Homenaje a Rodolfo Oroz
AUCh, 5ª Serie Nº 5 (1984): 285-297

SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA AND GEORGE ORWELL: PARALLELS AND CONTRASTS

NORMAN P. SACKS
University of Wisconsin, Madison

A close examination of the work and careers of Salvador de Madariaga (1886-1978) and George Orwell (1903-1950) reveals some striking parallels and affinities, without necessarily suggesting any influence one may have had upon the other. Madariaga was a trilingual writer (Spanish, English, French), and his years of residence in England (1916-1921; 1928-1931; 1938-1972), all as an adult, were nearly equal to Orwell's entire life span.[1]

Both men did a series of broadcasts for the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). During the 1940s and 1950s, Madariaga gave a number of lectures and interviews in English for the BBC on a variety of political and literary topics, and some of the lectures were published subsequently in collections of his essays. Again, during the decade of the 1940s, Madariaga broadcast a weekly commentary in Spanish to Latin America.

Orwell, who was born in Bengal, India; who had served in the Indian Imperial Police in Burma from 1922 to 1927; and whose first novel —*Burmese Days* (1934)— was based upon his experiences in Burma, worked in the Eastern section of the BBC, broadcasting to India from 1941 to 1943. His scripts for the BBC were not included in the four-volume *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), with the exception of one piece, "The Rediscovery of Europe".[2]

[1] The information on MADARIAGA's periods of residence in England was furnished me by him in a personal letter of July 17, 1974.

[2] ORWELL did edit a volume, with an introduction, titled *Talking to India: A Selection of*

During his first period of residence in England, which coincided in part with World War I, Madariaga sent to the Spanish press a number of articles, which were collected and published in 1917 under the title *La Guerra desde Londres* (Tortosa: Editorial Monclús).[3] During World War II and after (1941-1946), Orwell regularly sent a "London Letter" to America's foremost literary magazine of that time, *Partisan Review*, edited by William Phillips and Philip Rahv, two veterans of the anti-Stalinist battles of the Depression decade of the 1930s in the United States. Orwell, along with his friend, Arthur Koestler, had been fighting in England the same battle against the pro-Soviet Union British intellectuals that Phillips and Rahv had been fighting in the United States against some American liberals, who were well disposed toward Stalin and the Soviet Union.[4]

Though Orwell was essentially a novelist and essayist, and Madariaga's multifaceted career included the writing of novels and many essays, both men shared an active career in journalism, which bridged their two main worlds of politics and literature.[5] And both contributed to raising journalism to a literary art. Madariaga's publications in newspapers and magazines were far more numerous than Orwell's. Moreover, they appeared in a number of languages, Madariaga having composed those in Spanish, English, and French himself.

Madariaga often contributed series of articles to some newspapers and journals. About two dozen articles were published in the Spanish weekly magazine, *España*, during the years 1916-1918, and some of them were incorporated into his book *La Guerra desde Londres*. In pre-Republican

---

English Language Broadcasts to India (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1943).

[3] *La guerra desde Londres* contains a selection of articles which were published in *España; El Imparcial*; and *La Publicidad*. Included in the book is a prologue by Luis Araquistain, who praised the book and called Madariaga "uno de los pocos periodistas españoles cuyos trabajos trascienden de la actualidad diaria y quedan como un valor permanente".

[4] For an account of this period in American political and cultural history, with particular attention to *Partisan Review*, see the following: WILLIAM BARRETT, *The Truants: Adventures among the Intellectuals* (New York: Anchor Books, 1983); IRVING HOWE, *A. Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Autobiography* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982); WILLIAM PHILLIPS, *A Partisan View: Five Decades of the Literary Life* (New York: Stein and Day, 1983); and PHILIP RAHV, *Essays on Literature and Politics, 1932-1972*, edited by Arabel J. Porter and Andrew J. Dvosin (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978). There are thirteen London Letters to the *Partisan Review* and five letters to Philip Rahv in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, hereafter abbreviated as *CEJL*.

[5] MADARIAGA had a high regard for the importance of the journalist in Western society. See his essay, *Le journaliste comme historien du présent*, which appears in the volume *Verantwortung* offered to Willy Bretscher, editor of the Swiss paper, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (Mélanges Willy Bretscher, 1957).

times, especially during the period 1925-1930, Madariaga contributed a number of articles, under the pseudonym 'Sancho Quijano', to the well-known Spanish newspaper *El Sol*. In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, a series of articles by Madariaga appeared in the newspaper *Ahora*. During the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, there were series of articles by Madariaga published in ABC; *Gaceta Ilustrada*; *Revista de Occidente*; and *Destino* (the latter series having been published in 1975 by Ediciones Destino in Barcelona under the title *A la orilla del río de los sucesos*). Apart from articles in Spanish published in Spain, it is well to call attention to a number of articles published by Madariaga in the organ of the Paris-based *Congreso por la libertad de la cultura*, namely *Cuadernos*, during the 1950s and 1960s, some of which were later incorporated into a two-volume collection of articles by Madariaga titled *Cosas y Gentes* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1979); and to the numerous articles published in the New York-based journal *Ibérica*, collected and published in 1982 by Espasa-Calpe under the title *Mi respuesta*.[6]

Madariaga's prolific activity in journalism may be observed also in the English-language press, both in Great Britain and the United States. His articles have appeared in the following British journals and newspapers: *The Living Age; The Spectator; The* (London) *Times; Observer; The Manchester Guardian; World Liberalism; The Listener*; and *The Tablet*. And in the United States, Madariaga's articles may be found in such journals and newspapers as the following: *Atlantic Monthly; The Forum; Yale Review; Foreign Affairs; New Republic; Newsweek; Saturday Review of Literature; Current History; New York Times: New York Times Magazine; Christian Science Monitor*; and others. On occasion, Madariaga contributed series of articles, for example, to *The Forum*[7] and the *New York Times Magazine*.

Madariaga's journalistic activity reflects an interest on his part in the following themes, among others: Spain; the fate of Europe; national character; the Spanish language; Don Quijote; nationalism; Fascism; Marx and Marxism; the Soviet Union; the Franco regime; the Hispanic family of nations; democracy's battle for survival; liberalism; the Press; freedom; equality; political concepts in general; political and cultural figures, both Spanish and international; the Monroe Doctrine and its effects; human rights; disarmament; Gibraltar; Europe and America; and world government.

[6] For a discussion of some aspects of MADARIAGA's *Ibérica* articles, see my "Salvador de Madariaga's Liberal Response in the United States", *Hispania*, Vol. 66 (March 1983), pp. 127-129.

[7] All but three of the sixteen chapters of MADARIAGA's book titled *Americans* (1930) had been previously published as articles in *The Forum* (New York).

A fine definition of 'democracy', according to Madariaga, was government by public opinion, and so he was an inveterate writer of letters to the editor, especially to prestigious British and American newspapers, such as the London *Times* and the *New York Times*, in an effort to influence public opinion. His letter writing may be considered an extension of his journalistic activities.

Apart from his "London Letters" to the American journal, *Partisan Review*, and an occasional article for a few American magazines, virtually all of Orwell's journalistic activity was confined to British periodicals and newspapers, including the following: *Observer; Encounter; Tribune; Manchester Evening News; Horizon; Time and Tide; New Leader* (London); *New English Weekly; New Statesman and Nation; Adelphi; Polemic;* and *The Listener*.[8]

Orwell wrote reports and book reviews regularly for the *Observer* from March 1942 to his death in January 1950. He first began reviewing for the Socialist weekly *Tribune* in March 1940, and by the end of November 1943, he began work as its literary editor. It was in the *Tribune* that Orwell published a series of seventy-six articles bearing the generic title "As I Please", all but three of which appear in the four-volume *CEJL*. He began in December 1943 to write a weekly column about books in the *Manchester Evening News*, and he continued in this assignment until November 1946. Many of Orwell's best essays and reviews appeared in the literary monthly *Horizon*, from 1940 to 1950. *Horizon* was the most influential literary journal of Great Britain during the 1940s. And in the short-lived *Polemic*, Orwell contributed, after the war, some of his finest essays, such as *Notes on Nationalism; The Prevention of Literature; Second Thoughts on James Burnham*; and *Politics* vs. *Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels*, all reprinted in *CEJL*. *Horizon* helped to establish Orwel among the best-known essayists in Great Britain; and *Partisan Review* made him known in the United States, through his Letters from London during World War II, as a leading spokesman of English Left intellectuals.[9]

Orwell's official biographer, Bernard Crick, has summarized the themes that recur in Orwell's journalism and essays: "love of nature, love of books and literature, dislike of mass production, distrust of intellectuals, suspicion of government, contempt for and warnings against

[8] At least four BBC talks by Orwell were included in the *CEJL*, but these were not the result of his activity in the Eastern Service of BBC. They were published in *The Listener*, and include the following: "The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda"; "Tolstoy and Shakespeare"; "The Meaning of a Poem"; and "Literature and Totalitarianism".

[9] See RICHARD REES, *George Orwell-Fugitive from the Camp of Victory* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962), p. 70.

totalitarianism, advice on making, mending or growing things for yourself, anti-imperialism and anti-racialism, detestation of censorship, and praise of plain language, plain speaking, the good in the past, decency, fraternity, individuality, liberty, egalitarianism and patriotism.[10]

It is evident from what has been said of both Madariaga and Orwell as journalists that they have in common a talent for the essay, whether literary or political. Madariaga's volumes of literary essays include the following: *Shelley and Calderón and Other Essays on English and Spanish Poetry* (London: Oxford University Press, 1920), which includes an essay on the English poet Wordsworth; *The Genius of Spain and Other Essays on Spanish Contemporary Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), whose essays on Galdós, Giner de los Ríos, Pérez de Ayala, Unamuno, Baroja, Valle-Inclán, and Azorín were hailed by Angel del Río as the best to have appeared at the time;[11] *Don Quixote: An Introductory Essay in Psychology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), which was very favorably reviewed by the distinguished British literary critic and man of letters, V.S. Pritchett[12]; and *On Hamlet* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1948), which Madariaga published also in a Spanish version (as he did with the other volumes of literary essays), accompanied by a translation of the play into Spanish verse done by him.

Madariaga's political essays are numerous. A representative sample of them would include the following: *The Crisis of Liberalism; National Sovereignty; Hispanidad e Indigenismo; Europa entre el oso y el toro; Comunismo*; and *Violencia y diplomacia*. More extended book-length essays include *The Anatomy of the Cold War; Victors Beware* (*¡Ojo, Vencedores!* in the Spanish version); and *Latin America between the Eagle and the Bear*.

On the whole, Madariaga managed to deal separately with literature and with politics in his essays. The same cannot be said of Orwell, a thoroughly political writer, whose most significant literary essays could best be described as literary-political. In 1947 Orwell wrote: "What I have most wanted to do throughout the past ten years is to make political writing into an art. My starting point is always a feeling of partisanship, a sense of injustice ... And looking back through my work, I see that it is invariably where I lacked a *political* purpose that I wrote lifeless books and was betrayed into purple passages, sentences without meaning, de-

[10] BERNARD CRICK, *George Orwell: A Life* (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 21.

[11] See ANGEL DEL RÍO, "Salvador de Madariaga", *Ibérica*, Vol. 4, N° 11 (November 15, 1956), p. 7.

[12] The review appeared in the Weekly Magazine Section of the *Christian Science Monitor*, October 17, 1934, p. 11.

corative adjectives and humbug generally.[13] And in another essay, written the following year, Orwell said: "Of course, the invasion of literature by politics was bound to happen. It must have happened, even if the special problem of totalitarianism had never arisen..."[14]. Rather than abandon literature for politics Orwell combined the two.

Though Orwell's fame rests largely upon two works of fiction, namely, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the bulk of critical opinion agrees that his genius lies in his essays. Alfred Kazin, the American literary critic, found the four volumes of Orwell's collected essays, letters and journalism more interesting than his novels.[15] And if one were to select a half dozen or so of his finest essays, the list would include the following: *Charles Dickens; Rudyard Kipling; Politics* vs. *Literature: An Examination of Gulliver's Travels; The Prevention of Literature; The Lion and the Unicorn*; and *Politics and the English Language*, all of which appear in the four-volume *CEJL*.

A number of journalistic articles and essays by Orwell and Madariaga would place both men in the pamphleteering tradition, which in England would include such writers as Swift, Paine, Blake, and Shaw. Like their predecessors, Orwell and Madariaga were argumentative; were great issue raisers; and sought to change minds.[16]

In both Orwell and Madariaga, one notes a close connection between their experiences in life and their writings, though this is more evident in Orwell than in Madariaga. Richard Rees, a close friend, observed that Orwell, like Joseph Conrad, Simone Weil, and Arthur Koestler, was one of those writers whose life and work were so interconnected that it was difficult to think of the work without also thinking of the life.[17] Orwell's first book, *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933) is a narrative of his life among working-class people in Paris and among tramps in London for more than a year. His first novel, *Burmese Days* (1934) derived from his five years of service as a policeman in Burma, which left him with a violent hatred of British imperialism. *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937) was the result of a study Orwell had made on the living conditions of unemployed miners in the north of England. *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), a book of enormous importance for Orwell's subsequent development as a writer, was an account of the author's experiences in the Spanish Civil War, and his reflections upon those experiences. "The Spanish war and other

[13] "Why I Write", in *CEJL*, Vol. I, pp. 6-7.
[14] "Writers and Leviathan", in *CEJL*, Vol. IV, p. 408.
[15] ALFRED KAZIN, "Not One of Us", *The New York Review of Books*, June 14, 1984, p. 18.
[16] Ibid.
[17] *George Orwell-Fugitive from the Camp of Victory*, p. 5.

events in 1936-7", said Orwell, "turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly *against* totalitarianism and for democratic Socialism, as I understand it".[18]

Madariaga's years as a student in Paris and his many years of residence and activity in England contributed to making him a trilingual writer, so that he wrote a number of his books in English and Spanish; some in French and Spanish or English; and others in all three languages. His years with the League of Nations provided him with material or stimulus for at least four of his books: *Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards* (written in all three languages); *The Sacred Giraffe* (written in English and Spanish); *Anarchy or Hierarchy* (written in all three languages); and *Disarmament* (written only in English). He found that his years with the Disarmament Section of the League (of which he was the head) provided him with an unusual opportunity for watching Englishmen and Frenchmen "endeavouring to bridge over their differences by means of subtle, verbal girders". The novel, *The Sacred Giraffe*, provided him with a literary outlet for the experience he had as a draftsman of pacts during the Ethiopian crisis. As a matter of fact, he reproduced the text of a treaty in his novel which, according to him, provided the key to the Italo-Ethiopian dispute.[19]

Orwell and Madariaga, on two occasions, wrote politically-oriented novels of fantasy. Orwell's two most famous books, *Animal Farm* (1946) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), though classifiable as fiction, are in fact politico-social fables. *Animal Farm* belongs to the literary tradition of the satiric beast-fable. It may be read on several levels, one of which is an account of the way revolutions are made and later corrupted. An attack on totalitarianism, *Animal Farm* has given us the famous line which sums up Orwell's satiric purpose: *All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others.*

Nineteen Eighty-Four, of which there are more than the million copies in print, is in the tradition of the anti-utopian novel, and is Orwell's most celebrated work. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, as in *Animal Farm*, the corruption of language is revealed as the principal means for maintaining tyranny. Universally known are terms like *Big Brother, Newspeak, doublethink*, and *Ingsoc* (English Socialism). The Party in power believes in the mutability of the past and denies the existence of objective reality. Among the Party's

[18] "Why I Write", in *CEJL*, Vol. 1, p. 5.

[19] SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA, *Morning without Noon: Memoirs* (Westmead, Farnborough, Hampshire: Saxon House, 1974), pp. 99, 337.

oft-repeated slogans are: *War is Peace; Freedom is Slavery; Ignorance is Strength; God is Power; Two and Two Make Five.* The citizens are made to believe that "Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past". The definition of *doublethink* is memorable: "To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget, whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again, and above all, to apply the same process to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word 'doublethink' involved the use of double think.[20]

Orwell added to his novel and Appendix on *The Principles of Newspeak*, the official language of Oceania, based upon the English language. The vocabulary is divided into three categories: words needed for everyday life; words deliberately constructed for political purposes; scientific and technical terms. The grammar of Newspeak has two principal characteristics: an almost complete interchangeability between parts of speech; and regularity as to inflections. There were to be no ambiguities or shades of meaning. The language is replete with euphemisms. Newspeak was designed as a principal means of thought control. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has become the classic of totalitarian literature. It was intended as a warning, not as prophecy.

Madariaga's two novels, composed as fantasies, are *The Sacred Giraffe* (1925) and *Sanco Panco* (1964), the latter written only in Spanish. Like Orwell, Madariaga has made use, in *The Sacred Giraffe*, of political allegory as a weapon for satire, and has constructed an imaginary society as an aid to understanding our own. The novel recalls the Utopian satire *Erewhon* (an anagram of 'nowhere') by Samuel Butler, published in 1872. Unlike Orwell, whose pessimism in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is very deep, Madariaga has written an amusing, witty, and whimsical book. It is largely a humorous satire on present-day customs in England (Lest we forget, England is also the setting for Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*). A central theme is the complete reversal of the role of the sexes. The Ebonite Empire in Africa, a society of blacks, in the year 6922 A.D. is ruled by

[20] GEORGE ORWELL, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: The New American Library, 1961), pp. 32-33.

women; its affairs are managed by "ministresses" and "doctoresses", and its public opinion is directed by "shoutwomen". Man's place is in the home. The White Society (and, of course, European civilization) perished thousands of years ago in a geological disaster. The black race has taken up the "white man's burden". What has happened in this part of Africa is a logical outcome of many tendencies found in contemporary white society.

Sanco Panco, a *novela-fantasía* in its author's words, is a satire on the Franco regime in Spain. Its kinship with *Don Quijote de la Mancha* is evident. The name *Sanco Panco* is an obvious blend of Sancho Panza and Franco. The novel is replete with word and name coinages. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. are respectively referred to as *Usio* and *Ursio*. Washington is *Dólarton*. The *Ministro de Uniformación* offers a blend of *información* and *uniformidad*. Spain is named *Espanquia*, an abbreviated form of *Sanquipanquia*. And in *Espanquia*, the generals are called *yomandos*, with Sanco Panco referred to as *Yomandísimo*.

The satiric note in *Sanco Panco* is immediately struck in the opening lines: "En un ancho lugar del mundo que los antiguos llamaban Hesperia y los modernos Desesperia... vivía un general tan bizarro como sus numerosos compañeros; porque es fama que jamás hubo un general en Desesperia que no fuera bizarro. Este general llegó a ser rey". If Franco claimed to have saved Spain from communism, Sanco Panco "había logrado la corona por haber salvado al país de un descomunal gigante". Among the other giants named in the novel are *Sumaleón* (Mussolini) and *Yantasión* (Hitler). The latter ruled in *Ostrogotia* (Germany), and the former was "emperador de los etruscos".

Here is a fragment of an interview granted by Sanco Panco to an American newspaperman:

—¿Qué porvenir tiene la monarquía en Espanquia?
.....
—La monarquía aquí no es cosa de porvenir, sino de presente. Ya existe, y ya funciona.
—Pero, señor, si Vuestra Potestad me lo permite, vamos ....
—Diga, diga.
—Habrá monarquía, pero no hay rey.
—Yo no dije que había rey. Hay monarquía. Y aunque no hay rey, hay monarca. Soy yo.[21]

It is of interest to note that both Orwell and Madariaga, in an effort to make a very effective presentation of their political and social ideas, made use of well-established literary traditions, even though many of their ideas had been widely circulated in non-fictional prose. It may well be that they attempted the fantasy, which provided considerable imaginative free-

[21] *Sanco Panco* (México, D.F.: Editora Latino Americana, 1964), p. 176.

dom, in the hope that their political ideas might thus reach a large audience, and increase their chances of being taken seriously.

Orwell and Madariaga were strongly affected by the Spanish Civil War, though with different consequences for each. Orwell's views of that war are clearly expressed in his book *Homage to Catalonia*; and in two articles by him titled "Spilling the Spanish Beans" (*CEJL*, Vol. I, pp. 269-276) and "Looking Back on the Spanish War" (*CEJL*, Vol. II, pp. 249-267). Orwell went to Spain in December 1936 to write some newspaper articles on the Civil War, and became involved in the fighting by joining the militia of the POUM, and independent, anti-Stalinist Marxist group. He remained in Spain until May 1937, and his experience in the war, which was limited to the Aragon front and Barcelona, became a turning point in his life. A social revolution was in full swing in Barcelona, and it was the first time that Orwell had ever been in a town where the working class was in the saddle. His strong egalitarian sense led him to believe that the revolution was worth fighting for, since he had now experienced a kind of social democracy that he had never seen in the class-ridden society of England. Spain demonstrated to him that a classless society was attainable. In June 1937, as he was preparing to leave Spain, he wrote to a friend: "I have seen wonderful things and at last really believe in Socialism, which I never did before".[22]

Tragedy overtook the social revolution in Spain when the civil war that developed within the Civil War on the Republican side resulted in an increase in power and influence on the part of the Communists who, following the Soviet line, moved to suppress the POUM and the social revolution. It was here that Orwell discovered that "Communism is now a counter-revolutionary force; that Communists everywhere are in alliance with bourgeois reformism and using the whole of their powerful machinery to crush or discredit any party that shows signs of revolutionary tendencies".[23] Orwell became obsessed with the betrayal of the revolution he had witnessed, and with which he sympathized, in Spain; was shocked at how the Communists in Spain had distorted the truth concerning the POUM and his revolutionary comrades. The Spanish working class had struck him as basically decent, straight-forward, and generous, and the social equality that prevailed between officers and men in the militia had aroused his admiration. Orwell's experience in Spain changed the course of his artistic development. It was here that he learned the lesson that language (its use and abuse) and politics were inseparable; and the

[22] See "Letter to Cyril Connolly", in *CEJL*, Vol. I, p. 269.
[23] "Spilling the Spanish Beans", in *CEJL*, Vol. I, p. 270.

corruption of language which he witnessed in Spain dominated his thinking later on throughout *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. It was in Spain that he had a glimpse of the meaning of totalitarianism and of the ramifications of political language[24].

Orwell believed that the real struggle in the Spanish Civil War was between revolution and counter-revolution; "between the workers who are vainly trying to hold on to a little of what they won in 1936, and the Liberal-Communist bloc who are so successfully taking it away from them[25]. The bourgeois and the worker may both be fighting against Fascism, said Orwell, but they are not fighting for the same things; "the bourgeois is fighting for bourgeois democracy, i.e. capitalism, the worker, in so far as he understands the issue, for Socialism".[26]

Orwell usually speaks of the two sides in the Civil War as the Government and the Fascists. Madariaga, on the other hand, refers to the two sides as the "Revolutionaries" and the "Rebels".[27] He rejected both sides in the Civil War, and took no part in it. He left Spain in the early days of the war, and did not return until forty years later, a self-imposed exile, spending the greater part of the time in England, and his latter years in Locarno, Switzerland. During his years in exile, Madariaga made extensive efforts, some of them through the Press, to end the war; and he became the leader of the liberal anti-Franco movement outside of Spain.[28] It was during his period of exile that Madariaga's love for Spain became intensified. "Madariaga había aprendido a amar a España", said the Spanish novelist Ramón Sender, "fuera de España. Es en la ausencia donde nos damos cuenta del lugar que la presencia ocupaba en nuestra vida".[29]

During the decades of the 1940s and 1950s, Madariaga published his "Ciclo Hispánico", that is, his biographies of Columbus, Cortés, and

[24] ROBERT A. LEE, *Orwell's Fiction* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), p. 89. For an account of the Communist suppression of the POUM by one of the former POUM leaders, see JULIAN GORKIN, *El proceso de Moscú en Barcelona* (Barcelona: Aymá, 1974). Gorkin praises Orwell and regards him as "el primero en comprender que el fascismo y el stalinismo eran el anverso y el reverso de la misma medalla" (p. 62).

[25] "Spilling the Spanish Beans", p. 270.

[26] Ibid., p. 271.

[27] See MADARIAGA'S *Spain: A Modern History* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1958), Book Two, *passim* or any of the later editions in Spanish.

[28] An example of his anti-Franco activity is the book, *General, Márchese Usted* (New York: Ediciones Ibérica, 1959), a collection of broadcasts in Spanish beamed by *Radiodiffusion Française* to Spain during the years 1954-1957.

[29] RAMÓN SENDER, "Salvador de Madariaga hallado en los debates del mundo", *Cuadernos* (Noviembre-Diciembre 1956), p. 35.

Bolívar, together with the two-volume *The Rise of the Spanish American Empire* and *The Fall of the Spanish American Empire*; and he composed all these works in both Spanish and English. Brenan has observed that Madariaga was always anxious not to give a bad impression abroad of his country.[30] Madariaga's defense of Spain's historical and cultural reputation became increasingly stronger, especially during the years of exile, and this was reflected in some of his publications.

Neither Madariaga, a centrist liberal democrat, nor Orwell, a democratic socialist, had ever been a communist or even a Marxist, and so they were not disillusioned with the Soviet Union after the Moscow Trials or the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939. Orwell wrote in 1946: "I could never be disappointed by the STALIN regime, because I never expected any good to come of it... I have never fundamentally altered my attitude towards the Soviet regime since I first began to pay attention to it sometime in the nineteen-twenties". And Madariaga had opposed Soviet communism ever since Lenin "kicked the Duma to death". Orwell identified himself with the non-communist Left, though he reserved the right to criticize sharply those Leftist intellectuals who were merely anti-Fascist without being anti-totalitarian. He and Madariaga saw very early the similarities between communism and fascism, even before the word 'totalitarianism' became current.

As internal critics of political and intellectual groups where one might expect sympathetic treatment, Madariaga and Orwell paid the price of finding some of their significant works misinterpreted and misused in conservative and reactionary circles. Madariaga's criticisms of the Left in Spain during the period of the Republic and the Civil War were utilized by the Franco regime to discredit the Republic. Madariaga explained his position as follows: "In my narrative of the events which led to the Civil War, as well as in that of the war itself, it may at times seem as if I stressed the errors and shortcomings of the Left more heavily than those of the Right. This was inevitable for two reasons. The first is that in the countries for which I am writing this study, it is about what actually happened in the Left that new light is particularly needed. The second is that it is from the Left rather than from the Right that we expect our future. It is the Left, therefore, which stands in need of criticism. I hardly know the men of the Right... On the other hand, every one of the leaders of the Left... were old acquaintances or friends of a lifetime. It was in these men I, like every other liberal or Socialist Spaniard, had put my trust. This may also explain

[30] GERALD BRENAN, *The Spanish Labyrinth* (Cambridge University Press, 1950), p. 19.

why I have been led to concentrate on their doings rather than on those of the other side".[31]

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was interpreted in British conservative and reactionary circles as an attack on British Socialism and the Labour Party. Orwell responded to this misinterpretation as follows: "My recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in Communism and Fascism. ... I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere... The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasise that the English-speaking races are not innately better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, *if not fought against*, could triumph anywhere".[32]

Madariaga and Orwell shared a great preoccupation with language. For Madariaga, language was an important key to an understanding of national character. He was also concerned with the invasion of the Spanish language by English, as shown in an article of his titled "El español, colonia lingüística del inglés". Orwell, on the other hand, was concerned in a number of his works with the use of language by society as a means to control man completely. He was obsessed with the corruption of language, which he believed would inevitably lead to the physical destruction of the human species.

Madariaga and Orwell shared a number of traits. Both were autonomous individuals who had no hesitation in speaking their minds, whatever the cost. For both of them, liberty was the prime political value, though their views on 'equality' did not, in all respects, coincide. Although neither classified himself as a conservative, they seemed to have a conservative streak in them. They respected the past, along with old-fashioned virtues, such as decency, a favorite word with Orwell. They were passionate defenders of freedom of speech and writing. In some respects they might both be regarded as nineteenth-century liberals.

[31] See *Spain: A Modern History*, Preface, pp. VIII-IX. The sixth and seventh editions of the Spanish version *España* have a similar statement.

[32] See "Letter to Francis A. Henson", in *CEJL*, Vol. IV, p. 502.