



N° 17 | 2010

Littérature et politique Juillet 2010

---

## Political psychology in spain

**Adela Garzón Pérez**

**Ronald C. Dillehay**

---

### Édition électronique :

**URL :** <https://cpp.numerev.com/articles/revue-17/830-political-psychology-in-spain>

**DOI :** 10.34745/numerev\_607

**ISSN :** 1776-274X

**Date de publication :** 20/07/2010

Cette publication est **sous licence CC-BY-NC-ND** (Creative Commons 2.0 - Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Pas de Modification).

---

Pour **citer cette publication** : Garzón Pérez, A., Dillehay, R. C. (2010). Political psychology in spain. *Cahiers de Psychologie Politique*, (17). [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.34745/numerev\\_607](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.34745/numerev_607)

Political psychology is a relatively new, active discipline in Spain with historic lines of development. Using Ortega's concept of generation we trace the intellectual antecedents (1898-1936) and subsequent consolidation of the field. Scientific developments in psychology and political realities of the country comprise important influences in the development of the discipline. Identified empirically the main topics of political psychology in the period 1950-1990 are ideology, nationalism, political participation, and political culture. In the 1990s political psychology was closely tied to intellectual movements previous to the Spanish civil war. Nationalism, regionalism, and Spain's involvement in the tradition of Western democracies have significant places in the development of the discipline. As the discipline grew, several important research groups evolved; their research emphases and the factors that influenced them are identified and discussed.

---

**Mots-clefs :**

---

## Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe the origin and evolution of political psychology in Spain. To this end we recognize that there are several ways of describing the development of a given discipline: academic criteria (theories, methods, research), structural criteria (institutionalization of the field), and sociological phenomena which support and define the discipline (Seoane, 1988). Regardless of which of these we choose, it is obvious that political psychology is a new phenomenon in Spain, with a formal beginning in the latter part of the 1970s. This timing coincides with an historic and extra-academic fact, namely, the restoration of democracy subsequent to the regime of Franco. In addition, any of the criteria mentioned would lead us to accept tacitly a conventional, widely held (although excessively restrictive) definition both with respect to the political aspect (reduced to rational activity, mere control techniques, and maintenance of public power) and the psychological component (the individual subject as the unit of analysis). A definition of this restrictive type would consider political psychology as the scientific study of the psychological factors which determine political behavior and the effects that political systems have on psychological processes (Stone, 1986; Knutson, 1973).

However, if we do not reduce the term “political” to the mechanisms and strategies used to achieve and maintain public power but instead understand the term as the art of organizing society in terms of visible structures of control and the regulation of collective institutions, then it is evident that we cannot describe political psychology in Spain without referring to idiosyncratic Spanish phenomena. Notable among these are the problems of regional integration within a national collective undertaking. That is, if we adopt an *historic* perspective instead of an academic or sociological one, political psychology in Spain is seen as the heir of the intellectual generations of the late 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. What is new in the 1970s is that the previous intellectual socio-political concerns were converted into delimited and institutionalized knowledge, with attendant methods and specific theories. Many authors would say this is a strict and proper definition of political psychology.

In order to construct a scenario of the development of political psychology in Spain we start by conceptualizing the political side as a visible element of social organization, with politics as a result of the different ways of conceiving and experiencing social relationships. Second, and in relation to the foregoing, in the analysis we also focus on the collective side, the ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving within the different political expressions of socio-cultural phenomena, and in this combination of social structural and cultural phenomena we refer to politics as a manifestation of the public world.

It is evident that the academic and sociological criteria do not constitute a complete basis for the conception of politics we have given. A better procedure is to analyze political reality and intellectual thought and to describe chronologically how both aspects interconnect and influence each other. Ortega's concept of *generation* or *vital sensitivity* (Ortega, 1923) can be used as a working system to trace the intellectual antecedents and subsequent consolidation of Spanish political psychology. In addition, this approach enables us to go through our intellectual history without having to carry out a highly detailed chronological description of political thought. Instead, we proceed by extracting only those intellectuals who, sharing their own social and political experiences, developed similar ways of evaluating and thinking and who related their experiences and ideas to institutional political forms. This leads us, then, to the opinions and feelings that these institutional forms produced within Spanish civil society, as stated by Almond and Verba (1989), concerning the nature of political culture and its evolution in accord with the development of political models.

# **Intellectual Antecedents of Political Psychology in Spain**

## ***The Role of the Intellectuals at the End of the 19th Century***

In the late 19th century Spain was trying to get out of a traditional political culture in order to adapt itself to more modern and rational political forms. This effort entailed a

modernization process both at the economic level (consolidation of the middle classes) and within the political one (the First Republic was installed in 1873). However, the old structures were still present: The Republic was not a strong one, and the Parliament was dissolved. (In the 20<sup>th</sup> century the Second Republic was formed in 1931. It also failed to survive, and, after the provisional dictatorship, the monarchy was restored in 1975).

The fall of the Spanish Empire, the disappearance of its Golden Era, and the difficulties surrounding entrance into the European modernization process created an intellectual Spanish conscience of decadence. This state was aggravated by the failure of the First Republic and the defeat by the USA in the fight for the last Spanish colonies in America. To all this we have to add the so-called *End of Century Crisis*. Everything led to a reflection about both the past and the future of Spain and, as is the case in all such crises, the problem of how to define “the essence of being Spanish” arose. The social and political philosophy of that era--focused on the definition of the nation and, consequently, on national features and characteristics--became the antecedents of political psychology. In fact, several social philosophers of the time appealed to the collective psychology (in the style of Wundt, 1912) and to the differentiation between state and cultural community (Herder, 1784-91) in speaking about Spain.

In this late 19th century context, an association between the intellectual currents of the time and the elaboration of a political scheme for Spain took place. The commitment of the Spanish intellectuals to the political life had several departure points, and not all of them are specifically indigenous. On this matter it is well to remember that the figure of the intellectual with a commitment to reality is a European phenomenon to be found within the international scientific community. For example, in his 1990 analysis--*The Intellectual Manifest*--Marichal considered the Dreyfus case as the introduction of the intellectuals into the political discourse<sup>1</sup>. In the same way, the second factor, namely, the *end-of-century crisis* and the reflections about the society and its evolution, which characterized the Western intellectual currents in Europe at the end of the 19th century, is not original to Spain, either. The end-of-century crisis was a critical and reflexive reaction to the effects of the implementation in the whole of Europe of the principles established in the late 18th century, viz., democratic principles in politics, capitalism in economics, and positivism and specialization in knowledge.

This association in this era entailed the appearance of a series of intellectual movements committed to the reconstruction of Spain and concerned with Spanish nationalism. Among them were Krausism (Jiménez, 1986), Neokrausism defended by Giner de Los Ríos (1886), and the Institución Libre de Enseñanza (Institution for the Freedom of Education, 1876), which was an alternative education. The latter had important ramifications, such as the Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios (1907), which encouraged the exchange of higher education students with European universities, and the Centro de Estudios Históricos (1910), in which some members of the 1898, 1914, and 1927 intellectual generations took part. Although the first group which became aware of the commitment of the intellectual to social and political reality is the generation of 1898, Ortega y Gasset—who belonged to the group of 1914—first dealt with the subject of the role of the intellectual in the creation of a new Spain in his

conference Old and New Politics. The crisis at the end of the century, the lagging of Spain in relation to other European countries in political development (the bourgeois revolution was not consolidated in Spain) as well as at the social level (the people had to be socialized politically) and in the scientific scene, led the intellectuals to realize that intelligence had to play a managing, active role in the modern construction of Spain.

### ***The Central Axes of Spanish Political Thought***

We must mention three central dimensions of Spanish political life at this particular time in history, as they defined the socio-political thought of three generations of intellectuals (1888, 1914 and 1927). Their reflections are summarized in three large themes of the so-called “problem of Spain:”

1. Spain as a culturally and politically unified entity—the problem of nationalist feelings;
2. Spain’s position within the European continent, or its “context;” and
3. Spanish political modernization, between liberalism and traditionalism, where neither the monarchy nor the republic seemed to be able to settle.

An understanding of the “problem of Spain” is difficult if we do not recall that, in the late 19th century, the country was conflicted over the monarchy and the republic. The prevailing ambivalence engendered different constitutional changes (Constitutions of 1812, 1837, 1869, 1876, and 1890) and provoked an increasing disenchantment in civil society about politicians and politics.

In this period Spain suffered an identity crisis given its inability to adapt to the new times and the end-of-century crisis. Two responses arose: the Generation of 1898 and Catalanian Modernism (1892-1911). The latter strengthened the Catalanian identity by incorporating European cultural values and creating pretensions for political autonomy, while rejecting the policies of the central state. The Generation of 1898 understood that in order to reconstruct Spain, it was necessary to look within itself, to produce a deepening understanding of what was genuinely Spanish and to revitalize the country.

## **The Continuity of Three Generations (1898-1936)**

### ***The End of the Century and the Volkgeist of the 1898 Generation***

Active at the end of the century, the members of the Generation of 1898, did not take clear political positions, but they decisively influenced the socio-cultural framework of Spain. All the 1898 authors began with a concern with socio-political matters and took positions not ideologically far from socialism. While most of them ended up withdrawing from political concerns or adopting conservative positions, their meaning is to be found

in the socio-political complexity of the time and their political disenchantment.

The 1898 Generation was, first of all, a conflicted and complex one, related to the end-of-century modernist movement on a literary, philosophic, religious, and Hispanic basis. Their objective was to modernize Spain and to break the old monarchic and oligarchic forms which took the country into decadence. In so doing they invoked the Golden Age, so their attempt was, paradoxically, to revitalize those things they were actually fighting against.

The inclusion of the 1898 Generation as an intellectual antecedent of political psychology is justified because theirs was the first intellectual movement that fostered the idea of "national awareness," appealing to the collective psychology as a departure point for the reconstruction of Spain. Collective psychology (as described by Hartmann (1869) was understood as a moral element transferred from person to person, which becomes an integrating part of individuals and the soul of the people. The 1898 Generation defended a nationalism based on the *Volkgeist*. The affirmation of "national character" was developed in different ways. Some authors understood this concept as the cultural and historic community that defines a nation, and therefore appealed to the concept of Hispanic identity. Hispanic identity was conceived as a universal humanism characterized by the belief in social equality, through the fraternity that unifies all Hispanic peoples (Maeztu, *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, 1934).

Without doubt, one of the most remarkable representatives of the group is Miguel de Unamuno (1864-1936), one of the first intellectuals of the 20th century who associated psychology and politics. In 1891, Unamuno assumed the Chair of Greek in the University of Salamanca and was its vice-chancellor from 1901 until 1914. For Unamuno, what is specifically Spanish cannot be sought in the "individuality" of Spain (mannerisms, visible aspects, history) but in something deeper, like its "personality" (understood as an eternal dimension, a "history within"). This internal essence is manifested in the language, which collects and contains the knowledge, the traditions, and the basic values of the people. The Castilian language encircles all the traditions, and it was Castilla who committed himself to the national unification project. In addition, for Unamuno, Europe represented reason, a continent which was concerned with both means and achievements, whereas Spain was the world of plans, of ideals. Therefore, Unamuno's proposal to *Hispanize* in the manner of Europe as well as his proposal of a pure or genuine form of Spanish being to reform Spain were quite logical.

Confronted with Unamuno's eternal and unitarian tradition, other representatives defended the historicist conception with its emphasis on the influences of the different peoples who lived in 3rd century Spain--Jews, Arabs and Christians—and their roles in the construction of a national identity. From the three groups the Christian world represented the longing for the construction of a national identity, and it is, therefore, in old Castilian (in pure and noble form) that one found the *Volkgeist* in Spain.

In their political philosophy, the 1898 Generation developed the idea of Spanish nationalism, bringing together political, religious, and geographic (Castile) dimensions.

This identification between the Spanish national character and Castilian geography was established again, which was in contrast to the specific aims of the peripheral geographic areas of Spain, which had existed since the Medieval Ages. From either perspective, the antecedents of political psychology stem from a collective psychology, which was very close to the European nationalisms (Garzón, 1988).

### ***Culture and Politics: the Generation of 1914***

The first decades of the 20th century were marked by both national and international significant political events that awakened national awareness and also provided the political thought of the new generation of intellectuals with a distinctive direction. The foremost author in the 1914 group is Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955).

The Restoration and the inefficiency of both the liberal and the conservative governments, together with the fragmentation of the political parties and the consolidation of the regionalist parties, led clearly to the failure of the monarchy and the reinstallation of the Second Republic in 1931. There had been a prior period (1923-1929) of military dictatorship. In the international context, the First World War, despite Spain's neutrality, served as a catalyst for a great intellectual and political struggle in Spain. The division of Spain between Germanic defenders and allied supporters –Amigos de la Unión Moral de España [Friends of the Spanish Moral Union] and Liga Antigermanófila [Antigermanic League]– became the expression of the radicalization of existing national problems: the defenders of the traditional, monarchic, and imperialist Spain, and the defenders of the liberal, republic, and Spain of the common person. In addition, the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 reinforced the opposition between a small bourgeoisie and an enormous working mass who had become unhappy with the liberal political formulations. This opposition was the differentiation between liberalism and traditionalism.

The constitutional act of the generation was the foundation of the Liga de Educación Política [League for Political Education] (1913) whose clear objective was expressed by Ortega in his conference Old and New Politics in 1914. The conference unveiled the program of a generation of intellectuals which inherited—from the 1898 Group– “the problem of Spain,” and elaborated a new project for the modernization of the country. For this generation, the problem was not to be solved by looking for a “national identity” in the past, as proposed by the 1898 group, but by building up a new “Spanish man.” In their opinion, Spain needed a deep cultural transformation, and political education was the key. The generation aimed to break with traditional Spain and create a modern Spain. Their tools were liberalism (socialist), nationalization (from the Republic, once the monarchy failed), and cosmopolitanism (Europeanization of Spain, that is, the scientific and political incorporation of Spain into Europe). Many authors characterized the second Republic as their political design.

For Ortega y Gasset, the real social transformation of Spain would be possible only from its “culture,” and politics would be the only instrument, not as a means to acquire public power but as a way to inculcate values and ideals adequate to the national reality. And

in this sense the political undertaking departed slightly from the intellectual sphere (henceforth the ambivalence ortegiana with politics; see Sánchez-Càmara, 1987). Thus, politics understood in this way was converted into a matter for social pedagogy, which required the education of a selected elite and the majority, both oriented toward a collective interest (as opposed to particular interests). In effect, today we call this process political socialization.

### ***Political Socialization and Cosmopolitanism***

The most relevant contributions of the 1914 generation to political psychology are the formulations on political education and cosmopolitanism, represented by the books *España Invertebrada* and *La Rebelión de las Masas* by Ortega (1922, 1930). If socialization demands an analysis of the reality of Spain and its reconstruction, cosmopolitanism refers to the necessity of the Europeanization of Spain through a study of European reality, for which he proposed a supranational model. Both topics are based on Ortega's conceptions of society.

When we discussed Unamuno, we commented on his contribution to political psychology by describing his theory of the person; now, in contrast, we draw upon social psychology to describe Ortega's political formulations. Ortega developed the idea of society as "the will towards a common design" (Ortega, 1930; Rodríguez, 1987). In his concept of the social dimension, Ortega joined the European current of social psychology which contends that the group--as opposed to the individual--is the basic unit of social phenomena; thus, Ortega rejects the more American conception of the social level as shared perception or cognition (Garzón, 1989). In this regard, he distinguished the association of individual wills from the collective, the former being, in his words, "that opposed to society" (Ortega, 1930, p.17) and the second the basis of society, or the scope of the common will. In Ortega's account (1930, p.287), there exist antisocial forces and associative forces within any society, and that is why a public power (the State) is required to regulate the interaction of the forces. On the other hand, in his aristocratic thinking, he understood that society requires a "highly qualified managing minority" to orient and guide the majority. His liberalism and critique of rationalism are close to phenomenology, historicity, and existentialism, and far from the naturalist conceptions of psychology (Pastor, 1987).

The application of social theory to political phenomena made him think that Spain had been unable to articulate itself as a nation due to the lack of a managing minority in combination with the existence of a rebel, unmanageable majority focused on their own rights and interests. In fact, the great political forces—the Church and the central power of the state—did exist but were most concerned with their own interests. The result was an invertebrate Spain where regionalism and particularism hindered articulation as a common project. The failure derived from the very constitution of Spain: from the weak "germanization" (the Visigoths were already a worn out people when they arrived in Spain), and from Christianity, which did not facilitate the development of feudalism as a means to regulate the relationships among the "feudal lords." The lack of balance between majority and minority, essential for the articulation of a society, and the



appearance of ethnic and class particularism (i.e., lack of collective will) transformed Spain into an invertebrate country. Spain as a common enterprise had to be educated politically and had to embrace its inner diversity, taking into account that the foundation to build up a state was not ethnic separatism but the historic will.

The problem of Europe as a national entity is precisely the opposite: transcending the minority by the majority, manifested in public life through a process of homogenization. The appearance of the mass-man and the belief that all nationalities must have a similar constitution (initiated in the 18th century) are Europe's major diseases. That is, the idea of Europe as the union of nationalities is threatened both by the mass-man (without a past, a historic) and by the nations believing they are independent (the national sovereignty myth; see Seoane, 1991). Ortega pointed out the necessity of a public power well above the European nationalities to regulate the balance of power: the supranational state.

In this regard, Ortega was an antecedent of what came to be called the "democratic culture:" the play of relations between the managing class and the opportunity of the populace to participate in the civil society, a balance between participation and trust in the political leaders (Seoane, 1992).

### ***The Generation of 1927 and Social Concern***

The change in sensibilities of the Generation of 1927 had to be sought as much in new literary trends, ranging from avant-garde to surrealism, as in the critical situation of both national and international politics. If the previous generations saw the way to modernization in the liberal-bourgeois republic and in the West, the new ideologically radicalized generation denounced Western culture as decadent (a turn to the East) and identified the republic with the people. The crisis which followed the Second World War and the military dictatorship in Spain as a way out of the socioeconomic frustration contributed to the radicalization of this generation. So also did the identification with the popular revolution in Russia and the failure of the first two years (1931-1933) of the Second Republic. In addition, the failure of the reforms carried out during the first two years of the Second Republic with the reaffirmation of the right wing and the radicalization of the left (The Communist Party, PCE, appeared in 1921 and was inscribed in the Third International) intensified the opposition of political orientations –traditionalists and liberals, monarchists and republicans. These factors resulted in the civil war and Franco's subsequent dictatorship in 1939.

These are the main keys to understanding the contributions of the 1927 generation; they can be summarized as the adoption of a critical social thought, expressed through literature (in the social content of the novel), politics (essential for popular exaltation), and social sciences through the incorporation of a Marxist methodology to analyze the national reality.

*Conclusion.* Some of the intellectual antecedents of political psychology developed during the first decades of the 20th century. The philosophic-political legacy of the

generations analyzed can be summarized with three main themes. One is the concept of national character (Generation of 1898 and especially Unamuno). A second is democratic and cosmopolitan political education (Generation of 1914 and especially Ortega). The third is the adoption of critical social thought (Generation of 1927) which would influence the social psychology of the 1970s.

These themes also had ramifications in the development of psychology as a natural science. The social and political thought at the time, together with the need to modernize Spain, favored the construction of a scientific psychology instead of a rational psychology. However, the contributions of the generation of 1939 (Germain and Mira are its main representatives) were undermined at the moment of maximum academic maturity. The civil war opened a breach in the critical philosophical thought of the time and suspended the cultural and political modernization of Spain as well as the development of scientific psychology.

## **Psychology and the Socio-political Recession in the Period 1939-1952**

We have seen how Spanish social thought at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th became the foundation for the construction of a political psychology. In a similar vein after the end of the 19th century a rational psychology developed. This development was a consequence of Spanish neo-scholastic thought, and, in part, of the metaphysical Krausism of Sanz del Río—a combination of rational psychology and empirical psychology—with the works of Barbado (1884-1945; *Introducción a la Psicología Experimental*, 1928) and the works of Zaragüeta (1883-1974), e.g., *Teoría Psicogenética de la Voluntad* (1914). The latter two were ecclesiastics who reinterpreted W. James and garnered from him aspects of metaphysical thought (Rodríguez, 1989). In 1930, Zaragüeta assumed the Rational Psychology Chair in the Philosophy College in Madrid. There was also the Chair of Higher Psychology, which was occupied by Fagoaga in 1923, and both of them continued lecturing after the Civil War. Of note also is the relationship between Zaragüeta and García Morente, who both belonged to the Generation of 1914. Morente was one of Ortega's most accomplished disciples; he converted to Catholicism in 1937 and created the section of Pedagogy in the Philosophy and Humanities College (Ortega's initiative) which Zaragüeta joined. On the other hand, Morente directed the doctoral thesis of Julián Marías (1942) who represented the Catholic projection of Ortega's thought.

We differentiate this new phase in the development of psychology by political outcomes and important academic events in the development of psychology. This new period started in 1939 and coincided with the end of the Civil War, when a great many intellectuals were exiled—those committed to the modernization of Spain—with the resulting stagnation of both traditional liberal political thought and the secularization of science, and, therefore, the interruption of cultural modernization. This new era also created a break in the development of psychology as an empirical science, which had

been driven by neo-Krausism, La Institución Libre de Enseñanza (F. Giner de los Ríos), and the generations previously mentioned. Those committed to these tasks, Germain (1897-1986) and Mira (1896-1964), were forced to abandon the country in the midst of carrying out their developments.

An academic event of the time was the creation of the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas [Higher Council of Scientific Research] in 1939, with two sections, viz., Philosophy, which included psychology, and Pedagogy. This phase was defined by the reorientation of socio-political and cultural thought towards conservative political thought, namely the traditional Catholic perspective, and neo-scholastic philosophy. The end of the period (1952-1955) was marked by the international recognition of Franco's regime, which presented an opening for several developments: a concordat with the Holy See was signed guaranteeing Catholicism in Spain along with obligatory religious education; a military agreement was established with the U.S.A; and Spain became a NATO base. At the same time Spain joined the UNESCO, and in 1955 the OCDE and the United Nations. In the academic context, the Sociedad Española de Psicología [Spanish Psychological Society] was created in 1952 (its main founders were Germain, López Ibor, Yela, Pinillos, Mallart, etc.), and so Spanish psychology entered into the family of international organizations.

The transformation experienced through these changes leads us to use the term *generation* in a milder sense than the "vital sensitivity" which applied to earlier periods. The generations which followed from this point were completely different as far as their socio-political sensitivity is concerned; their common identity was more related to their scientific-academic commitments than to their social and political perspectives. We can identify these generations by the date they started and the end of this period, as follows: the Generation of 1939, whose main figures are Germain and Mira i López; and the Generation of 1952, whose central nucleus was Yela, Pinillos, Siguán, with those closely associated being Yagüe, Pertejo, Forteza, Secadas, etc. (Yela, 1976). Both generations were linked by a common objective: the reconstruction of psychology.

### ***The Generation of 1939 and Social Applications of Psychology***

Two phases have to be differentiated in the Generation of 1939. The first is the pre-war period, characterized by the followers of F. Giner de los Ríos, with the School of Madrid (influenced by Ortega), who focused on the development of social applications of psychology. Following this period was the post-war phase, linked to the Generation of 1952 and defined by the institutionalization of psychology.

In the first period, the theory and social applications of psychology stemmed from its continuity with the previous generations, through Zaragüeta in pedagogy and Lafora in medicine (both belong to the 1914 Generation). This enabled them to continue the educational line of neo-Krausism and the generation of 1914 and La Institución Libre de Enseñanza. Their psychology as an empirical science developed from two sources: one medical (initiated by Simarro and the first psychology laboratory in the Sciences College, which was followed by Ramón y Cajal, Marañón, Achurraco and Lafora); and the

other technical-pedagogical (with Zaragüeta, Luzuriaga, and Xirau).

The confluence of pedagogy and medicine lead to clinical, educational, and occupational applications of psychology. Those responsible were two neuropsychiatrists: Germain (Lafora's disciple) and Mira i López (from the Catalanian area, disciple of Turró). Madrid and Barcelona became the two vital points of the start of psychology, and the beginnings of the field occurred in the realm of application. Early psychology developed through the Instituto Nacional de Psicotecnia [National Institute of Psychotechnic] (1934) with the center that served in the development of personnel for the Servicios Nacionales de Orientación y Selección Profesional [National Service for Orientation and Professional Selection], which partially met the social and economic demands of the industrialization and modernization of Spain. These institutes carried out three activities: psychological assessment, medical-physical assessment (inadaptability, working accidents), and technical assessment (professional counseling) (Germain, 1954). Two international congresses of psychological assessment were held in Barcelona in 1921 and 1930. The 11th International Congress of Psychology was being prepared in Madrid for 1936, presided over by Ortega as honorary chairman, Mira as chairman, and Germain as secretary, but the congress did not come to pass due to the outbreak of the war. Their theoretical formulations were influenced by the trends in Europe (Germany and France: Piaget, Pieron, Janet, Claparede, Khöler) which enabled them to acquire a global and integrated vision of the concept of personality as the result of psychodynamic, biological, and social adaptation factors.

The second period was associated with the process of the institutionalization of Psychology, which culminated with the following generation, the generation of 1952. The framework was then the *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC)* [The Higher Council of Scientific Research]. The CSIC was created in 1939 as an institution dependent on the Ministry of Education, which in part controlled the ongoing scientific research and intellectual activity. Its director was the ecclesiastic Albareda, and Barbado (also an ecclesiastic) was charged with both organizing and heading the psychological and philosophical research. His orientation was toward traditional philosophy. Later, in 1948, a department of experimental psychology was created within the CSIC, which, with Zaragüeta's approval, was directed by Germain (Germain, 1981; Pinillos, 1981). Three research foci emerged: clinical, industrial, and educational. In 1946, a journal *Psicología General y Aplicada* appeared (which was a continuation of the old journal *Psicotecnia*) with Germain as its editor. Eight years later this journal became the organ of the Sociedad Española de Psicología.

### ***The Generation of 1952 and the Consolidation of Scientific Psychology***

The year 1952 has particular significance because of the recognition abroad of the Spanish political regime and the appearance of the Sociedad Española de Psicología [Spanish Psychological Society]. The Escuela de Psicología y Psicotecnia [School of Psychology and Psychotechnic] was created in 1953 at the University of Madrid, and a psychology curriculum was initiated at the university level. The first psychology students graduated from Madrid in 1966, while students from Barcelona came second,

with later graduates from Seville, Valencia, and Salamanca. However, the psychology degree was not formally introduced into a psychology section (within the philosophy and humanities degree) until 1968, and an independent college of psychology did not become a reality until the end of the 1970s. The claims of the profession at the time led to the formation of the Sección Profesional de Psicólogos [Psychology Section] in the Colegio de Doctores y Licenciados de Filosofía [Official Association of Doctorates and Graduates in Philosophy]; later on, the Colegio de Psicólogos [College of Psychologists] was created. Most of the Generation of 1952 members were trained in philosophy, and so they were the first psychologists who did not come from a college of medicine. They took on the objective of consolidating psychology as an independent science, as a framework for university-level research in distinct aspects of psychology. Their concern, as well as the concern of the previous generation, was to create the necessary infrastructure (academic qualifications, an independent official association of psychologists, colleges, laboratories) and the research impetus necessary for the development of a scientific psychology.

The central nucleus of this generation was formed by J.L. Pinillos, M. Yela, and M. Siguán, who created at the same time influential subgroups in Madrid (Yela), Barcelona (Siguán) and Valencia (Pinillos). The three began to develop diverse foci and areas of investigation of scientific psychology. In 1957 Yela assumed the chair of General Psychology in Madrid, and similarly, in 1961 Pinillos and Siguán obtained chairs in Valencia and Barcelona, respectively. Following the tradition of the Junta de Ampliación de Estudios [Board for the Expansion of Studies], the three professors got in touch with American, Latin American (Perù, Bolivia, Chile, Caracas), and European psychologists: Yela worked with Thurstone in Chicago and Michotte in Louvain; Pinillos traveled to Bonn (working with Behn, Müller, Kretschmer) and cooperated most closely with Eysenck in London. Siguán pursued industrial psychology in London. While Yela developed methods of assessment in psychology following the line initiated in techniques of measurement, Siguán focused on occupational and educational versions of the discipline. His studies on language and infancy, with a focus on bilingualism, developed his knowledge of regionalism. Pinillos (closer to Fagagoa, who set up the second psychology laboratory in Filosofía y Letras [the Philosophy and Humanities College] along with Cossío, laid out the basis for the different theoretical approaches of psychology. He integrated the empirical and humanist perspectives in the analysis of consciousness and behavior, and he started research on social psychology. On the other hand, he also maintained contact with sociologists (Linz, G. Seara, A. de Miguel, et al.), promoting within his peers sensitivity toward the social aspects of personality (stereotypes, social and political attitudes, authoritarianism, etc.). His integrating vision of personality, his relationship with Eysenck, and the legacy of the pre-war generations (in 1987, he promoted Ortega's philosophy as a theoretical substrate for psychology in Spain) led him to research in the arena of ideology and personality, which had an effect on J. Seoane of the Generation of 1968. J. Seoane would play a very important role in the birth of political psychology in Spain.

### ***The Generation of 1968 and Theoretical Frameworks of Scientific Psychology.***

The liberal thought of the previous generations was revitalized at the end of the 1950s. Together with the extant political opposition, a strong opposition to the existing political regime developed within the intellectual university community. University students initiated protests which led to the declaration of a state of emergency in 1956. Regionalist claims were asserted, with demonstrations in Catalonia and the revolutionary movements for independence in the Basque Country, and political demands were made by the fragmented left-wing (socialists, communists, anarchists, and Trotskyites), who used the university as a sounding board. The university atmosphere was aggravated by the international student movement, and riots caused the intermittent closure of the main universities. Between 1969 and 1975, numerous actions took place against the government. Then, in 1970, the legal procedure in Burgos against ETA (Basque separatist organization) terrorists attracted international attention, and the internal confrontations with the country's security forces lead to a new declaration of a state of emergency and the closure of the university in Madrid. The ecclesiastical sphere also took part by asking for a pardon for two of those who had been convicted who belonged to the church. In the same year, Prince Juan Carlos acquired the official role of successor to the Head of State (which was a way to re-install the monarchy). In 1973, ETA members killed Carrero Blanco, and in 1974 Franco's impaired health status brought back the subject of the controversial succession. In 1975, five of the eleven capital punishment decisions resulting from another terrorist-radical left wing legal case were carried out.

The agitation increased with the transference of power to the monarchy and Franco's death. In addition, since the late 60s, in order to strengthen the market, the capitalist class and the financial institutions needed to free themselves from obstacles posed by the political system. The church was already divided with the identification of Catholicism with the political regime disappearing: on one hand, the aristocratic Catholic groups (such as Opus Dei) played a decisive technocratic part in the government against the "Falange" leaders and defended the image of a lay society; on the other hand, the mid-level clergy got closer to the lower classes and supported their political and socio-economic aspirations. It was the beginning of the end of Franco's era, resulting in the transition to democracy (see Colectivo, *La Transición Política Española*).

This is the socio-political context in which the Generation of 1968 moved, a group that can be considered the "imitator" of the 1952 group, since with both the process of consolidation of scientific psychology was shut down. This is the last generation which carried out their studies in the context of the Facultades de Filosofía [Colleges of Philosophy] (the psychology sections within the philosophy degree programs appeared in the generation of 1968, and the first colleges of psychology were set up in 1978). Their education administratively within philosophy did not prevent them from committing themselves to the institutionalization of the study of psychology. However, their battlefield was not to distinguish psychology from traditional philosophy, which was the work of previous generations, but instead to create the necessary intellectual conditions for the development of psychology as an independent science. The social and political agitation in the country facilitated the intellectual debate over the epistemological framework of psychology. Among its most outstanding members were Seoane,

Genovart, Pelechano, Carpintero, and Trespalacios. They fostered the proliferation of the academic nuclei (centered in Madrid, Barcelona, and Valencia), and the construction of an academic structure began (theories, methods, research, subdisciplines) for the development of the independent colleges of psychology. H. Carpintero (close to J. Marías and Germain) developed the history of psychology; V. Pelechano introduced the focus on conduct and behavior modification; C. Genovart developed educational psychology in Barcelona. Because of his exposure to philosophy of science with M. Garrido (Professor of Logics and Philosophy of Science in Valencia) and his contact with Pinillos, J. Seoane contributed to the epistemology and methodological framework of psychology. His work was first through psychology as a natural science and later by means of the introduction of artificial intelligence and cognitive psychology. He subsequently fostered the development of social psychology through the dissemination of Wundt's *Wölkerpsychologie* as a theoretical paradigm. J. Seoane along with F. J. Burrillo and J. R. Torregrosa, who also belonged to this generation although they came from different backgrounds, would form the central nucleus of social psychology.

This Generation of 1968 can be considered the last in the family tree we have constructed. From that point forward it would be very difficult to conceptualize the multiple ramifications in a similar way. As a matter of fact, most of the members of the 1968 group created research nuclei for the different specializations in psychology (general, clinical, industrial, and educational). Through these branches, political psychology was re-initiated, already established as a formalized experimental science, thanks to Pinillos' works on stereotypes and authoritarianism, a line of research later taken up by Seoane. To this we now turn our attention.

## **Political Psychology and Its Institutionalization (1980-1992)**

### ***The Recovery of Political Content***

The social and political philosophy which stimulated the generations previous to the civil war was revitalized initially through the "scientific" reinterpretation of the national feeling and the analysis of ideologies. This study was carried out by some social psychologists whose background was general psychology and others from sociology and political science.

The major topics of socio-political thought at the beginning of the 20th century –psychology and national identity, Spain within the European context, and socio-political modernization– were re-launched in the academic scene of the 1980s by means of studies on stereotypes and sociopolitical attitudes. These works were descriptive analyses that aimed to "diagnose" the sociopolitical reality of Spain. They began with the earlier work of Pinillos in the study of primary social attitudes (1953; the author used Eysenck's Primary Social Attitudes Scale) and with research on national preferences (1960). In those Pinillos followed Otto Klineberg's line and tried to determine whether "a

stable hierarchy of ethnic preference existed in Spain and if it coincided with that of more developed countries." In 1963 R.Rodriguez Sanabra carried out a similar study on Spanish regional stereotypes. Pinillos also investigated the authoritarian personality and the Spanish adaptation of the F Scale (1963, Valencia).

However, due to the political problems that held back the country during the 1970s, it was not until the middle of the decade that one could begin to speak of the real institutionalization of political psychology. The start of the process is represented by Seoane's works in the University of Santiago de Compostela. Apart from broadening the application of the concept of the authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levenson, & Sanford, 1950) with the adaptation of Kreml's AF Scale and Christie's political scale, he began to raise issues through the study of political ideologies at the time of the reinstallation of political parties in Spain. This was manifested through the direction of several doctoral theses on these topics and in the formation of a series of professors (Garzón, Rodríguez) and students (Méndez, Sabucedo, Sobral) who would play an important role in the political psychology of the period.

On the other hand, in 1976, Burgaleta constructed a new questionnaire in Madrid on socio-political attitudes. The concept of authoritarianism also had a presence in Madrid from the perspectives of political science and social psychology. In this regard, it is important to mention the analysis by J.R. Torregrosa of authoritarianism in the working class as distinct from the concept of authoritarianism given by Adorno et al. in 1950 (Torregrosa, 1969). In addition, in 1968 F.J. Burillo in a brief review of the subject of political psychology and its poor development in Spain, introduced studies on "alienation." Furthermore, under his direction, J.L. Sangrador (1979) conducted a study of national stereotypes, which would become a reference point for Chacon's work in 1986.

In the university setting in Barcelona, the "national problem" had been recast by Siguán (Generation of 1952) in terms of the problems of bilingualism and socialization and their role in nationalist sentiment. In the 1980s, with the influence of diverse theoretical orientations principally from Europe (although also American, such as Gergen's social constructionism), several different research lines developed in Barcelona. These centered on studies of political power, political discourse and rhetoric (T. Ibáñez), and the necessity of a critical, Marxist social thought (Munné).

### ***The Institutionalization of Political Psychology***

The formalization of a discipline is always a long process which starts with the proliferation of research which cannot be encompassed by existing disciplines. New research teams appear and gradually spread the new contents, which become categorized into a distinctive theoretical field. In the late 1970s, the resurrection within a scientific perspective of the "national problem" and the socio-political modernization of Spain can be considered as the start of the formalization of political psychology in the country. The formalization was described by Seoane in 1978 as "the necessity of studying the social ideologies of the country (after Adorno and other works), and the necessity of the society and the psychology students to know the field of Political



Psychology" (see Castro's interview, *Conversaciones con Seoane*, 1978, p.30). However, its consolidation was a slow process which did not take place until the mid 1980s. By then, the existence of a section devoted to political psychology in the National Congresses of Social Psychology was already commonplace (such as those of Granada, 1985; Alicante, 1987; Santiago, 1989; and Seville, 1991). Involved academics had started to spread political psychology content through teaching (seminars, doctoral programs, etc.) and demands for incorporation of political psychology into university curricula.

In this slow process of formalization of a discipline, there is always an "event" which becomes a key date. Several events in Spanish psychology could each be considered as the official date of the constitution of political psychology: conferences in summer courses (Garrido, Villareal, among others); the appearance of monographs (e.g., T. Ibáñez, Sabucedo, Pastor); and the first courses dedicated to political psychology (Seoane, Morales, Roiz, et al.).

Nevertheless, we chose the year 1987, the year in which the first Congreso Nacional de Psicología [National Congress of Political Psychology] was held, presided over by J. Seoane with the collaboration of A. Garzón, A. Rodríguez, and T. Ibáñez. Numerous social psychologists who had already contributed to the development of political psychology took part. The congress emerged as a consequence of the necessity to highlight the studies carried out in Spain in the sphere of political psychology, which were being overlooked and stockpiled in libraries. The congress brought together for the first time and highlighted the existence of groups representative of Spanish political psychology. The Barcelona group coordinated by T. Ibáñez focused on political ideology issues, power, and political systems; the Basque Country representatives demonstrated an interest in ethnic identity and political mobilization; the Santiago de Compostela panel (Serrano, Sabucedo, and Sobral) analyzed subjects such as political negotiations, individual political behavior, and political participation; and finally, the Valencian and Murcian groups, who were the most numerous and under Seoane's coordination, showed their emphasis on personality and political issues, as well as topics such as the importance of the political dimension of legal psychology, political violence, psycho-history, and political socialization. One of the outcomes of the congress was the publication of the first handbook in Spanish of political psychology (Seoane & Rodríguez, 1988), with contributions by the participants and the Granada team, coordinated by J. F. Morales.

Two years later, in 1990, the first Spanish journal of political psychology was created (*Psicología Política*), with A. Garzón as journal editor and J. Seoane and R. Dillehay (USA) associate editors. The editorial board consisted of psychologists who had contributed to the institutionalization of political psychology in Spain (Morales, Rodríguez, Sabucedo, Villareal, Roiz, etc.), as well as European and American social scientists interested in Spanish psychology (Brewster Smith, Gergen, Stone, Winter, etc.).

The institutionalization of political psychology had started in previous decades, but its maximum expression was reached in the 1980s. From that time on, there was a

progressive increase not only of empirical studies of political psychology but also an augmentation of theoretical and methodological development. If the studies of regional stereotypes constitute the beginning of political psychology, during the 1980s the analysis of social ideologies and political participation acquired special relevance. Figure 1 shows the evolution of political psychology in Spain in terms of publications from 1953 (when Pinillos published his analysis of primary social attitudes) to 1992. The publications in political psychology are expressed as a percentage of the total number of publications analyzed.



# Tradition and Evolution of Political Psychology in Spain

## ***Academic Context and Research Groups***

In order to analyze political psychology in Spain over recent decades we decided to utilize an empirical study of the available literature. After reviewing the available literature (articles, books, lectures, etc.), we chose 175 works that appeared between 1953 and 1992. All of them comply with three pre-established conditions: a) the authors were psychologists, b) the work was published in Spain, and c) the contents were approached from a political and psychological perspective. It is obvious that 175 papers are not the total existing literature, but they are a representative sample of the themes of political psychology, and, more important, the reports constitute an essential core bibliography in the political psychology sphere.

We followed this empirical strategy because there is already an extensive literature and because it is difficult to find a generation during this period defined by its historic and socio-political sensitivity. The generations subsequent to 1968 are characterized more by their diversity than by their homogeneity--both with respect to the work done and their socio-political orientations. This is not surprising if we take into account that political psychology was consolidated within the context of a scientific psychology, which facilitated the adoption of a universal language and topics (taken from the particular morphological traits of the country) and was strengthened in the late 1970s when Spain adopted the political model of Western democracies.

Science and politics are phenomena responsible for the progressive "sprouting" of scientific literature, and in this sense the evolution of political psychology in Spain should not differ from other geographic contexts. So our hypothesis is that the political psychology of the 1980s reflects the intellectual concern of the time about the modernization of Spain. In support of this supposition we underscore three themes that characterized the period: social ideologies (in the style of Adorno in 1954 and subsequent developments), nationalism (the association of cultural differences with national identity), and political participation. Beyond that, the evolution of the contents

of political psychology was a response in part to the political evolution of the country itself: the studies of political participation were initiated in the period of full democratic development of Spain (in 1982 these studies were initiated, coincident with the electoral victory of the Partido Socialista [Socialist Party]). Another distinct aspect is that these studies were conducted within the formalism of the science, diluting, in part, the historic content of the phenomena studied. Nonetheless, two characteristics previously indicated, i.e., the reinterpretation of the problem of Spain and the socio-political context of the thematic evolution of political psychology, also appear out of the categorization of the existing literature that we shall consider next.

The literature we examine can be grouped into nine main categories. We developed these categories empirically in two steps. In the first step, studies were grouped under a common theme if their title referred to the same concrete phenomenon. For example, authoritarianism, dogmatism, terrorism, war system, voting behavior, and conventional participation formed six initial categories. If a study could be included under several themes, it was incorporated in the one that covered the main objective of the paper. In the second phase, by taking into consideration the title and the contents of the work, more abstract categories were established. For instance, authoritarianism and dogmatism were included in a single category of social ideologies; terrorism and war system were integrated into political violence; voting behavior and non-conventional participation were included in political participation.

According to our categorization of the 175 items (see Figure 2), the three phenomena most frequently studied are precisely those which can be considered to be a scientific re-interpretation of the "great topics of Spanish reality:" national identity (nationalism), democratic culture (participation), and social ideology (ideology and attitudes). They represent together almost 60% of the literature.



### ***From Stereotypes to Nationalism***

The studies on nationalism have evolved from the formulations of regional stereotypes (social diversification in Spain) and the analysis of social identity (Spain as a state integrated by different cultural identities) to the analysis of cultural identity as an expression of independent national identity (Galicia, Basque Country, Catalonia, etc.). Thus, the result is an elucidation of cultural differences leading to the formulation of different social and political entities opposed to the central state as an expression of the political unity of Spain.

The first topics studied were stereotypes and ethnic prejudices, which were basically defined by the perception Spaniards had of the different groups (Catalonian, Castilian, Galician, etc.). The concern about the social diversification of the Spanish people and the perception of such differences is the legacy of the "problem of Spain" studied by the generations of 1898 and 1914. They focused on the descriptive analysis of Spanish social reality, showing the stability of the different features which defined the national

diversity as well as the perception of the separatist nature of some cultural identities (Basque, Catalanian) and the integrating tendencies of others (for example, Asturian, Galician).

The second type of the work in this vein focused on the specific study of the different cultural identities that defined Spain as a political unit and analyzed the different aspects or signs of cultural differentiation of each separate national group, with each claiming its own cultural identity. The basic elements of the existing cultural differences were analyzed, among them the emphasis on psychological characteristics, their traditions and history (habits, myths, and legends). Moreover, ethnicity and language are also central elements of cultural identity, and they have been called on intermittently since the end of the 19th century for the construction of separate national identities (Máiz, 1984; Roiz, 1984).

This cultural dimension, emphasized since the end of the 19th century with the boom of European nationalist theories, lead to the formulation of different political identities. Such is the case of the Galician nationalism proposed by the regional leader Manuel M. Murgía, who in 1865 launched the idea of Galicia as a nation with a staked territory, a specific race (Celt, Arian), language, history, and culture. The same can be said of Basque nationalism, developed in the 19th century by the leader Sabino Arana. This nationalism emerged initially more as the economic reaction of a highly developed area than as a cultural or political reality. The case of Catalanian nationalism originated as a linguistic claim (the Catalanian language was revitalized through literature and history). Land, ethnicity, and language are the cultural elements used as a foundation for the political separate nationalist claims.

From the psychological research, the studies on regional stereotypes could be placed in the framework of a regionalist movement which had always avoided confronting the problem of “national character,” and therefore the adherents were not initially opposed to the central power and the idea of Spain as a political unit. These papers can be integrated within the panorama of political psychology in that their implicit significance is the conception of the national unity of Spain, a unity which encompasses different realities (psychological characteristics, political tendencies, habits). It is not by chance that this research, in general terms, was developed fundamentally in the central areas of the country (e.g., in Madrid, through the work of Pinillos, Sangrador, Buceta, Chacón, among others).

However, the studies on cultural identity were closer to the claim of cultural identity as a platform for the political identity of a nation itself. In this case, cultural identity was considered to be an essential factor of different political styles of participation, associating cultural identity with left-wing or nationalist ideologies and acquiring a political activist position (social mobilization, identification with separate nationalist parties, etc.). Examples are the studies by M. Villareal or by J. Valencia, from Universidad Vasca. Since the late 1980s, the studies on Basque nationalism have analyzed cultural identity as the basis for an “independent national identity” opposed to the central power of the state and defined by a political participation of opposition to

the conventional forms of political action. On the other hand, Catalanian nationalism presented a context with counter-cultural movements, which are in part a consequence of their openness to the scientific, intellectual, and political European currents. This is illustrated by the research carried out in Barcelona (T. Ibáñez, L. Iñiguez, etc.) which represented counter-cultural movements (feminism, rhetoric and the analysis of political discourse, etc.).

Regarding this movement for an independent nationalist identity, we must also mention finally the studies focused on a separate social identity (Galician, Asturian, Andalusian, etc.) without a political radicalization, which claimed their own cultural identity but in the sense of *Volkgeist*, as established by Herder. These studies of social identity claimed linguistic, historic, cultural, and social differences as the expressions of their collective psychology, but not as a platform for an independent political state.

As a summary, the studies on the characterization of Spain as a political unit can be assessed through a scale of political radicalization, with expressions for forms of anti-institutional political action, an independent political state, and opposition to the central state: on the lowest extreme are found the studies of stereotypes, in the center research entailing a moderate nationalism, and in the highest level those studies of separatist nationalist movements with a clear focus on the acquisition of independent national status.

### ***The Studies of Social Ideologies***

Together with the analysis of the cultural diversity of Spain, another significant topic of interest for political psychologists has been the study of social ideologies. Under this concept fall all of the works about *ideology, personality, and political attitudes*. We refer to social ideologies in the sense that the focus of interest or preoccupation of political psychologists was as much the ideological preferences of the citizens as the conservative, liberal, or leftist ideological profiles of the main parties and political leaders. Pinillos' pioneering analysis of social attitudes in 1953 in Valencia (in the style of Eysenck) and subsequent studies on authoritarianism with the adaptation of the F Scale, and Seoane's research in Santiago, are, independent of the clear influence of international political psychology, a reflection of the concern inherited from the social thought of the generations of 1898 and 1914. The same can be said of the studies on political alienation and primary social attitudes (J. Burillo) and those on authoritarianism in working classes (Torregrosa). That inherited concern was the difficulties of the Spanish people in achieving political stability. These empirical studies facilitated the first psychological diagnoses of the Spanish political reality since the end of Franco's era, and became a reference for subsequent research in which political attitude scales were analyzed and adapted (Méndez, Garrido, Pastor, Ovejero, Rodríguez, Sabucedo, and others).

Thus, the more general studies on ideology focused on its relationships with personality, values, and political behavior. In the studies of ideology, personality, and values the focus was on the political leaders and, especially, the political parties. The research

focus of work on the relationship between ideology and political behavior was the civil population. In other words, ideology in relation to social organization was understood tacitly as a problem of “political class” (the ruling minority observed by Ortega in his diagnosis of the *problem of Spain*), whereas ideology in relation to political behavior was understood as a phenomenon of political participation (in the terms of Ortega, the majority through its political behavior was identified with the social conceptions of the minority).

### ***Socialization and Democratic Participation***

The studies on ideology and socio-political attitudes which developed gradually through the 1970s and consolidated in the 1980s waned at the end of that decade. The progressive stabilization of democracy was parallel to the necessity of reinforcing the democratic avenues of political participation, which still was a reinterpretation of the problem of political socialization. In fact, in the field of political psychology in Spain since 1982, the studies on political participation have acquired great relevance (a good example of which is the work done by the political psychologists in Galicia). The interpretation of political participation as education or political socialization is shown clearly by the fact that more than 85% of the works on political participation focus on the study of electoral participation, participation in democratic conventional systems, and the psychological and sociological factors which determine political participation. Only 15% of the studies associates political participation with mobilization, non-institutional political action systems, and their links to nationalism. The latter studies were produced basically in the Universidad Vasca, particularly the works by Valencia and Villareal, among others. In the same mode and in the line of nontraditional participation, Burillo's and Seoane's 1989 formulations about the political significance of the green movement are important (VII Summer Course, San Sebastián, M. Villareal).

In the framework of political participation and behavior in the civil society, a small group of researchers focused on an analysis of education as a basis for the political beliefs of citizens. Formal education and differential education (the role of women) were the socialization elements analyzed, although they only represent 5.71% of the literature considered. The university in Granada was one of the pioneers in this field (M. Moya).

These three research fields (ideology, political participation, and nationalism) are the foundations of political psychology in Spain. They in part are the result of previous social thought, a concern about the reality of Spain as a political unit (nationalism) and its political habits (ideology and participation). The three topics together represent 57.14% of the literature studied (11.43%, 25.71%, and 20% respectively; as shown in Figure 2).

### ***Worldwide Culture: The International Issue***

One of the topics that the generations previous to the Civil War included in the problem of Spain was the incorporation of Spain into the international political context. It would not be easy to find, as an inheritance from earlier generations, a current debate in

political psychology in Spain on the division of Spain between identification with the allied liberal model or the traditionalist Germanic model (characteristic at the beginning of the century and during the First World War). Among other reasons is the fact that political psychology appeared in Europe mainly at the time of alliances, when Spain, given its incorporation and adaptation to the economic and political international organizations, had identified with liberal western models.

However, concern about the international context remains within this tradition of socio-political thought. Some of the studies initiated in Valencia about political violence reflect such concern. A group of these studies could be integrated in a field designated as the "psychology of international relations." Both in respect to the modes of international conflict (type of war) and the violence of international terrorists, the theoretical orientation is very like the European formulations of collectivities as the actors in political and psychological events. Notable here are the works by the Valencian group, initiated by Seoane and Garzón in the beginning of the 1980s.

The second research nucleus with an international context brings together two relatively recent theoretical lines: world order and political culture. If during the first years of the 1980s the main concern of political psychology was social ideologies and political participation, at the end of the decade the main subject was the incorporation of Spain in future international involvement. The world order or the configuration of the global village and the social conceptions which define post-industrial societies were new themes that preoccupied political psychologists in Spain. In one research line on political culture (Inglehart, Almond, and Verba; Bell; and others) and world order, we must mention the Valencia group (Seoane, Garzón) as well as contributions from Madrid (Roiz). The interest in the international political projects can be seen in the debates initiated by the journal *Psicología Política* in 1990. The studies on political violence together with those on world order and political culture represent 16.57% of the literature (10.29%, 3.6% y 2,68% respectively; see Figure 2).

As a whole, these seven categories (of the nine studied) define the political psychology of the 1980s, since they cover 79.42% of the literature from 1953 through 1992. The additional two categories, containing studies about democracy (4.58%) and political power (5.14%), can be seen as reflections of previous periods: the research on political power started in the late 1970s/early 1980s (T. Ibáñez); the studies of the legal system (Garzón, Sobral) and democracy are the result of the existing democratic stability, which makes possible inquiries about its functioning and effects (Roiz, Munné, etc.). The nine categories together cover 89,14% of literature examined. Apart from the political phenomena they contain which have been analyzed by political psychologists, the rest of the literature (10.86%) consists of theoretical and methodological elaborations of the discipline, among which the works on the conception of political psychology, research on psychohistory, and studies of political discourse stand out.

### ***Socio-political Context and Political Psychology***

Despite the influence of scientific formalism and international models on the conception

of political psychology, its development in Spain retains certain peculiarities. Its origin has to be sought not only in the legacy of the socio-political thought of the first half of the 20th century—as we did when describing the academic content and the thematic evolution—but also in the coordinates of the historic evolution of the country itself and the sociology of the political psychologists themselves.

Figure 3 shows the political evolution of Spain in four phases. *Franco's era* (1953-1976) began in the mid 50s with the international recognition of the political regime and the first psychological analyses of the Spanish reality. The second phase, *democratic transition* (1977-1982) starts with the first democratic general elections and finishes in 1982, when the centrist government of the UCD lost the elections. It was a fundamental step in the development of political, social, and economic liberties. Marking the year 1982 as one of major political change, the socialists won the general election, the Spanish democratic system was consolidated, and domestic politics were developed (1983-89). It was the step to democracy and socialism. This period finished with the 1989 general elections and a new socialist victory. Then, the last phase was one of continuity (1990-92) and has a remarkably international character. The socialist party completed the modernization of Spain, which made inevitable the development and integration of the economic and political international systems of the most developed western societies.



That the set of problems during each of the phases mentioned is related to the socio-political sensitivity of the psychologists is shown by a sort of parallelism between the political phenomena occurring in these phases and the major subjects of political psychology. Figure 3 shows the relative weight of the four topics characteristic of political psychology in each of the time periods. The relative importance of each type of publication is shown in Figure 3 in relation to the total of the literature analyzed for each period.

As can be observed, the studies on social ideology (basically authoritarianism) and nationalism (in its regional stereotype version) start at the end of Franco's era and develop completely at the critical historical moments in the mid-1970s, precisely when the change of regime and political system took place and two major problems for democratic stability were formulated. These two formulations were the so-called sociological Franquism (that is, socialization carried out in attitudes only slightly democratic) and how to give shape to the different cultural identities in the country without raising the issue of national unity. However, in the third phase, marked by the socialist victory, there existed a plurality of concerns, but the dominant topics refer to social ideologies (not limited to authoritarianism), socialization, and political participation as a way to achieve democratic stability. All this occurred after having experienced a failed coup d'etat and the existence of the nationalist problem, now in the version of national identity. National identity drew great attention during the socialist period with a clear opposition to autonomy as a model. At the same time, the problems about the world order appeared, now with reference to political violence



(terrorism and international affairs).

The fourth phase, continuity politically defined by the incorporation of Spain into the developed western societies, is the socialist period of "foreign affairs." Figure 3 shows the predominance of the world order phenomenon, now referred to as the psychological analysis of the models of world village and the study of the political guidelines of post-industrial societies (studies on post-industrial political culture). In fact, there is a decrease of studies of social ideologies (which now refer to the social values of the different ideologies and parties), and to a lesser extent, of nationalism and political participation. On the other hand, the problems of Spain's international political context seemed to gain importance. Therefore, once the domestic democratic politics were consolidated, the main concerns became the incorporation of Spain and its role in international politics.

The second peculiarity that we raised about the development of political psychology in Spain is related to the existence of research groups clearly defined by the political phenomena which were the focus of their research, despite the obvious influence of the historic and universal model of political psychology. In fact, we can differentiate the separatist nationalism groups (Basque and Catalanian), with exact contributions to political psychology, while analyzing the phenomena which define their geographic and socio-political realities. Whereas the *Basque group* focused on the study of nationalism (cultural identity, political activism, and citizen mobilization), the *Catalonian group's* theoretical concerns were more counter-cultural and post-modern, which reflect its modernization and openness to the European intellectual and socio-political movements. A third group, the *Valencian researchers*, in a peripheral zone more open to external affairs, was defined by an interest in global topics of political conception: psychohistory, international affairs, world order, post-industrial societies, and post-modern political culture. As tradition has proved, the *Castilian group* was most concerned with internal Spanish reality and political integration. Their members chose to study social ideologies, stereotypes, and the traditional conception of capitalist societies (alienation, social classes, etc.). Finally, studies of democracy and political participation, and those of authoritarianism, are characteristic of the *Galician-Asturian group*. Its members focused on nationalism, but with more emphasis on political participation than on the opposition to the central power.

[1](#) January 13 1898 issue of L'Aurore contained the article by Emile Zola *J'Accuse*, which provoked a controversy that divided French opinion and the whole of western society, during the first decades of following century. Targeting the president of the Republic, Zola, accused the military tribunal that had convicted Alfred Dreyfus of espionage of not having acted with independence, being subject to external pressures, and acting without evidence. The Dreyfus case had great repercussions in the Spanish intellectual world (Baroja, Blasco Ibáñez, Ortega). In recognition of this fact, current Spanish thinkers (Trías, Sábada, Marina and Marichal, Tusell and others) see this reaction as the birth of the intellectual power and they analyze the transcendence of the first manifesto (January 13, 1898).

- Abellán, J. L. (1991). *Historia Crítica del Pensamiento Español* [Critical History of Spanish Thought]. Vol. 5. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Almond, G.A., & Verba, S. (Eds.) (1989). *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Burgaleta, R. (1976). *Las actitudes sociales primarias de los universitarios españoles. Un nuevo cuestionario* [Primary social attitudes of Spanish university students. A new Scale]. Madrid: Marova.
- Burillo, J. (1986). La Psicología Política [Political Psychology]. *Papeles, Colegio de Psicólogos*, 4, 25, 4-7.
- Chacón, F. (1986). Estereotipos regionales de los madrileños [Regional stereotypes held by people in Madrid]. *Papeles, Colegio de Psicólogos*, 4, 25, 23-30.
- Colectivo (1992). Reflexiones sobre la "Transición Política Española" [Thoughts about "Political Spanish Transition"]. *Psicología Política*, 4, 85-124.
- Garzón, A. & Rodríguez, A. (1989). El individuo y los procesos colectivos [Individual and collective processes]. In A. Rodríguez-J. Seoane (Eds.). *Creencias, Actitudes y Valores* [Beliefs, Attitudes and Values]. Madrid: Alambra.
- Garzón, A. (1989). Psicología Política y Psicohistoria [Political Psychology and Psychohistory]. In J. Seoane & A. Rodríguez (Eds.), *Psicología Política* [Political Psychology]. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Germain, J. (1954). Universidad de Madrid: para la pequeña historia de la psicología aplicada en España [University of Madrid: for the small history of applied psychology in Spain]. *Rev. Psicología General y Aplicada*, 9, 2, 10-646.
- Germain, J. (1981). Autobiografía [Autobiography]. *Rev. Psicología General y Aplicada*, XXXVI, 1004-1051.
- Giner de los Ríos, F. (1886). *Educación y enseñanza Tomo XII. En Obras Completas*. [Education and teaching. T. XII. In Complete Works] Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1933.
- Herder, J. G. (1784-91), *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, Translated from the German by T. Churchill. London, printed by Luke Hanford. 2nd. Ed., 1803.
- Jiménez, A. (1986). *El krausismo y la Institución Libre de Enseñanza* [Krausism and the Free Institution for Education]. Madrid: Cincel.
- Knutson, J.M. (Ed.) (1973). *Handbook of Political Psychology*. Jossey Bass.
- Máiz, R. (1984). Raza y Mito Céltico en los orígenes del nacionalismo gallego [Race and

Celtic myth in foundations of Galician nationalism]. *REIS*, 25, 199-212. 137-180.

Marichal, J. (1990). *El intelectual y la política* [*Intellectual and politics*]. Madrid, CSIS

Maeztu, R. (1934). *Defensa de la Hispanidad*. [Defense of the Hispanidad]. Ed. RIALP, 1 ed. 1998.

Ortega y Gasset, J. (2003). *El tema de nuestro tiempo* [The theme of our time]. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, (Original work published 1923)

Ortega y Gasset, J. (1930). *La Rebelión de la Masas* [The revolt of the masses]. Madrid: Alianza Editorial (ed. de 1990)

Ortega y Gasset, J. (1922). *España Invertebrada* [Invertebrate Spain]. Madrid: Alianza Editorial (ed. de 1992)

Ortega y Gasset, J. (1914). *Vieja y Nueva Política* [Old and new politics]. En *Obras Completas*, vol.1. Madrid (1966)

Pastor, M. (1987). Concomitancias intelectuales y políticas: Ortega y Octavio Paz [The intellectual and political concomitants: Ortega and Octavio Paz]. *Revista de Occidente*, 72, 33-153.

Pinillos, J. L. (1953). Actitudes Sociales Primarias [Primary social attitudes]. *Rev. Univ. Madrid*, 1, 367-399

Pinillos, J. L. (1960). Preferencias nacionales de varios grupos universitarios [National Preferences in some groups of university]. *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas*.

Pinillos, J. L. (1963). Análisis de la Escala F en una muestra española [Analysis of the F Scale in a Spanish sample]. *Psicología General y Aplicada*, 18, 1155-1174.

Pinillos, J. L. (1981). La segunda vida de José Germain, el patrón de buen ánimo [The second life of José Germain, the pattern of good spirit]. *Rev. Ps.Gen. y Aplicada*, XXXVI, 173, 115-1120.

Rodríguez, A. (1987). Reflexiones sobre Ortega y la política [Thoughts about Ortega and politics]. *Revista de Occidente*, 72, 7-29.

Rodríguez, S. (1989). Confrontaciones epistemológicas en la Psicología española contemporánea (1850-1930) [Epistemologic confrontations in contemporary Spanish psychology]. *Historia de la Psicología*, 235-247.

Roiz, M. (1984). Los límites de la modernización en la estructura social de Cataluña y Euskadi [The limits of modernization in the social structure of Catalonia and the Basque Country]. *REIS*, 25, 199-220.

Stone, W. F. (1986). *The Psychology of Politics*. New York: The Free Press.

Sangrador, J.L. (1979). Estereotipos de las nacionalidades y regiones de España [Stereotypes of nationalities and regions of Spain. Madrid, *Tesis doctoral*.

Seoane, J. (1988). *Psicología Política* [Political psychology]. Madrid: Pirámide.

Seoane, J. (1991). El Nuevo Orden Mundial o Panteísmo democrático [New world order or democratic pantheism]. *Psicología Política*, 2, 71-76.

Seoane, J. (1992). Psicología Política y Sociedad Democrática [Political Psychology and Democratic Society] . En J.Seoane (Ed.). *Psicología Política de la Sociedad Contemporánea* [Political psychology in contemporaneous society]. Valencia: Promolibro.

Sobejano, G. (1967). *Nietzsche en España* [Nietzsche in Spain]. Madrid: Gredos.

Torregrosa, J. R. (1969). Algunos datos y consideraciones sobre el autoritarismo de las clases trabajadoras [Some data and considerations about the authoritarianism of working classes]. *REOP*, 1969, 16, 33-46.

Vilar.P. (1963). *Historia de España*[History of Spain]. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica (ed. 1991).

von Hartmann, E. (1869). *Philosophy of the Unconscious* (W. C. Coupland, Trans.). New York: Harcourt, Brace. (Original work published 1931).

Yela, M. (1976). La Psicología española: ayer, hoy y mañana [Spanish psychology: past, present and future]. *Psicología General y Aplicada*, 141-142, 585-590.

Wundt, W. (1916). *Elements of Folk Psychology: Outlines of a Psychological History of the Development of Mankind*. London: Allen, (Original work published 1912).