed by

economic reforms. On the streets, these expectations were manifested by a growing number of mass demonstrations. One of the biggest demonstrations of neighbours and housewives took place in Aranjuez near Madrid on 16 May. Two thousand activists and their families responded to a call by the Federation of Neighbourhood Associations to spend a day that was a mix of family fun and political activity. The gathering ended with the reading of a document that specified the Federation's goals: the implementation of all existing remodelling plans; the institution of price controls for basic commodities and services; and the legalisation of all existing neighbourhood associations. At this point, *Guardia Civil* forces attempted to disperse the assembled crowd by opening fire. Several demonstrators and journalists (from *El País* and *YA*) were injured and arrested. A spokesman for the security forces informed the press a week later that the actions had been "inevitable" due the insistence of the "non-existent Federation of Neighbourhood Associations to stage an illegal demonstration."[42] The dismissive words of the spokesman for one of the major law and order forces reflected the tenuousness of the Federation's formal standing.

The Madrid neighbourhood associations refused to give in. In June, they launched a "Civic Week" (*semana ciudadana*) under the suggestive heading "Madrid is Ours". The week included a variety of public acts in different *barrios* and culminated in an authorised demonstration that took place along *calle Preciados* on 22 July. The authorities authorised a short demonstration from 8 to 9 pm for housewives only. By 8:15 pm, however, more than 50,000 demonstrators had already crowded the street. They carried a range of banners denouncing the chaotic state of the schools in the periphery; the serious shortcomings in transportation and sanitary infrastructures; the rising cost of living; the lack of cultural programmes for children and young people, for the elderly and for populations with special needs; and the refusal of the authorities to legalise many of the existing civic associations. The demonstration was a show of unity and proved that the new and diverse civic entities that rallied under the banner of the Citizens' Movement could come together to pursue a common socio-political agenda.

Throughout 1976–1977, neighbourhood associations in Madrid presented demands that reflected their growing ability to turn concrete material demands into a more comprehensive political vision. In a series of demonstrations and press releases, they stated that they wished to see a city where the centralised and corrupt tendencies of the local bureaucracy were

suppressed; they called for the democratically elected mayor to account for budgetary issues before the citizens; they asked for technical experts, who would work with, and be supervised by, the citizens; and finally, they demanded that authorities divide the perimeter of the capital into smaller districts with independent budgets. This last demand came out of an understanding that self-management could be better practised within smaller spatial units.

Neighbourhood activists were fully aware that they were part of a process of political maturation. José Luis Lorca Palencia, president of the Neighbourhood Association in La Paz, Entrevías, explained:

> The neighbours come together to decide on the [solutions] that are most convenient in their view. The association arranges for street lights but it also promotes cultural activities, dialogue with the authorities and active participation, as far as we are allowed to (participate).[43]

Felix López Rey of Orcasitas was even more explicit:

> If our people had been politicised from the start, with a defined ideology, it would not have taken us 25 years to solve our problems. The existing level of political consciousness today is not the result of the adhesion to one ideology or another; today, [neighbours] and workers are not following an ideology that has been imposed upon them. Rather, they are responding in an honest and [consistent] way to the injustices that surround them.[44]

These quotations highlight two points: local identity and shared everyday experiences generated a sense of belonging and a shared fate, which functioned as an important incentive for mobilisation over time. Middle-class and working-class associations cooperated in order to promote their identity of local people, as collective consumers (of goods, infrastructures and services) and as individuals capable of contributing to policy formation. At the same time, neighbourhood associations that worked in outlying *barrios* highlighted the role of the unequal distribution of assets in the creation of peripheral spaces within the city. In both the Madrid and Barcelona Federations, these associations constituted a majority. The fulfilment of their demands (if carried to its logical conclusion) could lead to a confrontation with other associations in the more affluent areas of the city.

Sociologist Jordi Borja, who cooperated closely with many of the neighbourhood associations in Cataluña, reflected on a situation desired by these associations within a democratic system as early as 1976:

> What does it really mean when we say that the associations have a part to play in promoting a participative local democracy? It means that the neighbours should have two ways of controlling the local administration: through elections and the existing political parties, and through the associations. By the first channel, the neighbours exercise their right to elect the administration, and by the second, they can participate in controlling the budget (and the policies) which are implemented.[45]

In April 1980, the Federation of Madrid's Neighbourhood Associations published a press release. The text reflected the deep disappointment its leaders felt with the newly-elected administration. Despite the clarity of their proposals and the intensity of their activism, it seemed that the democratic vision of the neighbourhoods had left little impression on the new system:

> There are clear distinctions between the different city councils. Unfortunately, commonalities include: scant participation by local residents; lack of public information concerning the functioning of the administration (…); general apathy of the neighbours resulting from the fact that very little has really changed. (…) We therefore declare that it is the right of all citizens to take part in municipal life, not just on a formal level but in a truly open manner.[46]

What changed, then, between 1976 and 1980? Historian Pamela Radcliff identified the publication of the new democratic constitution in 1978 as the moment at which general popular demobilisation started. This was especially the case with neighbourhood associations that were not mentioned either within the constitution or in the Law of Local Administration (*Ley regulador de las bases del régimen local*), published in 1985. This proved a great disappointment for many activists. Legal acknowledgment would have constituted a clear statement by the authorities that the neighbours did, indeed, possess information and an understanding essential to urban governance. Furthermore, the presence of neighbourhood activists within the different municipal bodies (especially the District Boards) would have ensured a continued flow of information to the neighbours at large.

As Pablo Sánchez León has stated, during the 1979 municipal elections, both the PCE and the PSOE recruited many candidates who were neighbourhood activists.[47] The new democratically elected administration clearly brought about change in terms of planning regimes: in Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao, the local authorities spent a large percentage of their budgets on expanding public infrastructures. Peripheral neighbourhoods were finally brought into contact with the city through the construction of an extended system of roads, electricity and water provision facilities. Green zones and recreational facilities were expanded throughout the city. Regeneration plans of the old centres in Barcelona and Madrid were gradually implemented.

Under the first Socialist government (1982–1986), the concept of a 'Community of Neighbours' became part of the official discourse. However, the willingness of democratic authorities to accept its implications—to allow the 'community' to take an active role in designing and regulating their own living environment—was limited.[48] Within the framework of a liberal democracy, the Spanish State guaranteed an extended list of 'essential' rights (such as housing, education, health and so forth). Continued civic participation at all levels of governance, however, was never perceived as one of those rights. Yet it was precisely the right for active, innovative and creative participation which lay at the heart of the success in Orcasitas. Without it, as most neighbourhood activists understood, the ability of ordinary citizens to shape their inhabited space could not be sustained over time.

Notes

1. Inbal Ofer, *Claiming the City/Contesting the State: Squatting, Community Formation and Democratization in Spain (1955–1986)* (London: Routledge, 2017).
2. Manuel Castells, *The Urban Question: a Marxist Approach* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979).
3. Interview with Félix López Rey, *Mundo Social*, June 1975.
4. Interview with Antonio Villanueva Agüero, "La Democracia de los Vecinos," *Doblón*, 22 March 1975.
5. Catalonia and the Basque Country, on the other hand, were identified by the new regime as centres of political subversion. As a result, they were castigated and intentionally deprived of sufficient resources for reconstruction throughout the 1940s. Consequently, the General Plan for the

city of Bilbao was only published in 1945, followed by that of Barcelona in 1953.

José María Beascoechea Gangoiti and Fernando Martínez Rueda, "La creación del "Gran Bilbao" en el franquismo y el alcalde Joaquín Zuazagoitia (1942–1959)," *Bidebarrieta: Revista de humanidades y ciencias sociales de Bilbao* 22 (2011), 88.

6. On the construction of monuments and administrative spaces in Madrid, see: Zira Box Varela, *La fundación de un régimen. La construcción simbólica del franquismo* (doctoral dissertation) (Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2008), 353–437.

7. For more on Madrid's General Plan see: "Madrid, 1941: Tercer año de la victoria," in Carlos Sambricio, *Madrid, Vivienda y Urbanismo: 1900–1960* (Madrid: Akal, 2004), 314–328.

8. Functional zoning first received wide professional dissemination during the 4 International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM IV) that took place on board a ship sailing from Marseilles to Athens in 1933. Four functions of the modern functional city were set forth in what would become known as the Athens Charter: living, working, recreation and circulation.

For more information on the formulation of the Athens Charter, see Le Corbusier, The Athens Charter (translated by A. Eardley) (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973).

9. Fernando Terán, *Planeamiento Urbano en la España Contemporánea* (Madrid: Aliaza Universidad Textos, 1982), 173.

10. For more on this issue, see: Ofer, *Claiming the City/Contesting the State*.

11. Ministerio de Vivienda, *Reforma de la ley del Suelo y Ordenación Urbana* (Madrid, 1975), 9.

See also: Catherine Blain, "Team 10, the French Context," presented at the International Conference *Team 10—between Modernity and the Everyday*, organised by the Faculty of Architecture TU Delft, Chair of Architecture and Housing (June 5–6 2003). See also: Ben Highmore, "Between Modernity and the Everyday: Team 10", in *Ibid.*

12. Terán, *El Planeamiento Urbano en la España Contemporánea*, 544.

13. Jordi Borja, *Por unos municipios democráticos. Diez años de reflexión política y movimiento ciudadano* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios de Administración Local, 1986); Borja, *Luces y sombras del urbanismo de Barcelona* (Barcelona: Colección Gestión de la Ciudad, 2010); Carme Molinero and Pere Ysàs, eds. *Construint la ciutat democràtica: El moviment vecinal durant el tardofranquisme i al transició* (Barcelona: Icaria Editorial, 2010).

14. For this position see: Manuel Castells, *City and the Grassroots* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Víctor Urritia Abaigar, *El movimiento vecinal en el área metropolitana de Bilbao* (Bilbao: Instituto Vasco de

Administración Pública, 1985); Manuel Castells, "La formación de un movimiento social urbano: el Movimiento Ciudadano de Madrid hacia el final de la era franquista," in *La ciudad y las masas. Sociología de los movimientos sociales urbanos* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1986); Roberto Germán Fadiño Pérez, *Historia del movimiento ciudadano e historia local: el ejemplo del barrio de Yagüe en Logroño (1948–1975)* (Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 2003); Constantino Gonzalo Morell, "Una visión global de movimiento asociativo vecinal regional durante la Transición: 1970–1986," *Estudios Humanísticos. Historia* 9 (2010), 195–220; Pamela Radcliff, *Making Democratic Citizens in Spain. Civil Society and the Popular Origins of the Transition, 1960–78* (New York: Palgrave, 2011).

15. In the case of the associations in both Barcelona and Madrid, the 'triggering' event was the implementation of some of the partial plans that emerged from the Barcelona Metropolitan Plan and Madrid Regional Plan. In the case of Bilbao, the association of Recalde, for example, was moved into action by the death of a child, María Teresa Sánchez Rivas, who, in November 1970, had been run over by one of the dustbin lorries that operated and were parked in the *barrio*. It was this event that drove the neighbours to protest for the first time against the use of their *barrio* as a car park for the city's waste collection companies and the lack of educational and recreational facilities, leaving the children of Recalde to roam the streets.

16. See Radcliff, *Making Democratic Citizens in Spain*, 91–92. For more limited statistics, based solely on the information provided by the National Delegation of the F.E.T in charge of Associations, see: Elena Maza Zorria, *Asociacionismo en la España Franquista. Aproximación Histórica* (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2011), 102–103.

17. Castells, *The City and the Grassroots*, 226.

18. Neighbourhood commissions were prominent in Barcelona (in the area that would later be called Nou Barris and in neighbourhoods such as Carmel, Bon Pastor, Barceloneta, Can Clos and Sant Andreu) as well as in Otxarkoaga in Bilbao and Palomeras Bajas and Entrevías in Madrid.

19. Santiago Carrillo, "Salir a la superficie," *Nuestra Bandera*, 65,3 (1967), 15–16.

20. See. for example: Julia Abelson, Pierre Gerlier Forest, John Eyles, Patricia Smith, Elizabeth Martin and Francois Pierre Gauvin, "Deliberations about Deliberative Methods: Issues in the Design and Evaluation of Public Participation Processes," *Social Science and Medicine*, 57 (2003), 239–251; Rebeca Aers, *Inventing Local Democracy: Grassroots Politics in Brazil* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2000); Gianpaolo Baiocchi, "Participation, Activism, and Politics: The Porto Alegre Experiment," in *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory*

Governance, eds. Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (New York: Verso, 2003), pp. 45–76; Archon Fung, "Associations and Democracy: Between Theories, Hopes, and Realities," *Annual Review of Sociology* 29 (2003), 515–539.

21. Cornilius Castoriadis, "Autogestion et Hiérarchie," *Le Contenu du Socialisme* (Paris: UGE, 1979), 2.

22. Ruben Vega García, "Radical Unionism and the Workers' Struggle in Spain," *Latin American Perspectives* 114, 27, 5 (2000), 111–133; Francisco Fernández Buey and Jordi Mir García "Apropiación del futuro: revuelta estudiantil y autogestión durante el tardo-franquismo y la Transición," *Desacuerdos*, 6 (2011), 161–168.

23. In Bilbao, for example, the Recalde association, in 1968, conducted a survey which indicated that the *barrio* included a population of 8333 children under the age of 14. Of those, 1928 children received some sort of formal instruction in temporary classes constructed in the neighbourhood and a further 947 had school placements in other areas of Bilbao. 2850 children had no access to formal education. Following the death of María Teresa Sánchez Rivas in 1970, six neighbourhood associations in the Bilbao area demanded a meeting with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Housing. The meeting took place in May 1971 and was followed in September by the publication of the Emergency Education Plan for the Basque Provinces. For more on this see: Igor Ahedo Gurrutxaga, "Bilbao y frontera interna: integración comunitaria desde la exclusión urbana. El caso de Rekaldeberri," *Bidebarrieta: Revista de humanidades y ciencias sociales de Bilbao* 23 (2012), 108–110.

24. The number of shanty homes cited in the document was based on a partial survey of the neighbourhood that was conducted in 1961 and covered only about 20% of the *barrio*'s area. It was later contested by the Orcasitas Neighbourhood Association. See Gerencia Municipal de Urbanismo, *Plan parcial de ordenación de Orcasitas* (Madrid, November 1971).

25. M. Muñoz & M. Frias, "El tema de Orcasitas va al Supremo," *Sábado Gráfico*, 12 May 1973.

26. "Los problemas del barrio madrileño de Orcasitas," *YA*, 24 August 1973.

27. Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31 (1965), 186–197.
    For more on engaged professionals during the Spanish transition to democracy, see: Tamar Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain 1970–1985* (Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), Chaps. 4–6.

28. Poligono Meseta de Orcasitas, Hoja Informativa no. 3—La manzana, editada por el equipo de técnicos de la asociación de vecinos.

29. J. Manuel Bringas, "El técnico de los vecinos," Meseta de Orcasitas, *Boletín Informativo* 1 (April 1982), 7–8.

30. Asociación de Vecinos) de Orcasitas, *La Meseta de Orcasitas. Del Barro al Barrio*, (Madrid, 1986), 193–194.
31. For the first decree, see: https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-1976-26183. For the second, see: http://igvs.xunta.es/normativa/2_REAIS%20DECRETOS/RD%203148-78.pdf.
32. The price of the apartments in Orcasitas, for example, rose from 1,400,000 pesetas (with a monthly payment of 4000 pesetas spread over 35 years) to 2,450,000 pesetas (with a monthly payment of 9600 pesetas spread over 25 years). Widows and retired people were no longer allowed to spread the payments over 50 years. No discount was given to those neighbours that were qualified and willing to take part in the construction processes.
33. "Marcha verde de los vecinos sobre el ministerio de OBRAS Públicas," *Informaciones*, Madrid, 19 February 1979; A. Yañez, "Vecinos de Orcasitas protestan por el encarecimiento de las viviendas protegidas," *ABC*, 20 February 1979.
34. *Del Barro al Barrio*, 37.
35. Ramón Adell, "El estudio del contexto político a través de la protesta colectiva. La transición política en la calle," in *Movimientos sociales: cambio social y participación,* eds. María Jesus Funes Rivas and Ramón Adell (Madrid: UNED, 2003), 77.
36. The analysis is based on the information collected from the sections of local news in the following newspapers: *ΥA*, *Pueblo*, *El País*, *Gaceta Ilustrada*, *Informaciones*, *Diario 16*, *Mundo Obrero*, *ABC*, *Nuevo Diario*, *Ciudadano*, *Doblón*, *Mundo Social*, *Boletín HOAC*, *Arriba*, *La Tribuna Libre*.
37. "La concentración de Moratalaz," *El País,* September 1976.
38. "Una espectacular concentración en Moratalaz. Decenas de millares de personas protestan por la carestía de la vida," *El País,* 20 December 1976.
39. Adell, "*El estudio del contexto político a través de la protesta colectiva*", 78–79.
40. Mario Diani and Donatella Della Porta, *Social Movements. An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 23.
41. Mark Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties," *The American Journal of Sociology* 78, 6 (1973), 1360–1380.
42. See: "La Guardia Civil disuelve una concentración de "vecinos", en Aranjuez," *El País,* 18 May 1976; "Procesado y multado por la concentración de Aranjuez," *El País*, 21 May 1976; "Nueva nota de la Dirección General de Seguridad sobre los sucesos de Aranjuez," *El País,* 22 May 1976.
43. J. L. Lorca Palencia, "Así son los líderes de Madrid," *El País,* 4 May 1976.
44. F. López Rey, *Ibid*.

45. Jordi Borja, "Los nuevos movimientos urbanos están construyendo un nuevo marco político social," *JANO ARQUITECTURA, Revista de Arquitectura, interiorismo y diseño* (1979), 39.
46. Federación de Vecinos de Madrid, "Queremos participar activamente," *Pueblo*, 30 April 1980, p. 170.
47. Pablo Sánchez León, "Radicalism without Representation: On the Character of Social Movements in the Spanish Transition to Democracy," in *The Politics and Memory of Democratic Transition. The Spanish Model*, eds. Gregorio Alonso and Diego Muro (New York: Routledge, 2010), 95–112.
48. For this position see also: Victor Pérez Quintana and Pablo Sánchez León, eds. *Memoria ciudadana y movimiento vecinal. Madrid, 1968–2008* (Madrid: Catarata, 2008), 112–113.

Professional Citizenship in the Workplace: Teachers' Civic Initiatives

Abstract This chapter focuses on the social movements of teachers in order to explore the implications of their professional struggles for the construction of new forms of citizenship. The chapter shows that the teachers' movements adopted strategies that were intimately connected to the essence of their work. These practices extended their obligations and rights not only as professionals, but also as citizens. By perceiving their work in the schools as part of a struggle for social rights, they were turning it into a meaningful civic act. Their negotiation of their professionalism through the reaffirmation of their knowledge, the enhancing of their autonomy, and the extension of their ideals of service strengthened their ties to the community as professionals responsible for the weakest sectors of society.

Keywords Teachers' associations · Spanish transition to democracy · General law of education · Social movements

In the cycle of protests that emerged in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s, we can also find social mobilization among professional groups. Doctors, psychologists, architects and teachers organized within the framework of their workplace and assumed social-justice-oriented goals: doctors fought for better health services, psychologists aspired to the social integration of people with special needs, architects reclaimed fairer planning and teachers demanded a more inclusive and just education system.[1] In the case of

public sectors such as health and education, professional identity, practices and organisations were central to the struggle for these social goals. They were used to justify the mobilisation, carry it out and direct it, and at the same time they were its objectives, in the sense that there was a generalised effort to reformulate the understanding of professional work—a process which had implications for professional identity, practices and organisations. These were social movements that interacted within professional spaces, under a dictatorial regime, which deprived its citizens of basic rights, such as freedom of expression, association, and the option to participate effectively in politics.

In this chapter, we focus on the case of the social movements of teachers during the transition to democracy in Spain in order to explore the implications of these kinds of professional struggles for the construction of new forms of citizenship. In the first part of the chapter, we explore how, by introducing social militancy into the workplace, the teachers' movements challenge academic perceptions of professionalism that tend to marginalise the political implications of expert domains. We then move on to examine how their struggle for social rights aimed to reformulate the relations between the state and its citizens as manifested in their workplace. Looking at two specific struggles waged by the teachers, the next part of the chapter explores the interactions between crucial elements of professionalism and the construction of new modes of citizenship. The chapter concludes with an attempt to draw out the political vision underlying the activity of many of the teachers' groups and its connections with social movements in other countries at the time.

PROFESSIONALISM AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: THE CASE OF SPANISH TEACHERS

Although there is no single definition of a profession, it is generally accepted that three elements important to the concept are: knowledge; self-regulation; and social responsibility.[2] However, different occupations score differently on each of these requirements, and some activities are perceived as more or less professional in different eras—thus, professions are historically contingent. Teaching presents a good example of an occupation which, over the course of the past few decades, has undergone both processes of professionalisation and de-professionalisation: professionalisation through integration into universities and the requirement of

higher education certificates; and de-professionalisation due to loss of autonomy and the massive expansion of the profession.

More importantly, both traditional and more critical sociological treatments of the professions tend to distance them from any kind of social or political involvement. According to the traditional view, professionals' specific knowledge relates to social capital such as health, justice and education, and earns them the privileges of self-regulation and status. This social trustee professionalism shields them from the influence of ordinary domains such as politics, social movements, unions etc. More critical views hold that professionals are different from other occupations only because they have succeeded in convincing outsiders that, due to their knowledge and social orientation, they deserve their status and autonomy, but in reality, their basic operating principle is self-interested market rationality.[3]

Neither view—that of "social trustee professionals" nor that of "self-interested professionals"—contemplates the possibility of social and political militancy in the workplace. While, in the first case, there is a strong ethical code with regards to professionals' commitment to the well-being of society, it is understood in general terms, and does not allow the taking of sides over specific issues. In the second case, as the whole interpretation is based on power struggles, any other goals seem irrelevant and could even be considered counterproductive to the maintenance of status and privilege.

As a result of these sociological traditions, professional actors, which play a crucial role in modern societies, are not usually seen as political actors. Both academics and practitioners tend to frame them in discussions concerning questions of ethics, work, occupation and social status, downplaying any political meaning of professional work.[4] This tendency applies to sociological analysis of the teaching profession in Spain in the late Twentieth Century.[5] In one of the earliest studies on the role of teachers in Spain, Carlos Lerena claims that although teachers' working conditions were always very poor, the fact that they were associated with culture gave them social distinction. As a result, teachers have tended to perceive themselves as superior to the popular classes, identifying themselves with the state and despising any political activity.[6] In a later work, Félix Ortega maintains that there is a clear contradiction in teachers' social position in Spain. On one hand, there is the autonomous teacher who is responsible for educational activities in the classroom, while on the other there is the bureaucratic teacher—a civil servant who is an integral part of the state's

administrative machine. As a result of the reduction in their professional status, due to the proliferation of educational services, the loss of autonomy and the frustration due to their inability to affect their students' destinies, Spanish teachers tend to identify themselves as civil servants (*funcionarios*) —a label that implies mistrust of civil society and the avoidance of assuming any social, cultural or political commitments.[7]

Such general observations notwithstanding, in the 1970s, Spanish teachers were involved in large-scale mobilisation on two main issues: their working conditions and the pedagogical methodology used in the classrooms.[8] The former involved the creation of a democratic union to bypass the regime's state-controlled unions. With the establishment of the dictatorship at the end of the 1930s, the teachers' trade unions were abolished, along with the rest of the independent workers' organisations. A National Union of Teachers (*Sindicato Nacional de Enseñanza*, SNE) was later created in the private sector as part of the state-monopolised vertical union. In the public sector, as teachers were not allowed to belong to a union, the Spanish Teaching Service (*Servicio Español del Magisterio*, SEM) was their only legal option. Both organisations aimed to control teachers ideologically and guarantee their cooperation within the new state. However, from the late 1960s onwards, teachers were involved in creating alternative representative bodies and using the official system to fight for the improvement of their working conditions. These initiatives were very successful, and in the 1970s, 70% of Spanish teachers participated in labour conflicts, which were accompanied by the demand to democratise the educational system.[9]

The latter struggle saw the emergence of local groups of teachers, dedicated to transforming classroom practices. The mobilisation of teachers over pedagogical issues did not involve such high numbers, but included the creation of a wide variety of civic associations and the setting up of self-training courses for teachers. Their aim was to support young teachers who wanted to replace the dictatorship's hierarchical model of pedagogy with liberating and egalitarian teaching techniques. The extent of the pedagogical activity grew steadily in this period. In 1979, thirty self-training courses for teachers were organised, with 22,500 taking part. The number continued to grow, though at a slower rate, until 1982, when 52 courses were organised, with the participation of 26,893 teachers.[10] Around 10% of primary teachers were directly involved in these activities, but their circles of influence were much wider.[11]

The education system in the 1970s became a lively sphere in which a vibrant network of civic associations and social movements fought for a variety of economic, social and cultural goals.[12] While a sociological analysis of teachers does reflect part of the reality, it underestimates this phase of teachers' activism. This tendency stems partly from the prejudice discussed above, and partly from the fact that the pedagogical and union-related struggles are not perceived as a single phenomenon. However, as will be discussed in the following sections, most of the teachers' groups endorsed a common far-reaching educational programme. By rallying behind it, not only did these groups bring social and political issues into professional domains; they also challenged the state's long-standing control of their workplace. As we shall see, they negotiated professionalism in a way that had implications for the relationship between the state and its citizens.

Social Citizenship in the Workplace

The educational programme that was adopted by the teachers' movements was articulated in a series of documents published in the mid-1970s. One of the first documents to outline its principles was *Una Alternativa para la Enseñanza: Bases para la Discusión*,[13] presented in January 1975 at the annual assembly of the *Colegio de Doctores y Licenciados* in Madrid.[14] The main part of the *Alternativa* deals with the structure of the education system and presents its two main features: The first is the view of education as a public service: "*State-run education*, thus considered to be a *public service*, needs to extend to anywhere social needs require it, until it encompasses the fundamental teachings of all levels and types."[15] The second is the democratic planning and running of the education system: "A democratic reform requires *democratic planning* of educational policy, and *democratic running* of the whole of the education system. While we extol it as an alternative process, and while we speak of the creation of a New Public Schooling System, we are aware of the *necessity of breaking away from the bureaucratic and centralised way* that education is currently governed in the Spanish state."[16]

The term *Escuela Pública* became the slogan for the struggle, and encapsulated these two ideas: meeting the educational needs of the entire population with equal conditions, and enabling the public to participate in the running of the education system. This project positioned itself clearly in relation to the regime's educational policies. For many years, the Franco

regime dedicated very little funding to state schooling. As a result, the number of religious private schools grew steadily. The neglect of the education system, and of primary education, in particular, was so pronounced that in 1951 only 50% of children between 6 and 13 actually received primary education.[17] However, at the end of the 1960s, the regime changed its educational policies, and an education law—the General Law of Education, *Ley General de Educación* (LGE), passed in 1970—declared that "Education (…) in all aspects, shall be considered a fundamental public service…".[18] In addition, the law established *Educación General Básica* (EGB, Basic General Education for children between 6 and 14), whose objectives were as follows:

> …to afford equal educational opportunities to one and all, with no limitations other than each individual's own capacity to study; to establish an education system which is characterised by its unity, flexibility and interrelations, whilst offering a wide range of options for continuing education, and a close connection with educational needs, which guides the dynamic of the country's social and economic evolution. Ultimately, the aim is to construct a continuing education system which is not designed as a selective filter of students, but rather is capable of helping each and every Spaniard to fully realise his or her capacity.[19]

The LGE was passed five years before the publication of the *Alternativa*. It was radically different from the regime's previous educational policies. At least in terms of discourse, the regime took on board the premise that it was the state's responsibility to provide equal education to all its citizens.[20] In fact, within the circles of the clandestine opposition, it was recognised that it was becoming difficult to criticise the regime's educational policies at the time.[21] Hence, the *Alternativa* was a response not so much to the discourse of the regime as to the practical aspects of the implementation of the reform.

The reform was promulgated by the Spanish Parliament, but the economic reform that was intended to fund it was never approved. That is, the regime did not provide the financial backing for its own educational reform, and as a result, its implementation was slow and problematic. The economic crisis of 1973 complicated the situation still further, and in addition, the high-ranking officials spearheading the reform were gradually replaced by a more conservative team. This new team introduced changes which ran counter to the spirit of the reform, and became known as the counter-reform.

The 1970 reform spoke openly of the need to improve teachers' working conditions and social status. However, due to the complex political and economic situation, the regime was unable to fulfil its own promises. Conflict among primary school teachers broke out at the beginning of 1973, with the publication of EGB teachers' salary supplements, which were considerably lower than those of other state-employed educators. This was the first time that EGB teachers in the public sector were involved in large-scale mobilisation under the dictatorship.[22] The daily and specialised press carried information about gatherings of teachers across the country—most, though not all, organised by the SEM. Some of these assemblies grew to vast proportions, such as in Granada, where, according to published figures, more than 2000 teachers attended the meeting. In Madrid, 1500 teachers took part, and in Barcelona—where the number of participants reached 4000—the SEM issued a statement explaining that the meeting had been dissolved because the high number of participants was preventing the most urgent issues from being discussed.[23] This event represents a general trend whereby the SEM lost control of its own initiatives. The organisation failed to channel the teachers' activism to reinforce its own leadership, and instead found itself fielding public criticism of its own ability to function.

In most provinces, teachers' collective actions were not limited to huge gatherings, and there was talk, for the first time under the dictatorship, of EGB teachers taking part in massive strikes. No clear data exists on the number of strikers, and media coverage was very fragmentary, but all indications are that the strikes took place on a national scale.[24] As a result of these strikes and protests, teachers received a considerable increase in their salaries. However, this was a temporary remedy to civic unrest in the education system.

These first attempts at collective action in the public education system came after three decades, during which time, teachers were not involved in any activities against the regime. The brutal repression of republican teachers and the recruitment of teachers supportive of the Franco regime ensured that, for many years, there were no signs of opposition in the education system.[25] The success of the 1973 national strike led to the emergence of local assemblies, where independent representatives were elected. These local leaders established a network of contacts which, by the beginning of 1976, had become a representative body known as the *Coordinadora*.[26]

During this stage of the struggle, from the promulgation of the 1970 reform until the discussions of the *Alternativa* in 1975, the teachers'

movements demanded that the state fulfil its promises with regards to their working conditions.[27] It was not an overt bid to challenge the legitimacy of the dictatorship, nor its educational policy. On the contrary, by basing their demands on the regime's own policy, the movements were, in fact, indirectly legitimising it. However, the struggle brought, in its wake, the emergence of social practices that extended, and gave new meanings to, the limited status of citizenship under the Franco regime. Firstly, the demand for the government to be accountable to the public, and the pressure tactics that accompanied it, such as strikes by state employees, were a phenomenon without precedent under the dictatorship. Secondly, the emergence of open assemblies as a way of bypassing the regime's state-controlled unions transferred the source of legitimacy from the state to the citizens. Teachers were appropriating the right to present the state with their demands, and creating their own procedures for political participation, thus actively redefining their relationship with the state and their own role in the process.

The *Escuela Pública* as presented in the *Alternativa* in 1975 was closely related to these social practices of taking a level of control and making demands of the state. While it integrated ideas that had been previously circulating in the clandestine political parties of the left, it built on these experiences and their implications for its educational agenda. The central features of the *Escuela Pública* actually reflected two different concepts of citizenship that were being negotiated at the heart of the educational social movements. On the one hand, the definition of education as a public service refers clearly to the responsibility of the state to cater to the social needs of its citizens—that every Spaniard should have the right to the same kind of education. The document demands "universal and universally free education" for children from the ages of 4 to 16. In addition, it refers to a single educational path, which consists of different interconnected stages, culminating in a single qualification. This path would be provided in a "unified schooling system with uniform quality and levels, and with no discrimination with respect to installations, media, teaching staff or content". To achieve this, the authors demanded the integration of private education into the state system.

The second central feature of the *Escuela Pública*, which demands the democratisation of the education system, is associated with a more active concept of citizenship. The document refers to a "dynamic conception of management and control", meaning the opening up of the education system—which had, up until that point, been controlled entirely by the

central administration—to the participation of the regional, provincial, and local entities as well as professional organisations and unions. The democratic functioning of the school is described as follows:

> Therefore, the internal functioning of the educational centres, with regard to the concrete application of the general rules, the hiring and selection of staff, the control of financial resources, the pedagogical direction, etc., will be run in a democratic manner by teachers, students and parents alike.[28]

These democratic procedures, which guarantee the participation of teachers, students and parents, imply a participative dimension of citizenship.

The document of the *Alternativa* promulgated some of the educational ideas of the clandestine political parties, combined with the experiences of the struggles of growing circles of union activists and teachers who fought for the creation of a free union and better working conditions. This process began even before the publication of the *Alternativa*, especially among university graduates. However, the document had an even greater effect on EGB teachers, in general, and on the pedagogical movements, in particular.

A strike in the private education sector in Madrid, in January 1976, was the beginning of a new wave of protest actions in the public sector that spread across Spain. The *Coordinadora*, the representative body of teachers, based on local assemblies, was finally consolidated during these strikes.[29] That body presented the Ministry of Education with a list of demands, ratified by the governing assemblies in 20 provinces, which included claims relating to teachers' working conditions such as: equal work, equal wages, equality for interns, remuneration for hours of preparation, etc. In addition, it mentioned three obviously political demands: a democratic and independent representative body, teachers' participation in the design of educational policies and free education for all. The list reveals the influence of the educational project of the *Alternativa* relating both to working conditions and to political and social rights.

However, the Project of the *Escuela Pública* was not limited to the boundaries of the fight for working conditions, making itself felt in the events, courses and publications of the movements for pedagogical innovation. The Rosa Sensat association, which was the most important pedagogical movement of the period, published its version entitled *Por Una Nueva Escuela Pública* (For a New State School) in the summer of 1975

(while the Madrid document was being debated). The Rosa Sensat association was founded in 1965 to provide training for teachers who wanted to adopt active and critical pedagogical methods.[30] Its summer training sessions (*Escuelas de Verano*) soon became its most famous activity.[31] Teachers from all over the country travelled to participate in the event, going back to their schools with a message about the importance of a scientific approach to education, together with child-focused pedagogical methods. These ideas were presented as the most efficient cure for the authoritarian legacy of the Franco regime in school. The model of the *Escuelas de Verano* was adopted throughout Spain, disseminating the ideas of the movements for pedagogical innovation.

The document *Por una nueva escuela pública*[32] declared that it was part of the attempt to construct an alternative kind of education, mentioning the Madrid document. The main body of the text dealt with the running of the new democratic school. It mentioned many topics which had already appeared in the Madrid document, such as the relations between the school and the community, and the democratic management of the schools. In this case, however, these topics received more attention and were further developed. The Rosa Sensat document presented a school in which, on the one hand, the social context permeates the 'educational' work (in the strictest sense), while on the other, the work done in the school contributes to the community's cultural development. This was a new dimension to the *Escuela Pública* project. The school is part of the community, which is involved in its running, and in turn, the school is committed to the social and cultural life of the community.

Also, with regards to the democratic running of the classrooms, the document introduced new dimensions to the *Escuela Pública* project:

> It is desirable that the teacher should arrange the class in such a way as to serve the needs of the children as a group, and which—whilst preserving the same dynamic of the class group—resolves the problems posed by the least and most advanced of the pupils.[33]

This vision goes against the individualist and competitive perception of the educational process, and introduces the idea that the class is a group that should work together, collaborating and reconciling the needs of the most advanced children with those less able.

The documents from Madrid and Barcelona were discussed all over the country, and sparked the publication of similar documents in places such as

Galicia, Castilla y León, the Canary Islands, Andalusia, etc. These documents adapted the *Escuela Pública* to the local situation, but, generally speaking, retained the same spirit: on the one hand, fighting for the social right to education, while on the other, developing democratic procedures for the design of educational policies, the running of schools and the management of classrooms.[34] The process that started with demands being made to the state was followed by responsibilities being taken on which extended the meaning of civic participation in politics, social spaces and public services.

PROFESSIONALISM AND CITIZENSHIP

The mobilisation of teachers for better educational services, headed by the slogan *Escuela Pública*, was closely connected to their own experiences in the workplace. We shall use the examples of two specific struggles to illustrate how teachers negotiated their professional identity through everyday practices, connecting them to wider social issues—a process which, in turn, redefined their own role as citizens.

The teachers' movements, and especially the pedagogical social movements, saw the pre-school years (from birth to 6 years of age) as a crucial stage in education that was not catered to by the state. Another sector they considered to be neglected by the administration was the education system in rural areas. These two issues were discussed constantly in the pedagogical journals associated with the movements, such as *Cuadernos de Pedagogía* and *Colaboración*. In addition, many of the courses and activities in the summer training sessions organised by the movements were related to these two types of education. Moreover, activists from the movements were involved in attempts to mobilise teachers and parents in order to improve education services for young children and in rural areas. In the case of pre-school education, a national *Coordinadora*, uniting different educative centres, was created:

> At that time, the *Coordinadora Estatal* (national body), at its last meeting in Madrid, defined itself as a not-for-profit popular movement, with parents and workers from Infant Schools, which would have a specific definition in each nationality…the work of the *Coordinadoras* which make up the *Coordinadora Estatal* is an in-depth and systematic quest for real alternatives to the problem of Infant Schools, at all times: running study days, fighting for the survival of the *Escuelas Infantiles Laborales* (Working Infant Schools),

supporting parliamentary proposals which espouse the educational nature of these centres, etc.[35]

Setting themselves up as a social movement was one of the most important strategies of action these teachers adopted. To bring about the change they wanted, they created this professional platform, which assumed the role of vanguard in bringing about the social and political change of having pre-school recognised as an oficial stage.

In the case of the rural school, we see similar initiatives, but at the local level. For example, in the case of the province of Salamanca, a body was established to examine the administration's plan to substitute the small rural schools with regional educational centres:

> Our working plan, while it may be complex, is not difficult: committees in every town, examination of the project in each region and joint formulation of an alternative. Perhaps in this way, we can combat the *malaise* existing about the concentration schools and, from below, provide the solution which those in the highest spheres cannot envisage. This too is education (*El Adelanto*, 1977: November 11).

In both cases, teachers mobilised as a professional group, using their knowledge of the actual work 'on the ground' in the classrooms to justify their demands. They collaborated with parents and other groups of people, but assumed leading positions in this bottom-up struggle. In the quotation regarding the rural school, we can see how they emphasise the fact that the people with a direct connection to the issue might come up with a solution that the higher-ranking officials cannot find. A similar idea was expressed with regards to the pre-school struggle.

> This double edition about pre-school children, which you have in your hands, is born of the view that these ages are valuable to us as an educational stage of particular importance—an importance which has repeatedly been denied by the administration, and repeatedly reaffirmed by all professionals in the area.[36]

The educational administration refused to accept the teachers' opinion with regards to the importance of turning pre-school into an official stage of education. The discourse produced by the teachers' movement not only highlights the importance of their knowledge as professionals, but also refers to another crucial element: their autonomy. The way they described

the needs of professionals working in that stage of education clearly demonstrates this:

> In order to be able to work in these early years, one needs:
>
> An in-depth knowledge of the children's needs, of the development of the various functions, general characteristics of that age group, skill development, etc.[37]
>
> A systematic knowledge of pedagogical resources and of their gradual application to the situations both of each individual child and of the group.
>
> An in-depth knowledge of observation techniques as a tool for work, reflection, progress and evaluation of the harmonious development of the child and of our capacity to respond.
>
> Sufficient human maturity to respond appropriately to every situation, problem or hope caused by working with children on a daily basis.[38]

In both cases, teachers felt that their training did not prepare them to carry out their work, and sought professional development combined with higher levels of autonomy:

> …the teaching body that is currently sent out into the field after passing through the process of teacher training in the teachers' colleges expects to encounter a hostile environment…these new teachers have been given no awareness of the environment, and nor have they had any opportunity for any type of contact, practice in rural schools, nor identification with the interests of the field.[39]

Faced with this situation, an important strategy employed by the teachers' movements was providing self-training courses for educators. These initiatives actually took the task of teacher training out of the hands of the state and put it into the hands of teachers themselves. This process obviously increased their level of autonomy, and by the mid-1980s, even the Ministry of Education considered the training they offered to be equivalent to the courses offered by the universities.[40]

Another important strategy employed by the militants was opening pre-schools themselves and pressuring the administration to do so. In fact, the pre-school *Coordinadora* published studies about the situation at this educational level, analysing the position of the administration about the

question, and looking for potential allegiances among the recently legalised unions and the newly formed political groups:

> At present, the inadequacy of the *Escuelas Infantiles* is remarkable…We believe that, above all, it is discriminatory against the children—especially those from lower socio-economic and cultural level families. At a time which is so important and so fundamental for the development of a human being as infancy, to deny a child the attention he or she needs constitutes coercion, unfair selection and denial of the most fundamental human rights.[41]

Their work as professionals was related to broader questions of class, civil rights and citizenship. A similar vision can be seen with regards to the rural school:

> …while agriculture has been subjugated to the laws of industrial development, while instant death and slow deterioration of hundreds of towns have been decreed, and while over a million field workers have been forced to abandon their homes, what can we say about rural education? In practice, it has been non-existent, as it is impossible to uphold an educational policy when those people at whom it is targeted have their days numbered in their place of birth.[42]

Their struggle to save the rural school was embedded in a broader pursuit to save the rural areas. In both cases, we can see how ideals of service were extended far beyond the question of the wellbeing of the customers—i.e. the students—and touched upon the social context of the school.

Assembly-Based Politics and the Challenge of the Liberal State

It is difficult to clearly establish the types of activists who were involved in the different initiatives to create autonomous frameworks for the teaching profession, both in terms of working conditions and pedagogy. These were extensive and diverse phenomena in which militants of political parties, and teachers with no political experience, worked sometimes in parallel and sometimes hand-in-hand to achieve their common goals. In the struggle for an alternative free union for teachers, we see in some areas, as in Pontevedra, for example, how members of the official union decided, on the basis of assemblies, to leave the organisation and create an independent

and democratic union. In other areas, such as Madrid, (which became a leading force of teachers' collective actions), we see how the model of the illegal Workers Commissions became a uniting force, facilitating collaboration between communist and socialist clandestine activists. There is no doubt that this collaboration lent significant impetus to the teachers' fight, but it does not mean that at a local level we cannot find other agents and collaborations. In fact, although it is difficult to determine without further data-based research, it seems that various Catholic initiatives were an important factor in the consolidation of teachers' groups in many areas, such as the case of Vizcaya, which also contributed to national coordination.[43]

In the case of the pedagogical movements, again we witness different configurations of activists in different areas of the country. The leading movement, Rosa Sensat in Barcelona, was closely tied to Catalan nationalist groups as well as to activists of the clandestine socialist party in the region. However, in this case, as in many other areas, Catholic activists belonging to groups such as the JOC (Juventudes Obreras de Acción Católica— Worker Youth of *Acción Católica*), played an important part in teachers' mobilisation. Catholic activists were also decisive in the formation of a pedagogical movement in Castilla y Leon, as in different areas on the east coast of Spain. In the case of Madrid, Catholic activists were linked to the expansion of some groups. Nevertheless, in the leading pedagogical movement, we see a collaboration of sympathisers of the communist and socialist parties who made the decision to put their professional ideas ahead of their political commitment.[44]

In both the union fight and the pedagogical campaign, we witness collaboration between different kinds of activists. With the advancement of democracy, however, collaboration became difficult, as differences with regards to the desired political future became patent. With regards to the union struggle, the tensions arose with the legislation regarding the workers' unions in 1977. There is no doubt that the members of the political parties and the clandestine unions played a leading role and had a clear influence on the politico-educational project adopted by teachers. However, amongst the leadership, there were activists who rejected political organisations of the kind they identified with the unions and political parties of the left. Theirs was a militancy which defined itself by its resistance to the dictatorship, its aspiration for democracy, and its identification with the working class. It was not, however, based on a classist (or class, as members of the left-wing parties would define it) political identity.

Rather, it was based on the professional identity of teachers and their special social and cultural responsibility. It was also inspired by the participatory practices that characterised their successful mobilisation. Not only was it a strategy that would allow for collaboration between people of different identifications: it was part of a genuine political vision which saw participatory democracy as the best alternative to Franco's dictatorship.

The first newly-created education workers' union aspired to differentiate itself from both the inheritors of the dictatorship on the one hand, and the left-wing unions on the other. At the heart of it were activists from the teachers' movement who shared a leftist political vision, but who felt more comfortable with an assembly-based union than with a working class one.[45] It cannot be denied that teachers in Spain came mainly from the lower-middle class, and the working class discourse did not entirely suit them. Also, in many cases, their identity as activists had been created during the assembly struggle, and so they viewed their assembly-based union as an alternative to the working methods of the left-wing unions. They believed the future of the teachers' movement would be assured by the strengthening of the minimum structure of each province—i.e. school, regional and province-wide assemblies.[46] In the early months, there were many cases of double militancy: of members belonging to both the Workers' Commissions and the socialist union, on the one hand, and to the new union—El Sindicato de Trabajadores de la Enseñanza, The Union of Educational Workers—on the other. This lasted for a short period as the activists of the other unions joined them once they were established, and abandoned the common project.[47]

In the case of the pedagogical movements, the tensions between groups that found it easier to accept the parliamentary democracy that was being established in Spain and groups that fought for a more radical version of democracy reached a crisis point after the socialist government rose to power in 1982. There were tensions among the groups long before, as manifested clearly by the failure to create a national coordination attempted in consecutive annual meetings held from 1979. In these meetings, many topics were discussed, but no real steps were taken to consolidate real cooperation. While many groups agreed on the need to democratise Spanish education, getting them all to agree on a single plan was very difficult. Firstly, many of the groups were jealous of their autonomy and had a strong regional identity. Secondly, there were basically two types of groups, which found it very difficult to agree. The first was the more institutionalised movement, which had an administrative

structure and extensive relations with the political parties. Good examples of this kind of movement include Rosa Sensat from Barcelona and Acción Educativa from Madrid. Their members were often recruited by the newly-established regional and municipal democratic governments to assume positions related to education.[48] The second kind of group was perhaps represented mainly by the movement of the followers of the French pedagogical thinker Célestin Freinet. This movement, known as ACIES from 1973 and MCEP (Movimiento Cooperativo de Escuelas Populares—Co-operative Movement of Popular Schools) from 1977, was spread throughout Spain and resented any stable administrative structuring. It was solely based on volunteers and assumed assembly-based decision-making processes on all levels.[49] The different movements collaborated and participated in common events, but their reactions to the socialist education administration's attempts to establish partnerships were radically different. While the first kind of group integrated easily into the democratic arena allocated to it, the second group criticised its shortcomings continuously.

In 1983, the Ministry of Education organised a congress in Barcelona for all the pedagogical movements, with a view towards establishing working relations. However, in some cases, it met with appeals that threatened its future education law as it was presented to the participants (The LODE, *Ley Orgánica del Derecho a la Educación*—Organic Law on the Right to Education was finally enacted in 1985). Activists from the MCEP, for example, did not stop at demanding democratic running of schools, but instead categorically petitioned in favour of collective organisation for education centres:

> Therefore, we proclaim the teachers' right to form genuine pedagogical teams, within the framework of a policy which tends towards surpassing the hierarchical system, with individual responsibilities, and to substitute it for a co-operative system, with collective responsibilities…(This represents the) redefinition, if not outright rejection, of the current hierarchical system of inspection by someone who is not a practising educator, and who has little to do with the principles of supporting cooperative and team-based work which we would like to see implemented.[50]

While the Ministry of Education and the movements shared some principles, such as the demand for an emphasis on the learning process rather than the accumulation of knowledge, and the need to base the learning

process on the students' interests and capabilities, there were others that were difficult for the Ministry to accept. In this sense, the movements represented a cultural-political model of education that was very different from the Spanish model. It was based on solidarity and cooperation, and clashed directly with the more religious elitist trends that were deeply rooted in official education planning in Spain. In addition, the movements were promulgating ideas of pacifism, environmental protection, and feminism which might have been acceptable for the Ministry in a moderate form, but not as they were being presented by the movements. It is interesting to note that, contrary to the idea that the phenomenon of social movements in Spain was far removed from the European context, in the case of the teachers' movements, we can see the close links with the new social movements that had sprung up on the continent in the 1970s.

In both the pedagogical and trade-unionist struggles, issues identified with new social movements were seen as part of the fight against the heritage of the dictatorship, and touched upon controversial topics such as gender equality and pacifism.[51] More importantly, the new social movements offered a generalised critique of the current political arrangements, and in a sense, aspired to democratise democracy. These ideas asserted that people should be actively involved in the policies affecting their lives, and that decision-making processes should be undertaken with as much involvement from citizens as possible, rather than people having decisions imposed upon them from above.[52] The collaborative assembly-based ideas that were seen to varying degrees across the teachers' social movements were representative of this new way of viewing politics. This does not mean to say that we cannot find, at the heart of the teachers' struggle, demands related to wages or status corresponding to their social aspiration as a group. However, it does mean that in the fight for democracy waged by the teachers, we see how concrete political demands interacted with demands about professional identity, delineating a new relationship between citizens, professionals and the state.

NOTES

1. Encarna Nicolás talks about this phenomenon in general terms in Encarnación Nicolás, *La libertad Encadenada* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2005), 363–394.
2. Albert W. Dzur, *Democratic Professionalism* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2008).

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.* For studies on the political implications of professional work across different cases see: Angela Romano, ed., *International journalism and democracy: Civic engagement models from around the world* (New York: Routledge, 2010); Paul Lauritzen, *The Ethics of Interrogation: Professional Responsibility in an Age of Terror* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2013); Janice L. Thompson, "Discourses of social justice: examining the ethics of democratic professionalism in nursing," *Advances in Nursing Science* 37,3 (2014), 17–34.

5. There are not many sociological studies on the teaching profession in Spain. Antonio Guerrero Serón, "Perspectivas teóricas sobre la profesión docente," *Revista complutense de educación* 3,1 (1992), 43–72.

6. Carlos Lerena, "El oficio de maestro. La posición y papel del profesorado de primera enseñanza en España," *Sistema* 50 (1982), 79–102.

7. Felix Ortega and Agustín Velasco, *La Profesión de Maestro* (Madrid: CIDE, 1991); Felix Ortega, "Unos profesionales en busca de profesión," *Educación y Sociedad* 11 (1992), 9–21.

8. For a detailed study see: Tamar Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014).

9. Antonio Espinosa, "Algunos materiales para el análisis de la conflictividad docente (1978–1988)," *in Diez años de educación en España (1978–1988),* eds. Javier Paniagua and Ángel San Martin (Valencia: Diputación Provincial de Valencia y Centro de Alzira de la UNED, 1989).

10. These figures are based on the following summer schools. However, it must be taken into consideration that this is not a complete list of summer training events carried out in Spain during this period: Sevilla 1979–1982, Islas Canarias 1978–1982, Córdoba 1979–1980 and 1982, Jaén 1979–1982, La Rioja 1981–1982, Castilla y León 1978–1982, Extremadura 1977–1982, Mallorca 1976, 1979, 1982, Valencia 1978–1982, Murcia 1978–1982, Euskadi 1977–1982, Asturias 1977–1982, Galicia 1978–1982, Barcelona 1976–1982, Madrid 1976–1982, Málaga 1982, Aragón 1978 and 1981, León 1979–1981, Getafe 1981–1982. Carmen Elejabeitia, et al., *El maestro. Análisis de las escuelas de verano* (Madrid: EDE, 1983), 264–287.

11. Tamar Groves, "Everyday struggles against Franco's authoritarian legacy: pedagogical social movements and democracy in Spain," *Journal of Social History* 46,2 (2012), 305–334.

12. Jaume Carbonell, "De la ley general de educación a la alternativa de escuela pública-Algunas notas introductorias sobre los movimientos sociales en el sector de la enseñanza," Revista de Educación, n° extraordinario (1992), 237–255; Marta Jiménez Jaén, *La ley general de educación y el movimiento de enseñantes (1970–1976)* (La Laguna: Universidad de La Laguna, 2000).

13. "Una alternativa para la enseñanza" in Valeriano Bozal, *Una alternativa para la enseñanza* (Madrid: Centropress, 1977), 110–126.
14. The *Colegios* of different groups of professionals were created as autonomous associations, but as the dictatorship was consolidated, they came to operate under its control. Each professional college was meant for the holders of a specific university qualification—law, engineering, etc.—and teachers with a university qualification belonged to the *Colegios de Doctores y Licenciados*. Manuel de Puelles Benítez, *El colegio de doctors y licenciados de Madrid (1899–1999) – Una historia pública* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2000). The approval of the document by the members of the *Colegio* followed fierce debates that lasted for more than a year. See: *Boletín del Ilustre Colegio Oficial de Doctores y Licenciados* (March, 1974); "La junta general," *Boletín del Ilustre Colegio Oficial de Doctores y Licenciados* (May, 1974); "Reunión nacional de representantes de los Colegios de D.U.," *Boletín del Ilustre Colegio Oficial de Doctores y Licenciados* (September 1974); "Enmiendas presentadas a una alternativa para la enseñanza. Bases de discusión," *Boletín del Colegio de Doctores y Licenciados de Madrid* (November 1975); "Debate sobre la Alternativa," *Boletín del Colegio de Doctores y Licenciados de Madrid* (September-October 1975).
15. "Una alternativa para la enseñanza", 112.
16. "Una alternativa para la enseñanza", 113.
17. Agustín Escolano Benito, "Los comienzos de la modernización pedagógica en el franquismo (1951–1964)," *Revista Española de Pedagogía,* mayo-agosto (1992), 289–310; Manuel de Puelles Benítez, *Educación e ideología en la España contemporánea* (Madrid: Tecnos,1999), 309.
18. Available at: www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-1970-852.
19. *Ibid*.
20. On the LGE see the special issue: "La ley general de educación, veinte años después," *Revista de educación* n° extraordinario (1992). For more recent studies: Cecilia Cristina Milito Barone and Tamar Groves. "¿Modernización o democratización? La construcción de un nuevo sistema educativo entre el tardofranquismo y la democracia," *Bordón. Revista de pedagogía* 65,4 (2013), 135–148; Antonio Viñao Frago, "Education during francoism (1936–1975)," *Educar em Revista* 51 (2014), 19–35.
21. Bozal, *Una alternativa para la enseñanza,* 40.
22. Secondary education teachers and teachers in the private sector in Madrid and Barcelona were involved in conflicts even earlier. Pamela O'Malley, *La educación en la España de Franco* (Madrid: Gens, 2008).
23. Reports about teachers' assemblies and strikes can be found in: 'Complementos' *El Magisterio Español*, (27 January 1973 and 3 February 1973).

24. Jiménez Jaén, in her book, cites a document which speaks of the participation of an estimated 100,000 teachers, although this is probably an overestimation, given that at the height of the protests during the transition to democracy the number of strikers was 90,000. 'Profesores en huelga', *Treball*, 415, 27 May 1975, 135. In Jiménez Jaén, *La ley general de educación y el movimiento de enseñantes.*

25. On the political persecution of teachers see: Juan Manuel Fernández Soria and María del Carmen Agullo Díaz, "La depuración franquista del magisterio primario," *Historia de la Educación* 16 (1997), 315–350; Carlos de Pablo Lobo, "La depuración de la educación española durante el franquismo (1936–1975). La institucionalización de una represión," *Foro de educación* 5.9 (2007), 203–228; Enrique Gudín de la Lama, et al. "La depuración franquista del profesorado cántabro durante la Guerra Civil," *Historia Actual Online* 30 (2013), 53–68.

26. The specialised press reflected the emergence of this body as well as the criticism it aroused among the supporters of the SEM: "Un momento crucial," *Escuela Española*, 19 February 1976; "Coordinadora nacional de Educación General Básica," *Escuela Española,* 4 March 1976; "Nota del departamento de información del SEM," *El magisterio Español*, 27 March 1976.

27. Pamela O'Malley, *La educación en la España de Franco.*

28. "Una alternativa para la enseñanza," 126.

29. With regards to the assembly-based nature of the mobilisations of EGB teachers during the transition, see: Tamar Groves, "La democracia se hace así. La movilización sindical de los maestros y la democratización de la sociedad española," *Iberoamericana*, 46 (2012).

30. This important movement has received relatively little attention from researchers. Jordi Monés i Pujol-Busquets, *Els Primers Quinze Anys de Rosa Sensat* (Barcelona: Ediciones 62, 1981); María Teresa Codina, "Rosa Sensat y los orígenes de los Movimientos de Renovación Pedagógica," *Historia de la Educación* 21 (2002), 91–104.

31. On the expansion of the *Escuelas de Verano* and their political implications, see: Tamar Groves, "Las escuelas de verano: una reforma educativa desde abajo," in *Arte y oficio de enseñar. Dos siglos de perspectiva histórica. XVI Coloquio Nacional de Historia de la Educación,* ed. Pablo Celada Perandones (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2011), 145–154; Núria Simó i Gil and Jordi Feu i Gelis, "L'educació democràtica a les escoles d'estiu de l'Associació de Mestres Rosa Sensat (1966–2008) Democratic education in Summer Schools of Rosa Sensat's Association (1966–2008)," Educació i Història: Revista d'Història de l'Educació 25 (2015), 177–209.

32. The text can be found in Bozal, *Una alternativa para la enseñanza*, 182–208.

33. *Ibid.*, 193.

34. This can be appreciated in the papers presented at the first congress of pedagogical movements celebrated in Barcelona in 1983. *Primer congreso de movimientos de renovación pedagógica Barcelona, 5 a 10 desembre 1983* (Barcelona: Diputación de Barcelona, 1983).

35. "Informe sobre la situación de las escuelas infantiles," *boletín informativo 7–8 Acción Educativa* (1979), 7.

36. Preescolar, *boletín informativo 7–8 Acción Educativa*, 1979, 3.

37. *Ibid.*

38. F. Aquilina et al., "La escuela Infantil," *Primer congreso de movimientos de renovación pedagógica Barcelona, 5 a 10 desembre 1983* (Barcelona: Diputación de Barcelona, 1983), 754.

39. Grupo territorial de Salamanca, "La escuela en Castilla-León," *Colaboración* 19 (1978), 10.

40. CIDE, "Encuesta a profesores no universitarios de la enseñanza pública," *Revista de Educación*, 277 (1985), 207–236.

41. "Informe sobre la situación de las escuelas infantiles," *boletín informativo 7–8 Acción Educativa* (1979), 5.

42. Eliseo Bayo, "La muerte de la enseñanza rural," *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, suplemento 2 (1976).

43. Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain*, 20–53.

44. Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain*, 124–158.

45. "Acaba de nacer en Vigo un movimiento presindical," *Escuela Española*, 2 February, 1977.

46. "Profesorado estatal de EGB: normalidad los días 13 y 14," *Escuela Española*, 15 December 1976; "huelga de noviembre 1976," in, *Movimiento Democrático de Maestros* ed. Lozano Izquierdo (no place nor date), 45–56.

47. For public debates on the issue see: "A la búsqueda de una organización de enseñantes," *El Adelanto*, 28 January 1977; "Libertad syndical", *Escuela Española*, 9 February 1977.

48. On Acción Educativa see: Tamar Groves, "Política y sociedad en las aulas. Los movimientos de renovación pedagógica y su proyección educativa durante la transición española a la democracia," in *Utopía y Educación Ensayos y Estudios*, eds. José Luis Hernández Huerta Judith Quintano Nieto Sonia Ortega Gaite (Salamanca: FahrenHouse, 2014), 95–113.

49. On the Freinet movement in this period see: José Luis Hernández Huerta, "Influence and reception of Freinet in Spain. Map of the historiographical maze: Possible Means of Escape (1979–2016)," *Educació i Història: Revista d'Història de l'Educació* 29 (2017), 221–246.

50. MCEP-Madrid, 'Escuela hoy', in *Primer congreso de movimientos de renovación pedagógica Barcelona, 5 a 10 desembre 1983* (Barcelona: Diputación de Barcelona, 1983), 715–716.
51. See: Kira Mahamud Angulo, Tamar Groves, Cecilia Cristina Milito Barone, and Yovana Hernández Laina, "Civic education and visions of war and peace in the Spanish transition to democracy," *Paedagogica Historica* 52, 1–2 (2016), 169–187.
52. Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, *Social movements, an introduction*, second edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).

Citizenship and Democracy
in the Spanish Countryside

Abstract This chapter analyzes two key issues related to the interaction between local mobilization and national change. First, it deals with what was happening in most Spanish towns and villages while the main (national) treaties were being signed in Madrid. Second, it deals with what life was like in these towns and villages during the period when there was a democratic government at the national level (since April 1977), but local democratic elections had not yet been held. Focusing on these issues, the chapter provides an analysis of the process of democratization in Southern Spain, paying attention to the building process of Social Citizenship. Three towns serve as case studies for this chapter: Osuna (Sevilla), Montefrío (Granada) and Carcabuey (Córdoba).

One of the most neglected features of the transition from dictatorship to democracy during the late 1970s has been the role of rural Spain. This chapter analyses the role of people in rural Spain—peasant and farmer

---

unions, youth associations and local political parties—in the rebuilding of civil society in rural southern Spain following Franco's death in 1975, and their contribution to the Citizens' Movement, which was a vital part of the transition.[1] Recent research has revealed not only that the fight for democracy was relatively independent of national politics in rural areas, but also that the struggle for a more accountable and participatory type of democracy went on for far longer in rural Spain than it did in the cities.[2] This rebuilding of civil society in rural Spain is examined firstly at a regional level (Andalusia), and then at a micro-level with a closer examination of three small Andalusian towns (Osuna, Montefrío and Carcabuey). In these areas, as well as seeing action taken by trade unions, militants and activists, we also see ordinary people getting involved: people who were not, in principle, tied to any political organisation, but who fought for their civil rights. Some of these were people who had not taken part in any political action as part of the anti-Franco underground movement, but who in later years joined the civic fight to exercise their rights, after forty years of being unable to do so.

We want to examine what life was like in these villages during, for instance, the interesting period when a democratic government was in place at the national level (from April 1977), but before democratic local elections. Using examples of three different towns, we explain how the fight for equal access to public goods and services became a vehicle for redefining the relationship between Spanish citizens and the state.

Before we comment on the construction of democracy in Andalusia, we shall briefly clarify what we mean by democratisation in rural areas. Democracy might not have been easily perceived as a reality in villages, had it not led to the genuine attainment of certain rights. At a rural level, this meant equal access to a range of resources which had, for almost forty years, been restricted to a select few. We refer not only to natural resources in the strictest sense of the word. Employment, for example, in rural parts of Spain in the late 1970s and early 1980s, became scarce and highly sought after. Hence, unemployment benefits or financial assistance in the form of the "Empleo Comunitario" (Community Employment) programme were key in maintaining family incomes. For that reason, control of these public resources became the foundation of local people's demands. Many encountered strong resistance to change among certain social sectors within which the concept of democracy did not seem to include these kinds of rights.[3] This was the challenge facing Spanish society in the 1970s and 80s. The construction of democracy included consolidating a political

system that would guarantee a range of basic rights for civil society. This process caused conflict and, on a local scale, little is yet known of it. The struggle to achieve many of these rights meant dismantling the political structures put in place by the previous regime. It was essential to draw a line under the Franco regime's arbitrarily-based legacy. Furthermore, following the first municipal elections, there was still a great deal of work to do, in terms of continuing to flesh out the skeletal democratic system. Thus, when we speak of democracy, we are talking about equal access to public property and services, in the wake of forty years of deprivation for many due to the exclusive use of the resources by a few (of electricity, water, healthcare and education services, welfare resources, etc.).

With regards to the process of building a participatory democracy, we believe that the chronology derived from the interesting proposal put forward by Pamela Radcliff[4] can be further clarified if we extend our examination to the local level in rural areas. For Radcliff, the turning point was the proclamation of the Constitution (1978) which, in a way, institutionalised a model of citizenship with little room for participation. Around this time, the author identifies the start of a kind of deactivation of civil society. From at least the mid-1970s up to that point, Spanish civil society had demonstrated clear signs of dynamism, as shown by Radcliff's own studies of neighbourhood and family associations. However, looking at the rural domain and turning our attention to the performative nature of democracy itself and its relationship with social movements,[5] we see that the democratising process continued beyond the proclamation of the Constitution. The victory of citizenship (albeit limited) was still far from complete. As we shall attempt to demonstrate, the dynamism of civil society endured for a few more years. The fight to expand the channels for citizen participation continued at least until the first democratic municipal elections (April 1979). Even after that, though, the process continued in the villages, in view of the fact that, at this level, power relationships were still deeply entrenched after forty years of dictatorship.[6]

Without wishing to impose a normative or unidirectional periodisation, by focusing on the rural sphere in Andalusia, we see at least three important stages in the process of democratisation. The first began fairly soon after the dictator's death, and involved constant challenges to the regime and to the established models of living at the time. Direct confrontation did not seem to be the most widely used strategy, but rather more "infiltrated" strategies, gradually penetrating society in order to awaken and promote civic values that had practically been eclipsed by the dictatorship.

The second stage encompassed 1976/1977 up to April 1979, when the main challenges for civil society were to build a democratic institutional model with clear and transparent rules of play, which would not allow decision-making to fall back into the hands of the few, especially when those few had not been democratically elected. This period saw direct demonstrations in support of democracy, and the main way of instilling democratic values was to decry the highly prevalent fraudulent political practices. The distinction between the public and the private in terms of exercising power became one of the fundamental pillars of the democratising process.

The third stage involved what happened in the villages following the first municipal elections in April 1979. The main challenge was to bring about real changes in people's lives, constructing a social model of well-being that would support the new institutional framework. In Andalusian villages, the real possibility of exercising social rights did not come about overnight; it was necessary to edify these rights, and to do so by looking not only to Madrid, but also to the local and regional governments, who were key players in the new political apparatus.

Like any periodisation, this is open to criticism when applied to specific cases. Regardless, the intention is to show how, in parallel to the traditional story of the Spanish Transition with its well-known milestones (Franco's death, the coronation of King Juan Carlos, the Political Reform Act, legalisation of the Communist Party, general elections, the proclamation of the Constitution, etc.), there was a conflict-ridden and complex social process of change, which allows us to look at other "chronologies"— another narrative that accentuates the importance of civil society in the process of democratisation, without taking away from the importance of the democratic transition in the corridors of power.

Rural Andalusia During the Transition

To comprehend the process of democratisation experienced during these years, it is first necessary to gain a thorough understanding of the socioeconomic context in which it occurred. Andalusian agriculture had set out on the road towards "modernisation" (i.e. industrialisation) at the end of the 1950s, through the mechanisation of rural work. This mechanisation considerably increased dependency on the primary sector with regards to the industrial sector and saw the expulsion of agricultural labour. Many rural workers then emigrated to other areas of the country or to other

industrialised countries. However, in the mid-1970s, the international crisis halted these migratory movements. The tertiary sector continued to grow in relative terms, but its capacity to generate employment was not sufficient to absorb a growing active population looking for work. The immediate consequence was a considerable increase in unemployment in agriculture. The unemployment rate for this sector rose from 2.9% of the active population in 1977 to 5.8% in 1981, according to data from the *Active Population Survey* (Encuesta de Población Activa, EPA). The regions of Andalusia and Extremadura, where the majority of agrarian assets were concentrated, were worst hit. Agrarian unemployment became a major problem. According to data from the EPA, in 1976, Andalusia accounted for 62.2% of agrarian unemployment in Spain, and by 1986, this figure had risen to almost 70%.[7]

In this context, it is logical that employment should have been the primary concern for much of the Andalusian population. Failing to find work in industry, many were "tethered" to an agricultural sector that was increasingly vulnerable in the labour market. This group, therefore, was left to the mercy of state subsidies designed to minimise labour costs in the supposed process of "industrialisation".[8]

Rural Spain, in the 1970s, had changed profoundly since the 1930s. Spain was well known for violent confrontations between people without land and landowners, and sometimes even smallholders.[9] However, the number of people without land was diminishing rapidly, and Spain's small and medium producers were, above all, concerned with the market prices for agricultural and industrial resources, such as petrol, fertilisers and pesticides. In this context, new worries emerged among farmers and rural inhabitants. Agrarian reform was not their only worry, but it was central to their lives because of recent history, and because it could be understood as a way to prevent unemployment even during the 1980s.[10] Thus, as previously explained, in addition to land occupations, during these years, we find examples of several protest campaigns in rural Spain challenging the Franco regime's legacy of structures.[11] These campaigns first sought trade-union freedom, and then more democratic management of public resources. The activists' objectives were varied, with some engaging rural smallholders and others engaging people without land, and their activities took place in varying geographical contexts. We can speak of at least four kinds of rural movement campaigns: the tractor blockades and vegetable wars of the late Franco period that continued into the Transition[12]; the fight for agrarian reform, including land occupations and hunger strikes[13];

the struggles over the elections to the "Cámaras Agrarias"[14] in 1978, and their continuation into the municipal elections in 1979; and finally, the struggles over the control of public resources—especially the Community Employment funds. These campaigns were deeply interconnected: they influenced one another; and individual participants and the organisations that instigated their activism had multiple objectives and engaged in many forms of action. Here, we shall focus mainly on the latter two—i.e. those protests which are less well known and perhaps more directly connected to the calls for better control of public resources.

Against the backdrop of the late Franco period, control and management of employment, along with government subsidies, became fundamentally important for many Andalusian families. Unemployment benefits were relatively meagre and the local councils had very little ability to generate employment, but there can be no doubt that, during the crisis of the late 1970s, these subsidies made a real difference. Therefore, the "regularisation" of local power structures was a fundamental requirement to achieve better and more equitable distribution of employment, or of these public subsidies.

The struggle for the democratisation of local councils in Andalusia seemed to be at the heart of locals' concerns. To achieve this, it was first necessary to dismantle the previous system, which was still firmly entrenched, following forty years of dictatorship. During Franco's regime, local councils had enjoyed substantial room to manoeuvre, and the decisions made regarding the distribution of subsidies, or awarding of contracts for certain public services, had often been arbitrary.[15] Though on occasion, the mayor and councillors did not use this arbitrary practice, the system was no more democratic, or fairer.

At the local level, the fundamental problem stemmed from the fact that, in spite of the democratic changes operating at a national level, local councils loyal to Franco and his legacy continued to control many of the instruments of power—at least until the first municipal elections in 1979. In the rural sphere, there was, in fact, an attempt to institutionalise certain power structures inherited from the previous regime, side-stepping the issue of democracy. As we shall show later on, in 1978, the former Secretaries of the "Hermandades de Labradores y Ganaderos" (Francoist Union in the Countryside) still regulated the Community Employment subsidies and managed the records for the agrarian Social Security system.[16] The dismantling of this entire framework, in itself, entailed a process

Table 1 Local Elections 1979 in Andalusia. Percentages of abstention and participation by sectors of the population

Provinces	Participation		Abstention	
	<15,000 inhabitants	>15,000 inhabitants	<15,000 inhabitants	>15,000 inhabitants
Almería	61.91	55.30	38.09	44.70
Cádiz	63.76	55.03	36.24	44.97
Córdoba	71.15	65.80	28.85	34.20
Granada	64.54	60.99	35.46	39.01
Huelva	61.97	51.24	38.03	48.76
Jaén	70.87	65.57	29.13	32.43
Málaga	64.38	52.59	35.62	47.41
Sevilla	74.15	59.70	25.85	40.30

Author's own data on the basis of figures from the Instituto de Estadística de Andalucía (IEA), *Estadística de Elecciones en Andalucía* (Sevilla: Dirección General de Política Interior, 2002)

of political learning, which lies at the foundation of the democratisation process, and in which rural Spain played a decisive role.

There was an overwhelming desire to vote in municipal elections in rural areas. This is demonstrated by the polling figures from the first local elections, which were finally held in April 1979. The figures in Table 1 belie the myth of political demobilisation in the rural world in comparison to the "more dynamic" urban civil society. Participation was even higher in small municipalities than in towns with over 15,000 inhabitants.[17] The levels of abstention in small municipalities were, indeed, slightly lower.

Although this fact is usually characteristic of municipal elections due to the local leaders' close relationships with their constituents, we should by no means underestimate its value, in that, far from demonstrating demobilisation and political apathy, rural areas participated actively in the process. In any case, electoral participation data is not the only indicator of interest in politics, and in this case, interest in democracy, as we shall see.

SOCIO-POLITICAL MOBILISATION AND THE DEMOCRATIC LEARNING PROCESS

The relatively high level of electoral participation might be related to the mobilising action in rural areas in the lead-up to these first local elections.[18] Starting in the late 1960s, there was an intense process of social

mobilisation taking place in rural areas, led by men and women seeking to improve their working and living conditions. Through their actions, they initiated the political learning required to construct a more favourable framework for democratic local elections.

For many Andalusians, as indicated above, the main problem during these years was the alarming increase in agricultural unemployment, and it is within this context that we must understand the growing demand for Community Employment. Thus, it is understandable that the main trade-union agents at the time would eventually actively make demands regarding this programme.[19] Most interestingly, such demands focused not only on the amount of the subsidies, but also on the democratic quality of their management and distribution. There were frequent complaints about their fraudulent and arbitrary management[20] and their use as an instrument of coercion against day labourers.[21]

The distribution of the sums allocated for Community Employment was in the hands of local councils, which determined and managed the work undertaken in each locality.[22] At a time when local corporations were not democratic, complaints regarding this became particularly significant and were a clear challenge to the established local power. This instilled the desire to establish strategies to control and manage resources by disseminating the values of public responsibility. Hence, many residents proposed that the allocation of funds for work and any investment agreements should be undertaken democratically by each community through their representative unions.[23] Control of employment offices and Community Employment funds, therefore, was a cornerstone in the dismantling of the Francoist power structures, as it was clear that through the control of these funds, many villages would gain access to democracy.[24]

Many other demands were made. Agricultural workers initiated lock-ins, strikes, protests, occupations and all kinds of negotiations, demanding jobs, decent salaries, improvements in working conditions, unemployment insurance and, in general, measures aimed at improving living conditions in villages. New agricultural unions—at first clandestine and then eventually legalised (SOC, CC.OO., UGT-FTT)[25] worked to fight unemployment by championing measures such as bringing the retirement age down to 60, abolishing work paid by the day (still common in the Andalusian countryside) and expropriating large, badly-run farms.[26] They also proposed greater public investment for infrastructures in villages and the creation of unemployment insurance, from which other workers benefitted.[27] These were some of the demands that inspired the agricultural workers' strike,

organised by the socialists for 14 January 1978, which had wide-scale participation in Andalusia in spite of the barriers thrown up by the authorities to prevent it from going ahead.[28]

In Seville (capital of the Andalusian region), the farmer actions organised jointly by CC.OO and the UGT coincided with the strike called by SOC, which culminated on 28 January 1978 with the occupation of farming estates. This action saw the revival of an old form of peasant struggle that would come to be identified with that union. A few days later, representatives of different agricultural workers' organisations,[29] concerned about unemployment in the south of the country, called on all agrarian unions to protest against the situation.[30] Against the backdrop of these mobilisations and in spite of threats,[31] socialists and communists called a strike for 21 February. On that day, many people turned out for the strike in solidarity with the agricultural workers of Seville. There were protests in various places such as Carmona, Peñaflor, Puebla del Río, Puebla de Cazorla and Lora del Río. These actions also coincided with those instigated by SOC, which had a particularly strong following in Lebrija.[32]

A few months later, on 20 June 1978, thousands of protesters once again took to the streets in villages throughout Andalusia to protest against the rising unemployment. Once again, these mobilisations were preceded by acts of propaganda and public meetings and rallies, such as those held in Navas de San Juan, Cambil, Santiago de la Espada, Quesada, Úbeda (all in the province of Jaen) and Nueva Carteya (Córdoba).[33]

All these actions constituted demands for a more democratic framework for labour relations in rural areas. Amongst other things, they successfully implemented a social protection system that would minimise the negative consequences of the industrial conversion process, as had happened a couple of decades previously in the rest of Europe when the welfare state was established. Indeed, some of the unions calling for rights were, not by chance, connected with similar organisations in other European countries, which is clearly the case with the socialists, for example. It is well known that the German Social Democratic Party had been closely connected with the Spanish Socialist Party during the exile period, through the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, among others, which continued after the party's legalisation in Spain.[34]

However, it should not be forgotten that this model was not a framework simply created by the implementation of new national socio-labour agreements. There was a struggle to achieve them, during which the protagonists sometimes came up against different actors from the previous

regime. This can be clearly seen in the run-up to the municipal elections (April 1979) and their immediate antecedent in rural areas: the elections for the "Cámaras Agrarias".[35] These elections catalysed protests against the continuation of anti-democratic practices carried out for years by the local elites tied to the Franco regime.

After several delays, the central government finally called elections for the "Cámaras Agrarias" (May 21, 1978). Events surrounding these elections exemplify the ongoing attempts by certain political actors to control the local power structures. At a time when local councils were not yet democratic, the "Cámaras Agrarias", former "Hermandades",[36] continued to exercise social and political control in rural areas—especially given that they still managed the Social Security system. Furthermore, the Secretaries of the former "Hermandades" deliberately attempted to damage reformist candidates in the elections by using their privileged position. They were officially in charge of drawing up electoral rolls,[37] and were therefore able to exclude all those who declared themselves to be sympathisers of any of the reformist organisations. They also used the fact that they were responsible for managing Social Security registrations to "invite" certain candidates to withdraw, under the threat of not being included on this public register.[38]

The free unions, reformist parties and a variety of social organisations initiated various protest actions against such situations. Not only did they report fraudulent practices, but they also largely carried out training activities and offered legal advice, which undoubtedly helped to normalise democratic political practices that had been unused and gathering dust for nigh on forty years.[39] These events provided a political learning experience for the municipal elections, held a few months later, and certainly rendered the exercise of voting freer.

Indeed, a few months later, on 3 April 1979, the first democratic local elections were held. During the electoral campaign, social and political action intensified in the villages. There were continual reports of lack of freedom and demands to comply with current legislation[40] and once again, this raised democratic awareness of those who sought to exploit political inexperience to perpetuate authoritarian practices and behaviours. Raising awareness about the use of public resources was a crucial task. On several occasions, for instance, these reformist groups denounced the partisan use of public spaces by mayors who were now candidates (for the UCD party—Unión de Centro Demcrático, Union of Democratic Centre), to hold public rallies and meetings. The problem was that these mayors would not allow candidates from other political groups to use the same public spaces.[41]

In all these forms of action, we find a mixture of old and new agendas—old and new means of protest—but all with a common aim: to achieve more democratic access to power. This is a feature of the rural social movement at that time. In challenging Francoist structures, people initiated action in support of democracy. Activists (with or without a connection to unions or political parties) moved beyond the limits of the Francoist model, and in so doing, mobilised Spain's peasants in support of democracy. It is well known that the intergenerational historical memory of the Civil War played a significant role in the "rebuilding" of socialism and communism during the Transition[42] but, as has been pointed out, new worries also emerged in a new social and economic context. Going beyond the early 1980s, we can see it more clearly. New identities were beginning to mix with old social movements. In the mid-1980s, the modern environmental movement was created in southern Spain. The Movement for the "Andalusian Conservation Agreement" (Pacto Andaluz por la Naturaleza) was one of the first manifestations of the Spanish green movement, so let us examine its origin. This green movement, which called for sustainable use of forests, was made possible by the confluence of interests of several environmental organisations and the peasant union (Sindicato de Obreros del Campo). Their fight for the sustainability of forests resulted in the adoption of a new forestry policy by the regional government in 1989, and their protests introduced new ecological values to the population beyond the traditional conservationist conception of environmentalism. This, then, was the confluence of an old social movement (the peasant movement) and a new one (the green movement).[43]

DEMOCRATISING DEMOCRACY: THE CASES OF THREE ANDALUSIAN VILLAGES

After the first municipal elections, progressive local governments were formed by the victorious socialists and communists.[44] However, this did not automatically mean that democracy had achieved its goal. In many of these municipalities, a new stage was beginning, in which the challenge was no longer the formal victory of democracy, but rather the achievement of (social) rights that would bring about real changes in people's lives. To do this, it was necessary to do away with arbitrary political practices based on lack of control—in other words, with the type of social capital accumulated during the dictatorial regime and which Víctor Pérez Díaz called "*uncivil social capital*".[45]

In this last section, we would like to focus on the local sphere and pick out some specific examples of democratic construction that illustrate the process to which we are referring. We have looked at three municipalities of different sizes, which can be viewed as being fairly representative of rural Andalusia.[46] Firstly, we look at the municipality of Osuna (592.50 km^2) located in the Sierra Sur mountains in the province of Seville, which had 15,668 inhabitants in 1981. Secondly, we look at Montefrío (province of Granada), covering 254 km^2, located in East Andalusia, with 8511 inhabitants that year. Thirdly and finally, we examine Carcabuey (province of Córdoba), covering just 79.7 km^2, with 2932 inhabitants.

Historically, the characteristics of eastern Andalusia (Montefrío and Carcabuey) and western Andalusia (Osuna) are relatively different in terms of their geographical location, ease of access from the province's main city, communication networks and structure of land ownership. However, the common feature of these three towns is that a large portion of their population fundamentally depended on the primary sector, and all three underwent a relatively similar demographic evolution from the 1950s onwards, resulting from emigration to other areas or the main city within the province.

Electoral turnout was relatively high, especially in the case of the smallest village, Carcabuey (see Table 2). The political trajectory was slightly different, looking at the electoral results. In Osuna and Carcabuey, the Socialist Party governed from the first elections (1979) and stayed in power throughout the 1980s and early 1990s. In Montefrío, however, the largest number of votes in the first elections went to the conservative UCD. It was in 1983 that the left reached local power. The mayor held that office from then on throughout the 1980s and 1990s, although under different banners (firstly that of the "Partido del Trabajo" and then the "Partido Socialista").

As previously mentioned, one of the major challenges during these years was how to replace arbitrariness in decision-making with responsibility and transparency. In 1975, no-one was surprised when the Osuna local council approved a public contract to pave the streets of the village without holding any kind of open public competition. The reason given for this lack of openness was the urgency of the work, given the critical employment situation affecting the village.[47] We do not question the council's genuine intent to resolve a growing problem of unemployment urgently by approving a project that could give work to some locals, but what certainly is striking is the nonchalance with which this decision was taken behind

Table 2 Turnout at local elections: Osuna, Montefrío and Carcabuey (1979 and 1983)

	Osuna				Montefrío				Carcabuey			
	1979	%	1983	%	1979	%	1983	%	1979	%	1983	%
Electoral roll	14010		11418		7524		6091		2499		2410	
Abstention	6546	46.7	2529	22.1	3268	43.4	1862	30.5	679	27.7	678	28.1
Voters	7464	53.2	8889	77.8	4256	56.5	4229	69.4	1770	72.2	1732	71.8
Invalid votes	29	0.3	97	1.0	29	0.6	21	0.4	15	0.8	37	2.1
Valid votes	7435	99.6	8792	98.9	4227	99.3	4208	99.5	1755	99.1	1695	97.8
Blank votes	17	0.2	41	0.4	9	0.2	13	0.3	12	0.6	9	0.5
Councillors	17		17		17		13		11		11	

Author's own data on the basis of figures from the Instituto de Estadística de Andalucía IEA, *Elecciones locales* (Seville: IEA, 1992)

closed doors. Years later, this situation would certainly have sparked protests or at least complaints. In fact, four years later, on 10 November 1979, an open meeting was held at which the members of the new council informed the residents of the actions carried out in the first seven months of government. At the meeting, which was called by neighbourhood associations, proposals were submitted to the mayor and people demanded accountability regarding the management of public affairs. Local people demanded to see the council's financial statements and accounts, to have more information about decisions made regarding the restitution of certain street names, and to know the processes for awarding certain contracts and projects.[48] In the 4+ years between the first date (February 1975) and the second (December 1979), something had changed in addition to the institutions: the attitude of the representatives and those they represented, creating a new framework that made it much more difficult to make decisions in an arbitrary fashion.

At that time, citizens, many of whom had not previously been involved in any political or labour organisation, advocated this new democratic framework. Such is the case, for example, with Rafael Gómez—a teacher and the son of a civil servant attached to the Franco regime. Gómez, who began working at the local school in Montefrío in 1974, held the view that a large role in the initiatives for social and political change in the village was played by ordinary citizens, whose hands were forced by necessity:

> In the late 1970s, people—young people in particular—ceased to simply resign themselves to living in squalor in the village. In view of the terrible economic situation and the noticeable differences between social classes, they did not wish to see themselves forced into emigrating, for lack of any other option. We, the youth of those days, wanted to change things; we knew we could not continue in the same way. My brother, who had gone to work as a secondary school teacher in Birmingham, used to tell me that there, the police protected demonstrators instead of persecuting them. The young men and women who had not lived through the Civil War were fully convinced that things needed to change.[49]

During those years, Rafael Gómez had no hesitation in involving himself in the town's Festivals Commission, with the aim of overseeing the organisation of the festivals in a new, different way. To begin with, he writes, he wanted public funds to be managed with complete transparency and, above all, he wanted to initiate a participative process involving the rest of the

populace. This brought him into occasional dialectical conflict with some members of the town council and with some of his older neighbours, but he was able to slowly create a small group of active youth, committed to change. This sowed the seed for the neighbours' association that the young people tried to set up as a legal platform which would allow them to meet, to debate and to set the wheels in motion for civil initiatives. As we shall see later on, the civil government repeatedly denied authorisation, but this did not temper the young people's desire for change. Once the political parties were tolerated (though not officially legalised), "it didn't matter whether they gave us permission to associate; we didn't need it, and many of us", Gómez says, "began to get politically involved". In September 1977, he became Secretary General to the small socialist party in Montefrío, in connection with a few of his friends, who had left to study in Granada. His newfound political activism aside, though, like many others in the town, his activist spirit had been aroused a few years earlier, listening to the "underground" foreign radio broadcasts, or participating in the parochial activities set up in the 1960s by a progressive priest, Manuel Valero.

We see something quite similar in the town of Osuna. Lorenzo Cascajosa, born in 1951, along with other youths in his town, took part in a civic initiative that had enormous importance for its time. In 1979, they founded a local newspaper, *El Paleto (2ª Época)*, with the aim of informing the local residents of everything that went on in the town, with particular attention paid to matters relating to the management of public resources. Cascajosa, as a teenager, had also listened to the illegal radio station "La Pirenaica" (Radio Española Independiente), but, unlike Rafael Gómez, Cascajosa had been able to listen to it in his own home. Indeed, his political awareness came from his father, a baker in the town, who had told the boy stories of his grandfather—an anarchist militant who had been shot by a Franco death squad in 1936. However, in the 1970s, he did not participate in any political movement of opposition to the regime. Nonetheless, he did engage in dynamic civic activity. As in the case described for Montefrío, Lorenzo Cascajosa and many of his friends were very well aware that things could not continue as they were—hence their setting up of the newspaper, which, even in its very first edition, emphasised the importance of doing away with town councils, which were seen as simple administrative centres with very little representative capacity. The section entitled "Los Plenos Municipales" (Municipal Plenary Sessions) became an essential part of the newspaper, owing to its goal of "making (their) neighbours aware of the

problems concerning them, and educating them about how the Council works, who sits on it and how it is administered."[50]

In addition to these civic initiatives, the task facing the new democratic councils in this respect was huge, and crucial to the construction of the welfare state. In Osuna, one of the first actions following the elections of April 1979 was the "democratisation" of certain public sectors. The status of the municipal hospital was changed, bringing in local doctors, unions, neighbourhood associations and pensioners' associations to take part in its management, alongside the members of the council. The proposal was accepted without too much resistance by the new democratic council, which approved the modification of Article 9 of the hospital's statutes, changing the make-up of the executive board.[51] Unlike the previous managerial structure, formed of a board directly appointed by the local government, there was now a greater degree of participation of all sectors involved in the management of the public hospital: an achievement for which the citizens of Osuna congratulated themselves.[52]

As a result of the demand for another sector of the populace to be involved, a similar situation occurred with the Public Foundation of Sports Services: a local institution promoting sport, organising championships, courses and sports schools. As proposed by the new socialist mayor, Antolín Isidro, it was unanimously agreed to restructure the Foundation's governing body so that not only were members of the council involved in its management, but so too were representatives of all sporting clubs in the municipality, representatives of youth associations, neighbourhood associations, and school headteachers.[53]

Furthermore, public spaces were opened up which had previously been privately run. The new council decided not to continue leasing a space in the park in order to install the "caseta municipal" (bandstand) there, so that all the neighbours could enjoy a recreational space during the local festivities.[54]

The case of Montefrío is somewhat different. No-one doubted the legitimacy of the new UCD-led municipal government (1979), but the social action was somewhat more intense than in Osuna. Even before the elections, as in many other villages, there were mobilisations to push for labour agreements. In January 1977, olive workers in Montefrío met on several occasions with workers from other areas in the province (Granada) to demand a six-hour working day, rest on Sundays and holidays, a pay increase and the elimination of work paid by the day.[55] Many of the agricultural workers in the village also supported the strike that took place

in November 1979 to protest against the Government's economic plan, and to request a review of various wage agreements.[56]

In relation to the first national elections (June 15, 1977), in Montefrío, certain irregularities were also recorded, due—according to some—to the authorities' anti-democratic attitude, and according to others, to inexperience. The press at the time reported that some mayors, including the mayor of Montefrío, had denounced several people for posting Communist Party propaganda during the campaign, even though the party had already been officially legalised.[57] There were also reports of people putting up posters in unauthorised places for other parties closer to the Francoist mayor, for example the UCD, but what is particularly striking is that in this latter case, the perpetrators could not be identified by the police, whereas those putting up posters for the PCE or PSOE were identified in the reports, with their full names and national identity numbers.[58]

As in Osuna, in addition to these kinds of political and labour problems associated with parties and unions, in Montefrío, there were other social complaints. In February 1977, the young high school student Felipe Jiménez Comino, now a civil servant at City Hall, decided to demonstrate with other students in the village and make their demands known to the authorities. They drew up a table expressing their support for the demands of the Interim Teachers movement who, at the time, were greatly mobilised around the country. They also demanded the right to public education and requested, among other things, the elimination of university fees so that there would be no economic discrimination in terms of having access to university study. On the morning of 22 February, around 25 students began a march from the school to the doors of the Town Hall, carrying a banner that was confiscated by the "Guardia Civil", who then broke up the gathering. The list of their demands was presented and registered by the Town Hall's administrative office, as relayed by one of the students,[59] and the document was sent the following day to the Provincial Delegation of the Ministry of Education and Science.[60] However, beyond the impact this letter might have had within the student movement in Granada, it is also noteworthy as a mobilising act that encouraged students in the village to get involved in acts of protest and making demands during those unsettled times. The learning of democracy involved generating new spaces for political socialisation, which was manifested in these clandestine meetings and in meetings with young people from other towns and villages.

The local parish radio in Montefrío had previously been used as a means of disseminating the social concerns of some young people. The first "critical" voices were concentrated around the parish priest at the Church of San Antonio. The priest Manuel Valero Terrón, who headed up a radio station broadcasting content that was fairly critical, although tolerated, became the focal point for a small group of young people, such as Antonio García Larios (who later went on to become mayor of Montefrío, holding the office between 1983 and 1995).[61] They were concerned about the social inequalities in the village and, although the station did not broadcast any political content, it did report certain situations of social injustice perpetrated against those who suffered most from the economic crisis and unemployment.[62] For many young people, this was the awakening of civil awareness which, in some cases, crystallised into political activism (as was the case of Antonio García) or simply active participation in promoting democratic values—e.g. setting up a neighbourhood association.

There was a drive to launch a neighbourhood association in the early 1970s in the village. However, the civil provincial governor repeatedly refused to ratify it into the official register. Claiming that there were problems with their form, the Civil Government did not accept the by-laws drawn up by the twenty residents who had met to establish the association. Hence, their hopes to turn this platform into an instrument of social action that would also be tolerated by the regime were dashed. The younger members of society also fell afoul of the regime during these years. The magazine "Atalaya", founded in the village in 1974 by a group of young people with different ideological leanings, was shut down after its first few issues. On that occasion, the Civil Governor argued that the magazine's editor in chief, Juan Cano Bueso, a young resident of Montefrío, could not run a magazine because he was not a professional journalist.[63]

What happened with the failed interview with Judge Enrique Amat Casado, who had been the first president of the "Tribunal de Orden Público" (TOP—Public Order Tribunal),[64] clearly exemplifies the history of this brief publication. Enrique Amat had been a judge in Montefrío during the Civil War, and went on to have a street named after him. Taking advantage of the fact that he was in the village to celebrate the patron saint festivities, two of the young people involved in the magazine asked him for an interview and he agreed. The uncomfortable questions posed about the TOP, rather than questions about the "procession of the Virgin" that the interviewee was expecting, were reason enough to terminate the interview. The magazine had been photocopied at the school with the agreement of

the school headmaster, but it only produced four issues since it was unable pay the fine imposed.[65]

All these actions, although they failed in terms of being legalised, served to launch different civic initiatives, such as the holding of political meetings/rallies, conferences or debates, many of which had to be carried out in secret. However, they undoubtedly demonstrate the extent to which local populations were mobilised, and not just owing to the influence of events in the capital or nationwide. In this regard, we should pay attention to the local scene at the time, allowing a certain degree of autonomy for this sphere with regard to the generation of civil and citizen awareness. Indeed, Juan Cano pointed out recently that his "activity was much more linked to Montefrío than the provincial capital (Granada) in those pre-democratic years".[66]

Even once the political parties and unions had been legalised, there was still much to be done. As in the case of Osuna, following the 1979 local elections, there was still the task of bringing about real changes in people's lives—of endowing parliamentary democracy with social content. The task was not an easy one, requiring a major change in people's attitudes and mentalities. It meant understanding that requests made to the council for running water in homes should not be considered a "privilege", whose concession depended on the mayor's goodwill, but rather a right that must be guaranteed. It also entailed avoiding any favouritism when awarding public-works contracts, such as for transporters who carried the materials required for the public works carried out under the Community Employment plan. It appears that some lorry drivers from the village made such a demand in June 1981.[67]

As a result, the new council elected in 1983 set different initiatives in motion on occasion of these popular demands, opening up the use of certain services to the general public. In 1983, a new doctors' surgery was finally opened in the hamlet of Lojilla, located over 11 kilometres from the centre of Montefrío. Also, at the end of that year, the council requested that a "sport for all" programme be launched—a new educational plan funded by Andalusia's Regional Government—with the aim of encouraging sports activity in rural schools.[68] Also, for the first time, the possibility of changing the signs on certain streets was contemplated.[69]

The final example pertains to the third of the villages examined here: Carcabuey—a small settlement in the Subbaetic System of Córdoba province. Here, there were constant requests for public use of water. Equitable access to a scarce resource such as water entailed consolidating a concept of

"public property" that had been totally distorted for around forty years. Since the 1960s, water supply infrastructures had been growing, not just in cities, but also in towns and the most remote villages in the country. Gradually, access to running water was becoming widespread in Spanish homes. However, in some towns, the exclusionary and arbitrary practices of public authorities in the provision of resources endured. In some cases, such as in Carcabuey, regardless of the democratising processes taking place at the national level, those who had held a privileged economic and political position during the previous regime were permitted to benefit more than others in terms of access to this resource. Only with the arrival of mayors from new politically responsible governments from 1979 onward did this begin to change.

Throughout the 1970s, as in many other locations around Spain, the demand for new infrastructures to supply homes increased. The greatest problem, unsurprisingly, came during the summer months when, in many villages in the south of the Peninsula, such as Carcabuey, the only natural source in the village was not sufficient.[70] Against this backdrop, a situation arose that was unfair for many. Regardless of the restrictions, some houses in the village had a "guaranteed" supply, given that their families were the owners of a tap that was directly connected to the municipal water system, guaranteeing a certain supply; which they had bought in the 1920s and which tapped into the Bernabé natural spring.[71] In the late 1970s, many of them were still outside the public water system and did not even have a meter to regulate consumption; therefore, they were exempt from the payment of water rates even though the water came from the same spring.

Once again, popular demand forced a solution. The new council, constituted in 1979, tried to end a situation that, in the eyes of some, had gone on far too long, and attempted to modify the municipal law.[72] However, it was not until 1981 that there was a concerted effort to change the situation. The demand for domestic water had grown and it was necessary to bring in water from a different natural spring.[73] The question was whether all residents should pay for the cost of this new infrastructure, or whether the owners of taps (who had a "guaranteed" supply with the old Bernabé source) should be excluded. The decision eventually reached by the council left no room for doubt: The increase in prices to cover the costs would affect everyone equally.

The local government settled upon a general increase in the rates that would affect everyone, which led to protestations by some residents who possessed one of these private forms of access. They seemed unwilling to

renounce their ownership rights, despite the supply problems affecting the rest of the population.[74] Their pressure was such that they managed to delay the reformation of the local flow by a year. In 1983, finally, general interest prevailed over private interest—something that, during the last few governments of the Francoist regime, would have been inconceivable.

This is another example of the importance of regularising basic social services: ensuring equitable use of, and access to, public property for all citizens, with equal conditions. This is a fact that we now consider consubstantial to the model of government identified with democracy, which had to be implemented and made effective at a local level. With these examples, we have endeavoured to demonstrate the importance of the democratisation process beyond the construction of democracy in merely formal or institutional terms. In other words, we wished to emphasise the importance of looking at the concept of democracy from a phenomenological rather than an ontological perspective. This model of self-government is the result of a process of historical construction and, in this respect, it is always in constant flux. A dictatorship, but also a democracy, presents a constant source of challenges for civil society that can express its concerns or desires in very different ways[75] at national, regional and local levels, not only through parties and unions, but individually as ordinary people too.

NOTES

1. That is, the population living in the Spanish countryside; in 8440 localities with less than 20,000 inhabitants. Given the size of towns and villages in Spain, it is quite usual to consider municipalities with less than 20,000 inhabitants as "rural areas"—especially in southern Spain, where villages are relatively big. Even considering only localities with less than 5000 inhabitants, the number would be about 7,636,754 inhabitants, which is a not-insignificant figure when we are referring to social and political changes. These were the figures in 1970, when 45% of the total population lived in these municipalities. The rural exodus increased during the next decade, but in 1981, out of Spain's total population of 37 + million, 14 million lived in towns and villages with fewer than 20,000 inhabitants. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, accessed 2 August 2016, www.ine.es.
2. For a recent state of the art, see David Soto and Antonio Herrera, "El conflicto agrario en la historia contemporánea de España. Nuevas perspectivas de análisis," *Vínculos de Historia* 3 (2014).

3. Antonio Herrera and John Markoff, "Rural Movements and the Transition to Democracy in Spain," *Mobilization. The International Quarterly Review of Social Movements Research.* 16:4 (2011).

4. Pamela Radcliff, *Making Democratic Citizens in Spain. Civil Society and the Popular Origins of the Transition, 1960–1978* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

5. John Markoff, *Waves of Democracy. Social Movements and Political Change* (Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1996); John Markoff, "A Moving Target: Democracy," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie/European Journal of Sociology* 52(2) (2011).

6. In this period, works by organisations such as Comisiones Obreras (CC. OO.), Juventud Obrera Cristina (JOC) or Hermandad Obrera de Acción Católica (HOAC) were relevant. See Joe Foweraker, *Making democracy in Spain: grass-roots struggle in the south, 1955–1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

7. All information provided by Instituto Nacional de Estadísitica, accessed May 16, 2016. www.ine.es.

8. To ascertain the importance of these subsidies in the domestic economy, see Pablo Palenzuela, "Estrategias económicas domésticas de los jornaleros andaluces: salarios, subsidio y economía sumergida," *Agricultura y Sociedad* 50 (1989); and Juan Jesús González Rodríguez, "Clases agrarias, estrategias familiares y mercado de trabajo," in *Agricultura y Sociedad en la España Contemporánea*, ed. Juan Jesús González Rodríguez et al. (Madrid: MAPA and CIS, 1997).

9. Edward Malefakis, *Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution in Spain: Origins of the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970).

10. José M. Naredo and Manuel González de Molina, "Reforma Agraria y Desarrollo Económico en la Andalucía del Siglo XX," in *Historia de Andalucía a Debate II. El Campo Andaluz*, ed. Manuel González de Molina (Barcelona: Anthropos, 2002).

11. Herrera and Markoff, "Rural Movements".

12. Eduardo Moyano, *Corporatismo y Agricultura: Asociaciones Profesionales y Articulación de Intereses en la Agricultura Española.* (Madrid: MAPA, 1984); Víctor. I. Alonso et al., *Crisis agrarias y luchas campesinas 1970–1976,* (Madrid, Ayuso, 1976); Alicia Langreo, "Del campesino al empresario agrario: los conflictos actuales del medio rural," in *El campo y la ciudad,* ed. Miguel A. García de León (Madrid: MAPA, 1996).

13. Rafael Morales Ruiz, "Aproximación a la historia del sindicato de Obreros del Campo de Andalucía," in *La historia de Andalucía a debate I. Campesinos y jornaleros*, ed. Manuel González de Molina (Barcelona: Anthropos, 2000); Luis Ocaña Escolar, *Los orígenes del SOC. De las comisiones de jornaleros al I Congreso del Sindicato de Obreros del Campo en*

Andalucía, 1975–1977 (Sevilla: Atrapasueños, Autonomía Sur and SOC, 2006).

14. Public agencies which were the inheritors of the former "Hermandades de Labradores y Campesinos" (Brotherhoods of Farmers and Peasants)—the only and mandatory union at local level during the Franco period.

15. The programme *"Empleo Comunitario" (EP)*, launched in 1971 (Agrarian Social Security Act 41/70, 22 December) was established to alleviate the deficits affecting wageworkers in relation to other agrarian workers. The latter did not enjoy the same Social Security benefits in terms of unemployment protection. The programme's aim was to employ out-of-work agricultural workers on building sites or in public services, in keeping with plans previously established within a certain area, through the granting of financial subsidies to these workers. Over time, this system became institutionalised and provided a regular source of income for unemployed day labourers. The system that, in theory, was considered fairly "marginal", soon became a considerable source of spending, which progressively increased. According to official statistics found in the "Anuario de Estadísticas Laborales", in 1975 the volume of funds stood at 2000 million pesetas, and by 1982 it had risen to 24,255 million (Instituto Nacional de Estadística. Accessed 4 April 2016, www.ine.es).

16. Antonio Herrera, "Otra lectura de la Transición española es posible: la democratización del mundo rural (1975–1982)," *Ayer* 74 (2009).

17. In this case we have chosen to consider populations not of fewer than 20,000 inhabitants, but fewer than 15,000. This lies between the limit of 20,000 inhabitants established by Mabileau for France, and the 5000 inhabitants stipulated as the limit for rural constituencies by the Ministry of Justice. See Irene Delgado Sotillos, "El comportamiento electoral en los municipios rurales: una aproximación desde las elecciones municipales de 1995," *Agricultura y Sociedad*, 86 (1998). Populations of <15,000 inhabitants can be considered villages if we also take account of the fact that, as previously pointed out, we are talking about Andalusia, where rural agglomerations are rather large in comparison with other regions in Northern Spain. In any case, we are referring to localities where the weight of agro-industry and the activities derived from or dependent on this sector was relatively high, in view of the occupation of a large portion of their population.

18. An interesting practical exercise to show the relationship between mobilisation, union action and electoral results in the rural areas can be found in Alba Díaz and Aana Cabana, "¿De la pancarta al voto? Anotaciones sobre conflictividad, sindicalismo y resultados electorales en la transición a la democracia en el rural gallego" (paper presented at *XI Congreso de Historia Contemporánea*, Granada, September 12–15, 2012).

19. Whilst the "Sindicato de Obreros del Campo" (Union of Land Workers SOC), whose position was similar to that of the anarchists, was always more reticent in terms of accepting this demand as permanent, the socialists (UGT) and communists (CCOO) soon came to consider this system a "lesser evil" whilst awaiting structural reforms. The strategy focused on demanding greater funding and participation in the "Local Employment Boards" that distributed these funds. For an analysis of the position of CCOO on EP and then on the "Subsidio" and "Plan de Empleo Rural" (PER), see David Martínez and Salvador Cruz, *Protesta obrera y sindicalismo en una región "idílica". Historia de Comisiones Obreras en la provincia de Jaén* (Jaén: Universidad de Jaén, 2003). For an examination of the socialist case, see Antonio Herrera, *La construcción de la democracia en el campo (1975–1988)* (Madrid: MAPA, 2007). On the SOC, see Morales Ruiz, "Aproximación a la historia del sindicato".
20. "El concepto reforma agraria es todavía válido", *El Socialista*, 94, 4 February 1979.
21. "El Paro agrícola. Los campesinos queremos trabajo", *El Trabajador de la Tierra*, 5–6 (August–September 1977); "En la provincia de Sevilla hay 80,000 hectáreas sin cultivar," *El Trabajador de la Tierra* 11 (March 1978).
22. "Los fondos para el Empleo Comunitario, insuficientes y con retraso," *El Trabajador del Campo*, 16 (July–August 1979).
23. Resolutions on agrarian policy at the XXXI UGT Congress held in Barcelona in May 1978 (Archive of the Fundación Largo Caballero. Madrid).
24. Herrera and Markoff, "Rural Movements"; Herrera, *La construcción*,79–101; Herrera, "Otra lectura".
25. SOC (Sindicato de Obreros del Campo), CC.OO. (Comisiones Obreras), UGT-FTT (Unión General de Trabajadores-Federación de Trabajadores de la Tierra).
26. For further information about the type of protests in Spain's countryside during these years, see Herrera and Markoff, "Rural Movements".
27. "Más de 80.000 parados en el campo andaluz. La respuesta de la FTT-UGT", *El Trabajador del Campo* 2 (May 1977).
28. "El pasado día 14 el gobierno amordazó a los campesinos," *El Trabajador de la Tierra* 9–10 (January–February 1978).
29. FTT-UGT, Uniones de Agricultores y Ganaderos, Uniones de Campesinos, Unió de Pagesos, PSOE and PSUC.
30. "Comunicado de los Campesinos Socialistas," *El Trabajador de la Tierra* 11 (March 1978).
31. According to the socialists, prior to the strike, the Civil Province Governor sent telegrams to the mayors of 102 villages in Seville province, telling them

to prevent the protests and threatening fines of up to 100,000 pesetas against any shop owners who supported the strike out of solidarity. ("Por un puesto de trabajo. Manifestaciones campesinas en Sevilla" and "Andalucía. La represión del gobernador de Sevilla continua," *El Trabajador de la Tierra* 11 (March 1978).

32. "Por un puesto de trabajo. Manifestaciones".
33. "Andalucía, en lucha," *UGT: boletín de la Unión General de Trabajadores* 399 (June 1978); "Paso a paso por las zonas afectadas," *El Trabajador de la Tierra*, 11–12 (June–July 1978).
34. Pilar Ortuño Anaya, *European Socialist and Spain. The Transition to Democracy, 1959–77* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
35. See footnote 15 in Chap. 1.
36. Manuel Ortiz Heras, *Las Hermandades de Labradores en el franquismo. Albacete, 1943–1977* (Albacete: Instituto de Estudios Albaceteños, 1992); Daniel Lanero, *Historia dun ermo asociativo: labregos, sindicatos verticais e políticas agrarias en Galicia baixo o franquismo* (A Coruña: tresCtres, 2011).
37. Real Decreto 320/1978, 17 February, developing and improving on Real Decreto 1336/1977, 2 June, regulating elections to "Cámaras Agrarias" (*Boletín Oficial del Estado*, n° 56, 7/3/78).
38. "El problema de las Cámaras Agrarias es un problema Político," *El Trabajador de la Tierra* 11 (March 1978).
39. Through local UGT unions, the criteria, rules and foundations of how the electoral process should be carried out were distributed, paying particular attention to the procedure to be followed in order to lodge complaints and claims in the event of exclusion from electoral rolls and any irregularities that might arise (UGT, "Convocatoria elecciones Cámaras Agrarias," 1978. Archive of Fundación Francisco Largo Caballero in Madrid. File 837-02).
40. *El Correo de Andalucía*, 24, March 1979, 15.
41. "Los partidos denuncian numerosas anomalías en las votaciones," *El Correo de Andalucía*, 16 June 1977.
42. Alfonso Martínez Foronda, *La conquista de la libertad. Historia de las Comisiones Obreras de Andalucía (1962–2000)* (Cádiz: Fundación de Estudios Sindicales CCAA-A, 2003); Abdón Mateos López, *Exilio y clandestinidad. La reconstrucción de la UGT, 1939-1977* (Madrid: UNED ediciones, 2002).
43. For a full description of the case, see Antonio Herrera et al., "El Pacto Andaluz por la Naturaleza, 1985. La confluencia del movimiento campesino y el movimiento ecologista," *Historia Agraria* 50 (2010).
44. The UCD won 31.98% of votes in the municipal election in Andalucía, but the Socialist Party got 30.12% and the Communist Party 17.69%. In many towns and villages, a coalition of the latter two meant the councils were

controlled by the left. All the results from local elections are taken from Instituto de Estadística de Andalucía (IEA), *Estadística de Elecciones*.

45. Víctor Pérez Díaz, "From Civil War to Civil Society. Social Capital in Spain from the 1930s to the 1990s," in *Democracies in Flux. The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*, ed. Robert Putnam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

46. These are case studies that we are analysing as part of the research projects mentioned at the beginning of the chapter. They are also cases dealt with in the project called "*The construction of democracy in the rural world of Andalusia (1973–1982)*", financed by the Fundación Centro de Estudios Andaluces. The choice of these municipalities conforms to various criteria, linked to the wealth of documentation available in their municipal archives, as well as the edaphological-, weather-, political- and economic charac- teristics, seeking a certain degree of heterogeneity when referring to rural Andalusia. However, we are aware that any choice of case studies could be debated/disputed, and are currently trying to expand our study to other localities (Arcos de la Frontera, Baena and Linares).

47. "Comisión Especial de Hacienda y Servicios Benéficos Sociales," 12 February 1975, Comités Especiales, file 285. Municipal Historical Archive in Osuna.

48. "El Ayuntamiento informa", *El Paleto. 2ª época*, 1 December 1979, 14.

49. Interview with Rafael Gómez. Montefrío, 18 April 2012.

50. "Los Plenos", *El Paleto. 2ª época,* 12 December 1979, 11.

51. "Pleno del Ayuntamiento (Actas Capitulares)", 3 October 1979. Municipal Historical Archive in Osuna; "Pleno extraordinario del Ayuntamiento (Actas Capitulares)" 17 October 1979. Municipal Historical Archive in Osuna. "Los Plenos"

52. "Los Plenos", *El Paleto. 2ª época,* 12 December, 1979, 15–16.

53. *"Los Plenos"* and "Pleno extraordinario del Ayuntamiento (Actas Capitulares)", 31 May 1979. Municipal Historical Archive in Osuna.

54. "Los Plenos".

55. "Reivindicaciones de los aceituneros," *El País*, 12 January 1977.

56. "Masiva acogida en Granada a la convocatoria de huelga," *El País*, 23 November 1979.

57. "Los alcaldes a favor de alianza Popular," *El País*, 14 June 1977.

58. Several files "*Elecciones Generales (1954, 1977, 1979, 1982)*" and "*Elecciones Estatales*: file 5.2. Municipal Historical Archive in Montefrío.

59. Interview with Felipe Jiménez Comino. Montefrío, 27 November, 2011.

60. "Nota del 23 de febrero de 1977". Registro de salida, document no 269 (Municipal Historical Archive in Montefrío).

61. Here, as in many other villages around Spain, the role of the so-called priest-workers who were close to several organisations (JOC or HOAC) was

very important in the process of democratisation (Foweraker, *Making democracy*; Óscar Martín García and Damian González Madrid, "The social factor of democracy in underdeveloped Spain," *Democratization* 21,6 (2014), accessed March 17, 2016, Doi: 10.1080/13510347.2013.781587).
62. Interview with Antonio García Larios. Granada, April 18, 2012.
63. Interview with Juan Cano Bueso. Granada, May 9, 2012.
64. Special judicial body established in 1963 to prosecute political dissent in the Franco regime. It was officially abolished in January 1977.
65. Interview with Juan Cano.
66. Interview with Juan Cano.
67. "Información de los Camioneros," *La Razón. Agrupación Socialista de Montefrío. Boletín Interno para sus afiliados* 3 (June 1981).
68. Files from the year 1983, nos 611 to 664. Municipal Historical Archive in Montefrío.
69. By 1983, this process was not especially conflictive in Montefrío, since names were sought that would not generate controversy and about which there was widespread agreement. The proposal to name a street after Manuel Valero Terrón, the parish priest at the Church of San Antonio, was approved unanimously.
70. Rafael Osuna Luque, *Historia de Carcabuey, un municipio de la Subbética cordobesa* (Córdoba: Cajasur, 2002).
71. The water supply service in Carcabuey dates back to 1928, when the Council approved the project to pipe in drinking water from the nearby Bernabé natural spring. The possibility of buying a water tap/spout that would supply either 2 or 4 litres per minute was then decided upon ("Expediente de Ordenanzas Municipales". Municipal Historical Archive in Carcabuey, file 35).
72. "*Ordinance regulating domestic water supply in the urban centre of Carcabuey*" (Municipal Historical Archive in Carcabuey, file 34).
73. *Ordinance renewal file, 1981.* (Municipal Historical Archive in Carcabuey, file 35, p.8. and *Town Hall Minutes, plenary session September 22 1981* (Municipal Historical Archive in Carcabuey file 12/26).
74. Following two complaints rejected by the Council, Pedro María Serrano Galisteo, whose family had owned a water tap/spout since 1928, and 34 other residents, lodged an administrative-economic appeal against water rates in 1982 and managed to partially paralyse the reform of the municipal ordinance (Expediente de renovación de la ordenanza municipal, *1981–1983.* Municipal Historical Archive in Carcabuey, file 35 and *Actas Capitulares, March 28, 1983* and file 12/27).
75. Charles Tilly and Lesley J. Wood, *Social Movements, 1768–2008* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers. 2009); Markoff, "A Moving Target".

Citizen Building During the Spanish Transition to Democracy: Between the Spanish Debate and the Social Movements Debate

Abstract The concluding chapter strives to show how the four case studies represent different dimensions of the same phenomenon. Using contemporary new social movements' theories, it attempts to demonstrate how the Spanish case was both a national and international phenomenon that illustrates how the cycle of mobilization that swept across the west, from the 1960s, introduced changes into the meaning and practices of citizenship. It also ties these changes to current social mobilization, which seems to reemploy them not only in Spain, but in other parts of the world that share the political aspirations of the Spanish "15 m" movement.

Keywords New social movements · Spanish democracy · Citizenship

It is essential to point out that the "politics of consensus"—exemplified by the Moncloa Pacts—did not resolve any of the everyday problems. All they managed to do was alienate ordinary citizens from the [processes] of political decision-making.[1]

The objective of the transition was to institute in (Spain) a parliamentary democracy on the basis of the (existing) institutions, that were to be modified, and with the King as head of State. (…) In order to complete the process of political change, it was necessary for all those so-called "communists"—the proponents of a clean break with the past—to reach a basic consensus regarding the process that they wished to take place: the structure

and form of (future) political institutions. It was necessary to forget or move beyond the tragic and profound divisions between Spaniards dating from the Civil War.[2]

The above quotes are taken from two interviews published by the Spanish daily newspaper *El País*. The first interview was conducted in 1978 with Eladio García Castro (the General Secretary of the Maoist *Partido del Trabajo de España*). The second was conducted in 2008 with Alberto Oliart (former minister of the conservative centre-right party, the UCD). In many ways, these two quotes embody the conventional "bottom-up" versus "top-down" debate regarding the nature of the Spanish transition. They also point to the limitations of this debate. The first quote highlights the view that the efforts to reach a consensus through negotiations from the "top down" constituted a major hindrance to the creation of a truly democratic political system in which the voices of ordinary men and women could be heard. The second quote reiterates the position that viable political change could only take place by letting go of past rancour and by moderating the call for an absolute break from existing political structures. Both views (already present within the political discourse that emerged during the transition) greatly limit our ability to analyse the process of political change.

As the case studies in this book clearly demonstrate, the process of political change during the transition was driven simultaneously from the bottom and from the top. In its deepest and most complex form, it embodied the interaction between institutionalised politics and popular civic mobilisation. It is not the aim of this book to dispute the role of political parties, or of other institutional actors (such as labour unions) in this process. Nor do we underestimate the importance of the key agreements and documents that emerged from the negotiations between those actors and other (more conservative) elements within the existing political system. Documents such as the Moncloa Pacts of 1977, or the 1978 Constitution, dictated the direction of the transition and the quality of democracy in Spain to this day. Our intention in this book is to integrate, into the existing historiography on the Spanish transition, a comparative analysis of grassroots mobilisations and their contribution to the changes that took place in Spain between 1975 and 1982.

The Transition from Bottom Up and from Top Down: The Spanish Debate

As all four case studies in this book demonstrate, the roots of political change in Spain can be traced to the final decade of the dictatorship. Moreover, the nature of that democracy continued to be intensely negotiated after the official democratic transition had been completed. This fact is reflected not only in the maturation of certain reformist sectors within the Franco regime, which supported a highly regulated transition with the monarchy as a central political actor. Most importantly, perhaps, it is manifested in the emergence of new forms of civic activism, and in the evolving relations between the established entities of the clandestine opposition and an array of new civic associations. While the Franco regime did not significantly alter its character during the final decade of its existence, the changing cultural and economic conditions, as well as certain 'trigger events', generated a framework which gave rise to specific forms of mobilisation. These forms of mobilisation, as we show, were directly linked to the conditions and experiences of everyday life of different local and professional communities.

Between 1958 and 1966, the Franco regime passed a number of laws, which laid the groundwork for a realignment of civic and professional activism in Spain. The dictatorship did not view any of these reforms as a means to promote more democratic structures of political representation. Rather, they were promulgated in an attempt to improve the regime's international standing and in response to Spain's fast-changing economic needs. However, the new legislation was soon seized upon by those looking for new channels for collective action. Members of the clandestine opposition, having already infiltrated many of the official trade unions, used it to continue the struggle for improved working conditions. The new civic associations functioned as entities through which citizens could (for the first time since 1939) petition and engage the authorities in their role as consumers, neighbours, householders, etc. Of course, with the advance of the process of democratisation, the legislation institutionalising the new state continued to trigger protest with regard to specific issues.

This process was also influenced by transnational developments in social mobilisation and civic struggles. These provided activists and citizens, in general, with a new language regarding rights and the essence of democracy.[3] In the case of teachers and the mobilisation in rural areas, we can see

how international ideas on ecological matters, feminist concepts, and the need to ensure that ordinary people were closely involved in policy debates, penetrated both discourse and practice. With regard to Catholicism, the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) caused a major shift within world Catholicism by espousing, amongst other things, freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, the right to form trade unions and the concept of parliamentary democracy. In the context of Spain, the overturning of the clergy's monopoly on the liturgy and the championing of the 'the apostolate of the laity' undermined traditional structures of authority, creating a space for experimentation, within which the community was invited to contribute to its spiritual life and priests were perceived as guides and advocates of their parishioners rather than as the representatives of an exclusive spiritual authority.

The Spanish workers' movement, consumers' and neighbourhood associations, were clearly influenced by ideas relating to radical or direct democracy, which re-emerged in Western and Central Europe in the mid-1960s. It is true that the assembly-based model also had a national origin and was later identified with the Workers' Commissions. However, as can be seen in the different case studies included in this book, the forms of deliberation and decision-making that were adopted led, in many ways, to the adoption of broader concepts of self-management. In the early stages of development, Catholics, neighbours, housewives and even teachers often did not adopt self-management practices with a clear ideological vision in mind. In many cases, such practices were initially assimilated because they enabled activists to successfully mobilise large segments of the population and to navigate the existing political system in search of solutions to specific professional and material problems. Self-management, therefore, was an effective mechanism in the everyday struggle for better living and working conditions.

As self-management was applied both at the level of the production unit (the firm or enterprise) and at the territorial level of government (the local community) several conclusions soon emerged: the experience of self-management inevitably led to the questioning of established power relations and of the dichotomy between active and passive citizenship. Many people's understanding of rights was altered. No longer were rights understood as something to be conceded by the authorities, but as something to be defined through a creative, ongoing process of contestation and negotiation between the State and the community. As a

result, experiences of self-management at different levels of governance enhanced the status of the community (local, professional or religious) as a potential source of authority and knowledge, and as a driving force in relation to governance.

These understandings were reflected in the evolution of all four sectors studied in this book. In the case of neighbourhood associations, there were two important preconditions for the successful functioning of a self-managed society: access to information for those participating in decision-making processes, and flexibility in the assignment and/or redistribution of resources (both natural and produced), so that decisions, once reached, could be effectively implemented. Looking at all four case studies, we can see that the differentiated professional or communitarian context of the struggle dictated different organisational goals in the early 1970s. However, by 1975, the agendas of many civic and professional associations had evolved to include a call for the institution of different mechanisms of governance.

In the case of nonconformist Catholics, a coherent agenda with clear social implications had already emerged in the 1960s. Dissident priests insisted on a degree of autonomy, which meant that they were both part of, and separate from, the Church. By eliminating the myriad social and ecclesiastical barriers that divided the clergy from the laity, progressive priests and worker-priests brought an array of anti-hierarchical, collective, integrative ideals into Spanish society. This was apparent in the new structure of local churches, which encouraged equality and dialogue between priests and their community; in the practices which led to redefining (and at times even renaming) the community of worship; and in the new agenda that made use of religious services (such as the weekly Mass) in order to raise concerns relating to everyday life. Such practices caused a backlash from the Church hierarchy in the late 1960s. It was this backlash which, in the minds of many, highlighted the contradiction between the activist priests' political outlook and their commitment to the Church.

In the case of teachers, new practices and trains of thought were embodied in the philosophy of the *Escuela Pública*, which emphasised the status of the school as an integral part of the community. The *Escuela Pública* project encouraged parents and teachers to get involved in shaping their school's curricular contents and its running in ways that served the social and cultural life of the community. When the General Law of

Education (*Ley General de Educación*), passed in 1970, failed to fulfil its own declared goals (such as improving teachers' working conditions and social status), widespread conflict broke out. Teachers demanded that the State realise this law through concrete reforms. They also presented a list of other demands, such as equal working conditions, equal wages, equality for interns and pay for time spent on class preparation. The demand for democratic planning and management of the education system, however, was only presented more clearly in 1975–1976.

In the case of neighbourhood associations, isolated mobilisation *vis-à-vis* the local authorities were covered by the Spanish press as early as 1960. In March 1960, residents in the neighbourhood of Son Rapinya in the city of Palma (in the Balearic Islands) boycotted the public bus company due to the rising price of transportation. A year later, a large-scale protest took place in Madrid when the inhabitants of the shantytown of Orcasitas were denied entry into the houses which they themselves had helped to build. In 1965, women protested in Vilanova i la Geltrú in the Barcelona area demanding drinkable water. It was the publication of the Partial Plans (*planes parciales*), though, which served as the basis for urban reconstruction, triggering the first sustained mobilisations. The fight against the implementation of those plans defined the local community as a source of professional knowledge and as a 'client', to which both the authorities and planning professionals were accountable. Until Franco's death, however, the actions of most of the associations could be described in terms of subversion rather than explicit resistance to the dictatorship.[4] Only in early 1976—when individual neighbourhood associations merged into the Citizens' Movement—was their agenda gradually reframed in relation to the larger political project of direct democracy.

In the final case examined in this book—that of rural communities in Andalusia—we see a fight for financial gains accompanied by demands for transparent management and democratic distribution. In addition, efforts were made to involve citizens in the running of municipal facilities, such as sports centres and hospitals. Again, political activists were a central element in the struggle, but they were embedded in much larger networks of professionals, priests, neighbourhood associations and other civic initiatives. Their mobilisation in the late 1970s and early 1980s shows that the nature of democracy was contested as citizens pressed to become more involved in the running of public services. Democratisation of local power structures constituted an important step in ensuring the redistribution of

community resources (in the form of fertilisers, running water, arable land and even tax payments). It is not surprising, therefore, that ecological movements with their horizontal structure emerged in Andalusia relatively early in comparison to the rest of the country.

CITIZENS, ORGANISATIONS AND THE CITIZENS' MOVEMENT: THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS DEBATE

An analysis of the nature of the relations between different civic bodies (some recognised as the Citizens' Movement) can, we believe, shed light on some of the issues under debate within the field of social movements. Specifically, the case studies analysed in this book raise questions that relate to three debates at hand: the first debate concerns the networked nature of social movements; the second has to do with the role of everyday experiences in shaping the agenda and the practices of mobilisation of movements; and the third and final issue is to do with the processes of collective identity formation within the context of social movements.

The term "Citizens' Movement" first appeared in the Spanish press in the summer of 1975. It was used to describe the joint action of neighbourhood- and housewives' associations in their struggle against the rising cost of living and the shortcomings in the urban infrastructure.[5] However, we believe this term can encompass the much broader phenomena of social mobilisation throughout the years of the transition, that included a wide variety of professional and civic associations, students, feminists, artists, farmers, Catholics and various pressure groups, which were already active. While all of these entities strove to bring about political change, many of them were not directly affiliated with the parties of the clandestine opposition, such as the Spanish Socialist Party or the Communist Party.

The history of the Citizens' Movement places it at the crossroads between the traditional and new social movements. The movement operated as a network whose different sectors shared similar discourses about the meaning of citizenship, and engaged in common practices of communication and decision-making by consensus. More than anything, the way the Spanish Citizens' Movement operated can be compared with the networked properties of the social movements studied by Diani and Della Porta.[6] These networks were all about making links, building coalitions, and finding common ground with other groups or organisations that were seen as necessary for achieving specific political goals.

Political activists were also part of this network, and the political parties also took part in this mobilisation. The most important demands of this network in late 1975 and early 1976 were expressed in a document published on 17 March 1976 by the leaders of the *Coordinación Democrática* (CD—Democratic Coordination). This entity unified two initiatives established immediately after General Franco's death: *La Plataforma de Convergencia Democrática* (Democratic Unification Platform) (formed around the Spanish Socialist Party and the Democratic Christian Left Party), and *La Junta Democrática* (Democratic Council), (dominated by the Spanish Communist Party, PCE—*Partido Comunista de España*).

The document made direct reference to a '"package' of agreed-upon demands: full amnesty for all labour- and political prisoners; the return of all those exiled under the dictatorship and the full restitution of their rights; the full exercise of all human rights and of the internationally acknowledged political rights; freedom of association and the dismantling of all state-sponsored unions; the granting of political and cultural autonomy to the different regions that made up the Spanish state; the formation of a single, independent and democratic judiciary; and the initiation of a process of popular consultation based on universal suffrage.[7]

As we have seen, however, the Citizens' Movement (which at precisely that time was coming together as a major actor and as a mobilising force that backed the demands of the *Coordinación Democrática* on the streets) had set itself a broader and more diffuse goal of creating a better connected, informed and empowered public. The general mobilisations in support of the basic package of rights advocated by the *Coordinación Democrática*, and the mobilisation of specific sectors within the movement, led to the development of a form of politics that was more radical than anything advocated by the *Coordinación Democrática*. The everyday politics of the Citizens' Movement took shape through a variety of leisure events (such as a picnic for the families of the members of the neighbourhood- and housewives' associations, which took place at Aranjuez on 16 May 1976); through spontaneous meetings with, or support of, other groups and organisations (such as the demonstrations that took place in February 1977 in the village of Montefrío when pupils expressed their support for the demands of the movement that united teachers with no permanent positions); in extended campaign meetings (such as the meetings to create the teachers' *Alternativa* in Madrid, Barcelona and elsewhere); and through informal conversations with the neighbourhood or

village (a good platform for the latter was provided by the takeover of the local radio station in Montefrío by the parish priest).

An analysis of the grassroots civic mobilisation during the transition clearly highlights the importance of everyday life as a means by which strategies of mobilisation and different agendas can be developed. French sociologist and philosopher Henri Lefebvre defined this concept in his 1947 essay *The Critique of Everyday Life*:

> Everyday life, in a sense residual, defined by "what is left over" after all distinct, superior, specialised, structured activities have been singled out for analysis, must be defined as a totality. Considered in their specialisation and their technicality, superior activities leave a 'technical vacuum' between one another which is filled by everyday life. Everyday life is profoundly related to all activities, and encompasses them with all their differences and their conflicts; it is their meeting place, their bond, it is their common ground.[8]

For Lefebvre, the 'everyday' was characterised as unspecialised and spontaneous in nature. It is the basis for the formation of social bonds and therefore has the potential to function as an area of resistance. Resistance, in its turn, is conditioned by the ability to overcome alienation, which Lefebvre defined as the general inability to grasp and to think of the 'other'—an inability that resulted from the fragmented nature of modern life.[9] While viewing traditional everyday life as mostly based on the principle of non-separation (of functions, spaces, generations, genders etc.), he pointed to the tendency of modern everyday life to become more and more fragmented and therefore also extremely alienating.

Lefebvre's views on the importance of everyday life as an arena for social struggle link to a more recent debate in the field of social movements regarding the concept of 'prefigurative politics'. The term was coined in 1977 by Carl Boggs, who defined prefiguration as 'the embodiment, within the ongoing political practice of a movement, of those forms of social relations, decision-making, culture, and human experience that are the ultimate goal'.[10] The concept refers to the attempts to construct alternative or utopian social relations in the present, either in parallel with, or in the course of, adversarial social movement protest. It is based on the idea of participants acting out a vision of a better world by creating alternatives or through the way in which protest is carried out.[11] Luke Yates noted that:

> The notion of "prefigurative politics" is becoming established in [the] debate and refers to scenarios where protesters express the political "ends" of their actions through their "means", or where they create experimental or "alternative" social arrangements or institutions.[12]

Yates identified two main ways in which prefiguration has been used in the context of social movements: one refers to ways in which protests are made; the other has a broader concern with the building of movement 'alternatives' or institutions.[13] As the discussion regarding the mechanisms of deliberation and of *assembleismo* (assembly movement) demonstrates, all four cases included in this book provide examples of movement organisations engaged in prefigurative politics in the broader sense of the term. Participants contested power on a series of different levels, ranging from the macro-political level (exemplified by adversarial protest forms that confronted government ministries, local authorities and the national hierarchy of the Catholic Church) to the micro-political level (where the power relations shaping the interaction between individuals, collectives and the movement networks were contested).

As testimonies of activists often made clear, the prefigurative nature of mobilisation was deeply anchored in spatial arrangements. Going back to Lefebvre, it is important to note that the uniqueness of his analysis does not emerge simply from his definition of the everyday. Rather, it lies in the claim that the private and social functions associated with everyday life, and the structures that are constructed for their performance, are all embedded in space, and should be therefore analysed spatially. In *The Production of Space* (1974), Lefebvre expounded his theory that space was produced on three levels: the level of spatial practices, which assign the functions of production and of reproduction to particular locations with specific spatial characteristics; the level of representation of space that 'order' and legitimise the allocation of space and the construction of spatial practices through academic and/or professional discourses; and the level of representational spaces, which is inhabited space that embodies the complex symbolism of its users.[14]

This spatial shift in Lefebvre's work, which moved the focus of his analysis from the working class to the more general category of users of space, has been picked up on in the past decade by several scholars (such as Neil Brenner, Stuart Elden and Mark Purcell) who employed his model of spatial analysis from the perspective of both geography and political theory.

Spatial analysis clearly adds an important dimension to our attempts to understand the scope of the change undergone by Spanish society during the years of the transition. On the most basic level, the transition offered specific actors the possibility of appropriating public space for the first time since 1939 through specific protest events. Such events necessitated new forms of negotiation between the authorities and different civic entities. In addition, while negotiations could quite often turn into a struggle, protest events carried out on different scales broke down the real (and imaginary) barriers between different communities in Spanish society (such as urban residents of different classes, different religious communities, teachers and the consumers of educational services and different agrarian communities).

Spatial contestations had a unique place within the mobilisation repertoires of neighbourhood associations, which challenged the very nature and layout of the Francoist city. However, the ability to appropriate space according to the needs of its users also emerged as a central issue in all the other case studies discussed in this book. In the case of dissident Catholicism, changes in the relationship between parish priests and their communities were reflected in the structure of local churches and in the use of the parish house. As we have seen, dissident clergy broke with tradition by opening their homes for community use and choosing to live outside Church property altogether. The opening of the presbytery not only broke down divisions between the clergy and members of the lay community, but could also transform community life by providing a space where social projects could be carried out. The space of worship was also transformed under the impetus of the Second Vatican Council. The altar of the church was reversed so that the priest would face his parishioners instead of having his back towards them. Some priests took the decision not only to build their own churches, but also gave them a stark simplicity that was rooted in the community's view on the role of the church.

In the case of rural communities, the conflict over the uses and representations of space often related to public or institutional spaces. On several occasions, reformist groups denounced the partisan use of public spaces by mayors and other public officials, as well as the assignment of functions to specific spaces in ways that precluded egalitarian use. New councils were judged on the basis of their willingness and ability to open up green zones or institutional spaces in ways that would enable all local residents to enjoy the use of a recreational area during the local festivities.

In the case of teachers, the fight for a different type of education on behalf of local groups of professionals led to the transformation of

classroom practices. The school was perceived as a shared space where teachers, parents, students and other workers could deliberate and, together, construct a new educational community.

The newly appropriated spaces of the transition fostered the emergence of new subjects and collective identities. From this perspective, the case studies presented in this book engage with another theoretical debate: that which relates to the role of collective identities in the mobilisation of social movements. The central question in this debate is whether collective identity should be viewed as an end product that defines and conditions mobilisation, or whether it should be analysed as something in a continuous process of formation, which is consolidated through the process of mobilisation itself. As a process, the consolidation of collective identity involves cognitive definitions about ends, means, and the arena of action. Identity is given voice through a common language and enacted through a set of rituals and practices. Alberto Melucci defined collective identity as referring to a network of active relationships and stressed the importance of the emotional involvement of activists. According to Melucci, social movements recognise themselves through a reflexive understanding of their relations with the context or environment in which they develop.[15] He argues that 'the empirical unity of a social movement should be considered a result rather than a starting point'[16] and therefore rejects the idea that collective identity was a given, attempting to understand instead how it emerged in relation to a social movement.

Cristina Flesher Fominaya claimed that the notions of collective identity as a product and as a process were often conflated:

> (…) they refer to two different things, not to two elements of the same thing. (…) The 'product' definition refers more to a perception of shared attributes, goals and interests (something that can be felt by people inside the movement but also by those outside the movement), whereas the 'process' definition is more concerned with shared meanings, experiences and reciprocal emotional ties as experienced by the very people involved in the movement, through their interaction with one another.[17]

While much research is still needed in order to ascertain the ways in which a sense of collective identity was forged within different organisations in relation to the Citizens' Movement, the studies presented in this book can yield some tentative conclusions. It seems that the ability of specific

organisations to see themselves as part of a larger movement striving for profound political change in Spain developed as a result of two distinct processes: the first process resulted from the existence of common (and generally predetermined) attributes and goals. All of the organisations discussed in the book took it upon themselves to participate in the battle to achieve the minimal package of rights highlighted by the *Coordinadora Democratica*. Regardless of the route which they took to join the ranks of the democratic opposition during the twilight years of the Francoist regime, by the time of the dictator's death they were demanding, at the very least, amnesty for all political prisoners and the restoration of civil liberties. However, during the first two years of the transition, all of the organisations discussed in this book developed additional demands based on shared meanings and experiences that emerged out of the process of political struggle and mobilisation. This identity was based on a participative and active notion of democratic life, and placed the community (whatever its nature) at its very heart, as a source of knowledge and authority. It was precisely this identity which was never fully integrated into the new vision of democratic Spain.

There was never a specific moment when the Citizens' Movement declared its own work done. Like many other social movements, it was never formally 'disbanded'. Many of the organisations that were at the heart of the movement continue to exist to this day. Almost paradoxically, however, their ability to maintain constant levels of civic participation was seriously constrained following the passing of the democratic constitution and the holding of the first national and local elections, once their most urgent goals had been achieved. With the consolidation of democracy, the opportunities for action seemed more limited. Maintaining the type of cooperation that had previously existed between the different 'command centres' of the Citizens' Movement seemed less crucial. The core organisations, which made up the movement, managed to secure a level of continued collective action by redirecting their energies and focusing on specific goals in relation to issues surrounding education, cultural production, religious training, etc. Only when a massive economic crisis hit Spanish society in 2008 did we see a recurrence of the levels of civic mobilisation experienced during the transition to democracy.

Notes

1. E. García Castro, *El País*, "Un gobierno para la democracia," 20 December 1978, in M. Ortiz Heras, "Nuevos y viejos discursos de la Transición. La nostalgia del consenso," *Historia Contemporánea,* 44 (2012), 347.
2. A. Oliart, *El País,* "los objetivos de la Transición," 3 July 2008 in ibid, 351.
3. An exception is the feminist associations, which are not discussed in this book. For that discussion, see: Lidia Falcón, *Mujer y poder político. Fundamentos de la crisis de objetivos e ideología del Movimiento Feminista* (Madrid:Vindicación Feminista Publicaciones, 1992); Teresa María Ortega López, "La 'otra' transición política a la democracia. Nuevos enfoques teóricos, metodológicos e interpretativos para el estudio de la movilización social," in *Feminismos en la Transición,* eds. Mary Nash and Gemma Torres (Barcelona: Grup de Recerca Consolidat Multuculturalisme i Gènere–Universitat de Barcelona, Sociedad Estatal de Conmemoraciones Culturales, 2009), 13–52.
4. For more on the difference between subversion and resistance in the context of social struggles see: Katharine N. Rankin, "Critical development studies and the praxis of planning," *City* 13, 2–3 (2009), 219–229.
5. The earliest reference found appeared in E. Garrido Treviño, "Mientras el ayuntamiento se irrita Los vecinos recobran la legalidad," *Doblon,* 7 June 1975. Also see S. Molina, "Participación democrática," *Ciudadano,* 15 December 1975.
6. Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, *Social movements, an introduction,* second edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).
7. Jesús Rodríguez Cortezo, *Desde la calle. La Transición cómo se vivió* (Madrid: Visión Net, 2007), 264.
8. Henri Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life* (translated by John Moore) (London: Verso, 1991), vol. 1, 130.
9. M. Trebitsch in H. Lefebvre, *The Critique of Everyday Life*, p. xvi.
10. Carl Boggs, "Marxism Prefigurative communism and the problem of workers' control," *Radical America* 6 (1977), 100.
11. Barbara Epstein, *Political protest and cultural revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 122.
12. Luke Yates, "Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics and Goals in Social Movements," *Social Movement Studies* 14, 1 (2015), 1.
13. Ibid., 2.
14. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 33–34.

15. Alberto Melucci, *Nomads of the Present: Social Movement and Identity Needs in Contemporary Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 45–48.
16. Ibid., 43.
17. Cristina Flesher Fominaya, "Collective Identity in Social Movements: Central Concepts and Debates," *Sociology Compass* 4/6 (2010), 397.

INDEX