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At the end of the 1950’s, and with the Franco regimen solidly established in power, Spanish society would commemorate, without excessive display, the 150-year anniversary of the 1808 War of Independence. This conflict had brought the defenders of the monarchy into confrontation against those of liberal constitutionalism, and the conservative tradition against the ideals of progress. For many historians and intellectuals of the era, the war symbolized the authentic redefining landmark of Spain. It was an expression both of a people, who with their minimal military resources were capable of overthrowing the most powerful imperial force of the time, Napoleon, and of the extremely radical opposition to the pressure imposed by foreign ideals.

The substantial volume of movies about Goya and the War of Independence in Spanish cinema demands a needed reflection on the importance of this topic. The characteristics found both in the image of Goya, a key figure in Spanish culture who fused in his work the secular and the sacred, and also in the War, a conflict characterized by traditional social change, will be decisive references when this time period on the big screen. They will serve additionally as metaphors in subsequent years.

Few studies exist on this topic, and there are fewer still that treat the Franco period; hence, this article offers fundamental insight on how to interpret a period of such change in the Spain’s cultural and ideological history. Understanding this time period is essential to understanding the evolution and development of this view in a year such as 2008, a year which marks the 200-year anniversary of the War of Independence and consequently that of May 2, a date inextricably linked in today’s society with the life and work of Francisco de Goya.

Having scarcely ended the Civil War in 1939, the Franco regime used explicit references to the War of Independence both politically and ideologically as a way to discover, somewhere in the past, a justification for its own actions. In this way, by forcing a parallel between two such
historically distant events, the Civil War of 1936-1939 would become a new War of Independence set against the liberal ideals that threatened to disintegrate the Spanish nation; it would become a manifest desire to remain on the margins of the most pernicious foreign influences, those that the Second Republic had embraced wholeheartedly. Nevertheless, by 1958 the Franco regime had lost interest in the ostentatious celebrations of the War of Independence of 1808. The external political situation of the Franco regime had changed significantly during these years—not insignificantly, and among other issues, the Second World War had developed in this period—; the War of Independence of 1808 had difficult historical aspects that became continually more difficult to avoid. For example, it became uncomfortable to address issues such as the role played by the people against the Spanish armed forces, a topic that had unfortunately remained irrelevant and deluged by the impetus of the masses. Equally uncomfortable was the enhanced presence of the frenchified painter Francisco de Goya, who not only experienced a certain proximity to the progressive ideals that were to be combated, but had additionally bequeathed to the world the most important visual testimonials of the War of Independence. In synthesis, this war of 1808 had been a battle between the Spanish traditionalists and the liberal ideals represented by the French enemy. And by 1958, it became an issue that should be handled cautiously or omitted completely given that Franco had endeavored to offer to the world a more modern image of Spain, one unconcerned with the new developing nation.

Considering everything that occurred between 1939 and 1958, when it was deemed necessary to commemorate definitively the praises of 150 years of the War of Independence, the cinematographic views of the war, and the life and person of Goya would suffer multiple oscillations. It is necessary to reflect upon this vacillation as it reflects the progression of Spanish cinema, the historiography of art, and even the changes in the political agenda of the Franco regime.

The following comparison is a sample demonstration of the aforementioned changes in the image of Goya and his relationship with the War of Independence. While in 1939 the occurrences of the war were emphasized, and consequently they generated a negative image of the painter, in 1958, due to the need for an opening up to the exterior and for a more modern image, changes in distinct political, ideological
and cultural aspects of the era would cause the War of Independence to be intentionally forgotten. In addition, the life and work of Goya would begin to be revalued in a more persistent manner.

1958: The evolution towards opening up

The intense changes within the political sector, both on a national and an international scale, and the need to establish stronger ties with the allied powers that had recently defeated fascism in WWII impelled the Franco regime to design immediate strategies of opening up. These strategies could be most easily seen in a publicly accessible media form like film. Definitely, the Franco regime tried to initiate a process of change not only within the official politics and ideological doctrine of the regime, but also it endeavored to capture and publicize it on an aesthetic and propagandistic level.

In conjunction with the above mentioned, political logic saw fit to abandon the traditional, aseptic idea of Spain. Such an image resided in popular and ancestral culture; it remained impermeable to the influences of modernity and solidly anchored in Catholicism. It additionally remained distanced from the perverse influences of liberal ideas and immersed in a never-ending battle against the international enemies, beginning with France. So, new initiatives sought a revised image of Spain that was more amicable, less controversial and, above all, was open to the new waves of contemporary culture that entered from the surrounding countries. As a result, the continuous references to a glorious historical past, such as those found in representations of the War of Independence -definitely a fight against progress and foreign influence-, that had been used since 1939, were significantly revised from a more conciliatory and flexible perspective.

In fact, by 1958, few appeared interested in continuing the commemoration of the War of Independence with the same magnificence as before. Despite the 150-year anniversary of the historical event that was to be celebrated this year, the situation had changed to such a degree that very few voices from the Franco regime promoted continuing the ostentatious celebration of commemorative acts. Previously, such acts had been susceptible to manipulation, and at the same time susceptible to use as a platform to legitimate the Franco regime.
Therefore, the celebrations would relinquish the paraphernalia so characteristic of these events, and in turn, would bear comparison with popular festival, -of which Madrid was the epicenter of such celebrations-, amidst the protests of the only sector that maintained affinities with the regime and which was against such a display: the potent nucleus of the Falange that, among other issues, continued its solid presence in the film industry. The events would evidence nonetheless this change in tendency as well as in the regime’s limited interest in the issue. This is because the official program of acts neither stimulated the participation of the most prominent State institutions, nor did they generate exposition or other projects. It would also fail to attract madrileños instead of mislead tourists, those interested in the outdoor religious celebrations, and those nostalgic soldiers searching for memories of a glorious past (Demange, 277).

Following this train of thought, politicians showed little enthusiasm for invoking the figure of Goya, as an illustrious artist or as a figure associated with the aforementioned historical event. In this regard, it should be mentioned that if in 1958 neither the birth nor death of the painter was celebrated in a concrete way, one easily could have taken advantage, as occurred in the following years, of representing the events of the War of Independence through Goya’s biography and creative work. Moreover, one could have commemorated, in a slightly artificial way, the 130 years since the painter’s death in 1828. This, however, would not be made explicit in the official sectors, as is eloquently evidenced by the fact that the rachitic ceremony planned for the occasion abbreviated any allusions to the Aragon painter. There is no surprise, then, that the film industry did not produce a single State project on Goya or on May 2; there was not even a fictional feature film worthy of mentioning due to the circumstances within the government. Rather, there was a heterogeneous group of projects funded by private producers, which in the majority of cases were received by politicians and censorship administrators with reservations, if not with outright hostility. Only one cinematographic project would stand out as considered the only State project worthy of mention: a mid-length documentary that, although funded by a private producer, would be publicized by the Franco regime with enormous grandeur in numerous countries. It would be titled Goya: una vida apasionada (José Ochoa, 1957).
It is necessary to introduce a significant detail to explain the reason why the War of Independence diminished in importance during these years. Contrarily, the figure and work of Goya suffered a process of revaluation, which was visible both in the cinematographic project mentioned earlier and, above all, in the academic and cultural context of the time period. Despite the apparent disinterest on behalf of the regime, and the insubstantial ceremony planned to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the War of Independence, certain intellectuals would make notable attempts to stimulate the study of Goya. The most noteworthy activities include the revision of several books about the painter, written years before in a workshop of intellectuals led by Eugenio D’Ors. This project included Ramón Gómez de la Serna, Enrique Lafuente Ferrari y José Ortega y Gasset. This process would furthermore coincide with the death, three years earlier, of Ortega y Gasset, who was a figure of reference both for the most innovative scholars of Spanish art history and for the internal political dissidence against the regime. We should remember that in 1948, because of an almost mythical conference in San Sebastian, Ortega y Gasset had reproached the younger generations of art historians for “their lack of appreciation and interest in the fundamentals and in studies surrounding the discipline” (Portús y Vega, 112), since the majority thought that everything should be reduced to archival investigation, the accumulation of facts and the pure description of an artistic piece. This critique had only been adopted by art historians who were most open to the discipline’s evolution abroad, and who, for this very reason, were the subject of frequent retaliations by the Franco academic institutions.

Those texts of capital importance in the art historiography of Spain include Antecedentes, coincidencias e influencias del arte de Goya, originally written by Enrique Lafuente Ferrari in 1947. This work would be a fundamental text in the process of revising Goya’s image. In contrast with the academic tradition of archival inquiry and simple objective description, Lafuente’s work proposes a wider perspective that combines the cultural context from which a work is produced and its relationship with this context. It investigates furthermore art’s function and how it reflects the political and ideological conditions that fomented its production, as well as the importance of reflecting upon the genius of an author capable of responding to the process of historical change. For
this reason, it is necessary to establish certain empathy with the creative work, but also with the author and whatever relationship he can maintain with his ideological, political and cultural context.

Interestingly, this renovation effort, which would join the most progressive art historians with certain innovative approaches supported by the dissident political groups, would be coupled with the efforts of several intellectuals who favored a revaluation of Goya’s image. Some of these intellectuals, like Eugenio Dórs, continued receiving praises from the regime and the most prestigious honors from the State; they were treated as models of reference for the level of ideological orthodoxy. Despite its moral laxness, the Franco regime allowed this to occur -within certain limits- because it was befitting to the regime to project outward this image of modernity and liberty from within these waves of opening up that the Spanish government was attempting to initiate. In 1928, this philosopher and art critic published one of his critical essays on the Aragon painter, titled *El arte de Goya*, an edition of which coincided with the centennial of his death. This book, originally commissioned by the Junta Nacional in celebration of the centennial, would be revised by D’Ors in 1946. D’Ors helped convert this work into a reference material within the range of essays on Spanish art and the Francoist revisionist efforts to expand the perspective of Goya’s artistic work to a more universal eulogistic scale. This type of effort had been practiced in other countries, although the controversy surrounding Goya’s life was still ignored.

In any case, the essays written by Eugenio D’Ors and Enrique Lafuente Ferrari in 1947 would definitively open new doors. They would promote, from diverging ideological viewpoints, a revision of the life and work of Goya that Spanish cinema would take almost ten years to adopt, and that in some way would crystallize in the representation in *Goya, una vida apasionada* in 1957, almost at the brink of 150-year anniversary of the War of Independence.

1939. Proclamations for after a war

At the end of the Civil War, the figure of Goya represented, without a doubt, something detestable, negative and unworthy of being presented in the sacred pantheon of Spanish culture. It should be noted that, on the one hand, the Republican forces had utilized Goya and his
work as examples of the people’s fight against oppression, against the armed forces and the conservative tradition. Along these lines, the work of several “cartoon makers” of the period such as José Bardasano, Juana Francisca and Josep Renau was used as essential international propaganda for the republican ideals against the Franco military uprising. On the other hand, the regime’s intellectuals perceived Goya as a Francophile who, far from sympathizing with his homeland, had defended the modernist ideals that questioned secular traditions of Spain.

Republican propaganda poster: ¡Fuera el invasor! 18 de julio 1936-1937.  
Author: José Bardasano

In addition, by 1939, Spain was coming out of a fratricidal war of three years, which had produced a dictatorial regime and whose authoritarian and repressive strategies had imposed rigid conservative norms and regulations on society. In order to justify its actions in the period immediately following the war, the Franco regime would establish the need for a catharsis based on a purging of anti-regime ideals,
namely, those Republican ideals that symbolized the misfortunes and wrongdoing of Spain. This cathartic endeavor would likewise call for a defense of conservative, traditional, and racial values. Consequently, the nation, divided up until now -according to regime orthodoxy and internal and external enemies-, would be able to redeem itself thanks to Francisco Franco and his “New Crusade before God and before History.”

The War of Independence of 1808 was an anticipation of Franco’s “Crusade” against exterior enemies (in this case, the French) and interior enemies (the Republicans) that attempted to introduce liberalism and the gravest atrocities imaginable to society. Within the regime’s autarchic politics, foreign countries would now be considered the enemy, as would also the internal Republicans; both groups would represent licentiousness and immorality. The Franco regime, aware of the propagandistic power of the cinema, used this medium, particularly historical film in the initial
stages of the postwar period, in order to transmit its staunch conservative ideals as well as a new vision of history. It also used cinema as a medium to justify the regime’s staying power.

In its need to reaffirm power, the Franco regime searched through the nation’s history for means of justification; it would use basic historical markers for support, such as the Catholic Monarchs or the Conquest of America -when Spain was still an Empire-, or the War of Independence, a moment in which the nation took arms against the enemy. It also used the Spanish pictorial tradition, which included the courtesan, religious paintings or the academic historical painting from the 19th century as observed in artists like Eduardo Rosales or Francisco Pradilla.

Cinema or explicit political indoctrination fomented Francoist ideas and would justify the Civil War as the only solution towards order, morality, and justice on a national level. Although there were historical films that focused on war and contemporary themes, the “Cine de Cruzada” would soon produce films set in the 18th century that alluded directly or indirectly to the War of Independence and Goya. This would be the case until the definitive closure of the cycle during the 1950s, and for which reason Goya, at the beginning of the 1940s, would be viewed negatively. Goya would personify the pernicious foreign influence upon the citizen; this negative image translated into titles like *El abanderado* (Eugenio Fernández Ardavin, 1943). In this movie, the Aragonese painter appears as a drunk, a womanizer and a decrepit Francophile. It would not be until the following decade, and with a fundamental push from the academic sector, that we find the slightest positive aspect in the figure of the painter. An example would be *Goya, una vida apasionada* (José de Ochoa, 1957).
Film frame from *El Abanderado* by Eusebio Fernández Ardavín, 1943. Goya is represented in a frivolous way, as a drunkard and ladies man, giving a deplorable image of the painter.


The vision of a people at war with the foreign invader, taking arms in defense of the nation’s ideals, Race and Religion against an increasingly hostile world, would be one of the central themes of Spanish historical cinema in the late-1950s. It would be a main theme following the decline in 1942 of the so-called “Cine de Cruzada” (Gubern 1986, 82), a combination of historical film, or historical reconstruction, and war film with propagandistic motives. The “Cine de Cruzada” is set during the Civil War of 1936-1939, although beginning in 1942 the cycle would be interrupted by issues of international politics and would give way to views of war less violent in nature and more easily malleable by the War of Independence. This cycle would end in the following decade. A dispute in which Goya played a determining role, although seen in Spanish film of the 1940s, became a reference point in order to reflect Spain’s fight
against foreign influences. In reality, neither the War of Independence nor the figure of Goya had existed as themes in Spanish cinema following the Civil War, except when the distant year of 1808 was used as a backdrop for folkloric themes. This type of fiction was seen in titles such as *Goyescas* (Benito Perojo, 1942) or *La maja del capote* (Fernando Delgado, 1944). Or, in the realm of documentary films and in issues related to the art of bullfighting and its translation into Goya-type films, we find interesting works such as *Goya y los toros* (Adolfo Aznar, 1944) or *Aguafuertes* (José de Castro, 1944). Of course, the Franco regime continued using the War of Independence as a historical referent to justify its actions, and in this sense it attempted to translate the parallelism between both struggles into several bibliographical essays, such as the mythical *Historia de la Cruzada Española*, published between 1939 and 1943 under the direction of Joaquín Arrarás Iribarren, or into other artistic manifestations not associated with cinema. In the films produced in the early 1940s, the era of the War of Independence is viewed only as an aesthetic that is based on the “goyaesque” (types, outfits, dances and celebrations) and on bullfighting (this is precisely the era of effervescence of this aspect of Spanish cultural identity).

A good example of the above would be the documentary *Aquél Madrid de Goya* (1944), produced by Hermic Films with the aid of a complete technical team from the same entity; Manuel Hernández Sanjuán served as director, Segismundo Pérez de Pedro as director of photography, Luis Torreblanca in the staging, and Santos Núñez on the script. This short film -among others we could mention- would achieve financial success and, above all, institutional support for its distribution. In fact, for a long time it was included among the recommended titles by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to be distributed abroad through embassies or cultural organizations. Despite the aforementioned film’s transit through censorship, the film’s commentary brought in to question its supposed lack of artistic quality. In any case, the discourse trend in *Aquél Madrid de Goya* would demonstrate the effort to appropriate the figure of the painter and transport him to the cultural and celebrative terrain. In this sense, the film began as representing “Goya at the height of his undying art”; it continued through the bullfighting worlds of Pepe-Hillo, Romero and Costillares (a friend of “the genius Don Francisco”, as “he demonstrated in his paintings”.) The film continued
through the street markets and popular festivals, of which Goya was such a fan (not in vain “did he also go to the meadow to empty the wine bag and to put an end to the meat pies...[while] he watched people playing blind-man’s-bluff, and flying kites as rowdy gangs tossed some poor soul in the air on a blanket”); it later found its way into the great centers of cultural and scientific knowledge (with the Aragonese painter as the omnipresent leading thread, even if he had to be dragged by the hair: another of Goya’s friends, Don Juan de Villanueva, was constructing the Museo del Prado and had erected the observatory that allowed the city to view its seven stars.) And finally, the film ended at la Puerta del Sol where “at number 9,” Goya “witnessed the heroic event of the 2nd of May” in order to serve as “the witness to history.” (These facts were taken from censorship record no. 4875, General Archive of the Administration.)

In the realm of fiction, *Goyescas* would stand out as an emblematic film; some relevant historians considered it as “the great spectator movie” of postwar cinema. For this reason, many insisted on establishing oblique comparisons between the present-day Spain of 1942 and the historical past marked by the social confusion of the late 18th and early 19th century (Gubern 1994, 368). The director of this feature film was Benito Perejo, who until then had represented the most modern facet of Spanish film, but who, in this case, showed himself to be a “hieratical, pompous and staunch director who barely resembled his witty, agile, Republican productions and his earlier post-Civil War comedies” (369). Perejo’s *Goyescas* patently exemplified the paradox of creating a movie set in the period of Goya; the film rather eloquently omitted any reference to the painter, and alluded to the War of Independence through a recreation of the Mutiny of Aranjuez.
In other words, neither Goya nor the War of Independence of 1808 was used in Spanish cinema of the early-1940s as anything more than vague elements within a historical and cultural background of dances, celebrations, and bullfights. It would be many years until the figure of Goya was restored in a positive light. Let us remember that one of Goya’s few appearances as a character in Spanish film during these years was in *El abanderado* (Eusebio Fernández Ardavin, 1943), where as mentioned before, Goya appears as a drunken, womanizing Francophile. In the same way, once the cycle of the “Cine de Cruzada” ended, it would take several years before the War of Independence of 1808 would be used as a theme in Spanish national cinema. This would give rise to the production of films beginning in the mid-1940s such as *El verdugo* (Enrique Gómez, 1948), *El tambor de Bruch* (Ignacio F. Iquino, 1948),
Las aventuras de Juan Lucas (Rafael Gil, 1949) or Agustina de Aragón (Juan de Orduña, 1950).

Between 1946 and 1951 a notable change took place in the relationship between Spanish cinema and the War of Independence, and also indirectly with the figure of Goya.

In this second stage then, the War of Independence not only converted into a frequent theme in Spanish film, but films that did touch upon this subject matter received important recognition. For example, the most prestigious award, “of National Interest,” was conferred on the films El tambor de Bruch and Agustina de Aragón. These two films exhibit an obvious pro-government undercurrent similar to the tableaux vivants aesthetic that defined historical films of the 1940s; they also present an overt defense of traditional Spanish values that opposed the foreign enemy threatening to dissolve national customs.

Film poster: Agustina de Aragón, by Juan de Orduña 1950
The mythical crisis of historical cinema that the film *Alba de América* (Juan de Orduña, 1951) provoked and that related to the conflictive release of *Surcos* (Juan Antonio Nieves Conde, 1951), would occasion a new change in the relationship between Spanish film and Goya and the War of Independence of 1808. Despite the project’s official character, receiving praises from politicians and innumerable military, religious and historical consultancies, *Alba de América* would not obtain the maximum official category of “interés nacional” (*Surcos* in fact, did receive this designation.) Of course, no one could deny that behind the unequal treatment of these two films was the recently appointed Director General of Cinematography, José María García Escudero, a Falangist Catholic who nevertheless found it suitable to create a certain liberal outlet in Spanish cinema. This polemic would cost García Escudero his job.

From this moment on, nothing would remain the same: similarly, a period of Spanish film would end in which History as an instrument of the new regime became almost excessively commonplace. In the same way, the War of Independence and its representation as a historical event would be converted into a surfeit by politicians during the 1950’s. Fermín del Amo, one of the most recognized and most influential censors of the times, verbalized this principle when he pronounced himself overseer of the Fernando Fernán-Gómez project, *¡Guerrilleros!* (1950), a film presented to the censors at this crucial moment (record of censorship 38-50, General Archive of the Administration):

> We noticed a preference for the part of our history that took place around 1808. There are various scripts that we have read about this theme. If all were to be produced as films, we would saturate our public. As our history is so rich in interesting episodes, we do not understand this insistence. The episode that encumbers us today is of the worst; it does not allow us to situate ourselves in a retrospective production. The same could be said of the war against Napoleon: the argument is weak and the literary redaction is frankly inadmissible. For all of which, we propose that it be turned down. Since we believe that our mission should be to also orient, we can only regretfully lament the extremely low number
of films that have been made about the past Liberation Crusade, a theme not only exhausted but scarcely initiated by our producers.

The evolution of the figure of Goya during these years is notable, given the negative view during the 40’s that was marked by movie titles like *El abanderado* and that made it almost impossible to find a biography of Goya during this period. That in the supposed golden age of the biopic, a bio of the Aragonese painter could not be found seems paradoxical, given that his history as a liberal Francophile would be too large an imputation to hide. Only towards the end the 40’s would there be a timid attempt to restore the image of Goya within the sphere of the documentary, thanks to works like *Goya* (José María Elorrieta, 1948). We should not forget that it was not until the close of this decade when an academic restoration of the painter would appear on behalf of art historians like Lafuente Ferrari. For this reason, and for the need imposed by the regime to create an outlet, Goya, a figure of immortal genius for Spanish and universal culture, would undergo an intense process of revaluation beginning in 1951. If during the 40’s he did not appear in films, or if he was presented in a destructive and humiliating way, beginning in the 50’s Goya´s image would acquire a much more positive tone. This would be accomplished first in the commercial film industry. On the one hand, within fiction film production, titles would appear such as *La Tirana* (Juan de Orduña, 1958), a sentimental feuilleton in Fernando VII´s court. The film identified itself in particular with the Duchess of Alba and appeared as the genius of creation of Spanish painting. Within documentary film production, a number of titles would appear that centered on the life and work of the painter as well as on his particular artistic universe. This was made possible by some of the most innovative directors of the time, such as Jesús Fernández Santos, Vicenet Lluch and José López Clemente.
Among the above-mentioned names and titles, *Goya, una vida apasionada* (José Ochoa, 1957) would stand out. Despite its production by a private entity, it is the closest to an official project by the regime that could be found in the late 50s, nearing the date of the 150-year anniversary of the War of Independence of 1808. This film actually received a number of significant awards in Spanish cinema—for example, the award for the best documentary in the Premios a la Cinematografía Nacional, organized by the Sindicato Nacional del Espectáculo, and in the Premios del Círculo de Escritores Cinematográfico-. At the same time, the film was selected to participate in international competitions such as Cannes. And, of course, the film obtained the official rating of “interés nacional,” something extremely unusual for a short film of this type.

*Goya, una vida apasionada* presented, in color, an overview of the life and work of the painter. The film was articulated through a script written by José Ochoa himself alongside Agustín de Foxá, one of the
great national heroes of the intellectual world. Not only that, but de Foxá was one of the regime’s untouchable figures, given that he was a promoter of Falangism as well as a well-known writer, journalist and diplomat. He also authored the mythical Falange hymn “Cara al sol.” Of course, the view of Goya would appear clearly orthodox and stripped of any ideological or political facet that could hinder Goya’s image from the perspective of the regime.

Conclusion

The image of Goya and of the War of Independence in Spanish cinema would undergo significant transformations between 1939 and 1958. In fact, a careful review of the aforementioned events that occurred at the close of the century would reveal a profound and radical modification in the cinematographic perspective of those two themes. In the 1940’s, immediately following the Spanish Civil War, despite the new regime’s supposed interest in the war conflict of 1808, being able to find concomitance with the recent historical period and to foment hatred abroad, we do not find films on this particular theme. The image of Goya would be a sharp condemnation, as in El abanderado (Eusebio Fernández Ardavin, 1943), when it appears in movies like Goyescas (Benito Perojo, 1942). In these two films, what would especially be imposed is the 18th century-like atmosphere that alludes directly or indirectly to the War of Independence and to Goya.

Nevertheless, at the end of this period and the beginning of the 1950’s there was a resurgence of the War of Independence in films like El tambor del Bruch (Ignacio F. Iquino, 1948) or Agustina de Aragón (Juan de Orduña, 1950). But shortly thereafter, for cinematographic reasons – the crisis with Alba de América- or for political or ideological reasons –the Franco government’s desire to open up to and reconcile with international community- the War for Independence would disappear completely from the cinematographic map, even though its 150-year anniversary would be commemorated in 1958. In fact, if the war theme appears at all, it will be indirectly in films like Los desastres de la Guerra (José López Clemente and Manuel Hernández Sanjuán, 1953). Without entering into nationalist details, the universality that Goya’s artistic work gave to the conflict softened the war theme.
All of the projects that looked past the mentioned propositions that were presented to the censors on this topic were prohibited—for example, those presented by producers from as diverse ideological and political backgrounds as Adolfo Aznar, Santiago Oliver, José María Enríquez Girón or Fernando Fernán-Gómez. Such prohibitions were justified by the exorbitance that this theme caused in the political sector. Underlying all of this, however, was a newly imposed push towards an opening up that the Franco regime intended to establish. In this same ideological vein we find the emergence and disappearance of the figure of Goya in film. Goya’s image would evolve from the 1940’s vision based on pure disdain into the person and ideology of a vindication never before seen in the 1950’s. We should not lose sight of the effort put forth by the History of Spanish art—on behalf of intellectuals like Lafuente Ferrari—of the period, in its promotion of the Aragonese painter from an artistic perspective. This initiative left out the ideological problem, which would crystallize at the end of the analyzed time period in projects like Goya, una vida apasionada (José Ochoa, 1957), España 1800: un ensayo cinematográfico sobre Goya y su tiempo (Jesús Fernández Santos, 1959) in the documentary category, and La Tirana (Juan de Orduña, 1958) or La maja desnuda (Henry Koster) for example, in the category of fiction.

Without a doubt, the evolution of how film represented the figure of Goya and the War of Independence correlated with the evolution of the Franco regime. The regime that appeared to ignore both issues in the early-1940’s and to reestablish a parallel in the later 1950’s between the War of 1808 and the recent Spanish Civil War of 1936-1939, would also suppress in the 1950’s any reference to this parallelism, only to end up vindicating the figure of Goya.

For all of the information that the period between 1939 and 1958 offers, it would be a good point of departure for a comparative study of the different historical phases of Spain. From such a study one could establish parallels or differences with previous or later time cycles that could perhaps clarify the reason behind the different visual representations of Goya and the War of Independence in the Spanish film industry.

Translation: Audrey Bryant
Texas A & M University
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