

**Madariaga's Quixotism:
The Imperial Nostalgia of an Exiled Spanish Liberal**

Christopher Britt Arredondo
(The George Washington University)

“One ends up identifying with an enemy
whose structure one does not understand”.
—Giorgio Agamben

I. The Dialectic of Disenchantment

In his 1926 *Guía del lector del Quixote*, Salvador de Madariaga claims to find a reciprocal dualism at work in Cervantes' *Quixote*. As an organizing principle, this dualism is supposed to inspire Cervantes' self-conscious narrative style, to inform the episodic pairing of adventures and misadventures in the novel, and to shape the relationship between the novel's two protagonists. Don Quixote and Sancho's influence on each other forms what Madariaga calls a “fraternity of soul” that “unites” them in mutual enchantment (136). In this sense, Madariaga asserts that Sancho undergoes a process of Quixotization, which elevates him from his lowly world of bodily wants and desires into the heightened realm of Don Quixote's chivalric ideals. Similarly, he insists that Don Quixote undergoes a reciprocal process of Sanchification. This process tends however to spiral downward, from the self-sacrificial spiritual ideals of Don Quixote to the self-serving material interests of Sancho; from Don Quixote's yearning to achieve everlasting glory to Sancho's worldly desire for power; and from the high-mimetic realm of epic and tragedy, in which Don Quixote imagines himself to be a noble knight, to the low-mimetic realm of comedy and satire, in which Sancho finds himself the mocked governor of a fake island kingdom. Beaten, humiliated, and scorned, knight and squire eventually return home to La Mancha, from whence they will never sally forth again. Thus the reciprocal enchantment that initially unites Don Quixote and Sancho in a “fraternity of soul” ultimately turns into a reversible dualism that leads to their shared disenchantment. This reversal of fortune expresses a psychology of defeat: the defeat, that is, of what Madariaga refers to as Don Quixote's “moral authority” (119).

Like Ganivet's 1897 *Idearium español*, Unamuno's 1905 *Vida de Don Quixote y Sancho*, and Ortega's 1914 *Meditaciones del Quixote*, Madariaga's 1926 *Guía* treats Don Quixote as an icon for the modern Spanish nation. Consequently, for Madariaga, the defeat of Don Quixote's moral authority represents Spain's loss of moral authority in the modern era. Written at the threshold of modernity, the *Quixote* expresses with melancholy the very same disenchantment that Madariaga felt with regard to the processes of modernization in Spain. As he understood it, modernity had ushered in a prolonged period of decadence. This decadence was punctuated by two crises: the final collapse of Spain's empire in 1898 and the defeat of the Second Republic in 1939. The first had reduced Spain's power and influence in the world to almost nil. The second had eliminated the sovereignty of the Spanish people. Madariaga believed that among other nations such as the English, the French, and the Americans, modernity had delivered on its promise to liberate men from the tyranny of pre-modern forms of thought and power; but, that among the Spanish it had achieved the opposite. Indeed, Madariaga's disenchantment with modernity arises from the realization that in Spain modern democracy had converged with the primitive forms of thought and abusive practices of a totalitarian state. To the extent to which

this convergence of modern democracy with “totalitarian, post-democratic, and spectacular societies” remains a salient feature of our own postmodern era, Madariaga’s disenchantment with modernity speaks to our own predicament at the start of the new millennium (Agamben 1998, 10-11).

Although some cervantists credit Madariaga with having been the first to develop this psychological and political approach to the *Quixote*—some even going so far as to suggest that he helped found an entire new school of cervantine criticism, such praise for Madariaga’s originality of thought is in fact inflated (Bernaschina Schürumann 206). As Anthony Close has convincingly argued in *The Romantic Approach to Don Quixote*, Madariaga’s psychological rendering of Don Quixote and Sancho places him squarely within the tradition of nineteenth and twentieth century romantic interpretations of the *Quixote* (63-65). As do other proponents of this approach, Madariaga tends to idealize Don Quixote as a tragic hero and to deny the novel’s overall satiric design; he assumes that the novel symbolically expresses ideas about the nature of both men in general and Spaniards in particular; and he imposes on the novel an interpretation that reflects the ideology, aesthetics, and sensibility of the modern era (Close 1). What is more, as Michael Predmore has demonstrated, Madariaga’s interpretation of the *Quixote* is not merely part of this longstanding romantic tradition; it is a fairly unimaginative adaptation of the arguments that Unamuno developed in his 1905 *Vida de Don Quixote y Sancho* (288). Thus it would appear that Madariaga’s interpretation of the *Quixote*, when it is viewed from the fairly circumscribed perspective of cervantine criticism, is uninspired, derivative, and only of passing interest as a footnote in the annals of the romantic uses and abuses of the *Quixote*. However, when it is properly re-contextualized in the broader historical frame of the contemporary world and its ongoing political, economic, and social crises, Madariaga’s approach to the *Quixote* acquires added historical and theoretical significance.

Salvador de Madariaga (1886-1978) was a Spanish liberal whose political ideology was deeply influenced by the “organic” or authoritarian democracy he grew up with in Restoration Spain. In line with the elitist sociological and political views of other so-called liberal thinkers of the period—such as Joaquín Costa, Ángel Ganivet, Miguel de Unamuno, and Ortega y Gasset—Madariaga espoused a liberalism that was expressly conservative in outlook and aristocratic in spirit. The illiberal character of his liberalism notwithstanding, in 1931, the newly formed Spanish Republic appointed him as Spain’s Ambassador to the United States. Between 1932 and 1934, he also served as Spain’s Ambassador to France. In 1933, he was elected to the National Congress and served both as Minister of Public Education and Fine Arts and as Minister of Justice. With the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936, Madariaga elected to flee his native country for England. He dedicated his life in exile both to organizing opposition to the Franco regime and to the advancement of his elitist liberal ideals. In 1947, Madariaga published the “Oxford Manifesto” on international liberalism; and, in the company of neo-liberal economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, he helped found the Mont Pelerin Society, which is a transnational network that promotes free markets and a limited state (Bockman 133). In 1949, Madariaga was involved in the founding of the College of Europe, which sought to promote solidarity among the nations of Western Europe and provide elite training for individuals dedicated to the ideal of European union. In addition to his work with these liberal political, economic, and educational institutions, Madariaga advanced his political ideals through his work as a writer of essays, poems, and novels. Indeed, his elitist brand of liberalism shades his studies of Spanish imperial history, of Latin American postcolonial history, and also his

novel *Sanco Panco*, a political satire of Franco Spain and the Cold War era that is written in imitation of Cervantes's *Quixote*.

What emerges from these historical and literary works is a liberalism that, in both content and character, extends the undemocratic selectivity practiced in Restoration Spain by that government's two dynastic parties, the Conservatives and the Liberals. It celebrates, after the example of Ortega y Gasset's sociological elitism, the regenerating power of an "intellectual aristocracy;" and it complements this aristocratic elitism with a defense of the would-be humanistic values of Spain's so-called civilizing mission in the Americas. What is more, Madariaga even proposes his liberalism as a model for a regenerating imperialism in the contemporary world. In other words, he sees this Spanish brand of liberalism as a needed source of "moral authority" for a modern world that he believes is in desperate need of moral and political guidance.

While Madariaga was surely a political exile, he was by no means a cultural dissident. For him, the Spanish empire and its civilizing cultural values forever remained a fundamental point of reference. Madariaga's imperial apologetics may seem to be at odds with his status as a liberal political exile from Franco's Spain. After all, the Franco regime fashioned itself after the fascist rhetoric of intellectuals like Primo de Rivera, García Morente, and Ramiro de Maeztu who claimed that Spain had an imperial destiny to fulfill in the contemporary world (Britt 2005a, 175). However, as Claudio Guillén has suggested, it would be a mistake to equate Madariaga's political exile with cultural dissidence. "The archetypes of the literature of exile," writes Guillén, "[are] produced within the framework of an *imperium mundi* based not only on growing imperial power but on absolute confidence in the superiority of a single centralized culture" (275). Madariaga expresses such confidence in the centrality and superiority of Spanish imperial culture in his 1947 *The Rise of the Spanish American Empire*, where he claims that the history of Spain's conquest and colonization of the Americas was an enlightening and civilizing mission. He does so as well in his 1962 *Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear*, in which Madariaga asserts that Spain and Latin America are destined to play a crucial role in finally shifting the balance of power of the Cold War in favor of modern democracies the world over.

Guillén's theorization of the literature of exile further suggests that imperial apologetics of the sort that Madariaga practices are ultimately motivated by the fear that all exiles must eventually confront: the fear, that is, of ceasing to belong to one's world and thus being cast out from "civilization" and into a state of "barbarity:"

The basic dimensions and symbols of exile could be considered," theorizes Guillén, "the *circle* and the *center*, and even when the causes of banishment [are] political, its consequences [are] frighteningly cultural, for to be expelled from the center of the circle [amounts] to the danger of being hurled into the void or doomed to non-being. (275)

Madariaga, ever aware of these dangers, acknowledged the political reasons behind his exile, but he never foreswore the imperial cultural values that he believed best defined his place as an exiled Spanish intellectual.

As a liberal, Madariaga understood that in spite of having identified itself with Spain's imperial legacy, the Franco regime had in fact stripped Spain of the liberal imperial values that were its true source of moral authority. Madariaga's enduring interest in Cervantes as a humanist and in Don Quixote and Sancho as symbolic representations of Spain's would-be liberal imperial culture attests to his desire to restore that moral authority and claim it as the

legacy of Spanish liberals like himself. Whereas he only sketches out this argument in his 1926 *Guía del lector del Quixote*, he thoroughly works it out in his 1964 *Sancho Panco*.

In what follows, I will seek to demonstrate that Madariaga's quixotism expresses an exilic nostalgia for a home that he conceives as a civilizing cultural empire. The Spanish empire's legacy of liberalism, Madariaga will argue, qualifies it as a model of imperial moral authority. This is precisely the kind of moral authority that, for varying reasons, he believes neither the Soviets nor the Americans can claim to have exercised in the twentieth century. This lack of moral authority, Madariaga will insist, explains both the despair of the Cold War era and the nihilistic logic of mutually assured destruction that animates it. Only by recuperating Spain's liberal imperial values does the modern world, as Madariaga understands it, stand a chance to rise above the perverse nihilism of the Cold War and embrace, with renewed hope, the ideal of a human world united in brotherhood. The model for this brotherhood is the "unity of soul" that Madariaga discovers in the relationship between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. But whereas in Cervantes's *Quixote* this unity of soul ultimately gives way to a melancholic psychology of defeat, in Madariaga's quixotist works it rather expresses a psychology of resurgent vitality and expectant victory. As such, Madariaga's quixotism envisions a regenerating about-face of the decadent reversals of fortune that Spain has suffered in the modern age. His quixotism would turn Spain's modern disenchantment into a reason for the modern world to become enchanted with Spain's pre-modern imperial legacy.

Considering his nostalgia for empire, Madariaga is a prime example of an exiled Spanish thinker who does not fit nicely into the idealized view of exile that has become common among those Hispanists who follow the postmodern and postcolonial theories of exile put forth by thinkers such as Deleuze, Said, and Clifford. Due to the sway of these postmodern theories, we have grown accustomed to think of exile specifically and of displacement generally as "deterritorialized" spaces that we can "occupy" and from which we may express dissidence, speak the truth to power, or otherwise organize resistance to imperialism. Madariaga's insistence on maintaining Spain's imperial culture as a necessary point of reference must then surely come as a disappointment to many of us. Yet, his determination to reclaim from out of the darkness of Spain's conquest and colonization of the Americas a set of civilizing values capable of enlightening the contemporary world and restoring to it a modicum of moral authority should actually inspire us. I say this not in the sense that, like him, we ought to embrace the pre-modern values of Hispanic imperial civilization—that would be counter productive; but rather in the sense that, insofar as our predicament is *postmodern*, it would surely behoove us to cease thinking of exile in theoretical, ahistorical, and representational terms and acknowledge that our displacements --whether literal, metaphorical or some admixture of the two--, are historically and effectively bound to the imperial culture that replaced the Spanish empire in the modern era: that is, the *imperium mundi* of the Enlightenment and its ever-expanding "liberal" and "democratic" Empire of Liberty.

As an exiled Spaniard who lived in England, Madariaga identified this Empire of Liberty with British and American imperialism. Moreover, as a liberal, he was a true believer in the benevolence of this empire. He believed that the freedom of individuals and entire nations would increase and their sovereignty would expand only in proportion to the increasing freedom and expanding sovereignty of the Empire of Liberty. But he refused to identify this benevolent and liberating imperialism with its modern, British and American, forms alone. He insisted that Spain's empire had been the first to truly liberate the peoples it had conquered and colonized. As

such, his exilic nostalgia for empire expresses the idea that the continuum linking Spanish, British, and American imperialisms is not only historical, but ideological as well.

In our own day, the expansion of a global order under corporate control, the extension of colonialism, and the concomitant propagation of war on a planetary scale, all threaten to undermine modern democracy. That this global order expands by means of strategic displacements is a truth that postmodern theorists of exile conveniently ignore. Doing so permits them to treat displacement as if it were an opportunity for intellectuals, artists, and other dissidents to increase their freedom and expand the scope of their sovereignty. Consider, in this regard, Deleuze and Guattari's celebration of the "nomad". Such a playful and optimistic outlook on displacement is foolhardy. It distracts us from attending to the decadence of modern democracy and its gradual convergence with a postmodern global order that is fast becoming totalitarian, both in terms of its reach and of its practices. Madariaga's nostalgia for empire reminds us of the need to situate displacement in its proper historical and cultural context. As such, it points to a fundamental aporia in postmodern approaches to exile and displacement: they acclaim dissidence abstractly, but because they erase all historical and cultural specificity, they end up making it meaningless and harmless. Are the theories of postmodernism and post-colonialism simply confused or are they disingenuous expressions of pseudo-dissidence? In either case, by undermining the dissidence they praise, they risk becoming complicit with the global forces that are hard at work destroying democracy.

II. Quixotism and Hispanic Cultural Imperialism

Predmore was right to point out the debt that Madariaga's views on the *Quixote* owe to Unamuno's interpretation of it. Indeed, Madariaga greatly admired Unamuno, whom he characterized as the "prince of Spanish letters" and a modern-day Quixote who, out of loyalty to the Spanish nation, "bore a cross" and "incarnated the spirit of modern Spain" (Madariaga 1959, 118). Strangely, however, of the numerous similarities and coincidences of opinion that Predmore identifies between Madariaga's *Guía* and Unamuno's *Vida*, he fails to mention what is perhaps the most salient, because most general, point they share in common. Madariaga, like Unamuno before him, reads the *Quixote* as a Bible: that is to say, as a story of perdition and salvation. Whereas for Unamuno the *Quixote* is "Spain's national Bible" and Don Quixote is a "tragic Spanish Christ," for Madariaga it is the "Bible of the western spirit" (Unamuno 283; Madariaga 1961, 32). Both read the *Quixote* as a dualistic narrative of decadence and regeneration and each, in his own way, relates this reading to the contemporary world.

Herein lies the historical significance of Madariaga's interpretation of the *Quixote*: it participates in a modern Spanish intellectual tradition that is extra-literary and is concerned ultimately, not with the proper interpretation of Cervantes's novel, but with the critique of modern decadence and the formulation of a program for the regeneration of the modern world. Madariaga's interpretation of the *Quixote* follows, in other words, in the tradition of the Quixotism devised at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by Spanish intellectuals such as Unamuno, Ganivet, Maeztu, and Ortega y Gasset.

Generally attuned to the tendencies of the romantic tradition, the Quixotism of these intellectuals was nevertheless profoundly marked by the ongoing debates in Europe, Spain, and the Americas concerning the perceived decadence of Western civilization and the need to regenerate it. Whereas in Europe these debates were framed sociologically by thinkers like Simmel and Spengler and aesthetically by modernists such as Rimbaud and Wilde, in both Spain

and Latin America these debates concerning decadence took on a decidedly nationalist and pan-nationalist meaning that emerged in response to the dramatic events of 1898. This emblematic date marks both the definitive collapse of the Spanish empire and the birth of a new era of U.S. imperial expansion into Spain's erstwhile colonies in the Caribbean (Puerto Rico, Cuba, Panama) and the Pacific (the Marianna Islands, the Philippines, Guam).

The Quixotists in Spain, from Ganivet to Unamuno and from Ortega to Maeztu, responded to Spain's definitive loss of empire with a moral critique of decadence and an imaginative program for the cultural recuperation of the lost empire. To blame for Spanish decadence was what Ganivet saw as Spaniard's spirit of "undisciplined individuality," what Unamuno perceived as a "spirit of insubordination," what Ortega theorized as the "resentment of the masses," and what Maeztu, never one to mince words, simply termed "anarchy" (Britt 2005a, 18-19). Each of these Quixotists identified these decadent qualities with Sancho Panza. As a regenerating corrective to this anarchistic decadence, they fashioned a Don Quixote who epitomized the ascetic discipline by means of which they believed Spain, and in particular its anarchic Sanchos, could be spiritually transformed and regenerated. Accordingly, they fashioned a variously messianic, self-sacrificing, agonistic, or tragic Don Quixote and used this figure as an icon for Spanish national regeneration.

What is more, on the basis of these ascetic ideals, they reaffirmed Spain's role as the spiritual leader of the Hispanic world and reasoned that Spain would recapture its empire, if not politically and economically, than surely spiritually and culturally. By so doing, argued the Quixotists, Spain would offer its ex-colonies in the Americas, the Caribbean, and the Pacific the necessary weapons with which to defend themselves from the threat posed by American imperialism. As the Quixotists understood it, this threat was not only political; it was also cultural, even civilizational. US imperialism was fundamentally driven by base economic concerns, they argued, and therefore threatened to tie up all those who entered into commerce with it, whether by force or out of expediency, into a morally decadent morass.

The Quixotists of Spain were not alone in making this defense of the regenerating imperial values of Spanish civilization and opposing them to the decadent moral values of American imperialism. In Latin America, thinkers as influential as Rodó, Darío and Caro developed similar moral critiques of modern decadence and devised equally elitist programs for national and pan-national regeneration. According to these intellectuals, the decadence of American imperialism lay in what Rodó identified as its "utilitarianism," what Darío understood as its "economic militarism," and what Caro viewed as its "modern sensuality" (Britt 2005a, 187-205). These intellectuals feared that the Sanchos, or uneducated masses of Latin America, would be tempted by these modern vices. And not unlike their counterparts in Spain, these Latin American intellectuals also seized upon the figure of Don Quixote to represent their views of a pan-Hispanic cultural unity capable of resisting the decadent influence of US imperialism. In this regard, Rodó spoke of Cervantes and his *Quixote* as the ultimate expression of Hispanic genius and, like Unamuno, refashioned Don Quixote as a warring Hispanic Christ; Darío created a Don Quixote who was an optimistic Man of Faith; and Caro, for his part, spoke of the *Quixote* as the epic of the Hispanic world, with Don Quixote as its regenerating hero (Britt 2005a, 187-205).

These modern Latin American intellectuals, as well as their Quixotist counterparts in Spain, participated in a transatlantic, pan-Hispanic cultural movement that, as Fredrick Pike has shown, spanned the years of 1898-1936, emphasized the cultural unity of the Spanish-speaking world, and affirmed Spain's right to wield spiritual hegemony over its one-time colonies (Pike 1-

2). Madariaga's approach to the *Quixote*, first published in 1926, acquires added historical significance when it is properly situated in the context of this pan-Hispanic movement that emerged in response to Spain's imperial collapse and the rise of American imperialism. Certainly, this juxtaposition of Spanish and American imperialisms in the New World is characterized by a reversible dualism akin to that which Madariaga finds at work in the reversals of fortune suffered by Don Quixote. In other words, the supposedly high-minded civilizing imperialism of Spain is replaced by the apparently low-spirited and decadent imperialism of the United States of America.

Not unlike the Quixotists of Restoration Spain and postcolonial Latin America, Madariaga would use Cervantes's *Quixote* to argue for the spiritual resurgence of the Hispanic world. In doing so, however, he would need to confront the Franco regime, which had usurped the Quixotism propounded by Ganivet, Unamuno, Maeztu, and Ortega and used it to glorify Spanish National-Catholicism as a regenerating formula for both the nation and its imperial legacy (Britt 2005a, 171-177). To that end, Madariaga framed his defense of Spain's regenerating imperial values within the international framework of European and North and South American liberal democracies. In other words, he translated into liberal language the values rhetorically associated with fascism in Franco's Spain. He was aided in this effort by the quixotism espoused in Latin America by Darío, Rodó, and Caro, which was, in spite of its decidedly elitist and illiberal ideological content, nevertheless framed by Latin America's republican tradition. Finally, his views on Cervantes as a liberal and of the *Quixote* as the maximum expression of Spanish liberalism would come to play a central role in Madariaga's appropriation of Spain's imperial legacy.

III. Cervantes "a liberal in our modern sense of the word"

In his 1926 *Guía del lector del Quixote* (a book that he would translate into English and publish anew in 1934 with the title *Don Quixote: An Introductory Essay in Psychology*), Madariaga sustains that Cervantes was a modern liberal. Accordingly, he sees Cervantes as an enlightened individual whose independence of mind gave him the moral authority with which to denounce both the injustices suffered by Spaniards at the hands of Spain's enemies and the injustices imposed on Spaniards by Spain's own imperial apologists. Speaking of Cervantes' captive years in Algiers, Madariaga writes:

There, in chains, by standing up to his executioners, he could command respect; by expecting nothing, begging nothing, he could rise to a position of moral independence and freedom such as few men can enjoy. In the prisons of Algiers, Cervantes tasted that feeling of plenitude seldom granted: *complete moral sovereignty*. (17)

In the *Quixote*, argues Madariaga, Cervantes exercised this same moral freedom in order to question Catholic Spain's imperial policies, institutions, and practices:

What are we then to make of this spirit of freedom in the thought of Cervantes? [...] What of his mocking attitude towards the clergy, his hardly veiled hints about the Inquisition, his protest against the expulsions of the Moriscos, and, at least by implication, of the Jews; his ironical attitude towards the pride of the old Christians? (27)

With this series of questions, Madariaga focuses attention on the object of Cervantes' critique: the double tyranny of Spain's absolute monarchy and its inquisitorial Catholicism. Given Cervantes's critique of tyranny and defense of liberty, Madariaga affirms that Cervantes was "a liberal in our own modern sense of the word, a man who seeks harmony and concordance in all things" (28). Indeed, this view of Cervantes as a freethinker and critic of Spanish political and religious tyranny would seem to make him a liberal "in our own modern sense of the word".

Still, what Madariaga has in mind, when he calls Cervantes a modern liberal, does not only involve this critique of tyranny; it also includes a defense of Spanish imperial values. In regard to Cervantes, Madariaga affirms: "He was one of the minds of his time—Francis Bacon was another—who guessed in Nature some immanent wisdom from which man could only stray at his risk. He was the herald of the age of reason" (28). By associating Cervantes with Bacon, who in his *Nova Atlantis* equates enlightenment with imperial expansion, Madariaga hints at this other meaning behind the modern liberalism that he fashions for Cervantes. Like Bacon, Madariaga suggests, Cervantes is an enlightened imperialist. In his political treatise of 1962, *Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear*, Madariaga clarifies his thinking on the imperial ideal contained in the myth of the New Atlantis:

The New Atlantis," he writes, "the citadel formed by the nations on the shores of the Atlantic, is fast becoming the center of the future world. No one can deny to the United States the leading share in this phase of human history. But no one can deny either that, after the Anglo-Saxon, the Hispanic element is bound to be the strongest in it. (79)

For this reason, Madariaga argues, European and North American historians of Latin America must "admit Spanish and Latin American life as subjects and initiators of culture and civilization on an equal footing with that of the United States and the rest of Europe" (81). In terms of enlightenment, Madariaga insists, Spain's imperial legacy is on par with that of the Anglo-Saxon "empire of liberty". Cervantes is Bacon's contemporary and soul mate.

It is, however, in his 1937 *Hierarchy or Anarchy*, which was the first book that he would publish in exile, that Madariaga defines with conceptual precision what he understands modern liberalism to be. He associates liberalism with what he calls "organic unanimous democracy". Such a democracy, argues Madariaga, is ideal in that it "ensures that the government *is* an aristocracy [...] Aristocracy means, after all, that the power is in the hands of the best" (126-127). This liberal ideal of organic unanimous democracy is an abstract and theoretical description of the liberalism that in fact existed in Restoration Spain, where Madariaga grew up reading and admiring the likes of Unamuno and Ortega. It was a liberalism that was devoted, as Pike observes, to the maintenance of a "hierarchically, organically or corporatively structured, stratified, nonopen, nonpluralistic society" (Pike 5). In Restoration Spain, which spanned the years 1874 to 1931, liberals were not, in spite of all their bitter differences, in fundamental disagreement with their political adversaries, the conservatives. Being, as they were, the only two dynastic parties in Restoration Spain, Liberals and Conservatives alike sought ways "to provide for popular participation in the life of the nation without threatening the final moral, aesthetic, cultural, and political authority of a directing elite" (Pike 6). Liberalism in Restoration Spain, not unlike the liberalism that Madariaga espouses in *Hierarchy or Anarchy*, sought to provide for greater mass participation in society so as to bolster the oligarchy that in reality governed the country.

In describing his vision of a properly hierarchical liberal society, Madariaga borrows heavily from Ortega y Gasset's elitist sociology, according to which "human society *is* always aristocratic; indeed, a society is a society only to the extent to which it is aristocratic, and it stops being one insofar as it stops being aristocratic" (Ortega 1937, 44). Likewise, Madariaga would maintain that: "A constant trend of social life reproduces the same general design in all human communities. A first rough sketch of this design shows it divided into three tiers or layers, which go by the respective names of people, middle class, and aristocracy" (*Hierarchy* 154-155). Reproducing Unamuno's dubious notion of *intra-historia*, Madariaga characterizes "the people" in essentialist terms as the "depository of ancestral memories" and the "psychological substratum of the whole nation" (156). He also, in keeping with the spirit of Ortega's sociology, insists on defining the people as "a mass, and therefore –for mass means dough—passive and plastic" (155). For their part, the middle classes "incarnate intelligence;" but this is an intelligence suited only to technical expertise; they must "master a technique" and "obey" the "theory and practice" of their technique: "They are bound to submit to the discipline of things" (157). As concerns Madariaga's definition of the aristocracy as comprising "the best," this too is an idea that he derives from Ortega who, in his 1922 *España invertebrada* had argued: "Herein lies the elemental creative mechanism of all societies: the exemplarity of the few articulates itself in the docility of the many. The result is that their example spreads and those who are inferior perfect themselves by adopting the sense of those who are superior" (87).

In keeping with this elitist conception of a "vertebrate" or hierarchical society, Madariaga constructs an aristocratic heroic type who is destined to govern the masses and lead them by example. These aristocratic heroes are "men with the gift of creative intuition;" they are "sculptors of people" who "assume that in their case leadership is a duty and a natural function, and they devote themselves to it with a self-denial which springs from a right intuition of the aims to be achieved" (Madariaga 1937, 159-160). Also like Ortega's elites, who are called to service by a selfless sense of vocation, Madariaga's aristocrats are self-selecting: "He knows himself to be one because he hears himself called to his high and arduous endeavor by an internal voice –his vocation" (169). The heroic character of Madariaga's aristocrats is likewise founded on ascetic discipline and self-denial: "For the first duty of the aristocrat is to master himself. Discipline is the first law of his life [...] a life of virile energy disciplined to action [...] He owns himself in order to give himself. His vocation dictates to him his task. His intellectual love makes him a slave of it" (170). In all these aspects, Madariaga's aristocratic heroes recall the regenerating heroes imagined, in Restoration Spain, by Ganivet, Unamuno, Maeztu, and Ortega.

Indeed, Madariaga's heroic aristocrats are like Don Quixote: "The aristocrat fights on two fronts: that of outward reality, which he endeavors to model and shape so as to fit his own inner vision, and which revolts and bites his hands, and the front of inward reality, where he meets the weak and frail man within [...] His duties clearly follow this rule; self-denial, but not self-negation" (171). In his *Don Quixote: An Introductory Essay in Psychology*, Madariaga refers to Don Quixote in similar terms as "the man who had set himself to live only to serve" (162). This aristocratic self-denial is the source of what Madariaga calls Don Quixote's "moral authority" (119).

Don Quixote's moral authority, which is based in ascetic discipline and self-denial, is a complement to Cervantes' moral authority as a would-be modern and liberal imperialist. Together, these two forms of moral authority define Madariaga's understanding of modern liberalism. It is in the name of this liberalism that he uses the *Quixote* to defend Spanish

imperial values and to affirm that, by reason of these noble civilizing ideals, Spanish culture and the Hispanic world at large can offer the modern world a much needed example of imperial moral authority.

IV. The Black Legend, Whitewashed

In his historical texts, which treat the rise and fall of the Spanish empire, Madariaga complains of the tendency among western Europeans as well as North and South Americans to deride Spain for the systematic forms of cruelty and religious intolerance that marked its conquest and colonization of the Americas. In a similar vein, he laments the creation, by these putative enemies of Spain, of the so-called black legend. According to this legend, which Julián Juderías first defined in his 1914 *La Leyenda Negra*, Spain is synonymous with tyranny, intellectual obscurantism, and a decidedly counter-reformation, anti-enlightenment, pre-modern and backward culture. Madariaga therefore understands his job as an historian of Spain and Latin America to consist of dispelling this legend. But rather than produce a critical revisionist history of Spanish imperialism, he is pleased to counter the black legend with what, following Benjamin Keen, may be thought of as a white legend (706). Indeed, by countering the black legend with this white legend, Madariaga practices what Renato Rosaldo has theorized as imperialist nostalgia: “Imperialist nostalgia uses a pose of ‘innocent yearning’ both to capture people’s imaginations and to conceal its complicity with often brutal domination” (69-70).

Madariaga’s nostalgic whitewashing strategy is two-fold. He argues that Spain’s imperial culture was actually driven by humanistic and Christian ideals; and that those who insist on blackening this historical record are motivated, in great part, either by envy or by the desire to justify as truly enlightened and civilizing the violent expansion of their own empires. Representative of the first moment is the following critique of the black legend, which Madariaga offers in defense of Spain’s conquistadors: “The gold-looting Spaniard is splashed large over the page; but the Christianizing Spaniard who put a stop to the burying of wives alive and to the eating of war prisoners does not figure in the story at all” (Madariaga 1962, 78). Representative of the second moment is this critique of the era of US imperial expansion: “This era of struggle and spirited expansion necessitated as a psychological adjunct a systematic denigration of the adversary [i.e., Spain]. A good deal of the mud has stuck” (Madariaga 1962, 81). It is thus with an eye to scraping the mud off the façade of Spain’s imperial legacy that Madariaga undertakes to alter the historical interpretation of Spain’s conquest and colonization of the Americas. What according to the black legend was a violent history of destruction becomes, according to Madariaga’s nostalgic imperialism, a civilizing history of enlightenment.

The Spanish empire, argues Madariaga, was based on what, to his mind, were liberal, indeed even democratic, religious and political ideals. With regard to religion, he argues in his 1947 *The Rise of the Spanish American Empire*, that “a deep-lying spiritual equality prevailed among the races” in colonial Spanish America (21). This spiritual equality was matched by a political impartiality whereby the monarchy recognized the “human equality of all the vassals of the King before the law and justice” (26). This political equality belies the “old prejudice of Anglo-Saxons,” reasons Madariaga, who believe that the Spanish empire did not make room for democratic institutions: “The Spanish tradition,” he writes in this regard, “was not parliamentary but municipal. The municipal community was a landowning democracy. It reached a considerable development, particularly in Castile, where it became a kind of small republic, with

its own army and flag. This was the municipal spirit which the Spaniards transferred to the New World” (Madariaga 1962, 60).

Madariaga’s nostalgic whitewashing of the black legend involves far more than this defense of Spain’s putatively democratic and liberal religious and political traditions. It also encompasses the defense of the empire’s most illiberal institutions, chief among them the inquisitorial Church and the absolute monarchy. Incredibly, he presents them both as institutions that were dedicated to the advancement of enlightenment.

The Inquisition, as Madariaga understands it, was a source of unity for the Spanish commonwealth. “The idea that it was a dark institution bent on denying to the human spirit all avenues of development by suppressing free thinking or free discussion is a superstition of some Protestant free-thinkers which free-thinking free-thinkers should avoid,” he argues with the linguistic flair of a Spanish baroque poet (Madariaga 1947, 37). He even goes so far as to suggest that in the three-hundred years that it was active in Latin America, the Inquisition was responsible for fewer deaths and much less terror and torture than those brought on by with hunts in Protestant Germany, England, France, Holland, and New England (147). What is more, he goes out of his way to point out that the Church in Latin America did not merely look after the spiritual well being of the native populations, but their physical health as well. “The friars were untiring organizers of hospitals and from the earliest days conquered the natives by the self-denial with which they nursed them in their illnesses” (51). Finally, he claims that the inquisition did not stand in the way of “true research into nature,” but actually trained humanists and favored “enlightenment” (176). To that end, he points to the case of Sahagún, whose ethnographic study of New Spain helped lay the foundation of modern anthropology, cartography, linguistics, and botany.

But Madariaga overstates the case, even going so far as to suggest that this same spirit of scientific discovery was the driving force behind Spain’s conquest and colonization of the Americas. In his conquest of Mexico, Madariaga tells us, Hernán Cortés was chiefly motivated by an “ever enlightened curiosity” (29). The examples of Sahagún and Cortés, he argues, “counsel discretion to those who have condemned the Spanish conquest on the ground that it destroyed the antiquities of Mexico” (29). To the contrary, Madariaga sustains, “the crown kept alive this scientific interest” and understood that its imperial expansion accorded with the enlightening “task of exploration” (29).

With this defense of the supposedly enlightening influence of both the inquisitorial Church and the absolute monarchy, Madariaga paints an image of the conquest and colonization of the Americas that largely ignores the systematic forms of cruelty and violent destructive force with which the conquistadors and their religious counterparts in fact treated the native populations as well as the slaves whom they would eventually import from Africa to replenish the dying populations of indigenous peoples condemned to labor in the silver and gold mines of Spanish America. Rather than critique the cultural violence of forced religious conversions, and rather than denounce the racial economics of slavery, Madariaga celebrates the deeds of friars and conquistadors alike as feats of spiritual enlightenment and scientific discovery. “The necessity of converting the Indians and of planting the Christian tree as firmly as possible in that heathen land, was the guiding principle which ruled over all this enlightening activity,” he smugly concludes (30-31).

Evidently, the purpose of this nostalgic whitewashing is to dispel the influence of the black legend and draw attention away from the brutality of Spain’s conquest and colonization of the Americas. In order to complete this process, Madariaga must adopt a pose of innocent

longing not only in regard to the rise of the Spanish American empire, but also with respect to its decline. According to Latin American *libertadores* like Simón Bolívar, Spain was doomed to lose control of its colonies by reason of its cultural backwardness and political tyranny. Madariaga counters this explanation of the decline of the Spanish empire—an explanation that is central to the black legend—, by arguing that what was to blame for that decline was not Spanish tyranny, but rather the anarchy that Spanish Americans had inherited from Spain. “Everywhere, in the vast body politic of the immense empire, the forces of local or individual selfishness pull divergently and waste away the collective substance of the commonwealth [...] Authority disintegrates and anarchy swarms everywhere” (71-72).

This decadent anarchy, Madariaga insists, is Spanish at heart:

Anarchy is the natural state of the Spaniard. Spaniards—whether European or Creole—start with a primordial and unreasoned opposition to all law, however well established and justified. Distance from authority suits them admirably. Spaniards always end by devouring their institutions with the acid of their corrosive individualities. In the Indies [...] every one of the organs of collective life gradually tended to take the shape of the instrument which the man who wielded it needed for his personal purpose. (283)

This self-serving anarchism, reasons Madariaga, undermines “the collective spirit needed to make institutions live and grow” (290). Thus it is anarchy, and not the double tyranny of Spain’s inquisitorial Church and its absolute monarchy, that explains for Madariaga the decline of both Spain and its colonies into a state of political chaos. “We had been depicted [by the black legend] a Spanish king despotically oppressing the Indies. We find the Indies living as they pleased, corroding with their anarchy the institutions which the Crown endeavors to maintain” (290).

The decline of Spain and Latin America is not only political however. It is also cultural. According to Madariaga, the anarchism of the Spaniards combines with another two “permanent features of the Spanish character” to generate a state of cultural decadence: namely “a tendency toward idleness, and a tendency to neglect technique” (297). The consequence of this intellectual laziness and neglect for modern science and technology is the decline of Spanish prestige and cultural influence. “Spain dropped out of the list of great powers because she ceased to be abreast with the others in the struggle of man with nature” (318). Spain’s timid enlightenment and cultural backwardness is both a curse and a blessing in disguise, reasons Madariaga:

Spain had kept her Empire, if not altogether closed and isolated, at least screened from the world [...] shunted off from the main stream of history. This main stream was leading men away from the Christian fold, through the Renaissance and the Reformation, to free-thinking humanism towards the era of the Machine which is now swallowing us. The Spanish world was, and to a great extent, still is, on the margin of that evolution of western man [...] The Spanish world did not accompany the rest of men in their glorious and terrible experiences through the hell of the machine age. (320)

There is a reversible dualism at work here, which permits Madariaga to nostalgically suggest that Spain’s cultural backwardness and obscurantism have saved both it and its ex-colonies in the Americas from the industrial and dehumanized “hell of the machine age”. It is precisely by virtue of this saving grace that Spain and its putatively liberal imperial legacy can be

called upon, in the modern age of the machine, to provide the world with an alternative set of spiritual and cultural values capable of overcoming the nihilistic Cold War logic of mutually assured destruction.

V. *Sanco Panco* or a World without Moral Authority

In his political satire of Franco's Spain and of the Cold War era, the 1964 novel titled *Sanco Panco*, Madariaga presents a grotesque vision of an Hispanic world that has been stripped of its imperial moral authority and sunken into a state of moral depravity and political corruption. As such, this "novel-fantasy," as Madariaga calls it, offers its readers an inverted duplicate of the otherwise uplifting image that he develops of Spain's imperial legacy in his 1962 *Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear*. Published only two years apart, these texts complement each other. In them, Madariaga makes the same basic argument concerning moral authority: to wit, that the contemporary world is in dire need of it and that Spain's liberal imperial legacy can provide an inspiring example of it. Whereas in his political satire of 1964 Madariaga makes this argument indirectly and ironically, in his political treatise of 1962 he does so explicitly and in all seriousness.

As Alexia Dotras Bravo has demonstrated, *Sanco Panco* is written in imitation of the style of Cervantes' *Quixote*. Among the various stylistic aspects that Madariaga borrows, Dotras Bravo highlights the most relevant. The novel begins, much like the *Quixote*, with a prologue to the reader in which Madariaga claims that he is not the true author of the novel, only its step-fatherly transmitter. The complete title of the novel -- *La más verídica que verdadera historia de Sanco Panco: Escribióla Manuel de Corzantes y la da hoy a luz Salvador de Madariaga*—is another play on this cervantine technique, by means of which the narrator treats the story he is telling as if it were based on a completed history that he has found. For their part, the chapter headings also mimic the style of those in the *Quixote*. The novel also contains poetry that is reminiscent of the poems Cervantes intersperses throughout the *Quixote*. And, in what is perhaps the most obvious reference to the *Quixote*, Madariaga names the protagonist of his novel, Sanco Panco, which is a corruption of both Sancho Panza and Francisco Franco (Dotras Bravo 279-282).

There are also thematic correspondences between Cervantes's *Quixote* and Madariaga's *Sanco Panco* that are worth noting. In the *Quixote*, the Duke and Duchess trick Sancho into believing that he has become the rightful governor of a nonexistent island kingdom. Likewise, in Madariaga's satire of Franco's Spain, Sanco Panco is portrayed as the stand-in king and dictator of an isolated nation. The key difference is that, whereas in the *Quixote* Sancho has access to Don Quixote's wise counsel and moral guidance, in *Sanco Panco* the Sancho-like dictator is completely left to his own devices and vices. Another important thematic element that both novels share is their protagonists' belief in the existence of giants, monsters, and wizards. In the *Quixote*, this element of fantasy contributes to Cervantes' burlesque treatment of novels of chivalry. In *Sanco Panco*, by contrast, the fantastic rather serves to underscore Madariaga's satiric treatment of the Franco regime. The use of the fantastic in this mode is in line with what Eric Rabkin has theorized as a "literary political dystopia" (140-150). The overall aesthetic of the novel is thus appropriately grotesque and absurd. As such, it would seem to represent an attempt by Madariaga to revive Valle-Inclán's inimitable *esperpentos*. This is not however the case. In the *esperpentos* of Valle-Inclán, the grotesque and absurd serve to criticize Spain's classical and tragic heroes; in Madariaga's novel this aesthetic rather serves the opposite

function. Madariaga uses the absurdly grotesque and grotesquely absurd aesthetic of dystopian fantasy to criticize the Franco regime, among other things, because it has failed to live up to Spain's heroic ideals of imperialism. Absent Don Quixote and his aristocratic example of self-denial, the best that Sancho can hope to do is what Sancho Panco does i.e., misgovern his isolated, island-like kingdom.

The novel, which is divided into sixty relatively brief chapters, does not offer much in the way of a plot. The events transpire in a silly, bizarre, and incongruous world that is governed by four giants: Yantasi3n (Hitler), Sumale3n (Mussolini), Ursio (the USSR), and Usio (the USA). The protagonist, Sancho Panco, aims to become ruler of his native Hesperia (Spain). In order to rise to power, he attains the assistance of Yantasi3n and Sumale3n (that is, of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, respectively). However, after their defeat at the hands of Ursio and Usio, Sancho Panco discovers that he must now befriend these unfriendly giants too. Sancho Panco deals with them deftly and expediently, negotiating with the one, then with the other, and eventually playing them off each other. The result is the tale of a country that has been made subject to the whims and self-interests of, not only Sancho Panco and his corrupt minions, but these two monstrous giants as well.

By representing the US and USSR as tyrannical giants, Madariaga suggests that they, like Franco, are essentially bullies and devoid of any moral authority. In this sense, Madariaga writes in *Latin America between the Eagle and the Bear*: "Authority is the very opposite of force. Force is a bully that steals obedience. Authority is given acquiescence out of the abundance of heart" (68). To illustrate his meaning, Madariaga adds: "The power of Franco is immense. His authority is nil" (68). To the extent to which the two nuclear powered Cold War empires sought to determine the course of political events in Spain and Latin America, and did so by associating themselves with dictatorial bullies like Franco in Spain and Castro in Cuba, they too are, in Madariaga's view, deserving of ridicule.

Indeed, when the three are taken together -the Franco regime, the United States, and the Soviet Union-, they form a trio of treason. In this sense, Madariaga asserts that:

When the United States signed a treaty of alliance with Franco, the pro-West sector of Spanish opinion felt betrayed [...] Admiral Sherman arrived in Spain in the early nineteen-fifties to start negotiations for naval and air bases [...] turning the whole of the country into at least a potential Gibraltar [...] That the United States should have accepted from [Franco]-and from him alone-what only Spain could give is one of the somber thoughts that blacken the horizon of every liberal Spaniard. (100-101)

The communism of the Soviets fares no better in Madariaga's estimation, as it represents the total elimination of individual, civic, political and economic liberties:

The mere existence of a dictatorship in a country acts inevitably as a preparation of that country for the advent of communism [...] The dictator creates habits of submission without discussion to the powers that be. He is by necessity, if not by ideology (for which he does not care), a totalitarian. Used to an arbitrary totalitarianism, many of his subjects ripen into communists since, not unreasonably, they see in communism a totalitarian system which, at any rate, is dignified by an ideology. (22)

In a similar vein, he adds:

We are everywhere seeing the forms of liberal democracy jeopardized; twisted and tortured by foreign oppression in communist-dominated countries [...] Disorder and confusion are the inevitable dust-clouds in the wake of such agitated events. Now, disorder and confusion are as favourable to communism as they are injurious to liberal democracy. (xi)

And so it is that, by reason of their associations with dictatorships, both the United States and the Soviet Union do injury to the empire of liberty that Madariaga would like to see spread across the globe.

In *Sanco Panco* Madariaga examines the injury that the Franco regime has done to Spain's allegedly liberal imperial legacy. Emptied of its moral authority, this legacy is reduced to a shadow of its historical vitality. It is in this sense that Madariaga has Sanco Panco proudly declare: "What matters is not the idea, but the word" / "Lo que importa no es la idea sino la palabra" (37). Elsewhere in the novel, Sanco Panco elaborates on this theme, musing that:

Our words of yesteryear are subtle and bend to our sovereign will; they take its shape, like wax does the shape of a seal. We will repeat the mottos of the past and give them new meaning.

[Nuestras palabras de antaño son [...] verbo sutil que se doblega a nuestra voluntad soberana y de ella toma su forma como la cera del sello. Repetiremos los dichos de antaño y les daremos un sentido nuevo. (134)]

As dictator, Sanco Panco remakes the past in his own image; manipulating the imperial discourse of the past, he empties it out of all meaningful content in order to promote "the exaltation and glorification of emptiness" / "La exaltación y la glorificación de lo hueco" (142). This emptiness, like the hollowed out cave in which the dictator lives, represents the void of moral authority at the heart of the regime. Fittingly, the dictatorship creates an inverted world where night is day and day is night, and where vice becomes virtue and virtue is twisted into vice:

We are in truth the negation of what people call liberal democracy. Where they have lights, I have shadows. And vice versa.

[Somos en efecto una negativa de eso que llaman las democracias liberales [...] Donde [ellos] tiene[n] las luces yo tengo las sombras. Y viceversa. (122)]

By means of his quixotism, Madariaga would set this inverted world upright again. He would have the Sancho-like regime of Francisco Franco governed properly by the wise counsel of Don Quixote and his would be "aristocratic" moral authority: an authority, it should be recalled, that is born out of ascetic self-discipline and self-sacrificing idealism. Of course, Madariaga acknowledges that in the Cold War era, in the "hell of the machine age," Spain has neither the authority nor the force with which to impose its will on the world. The requisite moral authority is a thing of the past; it is available to the present only in the form of Spain's legacy of liberal imperialism. The requisite force belongs to the two imperial "bullies" of the

Cold War era. Of the two, argues Madariaga, only the United States stands a chance to attain the moral authority needed to govern the world, according to Madariaga's liberal ideals.

In order for this to come about however, the United States must humbly acknowledge its loss of moral authority and seek, once again, to gain the admiration of all those liberals who have come to feel betrayed by reason of its association with dictatorships in Spain, in Latin America, and elsewhere in the world. With regard to this "American betrayal," as he calls it, Madariaga writes:

It is doubtful whether to this day the American people realize the devastating harm which such behaviour on the part of the United States does to the moral authority of the United States, and therefore to world peace. The jeering smiles with which any favourable comment on the United States is met in the whole of Latin America, where do they come from if not from this despairing cynicism and disbelief? What avails it that the Pentagon has won a few bases in Spain if the United States has lost a continent? (Madariaga 1962, 102-103)

The United States can recuperate its lost moral authority, argues Madariaga, by embracing liberalism, which he characterizes as the only forward-looking political school of thought there is. "For good or ill," he concludes, "the U.S.A. must incarnate this philosophy, and the defense of this way of life [...] must become the primordial duty of the nation which was born under the banner of freedom" (187). Thus Madariaga calls on the United States to conduct itself as would a liberal Spanish imperialist: that is, with a sense of "duty" and the willingness "for good or ill" to sacrifice its worldly interests in name of a higher, civilizing ideal.

VI. Exile, Empire, and the Crisis of Enlightenment

Madariaga's quixotism expresses his nostalgia, as an exiled Spanish intellectual, for a home that he conceives as a liberal civilizing empire. In his historical essays and political treatises as well as his cervantine criticism and quixotic novel *Sanco Panco*, he glorifies Spain's ostensibly liberal imperialism as a model of imperial moral authority for the contemporary age. Indeed, he even ventures to suggest that the world will only be saved from "the hell of the machine age" if and when the United States decides to combine its impressive military and economic force with the no-less-impressive moral authority that Madariaga uncovers in the liberal imperial legacy he constructs for Spain. As such, Madariaga's quixotism is fraught with the tensions and ambiguities of a political exile from Franco's Spain who incongruously identifies with the very same imperial cultural values that were first exalted by the Quixotists of Restoration Spain and later incorporated into the official rhetoric of Spanish National-Catholicism. In this sense, Madariaga exhibits in his exile certain tensions that are akin to those that Sebastian Faber has identified in the case of Spanish republicans who fled Franco's Spain for Mexico. These republican intellectual exiles were torn between their radical egalitarian politics, on the one hand, and their traditional, elitist, "culturalism," on the other (Faber 5). In the case of Madariaga, the fundamental tension lies between his affirmation of international liberalism and nostalgia for Spanish imperialism. This tension helps explain the historical significance of Madariaga's quixotism; and it also helps to illuminate the sense in which Madariaga's imperial nostalgia remains pregnant with theoretical implications that are pertinent

to our own postmodern predicament and the multifarious displacements that characterize it (Clifford 3).

With this fundamental tension in mind, it is worth noting that Madariaga refused to link his experience in exile to that of the thousands of nineteenth-century Spanish liberals who had fled from tyranny in Spain and, much like Madariaga would do one hundred years after them, sought refuge in London, England. As Vicente Llorens argues in his 1954 *Liberales y Románticos*, the intellectuals among this group of exiles included some of the greatest literary figures of Spain's romantic movement, from Espronceda to Zorrilla to the Duque de Rivas. For an essayist and novelist such as Madariaga, who self-identified as a liberal, this rich literary tradition of liberal Spanish exile writing must surely have represented a tradition he could have proudly claimed as his own. But Madariaga's nostalgia as a Spanish liberal in exile was not for a lost "home" that he imagined liberally. He conceived of his home imperialistically. Consequently, he did not seek, as Vicente Llorens surely did, to develop a sense of solidarity with exiled Spanish liberals from the past. That he did not do so, most certainly, is the unfortunate but understandable result of the decidedly illiberal liberalism that he championed throughout his career as a writer. Indeed, Madariaga's elitist liberalism is diametrically opposed to the democratic liberalism that Llorens identified with the Spanish liberals and romantics who had fled in the 1820s to London and, most especially, with the enlightened thinker José María Blanco White, who had fled to London as early as 1810.

Unlike Madariaga, who in the twentieth century explained the decline and fall of the Spanish empire by appealing to the idea of Spaniard's congenital anarchism, Blanco White, at the start of the nineteenth century, unequivocally identified the double tyranny of Spain's inquisitorial Church and absolute Monarchy as the principal cause of Spain's imperial demise and cultural decadence (Britt 2005a, 115). For having advanced this critique of Spanish national and imperial decadence, Blanco's contemporaries in Spain came to view him as a traitor. Over the course of the nineteenth century, he was simply removed from the annals of Spanish literary and intellectual history, and when he did make an appearance, such as in Menéndez y Pelayo's 1882 *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*, it was only to be vilified as a heretic, libertine, and turncoat. Menéndez Pidal would sustain similar opinions in his 1957 *España y su historia*. Madariaga, whose elitist liberalism and glorification of organic democracy placed him in the same ideological camp as Menéndez Pidal, preferred to treat Blanco White in much the same manner: that is to say, he chose to say nothing of any real consequence about him.

Due, in part, to the influence of Llorens' analysis of Spain's liberal exiles of the nineteenth century, the figure of Blanco White in particular has come to epitomize the tendency among Hispanists to idealize intellectual exile and associate it indiscriminately with dissidence. This view has gained ground however not only because of the influence that Llorens' rigorous work as a literary and intellectual historian has had on subsequent treatments of Blanco White; it is due as well to the considerable influence of Juan Goytisolo who, in 1972, published the *Obra inglesa de Blanco White*, an anthology of strategically selected texts that Goytisolo translated beautifully into Spanish, but had to publish in Buenos Aires because in Franco's Spain Blanco White was still considered to be a *persona non grata*. As Alison Ribeiro de Menezes has demonstrated, Goytisolo's translation and publication of Blanco White's work contributes to his overall strategy to "canonize dissidence" and rehabilitate an "anti-establishment tradition" on the basis of which intellectual exiles may construct solidarity with other Spanish exiles and dissidents from across the ages (29).

In his lengthy introduction to the *Obra inglesa*, Goytisolo explains the logic behind this strategy to associate exile with a tradition of dissidence:

If I feel any impulse toward solidarity, it is never with the image of Spain that arises from the reign of the Catholic Kings, but with its victims: Jews, Muslims, new Christians, Lutherans, encyclopedists, liberals, anarchists, Marxists.

[Si algún impulso de solidaridad siento, no es jamás con la imagen del país que emerge a partir del reinado de los Reyes Católicos, sino con sus víctimas: judíos, musulmanes, cristianos nuevos, luteranos, enciclopedistas, liberales, anarquistas, marxistas. (91)]

All of these victims of National Catholic Spain were, of course, forced into exile. They were forced away from home, forced into a state of isolation, and alienated from their communities. Goytisolo does not suppose that by affirming solidarity with these other Spanish exiles, he will create an expatriated nation of exiles. In this regard, he clarifies that the negative solidarity he has in mind can only serve as the basis for the creation of a trans-historical community of exiled freethinkers:

In the most decisive historical moments, the side I would have liked to defend was always defeated. In truth, can the mere vindication of unrealized possibilities, of squashed dreams, and of projects that have been condemned to this day to failure be called patriotism? We would do better to call it a fraternity of outsiders, pariahs, and marginalized minorities.

[En los momentos históricos decisivos, el bando que hubiera querido defender fue derrotado siempre. En puridad, ¿puede darse el nombre de patriotismo a la mera reivindicación de posibilidades fallidas, de tentativas aplastadas, de empresas condenadas hasta ahora al fracaso? Llamémoslo mejor fraternidad de *outsiders*, parias y marginales. (91)]

For Goytisolo then, the affirmation of solidarity with other Spanish exiles does not, in truth, put an end to their or his exile. At best, this solidarity among dissidents constitutes a community of marginalized, isolated, alienated “outsiders”. In the terms of Guillén’s theory of exile, they are people who have been expelled from the “center” of the imperial “circle” and hurled into a cultural “void” where they can hope for nothing better than a life of “non-being”. Still, insofar as the solidarity that Goytisolo constructs around dissidence is expressed negatively, it serves to negate the “non-being,” isolation, and alienation of exile. Significantly also, it is on the basis of that negation that he constructs an alternative Spanish history that, although it is neither national nor imperial, is however multicultural. In opposition to the religiously intolerant and politically tyrannical culture of imperial Spain, this multicultural Spain can claim as its legacy multiple traditions of enlightenment, from Jewish and Muslim mysticism or Mayan and Incan shamanism to the liberals, anarchists, and Marxists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Insofar as Goytisolo fashions himself as an exiled cultural dissident, his ideas on exile may seem to adhere seamlessly with postmodern theories that equate displacement with an anti-imperial stance. I have in mind theories such as Deleuze and Guattari’s, according to which post-modernity presents us all, insofar as we are displaced, with an opportunity to express our

“anti-oedipal desire” and live freely as “deterritorialized nomads” or Said’s theory of a fragmentary “resistance culture” that is always and already opposed to “the cultural integrity of empire”. But whereas Goytisolo clearly conceives his exile in opposition to the specific culture of Spanish imperialism, these postmodern theories tend, as Caren Kaplan has argued, “to absorb difference and create ahistorical amalgams” that erase historical and cultural specificity, proposing in their place a rather generic and supposedly ubiquitous postmodern condition or predicament of unsettled and unsettling displacements (2). This ahistorical tendency to oversimplify the relationship between exile and empire is at work across both a wide range of postmodern discourses on displacement --from theoretical discussions of diaspora to the analysis of tourism--, and across an equally broad array of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences --from anthropology to feminism. Consequently, there is an urgent need to, as Kaplan puts it, “pose the question of displacement in such a way as to render it historically and politically viable” (25-26). This, reasons Kaplan, can be achieved only by “situating” postmodern discourses of exile and displacement “more specifically and to demystify their erasures of history as well as place” (4). Surely, insofar as Goytisolo ties his exile to the imperial legacy of Spain, he may be said to “situate” the successive waves of Spanish exile historically and to “demystify” the erasures of place (literally the *dis-place*-ments) imposed by the abstractions of postmodern theory.

The case of Madariaga is fundamentally different. It is true that Madariaga, like Goytisolo, conceives his exile in relation to Spain’s imperial legacy. But whereas Goytisolo highlights the crucial role that exile and displacement have played in the expansion of that empire, Madariaga tends to ignore it; and when he does acknowledge it, he whitewashes it, presenting it as a necessary evil in an otherwise civilizing and liberating process of enlightenment. Indeed, Madariaga’s solidarity is not with those who have been exiled and displaced by this process, but with the empire that conquers and colonizes. He justifies this identification by claiming that Spain’s empire was founded on democratic and liberal values that arose spontaneously and organically among Spaniards who, although anarchistic at heart, naturally recognized the need for a hierarchical organization of life. This organic democracy, as Madariaga calls it, forms the basis of the Spanish empire’s moral authority. Thus his exilic nostalgia for empire is, in truth, nostalgia for a pre-modern imperialism that conquers and colonizes in order to spread the aristocratic moral values Madariaga associates with organic democracy. He is nostalgic, in other words, for a kind of democracy that predates the decadence of modern democracy and its perceived convergence with totalitarianism.

There are two instances of this decadence that are pertinent for Madariaga. The first, for reasons that are obvious enough given his status as a political exile from Franco’s Spain, is the failure of the Second Republic to live up to its emancipatory promise; its decline into a state of veritable anarchy; and its eventual defeat at the hands of German, Italian, and Spanish fascists. The second, less obvious, instance of this decadent convergence of modern democracy with totalitarianism concerns the expansion of the United State’s so-called Empire of Liberty. The issue here is not simply a matter of patriotism. Madariaga, it is true, denounces the fact that U.S. national and imperial expansion conveniently relied on the collapse of the Spanish empire in the Americas, the Caribbean, and the Philippines; but his real point of contention is that, in becoming an empire, the United States betrayed its own enlightened and liberal democratic ideals.

In both instances, the convergence of modern democracy with totalitarianism is due to a lack of moral authority. Another way to put this, in Madariaga’s own terms, is to say that neither

the Second Republic in Spain nor the United States of America are organic democracies. The sort of natural aristocratic leadership that Madariaga believes is needed to keep the anarchic tendencies of the masses in check governs neither of them. Thus, what is ultimately at issue for Madariaga in the perceived decadence of modern democracy is the aristocracy's loss of sovereignty. By placing blame for the decadence of modern democracy squarely on the shoulders of the anarchic masses, Madariaga suggests that displacement is at the core of this problem: the displacement, that is, of gifted aristocratic elites by incompetent anarchistic mobs.

Postmodern theorists of exile and displacement tend to see this issue of lost or displaced sovereignty from a perspective that is diametrically opposed to Madariaga's. Whereas Madariaga views the displacement of the aristocracy by the masses as a constraint on liberty, postmodern theorists, from Deleuze to Clifford, have wanted to see in this displacement of sovereignty a situation that is ripe with revolutionary potential. Where Madariaga sees a loss of sovereignty, they see an increase. But there is something amiss in all this. Neither party to this debate actually questions the political order as such. Fundamentally, they agree that what is at issue is who within the political order should be invested with certain powers and who should not. Madariaga adopts a pose of innocent yearning for aristocratic self-government that conceals the often-brutal practices of conquest, colonization, displacement, and exile by means of which the Spanish empire consolidated and increased its power. For their part, postmodern theorists like Deleuze and Guattari also adopt a pose of innocent yearning for revolutionary anarchistic self-government that conceals how totalitarian states use displacement in order to concentrate their power. By adopting these respective poses of innocent yearning, Madariaga as much as Deleuze and Guattari ingenuously pretend that they are not part of the problem, but rather the solution. The real issue with the gradual decline of modern democracy and its eventual convergence with imperial and totalitarian forms of power is not, however, a matter of determining who should be invested with sovereignty but that the modern notion of democratic sovereignty is in and of itself in a state of profound crisis.

As first theorized by Horkheimer and Adorno in the 1940s, this crisis can be conceived as the result of a dialectical inversion of values. "Enlightenment," they write at the start of their seminal *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*, "understood in the widest sense as the advance of thought, has always aimed at liberating human beings from fear and installing them as masters. Yet the wholly enlightened earth is radiant with triumphant calamity" (1). This crisis of enlightenment, they argue, has transformed enlightenment thought into an instrument of domination and re-established the preeminence of primitive forms of authoritarian power. Accordingly, they identify enlightenment -not as Madariaga does, with the utopian promise of Bacon's imperial myth of the New Atlantis-, but rather with totalitarianism and the industrial mobilization and extermination of millions of people, the propagandistic manipulation and deception of the masses, and the destruction of human experience and historical memory.

In the 1960s, Lewis Mumford complemented this critique with his own theory of the nihilistic tendencies of industrial life. In *The Myth of the Machine*, Mumford identifies "megatechnics" or the "spreading of the empire of the machine" as the core problem of enlightened modern society. On this point, Madariaga would agree. But whereas for Madariaga, what he called the "Monster-Machine" was mostly a matter of economic dominance by either the USSR or the United States of their respective areas of influence, for Mumford, "megatechnics" seeks "the universal imposition of the megamachine as the ultimate instrument of pure 'intelligence', whereby every other manifestation of human potentialities become suppressed or completely eliminated" (158). This nihilistic attitude leads to the formation of the nuclear war

machine, a machine that requires as a condition for its “effective operation [...] a permanent state of war” (256). The crisis of enlightenment, according to this analysis, essentially empowers the perverse logic of the Cold War: a logic that enables “the means of death” to “outpace the means of life” (301).

At the start of the twenty-first century, this regression toward primitive forms of total domination and the nihilism that underlies it remains the single greatest problem that we face. In our time, the crisis of enlightenment has acquired a truly global dimension: global warming and ecological destruction brought on by the technological and industrial domination of nature; a global “War on Terror” that threatens to impose a state of permanent war on the entire globe; and everywhere the signs of social, economic, and political disintegration associated with what Giorgio Agamben has theorized as a permanent state of exception. As Noam Chomsky has argued, we are now confronted with an urgent choice between a global profiteering hegemony and the very survival of life on the planet. Clearly, ours is not an age of enlightenment, but an age of destruction, given over to a profound sense of nihilism for which, ironically, it would seem that only the Enlightenment and its unsettling legacy of modern liberal imperialism holds a viable option. It is from out of this wreckage of the Empire of Liberty that we must salvage an understanding of sovereignty that neither isolates us from nature nor alienates us from life. I have in mind a democratic sovereignty that would be capable of inspiring and encouraging us to do more with our postmodern displacements than simply use them to express our “innocent yearnings” for a way out of what Madariaga called “the hell of the machine age”. Perhaps Madariaga’s acknowledgement as a political exile that he is at home in empire can convince us of the need to take up a similar position vis-à-vis our own postmodern displacements and the imperial culture that uses them to satisfy its insatiable lust for power.

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodore and Horkheimer, Max. *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2002.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- . *State of Exception*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2005.
- Bernaschina Schürumann, Vicente. “El último llanto de Sancho: Lucha de poderes y la interiorización de la moral de Don Quixote”. *Revista Chilena de Literatura* 78 (April 2011): 205-222.
- Bockman, Johanna. *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2011.
- Bolívar, Simón. *Carta de Jamaica*. Mexico: UNAM, 1978.
- Britt Arredondo, Christopher. *Quixotism*. New York: SUNY P, 2005a.
- . “Blanco White ante el casticismo español”. *José María Blanco White: crítica y exilio*. Eduardo Subirats ed. Barcelona: Anthropos, 2005b. 109-116.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Hegemony or Survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Close, Anthony. *The Romantic Approach to Don Quixote*. London: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Deleuze, Gille and Guattari, Felix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 2000.
- Dotras Bravo, Alexia. “Escritura cervantina en *Sanco Panco*: parodia y recreación del *Quijote* según Salvador de Madariaga”. *Anales Cervantinos* 44 (2012): 279-286.
- Faber, Sebastian. *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1975*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 2002.
- Goytisolo, Juan. *Obra inglesa de Blanco White*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Formentor, 1970.
- Guillén, Claudio. “On the Literature of Exile and Counter-Exile”. *Books Abroad* 50.2 (Spring 1976): 271-280.
- Juderías, Julián. *La leyenda negra*. Madrid: Editorial Nacional, 1960.
- Kaplan, Caren. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Keen, Benjamin. “The Black Legend Revisited: Assumptions and Realities”. *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 49. 4 (1969): 703-719.
- Llorens, Vicente. *Liberales y románticos: una emigración española en inglaterra: 1823-1834*. Madrid: Castalia, 1968.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. *Don Quixote: An Introductory Essay in Psychology*. London: Oxford UP, 1961 (1934).
- . *Hierarchy or Anarchy*. New York: Macmillan, 1937.
- . *Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear*. New York: Frederick Praeger, 1962.
- . *Presente y Porvenir de Hispanoamérica*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1959.
- . *The Rise of the Spanish-American Empire*. New York: Free Press, 1947.
- . *Sanco Panco*. Mexico: Ediciones e Impresiones Rodas, 1964.
- Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino. *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1946.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. *España y su historia*. Madrid: Minotauro, 1957.

- Mumford, Lewis. *The Myth of the Machine*. 2 vols. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1967.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *España invertebrada*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente en Alianza Editorial, 1992.
- . *La rebelión de las masas*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1937.
- Pike, Frederick. *Hispanismo: 1898-1936: Spanish Conservatives and Liberals and Their Relations with Spanish America*. London: University of Notre Dame, 1971.
- Predmore, Michael. "Madariaga's Debt to Unamuno's *Vida de Don Quixote y Sancho*". *Hispania* 47. 2 (May 1964): 288-294.
- Rabkin, Eric. *The Fantastic in Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976.
- Ribeiro de Menezes, Alison. *Juan Goytisolo: The Author as Dissident*. London: Tamesis, 2005.
- Rosaldo, Renato. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*. Madrid: Alianza, 1993.
- Valle-Inclán, Ramón del. *Luces de bohemia*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1973.