

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Ramiro de Maeztu between Spanish and Argentinian nationalism / Botti, A.; Lvovich, D.. - 63:(2020), pp. 35-56.

Routledge

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

06/05/2026 12:51

(Article begins on next page)

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>List of contributors</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
1 Hybridizing ideas in the “Latin space”: Transnational agents and polycentric cross-border networks ANNARITA GORI AND VALERIA GALIMI	1
PART 1	
Transnational agents	13
2 António Sardinha and his Ibero-American connections: Traditionalism and universalism SÉRGIO CAMPOS MATOS	15
3 Ramiro de Maeztu between Spanish and Argentinian nationalism ALFONSO BOTTI AND DANIEL LVOVICH	35
4 Pietro Maria Bardi’s first journey to South America: A narrative of travel, politics and architectural Utopia PAOLO RUSCONI	57
5 Plínio Salgado between Brazil and Portugal: Formation and transformation of Brazilian integralism LEANDRO PEREIRA GONÇALVES	85
PART 2	
Intellectual networks	107
6 The <i>Association de la Presse Latine</i> : Efforts and failure of a right-wing transnational pan-Latinist project ANNARITA GORI	109

vi	<i>Contents</i>	
7	<i>Les amis étrangers</i> : Maurrassian circles and a French perspective on the Latin space during the thirties VALERIA GALIMI	132
8	Atlantic crossings: Intellectual-politicians and the diffusion of corporatism in the thirties Latin America ANTÓNIO COSTA PINTO	152
9	Local and global connections of Argentinian, Uruguayan and Chilean fascists in the thirties and early forties ERNESTO BOHOSLAVSKY AND MAGDALENA BROQUETAS	171
	<i>Index</i>	195

T&F PROOFS NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Contributors

Ernesto Bohoslavsky, Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento (Argentina)

He obtained his PhD in Latin American History at Universidad Complutense de Madrid and currently is an Associate Professor in Latin American Contemporary History at Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento. Bohoslavsky is the Coordinator of the MA program of Contemporary History at Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento; researcher at Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina; and member of the Asociación Latinoamericana e Ibérica de Historia Social. He specializes in Latin American History, with a focus on the twentieth century. He has conducted research on right-wing ideologies, parties and intellectuals in Argentina, Brazil and Chile, using a comparative and transnational history approach. Other research interests include State building process in South America and historical museums in Latin America. His most recent publication is *Circule por la derecha. Percepciones, redes y contactos entre las derechas sudamericanas, 1917–1973*. Los Polvorines: Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento, 2016 edited with Fábio Bertonha.

Alfonso Botti, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia (Italy)

He is a Professor of Contemporary History at the Department of Linguistic and Cultural Studies of Modena and Reggio Emilia University. He is the Director of the journal *Spagna contemporanea* and Co-director of *Modernism*. His main scientific interests are Spanish and Italian history of nineteenth and twentieth centuries, focusing in particular on religious aspects and cultural-ideological processes in the perspective of comparative history. His scientific production is mostly focused on these issues, starting with an interest in the relationship between religious and secular culture and moving towards the multiple interconnections between religious and political experiences and modernization and nationalization processes. His selected publications include *La Spagna e la crisi modernista* (Brescia, Morcellina, 1987), *Cielo y dinero. El Nacionalcatolicismo en España, 1881–1975* (Madrid, Alianza, 1992, 2008), *La questione basca* (Milano, B. Mondadori, 2006), *Luigi Sturzo e la guerra civile spagnola* (Brescia, Morcelliana, 2019).

Magdalena Broquetas, Universidad de la República Montevideo (Uruguay)

She obtained her PhD in History at Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Argentina) and is currently Associate Professor at Universidad de la República (Uruguay), where she teaches courses on contemporary history of Uruguay, right-wing movements and photography. Her research is about the Uruguayan right-wing parties and social movements during the Cold War focused on the circulation and reception of ideas between South America and Europe and the organization of regional and transnational networks. Her other field of expertise is history of photography. Between 2002 and 2016, she participated in the foundation and development of Centro de Fotografía de Montevideo (Center of Photography of Montevideo). Her most significant book is *La trama autoritaria. Derechas y violencia en Uruguay*, Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, Montevideo, 2014. She is also author and editor of two volumes of *Fotografía en Uruguay. Historia y usos sociales. 1840–1930, 1930–1990* [Photography in Uruguay. History and social uses. 1840–1930, 1930–1990] (Montevideo, Centro de Fotografía, 2011, 2018).

Sérgio Campos Matos, Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)

He is a Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Lisbon; his main areas of research are historical cultures and national memories, historiographies, nationalisms and relations between Portugal and Spain within wider contexts. He has authored and co-authored papers in these areas for international reviews. Recently, he published *Iberismos – nação e transnação, Portugal e Espanha (c.1807–c.1931)* (Coimbra, 2017). He is co-editor of *A Universidade de Lisboa séculos XIX e XX* (Lisbon, 2013) and *Historiografia e Res Publica* (Lisboa, 2017). He has been editing the *Dicionário de Historiadores Portugueses (1779–1974)* on the site of the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal. He is researcher at the Centro de História of the University of Lisbon, where he coordinates the research group on Uses of the Past.

António Costa Pinto, Instituto de Ciências Sociais – Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)

He is a Research Professor at the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, and Professor of Politics and Contemporary European History at ISCTE-IUL, Lisbon. He has been a visiting professor at Stanford University, Georgetown University, a senior associate member at St Antony's College, Oxford and a senior visiting fellow at Princeton University and at the University of California, Berkeley. From 1999 to 2011, he was a regular visiting professor at the Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris. He was the President of the Portuguese Political Science Association (2006–2010) and his research interests include authoritarianism, political elites, democratization and transitional justice in new democracies, the European Union and the comparative study of political change in Southern Europe. His most recent book was published by Routledge: António Costa Pinto *Latin American Dictatorships in the Era of Fascism* (2019).

x *Contributors***Valeria Galimi, University of Florence (Italy)**

Valeria Galimi obtained her PhD in History at the Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna in Pisa and currently is *Ricercatrice* in Contemporary History at the University of Florence (Italy) and *Chercheuse associée* at the Institut d'histoire du temps présent (CNRS) in Paris. She was working as a Research Fellow at the International Institute for Holocaust Research Yad Vashem, Israel (2010–11); at the Vidal Sassoon Center for the Study of Antisemitism, Hebrew University (2013); at the European University Institute in 2014. She was *Professeure invitée* at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris in 2015 and Université de Paris VIII (2018). She has research experience in several areas of contemporary history, in particular the history of European Antisemitism, the history of fascism and the Second World War; the history of European Intellectuals in interwar period. Her publications on this topic include *L'antisemitismo in azione. Pratiche antiebraiche nella Francia degli anni Trenta* (Milan, 2006, second edition in print); *Il Welt-Dienst di Erfurt: prime note su un centro transnazionale dell'antisemitismo degli anni '30*, H. Paulo, A. Pena (eds.), *A cultura do poder. A propaganda nos estados autoritários* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2015).

Annarita Gori, Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)

She received her PhD and Doctor Europeus (2012) from the University of Siena. She is currently Associate Researcher at Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa and her field of expertise is the cultural propaganda of right-wing dictatorships and the intellectual networks in the interwar Europe. She has also actively participated in two international groups of investigations: *Direitas, História e Memória*, and *La Raza Latina, La patria Hispana Intelectuales, identidades colectivas e projectos entre as organizações España, Itália e Argentina (1880–1945)*. She was visiting scholar at New York University (2015) and SciencesPo (2016), and during Spring 2020 she will be visiting professor at Brown University. Her most recent publications are “Italian Fascism and the Portuguese Estado Novo: International Claims and National Resistance” (with Dr. Almeida de Carvalho), *Intellectual History Review*, 2019 and “Celebrate Nation, Commemorate History, Embody the Estado Novo”, *Cultural and Social Studies*, 15, 2018.

Daniel Lvovich, Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento (Argentina)

He obtained his PhD from the Universidad Nacional de la Plata. He is a Professor at the Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento and the Universidades Nacionales de La Plata y San Marin, and independent researcher at Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET). In 2013, he won the national Argentinian competition for the Scientific Investigation Program (PICT) founded by the National Agency for Scientific and Technological Promotion (ANPCyT). His project – *Desafíos teóricos, historiográficos y didácticos del abordaje del pasado reciente en Argentina* – deals with the relationship between civil society and historiography with the recent Argentinian past.

Leandro Pereira Gonçalves, Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (Brazil)

He is an Associate Professor at the Department of History of the Federal University of Juiz de Fora (UFJF). He obtained his PhD in History from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP), with a Junior Visiting Fellowship at the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon (ICS-ULisboa). He obtained his Post-doctorate from the National University of Cordoba (Center for Advanced Studies, Argentina). He has worked as an Associate Foreign Investigator at the Centre for Studies in Religious History at the Portuguese Catholic University (CEHR/UCP). He worked as a leader of the *Direitas, História e Memória (Right-Wing, History and Memory)* research group, listed under the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), and was a coordinator of the homonymous research network. His current research focuses on conservatism in the twentieth century, right-wing studies, Christianity and authoritarianism, fascism, integralism and aspects theorized through political culture, with special attention to transnational elements between Iberia and Latin America. His most recent book, *Plínio Salgado: um católicointegralista entre Portugal e o Brasil (1895–1975)*, was published in Portugal by Imprensa de Ciências Sociais (2017) and in Brazil by Fundação Getúlio Vargas (2018).

Paolo Rusconi, Università di Milano (Italy)

Paolo Rusconi is an Associate Professor of History of Contemporary Art and Head of Arts History Specialization Course at the Department of Culture and Environment heritage at the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Milan. He obtained his PhD in History and Criticism of Artistic and Cultural Heritage at the University of Milan (1996/2001). He has conducted thorough research on several topics related to the relationship between the visual arts, literature and arts politics in twentieth century Italian culture, with a particular interest in the work and the critical acclaim of Amedeo Modigliani, Renato Birolli and Pietro Maria Bardi. He has also conducted a lot of studies on artistic relations between Italy and Brazil. He is the President of the Guido Lodovico Luzzatto Foundation; responsible for the international collaboration agreement with MAC/USP; member of the Scientific journal Committee “L'uomo nero. Materiali per una storia delle arti della modernità” (University of Milan) and “ACME” – Annali della Facoltà di Studi Umanistici dell'Università degli Studi di Milano. He has been the curator and co-curator of many exhibitions.

3 Ramiro de Maeztu between Spanish and Argentinian nationalism

Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich

3.1 Introduction

Starting with a biographical and intellectual profile of his character, in conjunction with references to the political situation in Argentina in the twenties, this chapter aims to outline the relations established by Ramiro de Maeztu with the Nationalist Right circles in Argentina, where he was ambassador for two years (1928–1930). In light of the existing literature, new research and various considerations that have investigated further into some aspects that were originally overlooked, this contribution aims to outline the role of transnational *asentamiento*, as fulfilled by Maeztu, in shaping authoritarian nationalism on both sides of the Atlantic, as much for the personal contacts he made in Buenos Aires as for the influence exerted by his work both in Europe and Latin America.

Ramiro de Maeztu y Whitney was born in Vitoria in 1875 of a Cuban father, who had Riojan origins, and a French-Scottish mother.¹ At the age of 17, he interrupted his studies to work in Paris as an employee in the commerce industry, a job he quickly abandoned to return to Spain. Following this, he left for Cuba where he worked for some time in his father's business in Cienfuegos. Following the economic depression that started in 1892, Maeztu moved to La Habana where he carried out diverse jobs, making contacts within the working-class world. At his mother's request, he returned to Spain in 1894 after his father's death, moving with his family to Bilbao where he started working for the newspaper *El Porvenir Vascongado*. From 1897, Maeztu lived in Madrid where he wrote for some republican and socialist journals and magazines. As a critic of the Spanish society he lived in, he published, in 1899, *Hacia otra España*, a collection of articles that placed him amongst other critics of the Bourbon Restoration of 1874. In order to advocate the regeneration of the country, especially after the *désastre* of 1898, these critics took the name of *Regenerationistas* or Generation of '98.² With the beginning of the new century, Maeztu became part of the editorial staff of the prestigious newspaper *El Imparcial*, becoming close friends with the director's son José Ortega y Gasset, who was almost the same age as him. At the same time, he worked for other

36 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

newspapers, such as *Diario Universal*, *Alma española* and *Madrid científico*. It was then that Maeztu emerged as an anti-clerical activist, a liberal promoter of the economic development, an advocate of the country's modernization, and an opponent of Catalan and Basque nationalists. During these years, his main cultural references were Nietzsche, Spencer and Marx, ~~who~~ he approached in a messy, rhapsodic and superficial way.

This background also highlighted his contradictory views: he was initially against the war with the United States, and then in favour; he was attracted by socialism and at the same time adverse to its classism; he was critical of the dynastic parties, but in many aspects a follower of Antonio Maura; he was a committed militarist and supporter of the army, but upholder of innocence concerning "The Dreyfus Affair". To avoid conviction for an assault, Maeztu accepted the proposal of moving to London, working as a correspondent for the conservative *La Correspondencia de España*, which he rapidly complemented by collaborating with *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires, a job arranged through his friend Francisco Grandmontagne. Hence, his relations with Argentina began on 1 January 1905, when he published an article regarding Don Quixote in *La Prensa*.

His years in London had a remarkable influence on his thinking and outlook on life.³ Primarily, during this period, he got closer to the parliamentary system, which he had severely criticized while in Spain, and he also started to appreciate the British Socialism proposed by the Fabian Society, of which he was a member. He met Baron Von Hügel who opened his mind up to a different way of comprehending religion as well as to the possibility of a Christianity other than the dominant clericalism of the Iberian country. He also absorbed fresh perspectives by listening to Reverend Campbell and even felt an element of ephemeral sympathy regarding his proposals of religious modernism, as he wrote to Ortega y Gasset, and in some of his articles in the Barcelonan *El Diluvio*.⁴ In particular, he harboured the belief that morality and religion could have a decisive influence on social and economic processes; a topic that he would further explore during the ensuing years, after meeting the historian and economist Richard H. Tawney. In London, Maeztu also met Ricardo Rojas, correspondent of *La Nación* of Buenos Aires, who was in Europe to study the role of history and its teaching in different national school systems, described in *La Restauración Nacionalista*⁵ (1909). These experiences allowed Maeztu to embrace the liberal and progressist field, to take sides in favour of Francisco Ferrer and, consequently, to interrupt his collaboration with *La Correspondencia de España* in December 1909.

In October 1910, Maeztu returned to Spain where he held several conferences, all based on the ideas inspired by his new outlook. In March 1911, he moved to Barcelona, leaving again a few months later and moving towards Magdeburg with a grant from the Junta de Ampliación de Estudios in order to study the neo-Kantian thought of the philosopher Hermann Cohen and Nicolai Hartmann, at that time his disciple. In 1913,

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 37

he adhered to the manifesto launched by Ortega y Gasset with the Liga de Educación Política, a liberal nationalist reform project mainly targeting intellectuals. Back in London, Maeztu joined the *New Age* group founded by Alfred Richard Orage, with whom he collaborated from 1913 to 1920 following its evolution from Fabian socialism to the guild version inspired by Arthur Joseph Penty, William Morris and John Ruskin.

With the outbreak of the Great War, *El Heraldo* sent Maeztu to a then neutral Italy; in July 1915 he signed the pro-Allied manifesto, he occasionally collaborated with the magazine *España* directed by Ortega y Gasset, and also wrote articles from the war front, sometimes even for the Argentinian press.⁶ In 1916, Maeztu married a British woman, Mabel Hill, in a Catholic ceremony and in the same year he published *Authority, Liberty and Function in the Light of War*, a second collection of articles that would be issued in Spain under the title of *La crisis del humanismo*. Politically speaking, during these years Maeztu still occupied a grey area. Therefore, it is not surprising that he found supporters and critics from both Left and Right. From 1917, he collaborated with the Bilbao magazine *Hermes* where he published articles criticizing liberalism, with positive evaluations of the religion, and three years later he started to write in Ortega y Gasset's liberal newspaper *El Sol*. In the meantime, he returned once more to Spain, living for some time in Barcelona, and then moving permanently to Madrid. During this period he developed an interest in various European traditionalist movements, in particular the *Integralismo Lusitano*, meeting one of its leaders, António Sardinha, and in the work of the Dominican González Arintero.⁷ Maeztu favourably welcomed the coming to power of General Primo de Rivera, a figure he wrote about in the Argentinian press,⁸ although he did not immediately adhere to the dictatorship's unique party, the Unión Patriótica.

In June 1925, Maeztu travelled to the United States of America where he was extremely impressed by the dynamism of the civil society and by capitalism, which he connected with the Puritanical religious and Calvinist matrix. Thus, he authored a series of articles about "the reverential meaning of money" and "the sacramental meaning of labour" as opposed to the pre-capitalist and sensual mindset of money that characterized the Spanish bourgeoisie. In Maeztu's opinion, it was necessary to give a religious base to economic life: 'We have to work thinking that the salvation of the soul relies on work', he wrote.⁹ The attempt to interpret the Weberian theory in light of the Catholic Church is clear, as well as the correspondence of this idea with the views of a still unknown presbyter, José María Escrivá de Balaguer, who would eventually establish Opus Dei in 1928.¹⁰

Maeztu's interest in Latin America is confirmed by his involvement with the *Asociación Hispanoamericana de Intercambio Cultural, Arte y Universidad*, promoted by the dictatorship through the opening of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs bureau (called at that time Ministry of State), which was created with the intention of expanding the cultural relationships with Latin American Hispanic

38 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

republics. At the same time, other initiatives – such as intercontinental flights, academic conventions and commemorations – were specifically designed in order to strengthen ties with Latin America.¹¹

In February 1927, Maeztu quit *El Sol* and started to work for *La Nación*, the journal of the Unión Patriótica, to which he contextually adhered. This was an unconventional move for at least two reasons: first, because the majority of intellectuals were against the dictatorship¹² and second, because this full adhesion took place during the phase when the regime was dwindling.

Through his *La Nación* columns, Maeztu tried to give a cultural dimension to the dictatorship. When he had to point out the change of approach as a reaction to Positivism, Marxism – and even to Liberal thinking – he referred to Enrico Corradini, Antonio Sardinha, Henri Massis and Charles Maurras, Chesterton and Hilarie Belloc. When the dictatorship tried to institutionalise itself by calling a consultative National Assembly, Maeztu was called to be part of its First Section, whose objective was the development of a Constitution draft. In this context, he defended the restricted suffrage in the same way he had supported the restriction of citizenship. By this point, Maeztu manifested such extreme reactionary positions to the point that Primo de Rivera's decision to name him Ambassador in Argentina could be seen as a ploy to remove him from the country. Maeztu would stay in Argentina for two years and he returned to Spain immediately after the dictator's resignation.

Once back in Spain, Maeztu became president of the study centre *Acción Española* and leading figure of the homonymous magazine, a real laboratory of Francoism.¹³ He was then elected deputy in 1934 within the lists of the monarchist movement *Renovación Española*, the same year in which he published *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, his most famous work. Upon the outbreak of the civil war, he hid in a friend's house in Madrid, where he was discovered and arrested by a group of republican soldiers and confined to the Ventas prison. Maeztu was executed during the night between 28 and 29 October 1936, together with the Spanish Phalangist Ramiro Ledesma Ramos. The life of Ramiro de Maeztu had thus tragically ended: a self-taught intellectual, an omnivorous but disordered reader who lacked depth and consistency in thought; superficial and unstable when it came to which causes to support as much as pugnacious in their defence; an eccentric and a dandy, constantly in the limelight, eager to get noticed, but at the same time a prominent representative of those modern anti-modernity positions that had a noteworthy influence during the interwar period in Europe and Latin America.

3.2 Ambassador in Buenos Aires

Appointed ambassador in the Argentinian Republic on 16 December 1927, possibly at the suggestion of Pedro Sainz Rodríguez,¹⁴ Maeztu arrived in Buenos Aires on 19 February 1928, after stopping and giving a conference

in Montevideo, which was not entirely favourably received. A clue to this unflattering reaction was the appearance of a comment in *El Día*, which stated that if these were the ideas that Maeztu intended to use to bring Spain closer to America, it would be better if he got back on the boat and returned to Europe. In fact, according to this opinion, Maeztu's words confirmed the suspicion that he was not the ambassador of a people, but of a regime imposed and kept in power by force; the representative of a man and an institution, instead of a nation.¹⁵

On 20 February, he presented his credentials to the president who accepted them by signing the correspondent decree on 1 March. In Buenos Aires, the progressist magazine *Nosotros* criticized the designation,¹⁶ while the Catholic *Criterio* described it in its first issue as "the best gift that the Motherland has given us for a long time".¹⁷ *La Nueva Republica* also bestowed on him a very enthusiastic response. On its cover page it stated that Primo de Rivera's governance could not have chosen better, considering the nomination to be a signal of rapprochement between Hispanic America and Spain based on the ethnic and historic bonds temporarily destroyed by independence. "When the last repercussions of the battle for independence are over – it is read – Spain will return to be the mother of twenty countries formed with its blood and spirit".¹⁸

Maeztu arrived in Argentina when the era of radical governments (1916–1930) was coming to an end and when the nationalism of the country was entering a new season fuelled by immigration conflicts, the working-class issue and the theoretical criticism of democracy. The writer Leopoldo Lugones took a relevant stance in this context, proposing in 1924 the regeneration of Argentina through the adoption of military values intended to be the nation's religion.¹⁹ In the following years he would also inspire various initiatives linked closely with the fascist ideology.

From 1922, the president was Marcelo Torcuato de Alvear of the Unión Cívica Radical, who promoted a more moderate political tendency in comparison to his predecessor, Hipólito Yrigoyen (1916–1922), who was re-elected president in the 1928 elections, after a harsh conflict with Alvear that ended up dividing the radicals. This conflict would continue during the following months, and be worsened by the impact of the 1929 economic crisis and violent protests in the streets, and it came to an end only with the general José Félix Uriburu's coup on 6 September. This coup inaugurated the military intervention in politics, which lasted until 1983.

Opposed by all the Argentinian Right sectors, Yrigoyen found, in Maeztu, an admirer. In his reports to Madrid, the Spanish ambassador highlighted the plebiscitary nature of the new presidency: 'Never had an Argentinian politician, since the days of Juan Manuel [de] Rosas, caused a storm so deep, as had Mr. Hipólito Yrigoyen in this second election'.²⁰ Maeztu showed himself to be very understanding of the older president who, aware of the special importance of the relations with Spain, reserved equally cordial treatment for the ambassador. Writing to Madrid, Maeztu

40 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

affirmed that he did not see the coup as a solution, disagreeing with the interpretations that displayed the president as responsible for the crisis. He pointed out that the accusations and attempts to discourage him in Parliament were not supported by all and came only from high society circles.²¹ In particular, Maeztu highly appreciated Yrigoyen's steadfastness towards the United States: a position that allowed Argentina to remain neutral during the First World War giving the countrywide autonomy with regard to international politics. On 23 November 1929, when writing to the State Minister, Maeztu confessed a strength of emotion in verifying Yrigoyen's capacity to resist the pressure of the United States, thus defending the Argentinian sovereignty, "which was also the defence of Hispanism towards the arrogance of other races".²² This aspect differentiated Maeztu from most of the Argentinian nationalists who – with some exceptions, such as Manuel Gálvez – despised the plebiscitary traits of the radical government.

After Hipólito Yrigoyen's re-election to the presidency, various sectors of the resistance suggested the use of force as the unique solution.²³ If in 1916 the conservatives considered *Yrigoyenismo* as a passenger phenomenon, 12 years later they would be calling for a military intervention to put an end to the radical government. Different premises lay behind the criticisms coming from the conservative field. According to one of its section, the main flaw of the radical government relied on its scarce adherence to the provisions of the constitution and in the consequent risks that this entailed insofar as democracy was concerned. For instance, from 1928, *La Nación* repeatedly maintained that the nature of the relationship between the radical leader and its supportive masses evoked the anti-democratic tendencies seen in the regime of Mussolini in Italy, of Primo de Rivera in Spain and of Augusto Leguía in Peru. According to other sectors, such as the one expressed by the newspaper *La Fronda*, the problem was indeed represented by democracy. Starting in 1928, this newspaper started to request a change of regime and of the electoral law influenced by various authoritarian European tendencies, particularly by Maurrasianism. Obviously, the attacks of *La Fronda* against the parliament and the "political professionals" were particularly focused on the radicals, without targeting the traditional ruling class, whose dominion eventually had to be restored.²⁴ It was the usual conservative reaction towards the birth of new political actors, seen as usurpers of those roles that were typically monopolized by the élite. The changing climate within the conservative world was also translated into a greater receptiveness of authoritarian ideas in the Army. This was demonstrated by the fact that Leopoldo Lugones' articles revealing his anti-liberal positions, appeared in *La Nación* between 1927 and 1930, and were eventually published in a volume entitled *La Patria Fuerte*, printed by the Circulo Militar. The book was distributed by the Circulo Militar among its members, free of charge, on the eve of Uriburu's coup. Just a few weeks earlier, during an Armed Forces dinner, Lugones had directly instigated the military to seize power.

3.3 Argentinian nationalists and Catholics of the twenties

The first openly nationalist magazine, *La Nueva República*, was founded during this changing climate of public opinion. From 1 December 1927 to 5 March 1929, the magazine was printed fortnightly; from 18 June 1930 to 7 March 1931, it appeared weekly and finally was published as a daily newspaper from 5 October to 10 November 1931.²⁵ Initially perceived as the voice of a young intellectual group with many links to the cultural vanguard, the new publication revealed itself as a political and doctrinal organ of opposition to the government. Produced the first time by Rodolfo Irazusta, its chief editor was Ernesto Palacio, who had been an anarchist in his youth before converting to Catholicism in 1926 and who, at a later date, became the review director. Among the constant editors, we can find Juan Emiliano Carulla, who had been an anarchist before fighting in the Great War in the ranks of the French army and becoming a Maurrasian,²⁶ Julio Irazusta and Mario Lassaga. In addition, the doctor and Thomist philosopher César Pico and the lawyer Tomás Casares collaborated only for the first issues. Including mostly people from Buenos Aires and wealthy families from the coastal region, the editorial group was inspired by various thinkers, who shared a common Catholicism, connections with the Spanish culture and a fervent denunciation of the liberal democracy in general, and in particular of Yrigoyen's regime. In the case of Rodolfo Irazusta and Juan Carulla, their fundamental inspiration was Charles Maurras and the *Action française*, while Julio Irazusta was mainly influenced by Benedetto Croce, the spiritual philosopher, José Santayana and Edmund Burke.²⁷ César Pico exerted a notable influence among the young nationalist generations, especially through the Courses of Catholic Culture, an institution destined to shape a new Catholic intellectual generation. With a neo-Thomist orientation, the Courses, established in 1922 with the support of the episcopate, were influenced by European conservative and reactionary doctrines. Pico, who was a Thomist and an intolerant Catholic, was influenced by the thought of the first Maritain, Nicolai Berdiaeff and Hilaire Belloc; however, after the papal condemnation of the *Action française*, its admiration for Maurras' work turned into contempt. Under Pico's influence, Ernesto Palacio became a militant Catholic. Tomás Casares was also an intransigent traditionalist and anti-modern Catholic.

The readership of *La Nueva República* was not very large, but the review influenced relevant sectors of the elite, including the general José F. Uriburu, among its subscribers.

From the start, *La Nueva República* claimed that Argentina was going through a crisis – caused by intellectual disorientation, demagogy, the looting of the State and general laziness – putting the very existence of the Constitution of 1853 in danger. In this context, the journal assumed the voice of a patriotic and moral reactionary. The magazine's position was republican but not democratic, combining the defence of the

42 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

constitution with the criticisms against the Sáenz Peña law that introduced masculine universal suffrage in 1912 and was accused of being the harbinger of the country's political problems. In this sense, the group stood in continuity with the Argentine Republican political tradition. In accordance with Rodolfo Irazusta, who re-emphasized different sources of reactionary thought, a republican system did not support a government elected by the majority, but was in favour of a government representing the capacities and taking into consideration "in the social organism, the differences established by nature; the respect of superior positions, culture and age".

On the other hand, the democracy was a utopia, an abstraction and an opposition theory for men who suffered the inevitable inconveniences of every social organization "who seek revenge by theorising their own resentments".²⁸

For the editors of *La Nueva República*, the unlimited expansion of public employment was inseparable from democracy, believing that this was the reason that had allowed the development of clientelistic practices, which in turn guaranteed the reproduction of the political gears.

According to Ernesto Palacio, Argentina – along with the rest of the western world – was experiencing an intellectual downfall started by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the French revolution that, combined with demagogy, were taking the country into barbarism. In Argentina, the dominance of democratic thought had caused the negation of the two fundamental hierarchies: the Supernatural Catholic Church and the Natural State, replaced by the dominance of free will and a revolutionary sensibility. Palacio believed that among the main causes of this situation were secular tradition, criticism of the progressist parties, popular press propaganda and demagogic practices. Against what he described as a widespread conspiracy of enemy forces, Palacio attempted to undertake the counter-revolution on two levels: an intellectual one, in order to destroy the democratic and liberal sophisms currently dominating the press and the professors; and a political level, starting a "relentless fight against the enemies of the nation and of the order, against the coalition of the revolutionary rogue, increasingly more shameless and insolent".²⁹ The neo-republicans shared the idea that democracy and liberalism naturally led to socialism, chaos or foreign domination. Not only because the people's will, expressed through universal suffrage, ignored every political and social boundary, but also because its development was intended as a product of a series of conspirator forces. According to this interpretation, the moral decadence of the younger generations was the result of anti-Catholic propaganda, subsidized abroad. The origins of democracy were attributed to the supposed revolutionary spirit of Protestantism, stating that an alliance between Masonry and Protestantism, aimed at surrendering the country to the Jews, was behind the attack on Liberalism of the Church and its clergy.

Together with these enemies of the order, of the hierarchy and the Church, there were, naturally, other, less obvious enemies, such as Radicalism

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 43

and the Left. The neo-republicans introduced a permanently negative image of Hipólito Yrigoyen, even if their opinion concerning the Radical Party was more nuanced, significantly changing after Uriburu's coup in September 1930.

Hostile to Radicalism because of its plebeian composition, the neo-republicans were even more antagonistic towards the Left parties because not only did they gather the plebs, but they also had an unacceptable foreign presence in their ranks. As we have seen, the different anti-democratic reasons supporting and fuelling *La Nueva República* did not entail the abandonment of the republican tradition.

Such a statement may be relativized by looking at the positions of Pico and Casares who were defending a Catholic National that was clearly different from the traditional one. These views can be related to the fact that during 1928 both of them published more in the Catholic *Criterio* than in *La Nueva República*. Nonetheless, the longest-standing neo-republican group of the period remained characterized by extreme conservatism rather than by the defence of projects aimed at radically changing the system. The admiration for Mussolini and Primo de Rivera's regimes, with the exception of the ephemeral monarchic enthusiasm of Julio Irazusta, did not imply, in this first period, the intention to establish similar political experiences in Argentina. As stated by Rodolfo Irazusta, for the neo-republicans 'Alberdi's letter'³⁰ [was] the only hope of republicanism in the face of the invading democracy'. On the occasion of the 1928 elections and facing the imminent new victory of Yrigoyen's coalition, they disagreed with Lugones' claim for dictatorship, stating that it was not "time for such disparate solutions" and underpinning the necessity of building an openly reactionary programme instead of competing with Radicalism using its own demagogy.

Lugones accused the neo-republicans of "precipitous imitation of a bad European thing" for their reactionary nationalism and anti-Semitism. Palacio replied arguing that their intent was to connect with the Argentine tradition and remain on the ground of its institutions.

Relations between the neo-republicans and General Uriburu became frequent in the months leading up to the coup, and their magazine helped create a climate conducive to the coup in the public opinion and the Armed Forces – since the officers who organized the conspiracy distributed it in the ranks of the Army. In spite of this, the influence this had on the events of September 1930 was of little significance.

The transition from elitist and hierarchical republicanism to corporatism took place in *La Nueva República*, after the military *coup* which legitimized the radicalization of those positions that were inclined towards anti-Semitism and conspiracy theories. In his commentary on the corporatist manifesto published in Córdoba by a group of intellectuals headed by Nimio de Anquín, Rodolfo Irazusta argued that 'there is no doubt that the corporate system is an imperative necessity of social life, and that its introduction would greatly facilitate popular representation'.³¹

44 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

The magazine *Criterio* appeared in Buenos Aires in March 1928 and rapidly became the most influential Catholic press in the twentieth century.³² Despite its long trajectory, *Criterio*'s leaders rejected any ideological affiliation that went beyond strict Catholic observance, there is no doubt that the orientation of the publication in the early years largely coincided with the nationalist ideology. It was not infrequent that various nationalist exponents collaborated with it, or that regular editors of the magazine were also published concurrently in clearly nationalist press. Founded by a group of young intellectuals who attended Catholic Culture Courses, the magazine was directed by Atilio Dell'Oro Maini from March 1928 to the end of 1929, and by Enrique Osés,³³ until mid-1932.

Under the direction of Dell'Oro Maini, the magazine represented a Catholic tool of cultural information intended above all for an educated and elite public. On its pages were published writers such as Jorge Luis Borges, Eduardo Mallea, Leonardo Castellani and Manuel Gálvez, and collaborators of *La Nueva República* such as César Pico, Ernesto Palacio and Tomás Casares. Political collaborations, unlike cultural ones, did not allow for a variety of positions. Their tone invariably expressed the positions of the anti-liberal and conservative nationalism, which was very close to that of *La Nueva República*.

As Loris Zanatta wrote, *Criterio* was created in symbiosis with the flaming Argentine nationalist movement.³⁴ This was the cause of many ambiguities, in particular with regard to his collaborators who also wrote in *La Nueva República*. In 1928, in *Criterio*, Manuel Gálvez defended the modern dictatorships that considered the phenomenon to be exclusively Greek-Catholic and Catholic, to which he attributed the merit of restoring the forms of classical politics, the predominance of the spiritual over materialism and of reason over instinct. In Gálvez's view, the root of the evil of modernity lay in the romanticism generated by Rousseau, whose political consequences were democracy, socialism and the struggle against all order and hierarchy. The writer positively evaluated the Italian fascist regime and the dictatorships in Spain, Portugal, Poland, Greece and Chile, because "they all re-establish hierarchical order, imposing respect for power, placing the Church in its true place, establishing the religious teaching, fighting immorality".³⁵

The adoption of the Rousseauian tradition led inevitably to the most feared of evils, for which Gálvez predicted a solution similar to that of the countries he looked to as models. Although the Yrigoyen government was the object of *Criterio*'s criticism, this was far more sporadic and moderate than that of *La Nueva República*. On the occasion of the elections that led the radical leader to the presidency once more, the magazine affirmed that, if before 1912 the regime had used venality and *caudillaje* for its electoral machine, in 1928 it did the same, with the aggravating circumstance 'which is now not making capacity selection ...'.³⁶ Criticism of *Criterio* about Yrigoyen shared the arguments of conservative accusations: inaction,

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 45

weakness, permissiveness in front of the left, demagogy. But the condemnations made in the Catholic weekly were directed more against the democratic system, universal suffrage and parliamentarianism than against the President.

From the end of 1929, *Criterio* depended more directly on the Archdiocese of Buenos Aires, thus limiting the margins of autonomy of its collaborators, which motivated Atilio Dell'Oro Maini's renunciation of the direction and removal from the magazine of both its editors linked to the nationalist movement, and its collaborators from the literary avant-gardes. One of the causes of the ecclesiastical decision was the concern for the relevance acquired by the nationalist exponents in the magazine. With the direction of Osés, *Criterio* profoundly changed its editorial line. Without abandoning the anti-liberal and anti-democratic discourse, political current affairs lost space on its pages and the struggle against nationalism – driven by the claim of the primacy of theology over politics – became one of the recurring themes of the publication. However, in September 1930, *Criterio* supported the *coup d'état* because it was not just a change of men, but because it advocated the transformation of the political system.

From the perspective of *Criterio*, the deposed regime, elected under the rule of the Constitution and the Sáenz Peña Law, had been pernicious both for the men who were part of it and “for having come to power in the street of the rallies”.³⁷ It was necessary to reform the Fundamental Law and electoral procedures that would make it possible to put an end not only to the risk of a return to the power of radicalism, but also to the democratic regime. Maeztu, who had already returned home, while praising the virtues of an authoritarian Catholic regime in which the military subrogated to the lack of political elites, did not give his consent to this line. In the same journal, he found, in Gálvez, the proponent of conservative dictatorial governments on the two sides of the Atlantic.³⁸

3.4 Ramiro de Maeztu and his relationship with the Argentine nationalist and Catholic world

Upon his arrival in Buenos Aires, Maeztu had close relationships with the young nationalist intellectuals gathered around *La Nueva República*.³⁹ According to reports from Julio Irazusta, Maeztu was brought closer to them by the favourable impression that the Spanish got from reading two articles by Ernesto Palacio in the literary supplement of *La Nación*.⁴⁰ The other usual interlocutor of the Spaniard was the Basque priest Zacarías de Vizcarra (1879–1963). He had been in Argentina since 1912, fostering a close relationship with the emigrant Spanish community, and acting as a fervent diffuser of a traditionalist Catholicism, as well as being closely related with the young nationalists who frequented Catholic circles. Vizcarra was also a professor in the Catholic Culture Courses, and a contributor to *Criterio*.

46 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

The young nationalists usually met with Maeztu at the Spanish embassy. According to what had been written by Zuleta Álvarez, they shared with Maeztu the idea of the political mission of writers and the value of the Hispanic culture that they saw embodied in Maeztu, while rejecting the abstract purity of culture defended by other intellectuals.⁴¹ González Calleja affirmed that between Maeztu and the neo-republicans a current of mutual influence had been established, based on the criticism of liberal democracy, the value of Catholicism as a decisive component of both national identities and the desire for rebirth of the Hispanic cultural tradition.⁴²

Figallo falsely attributed these friendships to the growing interest of Maeztu in the traditionalist thinkers that gathered around the *Action française*, in Maurras and his interpretation of history that assigned to the Church the role of the reorganization of society and to the language, the persistent deposit of eternal spirituality of a nation. In his opinion, until then Maeztu would have admired authors such as the German Oswald Spengler and the Anglo-French Belloc; in fact the latest books published in France were received in the library of the Jockey Club, in addition to those books of the reactionary authors, who had such a strong impact on the intellectuals of the Argentine Right.⁴³

But it seems clear that Maeztu's knowledge of traditionalist and reactionary French thought preceded his arrival in Buenos Aires. The fact remains that, at first the young neo-republicans, then most of the Argentine authoritarian Right, incorporated Maeztu's ideas and ideology into their vision. An early example is an intervention by Rodolfo Irazusta entitled "El día de la Raza" on *La Nueva República*, which supported the authority of Maeztu as follows:

For the Latin, and therefore Spanish, criterion, racial affinity does not derive only from blood. The races that form Latinity are nothing but the superposition of new ethnic layers (*capas*) that have come to build their identity through a bond much stronger than that of blood transfusion: through spiritual unity. [If for the Spaniards] race did not exist in blood but in baptism [and] what unites the Spaniards and the Americans more than blood and language is religion, [the consequence is that] those who commit themselves to destroying the religious sentiment of our people, mixed with all the patriotic feelings, they undertake to destroy the strongest and most noble bond that unites our society.⁴⁴

However, this ideological affinity did not extend to the political evaluations of the moment, since the opinion of the government and Hipolito Yrigoyen remained divergent, which Maeztu defended by negatively judging the criticisms of the young Argentine nationalists. The friendship between Maeztu and Zacarías de Vizcarra was not without consequences, at the time intent on promoting the replacement of the *Día de la Raza*⁴⁵ denomination with Día de la Hispanidad (a proposition he had made for the first time in

De Maetzu between Spain and Argentina 47

an article published in 1926 entitled “La Hispanidad y su verbo” on *El Eco Español* in Buenos Aires).

According to a later reconstruction made by Zacarías de Vizcarra, the idea of using this term was born by analogy from the terms *Humanidad* and *Cristiandad* to indicate “the set of all the peoples of Hispanic culture and origin scattered in Europe, America and Oceania” and at the same time “the set of qualities that distinguish Hispanic peoples and cultures from the rest of the world”.⁴⁶

The priest had suggested to the *Real Academia de la lengua* that these two additional meanings be added to the lemma, as they had been present since the beginning of the century in his dictionary as a synonym of hispanismo. This lemma was used for the first time by Unamuno in 1909 to represent the liberal cultural project that, by mixing different races and cultures, united Spain with Latin American countries in a sort of spiritual confederation.⁴⁷

Maetzu enthusiastically agreed with the proposal of Zacarías de Vizcarra. Not only did he accept the term, but he later attributed, in the first issue of *Acción Española*, the invention of the term to the Basque priest.⁴⁸ This magazine published extensive excerpts from an article by the priest, which had previously appeared in Argentina. This article reported the predictions of St. Bridget⁴⁹ in the first half of the fourteenth century on the events that would have preceded the coming of the Antichrist. He attributed two missions to the Spanish lineage, which is to the whole of Hispanidad, on behalf of Christianity, in order to save Humanity from its most terrible crisis. These missions were (1) to defeat the Antichrist and all his court of Jews, with the sign of the Cross; (2) in particular to Spain the task of completing the work begun in Covadonga, Las Navas, Granada and Lepanto, destroying the sect of Muhammad and restoring the Cathedral of Saint Sophia in Constantinople to Catholic worship.⁵⁰

In 1934, Maetzu would have further clarified his conception in his *Defensa de la Hispanidad*. For him the *Hispanidad* linked the spirit of the Spanish nation, born in 586 with the conversion of Recaredo, with Catholicism. In the idea of Maetzu, *Hispanidad* was born on 12 October 1492, identifying it with the conception of the world elaborated by Spanish humanism between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to which Providence had assigned the mission to realize the Christian idea of humanity.

This task was accomplished with the discovery and evangelization of the American subcontinent, which led to the formation of a permanent community based on Catholicism. Enlightenment reformers, starting in the eighteenth century, had already lost the profound meaning of the national idea. This gave rise to the decline of Spain, compensated for on the other side of the Atlantic by the inclusive attitude of the Spaniards towards the indigenous peoples (while the Anglo-Saxon colonization was characterized by exploitation). To get out of the crisis that had struck Spain and the Spanish-American nations (in which Maetzu included the

48 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

Portuguese-speaking ones) it was therefore necessary to restore *Hispanidad* with its religious values.

Recently, according to David Jiménez Torres, during his stay in London, Maeztu would have elaborated some ideas that would later merge into his *Defensa de la Hispanidad*. The argument rests on three articles published between 1911 and 1912, in which Maeztu extolled the modalities of the Spanish colonization by contrasting it with the Anglo-Saxon one and invoked the unity of the Hispanic peoples on the basis of shared culture, without this implying the political dominance of one part over the others. Jiménez Torres acknowledges, however, that Maeztu had not yet developed the two ideas that would be central in his *Defensa de la Hispanidad*: the defence of the monarchy as a form of government and the emphasis placed on Catholic values.

Particular interest in the Jiménez Torres interpretative proposal is the reconstruction of contacts and suggestions in this regard, that marked the London years of Maeztu. These were the relations with the Peruvian diplomat *arielist* Francisco García Calderón,⁵¹ and the suggestions coming from the cultural magazine published in London *Hispania*, which propagated the pan-Hispanic unit. Maeztu was influenced above all by a cultural climate strongly imbued with the debate around ancient colonial empires, in which some intellectuals did not consider them as gigantic historical aberrations, but as virtuous alliances on an equalitarian basis, from which both former colonizers and colonists would have benefited.⁵²

3.5 Medium-term impact

Careful to distance himself from the concept of Maurras' nation and from the *Politique d'abord* of the *Action française*, which the Catholic Church finally condemned in 1926,⁵³ Maeztu specified the contours of a nationalism that was completely compatible with the teaching of the ecclesiastical magisterium. This "nationalist catholicism", of which *Hispanidad* would be a sort of globalizing version, coincided with the project of Christianity to be realized in the Hispanic world. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Spanish primate, Cardinal Isidro Gomá, made the project his own in the speech delivered in the *Día de la Raza* of 1934 on the occasion of the International Eucharistic Congress of Buenos Aires, in which he said: 'America is work of Spain. This work of Spain is essentially of Catholicism. There is therefore a relationship of equality between the Islamic and the Catholic.' This text was later published in *Acción española* and in an appendix to the subsequent editions of Maeztu's book.⁵⁴

The favourable reception that the *Defensa de la Hispanidad* enjoyed in the circles of Argentine nationalism, as evidenced by the reviews of Julio Irazusta and Ernesto Palacio is not surprising. Both believed that the Argentine identity was formed at the same time as the colony; Irazusta compared the *Defensa de la Hispanidad* to the counter-revolutionary

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 49

programme of the *Enquête sur la Monarchie* of Maurras. This idea of *Hispanidad* had the advantage of not subordinating the nationalizing project to the Monarchy, but to the “Universal object of world evangelization”. In his opinion, Maeztu “clarified ideas that we had thought of and offered others that they had not thought of, bringing them all together in an organic system of admirable architecture”.⁵⁵ Palacio wrote, inspired by the *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, that the Argentinians were ‘Spanish, or rather [...] the extension of Spain in the Río de La Plata, due to the persistence [...] of the two differential elements, constitutive of culture, which are religion and language’.⁵⁶

Maeztu did not exercise an ephemeral influence in Argentina and Latin America. Even later, the *Defensa de la Hispanidad* was used to combat indigenism and pan-Americanism. Subsequently, the nationalist intellectuals gathered around the magazine *Sol y Luna* followed the idea of *Hispanidad* proposed by Maeztu. Published between November 1938 and May 1943, the magazine was directed by Mario Amadeo, Juan Carlos Goyeneche and José María de Estrada, counting among his nationalist collaborators Marcelo Sánchez Sorondo, Ignacio Anzoátegui, César Pico, Máximo Etchecopar and the philosopher Nimio de Anquín. Predominantly devoted to literary criticism, the publication claimed the need to maintain ties with Spain through the idea of *Hispanidad*, whose symbols were the cross and the sword.

With the claim of authentic Argentine identity, the ideological bases of the nineteenth-century elites who had preferred positivist liberalism to the Spanish roots were undermined. If, for its anti-liberal nationalism, *Sol y Luna* overcame the positions of *La Nueva República* in radicalism, the two publications were complementary in forging the ideological baggage of Platense Hispanicism. During the thirties it approached Spanish Falangism, to then support the rebel soldiers at the outbreak of and during the civil war.⁵⁷

The Buenos Aires period offered Maeztu the opportunity to come into direct contact with Argentine Catholic traditionalism, to refine his idea of *Hispanidad*⁵⁸ and the political project he led when he returned to Spain, on the pages of *Acción Española*. The magazine filled that void, reported by Maeztu, that the young Argentine nationalists had occupied by carrying out the revision of the nineteenth-century ideological baggage (liberalism, socialism, positivism).⁵⁹ Drawing up with the *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, the ecumenical mission of the Hispanic race, charged with guiding humanity towards salvation – as it was written – Maeztu’s Argentine stay was also decisive for the formulation and projection of Spanish counter-revolutionary nationalism in America.⁶⁰

On the other hand, the reading of the works of Spanish and the attendance that they had, marked for many exponents of Argentine nationalism the opportunity to radicalize their positions and to better place them in the wake of the reactionary European political thought of the

50 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

Catholic-fundamentalist matrix. Maeztu's influence went beyond Argentina, finding traces in various Latin American figures.⁶¹

What was the relationship with fascism?⁶² In this regard it is useful to recall what Federico Ibarguren wrote:

we, young revolutionaries (anti-liberal, but with autonomous bases) of the 1930 generation of 'fascist' had very little, very little. We were, on the other hand, 'Lugonian' to the bone in those distant times of La Nueva República. Being 'Lugonian' is different from being a 'fascist'. Evidently. Fascism as a theory was generated in a laboratory of intellectuals with the socialist sperm – totalitarian and secular – of the twentieth century; instead Argentine nationalism feeds on the ancient Hispanic cult of the personality, where the Catholic tradition sprouts like a well watered seed under the earth.⁶³

It is a testimony that many years later, evidently interested in supporting the originality of Argentine nationalism (which nationalism has ever admitted to owning exogenous ideas and movements?) and to mark their distance from the regimes that were destroyed by the world conflict after causing the worst catastrophes in the twentieth century. But if one looks at the premises and assumptions of fascism, the many streams that flowed into it, the segments of political cultures that landed there, feeding it, another perspective opens up with respect to that of insisting on its radical novelty, modernity and uniqueness. These characters found nourishment in a cultural and political background in which conservatism, reactionary-ism, counter-revolutionism and a certain Catholicism merged, and merged without being singularly considered new and modern. They then resorted either directly to fascism or to authoritarian political systems, with marked totalitarian tendencies: in Italy, Spain, Europe and on the other side of the Atlantic.

Notes

- 1 Despite some intentional omissions, the best biographical and intellectual profile of Ramiro de Maeztu is the one by Pedro Carlos González Cuevas, *Maeztu Biografía de un nacionalista español* (Madrid: Marial Pons, 2003). The present profile refers only to this work when not otherwise specified.
- 2 Mainer defined *Hacia otra España* "El libro más 'noventayochesco' de cuantos vieron la luz en el bienio 1898–1899" in José Carlos Mainer, *La doma de la Quiebra. Ensayos sobre nacionalismo y cultura en España* (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2004), 115. If Spanish historiography took long to admit, the regenerationism was typically proto-nationalist expressed in diverse ideological ways. It goes far beyond this contribution to point out the abundant literature regarding this matter, as well as that surrounding the relation between regenerationism, modernism and the generation of '98.
- 3 Apart from what was already identified in the biography by González Cuevas, see also Andrea Rinaldi, "Ramiro De Maeztu y la redacción de The New Age:

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 51

- el impacto de la I Guerra Mundial sobre una generación de intelectuales,” in *Falange, las culturas políticas del fascismo en la España de Franco (1936–1975)*, ed. Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer (Zaragoza: Institución “Fernando el Católico” – Diputación de Zaragoza, 2013), 463–80 and Valerio Torreggiani, “Gli anni londinesi di Ramiro de Maeztu e le influenze del New Age Circle: un caso di circolazione transnazionale delle teorie corporative (1905–1919),” *Studi storici* 3 (2017): 755–86.
- 4 Alfonso Botti, *La Spagna e la crisi modernista. Cultura, società civile e religiosa tra Otto e Novecento* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1987), 80–7.
 - 5 Volume about the instruction of history in different European countries (Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain and Italy) and after in Argentina. Pointless to refer to it as a precious source.
 - 6 Ángeles Castro Montero, *Ramiro de Maeztu enviado especial de La Prensa en el frente británico. Reflexiones, crónicas de guerra y propaganda aliada para la opinión pública argentina (1914–1918)*, *PolHis* 14 (2014): 71–93. <http://polhis.com.ar/index.php/PolHis/article/view/8>.
 - 7 With reference to Lusitanian Integralism’s reception in Spain see Pedro Carlos González Cuevas, “El integralismo lusitano: su recepción en España,” *Proserpine* 11 (1994): 79–110.
 - 8 Ramiro De Maeztu, “El Ejército en España. El peligro de la balcanización,” *La Prensa*, 4 November 1923.
 - 9 Now in Ramiro de Maeztu, “El sentido reverencial del dinero,” in *Obras* (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1974), 801.
 - 10 A mention exists in Alfonso Botti, *Cielo y dinero. El nacionalcatolicismo en España (1881–1975)* (Madrid: Alianza, 1992), 70.
 - 11 Beatriz J. Figallo, “Ramiro de Maeztu y la Argentina,” *Res Gestae (Rosario)* 24 (1988): 75–7; Luis Ocio, “La configuración del pensamiento reaccionario español: el caso de Ramiro de Maeztu durante su etapa de embajador en la Argentina,” *Historia Contemporánea, (Bilbao)* 18 (1999): 354.
 - 12 Genoveva Quipo de Llano, *Los intelectuales y la dictadura de Primo de Rivera* (Madrid: Alianza, 1988).
 - 13 At least, starting from the volume of Raúl Morodo, *Acción Española: orígenes ideológicos del franquismo* (Madrid: Tucur, 1980).
 - 14 Pedro Sáinz Rodríguez, *Testimonio y recuerdos* (Barcelona: Planeta, 1978), 153.
 - 15 Highlighted by Eduardo González Calleja, “El hispanismo autoritario español y el movimiento [sic] nacionalista argentino: balance de medio siglo de relaciones políticas e intelectuales (1898–1946),” *Hispania* 226 (2007): 599–642, 614.
 - 16 Eduardo González Calleja, “El hispanismo autoritario,” 611.
 - 17 Enrique Zuleta Álvarez, “Maeztu en Buenos Aires,” *Razón Española* (1997): 320.
 - 18 “Ramiro de Maeztu,” *La Nueva República*, 1 March 1928, 1.
 - 19 Leopoldo Lugones, “Discurso de Ayacucho (1924),” in *La Patria Fuerte* (Buenos Aires: Círculo Militar, 1930), 13–18.
 - 20 Note from the ambassador to the State Minister, August the 8th of 1928, quoted by Beatriz J. Figallo, “Ramiro de Maeztu y la Argentina,” *Res Gestae (Rosario)* 24 (1988): 83. See also Id., “Yrigoyen y su segundo gobierno vistos por Ramiro de Maeztu,” in *Todo es historia (Buenos Aires)* 312 (1993): 80–93.
 - 21 Figallo, “Ramiro de Maeztu y la Argentina,” 87–8.
 - 22 *Ibid.*, 89.
 - 23 This paragraph and the successive, when not specifically mentioned, are a result of Daniel Lvovich, “La imagen del enemigo y sus transformaciones en *La Nueva República* (1928–1931),” in *Entrepasados. Revista de Historia* 17 (1999): 49–71 and *El nacionalismo de derecha en la Argentina. Desde sus orígenes hasta Tacuara* (Buenos Aires: Claves para todos, 2006).

52 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

- 24 Founded in 1919 by Francisco Urriburu (1872–1940), *La Fronda* had some young editors from *La Nueva República*; María Inés Tato, *Viento de fronda. Liberalismo, conservadurismo y democracia en la Argentina, 1911–1932* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2004).
- 25 On 3 November, appearing with the subtitle *Época de la reorganización nacional* it was jointly directed by Palacio and Rodolfo Irazusta.
- 26 Juan E. Carulla, *Al filo del medio siglo* (Paraná: Editorial Llanura, 1951).
- 27 While recognizing that it was a temperate Mauristism compared to that of its European contemporaries, it underlines the influence of Maurras, Fernando Devoto, *Nacionalismo, fascismo y tradicionalismo en la Argentina moderna* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2002), 193 ff.
- 28 Rodolfo Irazusta, “República y Democracia,” *La Nueva República*, 15 March 1928, 1.
- 29 Ernesto Palacio, “Organicemos la contrarrevolución,” *La Nueva República*, 1 December 1927, 2.
- 30 Rodolfo Irazusta, “La Política,” *La Nueva República*, April 14, 1928. Referring to *Bases y Puntos de Partida para la Organización Política de la República Argentina* by Juan Bautista Alberdi (1810–1884).
- 31 Rodolfo Irazusta, “La Revolución Americana,” *La Nueva República*, 8 November 1930.
- 32 Regarding the magazine and its ideological orientation see Fernando Devoto, *Nacionalismo, fascismo y tradicionalismo en la Argentina moderna* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2002), 206–34; Loris Zanatta, *Del Estado liberal a la nación católica. Iglesia y ejército en los orígenes del peronismo, 1930–1943* (Bernal: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 1996), 46–50 and 133–34; María Ester Rapalo, “La Iglesia católica argentina y el autoritarismo político: la revista *Criterio*, 1928–1931,” *Anuario del IEHS (Tandil)* 5 (1990): 51–70 and Id., “De la Asociación del Trabajo a la revista *Criterio*: encuentros entre propietarios e ideólogos, 1919–1929,” in *La derecha argentina. Nacionalistas, neoliberales, militares y clericales* (Buenos Aires: B. Argentina, 2001), 139–44; Miranda Lida, “Estética, cultura y política en la revista *Criterio* (Argentina, 1928–1936),” in *Nuevos Mundos, Mundos Nuevos*, 2015. <https://journals.openedition.org/nuevomundo/67968> (accessed 7 May 2018).
- 33 During the 1930s, Osés was an indefatigable anti-liberal, anti-Communist and anti-Semitic agitator in his newspapers and at the La Mazorca publishing house, which had relations with the Unión Nacionalista de Estudiantes Secundarios, Renovación and other minor nationalist groups. Like others, he tried to set himself up as a leader of the *nacionalismo* and, although the organizations to which he belonged never reached hegemonic positions, from 1941 the newspapers of this orientation called him *Jefe del Nacionalismo* o *Primer Camarada* (see Daniel Lvovich, *Nacionalismo y Antisemitismo en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones B, 2003), *passim*).
- 34 Loris Zanatta, *Del Estado liberal a la Nación Católica. Iglesia y Ejército en los orígenes del Peronismo. 1930–1943* (Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 1996), 47.
- 35 Manuel Gálvez, “Interpretación de las dictaduras,” *Criterio* 32 (1928): 44.
- 36 Editorial, “Un deber de conciencia,” *Criterio* 4 (1928): 103.
- 37 Editorial, “El manifiesto del gobierno provisorio,” *Criterio* 136 (9 October 1930): 461–62.
- 38 Manuel Gálvez, “Ignorancia, república, comunismo,” *Criterio*, 13 August 1931.
- 39 On Maeztu’s relations with the group of *La Nueva República*, see Vicente Marro, *Maeztu* (Madrid: Rialp, 1955), 245–58 and also Enrique Zuleta Álvarez, “Maeztu en Buenos Aires,” *Razón Española* 83 (1997): 319–25. González Cuevas, *Maeztu*, 240–44.

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 53

- 40 The two articles were Ernesto A. Palacio, "De la inteligencia como servicio público," *La Nación*, January 29, 1928 e Id., "Nacionalismo y panteísmo político," *La Nación*, 26 February 1929. Julio Irazusta, "La 'Historia de Argentina' de Ernesto A. Palacio. A los veinticinco años de su aparición," *Nueva Historia Buenos Aires* 24 (1979): 328.
- 41 Enrique Zuleta Álvarez, "Maeztu en Buenos Aires," *Razón Española* 83 (1997): 321.
- 42 González Calleja, "El hispanismo autoritario español," 611.
- 43 Figallo, "Ramiro de Maeztu y la Argentina," 81.
- 44 *La Nueva República*, 12 October 1931.
- 45 The festivity was established by Yrigoyen during his previous mandate with a decree of 1917, "as a tribute to Spain, the ancestor of the nations to which he gave an immortal heritage with the yeast of his blood and the harmony of his language."
- 46 Zacarías de Vizcarra, "Origen del nombre, concepto y fiesta de la Hispanidad," *El Español*, 7 October 1944.
- 47 Miguel de Unamuno, "Sobre la argentinidad," now in *Temas argentinos* (Buenos Aires: Institución Cultural Española, 1949), 63.
- 48 'La palabra se debe a un sacerdote, español y patriota que en la Argentina reside, D. Zacarías de Vizcarra'. R. de Maeztu, "Hispanidad," *Acción Española* 1 (1932): 8. On the magazine and the homonymous movement see Raúl Morodo, *Los orígenes ideológicos del franquismo: Acción Española* (Madrid: Alianza, 1985); Pedro Carlos González Cuevas, *Acción Española. Teología política y nacionalismo autoritario en España (1913-1936)* (Madrid: Tecnos, 1998); Ismael Saz, "Las culturas de los nacionalismos franquistas," *Ayer* 73 (2008): 153-74. On the reception of Maurras in Spain see Pedro Carlos González Cuevas, "Charles Maurras y España," *Hispania* 188 (1994): 993-1040 and the articles in Xavier Pla, ed., *Maurras a Catalunya: elements per a un debat* (Barcelona: Cuaderns Crema, 2012). The birth in Spain of a magazine and association very close even in the name of the *Action française*, recently condemned by the Holy See confirms the strong relationship built by the Spanish promoters with the teaching of the Magisterium. The nuncio in Madrid Federico Tedeschini at the beginning of February 1935 in a report to Pacelli expressed concern about the proximity of the *Acción española* with the *Action française*. Then he did not send the report because he was reassured of their loyalty to the Pope by the main representatives of the magazine (Maeztu, Pemán, Vegas Latapié e Vigón) who visited him (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Arch. Nunz. Madrid, b. 913, ff. 420 e 423).
- 49 Vizcarra quoted regarding the prophecies of Saint Bridget, Giuseppe Ciuffa, *L'odierna guerra nell' Apocalisse di S. Giovanni* (Rome: Tipografia Pontificia, d1916), 181, 184.
- 50 Zacarías de Vizcarra, "El apóstol Santiago y el mundo hispano," *Acción española* no. 16 (1932): 385-400. On the origins of the concept of *Hispanidad* see Ricardo del Arco y Garay, *La idea del imperio en la política y literatura españolas* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1944), 787; Rosa María Pardo Sanz, *¡Con Franco hacia el Imperio! La política exterior española en América Latina, 1939-1945* (Madrid: UNED, 1995), 215-19; Pedro Carlos González Cuevas, "Hispanidad," in *Enciclopedia del Nacionalismo*, ed. Andrés de Blas Guerrero (Madrid: Tecnos, 1997), 215-19.
- 51 From the essay *Ariel* (1900) by the Uruguayan writer José Enrique Rodó, with which we indicate the pre-existing Latin American ideological current. Opposing Anglo-Saxon utilitarianism, this current defended the values of Greek-Latin culture.
- 52 David Jiménez Torres, *Ramiro de Maeztu and England: Imaginaries, Realities and Repercussions of a Cultural Encounter* (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2016), 148-58.

54 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

- 53 Jacques Prévotat, *Les catholiques et l'Action française. Histoire d'une condamnation, 1899-1939* (Paris: Fayard, 2001).
- 54 Isidro Gomá y Tomás, "Apología de la Hispanidad," *Acción española* 64-65 (1934): 193-230.
- 55 Julio Irazusta, "Un acontecimiento de la literatura política española: *Defensa de la Hispanidad* de Ramiro de Maeztu," *La Gaceta de Buenos Aires*, 20 July 1934, no. 1, cit. in González Calleja, "El hispanismo autoritario español," 620.
- 56 Ernesto Palacio, "Defensa de la Hispanidad, de Ramiro de Maeztu," *El Hogar (Buenos Aires)* 21 September 1934; see also Id., *La Historia falsificada* (Buenos Aires: Difusión, 1939), 62. Noted that, among others, Noriko Mutsuki, *Julio Irazusta. Treinta años de nacionalismo argentino* (Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2004), 112.
- 57 Osvaldo Rodolfo Martini, "Ramiro de Maeztu en la Argentina. La gestación de la doctrina de la Hispanidad entre el catolicismo y el nacionalismo argentino," *La Razón Histórica, Revista Hispanoamericana de Historia de las Ideas* 24 (2013). <https://www.revistalarazonhistorica.com/24-2/>.
- 58 Ramiro de Maeztu, "La Hispanidad," *Acción Española* 1 (1931): 12; Id. "Hispanidad," *Acción Española* 5 (1932): 449-50 and Id. "La tradición hispánica de América," *Acción Española* 94 (1934): 1-5.
- 59 Ramiro de Maeztu, *Criterio*, 1930, no 119; cit. in Martini, "Ramiro de Maeztu en la Argentina," 20.
- 60 González Calleja, "El hispanismo autoritario español," 609.
- 61 Among them is the Nicaraguan Pablo Antonio Cuadra; the Peruvians Felipe Bareda Laos, Víctor Andrés Belaúnde, José de la Riva Agüero and Alberto Wagner de Reyna; the equatorian José María Velasco Ibarra; the Chilean Víctor de Valdivia and Osvaldo Lira; the Mexican José Vasconcelos and the Uruguayan Alberto de Herrera; Eugenio Vegas Latapié, *Romanticismo y democracia* (Santander: Impta. Aldus, 1938), 180-81; Alberto Martín Artajo, *Hacia la comunidad hispánica de naciones* (Madrid: Cultura Hispánica, 1956) and Marrero, *Maeztu*, 474-95.
- 62 See Federico Finchelstein, *Fascismo Transatlántico. Ideología, violencia y sacralidad en la Argentina y en Italia, 1919-1945* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2010).
- 63 Federico Ibarguren, *Orígenes del nacionalismo argentino. 1927-1937* (Buenos Aires: Celcius, 1969), 12.

References

- Álvarez, Enrique Zuleta. "Maeztu en Buenos Aires." *Razón Española* 83 (1997): 319-25.
- Botti, Alfonso. *La Spagna e la crisi modernista. Cultura, società civile e religiosa tra Otto e Novecento*, 80-87. Brescia: Morcelliana, 1987.
- Botti, Alfonso. *Cielo y dinero. El nacionalcatolicismo en España (1881-1975)*. Madrid: Alianza, 1992.
- Carulla, Juan. *Al filo del medio siglo*. Paraná: Editorial Llanura, 1951.
- Devoto, Fernando. *Nacionalismo, fascismo y tradicionalismo en la Argentina moderna*, XXI. Buenos Aires: Siglo, 2002.
- Figallo, Beatriz. "Ramiro de Maeztu y la Argentina." *Res Gestae (Rosario)* 24 (1988): 73-92.
- Figallo, Beatriz. "Yrigoyen y su segundo gobierno vistos por Ramiro de Maeztu." *Todo es historia (Buenos Aires)* 312 (1993): 80-93.
- Finchelstein, Federico. *Fascismo Transatlántico. Ideología, violencia y sacralidad en la Argentina y en Italia, 1919-1945*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2010.

De Maeztu between Spain and Argentina 55

- Garay, Ricardo del Arco y. *La idea del imperio en la política y literatura españolas*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1944.
- González Calleja, Eduardo. "El hispanismo autoritario español y el movimiento [sic] nacionalista argentino: balance de medio siglo de relaciones políticas e intelectuales (1898–1946)." *Hispania* 226 (2007): 599–642.
- González Cuevas, Pedro Carlos. "Charles Maurras y España." *Hispania* 188 (1994): 993–1040.
- González Cuevas, Pedro Carlos. "El integralismo lusitano: su recepción en España." *Proserpine* 11 (1994): 79–110.
- González Cuevas, Pedro Carlos. "Hispanidad," In *Enciclopedia del Nacionalismo*, edited by Andrés de Blas Guerrero, 215–19. Madrid: Tecnos, 1997.
- González Cuevas, Pedro Carlos. *Acción Española. Teología política y nacionalismo autoritario en España (1913–1936)*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1998.
- González Cuevas, Pedro Carlos. *Maeztu. Biografía de un nacionalista español*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2003.
- Ibarguren, Federico. *Orígenes del nacionalismo argentino. 1927–1937*. Buenos Aires: Celcius, 1969.
- Jiménez Torres, David. *Ramiro de Maeztu and England: Imaginaries, Realities and Repercussions of a Cultural Encounter*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2016.
- Latapié, Eugenio Vegas. *Romanticismo y democracia*. Santander: Impta. Aldus, 1938.
- Lida, Miranda. "Estética, cultura y política en la revista *Criterio* (Argentina, 1928–1936)." *Nuevos Mundos, Mundos Nuevos*, 2015. <https://journals.openedition.org/nuevomundo/67968>.
- Lvovich, Daniel. "La imagen del enemigo y sus transformaciones en *La Nueva República* (1928–1931)." *Entre pasados. Revista de Historia* 17 (1999): 49–71.
- Lvovich, Daniel. *Nacionalismo y Antisemitismo en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones B, 2003.
- Lvovich, Daniel. *El nacionalismo de derecha en la Argentina. Desde sus orígenes hasta Tacuara*. Buenos Aires: Claves para todos, 2006.
- Mainer, José-Carlos. *La doma de la Quiebra. Ensayos sobre nacionalismo y cultura en España*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2004.
- Marrero, Vicente. *Maeztu*. Madrid: Rialp, 1955.
- Martín Artajo, Alberto. *Hacia la comunidad hispánica de naciones*. Madrid: Cultura Hispánica, 1956.
- Martini, Osvaldo. "Ramiro de Maeztu en la Argentina. La gestación de la doctrina de la Hispanidad entre el catolicismo y el nacionalismo argentino." *La Razón Histórica, Revista Hispanoamericana de Historia de las Ideas* 24 (2013): 9–21.
- Montero, Angeles Castro. "Ramiro de Maeztu enviado especial de *La Prensa* en el frente británico. Reflexiones, crónicas de guerra y propaganda aliada para la opinión pública argentina (1914–1918)." *PolHis* 14 (2014): 71–93.
- Morodo, Raul. *Acción Española: orígenes ideológicos del franquismo*. Madrid: Tucur, 1980.
- Morodo, Raúl. *Los orígenes ideológicos del franquismo: Acción Española*. Madrid: Alianza, 1985.
- Mutsuki, Noriko. *Julio Irazusta. Treinta años de nacionalismo argentino*. Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2004.
- Ocio, Luis. "La configuración del pensamiento reaccionario español: el caso de Ramiro de Maeztu durante su etapa de embajador en la Argentina." *Historia Contemporánea, (Bilbao)* 18 (1999): 347–82.

56 *Alfonso Botti and Daniel Lvovich*

- Palacio, Ernesto. *La Historia falsificada*. Buenos Aires: Difusión, 1939.
- Pardo Sanz, Rosa María. *¡Con Franco hacia el Imperio! La política exterior española en América Latina, 1939–1945*. Madrid: UNED, 1995.
- Pla, Xavier, ed. *Maurras a Catalunya: elements per a un debat*. Barcelona: Cuaderns Crema, 2012.
- Prévotat, Jacques. *Les catholiques et l'Action française. Histoire d'une condamnation, 1899–1939*. Paris: Fayard, 2001.
- Quijo de Llano, Genoveva. *Los intelectuales y la dictadura de Primo de Rivera*. Madrid: Alianza, 1988.
- Rapalo, María Ester. "La Iglesia católica argentina y el autoritarismo político: la revista *Criterio*, 1928–1931." *Anuario del IEHS (Tandil)* 5 (1990): 51–70.
- Rapalo, María Ester. "De la Asociación del Trabajo a la revista *Criterio*: encuentros entre propietarios e ideólogos, 1919–1929," In *La derecha argentina. Nacionalistas, neoliberales, militares y clericales*, edited by David Rock, Sandra McGee Deutsch, María Ester Rapalo, Ronald Dolkart, Daniel Lvovich, Richard Walter, Leonardo Senkmank and Paul Lewis, 113–50. Buenos Aires: Eds. B Argentina, 2001.
- Rinaldi, Andrea. "Ramiro De Maeztu y la redacción de *The NewAge*: el impacto de la I Guerra Mundial sobre una generación de intelectuales," In *Falange, las culturas políticas del fascismo en la España de Franco (1936–1975)*, Zaragoza: institución "Fernando el Católico", edited by Ruiz Carnicer and Miguel Ángel, 463–80. Zaragoza, Spain: Diputación de Zaragoza, 2013.
- Sáinz Rodríguez, Pedro. *Testimonio y recuerdos*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1978.
- Saz, Ismael. "Las culturas de los nacionalismos franquistas." *Ayer* 73 (2008): 153–74.
- Tato, María Inés. *Viento de fronda. Liberalismo, conservadurismo y democracia en la Argentina, 1911–1932, XXI*. Buenos Aires: Siglo, 2004.
- Torreggiani, Valerio. "Gli anni londinesi di Ramiro de Maeztu e le influenze del New Age Circle: un caso di circolazione transnazionale delle teorie corporative (1905–1919)." *Studi storici* 3 (2017): 755–86.
- Zanatta, Loris. *Del Estado liberal a la nación católica. Iglesia y ejército en los orígenes del peronismo, 1930–1943*. Bernal: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 1996.