

## Spain and the United States: a cinematic relationship, 1939-1953

### Rafael de España

When the Spanish Civil War ended, the political and ideological atmosphere of Spain changed a lot: for the new regime, democracy and freedom were synonymous with the «decadent and corrupt» republican years. The triumph of Franco's Army was due in great part to the support of Germany and Italy, and this inevitably led to a preponderance of the Fascist ideas represented by the Falange party. In fact, Franco was never a real Fascist, but at this moment he considered unavoidable to adopt a sympathetic attitude towards this ideology<sup>1</sup>. In the cinematic field this was reflected in a significant increase of German and Italian films shown on Spanish screens and a decrease in American films, that were seen as frivolous, banal and even immoral. The influence in American films of Roosevelt's «New Deal», with its emphasis on democracy, free speech, and capitalism, was regarded with special contempt by the rhetorics of the new regime, who preferred the sober and virile atmosphere of Nazi films. Moreover, some famous Hollywood actors had been involved in pro-Republican activities during the years 1936-1939; they were declared *persona non grata* by Franco, but curiously their films were *not* banned. The names of these players (James Cagney, Franchot Tone, Fredric March, Joan Crawford, Charles Chaplin, and many others) were eliminated in the ads, trailers and release prints of the films in which they appeared but nothing more, despite the fact that their scenes were preserved and everyone was recognized by the public! This absurd form of censorship shows very clearly Franco's hesitancy to disturb the Americans: the radical Falangists were satisfied with this childish penalty but the Hollywood producers were not affected in their economical interests<sup>2</sup>.

Anyway, during the period 1939-1942 films coming from the Axis countries predominated -slightly- over the American ones (see Table I). None of the Hollywood's propaganda films were released, but it's true, too, that the most viciously propagandistic Nazi films had very limited showings. For example, the anti-semitic *Jud Süß* (1940, dir. Veit Harlan) or the anti-British *Ohm Kruger* (1941, dir. Hans Steinhoff) were premiered in semi-private screenings for VIPs but had no general release in theaters (the US Embassy, on the other hand, also showed a number of films for a private audience). The only overtly anti-semitic film released in Spain (on November 1941) was *Robert und Bertram* (1939, dir. Hans Heinz Zerlett), in which the Jews were portrayed as «comic characters more than subhumans»<sup>3</sup> and the racial innuendoes passed largely unnoticed among Spanish audiences. Most of the German and Italian films were period spectaculars, sentimental comedies («white telephone» films) or Viennese musicals. Some of them enjoyed great popularity, especially those coming from the Italian studios, with a lesser emphasis on ideology than the German films: the marvelous epic *La corona di ferro* (1941, dir. Alessandro Blasetti; released in the US as *The Iron Crown* after the War) or the costume melodrama *Un colpo di pistola* (1942, dir. Renato Castellani) are well remembered today. The German films, although praised by some critics (mainly in the Falangist magazine *Primer Plano* -i.e., «Close Up» ), were disliked by the audiences, that found them heavy-handed and lacking pace; only some operettas, the Heinz Rühmann comedies, the beautiful romantic melodrama *Der Postmeister* (made in Nazi Austria in 1940 by Gustav Ucicky), and adventure films like the second version of *The Indian Tomb* (1938, dir. Richard Eichberg, starring the sexy dancer La Jana) or the antibolshevik *Panzerkreuzer Sebastopol* (1936, dir. Karl Anton) were relatively well-received.

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
Spain	16	26	30	38	47	42	30
United States	56	77	45	28	61	120	138
Germany	34	71	50	8	8	12	6
Italy	9	16	17	9	33	13	1
Great Britain	4	16	13	18	21	17	11
France	4	13	18	16	10	4	5
Portugal						1	1

Mexico		2	6	3	3	2	13
Argentina	1	9	4	3	7	3	5
Cuba	1						
TOTAL	125	230	183	123	191	213	210

**TABLE I**

Number of films released in Spain during the years 1939-1945 according to its country of origin.

Source: CUEVAS, A. (ed.) *Anuario Cinematográfico Hispano-Americano*. Madrid: sindicato Nacional del Espectáculo, 1950, p. 345.

The real success of these years was precisely an American film, David O. Selznick's classic production of *Rebecca*. The premiere of this film, the first that Alfred Hitchcock directed in Hollywood, aroused an enthusiasm among critics and public as any German or Italian film had never done, despite the objections and cursings that came from *Primer Plano* against the dangers of «rebequismo», as they said. In fact, this film influenced a whole generation of moviegoers: a 1948 film, Llobet-Gracia's *Vida en sombras*, tells the story of a man, fanatical filmmaker, who considers himself, and his love for cinema, responsible for his wife's death; because of that, he decides not to see or making a film again. A friend convinces him to see *Rebecca*, and the old love is reborn. *Rebecca* was released on December 10, 1942. This year marked a change in Franco's politics. The American landing in Africa showed clearly that things began to go wrong for the Axis, and Franco decided to express some benevolence towards the Allies. On April, 1943, the first American war film was released: it was a «B» production from Republic titled *Women in War*, directed by the obscure John H. Auer and dating from 1940; its message was far from aggressive, but unmistakably pro-British. Bands of Falangists ransacked the theaters where the film was shown, but authorities didn't take notice. Even greater anger was provoked in the pro-Fascist media when *In Which We Serve* (1943), Noel Coward-David Lean's glorification of British Navy, was passed by the Censor and released on September 25, 1944, under the title *Sangre, sudor y lágrimas* («Blood, Sweat, and Tears»). These two examples are of special interest because they are exceptions to the Spanish censors' otherwise strict neutrality, which forbid practically any reference to the War events until 1945. For example, in the Spanish-dubbed version of Alfred Hitchcock's *Foreign Correspondent* (1940), released in 1944, the belligerent speech broadcast by the hero from bombed London was transformed into a pacifist message. And the same was true for the Axis films: in 1943 censorship approval was denied to Roberto Rossellini's *Un pilota ritorna* (1942), an officially-sponsored Italian production about the campaign in Greece, personally supervised by Mussolini's brother Vittorio<sup>4</sup>.

It was becoming evident that things were going badly for the Axis, and Franco was attempting an approach to the Allies -especially the Americans. The Press received orders to treat the War in the Pacific from a pro-American point of view, exposing clearly the Japanese atrocities in the Philippines<sup>5</sup>. In fact, even the most radical Spanish media never had a friendly feeling towards the «Empire of the Rising Sun»: not long before, the Philippines had been a part of Spain, and their suffering under the Nippon boots was felt by everybody. Still the first films portraying the Japanese as real «villains» didn't appear until 1946. And later, the war in Philippines was used in Spanish films to make a sympathetic approach to American people. One of the most typical examples of this was *Noche sin cielo* (1947, dir. Ignacio F. Iquino). Loosely based on historical fact, it depicted the cruelty of the Japs towards the Spaniards living in Philippines, and among the characters appearing in the plot it was included Frankie, a young and handsome American pilot who (as Press publicity said) «with his optimism and noble heart cheers up poor Rosa (a girl who has been brutally raped by the invaders)»<sup>6</sup>.

The film that used a Philippine setting to enhance the friendly relationship between Spaniards and Americans in the most strange and oblique way was *Los últimos de Filipinas* (1945, dir. Antonio Roman). Ironically, it deals with an actual incident of the 1898 war, when Spain lost the two last remains of its Empire -Cuba and the Philippines- precisely at the hands of the United States. The military garrison of Baler, a little Spanish outpost in the Philippines, unaware that the war is over and Spain has ceded the islands, heroically resists for months the assault of the Filipinos. The most interesting aspect of this film (that begins with an acknowledgment to the US Embassy for its cooperation) is the way in which it avoids any anti-American diatribe, even though a scene was inserted in which a group of American sailors are killed by the rebels when attempting to help the courageous, but badly informed, defenders of Baler. As a matter of fact, the «message» proposed by the script had little to do with the 1898 incidents but very much with the political climate of 1945, when it was obvious to Franco that the end of the World War

would result in a reaction of the victors against his regime. Therefore, the real message the film wanted to enforce in the moviegoer has to be divided into three categories: one, the necessity of getting ready for resistance to a foreign aggression; two, reassurance that the Army was the principal defender of the Country, and three, dispell any remant of the resentment towards the Americans created in Spain after the defeat of 1898: in 1945 Franco needed to gain the benevolence of the powerful United States, felt by him as the only possible supporters of his political ideas.

After 1945 there was an increasing flow of American films to Spain. They were very well received by the public, with reticence by some critics and with usual care by the censors: the main obsessions of these gentlemen were kiss scenes and naked flesh, so they were not especially worried by Hollywood films, which were al ways very conservative in the sex department. But American movies were not so careful, for example, in the way they depicted foreign countries. For Hollywood, Spain was the land of brave *toreros* and beautiful *señoritas*, and the atmosphere of the «Spanish» pictures was not even Andalusian, but mainly Mexican. The native Spaniard found it hard to recognize the Barcelona glimpsed in the early scenes of *Proud Flesh* (1925, dir. King Vidor), or the Valencian setting of *The Torrent* (1926, dir. Monta Bell). When the silent version of Blasco Ibáñez' *Blood and Sand* (1922, dir. Fred Niblo) was released in Spain the Seville sequences were re-edited, inserting some footage of the actual locales, to avoid an angry reaction on the part of the audience<sup>7</sup>. In 1935 there was a famous incident on this subject, when the Spanish -then Republican- Government made a formal protest to Paramount for the ludicrous image of Spain presented in *The Devil is a Woman* (1935, dir. Josef Von Sternberg), with Marlene Dietrich as an unlikely Andalusian siren. In an official statement, the Spanish Government said: «We feel justified in protesting against a foreign film which misrepresents Spanish scenes, customs and character to the extent of making it ridiculous»<sup>8</sup>. This angry reaction seems rather exaggerated today, because this film was never intended to be realistic, and Spain was depicted in the same flamboyant fashion as Morocco, China and Russia in earlier Von Sternberg efforts. But it was effective: Paramount withdrew the film, which remained unseen for many years.

You can imagine what happened some years later, when the 1941 color remake of *Blood and Sand* (dir. Rouben Mamoulian) was revised by the censor. This opulent spectacle, with its extremely rich, sometimes kitschy visuals, is a joy for the eye but is undeniable that its vision of Spain is crude and unreal-not to say surrealist. The film didn't pass the censor until 1949, and then only with a lot of cuts and modifications: at the beginning a title was inserted making clear that the action didn't take place in contemporary Spain but in an imprecise 19th Century; the arena sequences were completely reedited, eliminating such oddities as the «widows' box» that does not exist in any bullring, and the Rita Hayworth character lost her name «Miura» -a real one- as well as the most daring sex scenes<sup>9</sup>. Another point of trouble was with period films concerning characters or events from Spanish History. Films like *The Sea Hawk* (1940, dir. Michael Curtiz), with its Hitler-like portrait of Philip II, were strictly forbidden, as was *Captain from Castile* (1947, dir. Henry King), for its ambiguous treatment of Cortez and the conquest of Mexico. Even Hollywood's seemingly innocuous pirate adventures were censored because Spaniards appeared usually as the villains of the plot: in some cases, the story was arranged in order to make unclear their nationality (*The Black Swan*, 1942, dir. Henry King, not released in Spain until 1948); in other cases they were simply banned (*The Spanish Main*, 1945, dir. Frank Borzage).

But the greatest controversy was, curiously, with a film that was passed by the censor without any objection: *Suez* (1938, dir. Allan Dwan). In this highly-fictionalised account of the construction of the Suez Channel, Emperor Napoleon III's Spanish wife Eugenia played an important part. Some scenes in the plot suggested that she had an affair with a handsome Ferdinand de Lesseps (the characters were played by the glamorous Loretta Young and Tyrone Power). The film was premiered in Madrid on October 13, 1943, and got generally good reviews. But soon came a stormy protest from a group of historians, who found absolutely inadequate and offensive the way in which the noble and modest Spanish lady who became Empress of the French was portrayed in the film. The protest was so strong that it even promoted a film destined to reestablish the lady's good reputation: it was titled with the name of its heroine, *Eugenia de Montijo* (1944, dir. José López Rubio)<sup>10</sup>, and is remembered (no complete prints survive) as a fine film, beautifully photographed and designed. The plot ended triumphantly with the marriage of Eugenia with Napoleon, thus avoiding the later years, which were obviously more controversial.

Another point of conflict was the treatment of religious subjects. Despite (or perhaps because of) the extremely respectful approach to any religion imposed by the Hays Office, some Hollywood films were considered quite unorthodox by the ecclesiastical member of the Censors Board. One typical case was *The Keys of the Kingdom* (1943, dir. John M. Stahl). Based on a novel by A. J. Cronin, the hero was a Catholic priest and the events of the plot were always presented in a way favorable to Catholicism, but some scenes in which the priest discussed religious aspects with non-Catholics (Chinese and Protestant) appeared ambiguous to the eyes of Spanish censor and he imposed several cuts; the domestic version was released in 1946 in a very disfigured form. A similar thing happened with *Gentleman's Agreement* (1946, dir. Elia Kazan), a film whose main purpose was to expose anti-semitism in the United States. Presented to the Censor under the proposed title *La luz es para todos* «(Light is for Everybody) », it was drastically rejected on the basis of «theological errors» , for stating that Christians were not superior to Jews, and even that a Jew could be proud of being a Jew! That Censor decision was put into public evidence by the American press, offering to their readers an inquisitorial and intolerant image of Franco's Spain; the Government, afraid of any negative reaction of American people, decided to revise and pass the film with some modifications and with the initial title changed to *La barrera invisible* «(The Invisible Wall)». It was released in 1949<sup>11</sup>.

In the meantime, what was the fate of Spanish films in the States? Traditionally they were screened in theaters which specialized in Spanish- language movies, and were usually shown in original version without subtitles, in effect keeping them hidden from English-speaking audiences. During the Thirties a certain number of Spanish «Republican» films were released in this way, even receiving good reviews (see *Variety*, or *The New York Times*) but passing absolutely unnoticed by the general public. In the Forties the Spanish- language film market was dominated by Mexico, which in this period had a sort of «golden age»<sup>12</sup>. The elementary industrial level of Spain's films in the years immediately after the Civil War made them difficult to export. Anyway, the efforts of Franco's administration to create a real film industry in Spain (mainly by means of subsidies) resulted in an increase of more lavish productions, especially period films.

One of the first major costumers was *Goyescas* (1942, dir. Benito Perojo), a loose adaptation of the famous opera by Enrique Granados (that was precisely the first Spanish opera premiered at the Metropolitan, in 1916). Although the script took a lot of liberties with the original *libretto*, changing the tragic ending and creating a double role for the heroine in order to please the star Imperio Argentina -who was the «first lady» of Spanish screen in these days-, the production was handsomely mounted and was praised by the critics, being awarded at the Venice Film Festival. But the 1944 New York release was considered «disappointing» for the most «patriotic» Spanish film critics, who disliked the reports in American press as well as the fact that the premiere was in a Spanish-language theater that usually screened only Mexican films of dubious value<sup>13</sup>. In fact, the New York reviews were not unfavorable in a strict sense -«the film has a certain grace and charm to recommend it», *Variety* said<sup>14</sup>-; they appreciated the industrial effort, but it was evident that the film was below average for Hollywood standards. The period spectaculars to which the American public was accustomed showed a greater technical skill than the Spanish product. The sound recording and photography were severely criticized; in the first case the assertion was relatively true, but the objections to camerawork could be attributed to the poor quality of the print under review. Some comments in *Primer Plano* alluded to the fact that *Goyescas* was an old production, and that New Yorkers must wait for better films to come in the years to follow ...But unfortunately the distribution of Spanish films in the United States was stopped because of the political scene: the reaction of the Allies at the end of the war against Franco's Spain -promoted basically by France and the USSR but strongly supported by Truman- culminated in the withdrawal of ambassadors in 1946 and virtually closed America to any Spanish cultural influence<sup>15</sup>.

One important consequence of the boycott to Franco was the Allies inclusion in their «blacklists» of the most powerful Spanish film company of the Forties, Vicente Casanova's CIFESA. This incident has never been sufficiently explained<sup>16</sup>. The Americans blacklisted CIFESA supposedly for its cooperation with the German-Italian, but it is extremely difficult to find any real evidence of this. Most of CIFESA's productions of the period 1939-1945 were comedies without any political signification (in fact, none of the Spanish films produced in these years served as propaganda vehicle of the Axis); it's true that CIFESA, as a distributor, released some German and Italian pictures, but the ideological concern of these films was minimal, and other companies did the same. Probably it was a mistake, but the Spanish

Government was obliged to cut the supply of imported celluloid to CIFESA, forcing it to buy this precious material in the black market and affecting its activities severely. Although it was never proven, many people saw this as a manoeuvre of the Hollywood film industry to assure the predominance of American productions in the Spanish market, eliminating the only company that worked regularly, with contract players and technicians and with good results at the box office. The international boycott that came after 1945 and the subsequent wave of nationalistic, xenophobic feelings among Spanish authorities saved CIFESA from bankruptcy and embarked it in a series of expensive costume films that caused its definitive fall in 1951.

Precisely some of these CIFESA productions were the first Spanish movies to appear in the States after a long period of absence. Imported by a Mexican firm, Azteca, and with English titles by Hermann G. Weinberg, in 1949 were released *The Nail* (*El clavo*, 1944) and *Don Quixote de la Mancha* (1947) -both directed by Rafael Gil-, and in 1950 *The Mad Queen* (*Locura de amor*, 1948, dir. Juan de Orduña). All of them were period films, based on reputed literary authors. *El clavo* was a romantic tale, with a well-recreated gothic atmosphere, about a judge who falls in love with the woman responsible of a crime that he is investigating. *Don Quixote* was a dull and unimaginative adaptation of Cervantes' famous classic; produced on a large scale, fear of betraying the literary work tied the hands of the director, usually a more brilliant craftsman, and the result was rather boring despite the superb sets and the fine musical score. On the opposite side, *Locura de amor* was a real commercial success, a tremendous hit not only in Spain but in all Spanish-speaking countries (in Mexico a parody titled *Amor de locura* was filmed in 1949). It was historical pageantry about the tragic fate of *Joanna of Castile*, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, who became insane because the infidelities of her frivolous husband Philip the Fair. Based on a Nineteenth-century play, its melodramatic plot was full of courtisan intrigues, love, jealousy, betrayal, and romance, all performed in a highly theatrical way by the entire cast, especially by the star Aurora Bautista, who made an unmatched performance in the part of this woman consumed by jealousy. *Locura de amor* is still a highly entertaining film and surprises us with its very lavish visuals; its magnificent and costly sets look incredible in a film produced in a country ravaged by war and isolated from any economical support from abroad. All these films had been great critical successes in Spain when released, and received a lot of awards. The reviews of New York critics were sympathetic but cold, because of the better results obtained by Hollywood in similar efforts. The main objections were for the editing, considering it slow and lacking pace; *Don Quixote*, especially, was regarded -with reason- as excessively long and tedious. Anyway, some virtues were remarked. In *El clavo* sets and costumes were highly praised, as well as the photography. The players got favorable reviews in spite of their unknown faces: for example, the *Variety* critic noted in *Don Quixote* that Juan Calvo (who played the part of Sancho) «stole the whole show». The same periodical considered *The Mad Queen* could go very well at the box office with a crisper editing and the inclusion of «some familiar Latin names in the cast»<sup>17</sup>.

We find a curious attempt to make Spanish films more attractive to American audiences in 1952, when *El Capitán de Loyola* (1946, dir. José Díaz Morales), a biopic of the founder of the Jesuit Order, was released in New York in a «revised» version under the title *Loyola -The Soldier Saint*. The changes of the American version (sponsored by the communication arts department of Fordham University and supervised by its chairman, Father Alfred J. Barret) included a slight re-editing, with and added prologue and the reworking of the entire sound track (not only the dialog, that was dubbed into English, but also a new musical score). The *Variety* critic<sup>18</sup> found the modifications very useful to improve the commercial run of the film in the States. It is true that, at the end, he considered it of limited appeal («mainly for art houses»), but the review was, in general, positive. This is amusing because the original version had a rather cold reception among public, critics, and even film authorities when it was released in Spain<sup>19</sup>. In fact, the direction, despite some fine action sequences, is rather heavy-handed; its (relatively) good American review has to be attributed to that particular approach of American critics to European films<sup>20</sup>.

By the time *Loyola* was released in New York, things had changed completely in the political arena: Communism was enemy number one of the Western World -i.e., the United States- and no other chief of State was more anti-Communist than Franco. Thus, Spain was destined to become a faithful ally in the fight against the Reds. The United States was interested in Spanish cooperation, but it was Franco who really wanted American support: the friendship of the most powerful country in the West implied that he was right and their enemies should be obliged to shut up. It is considered today that the Spanish-USA treaties of 1953 consolidated Franco in his power for the rest of your life; maybe this is exaggerated, but its importance in the development of Francoism is undeniable.

In that same year, 1953, Spain presented at the Cannes Film Festival Luis G. Berlanga's *Bienvenido Mister Marshall*, a parody of Spanish-American relationships suggested by the non-inclusion of Spain in the Marshall Plan as well as the Spanish necessity of economical support from the United States. The film deals with the reactions of the residents of Villar del Rio, a poor Castilian village, at the news of the imminent arrival of the American aid: expecting a deluge of gifts from the rich and generous Uncle Sam, the mayor decides to change the face of the village to please the Americans, for example decorating it with Andalusian motifs because he thinks that is the idea that foreigners have of Spain. The schoolmistress, a spinster, is also delighted with the news: in the original script there was a scene in which she dreams of being raped by an entire football team, but it was not actually filmed for fear of censorship. On the other hand, a poor farmer imagines that Americans will give him the tractor he needs for his labor. But not all the inhabitants are satisfied with the events to come: for the old hidalgo, whose ancestors were *conquistadores*, Americans are merely «Indians», and for the local priest North America is a land of Protestants, Jews, and gangsters: in an amusing dream sequence he sees himself sentenced to death by members of the House of Un-American Activities Committee dressed as Klansmen. In the last scene the American bypass the village: all the dreams of prosperity vanish, and the villagers return to their traditional way of life.

The purpose of the film was to show the poverty of rural Spain and, at the same time, to ridicule the official interest in American aid. Although this critical approach was quite explicit (in an early scene a group of stiffed bureaucrats from Madrid visit the mayor and explain him that Americans should be: extremely well received) it was ignored by the censors, who saw it instead as a veiled criticism of the United States for having excluded Spain from Marshall Plan aid. In fact, the only adverse reaction came from actor Edward G. Robinson, then a member of the Cannes Jury, who protested the anti-American feelings expressed by the film; he was very angry with a shot at the end in which a star-stripped flag was seen floating down a stream (this shot was deleted in " the American print of the film, released in 1956 under the title *Welcome Señor Marshall*). No doubt Mr Robinson was partly right, because the company that produced *Bienvenido Mister Marshall*, UNINCI, was formed by several left-wing people, and co-scriptwriter Bardem was a member of the Communist Party, but in the actual film the criticism of Americans is always gentle and non it aggressive, even for the most zealous patriot: Robinson's reaction should be explained in the context of the hysterical atmosphere created in Hollywood by McCarthy's anti-Red crusade<sup>21</sup>.

*Bienvenido Mister Marshall* is a turning point in the story of the relationships between Spain and the United States, political as well as cinematic. When the first military bases in Spain were opened, Spaniards and Americans met definitively on the same ground. Franco's regime would lean firmly on this friendship; it is not exaggerated to say that its survival depended on this. From now on, the American characters in Spanish films would be good, handsome, and extremely friendly; only in the late sixties this image changed a little, influenced by the anti-Americanism so widely sprayed among European intellectuals on the occasion of the Vietnam War. Although the inhabitants of Villar del Rio didn't see any American, other Spaniards made the best of the American landing. In the field of filmmaking, for example: in the Fifties began the production of international movies (made with American money) in Spain, which has increased through the years. Although this didn't enhance the artistic level of Spanish films, is undeniable that it was an excellent training for the Spanish technicians and a source of benefits for studios and production facilities<sup>22</sup>.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- (1) The exact ideology beneath Franco's regime has always been subject of controversy. A concise and clever approach to this is in RAMÍREZ, M. *España 1939-1975. Régimen político e ideología*. Madrid: Guadarrama, 1978.
- (2) GUBERN, R. *La censura. Función política y ordenamiento jurídico bajo el franquismo, 1936-1975*. Barcelona: Península, 1981, pp. 62-63.
- (3) LEISER, E. *Nazi Cinema*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1974, p. 75.
- (4) GONZÁLEZ BALLESTEROS, T. *Aspectos jurídicos de la censura cinematográfica en España*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1981, p. 224.

- (5) SINOVA, J. «La prensa, la censura y las consignas», en *Historia del franquismo*. Madrid: Diario 16, 1985, vol. 1, p. 378.
- (6) Regrettably there are no prints of this film available today. Contemporary reviews were generally good, judging it entertaining and well-made.
- (7) FERNÁNDEZ CUENCA, C. *Toros y toreros en la pantalla*. San Sebastián: XI Festival Internacional de Cine, 1963, p. 67.
- (8) *The New York Times*, October 24, 1935.
- (9) GONZÁLEZ BALLESTEROS, T. *Op. cit.*, p. 224.
- (10) CENTENO, F. «La verdadera emperatriz» (with an interview with López Rubio), in *Cámara*, no.30, May 15, 1944.
- (11) K. R. M. Short's brief account on this subject is accurate but he is wrong when says the film was never shown in Spain: «Hollywood fights Anti-Semitism», in SHORT, K.R.M. (ed.) *Feature Films as History*. London: Croom Helm, 1981, p. 185.
- (12) MORA, C. J. *Mexican Cinema. Reflections of a society, 1896-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982, p. 75.
- (13) (Anonymous), «Intercambio cinematográfico», *Primer Plano*, No.202, August 27, 1944.
- (14) *Variety*, June 28, 1944.
- (15) The real importance of this «boycott» begins to be questioned: see PORTERO F. *Franco aislado. La cuestión española 1945-50*. Barcelona: Aguilar, 1989.
- (16) FANÉS, F. I. *CIFESA. La antorcha de los éxitos*. Valencia: Institución Alfonso el Magnánimo, 1981, pp.139-146.
- (17) *Variety* reviews: *Don Quixote*, May 18, 1949; *The Nail*, June 22, 1949; *The Mad Queen*, November 1, 1950.
- (18) *Variety*, April 23, 1952.
- (19) The historian Carlos FERNÁNDEZ CUENCA, always benevolent towards Spanish productions, denounces the «poor quality» of this film. *Cine religioso. Filmografía crítica 1896-1959*. Valladolid: V Semana Internacional de Cine Religioso y de Valores Humanos, 1960, p. 182.
- (20) For example, the first Spanish film to win an Academy Award, José Luis Garci's *Volver a empezar (To Begin Again)*, 1982), in its country of origin had been a critical and commercial failure.
- (21) BESAS, P. *Behind the Spanish Lens. Spanish Cinema under Fascism and Democracy*. Denver, Col.: Arden Press, 1985, pp.36-38; CAPARRÓS LERA J. M. and DE ESPAÑA R. *The Spanish Cinema: An Historical Approach*. Barcelona: Film-Historia, 1987, p. 53.
- (22) POZO S. *La industria del cine en España*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1984, pp. 203-207.