

7820 Brentwood Drive Apt. 20
Stockton 7, California
el 16 octubre 1.963

Estimado Profesor Ferrater:

Muchas gracias por su carta de agosto, la cual llegó a Madrid después de que me había marchado yo; acaba de llegarme aquí en California.

Le agradecería el mandarme el libro de Miguel Maura. A mi también me gustó — como ya le dije, escribe él mucho más despasionadamente que habla. Al hablar con él, hace unos años, pensé que sería un libro de poco valor porque él habló de los hechos en términos emocionales y excitados. Por ahora, necesito el libro porque lo cito en la nueva versión de la famosa tesis, la cual estoy terminando este otoño. (Tiene también una carta de Richard Herr— creo que le mandé la carta para ^{que} ver sus sugerencias.)

Me encontré con Juan Marichal en Madrid y hablamos un rato, estando allí en la escalera de Miguel Angel 8. Le dije lo que había dicho Herr y él volvió a animarme a mandar la tesis para que él (Marichal) la leyese. Creo que ya sabe que él me pidió el favor de leerlo antes que Herr, pero ya estaba yo comprometida.

Un año y diez meses después de entablar conversación con la Universidad de California, sobre la traducción de Una Aproximación a la historia de España por Vicens, tengo una carta diciéndome que si y preguntándome el honorario que espero recibir (dado que la Vda. de Vicens posee "the royalties.") ¿Tiene idea de lo que debo pedir?

~~001149~~

Estoy encantada con mi nuevo puesto.
Tal vez ha leído ^{algo} sobre el programa de Elbert Covell,
todo en el castellano; en el ejemplar del 11 octubre
de Time hay un artículo y hay uno mejor en Newsweek,
hace unas semanas. Tengo un puesto bien lindo—como
dicen mis compañeros latino-americanos— como ayudante
al director. Además, enseño seis horas semanales—
un curso sobre la historia de España y uno sobre la
literatura española. Me cuestan horas y horas de
preparación (son en español pero no es por esto—es
porque este es mi primer año de enseñar).

Le deseo un buen año de permiso (¿o es
solamente un semestre?). Un saludo muy atento de

Juan Linerdy

Ya he escrito a un amigo de Madrid pidiéndole el favor,
de estar al tanto de referencias a su obra. Me pareció
que Vd. estuvo de moda este año — por lo menos, le
comentaron mucho, en el sentido que su ausencia de
España representa una gran pérdida para el país.

1 - X1 - 63

001150

24 Orchard Lane
Ithaca, Pennsylvania
March 30, 1962

Dear Mr. Fruje:

At the suggestion of Professor Jose Ferrater Mora, whose book on Unamuno has just been published by the University of California press, I write to inquire if you would be interested in my project to translate a short, recent history of Spain entitled "Una Aproximacion a la Historia de Espana" by Jaime Vicens Vives. For several years I have been interested in this project which I discussed with Vicens' widow in Barcelona last month. At that time she told me that an English firm had written to express interest in this book but kindly offered to delay a reply until I attempted to find a publisher for she would like to have it appear in the United States. Ferrater, a good friend of Vicens, has agreed to write an introduction for me.

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the book which, as you will see, is a series of essays dealing with each century in terms of problems; it also contains a lengthy essay on Spanish historiography. The style is good and the book makes interesting reading. I planned to do more than translate, making of the footnotes an accurate and extensive chronological addition so that it could be used as a textbook.

For years I have been interested in this book for two reasons. The obvious is the lack of general Spanish history books in English; Rafael Altamira's book is still the standard and although the last edition is dated 1949 it is still essentially the book he published in 1914. The recent Livermore book is largely based on it. The second is Vicens' application of new social and economic disciplines to Spanish history which has been largely political and chronological until now. I talked with Vicens before his death and he was enthusiastic. Professor of History in the University of Barcelona, his work had received international recognition and he was asked to read a paper at the International Historians Association meeting in Stockholm in 1960. Unfortunately his death of cancer in June 1960 at fifty years of age made this impossible. Vicens was co-owner of a publishing firm in Barcelona which has now split; his books are published by the firm headed by his wife.

001149

100-2111

My delay in taking up the translation is that as the director of an American school in Madrid I had little time to spare. Now that I have returned to finish my doctoral thesis on Spanish history at Bryn Mawr I find the project of renewed interest.

Because of the University of California's recent interest in hispanic literature and philosophy, we thought your press might be interest in Vicens' book. As a Cal graduate I have a rather special interest.

Thanking you for your kind attention to this matter,
I remain

Sincerely yours,

Joan Connelly

Mr. August Fruje
University of California Press
Berkeley 4, California

001144

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

March 3, 1963

Dear Joan:

I have read through your dissertation, some of it rapidly, particularly toward the end, but sufficiently closely, I feel, to give an appraisal that I doubt would change markedly on closer reading. If I make errors in details in my comments - that is, if you have said things I criticize you for not saying - my rapid reading may be at fault. I have made many comments in the margins, so what I have to say here is in the nature of over-all criticism.

First of all let me say that I think you have the basic materials for an excellent, even important, work. You have unearthed a tremendous amount of material out of a vast number of sources. The industry of your research is impressive. If I seem to tear what you have done apart, it is because I would like to see the final product be as good as I think it can be. Furthermore, you will have to understand that my comments arise largely out of my own predilection for history that is analytical rather than narrative. Very good narrative history is written ("How" history, as C.V. Wedgwood calls it: did you see the New Yorker article on English historians?), but the kind of history that is ~~next~~ given highest recognition is that which makes a purposeful attempt to explain the events under study ("Why" history). I find the latter far more satisfying, and you make sufficient incursions into the realm of explanation for me to believe you have this objective too.

With this in mind, then, I suggest that what your study lacks is a basic conceptual framework. What is your concept of causation in history? Particularly in the type of events you are discussing? As I see it, you are dealing with one of the most profound questions in 19th-20th century Spanish history: how a people that for centuries was profoundly religious, Catholic, became anti-clerical, antireligious, at least in the cities, and particularly in Barcelona. The major difference between Spain in 1810-14, which I am studying, and in 1936-39, lies precisely here, and yet no one has made a real attempt to explain the loss of control of the church over the lower classes (Brenan's explanation based on church loss of property in 19th century, is still the best going, I believe, and yet it is surely inadequate). Yet the only conclusion you seem to reach is that "the Barcelona worker had purposely been indoctrinated with a violent form of anticlericalism in order to divert his attention from social abuses" (p 620) I.e., it was all a successful manoeuvre by the Radical party. This seems to me far too superficial an explanation. Let me suggest some ways I think you can get into this more deeply.

First I think you should study this partly as an example of the effects of 19th cent. urban growth, with its attendant sociological problems. You should somewhere describe in considerable detail the city of Barcelona, particularly the working class areas - the ecology as the sociologists call it. How do they live together, what are their social tensions, their relations with other classes, with the forces of order, with the church, between workers and lower middle class, between old residents and immigrants. In order that you can get some idea of the problems you might treat, I suggest you read Don Martindale's introduction to the Collier paperback edition of Max Weber,

~~001146~~

The City (I think ecology is more important than he does). This also suggests other works you could look at. I also suggest you look at the essays in Paul K. Hatt & A.J. Reiss, Cities and Society, esp. by P. & M. Hauser on Changing population, Davis & Casis on Latin American cities, etc. See also R. K. Merton Social Theory and Social Structure (1957 edit) pp. 70-82 (the whole introduction is valuable).

Second I think you have a problem here of "social communication." In what ways are anti-clericalism and other ideas transmitted to the workers? How many of them really read newspapers; go to speeches; attend meetings; pick up gossip in their shops or by contact in the streets. Despite its social science, quantifying approach, I think you could get a lot out of studying the types of problems dealt with in Karl W. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication, especially the later chapters. Involved in this also is the problem of "images." What did the workers think themselves to be? the upper classes? the clergy? "Images" and reality are related but are not identical. Many of these problems, although tackled from the point of view of the upper rather than the lower classes, are dealt with in Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, chaps. 4 & 5. I recommend them to you since they deal with the same chronological period. I'll also send you a study of "images" I have made but not yet published, dealing with Spain in 1808.

Another theoretical problem is that of mass psychology, or how mobs act and why. I don't think this has really been solved yet, but I suggest you look at G. Rudé, The Crowd in the French Revolution, which is a study more of who was in the crowds than why they acted as they did. G. Lefebvre's Coming of the French Revolution, is still an excellent study of how groups interact on each other. You might, if you get time, look at sociologist Clark Kerr's report on the party raid on the Berkeley campus in May 1956. As I recall it goes briefly into current explanations of mob action. (It was issued about June 1956).

So far I have been suggesting that you will get a lot more out of ^{your} material if you see how other historians and other disciplines have treated the kind of problems you are dealing with. Now let me propose that you treat the subject much more analytically. So far description almost buries your analysis. Your descriptions are good, moving, exciting, and you should not eliminate them (some may have to be cut out). But you don't seem to be studying the burnings to see if there is any pattern to the actions; and when you do point out some patterns at the end, it is too late for us to appreciate them. You could perhaps analyze the types of groups involved: workers, local party leaders, the public both as observers and inactive residents, central govt, city govt, army (officers vs. men), police forces, etc. What is the role of each in determining the events. How do they interact and force ^{or incite} each other at times to do ~~unexpected~~ unplanned acts? How do ecology & communications fit in? You might create a sort of hierarchy of importance of the various factors. And all the time making clear to your reader what is the basis of your reasoning and your evidence. To my mind the critical point is still why an anti-military strike becomes anti-clerical and you still have not discussed the problem analytically. Singling out the role of each group or condition (including pre-existing "images") would help. (You do some of this at the end, but your material has not led up to it.)

Questions that occurred to me were: Why were so few clergy killed, in fact they were on the whole treated kindly? Why were women so prominent in the violence? You could do more with analyzing the occupational make up of the mobs & spectators.

Who had been educated in church schools & why were they so frequently leaders in the uprising? Were some orders attacked more than others? New orders more than old? Do more with the location of buildings attacked & compare with location of those not attacked. (I don't admit some of these ideas have occurred to you already)

Your present conclusion is less a conclusion than an account of the later effects of the T-agric Week.

This, it seems to me, is how you should deal with the main section, which would appear to begin in May 1909. From here on chronology and telling a story become proper (though I suggest concurrent analysis). All that goes before I would put into a general and lengthy ~~conclusion~~ introduction. That is, your book should be part I, setting the stage, part II action. This is roughly what Brennan does in the Labyrinth, with action being Part III on the Republic. Even Part I is analytical rather than chronological history. This is also how I did my 18th Century Revolution. Thus your first part should not try to tell the political history of Spain, 1898-1909, or even parts of it, but simply analyze those aspects that will have bearing on your major section. It could almost be broken down into sections on the factors you will later be discussing: city govt., central govt., polit leaders, working classes, their ideologies (Images), Barcelona as a city, etc. Deal with each subject once only. As it is at present Ferrer comes in several times in the first part, so does Solidaridad Catalana, & Radical. Much of what you describe about Madrid politics seems to have no relevance to your main subject. The first 7 chaps is where I think you could cut down most sharply. Cut out a lot of your quoted conversations. Don't concern yourself about what the people accused each other of doing except as it will build up the climate of opinion or "images." This whole part needs both more (dealing with Barcelona, urban problems & psychology, etc. as outlined earlier) and less (the story of national politics, details on legislation, party conflicts, etc.). You could eliminate an awful lot of personal names throughout the whole study. I should think that in the end, by eliminating and tightening up, you could put in these other aspects and still have a MS about 200 pages shorter.

(including lives & acts of political leaders)

Tell who they were, not a history of them per se

Finally, let me urge you to read Louis Gottschalk, Understanding History, chap. vii, on "The Problem of Credibility", particularly the section on "Corroboration." Make sure all the events, encounters, you describe are supported by proper evidence.

If you decide to follow even only part of my suggestions, it is obvious that you will not finish this spring. My own recommendation, now that you have a job, is to think of this as a task of a couple of years, during which you will probably want to get back to Barcelona for new material and a new look at the city. I think in the end you will be rewarded by turning out a really worthwhile book. The questions you deal with are central to much of contemporary history, not only in Spain: loss of faith in religion, popular politics, the city, popular risings. You will not answer them all, but by paying attention to the problems as problems you can shed an awful lot of light on them. More than most historians do.

Thanks for the chance to read your study, and good luck.

Dick

I am returning your MS separately