

OPRIMIDO, CENSURADO, CONTROLADO:  
AUTHORITARIAN CENSORSHIP OF THE MEDIA IN SPAIN UNDER FRANCO'S  
DICTATORSHIP

By  
Darby Hennessey

A thesis submitted to the faculty of The University of Mississippi in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College.

University, Mississippi

© May 2017

Approved by

---

Advisor: Dr. Samir Husni

---

Reader: Dr. Robert Magee

---

Reader: Professor Joe Atkins

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking Dr. Samir Husni, my advisor and professor, who was patient and understanding during the thesis process. I am very grateful for his help, support, and willingness to allow me to handle his magazine collection, partially for thesis purposes, partially because of my own curiosity. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Robert Magee and Professor Joe Atkins for their generous willingness to be my additional readers. Thank you all for taking the time out of your busy schedules to help me with this project. I hope I have made you proud.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for their continual support and encouragement through this process. Whether it was sending an uplifting message, buying me coffee, or simply putting up with me when things got stressful, your support was felt and highly appreciated. From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

Finally, thank you to the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College for an inspiring past four years. You made an Oregon girl feel at home, and I can hardly find the words to express my gratitude for the memories I've made, the academic skills I've learned, and the brilliant people I've met. Muchísimas gracias.

## ABSTRACT

Francisco Franco is one of the most formidable dictators of the 20th century, and his overwhelming control over the press and other media in Spain during his 36 years as an authoritarian dictator is among the most notable forms of press censorship in history. This thesis examines the various measures Franco's regime took to censor the press and other media platforms (print news, non-news print media and digital media) and explains that, through these measures, Franco's regime fits and even expands the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication. This theory has historic and philosophical backgrounds, but by applying the basic principles to the modern example of the *franquismo* period in Spain, one can see the overarching idea of censorship in the media imposed by an authoritarian regime. Furthermore, this thesis will examine the aftermath of the regime, and how the legacy of censorship and media corruption still lingers in Spanish society today.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part One: Introduction.....	5
Part Two: The Man and His Regime.....	11
Part Three: Print Media.....	16
Part Four: Non-Journalism Print Media.....	38
Part Five: Digital Media: Television, Radio, and Cinema.....	48
Part Six: Post-Franco and the Legacy Today.....	53
Bibliography .....	60

## **Part One: Introduction**

We, as Americans, feel entitled toward our freedom of speech, and rightly so, as the First Amendment guarantees this right in our lives as professionals and citizens. But what about the injustice and suppression of speech and press in other countries? It's a reality thousands across the world live with today, and an issue that has countless historic roots. Many people have at least some kind of understanding about media censorship in foreign countries today, but in Western society, many adhere to the disillusioned mindset of "it would never happen here." But what many in today's world do not know (due to a combination of societal apathy and passage of time), is that Spain, one of the world's most influential Western countries, was subjected to tyrannical media censorship for decades under the reign of dictator Francisco Franco from 1939 to 1975.

While Franco's name may not stir the terror in Spaniards' hearts like it once did, he is still a formidable historic figure when considering fascist dictators of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Allied with Benito Mussolini of Italy and Adolf Hitler of Germany (among others), Franco quickly made the Kingdom of Spain his own toy to manipulate, exploit, and censor. His atrocities are numerous, including orders of mass executions and assassinations, repressing regional cultures and languages, and maintaining a tight grip on the press and cultural media for his propaganda. Most notably, for the sake of this thesis, Franco restricted the citizens, authors, filmmakers, and journalists of Spain from the freedom of speech and expression that is now guaranteed in their Constitution.

The significance of this time in Spain's history reaches beyond its time and borders. Franco's era and his censorship practices upon the press serve as an example of an overarching

theory that reaches back to the philosophies of ancient Greece: the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication.

By the definition coined by scholar Fred Siebert, this is “a theory under which the press, as an institution, is controlled in its functions and operation by organized society through another institution, government” (Siebert 10). This theory is largely considered the most pervasive of all press theories, both historically and geographically. One can see instances of the authoritarian method of control throughout historic dictatorships all over the world, such as in Japan, Russia, several South American countries, and of course Spain, among many others. However, the theory itself was developed in England in the 16th and 17th centuries, and has since spread throughout the world as an accepted method of examining and explaining power struggles in the press (Siebert 7).

Although the theory appears straightforward, there is actually much more complexity to it than simply a government’s control over the media. The obvious reason for controlling the media as an authoritarian regime is to maintain power and promote propaganda, but there are psychological and philosophical reasons behind it that better explain why authoritarian leaders choose this theory for their own means. The desire to control the media as a governmental institution is driven by four philosophical relations between man and the state: the nature of man, the nature of society and of the state, the relation of man to the state, and the nature of knowledge and truth (Siebert 10). All four of these relations revolve around one goal: for man to be the pervasive and absolute entity in charge of his own free will. These may seem like abstract ideas, but they all come back to one philosophy: an authoritarian leader, above all, desires absolute power over his people, and can ensure this power by using the press to “support and advance the policies of the government in power; and to service the state” (Siebert 7). Franco

was no different, and was particularly known for his ambition to transform Spain into a conservative, Catholic country by means of promoting his ideals via various forms of media, including the press and other cultural platforms (theater, film, literature, etc.), and by suppressing unfavorable opinions in said platforms.

The Authoritarian Theory of Mass Media can be broken down into five specific principles: 1. Media should do nothing which could undermine established authority. 2. Media should always (or ultimately) be subordinate to established authority. 3. Media should avoid offense to majority, or dominant, moral and political values. 4. Censorship can be justified to enforce these principles. 5. Unacceptable attacks on authority, deviations from official policy or offenses against moral codes should be criminal offenses (McQuail 86). Under these principles, clearly the press does not have a lot of autonomy to publish what they want in fear of potential criminal charges and/or censorship. In short, the authoritarian government in control has absolute power over the press, both on WHO is allowed to print or produce media and WHAT they are allowed to produce. The theory claims that authoritarian leaders view this control as a means to “protect and prevent the people from the national threats through any form of communication (information or news)” (Communicationtheory.org). This can either be done via licensing requirements, legislation, or censorship policies; in Franco’s case, it was all three. If these measures are violated, the government has the right to revoke any licenses, increase censorship policies, or restrict “any sensitive issues from press to maintain peace and security in the nation” (communicationtheory.org). This, of course, is from the viewpoint of the dictator or government, who disregard the injustices they inflict upon the press and their citizens.

Such a viewpoint suggests that the government in charge does not consider its constituents capable of “developing the attributes of a civilized man” (Siebert 11). This mindset

actually originates from the Greek philosopher Plato, who postulated that the state is required to establish a unified system of ideals and cultural goals to then impose upon the people, which was enforced by controlling the opinions and discussions of the citizenry (Siebert 12). Under the Authoritarian Theory, therefore, there is no room for private thought or opinions, nor is there a welcoming environment for political discussion or criticism. In short, Plato theorized that this authoritarian structure was best to control and maintain a stable country, and therefore the state must cultivate a society that is obedient to authority. One of the means to create such a controlled environment is to control what society hears or reads, which thus leads to control and suppression of the press.

It is important to note, however, that the Authoritarian Theory is not the same as a similar theory, the Soviet Communist Theory (also known as the Totalitarian Theory). While communist or totalitarian governments, as the title suggests, has total control over the press due to their sole ownership of all platforms, authoritarian regimes contrarily allow private ownership of the media (Seibert 7). Under Franco's authoritarian rule, the press was not completely government owned, yet was still subjected to government policies and censorship. It is a minute distinction between these two theories, but an important one to consider when, in later sections, I will examine exactly how Franco's government influenced all press, both privately and state owned.

While this press theory does allow for private ownership, one of the main problems, historically, with the authoritarian system is establishing restraint and control over the private media. Siebert notes in his essay that there have been attempts at various methods, but no one has been effective over an extended period of time (19). In Franco's regime, he employed a method of censorship boards, which would examine and edit every piece of media before it was



published. While, of course, this ultimately failed, it did last for all 36 years of the regime (with some modifications over the years).

Although the typical Authoritarian Theory usually applies to news media, this thesis will expand and apply the theory to other mediums under Franco's regime, as he also censored and restricted content from such platforms as literature, theater, film, and more. Thus, the era of *franquismo* (the Spanish term for Franco's years in power) does not only embody the Authoritarian Theory in its news media, but expands the definition of the theory itself to include other forms of media, despite their exclusion in the typical definition.

The days of Franco's regime and the Authoritarian Theory has long passed in Spain and the Authoritarian Theory no longer applies to the structure of Spanish media. The freedom of the media in Spain has improved tenfold since the Franco era, as has the freedom to express the traditions of the country (languages, cultures, etc.). Part of this improvement is due to the resistance of the Spanish people to unjust fascism and censorship. The Spanish people could just as well conceded and accepted the censorship, but to many of the writers, reporters, artists, and filmmakers at the time—as well as many civilians—this was not an option. The widespread resistance of many to the various censoring methods in Spain is, without a doubt, part of the reason the Authoritarian Theory ultimately failed. It was not simply the death of the dictator that overturned his grasp on the media, but the resistance held to it by its victims that helped it crumble. This is not to say the resistance efforts were easy. As I shall examine in the following sections, the censorship of the media was widespread, encompassing not only the print and broadcast press at the time, but even artistic and cultural productions and publications, such as literature (both foreign and domestic), theater, film, and more. When examining the drastic changes in the Spanish society and legislation today, it is difficult to imagine that not even a

century ago, the Spanish media was not allowed to report on current events freely, let alone have any editorial opinion or criticism of the government. Today, the right to freedom of expression is explicitly guaranteed in its post-*franquismo* Constitution, a welcome change for Spain.

Is all of this change, all of the progress of Spain's legislation intended to suggest that Spain was suddenly a completely free country in regard to media and press? Of course not. While, visually, Spain became more flamboyant with their images after the *franquismo* period (i.e. allowing nudity in publications, liberalized cinematic standards in terms of content and ratings, etc.), they were not at complete liberty to report what they wanted about the government. Although the dictatorship was officially over in 1975, corruption and the legacy of Franco's control over the media lingered on for years after his death, and the remnants of that legacy is still relevant today.

To summarize, this thesis aims to dissect the man himself, Francisco Franco, and how through his 36 years as dictator his control of the print (both news and otherwise), digital, and cultural media demonstrates the overarching philosophy of the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication, as well as expanding upon the given definition. Although this absolute control dissolved with his regime and eventually concluded with Franco's death, the beginning of a new, liberated Spain was not easy to achieve due to lingering effects of the censoring legislation and societal norms. By examining the past and present of media censorship in Spain, this thesis will demonstrate that this example of dictatorial media control emulates all the typical characteristics of an authoritarian regime, thus making Franco's hold on the media (news and otherwise) a certified example of an expanded version of the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication.

## Part Two: The Man and His Regime

To understand the hunger for power and the cruel dictatorship with which Franco reigned, one must understand, at least briefly, who Francisco Franco was.

Franco was born in 1892 as Francisco Franco Bahamonde in El Ferrol, a small town in the province of Galicia. Born to a “modest, middle-class naval family” (Ager), Franco himself enrolled in a military academy in Toledo at the age of 15, and gained military repertoire and prestige from his subsequent military successes in Morocco, where Spain was recollecting territories they had lost in years previously (Pack). Franco quickly stood out as a prominent military figure, and was the youngest commanding officer since Napoleon Bonaparte (Lea). However, he was not, at first, predisposed to a military career. In fact, in comparison to Benito Mussolini or Fidel Castro (dictators to whom he is often compared), he was not as predictable in his future career. Quite the contrary: Franco is often described as lacking in a strong political ideology, and, simply put, he morphed his regime as he went, doing anything to conserve power (Pack).

In short, Francisco Franco “winged it.”

It is also important to understand Franco’s background when considering his future practice of censoring regional languages. Franco was born in Galicia, where three million of its inhabitants learn both *Castellano* (Spanish) and *Galego* (Galician), the regional language. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that although Franco did not learn Galician as a child, he was certainly exposed to it and at least understood the basics. This then begs the question: why did he ban his native regional language from being printed and spoken in his own country? Perhaps he may have argued for unification and nationalistic reasons, but the true answer lies in

the idea of censorship as power. Franco, a dictator trying to control an entire country by means of propaganda, understood that his message could not reach as far if some citizens were not speaking strictly *castellano* (Ager). This desire for power and unity is typical of any fascist dictator's regime; under the guise of desiring a unified country, dictators often suppress cultural diversity to create a unified, unwaveringly loyal state upon which they can impose their absolute power. Franco attempted (yet ultimately failed) to do this by prohibiting the regional languages of Spain.

Despite his meager beginnings, Franco quickly gained influence and prestige through the military. The catalyst for Franco's quest for power and control in the country came with the collapse of King Alfonso XIII's reign, which caused the closure of the Military Academy in Zaragoza in 1931, where Franco had served as director three years earlier. Though Franco was open about his distaste toward a constitutional monarchy and communism, he declined to partake in a military coup attempt in 1932, which eventually failed. Nevertheless, he drew inspiration from his Catholic faith and Spanish patriotism in order to lead a successful insurgence in the Spanish region of Asturias in 1934. This, finally, gave Franco the power and recognition as a strong military figure that he needed to propel him to the title of *generalissimo* (the equivalent of commander-in-chief) and dictator two years after (Pack).

Franco, like other fascist dictators, feared communism in his country above all else. He was convinced that communist insurgents were bringing down Spain's infrastructure from the inside, and sought to suppress all sources of this ideology (Pack). In reality, communism was far from a threat in Spain. Disillusioned by this imaginary communist insurgence, he also rejected the quickly growing government system in the Western World: democracy; "Franco saw himself as the one designated to save Spain from the chaos and instability visited upon the country by the

evils of parliamentary democracy and political parties, which he blamed for destroying the unity of Spain” (Solsten and Meditz).

Upheld by the support of military rebels and the Catholic Church and determined to prevent the growing potential for a parliamentary democracy in Spain, Franco began a military rebellion in Spanish-held Morocco in July 1936, which eventually morphed into the Spanish Civil War (Pack). The war was between two forces: the Republicans, which were against Franco’s troops and favored a parliamentary system of government, and the Nationalists, which were on Franco’s side and supported the military rebellion and authoritarian system (Brown).

From the transition from the end of the war to the beginning of the regime, there was motive for censorship policies. The Spanish Civil War took thousands of lives, both in battle and by government-sponsored mass executions of opponents to the military rebellion. In the case of the mass executions, the motive for censorship was clear; the government clearly wanted to keep the government-ordered executions to remain covered-up, and there was no better way to ensure this than censoring the media against reporting the gruesome facts.

Also while rising to power, Franco aligned himself with a few powerful groups within Spain, all of which he knew would, in turn, support his extreme conservative views. Most notably among these groups were the Catholic Church (which would have huge influence over censorship methods and processes later in the regime) and the *Falange*, a right-wing group of authoritarian Nationalist supporters. The Falange fused with Franco’s growing group of supporters in April of 1937, two years before Franco would officially assume power as *generalissimo* (dictator) of Spain (Fusi and Carr 191). However, these groups were never as powerful as Franco alone was, and he preferred and kept it that way, controlling them under

“their common loyalty to Franco. Franco was particularly skillful in manipulating each of these ‘families,’ giving each a taste of power, but not allowing any group or individual to create an independent base from which to challenge his authority” (Solsten and Meditz).

Franco’s following among these groups and by part of the population was cult-like, with his supporters wildly following every move he made. By 1964, he was being called such things as “Minister of God,” “the man sent from God and made Leader,” etc. This only expanded his material for propaganda, and in November of 1964, personally starred in a film made especially for him: *Franco, ese hombre (This Man Franco)*. Indeed, this exaltation went so far into Franco’s head that he began to believe, according to Marshal Pétain, that he was “the Virgin Mary’s cousin” (Fusi and Carr 112-113).

Along with various Spanish groups, he also ideologically aligned himself with Adolf Hitler’s New Order, moving Spain from a monarchy to an authoritarian dictatorship with Franco at the helm, a similar structure to Hitler’s Germany. This dictatorship lasted through World War II, but Franco surprisingly refused to become involved with the ongoing conflict between the Axis and Allied powers, and was the only noncommunist dictator to last through the war (Pack). Instead of becoming involved in the war, Franco focused on strengthening his hold upon Spain, and in 1962, modified the dictatorship yet again. Although nothing changed in the structure of the government, Franco declared the regime a monarchy by technicality, yet continued to maintain his stature as ruler for life (Fusi and Carr 118).

Franco’s regime, although technically a monarchy, was still considered an authoritarian regime. However, many experts classify his specific authoritarian structure as “semifascist,” mainly due to his link to the Catholic Church and his (albeit limited) openness to international

connections. This slight difference makes his regime notably different than other dictatorships in Europe at the time, as he did not pursue the totalitarian domination of all societal institutions (social, cultural, religions, economic, etc.), but opted for an authoritarian system and ideology (Solsten and Meditz). This definition of his regime carries over into his implementation of press theories. To reiterate, Franco's method of press control was authoritarian, not totalitarian, meaning he allowed for some privately owned and foreign publications in Spain yet still held immense control over all areas of the media. Again, this is a slight but important distinction of the structure of the regime.

Describing all of Franco's 83 years of life and 36 years in power could take up an entire thesis in itself. For the sake of studying his control over the media, however, only the basics are necessary. After 36 years of authoritarian control in the military and politics, suppression of regional languages (despite his background with *Galego* from his youth in Galicia), and imposing Catholic and dictatorial ideology in the press, Franco's time as dictator ended with his death in 1975.

In the following sections, each level of media that existed in Spain during Franco's 36 years of power will be dissected: print (newspapers, magazines, etc.), non-news print (literature and theater), and digital media (television, radio, and cinema). Although each level was affected by censorship policies, the methods and reasons for censorship varied among them, all encompassed under two key pieces of legislation: the Press Law of 1938 and the Ley Fraga of 1966.

### Part Three: Print Media

Even from early in his rise to power, before any legislation was formally passed and before Franco assumed the role as *generalissimo* and dictator, we can see the Authoritarian Theory in use via censorship as a political tool.

It was August 1936, just a month after Franco launched his military rebellion against the Spanish government in Morocco and began to seize power as dictator of Spain. The rebel forces drop bombs into Madrid, leveling buildings and leaving the citizens of Madrid shaken. Miles away, a plaza in Toledo also suffers bomb damage. And, in the United States, *The New York Times* reports the bombings as “passed by the censor” (The New York Times 1936).

This is just one of many articles passed by censors in the years Franco ruled Spain, as well as the years leading up to the regime during the Civil War. The article also included a message from the government: a safety order issued to the citizens of Madrid regarding the bombings. Whether this was one of the government’s mandated, pre-written messages for the media to publish or just a friendly reminder, we are not sure. However, seeing as this notice was “passed by the censor” and directly affected Spanish citizens, it seems possible that this safety notice was, indeed, part of the government control and influence on the media, reaching as far as *The New York Times*.

This early censorship is a result of the *Prensa del Movimiento* (the Press of the Movement), a committee molded out of publishing facilities that was confiscated by Franco’s supporters from the Republic during the Civil War. The *Prensa* was originally only meant to be a provisional measure for the duration of the Civil War, yet remained in effect long into his regime, and was renamed the Press Law of 1938 (*Ley de Prensa* in Spanish) when Franco



officially came into power. This legislation, in simple terms, “required state authorization for publications of any kind, and provided for the suspension of any publication without appeal. In addition, it enabled the state to intervene in the appointment and dismissal of newspaper managers and editors, even in the case of the privately owned press” (Gunther). Again there is that distinction of totalitarian control allowing privately owned media sources, yet still exercising complete control over them.

From this basic summary of the legislation alone, we can see the Authoritarian Theory at work. The entire legislation is long and arduous to read, but it does outline the basic responsibilities (read as: authoritarian powers) of the government upon the press. They are as follows, translated from Spanish to English (translations modified for readability):

“First: regulation of the number and extend of the news publications. Second: the intervention in the designation of management. Third: regulation of the journalist profession. Fourth: the supervision of the activity of the press. Fifth: censorship while its suppression is established” (derechos.org).

All of these duties were handed to the *Servicio Nacional de Prensa*, which was the vehicle in which the government (overall) could efficiently control the press. In short, it was this *Servicio* that turned the regime from a dictatorship into an example of the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication. Under each of the responsibilities listed above (and when taking the entire legislation into consideration), the government quickly took control of all press faculties in Spain including the press, thus making the Franco regime immediately an example of the Authoritarian Theory.

The *Junta de Censura*, or Censorship Board, specifically held the most control of the media as part of the *Servicio Nacional de Prensa*. Through the *Junta*, the single political party of the regime controlled all press in Spain, as well as produced and distributed propaganda (Villarova). The *Junta* was composed of representatives of the Catholic Church, government officials, and other Franco loyalists, and exercised absolute control over all public and private publications (Lea). In this focus upon upholding and encouraging Catholic virtues through his control over the media, we can see Franco's obsession with having a moral and faithful country, even if said country could only be obtained by manipulation and power.

Although this law affected news publications and non-news publications (such as literature, both foreign and Spanish), journalists were under especially strict control. During and following the Spanish Civil War, many journalists were removed or "purged" from their jobs, and were required to officially register with the government to maintain their positions. And this was just the beginning: not only was government registration required, but journalists had to submit their work for daily inspections, and all edited work required signed authorization from the *Junta* before it could be published. Much of the censorship enforced by the *Junta* was to eliminate "any information or ideas considered by the Church or government to be dangerous or subversive were immediately redacted or rejected altogether in order to prevent 'corruption' or 'contamination' of the populace" (Lea). These same guidelines continued for decades, heavily based in Catholic ideology and morality.

When examining its code of morals and values, it is no wonder that the Catholic Church in Spain eventually began to support Franco's censorship and propaganda actions. Spain has a large tradition of censorship from the era of the *Reyes Católicos* (Catholic Kings), which still lingers in the traditionally Catholic country today, perpetuated by the single entity formed

between the Church and State (Jimenez). The Church had profound influences in the censorship boards during Franco's era, and was quick to align itself with his regime to gain control over the country.

The Spanish regime's propaganda was different than other fascist propaganda in Europe, because it focused heavily on Catholic morality and ideology. That being said, Church leaders were very active in the process of propaganda and censorship, and a Pamplona priest, Fermin Yzurdiaga, was "one of the party's most active propagandists," eventually becoming a chief of press and propaganda of the pro-Franco Falangist party in 1937. This Falangist propaganda and control was directed, for the most part, toward the working class more than any other social group, as the working class constituted the vast majority of the Spanish population (Payne 254). By collaborating with other powerful groups in the political regime, the Catholic Church was able to further its own ideologies, while, in turn, supporting fellow conservative movements. Franco, in exchange, was allowed immense power within the Church, including an agreement between the Spanish government and the Vatican in 1953, which allowed Franco to control the selection of new bishops within Spain (Gutierrez). Thus, the dynamic between the Catholic Church and the regime was not one-way, but rather was more of a symbolic power exchange and mutual desire to exercise control on the country.

The *Junta*, however, was not only an entity that edited publications, but also produced mandated content for the media, as we suspect was the case in the earlier *New York Times* article. The regime demanded publications or broadcast to follow its "orders": prescribed methods acceptable by the government to report and interpret news (particularly political news), or orders to avoid coverage of entire events. Some orders were so detailed that they even specified how publications should align photos, size headlines, or use arguments in editorials. Not even

advertising in the publications was exempt from the control and mandates of the *Junta* (Gunther).

The problem with the mandated orders method of censorship is that today we do not know what the published articles would have been without these restrictions and requirements. In other words, in the case of censorship, there is an extreme lack of evidence; rather, the lack of evidence is evidence of censorship. While some aspects of publications are things we must simply accept as they are, we can examine certain articles or visual elements within publications as artifacts of Spain's censoring policies and compare them to the factual reality of what occurred. For example, historians know the events of the Civil War and the many deaths that occurred, yet the complete lack of reporting done on these deaths in the Spanish press acts as evidence of censorship. These observations, however, only emerge decades after the fact, as the censorship during the regime was so complete that some citizens went generally unaware of what was occurring within their own country. Nevertheless, with modern technologies at our disposal, we can compare past publications with the facts we now know about the *franquismo* period, and use these comparisons to demonstrate the censorship.

However, this still poses a problem when trying to specifically describe censorship. As most of the comparisons are generalizations, it is hard to specifically point out articles that show the lack of reporting about the known events at the time. As stated previously, most censorship control under Franco's Authoritarian Theory principles was to eliminate content that was against the regime's policies, was not congruent with Catholic ideology, and/or directly insulted Franco or his followers. The government orders contributed to this trend, but also were part of a crucial element for the regime, especially post-war: a political cover-up of acts of violence to limit public awareness of the horrific events that had occurred in the Civil War, and the continual

violence that was occurring post-war. This is where we must use generalizations and lack of evidence to prove this cover-up. In short, as is typical under an authoritarian control of the press, there is no evidence that any publications distributed articles that adequately described the reality of Spain during this time. Instead, papers and magazines were filled with government-approved articles.

We can see this lack of evidence by using an online archive of all major papers in Spain during Franco's time. In 2007 the "*Hemeroteca Digital*" was formed, a project by the Digital Spanish Library (*Biblioteca Digital Hispanica*), which aimed to electronically scan and publish Spanish newspapers and magazines from decades and centuries past. A collection that started with 143 publications has grown to over 1 thousand, with nearly 5 million pages of texts available to peruse, as of 2012. Although this project was initially started for conservation reasons, it is also a useful tool for those looking for examples of Franco's censorship. This gives not only researchers access to old publications, including those from Franco's years, but allows the Spanish public to examine news and see the vast absence of accurate reporting. For convenience sake, there are filtering methods for the collection, including filters by date, topic, keywords, and more (bne.es).

When I conducted a search of all publications within the archive with keywords "Franco" and "*Guerra Civil*" (Civil War) between the years 1936 and 1975, there was no evidence of any articles that reported anything more than the bare facts of the war and the dictatorship that followed. There was no mention of the thousands of Spaniards who went missing during the war, nothing about the government-ordered executions, and only praise for Franco in any of the articles (hemerotecadigital.bne.es). In short, the government began, sustained, and ended its

years applying the principles of the Authoritarian Theory upon the press, especially as it tried to keep its war crimes away from public attention.

The period of 1936-1945 was a time of “brutal repression” and a rise of the wealthy elite, a power gained through violence during and after the war. Approximately 200,000 people were executed by the regime following the Civil War, and an estimated 200,000 more died of hunger or illness. Even more opted for suicide to escape the repression, torture, and overall violence of the time. In Galicia, Franco’s own province, an order was issued that no death certificate was to be given to families that identified the bodies of their executed relatives. Spaniards had to endure torture, societal humiliation (ex, shaving the heads of women, etc.). But none of these atrocities were reported in Franco’s press, as the government-issued orders ensured that the media would publish the “proper” news, and not the unsavory actions of the regime to its citizens (Richards 30).

Under these orders and censorship, political news was limited to official approved press releases about ceremonies, appointments and inaugurations, in the tone of the authoritarian regime. Local news was allowed a marginal amount of leniency, but when critical, often caused conflicts with local authorities and sanctions on the offending paper. Surprisingly, international news was the most balanced, and was the largest section of the paper. This was especially true for papers that could afford to employ foreign correspondents (Gunther). Publications also used foreign news to create the expected favorable image of the regime (Watkins 59). By carefully selecting snippets of foreign news, which was generally more acceptable than domestic news, publications were promoting an exalted, propaganda-like image of Franco. One highly popular paper, *Arriba*, chose to use foreign news to illustrate Franco’s positive and improving reputation abroad: U.S. reporters said “the Caudillo’s prestige increases” due to his foreign influence,

Belgium papers “praised Franco”, and more (Watkins). From this, we can see that early in the regime publications were not outspoken against their repression and the atrocities of the regime, and generally chose to go along with the expectations of the *Junta* and the Press Law, and agreed to publish content mandated by the government.

Whether consciously or unconsciously, Franco’s government applied the principles of the Authoritarian Theory from the beginning of his reign. As demonstrated by their use of praising international content, the media was, indeed, “doing nothing which could undermine established authority,” meaning it adhering to the prohibition of printing critical articles (whether factual or opinionated). Secondly, in conjunction with the fourth principle, censorship policies (such as the Press Law of 1938) were used to enforce the subordinate actions of the press (McQuail 86).

Enjoying his strict hold upon the country and focused on his nationalistic goals, Franco chose to not participate in World War II, yet Spain still felt the effects of this brutal war. Franco was notoriously friendly with Hitler and Mussolini, despite refusing to join them and the other Axis powers during the war. Nevertheless, Spain continued its habit of repression of its press, a policy that is, according to author Stanley Payne, “very broad, much more extensive than the juridical prosecution of individuals, for it involved rigorous censorship and a purge of education and other state personnel. The entire decade of the 1940s was a time of strict repression in Spain” (Payne 18). This implementation of the Authoritarian Theory and its practices (although not specified by name) was noticeable by many journalists, although they could not do anything to stop it. One journalist, Ramon Garriga, noted that, “in no other country did the press behave in such a servile manner during the war years” (Payne 122). Thus, although Franco did not join forces with his fellow fascist leaders, Hitler and Mussolini, he continued to implement the

restrictive policies in his own country, making little progress toward liberalization and opportunity for Spanish citizens.

Another journalist plagued by censorship on a daily basis was famed author Gabriel García Márquez. Though Columbian, García Márquez worked for a time as a reporter in Spain, a period which unfortunately fell under the years of the regime. In the newsroom at El Universal in Cartagena, García Márquez recalls the daily visits from a government censor: “*se instalaba en un escritorio de la redaction como en casa propia desde las seis de la tarde, con voluntad y mando para no autorizar ni una letra que pudiera rozar el orden publico*” [‘beginning at six o’clock in the evening, he installed himself at a desk in the newsroom as if he were in his own house, with the intention and power not to authorize a single letter that might interfere with public order’]” (Herrero-Olaizola 125). This demonstrates the subordination outlined in the Theory with which writers and journalists succumbed to after decades of censorship. At this point, there was no reason to rebel or openly disagree with the policies, for it could mean losing one’s job, publishing license, etc. (Herrero-Olaizola 125). Not only did the *Junta* censor the press, but actively banned and exiled certain writers that were considered “*antifranquistas o simplemente indiferentes al ‘Movimiento Nacional’* [anti-Franco or simply indifferent to the National Movement]” (Jimenez). While García Márquez himself was not exiled, there were instances of journalists being forcibly removed from their jobs, as well as exiled to other countries.

Upon examining all of these requirements set forth by the government and the principles of the Authoritarian Theory, one begins to wonder how the regime could have possibly enforced such strict standards. Part of the government’s strategy to maintain control was to keep the policies arbitrary; that is, the criteria used by the *Junta* to determine what had to be censored



“had an aura of mystery” (Watkins 63). This hazy, unspecific policy allowed the government and the *Junta* much flexibility and power when it came to determining what was allowed to be published. The kept the categories of the prohibited content broad: sexual immorality (as determined by Catholic standards), political opinions misaligned with the regime, improper use of language (also known as “linguistic purity”), and religious topics that were not strictly Catholic (Watkins 63). Under these broad terms, the *Junta* could practically do whatever it wanted, as long as it justified its actions under one of these reasons. Furthermore, the fear of “criminal offenses” was a crucial principle to keep the Authoritarian Theory functioning, as keeping journalists in a constant state of fear of persecution also kept them subservient to the policies of the government.

Most apparent, however, was that expression of political opposition to the Franco regime was prohibited, which is of course the main principle from the Theory, as outlined by McQuail. Any open disagreement or dissent would be censored by the government, and thus it was futile to attempt to publish it in commercially available newspapers, so newspapers began to start sounding the same. Press under the Franco dictatorship, as with many dictatorships, was not taken at face value. Readers were conditioned to read as much for what was not said as what actually was published (Watkins). Tellingly, in a 1964 survey, 65 percent of readers in Madrid said they did not believe the news they read (Gunther).

It’s hard to determine exactly how damaging the years of censorship was to the press and culture of Spain, since there is no evidence to suggest how the press or other publications or cultural endeavors may have been without limitations. This is part of the authoritarian strategy of media control; that is, taking over all publications (public and private) by force or coercion and transforming them all into pro-state publications. By snatching up the majority of the publishing

sites, the new Francoist state became the primary newspaper source in Spain over privately-owned sources, and one of the most important in all of Europe when considering numbers: by 1948, there were 38 daily publications (“dailies”) in publication, as well as eight weekly and five monthly magazines. These are just the numbers, however; in terms of circulation, the privately owned press benefited from wider circulation, but were still subjected to censorship as dictated by the Press Law and the Authoritarian Theory (Gunther).

However, public publications under regime control occasionally had a critical article slip through. For example, in 1941, Franco appointed General Valenti Galarza as Minister of the Interior, which caused so much opposition among the country that a sarcastic article was published in the daily newspaper *Arriba* on May 18, just 13 days after Franco’s appointment of Galarza on May 5. The article was from the Falangist group’s point of view, but the author criticized the new Minister so much that it caused Franco to re-work his cabinet appointments (Fusi and Carr 56). While this was a very risky move (the reporter could have faced criminal charges), it was clearly a significant step for the media’s influence over the government.

Nevertheless, the private press dominated the readership of Spaniards, and the state suffered as its circulation decline, plunging to a collapse in the final years of *franquismo*. These private sources, however, were not by any means primarily anti-Francoist. In fact, the Catholic Church (arguably the primary supporter of Franco that enjoyed immense political influence) boasted 34 newspapers in publication to a circulation of nearly 340,000 at the end of the 1950s. Other private publications included *Ya* (reaching over 100,000 people) and *ABC* (reaching over 200,000) (Gunther). But, again, these private publications could not exercise a freedom of press, having to always adhere to the overall ideology of the regime.

Although *franquismo* Spain had a large number of newspapers in active publication, the circulation rate was low overall, averaging only 71 newspapers sold per thousand persons in Spain. Compared to other large first-world countries such as the United States, France and Japan, who averaged between 242 and 573 papers sold per thousand, this is strikingly low. This decline in consumers is a direct result of the censorship policies, as they did not only keep the public uninformed when they read the news, but lack of accurate information eventually discouraged them from even buying it, as nearly everything had the same, government-approved messages.

While newspapers had little success in informing the public on the goings-on in the regime, let alone serving as a platform for criticism, magazines quickly became the medium in which political criticism could be most easily channeled. This was in part due to their more limited and less frequent circulation, which was an advantage: the *Junta* was more focused on the daily newspapers, and thus often overlooked magazines in their rigorous censorship policies. Magazines were in a better position to articulate controversial opinions and values and provide the public a platform where they could get more accurate information. However, this increase in popularity ended after freedom of the press was established post-Franco (Gunther).

The lack of information in the media, both in papers and magazines, caused not only an acute mistrust of the media, but also a mass disinterest in politics within Spain. To successfully run and maintain an authoritarian regime, a government must placate their citizens and maintain a constant state of passiveness, rather than rally citizens to become active participants in society. This technique is mimicked in the Authoritarian Theory, which advocates for the media to be “subordinate to established authority” (McQuail 86). Controlling the media in one’s country is a key tool to creating this passiveness, which is exactly what Franco’s regime achieved. By diluting the information available to citizens and screening information for items that might

cause criticism or outrage, Franco's government was able to keep the citizens uninformed enough to "bore most Spaniards into passivity and acquiescence, and deprived them of stimuli that might have triggered political mobilization." As a result, 50-55 percent of Spaniards reported to have "simplistic political attitudes," as reported by studies in the late 1960s. Only 15 percent of the population actively identified and supported the regime, but only about 25 percent were actively against the regime. This leaves the majority of the citizenship at an apathetic or disinterested state regarding politics. Through media censorship and control, the government worked to pacify the population, and succeeded in doing so for the majority of society (Gunther).

However, the government's role in the media was not only as a supervisor, but also actively creating propaganda pieces. Franco himself even contributed to the print media, and published a piece in *Arriba* under the pseudonym Jakim Boor on December 14, 1946, the first in a line of 49 articles from 1946 to May 1951. In the articles, which later would be compiled into a book, *Masonería* (Freemasonry), Franco labeled anyone and everyone who had ever criticized him a "freemason" (including Roosevelt, Churchill, Truman, etc.), and claimed that they conspired to work against him and a higher organized political party sought to bring down the Spanish government with communism.

Did Franco really believe in this huge conspiracy against him and his country? Perhaps. But it is equally, if not more likely that he used this theory and his 49 articles as a propaganda tool, an ulterior excuse for the ultimate failure of his regime and likely an attempt to confuse the public or induce paranoia. Physically and virtually surrounded by rejection from other countries in the western world, Franco quickly realized that his actions were being judged, and rebuked the judgments by creating this conspiracy. If scholars of the future are to believe this theory of a made-up conspiracy, then it is clear that this was not just institutional propaganda, but rather a

political tool coming directly from Franco's own pen, a method of control and power over his country, a means of damage control (Fusi and Carr 70-71). Furthermore, it adds to the list of prohibited topics the press could print. To any rational person, this theory of government conspiracy by the freemasons is wildly inaccurate and lacks concrete evidence, and yet the press could not use their publications to criticize these ravings. *Arriba* could not opt to disregard these articles and not publish them, trapped under regime control and forced to print its propaganda. Yet again, the press theory in place within the authoritarian government prevented the press from being critical or even offering another theory to the public. Instead, the press simply had to accept and continue printing any ideology Franco promoted.

These ludicrous claims also indicate a decline of power within the regime. As the years progressed, things were quickly slipping through the cracks. For example, in 1963, the Abbot of Montserrat made unmistakably anti-Francoist statements to *Le Monde*, and was expelled two years later. Instances of published criticism became more and more common as Franco began to lose his grip on censoring the country (Fusi and Carr 114-115).

As the years went on and as Franco lost this firm hold on the country, the regime's policy on press freedom began to shift. Economic liberalization and a new openness to international influences brought promise to the country's press, and, finally, in 1966, the censorship model officially moved toward liberalization. The biggest step toward this liberalization was by Manuel Fraga Iribarne, who was responsible for the regulation of the media starting in 1962 (Gunther). Fraga Iribarne embodies a new societal movement in Spain in the 60s: the tendency for citizens to become more involved in politics. Originally a law professor, Fraga Iribarne rose to the Minister of Information and Tourism in 1962, and eventually would change the structure and implementation of censorship upon the press (Herrero-Olaizola 39).

At first, Fraga left the Press Law of 1938 alone, simply relaxing the repressive acts of the censors and slightly decreasing the stream of issued “orders” to the press. However, this relaxation movement eventually led to the Press Law of 1966, often referred to as the Ley Fraga. This law eliminated prior censorship and alleviated direct control of the government on newspapers and publishers. Publishers were also newly allowed to appoint their own managers and editors, although they were still expected to adhere to the Authoritarian Theory’s principles (i.e. not publish anything that criticized the regime, was in poor moral standard, etc.). However, this new law ushered in an era of self-censorship, delegating the responsibility of censorship to the publications themselves instead of the *Juntas*, which both helped and hurt the writers and publishers of the time (Gunther).

This new era of liberalization has become known as the “*apertura*,” or the “opening up” of the regime to freedom of the press (Gutierrez). Upon drafting his new Press Law (aptly named after himself), Fraga delivered a speech to the Ministry of Information, of which he was in charge: “*Ya tienen Ley de Prensa. Yo la he elaborado y yo voy a gobernar su cumplimiento. A mi, y no a ustedes, toca administrarla.*” [‘Here you have your printing law. I drafted it, and I plan to enforce it. I, not you, will administer it’].” Clearly Fraga was not shy about taking on the responsibilities of his position, nor was he hesitant to express his new power and authority over the press. At a time where censorship was strictly enforced and increasingly detrimental to publishers, Fraga’s new proposition for a more relaxed law was not only necessary, but welcomed (Herrero-Olaizola 1-2). It gave the media a glimpse of what was to come after Franco’s death, and stopped the Spanish government and its censorship boards from hovering over the newspaper’s heads, ready to clip, cut and slash anything that displeased them (Solsten and Meditz). However, it is important to note that this new policy did nothing to reverse the

Authoritarian Theory in place. Although it did allow for some leniency, the government still had complete control over the media and still exercised censorship over it, still enforcing the principles of the Theory to ensure there was no political criticism reaching the public.

The Ley Fraga also increased the specificity of the censorship policies, as it was not until this new law that there were clear, outlined limitations given to the press (Jimenez). Under the previous Press Law of 1938, the guidelines for censorship were more vague, and the censorship boards had more power over the press because the broad categories of prohibited content allowed them to decide arbitrarily which publication could stay or go. Although Franco himself did not entirely approve of the Ley Fraga (he considered the media “pretty brazen,” and preferred the strict censorship of before to this *apertura*), he actually contributed to its creation, insisting that it outline the new, specific offenses the press could commit. These offenses included criticisms of the Catholic Church, criticism of his regime, promoting communism or “immoral” acts, and encouraging social disorder (strikes, protests, etc.) (Fusi and Carr 118). These specifications furthered the Authoritarian Theory already in place, as it narrowed the scope of principle 3: “media should avoid offence to majority, or dominant, moral and political values (McQuail 86). Although similar to the Press Law of 1938’s specifications, and continuing the principles of the Authoritarian Theory, the Ley Fraga elaborated what each prohibited topic included, which aided publishers not only in avoiding offending content, but also in protecting their publications from abuse of power from the government. With new specificity, the government could no longer abuse their censoring powers, as the standards were more transparent to the ones they were censoring.

Fraga added to this new specificity, and implemented a policy that dictated “three gross misconducts in one year signified perpetual disqualification as an editor” (Barrera and

Apezarena). By “gross misconducts,” the law meant three violations of the press printing something that was not appropriate under their political and moral ideology, which again follows the Authoritarian Theory’s principle of considering unacceptable content a criminal offense. Although this “three strike” policy may sound harsh today, it actually benefitted editors; for the first time, editors had a concrete understanding of the expectations from the government, and the government, in turn, had concrete limitations of what punishments they could or could not inflict upon editors.

Perhaps the biggest impact the Ley Fraga had on the media in Spain was on political news, since there was a marginal liberalization on how publication could share their political ideology and (light) criticism. This, however, was just for independent, private publications; state-run publications continued to be under strict government control. As a result, independent publications increased their circulation, while state-run ones experienced a decline in readership. And yet, the government still had to approve what publications printed, showing that the authoritarian government was only slightly willing to allow some leniency and still had the final say of what content would reach the public.

Although these public sources were still prohibited from directly printing stories about their own country’s politics, they circumvented this restriction by using other countries transitioning to democracy as a way to educate the Spanish public—in a strange, coded way—to what was happening in Spain. “While clashes between political ideologies, or the basic nature of parliamentary democracy could not be openly discussed with specific reference to Spain, press coverage of elections or parliamentary struggles in Italy, France or Britain was relatively free from censorship, and thus could be used to teach Spaniards about the underpinnings of democratic politics” (Gunther). Technically, reporting on other countries’ movements toward



democracy was not undermining the state in Spain, and therefore was permitted. As long as the press was still subordinate to its own government as dictated by the Authoritarian Theory, international news and politics was fair game.

With the increased leniency and despite the continual authoritarian control, public confidence in the press increased from 33 to 47 percent between 1960 and 1973, while distrust fell from 65 to 30 percent in that time. The public also became more interested in the news, and were able to get information about previously prohibited topics, such as strikes and protests. Furthermore, between 1966 and 1974, the percentage of Spaniards in favor of freedom of expression increased from 40 to 74 percent (Gunther), a notable leap in the public support for liberalization. Thus, the public opinion was in line with the new liberal legislation, therefore only increasing the societal movement toward greater expressive freedoms not only in cultural outlets, but in the press. With this new shift, the Authoritarian Theory was failing in Spain.

The *apertura*, however, would not completely liberate the press and cultural outlets in the country, and historians often refer to it as a partial liberalization, not yet to the standards of the press freedom the Western world typically enjoys today (Gunther). Fraga would ultimately not have done much to change this norm, as he would “administer the law in such a way as to alter, but not to end, the censorship practices of the regime...” (Herrero-Olaizola 1-2). All publications still had to adhere to the strict standards of the authoritarian regime but, at this point, publishers were already practicing self-censorship.

The practice of self censorship is one of the ways we can expand the Authoritarian Theory in this scenario. Although nothing in the theory calls for self censorship by name, it is a direct product of the fear the press felt from the possibility of criminal charges or prosecution, as

outlined in the fifth principle of the Theory. Furthermore, self-censorship actually hinders study of press and other published media under the regime. As stated previously, censorship is a difficult concept to find evidence for, because the evidence is that there is no evidence. That being said, with publishers (both in the press and in literature, as we will see in the next section) practicing self-censorship, there were fewer traces of pre-censored material, as limits were now in place during the creation process. Thus, there is even less evidence than before Fraga's law, as censors were getting less and less material that needed government control as publications opted to self censor to avoid the hassle or delay in publishing that often came from censor examinations.

Although this new law assured a new freedom for the press, it also continually led to heavy fines, confiscation of newspaper and magazine issues, or closure of said publisher. In fact, on July 21, 1966 (the same year the Ley Fraga was implemented), Spanish authorities ordered the confiscation of the monarchist daily paper, *ABC*, for its publication of an article by Luis María Anson that violated the content limitations of the regime (Fusi and Carr 123-124). During the 20th century, *ABC* was one of the most popular and important Spanish newspapers, and had been a daily paper since 1905. Although it had strong ties to the Catholic Church and generally supported Franco's government, the paper always maintained its preference for a monarchy over a dictatorship (Pressreference).

In the article in question, Anson openly supported one of Franco's opponents, Don Juan de Borbón, who promoted the monarchy over the authoritarian system in place. Clearly, this opposition went against Franco's political ideology and violated the prohibition of content that criticized the regime, a key principle in the Authoritarian Theory. As a result, the government

swiftly confiscated the offending publication, again demonstrating their authoritarian power over the country's media, no matter how popular the publication may be (Fusi and Carr 123-124).

But the new liberalization of the *apertura* was not without obstacles. The new freedom brought on by the Ley Fraga halted temporarily between January and March of 1969, when the Basque terrorist group ETA began carrying out acts of terrorism in the name of their region's freedom, causing the government to declare a state of emergency. The ETA's movements in northern Spain, along with conflicts with students and workers in other parts of the country, temporarily restored the previous rigorous censorship policies on the press (Barrera and Apezarena). This was to ensure that publications would not encourage such aggressive and anti-regime acts, but once the conflicts died down and the government had better control over the situation, the *apertura* resumed as before.

As Franco's time was coming quickly to an end, the country began to fall into chaos. In 1972, the daily evening paper *Madrid* was shut down by the government. The *Madrid* was a notoriously progressive press organization, and after its closure, its offices were bombed on April 21, 1973, and its editor forced into exile. The *Madrid's* closing is just one of many publications and organizations that suffered closures or fines due to their work even during the *apertura*. However, this unjust closure did not do much to faze the press, which was already on a path of increased criticism toward the regime now it had worked out how to get around the strict restrictions (Fusi and Carr 143).

At the absolute end, only a year before Franco himself would die with his movement, public and media dissent was growing rapidly, and the government opened the restrictions even further. Arias Navarro, who would become the first prime minister of the monarchy after

Franco's death, proposed a new, second *apertura* for the country, met with enthusiasm by the press. From then on, the press enjoyed more freedom that had not been seen in the country for decades, and initiated a new interest in political activism in society. This second liberalization period also influenced the artistic media, and nude figures were suddenly allowed in the press, as well as in film, art, and theater. Scandalized, Franco and his most conservative supporters disapproved, but this marked the first step in the liberalization of Spain's society and culture, as well as continued liberalization of the press. For the first time, the press could report freely on the strikes, terrorism and political happenings in the country, and were allowed to report on political leaders with new freedom. The Authoritarian Theory at work in Spain continued to crumble, and the freedom Spain would see post-Franco was in sight.

But this new, last stretch of freedom didn't go without opposition. On April 28, 1974, Jose Antonio Girón de Velasco published a manifesto in *Arriba*, expressing his disdain for the new press freedoms and warning that the still-conservative government would not allow the regime to be criticized (Fusi and Carr 152-155). Franco's supporters were employing last-ditch efforts to uphold the regime their dying ruler had created, but were realizing that the hold they once had upon the media and the authoritarian rule that had worked for so long was dwindling as fast as Franco's health.

Despite the argument by some *franquismo* experts that the regime loosened its hold on the country (and, namely, the press) during the tail end of Franco's dictatorship, the fact remains that the government in Spain remained fully authoritarian for all 36 years. This supposed "relaxation" of the government to the press was only applicable to the conservative factions, who aligned themselves with Franco's ideals in their publications (or, perhaps, knew better than to publish any criticism). Furthermore, the small liberty from the government was only granted to

those in higher socio-economic classes, who were generally conservative and could be trusted not to cause conflict by acting or speaking out against the government. Although the dictator's power was failing, the regime began and ended its years controlling the print news media through the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication.

## **Part Four: Non-Journalism Print Media**

By definition (and historically), the Authoritarian Theory only applies to the news media. However, given the widespread use of censorship and the consistency of the limitations and prohibitions Franco imposed upon the media, we can apply the theory to other platforms, such as non-news print media such as literature and theater. As we will see, the government and the *Junta* censorship boards held the same standards of censorship to other platforms as they did for the press; literature and theater were not allowed to produce critical political commentary, criticize the Catholic Church, promote other religions, or discuss communist ideology. Given these restrictions, the Authoritarian Theory of Mass Communication can be expanded to include other media platforms in addition to the printed news press.

In the time of Franco's reign from 1939 to 1975, about 500 thousand books were published in Spain, all of which had to get the approval of a censor to reach the public. The government also issued "orders" when it came to literature and plays, similar to the orders they issued to the newspapers and magazines. Beginning immediately after Franco's established role as *caudillo* and dictator, the theater community was subjected to requirements for plays that advocated Catholic and nationalistic ideology (Lea). Although it is still unclear today exactly how many of the works were subjected to orders, cuts or changes, there is still evidence of some changes in Spanish literature today, 42 years after Franco's death. But the regime also affected foreign writer's works. Novelists like Ernest Hemingway, George Orwell, James Baldwin and Ian Fleming were censored due to various content violations.

The first, and perhaps the most predictable cuts in the offending literature was to passages or phrases that criticized the Spanish Civil War, the government, or Franco himself. It

is no surprise that Franco would want any criticism toward him or his country to go unseen by the Spanish citizens, and augmented his propaganda by also stripping any offensive content from other reading materials beside the press. Secondly, Franco's censors cut all critical passages toward the Catholic Church, as well as material that did not align with its morals and values (i.e. sexually explicit scenes, etc.) For instance, in the *James Bond* novels by Ian Fleming, the typical sexual relations with Bond's many swooning women went unread by the Spaniards, as pages of this material was cut by Franco's government in the Spanish copies of the novels (Lea).

Hemingway, however, was perhaps the most notorious for his subjugation to the censorship, as well as his reaction to it. In his novel *Across the River and Into the Trees*, Hemingway's writing was changed even down to the word choice: the word "lesbians" was not acceptable, and changed to "good friends." His biting critical characterization of "General Fat Ass Franco" was unsurprisingly changed as well to "*General Asno Gordo*" (or "fat donkey"). Even versions as recent as 2001 contain these edits, although Franco's regime ended in 1975. Nevertheless, his legacy lives on in the literature that has been left untouched since its censorship, and has mostly gone unnoticed by the public. Anyone without an outside knowledge of other versions of these texts would have no inclination that there was anything to be suspicious of in the first place (Buck).

A phenomena that was common in literary censorship above all other types was "linguistic purity," or the tendency for Spanish censors to make foreign novels and translations "more Spanish." Under the regime, Franco ordered that *Castellano* (Spanish) was the only language allowed for printed material, which included all press, literature, cinema, etc. (Herrero-Olaizola 7). Specifically, the regime worked to suppress the use of Basque and Catalan, the regional languages of the Basque Country and Cataluña, respectively (Solsten and Meditz).

However, there was always a catch: the regime defined what “proper” Spanish was, and therefore tended to look down on Latin American works for their “impure” language. That is to say, they regarded Latin American novelists’ use of Spanish as inferior compared to the “acceptable” Spanish of Spain. It was a common occurrence for censors to change Latin American vernacular or phrases to better align with the “proper” language standards. These censors were not for content, but rather a product of the superiority complex the regime and its nationalism idealization. Non-Spanish works also became the target of censorship, as the translations were often “unacceptable” for the linguistic purity expectations of the regime. However, preserving this linguistic purity also became a guise for rejection due to immoral or overly-critical content (Herrero-Olaizola 7).

A specific example of this patronizing censorship practice was toward author Gabriel García Márquez, who experienced censorship as a novelist with his book *La mala hora* in 1962. Upon examining the novel when published in Spain, García Márquez was dismayed to find that his text had been modified to “correct Castilian,” removing all “Americanisms,” and changing phrases that were not “Spanish” enough for the audience. Unsurprisingly, there is no record of who, specifically, made these linguistic changes, though it is clearly the world of the *Junta*. Although undocumented, this is clearly a specific case of censoring text for “linguistic purity,” which was a common practice for Latin American authors’ works (Herrero-Olaizola 128-129).

The practice of linguistic purity is one of the few instances of censorship during the *franquismo* era that does not fall under the typical definition of the Authoritarian Theory. Although this theory is already stretched to include other media platforms, it is too far of an extrapolation to include linguistic purity as well, as this method was not about censoring because of ideology reasons, but simply just a sense of superiority the regime held above all other



languages besides Spanish. Although this practice does not fall under the classic definition of the Authoritarian Theory, it does qualify as a type of censorship, which does play into the Theory, further demonstrating the various measures the *franquismo* government took to impose absolute, powerful censorship upon the country's media. No one censorship means qualifies or disqualifies this era as an example of the Theory, as it is the entire situation as a whole that embodies and exemplifies this particular press theory and the power a totalitarian government can have upon a country.

Along with experiencing linguistic purity censorship, García Márquez also experienced criticism from a new repressive force: the citizen censor. Under the guise of a concerned parent, Vernet Mateu, a Spanish citizen and Franco supporter, wrote a scathing letter to Spanish authorities about García Márquez's novel *Cien años de soledad*, which was full of "repugnant" content. It is doubtful that the censors simply did not catch these immoral passages, but probable that they instead looked the other way, so to speak, to allow for its publication. Mateu is harshly critical of not only García Márquez, but the censoring boards for this oversight, and included photocopies of the offending passages to fully demonstrate its obscenity, which he felt "corrupts and brutalizes sixteen-year-old boys" (Herrero-Olaizola 138). Mateu serves as an example of how caught up some regime sympathizers were with the policies, especially regarding questionable content in books. In short, the influence of censorship not only affected the government and the publishers, but seeped into Spanish society, causing some action on citizens' part to uphold said censorship (Herrero-Olaizola 135-138).

However, the most common reason for literature censorship was for questionable content, consistent with the censorship of the press under the Authoritarian Theory. One Latin American author who bypassed content censorship with talent was Vargas Llosa, a Peruvian writer who, on

principle, rejected censorship of all kinds. His novels, however, were so well written that the censors often overlooked questionable moral, often “pornographic” content due to its “strong literary quality.” But Llosa also had to contribute a certain amount of flexibility and cooperation toward the censors to get this result, and his willingness to conform (to a certain degree) paid off with the publication of his novels that, under other circumstances, would undoubtedly have been banned (Herrero-Olaizola 40-41).

Because of the franquismo literary restrictions, many prominent authors either chose or were forced into exile. They refused to adhere to the strict censorship policies over their works, and thus left the country. This purge of authors and artist was also implemented on a larger level; cultural and intellectual organizations that did not follow the regime’s content or language requirements were also eliminated, which unfortunately resulted in “a decided gap in scholarly and creative production” (Lea). Included in the persecuted authors were playwrights Antonio Burero Vallejo and Alfonso Sastre, both of whom were victimized for the political commentary in their works. After being a political prisoner for six years, Vallejo wrote *La historia de una escalera* in 1949, which “painted an exceptionally dark and seething portrait of *El Caudillo* and his followers” (Lea). However, Vallejo obscured his criticisms with symbolism, and wrote in a way that was barely possible under the censorship policies. This not only demonstrates Vallejo’s skill as a writer, but his immense courage to take on the regime and risk further incarceration or exile for his criticisms (Lea).

In one instance, the adverse behavior toward the regime led to a writer’s death. Poet and playwright Federico García Lorca was one of thousands of casualties of the regime, but he has only just recently been recognized as such. For years, Franco and his government claimed that García Lorca’s death in 1936 was nothing more than a result of his involvement with rebel forces

during the Civil War. However, in an article in *El País* (as quoted in *The Guardian*), a García Lorca biographer Ian Gibson revealed that Franco's government actually murdered the poet, a significant difference from the accidental death story that had been regime rhetoric for years. Thus, writers during the Civil War and *franquismo* were not only in danger of being censored or exiled, but also of being killed on government orders (Kassam). Here again we see fear of criminal prosecution and punishment as an incentive to follow the censorship policies of the government inspired by the basic principles of the Authoritarian Theory.

Just as the *apertura* of the Ley Fraga in 1966 caused a change in the workings of the press, it also impacted book publishers in two significant ways: it modified previous procedures on consultation and prior censorship of the work, and it changed procedures regarding archiving of works, which, previously, had resulted in books being confiscated for offending material. This confiscation policy had caused economic loss for publishers, so the new law was ushered in with cautious enthusiasm and hope for a change (Castro).

Furthermore, previous to the *apertura*, there were no deadlines set for the government to respond to publishers with their censor edits. This often resulted in delays in production and publication, which was a "severe hindrance to the success of the publishers in the booming and fiercely competitive book market of the 1960s and 1970s. For years they had begged for leniency when it came to the censorship rules; the 1966 law was the regime's response to their demands." New rules through the Ley Fraga allowed for direct negotiation with censorship authorities and policies, rather than the bureaucratic silence that had crippled publishers before. Now, publishers could submit their self-censored works under the new policy of "voluntary submit" to the government, which would give a final verification that the work was acceptable before publishing it. This is quite a different process from the "*consulta obligatoria*"

of years previously, which required publishers to submit their works for a thorough examination that would often delay the publication process (Herrero-Olaizola 9).

Another significant change that came with the Ley Fraga was within the concept of the “*silencio administrativo*,” or “official silence.” In this policy, censors would opt to stay “silent” regarding a work when it contained questionable content but also showed potential benefits if published. When claiming *silencio administrativo*, censors would not officially approve of a work, but would not ban it, thus allowing it to be published with little to no censorship imposed. Under the new Ley Fraga, this was an advantage for publishers, as it would allow a publisher to print said text without limits (Herrero-Olaizola 11). The term “*silencio administrativo*,” however, also refers to the process in which the *Junta* would choose to not comment on a work at all, therefore leaving it in a state of limbo: not approved, not banned, and unmoving in the bureaucracy of the censorship boards (Castro). This was a tactic in which the authorities could simply ignore a book’s request for publication, and block its distribution by simply not doing anything, a new twist on the ways the government could implement their authoritarian power over publishers. Rather than overtly censoring writers and publishers (though justified in the principles of the Authoritarian Theory), the *Junta* could opt to not do anything, a sly and perhaps passive aggressive tactic that was nevertheless effective in blocking various works of literature.

Another key reason the Ley Fraga was met with such enthusiasm and optimism is because it allowed a new advantage for writers and publishers: negotiation. Now writers could negotiate with the censors on issues within the material, a right that was unheard of in years previously. Publishers employed various negotiation and compromising tactics under this new law, including “softening” the translation, resubmitting the same book with another title, cover,

or translation (these could be found simultaneously or separately), or changing the declared number of books published. (Castro)

Writers and publishers often had to relinquish some rights for the benefit of the censors, such as agreeing to cut parts of the work, “soften” the translation (changing potentially critical passages to “nicer” versions, as seen in the Hemingway example previously), or distribute it to the least amount of readers possible. Although these situations were not ideal for writers looking to publish their work nor for publishers trying to make a profit, it was a necessary sacrifice under the censorship of the regime. However, as time went on, authors and publishers became increasingly more willing to negotiate and talk with the censorship board, as the intimidation methods they had previously used upon the publishers were no longer working (Castro).

Publishers also tried to circumvent censorship policies by resubmitting same book with a different title. If a book was previously denied by the censors, publishers would sometimes change the title in some way or adjust the translation of the title, and then resubmit it. Most times the change of title worked and deceived the censors, who did not recognize the book before reading it and therefore accepted it for further examination. For example, a 1973 Spanish version of *The Betsy* by Harold Robbins was previously denied by the censors for “lack of morality” and sexual content. However, Robbins’ publishing house, Luis the Caralt, waited several months before resubmitting the book under the title *Los ejecutivos*, which was then approved. A similar, if not simultaneous ploy was resubmitting the book with a different cover, often replacing lewd cover art with one that would appease the censors (Castro). However, by doing this, the publishing house was risking the possibility that the censors could deduce what was happening and deny the book again or worse, and inflict fines or sanctions upon the publisher.

Publishers also attempted to avoid censorship by re-translating previously denied texts. Although the censors often cut portions of offending texts out, it was sometimes easier to just ban it than mutilating it. However, publishers were able to circumvent this issue with re-translating the text to “fix” the offending, controversial passages, adapting the text to fit the moral standards of the regime and its Catholic influences (Castro).

But, as stated previously, publishers often had to self-censor works so as to not get caught up in the time-consuming process of going through the censors. While in the process of translating foreign texts to Spanish, publishers would often preemptively self-censor passages they knew would be scrutinized by government censors, bypassing any resistance the original copy might have faced (Castro). The authors were aware of the rule, both written and implied, and “knew what had to be done to comply with or subvert the values of the Establishment” (Merino and Rabadan).

Unfortunately, this practice of self-censorship is even harder to identify and trace back than overt, official censorship (which is hard enough to study on its own). Self-censorship, however, is particularly difficult to trace because it leaves very few vestiges of pre-censored versions that may have indicated what could have been if not for the policies in place. But, again, this leads to a strange version of evidence: “These ‘non-existent’ texts reveal as much about the motives and criteria underlying the decisions of the Censorship Boards” (Merino and Rabadan). Therefore it is difficult to see the Authoritarian Theory in action with self censorship in place. But with the knowledge of the censorship policies and the few vestiges of changed copies that remain from the *franquismo* era, we can compare the true texts with the censor-approved ones as see that, indeed, the regime had full power upon not only the press, but the non-news print media as well.

Although the genre of non-journalism print media does not fall under the technical definition of the Authoritarian Theory, it is clear that this expansion works due to the same policies and laws of journalistic media applied to this new category of media. This expansion, therefore, is not an unreasonable extrapolation, but rather an appropriate extension of the classic definition of this press theory that demonstrates more examples of a totalitarian censorship system.

## Part Five: Digital Media: Television, Radio, and Cinema

During Franco's era, digital media was growing in popularity and quality. Radio was already a common media for news consumption, but television and cinema were rapidly growing technologies that allowed the media (both for news and entertainment) to produce visual content. However, despite the increase in popularity and innovation within these platforms, they were still subjected to the censoring principles of the Authoritarian Theory and the content limitation the regime imposed.

In 1939, the state issued a decree that censored the radio broadcasts, declaring that all coverage of national and international news was reserved exclusively for the official governmental network, *Radio Nacional de Espana* (RNE). Private broadcasts, though also allowed, were required to transmit the government's radio's broadcast twice a day, making the only news source the RNE. This strict requirement and other radio policies were consistent throughout the regime, as radio, unlike print media, was not affected by the Ley Fraga, and was not allowed the liberalization process until the country's Constitution was written after Franco's death. Fraga himself actually restricted radio more during his time as Minister of Information; in 1963, there were 471 broadcasting stations throughout the country, but Fraga reduced this number to about 200, and grouped them into six broadcasting networks. Within these 200 stations, about half were state-run, while the other half was operated by a network controlled by the Catholic Church. Although Fraga was not the leader of the regime himself, he has a significant role in the authoritarian control of the state, and was not afraid to exercise all restrictions to appease the censorship requirements set forth by Franco and the policies of the Authoritarian Theory.



Due to the lack of diversity in coverage, daily radio listenership shrank from 86 to 33 percent from 1960 to 1974. Due to these shrinking numbers, television overtook radio as an entertainment medium, and even surpassed print media as a news source, particularly for international news. In 1973, a survey of Spaniards' daily habits revealed that more citizens (75 percent) watched television every day than read a newspaper or listened to the radio (31 and 42 percent, respectively). The government was well aware of these high numbers of television viewers, and subsequently used television as another propaganda tool, and was more strict on television than radio or print media. However, Spaniards were more trusting of television than other mediums, which explains its high viewing numbers as compared to other platforms (Gunther).

Although not a part of the news cycle, we can also include cinema as part of the Spanish media controlled under the Authoritarian Theory and the press laws set forth by the government. While film is not part of the press, it was still subjected to strict censorship guidelines and policies that restricted content that criticized the regime, promoted communism, or went against the conservative Catholic ideology, restrictions consistent with those imposed on other platforms.

Dubbing (recording Spanish dialogue over the original language's dialogue) was obligatory in the regime; films were either dubbed into Spanish or else banned completely. But the dubbing was not always correct—censors would use the dubbing tool as a way to delete or change parts of dialogue that were unsavory (Enforex). This falls in line with the practice of linguistic purity, similar to that which was imposed upon literature, as well as consistent with the principles of the Authoritarian Theory, which dictate that media must be subordinate to the authoritative power and adhere to appropriate, government-approved content.

Although control over cinema was strict, there was eventually a slight liberalization of film. The *Junta de Clasificación y Censura de Películas Cinematográficas* (Board of Classification and Censorship of Cinematography) was created in 1962, and allowed more movies to be screened in Spain whereas, previously, dubbed foreign films were banned for “poor moral standards.” The Catholic Church, however, fought back against this new liberal and often sensual screenings, as they “could not accept the growing distance between the Church and the State.” Their opposition resulted in an official report in 1963 by the film industry’s censorship board, which defended the new liberalizing decisions and provided a comprehensive list of the censors in charge of deciding which movies would be banned or allowed.

Previous to this liberalization by the *Junta*, the *Comisión Nacional de Censura Cinematográfica* (National Commission of Cinematographic Censorship) was in charge of cinema censorship beginning in 1942, which often coordinated with the Catholic Church to censor films that were morally problematic to the regime. The Church representative was the only one on the board able to exercise the power of veto, again demonstrating the influence of the Church in the government, especially its censorship practices (Gutierrez).

For example, on Feb 17, 1950, the Spanish ecclesiastical authorities approved the “*Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos*,” a code for public performances which included the following classifications for films: 1. Todas audiencias, incluyendo niños (All audiences, including children); 2. Jóvenes (Young viewers 14-21); 3. Mayores (adults 21+); 3R. mayores, con reparos (adults but with concerns on moral grounds); 4. Gravemente peligrosa (seriously dangerous, should probably be banned) (Gutierrez).

According to the TRACE cinema catalogue (a depository of historic cinema data, including notations about the censorship of said cinema), of the 1321 films authorized by the censorship board that were English-language films between 1951-1962, only 13 (0.98%) were classified as 4's by the religious censors. Clearly this very small percent shows that the *Junta* censorship board was typically inclined to follow the religious censors' classifications and overall reluctant to approve of films that were not approved by the Catholic Church.

In comparison, between 1962-1969, of the 1017 films dubbed from English to Spanish, 67 films (nearly 7%) were classified as 4's, but then subsequently approved. This is clear, numerical evidence that the system was becoming more liberal with its approval to film content, and evidence that the censorship boards were tending to lean away from the influence of the Church (Gutierrez).

Filmmakers and fans were able to get around censorship rules, however liberal, by the establishment of *Salas Especiales*: specialized theaters that promoted screenings of "quality" foreign films to small Spanish audiences. Although these screenings did not completely escape censorship control, they did allow for audiences to see films that were unavailable to the general public (Gutierrez). Furthermore, filmmakers were in constant negotiation with the censorship boards to get their films approved for the general public. In order to avoid their films from being banned, translators and distributors made changes before seeking the boards' approval, practicing self censorship, similar to publishers of literature and the press (Gutierrez).

As with print platforms, film production and screenings were also affected by the Ley Fraga. The *apertura* was not only influenced by external opposition from society, but also an internal source: José María García Escudero, a notably liberal figure in the system of censorship

boards. Escudero was against the moral censorship from the Catholic Church, and argued that instead of censoring films as a method to improve societal morality, the solution lay in the education system. He argued that instead of banning movies, schools should implement moral education, which would allow audiences to be more independently thinking in regards to a film, rather than being drastically influenced by the film itself (which is what the Church was afraid of). He expressed this view at a conference on Censorship and Freedom at the Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca on December 16, 1951. Escudero's educational system would "...se trata de enseñar a dominar la película en vez de ser dominado por ella. (...it is about teaching [the audience] to control the film instead of being controlled by it). " In other words, it would allow audiences to view films without the need for censorship methods in the first place. At the same conference, Escudero stated that "*Los beneficios de la censura-dije-se perciben en seguida y sus perjuicios sólo a la larga; con la libertad sucede al revés: produce muchos males inmediatos, que el tiempo transforma en buen medida en bienes* (The benefits of censorship-I said- are perceived immediately and its drawbacks only in the long run; with freedom it is the opposite: it causes a lot of immediate harm, which to a large extent time turns into good). " From the figure of Escudero alone, we can see that the mood of the regime and its opinions toward censorship (in this case, in film) was loosening and becoming more liberal (Gutierrez).

As in print media, the shift in digital media that came with the *apertura* (with the exception of the ever-controlled radio platforms which did not benefit from this) demonstrated the decline of the Authoritarian Theory at work in Spanish media. The public desired a lessening of the strict censorship policies, and foreign films allowed them a glimpse into what could be for films. In short, it was the public opinion that most contributed to the failure of the authoritarian hold on the media, which eventually broke as the regime collapsed.

## Part Six: Post-Franco and the Legacy Today

On November 20, 1975, *Generalissimo* Francisco Franco finally succumbed to his long-failing health problems. Franco died in his sleep, a peaceful end to the dictator who had began his career with violence in chaos and sustained his power via scare tactics and propaganda. By his death, opposition to his regime was expressed “almost openly,” as the power and control of his government had diminished greatly since its beginnings (Lea). With his death came a time of transition in Spain, most notably for the censorship measures he had imposed throughout his regime.

Freedom of the press and other publications was not a priority upon Franco’s death compared to the radical governmental shift and economic repairs that required revisions in the following years (Solsten and Meditz). It took nearly a year for things to begin to change politically, and Prime Minister Adolfo Suárez led this change with the Law for Political Reform in 1976, which increased the freedom of the press, among other things (Gunther). But this reform law did not undo the Ley Fraga of 10 years previously, and it would not be until the Constitution of 1978 that this Press Law would be formally undone.

The first step to revamping the power structure of Spanish press was redistributing power and ownership of the various platforms. State-run newspapers were sold or closed down, and the radio monopoly the government ended (Villarroya). This allowed for a further increase in private ownership of the press, unhindered by authoritarian power, as the Constitution drafted in 1978 explicitly allowed freedom of the press and artistic expression. On the cultural side of the media platforms, much of the regional cultures silenced by the *franquismo* period were revived, and new organizations were established to actively promote cultural expression (Villarroya).

Publications, both in the press and in literature, took advantage of the suppressed society by opting for uninhibited, very liberal content and images. For example, one of the most popular magazines, *Interviú*, boasted their “unrestrained political reporting with equally uninhibited photography. This blending of political and sexual liberation proved highly attractive to Spanish readers, after Franco’s repressive policies in both these areas” (Solsten and Meditz).

However, while most publications celebrated this newfound freedom of expression, the press of the state, right-wing publications, and the conservative monarchist daily paper *ABC* resisted the new political change in the country. This support for the falling regime, however, would be almost completely eliminated within two years as older generations in the newsrooms were replaced with new journalists (Gunther).

Although a new Constitution was penned in 1978 to make Spain into a democracy after Franco’s death in 1975, the 1966 Press Law was not formally replaced until 1988. Furthermore, the Spanish government continued to subsidize certain press organizations starting in 1979, which many believe may have influenced the press to continue to self-censor their work to better suit the government even after Franco’s death. Therefore, it was not his death that ceased the censorship of the media, as clearly it continued, although in a more subtle and corrupt way. However, the influence of the Authoritarian Theory was officially over. The government no longer exclusively controlled the media in Spain, and those who had been censored no longer feared retribution if they violated previous content requirements. In short, the press theory had failed after 36 years.

However, it was the Constitution, above all other measures, that changed the freedom of the press for the better and officially ceased the authoritarian power upon the press and other

media. It specifically breaks down the new guarantees for freedom of expression into these sections:

“Section 20.1: The following rights are recognized and protected:

a) the right to freely express and spread thoughts, ideas and opinions through words, in writing or by any other means of reproduction.

b) the right to literary, artistic, scientific and technical production and creation.

c) the right to academic freedom.

d) the right to freely communicate or receive truthful information by any means of dissemination whatsoever.

The law shall regulate the right to the clause of conscience and professional secrecy in the exercise of these freedoms.

2. The exercise of these rights may not be restricted by any form of prior censorship.

3. The law shall regulate the organization and parliamentary control of the mass communication media under the control of the State or any public agency and shall guarantee access to such media by the significant social and political groups, respecting the pluralism of society and of the various languages of Spain.

4. These freedoms are limited by respect for the rights recognised in this Part, by the legal provisions implementing it, and especially by the right to honour, to privacy, to the own image and to the protection of youth and childhood.

5. The seizure of publications, recordings and other means of information may only be carried out by means of a court order.”

“Section 20.3: The law shall regulate the organization and parliamentary control of the mass communication media under the control of the State or any public agency and shall guarantee access to such media by the significant social and political groups, respecting the pluralism of society and of the various languages of Spain.”

“Section 149: The State shall have exclusive competence over the following matters:

27. Basic rules relating to organization of the press, radio and television and, in general, all mass-communications media without prejudice to powers vested in the Self-governing Communities for their development and implementation.”

As we can see, these new guarantees are a far cry from the restrictions of the regime and the previously imposed principles of the Authoritarian Theory. Although the state retained some power over the press, such as the right to seize a publication with a court order, there was no longer absolute power over the press. Instead, the Constitution distributed the power of the press to the press itself, guaranteeing the freedom to express any and all opinions and political views, in any language, and the right to report on all current events and political movements. In short, all previous censorship policies were disbanded, and the press was finally free of the restrictive authoritarian control.

Ultimately, Franco’s attempt to completely unify the country failed. After his death, a Constitution was drafted that divided the country into 17 semiautonomous regions, but the old fears of Spain dissolving once divided “have proved unfounded.” Now, the regions have their



own cultures and proudly flaunt their own languages, something that was not even fathomable under Franco (Schumacher).

However, the regime's legacy and adoration for its leader does not just linger on in policies. Hints of Franco and his impact on the country can be found sprinkled throughout Spain: statues, streets and foundations named after Franco still remain, and supporters annually visit his grave to "pray for his eternal soul," an act that would be an outrage in other countries, such as if Germans prayed for Hitler, or Italians prayed for Mussolini.

This grave, the *Valle de los Caídos* (or the Valley of the Fallen), is a physical example of Franco's propaganda. Republicans killed in the Civil War were brought to this site, and some are still entombed there against the will of their surviving families, for the sake of making Franco's fallen supporters look bigger. Although some may argue that the site is a place where victims from both sides can be laid to rest together, united in death as they weren't in life, the fact remains that this was not the chosen place of rest by some of the fallen. Indeed, it was yet another propaganda tool to exalt the cause of the Nationalists.

Those who support Franco even today defend his violent military rebellion (which started the Spanish Civil War) as a necessary movement to end the chaos of the time. Jaime Alonso, vice president of the Francisco Franco Foundation in Madrid, maintains that Franco's legacy lives on, not just in the physical elements of the country, but in the political infrastructure. Alonso said in an article in Financial Times, "[Politicians] are afraid of him. They know very well that Franco is more than just a reference, that he is something embedded in the culture of the Spanish people as a solution."

And yet, the Spanish education system lacks any concrete curriculum about the Civil War, nor the dictatorship that followed. As a result, the population remains largely uneducated about the *franquismo* period. Even today, there are no museums commemorating the era, besides the mass grave at the Valley of the Fallen. Spain, uniquely, is one of the only previously dictator-led countries in Western Europe that has not faced its previous injustices head-on: there has been no official apology to the victims or to the press, writers, and filmmakers that suffered from the *franquismo* consequences. In short, Spain cannot reach a common ground on how to react retroactively to the atrocities the Spanish people were subjected to for decades.

From 2004-2011, Spain's socialist prime minister José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero pushed previous limits on attempts to "repair" the country from the Franco era, funding exhumations of Republican graves and passed a law that called for the removal of Franco statues and street names. These movements, however, were faced with strong opposition from the right-wing, conservative party and the Catholic Church, which opted to ignore or forget the past to move on. So, again, efforts to undo Franco's legacy was halted, as were last-minute legislation drafts to change the Valley of the Fallen, which proposed to go as far as to remove Franco's body from the monument, as well as replace its supervision from the Catholic Church to another organization. As of today, the *Valle de los Caídos* remains the same, Franco's body laid to rest among his supporters and his victims, in a monument built by prisoners of war from the Republican side (Brown).

Spain, in all its new freedoms, is still hesitant to even address its oppressive past. Javier Cercas, a Spanish novelist, finds this hesitancy to address the past a serious concern when looking at the future of Spain: "There is no one way to deal with the past" he said in an article in *Financial Times*, "...If there is no accord over the past, then the past can always be used, can

always be manipulated. There is no accord over our past, and that means that finding an accord over our present and our future is much more difficult. Can we live with this? Yes, we can live with this. But would we live better if we had a common narrative? We would live much better” (Brown).

Is Spain stuck in its old ways, lingering in the legacy of a dictator? Perhaps, but moving on is not always easy to do, especially when it means changing legislature or societal norms. The liberation of the media post-Franco certainly helped the country move on from the strict fascist and heavily Catholic standards from decades previously, but the country could still take great strides in moving on from the lingering *franquismo* in society. Nevertheless, the years of the Authoritarian Theory at work in Spain are long gone, and its failure in Franco’s regime will certainly ensure that Spain will never tolerate such a restrictive hold over the media again.

## Bibliography

Ager, Simon. "Galician (Galego)." Galician language, alphabet and pronunciation. Kualo, n.d.

Web. <<http://www.omniglot.com/writing/galician.htm>>.

"Authoritarian Theory". *Communication Theory*. N.p., 2010. Web.

Barrera, Carlos, and Jose Apezarena. "In Democracy as in Dictatorship." *The International*

*Journal of Press/Politics* 18.2 (2013): 188-207. Print.

Biblioteca España. "National Library Of Spain". *Bne.es*. N.p., 2016. Web.

Buck, Tobias. "Spain fails to turn page on Franco's legacy of censorship." *Financial Times*.

*Financial Times*, 23 Sept. 2016. Web.

Castro, Cristina Gómez. "Translation And Censorship In Franco'S Spain: Negotiation As A

Pathway For Authorization". *Universidad de Cantabria* (2017): 63-76. Web.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the

Library of Congress, 1988. Web.

Fusi, J.P., and Raymond Carr. *Franco: A Biography*. Trans. Felipe Fernandez-Armesto. New

York: Harper& Row, 1987. Print.

Gunther, Richard, José Ramón Montero, and José Ignacio Wert. "The Media and Politics in

Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy." *Democracy and the Media* (1999): 1-46. Web.

Gutierrez Lanza, C. "Censors and Censorship Boards in Franco's Spain." N.p.: n.p., n.d. 205-320.

Web.<<https://buleria.unileon.es/bitstream/handle/10612/4297/Chapter%2017.Censors%20and%20ensorship%20Boards%20in%20Franco%C2%B4s%20Spain%20.pdf?sequence=1>>.

Herrero-Olaizola, Alejandro. *The Censorship Files: Latin American Writers and Franco's Spain*.

Albany: State U of New York, 2007. Print.

Jimenez, Pedro. "HISTORIA Y CIVILIZACIÓN Apuntes sobre la censura durante el franquismo" *Boletin* (1977): 3-8. Universidad de Mons. Web.

Kassam, Ashifa. "Federico García Lorca Was Killed On Official Orders, Say 1960S Police Files". *The Guardian* 2015. Web.

Lea, Kathryn. "'Speaking Franco: Francisco Franco and the Evolution of the Spanish Artistic Voice'". *The Corinthian*. N.p., 15 May 2013. Web.

"Ley De 22 De Abril De 1938, De Prensa (Rectificada Ante Error En La Publicación De La Ley De Prensa En Fecha De 23Abr38)". *Derechos.org*. N.p., 2014. Web.

Llorens, Carles. "Spain's Media Concentration Policy: A Patchwork Crucial to the Understanding of the Spanish Media System." *International Journal of Communication* (2010): 844-64. 29 Mar. 2010. Web.

McQuail, Denis. *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. 1st ed. London: Sage Publications, 1983. Print.

Merino, Raquel and Rosa Rabadan. "Censored Translations In Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project — Theatre And Fiction". 15.2 (2002): 125-152. Web.

Minder, Raphael. "Civil War Legacy Continues to Divide Spain's Politics and Its Streets." The New York Times. N.p., 19 Nov. 2015. Web.

Pack, Sasha D. "Franco, Francisco." Encyclopedia of Modern Political Thought, edited by Gregory Claeys, vol. 1, SAGE Reference, 2013, pp. 299-300. Gale Virtual Reference Library, go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=GVRL&sw=w&u=mag\_u\_um&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CCX3708400108&it=r&asid=55d3b59735c93844644240c4cb851165.

Payne, Stanley G. Fascism in Spain, 1923-1977. Madison, WI.: U of Wisconsin, 1999. Print.

Payne, Stanley G. Franco and Hitler: Spain, Germany, and World War II. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2009. Print.

"REBEL FLIER DROPS BOMBS INTO MADRID; Damage Slight and Loyalist Planes Grounded Invader, Government Reports." The New York Times [Madrid] 28 Aug. 1936: 3. The New York Times. Web.

Richards, Michael. A Time of Silence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Schumacher, Edward. "SPAIN 10 YEARS AFTER FRANCO: DEMOCRACY APPEARS ROOTED." The New York Times [Madrid] 19 Nov. 1985, World sec.: n. pag. The New York Times. Web.

Siebert, Fred, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm. *Four Theories Of The Press*. 1st ed. University of Illinois: University of Illinois Press Urbana, 1956. Print.

"Spain Press, Media, TV, Radio, Newspapers - Television, Circulation, Stations, Papers, Number, Print, Freedom". *Pressreference.com*. N.p., 2017. Web.

Spain. The Senate of Spain. Spanish Constitution 1978. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Senate. What's It: Constitution. Senate of Spain, 31 Oct. 1978. Web.  
<[http://http://www.senado.es/constitu\\_i/index.html](http://http://www.senado.es/constitu_i/index.html)>.

"Spanish Films." Enforex. N.p., n.d. Web.<<http://www.enforex.com/culture/spanishfilms.html>>.

Spencer Brown "Facing up to Franco." *Financial Times* (London, England). May 9, 2015.

LexisNexis Academic. Web.

Villarroya, Anna. "Spain : 1. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments."

Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe - European culture policy database. N.p., 24 June 2015. Web.

Watkins, Jacob Fox. "Not Just "Franco's Spain" - The Spanish Political Landscape During Re-Emergence Through The Pact Of Madrid". *Journal of the Association for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies* 39.1 (2014): 55-107. Web.