1. INTRODUCTION

The production of El Santuario no se rinde [The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender] (Arturo Ruiz-Castillo, 1949) must be situated in the historical moment of change in the Franco regime’s propaganda strategy. When the Cold War began in 1947, the regime saw the necessity to improve its ties with the United States and in order to accomplish that, it needed to change its external image. This strategic change manifested itself through a cinematic production that was not only completely controlled by the state, but was also considered to be a cornerstone of its propaganda policy.

The recent recovery of Raza [Race] (José Luis Sáenz de Heredia, 1941) has contributed to the comparative analysis and has made these strategic changes evident. Ferrand Alberich’s study of Race’s three texts makes clear the evolution of the propagandist contents of the Franco regime throughout the 1940s: in the first place the novel Raza. Anecdotario para el guión de una película [Race: Storybook for a Movie Script], written by Francisco Franco himself under the pseudonym Jaime de Andrade; second, the film Raza [Race] and, finally, a second version entitled Espíritu de una raza [Spirit of a Race] (1950). With the excuse of improving the sound track synchronization, the fascist symbols were eliminated along with the references to parliamentary democracies. An attempt was even made to destroy the copies of the first version to erase the traces that connected the Franco regime to the Nazi-Fascist axis.

The differences between the versions (Alberich 51-61) are found in the definition of who is “The Enemy of Spain” –“the bad guys” of the film- which is the same as indicating the enemies of the Generalísimo Franco:

The enemy of Spain that in the book and the first version of the film was in reality three: civil society, parliamentary democracy, and communism, which, in both the book and the film had received only a passing mention, without giving it any relevance as an adversary. The military and fascists were the absolute heroes of the book and the film. A good part of the modifications of the new version have to do with eliminating the references to the first two enemies: civil society and parliamentary democracy.1

1 Original text in Spanish: “El enemigo de España que en el libro era la sociedad civil y en la primera versión de la película, la democracia parlamentaria, pasa a ser el comunismo que, tanto en el libro como en la película
Fundamentally, what influenced the internal metamorphosis of the Franco regime is the world political context: the end of World War II (1945), the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini’s totalitarian regimes, allied with Franco, and the beginning of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. In that period, the regimen changed its strategy so that nothing substantial would change. The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender (1949), as we will be able to see, came before the changes in the image of the dictatorship through the fiction of cinema. This was the same change that showed itself a year later in The Spirit of a Race (1950).

2. THE DIRECTOR AND THE PRODUCTION OF THE FILM

Arturo Ruiz-Castillo y Basala (1910-1994), in his youth, participated with Federico García Lorca in the creation of the emblematic theater group La Barraca, with which he travelled throughout Spain during the first years of the Republic (Torres 410-411). In the middle of the Civil War he carried out his first documental cinematographic work: a series of propagandist feature films promoted by the Republican left, The Alliance of Anti-fascist Intellectuals, and especially Popular Film, a producer with ties to the Spanish Communist Party and the Catalan Unified Socialist Party.

After the war, he restarted his cinematographic activity with CIFESA\textsuperscript{2} (the Spanish Film Industrial Company), with works similar to those he had previously done, but with the opposite ideological baggage. Even Juan E. Monterde (205) indicates that Ruiz-Castillo is one of a handful of film directors in the 1940s who were favored by official help from the regime.

The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender, Arturo Ruiz-Castillo’s fourth fictional feature film, is based on a text by José María Amado y Arniches. The plot is based on a remarkable wartime event that occurred during the Spanish Civil War in the foothills of Sierra Morena, the mountain range that stretches across southern Spain.

The film tells the story based on the memories of Marisa, daughter of a noble landowner. This woman’s life is saved thanks to the intervention of Luis de Aracil, a Republican who frees her from a militia group. Aracil and Marisa take refuge in the sanctuary of the Virgin of the Head, the National enclave defended by the forces of the Civil Guard\textsuperscript{3} that tries to hold out against the siege of the Republican army. Aracil, seeing a way to pass from one group to another, in spite of his Republicanism, fears the communism that the attacking forces profess and returns with the refugees of the sanctuary. Finally, in spite of

\footnotesize{anterior, sólo era mencionado de pasada, sin darle ninguna relevancia como adversario de los militares y fascistas que eran los héroes positivos del libro y de la película, respectivamente. Buena parte de las modificaciones de la nueva versión se encaminan a eliminar las referencias a otros enemigos.”}

\textsuperscript{2} CIFESA (Compañía Industrial de Film Español, S.A.) was the most important Spanish movie company from the 1930s until the 1950s. With its headquarters in Valencia, it copied the production model of the Hollywood studies and perfectly accommodated itself to the Franco regime’s ideology.

\textsuperscript{3} The Civil Guard, created in 1844, is a military organization which was responsible for public security in all of the territory of Spain, especially with a police function in the rural areas. It is popularly known as “la Benemérita [The Worthy]”.

heroic resistance led by Captain Cortés, the Republicans and the international brigades take control of the Hill of the Virgin of the Head. Nevertheless, after a lapse of two years, the film ends with Franco’s victory and the end of the Civil War.

Even though the production of the film was ambitious, it went through some difficulties. Juan Mariné, photography director, with whom Arturo Ruiz-Castillo had already worked in previous films, tells of the following events (Soria 55):

The film was shot almost entirely indoors, except for two days outside in Andujar, in the sanctuary itself. Later, after being stopped twice due to economic difficulties, the filming was re-started. Upon seeing the projection, I didn’t remember exactly and I didn’t know how to distinguish between the real outdoors and what they had filmed outside. The day and night effects were perfectly married up in a completely adjusted fashion, due to, above all, the expertise of Arturo Ruiz-Castillo, who not only directed and wrote the script, but also took charge of the decoration and the mock-up.

In the first decade of the Franco regime, the national film industry was under the direct and absolute authority of the administration (Caparrós 78) and The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender did not escape this control. The synopsis was inspected by the General Director of the Civil Guard; and Franco himself asked to see it before its premiere. The censorship process, however, did not impose any restrictions on the film’s production (Zumalde 259), and during the production process a colonel (M. Rodrigo Zaragoza) and a captain (E. Ortiz de Zugasti) participated as military advisors. The premiere at Madrid’s Callao cinema turned into a national event (ABC, 20 December 1949: 29-31). The premiere in Seville was just as noteworthy and was attended by the Captain General of the plaza and the staff of the Civil Guard (La Vanguardia, 18 February: 4). In Barcelona’s Tivoli cinema it was also received with enthusiasm and the press held back no praise for the director and his team (La Vanguardia, 24 March 1950: 14). The unanimous applause of the press of the time and the approval of the regime -especially the Civil Guard- gives us an idea of the institutional and propagandistic character of this production.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE FILM

3.1. THE MARTYR, THE ARISTOCRAT, AND THE NOTORIOUS BAD GUY

The titles of the credits appear over a panorama of backlit clouds accompanied by heavenly choirs that invoke songs to the Virgin. This start, evocative of divinity, is the background for an off-screen narration by Marisa (Beatriz de Añara) about images of the

---

4 Original text in Spanish: “Prácticamente la película se rodó todo en interiores, excepto dos días de exteriores en Andujar, en el mismo santuario. Cuando más tarde, ya que la película se paralizó varias veces por dificultades económicas, se reemprendió el rodaje. Al ver la proyección, no me acordaba exactamente y no sabía distinguir lo que era exterior auténtico de lo que se había rodado en exteriores. Casaban perfectamente los efectos de día y noche y estaba todo el conjunto exactamente ajustado, debido, sobre todo, a la pericia de Arturo Ruiz Castillo, a quien se debía, no sólo el guión y la dirección, sino también los decorados y maquetas.”
sanctuary of the Virgin of the Head and the tomb of Captain Cortés (Tomás Blanco), a nostalgic evocation of one of the events of the Spanish Civil War, narrated from the point of view of Marisa, daughter of the Marquis of Orduña, who was an eye witness to the original event.

From a low angle, the camera approaches the hill which is crowned by a hermitage, elevated and solitary, while the voice of the heroine says,

Over those ruins what were once familiar, were raised, again, the sanctuary of the Virgin of the Head. The time had erased the traces of the war, but I felt the nostalgia of other hours of misery and of fear . . .

How is it possible to feel nostalgia for misery and fear? Masochism is revealed as something inherent in the noble heroine’s spirit. Marisa “enjoyed herself” in spite of all the suffering that the war had caused, and still longed for the misery and fear that she had experienced. Paradox or contradiction? The resigned suffering in the face of adversity can only be justified from the religious sentiments of the narrator, whose pain is similar to that which Jesus Christ suffered on the road to Calvary, when she said, “by these stones were extended a painful ‘vía crucis’.”

The shot continues toward the sanctuary and the subjective camera enters in a cemetery and crosses different fences until arriving at a crypt topped by a crucified Christ, three laurel crowns, a bouquet of dried flowers and an inscription that reads, “Captain Cortés.” The narrator appears from the back in the frame, where we can’t see her face. She leaves the bouquet of dried flowers. In this presentation a scene shows the end of the story and the character made hero: Captain Cortés, a military martyr who died defending a sacred place.

We go back to the beginning of the story, to the peaceful life of an aristocratic family, in the times of the Spanish Republic, before the beginning of the revolution caused by the Popular Front trade unions. The Marquis of Orduña (Rafael Bardem) and his daughter Marisa travel by chauffeur driven car to the lordly estate of El Romeral, a large property in the middle of Andalucía.

Marisa finds herself with a couple of Civil Guard members while riding on horseback through the country. Luis de Aracil (Alfredo Mayo), also on horseback, crosses paths with them and says hello. According to guards, Aracil is “a notorious bad guy.” This is the first note of a character who does not square with the ideological position represented by the Civil Guard and, from the beginning, is under suspicion.

---

5 “Sobre aquellas ruinas que me fueron un día familiares, se alzaba, otra vez, el santuario de la Virgen de la Cabeza. El tiempo había borrado las huellas de la guerra, pero sentía la nostalgia de otras horas de miseria y de miedo […].”

6 The Second Spanish Republic was a legally establish democratic state (1931-1939) which, after three years of civil war, was defeated by the military uprising of general Franco, whose triumph gave place to four decades of military dictatorship (1936-1975).
3.2. REVOLUTION AND UPRISING

The peaceful life is shattered when a group of landless peasants protests at the front gate of the estate and wants to enter. The complaints of the protest have to do with the “lands of the edge of the property”. The class conflict in this historical moment is sustained in a series of Marxist and anarchic-union theories, which are very subtly represented in this scene. The occupation of the large estates pushed by the anarchist movement and the Agrarian Reform promoted by the government were two of the central themes that marked the conflicts in the rural world. The inclusion of this occupation in the scene represents a simple protest of peasants who can’t be reasoned with. Aracil, invoking a supposed “law”, imposes order and discounts the action of the peasants, saying, “the Law doesn’t protect those who want to destroy.” At the end, he arrogantly justifies his intervention saying, “Those people don’t know what they’re doing.” Aracil receives a message and attends an angry meeting of militants where he reproaches them for their attitude with the protesting peasants. They say that the Civil Guard is requisitioning weapons and that it is feared that a military uprising is soon to occur.

In a parallel action, Captain Cortés (Tomás Blanco), the commander of the Civil Guard post, receives a phone call from the governor (delegate of the Republican government). Cortés citing existing ordinances as the reason why he will not obey the governor’s orders, “I follow the rules to the end. I will not tolerate excesses against lives and property. The Civil Guard does not accommodate external demands, Mr. Governor.” While declaring his resistance to his boss (off screen), the camera starts an approaching panoramic shot of an ornamental list of rules posted on the wall of the office. Accompanying the emphatic movement, an omniscient voice recites the “principles”, reiterated by the captain, that we attribute to the values of the Civil Guard, “The Civil Guard will guarantee public security for all Spaniards (…), and will defend lives and properties.”

A non-commissioned officer rushes into the captain’s office with news that the Africa Army has taken up arms against the government of the republic. This confirms the military uprising that the militia members feared. This message is the primer that fires the principal plot of the movie. Captain Cortés starts organizing his troops.

A collage of rapid images: the pages of an almanac flash from the 16th to the 24th of July of 1936, cannons firing, projectile impacts, rolling breakers of surf and a panoramic shot of Madrid’s Puerta del Sol full of people protesting (images of the archive of the proclamation of the republic of 1931) illustrate the voice of the narrator:

The apparent calm lasted very few days. The hatred, the passions, the egoisms and the injustice were unleashed with an unanticipated level of cruelty. The revolution extended to every corner...

In this collage the cannons and munitions are imposed over the social mobilization under an anxious democratic regime, the fascist warmongering facing off against liberty.

The El Romeral mansion is occupied by militia members. The Marquis of Orduña is detained and assassinated. The execution occurs off-screen after a fade to black. Marisa,
the Marquis’ daughter, is placed under house arrest. The religious spirit is well represented in the scene where the Marquis is arrested and taken away to be shot. "I am not alone," he says, while he gazes at a crucifix that he carries in his hand. This gesture confers on him the status of resigned martyr accompanied by God, one more victim of the “cruelty of the revolution”. The term revolution used off-screen is inevitably associated with the negative acts of the human condition: hatred, passion, selfishness, injustice, and cruelty.

It is worth pointing out that a double causal relation exists in these actions. In the first place, the peasant protests give rise to the military uprising against the government of the republic, and the second cause/effect is produced between the military uprising and the Republican crimes. Nonetheless, only the violations of the second cause are visible to the viewers since the point of view hides the rebellious military’s repression of the civilian population.

Starting at that moment, sides are taken, metaphoric of the resurgence of the two Spains, on one side the thoughtful people who reject the abuses and, on the other side, the revolutionaries: “those people who don’t know what they’re doing” and “unleash the cruelty.” This is a definitive positioning that hierarchically arranges the opinions and points of view of one of the parts in the conflict against the other. Cruelty faces off against victimization.

3.3. THE MARIAN SANCTUARY AGAINST COMMUNIST SPAIN

The situation shows that the victims – those who favor the military uprising- seek refuge in a safe place to protect themselves from the “egoism and injustice.” In the train station, the Civil Guard detains a group of militiamen “in legitimate defense” and prevents them from blowing up the railway. This train is on its way to pick up a group of fugitives to head to the sanctuary of the Virgin of the Head, which has been converted into a religious stronghold and base of support for the rightwing anti-Republican military defended by the Civil Guard forces. The refugees hope to be liberated by Franco’s rebellious troops, but that moment never comes. Once again, the idea of spirituality attributed to the holy place is unavoidably associated with the refugees and their defenders.

Aracil betrays his militia companions who are keeping Marisa in custody and, by subterfuge, frees her from house arrest. Aracil is wounded while fleeing with Marisa at night and Marisa brings him to the Sanctuary. He would have wanted to go back with “his people” (the Republicans), but his physical condition does not permit it. Weak, badly wounded and delirious, he is hospitalized in the Franquista enclave. Captain Cortés investigates Aracil’s Republican background and asks Marisa’s opinion. Marisa, enamored of Aracil and thankful to him for having saved her from arrest, gives him a good endorsement. Cortés believes her and qualifies Aracil’s behavior as “exemplary.” The situation in the Sanctuary is precarious. They lack food, medicine, and munitions and are practically isolated. Every now and then, supplies are air-delivered by Franco’s airplanes. While the Soviet Air Force bombs the area, the refugees heroically resist. The death of a young soldier in the trenches motivates his father, Don Pedro, a civilian taking refuge in the Sanctuary, to express his desire for vengeance and he blames Aracil for the death of his son, saying, “It was your people.”
Because of this confrontation, Cortés asks for more reports on Aracil and he is told that he is an excellent person although his situation among the refugees is complicated. Cortés meets with Aracil and expounds on his political ideals with an ambiguous language that is open to multiple interpretations. In the corners of his mind, the two men coincide in their expressed polyvalent concepts of “justice”, “social”, “religion”, and “power”; they express a desire to limit differences and avoid revenge and, the Captain categorically tries to soften the differences of the ideas of the two sides:

There are many here (franquistas) who think just like those from below (Republicans), and many of those from below think just like those that are here.

The construction of the dialogue is filled with rhetorical circumlocution that tries to avoid the expressions commonly accepted to designate the sides of the conflict: Republicans and Nationals. These roundabouts try to erase the association between the Nationalist Spanish side with the German Nazis or the Fascist Italians, defeated in the recently concluded Second World War. On the other side, the term, “Republican” (the enemy) is also avoided at all costs to prevent association with the Republican Party of the United States, the country with which the Franco regime was trying to reestablish diplomatic relations. Even more poetic is the use of rhetorical resources in the speech of the Captain –soldier and “man of the land”– which adds social character (rain for everybody) and spiritual (look to heaven) values closely tied to the rural environment:

I am the son of laborers. I’m a man of the land, not of the city. The country unites, the city separates. Here in the country we spend the day looking at heaven and when it rains, it rains for everybody.

In this scene we hear an incoherent dialogue, but, finally, the two participants reach an agreement that they seal with a firm handshake. Here we see the metaphor of a desire that is never fulfilled: the representation of a national reconciliation between the two Spains, a task that was impossible during the life of the dictator. Nonetheless, this scene definitively anticipates the Communist Party’s proposal for national reconciliation in 1956. In this sense, The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender (1949) is the historical precursor of a desire to overcome the Civil War and the wish for a national understanding. But we can in no way attribute the discourse of reconciliation to the Franco regime. It could be that the censors did not perceive the metaphor of reconciliation and it could be thought that it was subtly introduced by the director. This possibility is not surprising if we consider that Arturo Ruiz-Castillo —although he adjusted to the Franco regime— worked for Republican groups during the war.

In the Sanctuary the shellings, attacks, losses and restrictions continue. At one point, Aracil decides to escape to the Republican side, but something unexpected occurs while he drags himself between the rocks and bushes. A Republican loudspeaker is broadcasting propaganda and directing threats at the refugees in the hermitage. At some point, Aracil hears a decisive phrase: “All of Spain is communist.” When he hears it, he halts, thinks, and returns to the refugees in the Sanctuary.

If up to that point the enemies of the Sanctuary were the “revolutionaries” (the term
“Republican” is not used). But from that point on the enemy is solidified and labeled as “communist,” a phrase that provokes fear and makes a real Republican like Aracil change sides immediately. The demonization of everything related to “communism” is a constant of the Franco regime. Aracil’s repentance supposed a character that, in spite of his support of what the dominant discourse would call “revolutionary and unjust” ideas, has a lucid moment in which he changes and joins the “good guys” of the film. The Christian value of mercy is again invoked, the lost sheep who repents of his deeds returns to the herd. It is a triumph of good over evil, made possible by repentance of sins.

Aracil joins the civilian combatants who defend the Sanctuary. Don Pedro, motivated by his desire to avenge the death of his son, ferociously launches himself at the enemy troops. Aracil stops him, takes his place and commits an individual act of bravery by launching a grenade into an enemy machine gun nest. By this heroic act, Aracil not only gains the confidence of the refugees who doubted him, but also has redeemed his “errant” past.

3.4. VICTIMIZATION, HEROISM AND MILITARY PATRIOTISM

The situation of the Sanctuary’s refugees goes from bad to worse. Winter has passed into spring and the attacks continue. After an intense bombardment, the attacking army orders the refugees to surrender and guarantees the safe evacuation of women and children. Nonetheless, all (women, children, and the sick) unanimously refuse to leave the enclave: “We will not leave here! The sanctuary does not surrender!” But the attack is unstoppable. The tanks roll over the trenches and the enemy troops (international brigades) occupy the Sanctuary. The occupying soldiers enter a large room where women and children are crowded among the ruins of the building. Realizing that the people are civilians, the soldiers stop pointing their rifles. This is a positive gesture attributed to the Republican assault force that the Franco regime censors passed over, another astounding gesture —contradicting the regimen’s modus operandi— whose authority and responsibility would have to be attributed to Arturo Ruiz-Castillo.

In his office among the ruins, Captain Cortés is found down and badly wounded. As he tries to rise, he exclaims in an agonizing voice: “Spain!” At that moment, as a French soldier is about to shoot him, a Spanish Republican stops him, saying, “He is Spanish. You don’t understand.” A bloody Cortés rises with difficulty and, staggers to the wall where a sign hangs with the words, “The Civil Guard dies, but does not surrender.” He falls mortally wounded under this inscription. The rest of the survivors have lost the battle but they have not surrendered. They have been heroes to the end. Nonetheless, to lose a battle does not mean the war is lost, and the war continues.

Another positive detail about the production for the Republicans must be pointed out: when the international brigade soldier is going to shoot Captain Cortés, the Spanish soldier who accompanies the brigade halts this despicable action and celebrates his “Spanishness.” That is to say that among evils there are different levels of evil and the Spanish soldier (although he is Republican) is less evil than the foreigner.

A panoramic shot shows us the physical deterioration of the detained survivors.
Marisa’s off-screen voice anchors and reiterates the significance of the images while a group of the heroes parade while accompanied by solemn music.

3.5. IN THE END, FRANCO WINS THE WAR

But the war continues. A time lapse of two years transports us to the end of the conflict (1939) with an enthusiastic and victorious inscription. A collage brings us to an exalted ending that has nothing to do with the tragedy of the Sanctuary. Very much on the contrary, it shows a dazzling ending that returns dignity to the heroes that died defending the Franco ideal. Divinity has rewarded those who have always been “looking to heaven” with a victory. The off-screen voice of Marisa tells about the end of the war. We see bombs dropped on a map, the title MADRID cannons, a cloudy sky, a divinely sourced backlight and the ruins of the sanctuary. This is followed by a masculine voiceover reading the well known finish of the war dictated by General Franco, “The war has ended”. This phrase appears printed on the screen and, in the background, the chapel of the Sanctuary lies in ruins. The end of the collage, accompanied by triumphant music, is a succession of four images strung together: a flag with the shield of the imperial eagle, mountains and sky, the tomb of Captain Cortés with a Christ and laurel crown (which we saw at the beginning) and a low angle shot of many national flags, lined up in perspective, waving in the wind and advancing together. The image fades to black.

This final part is best understood from the plastic point of view and for its ideological meaning, which unifies all elements of the film: the tomb of the military, Catholic hero, the heavenly light and the firm advance of the flags of “national uprising.” Franco has won the war and the death of the protagonists has been sublimated by the victory of his ambiguous ideals. Nevertheless, the classic ending of Greek tragedy is seen as truncated by the definitive victory of the “good guys” of the film. A happy ending in every respect.

It is not strange to find happy endings to tragic stories based on wartime events: in the ending of The Last of the Filipinos (Antonio Román, 1945) the survivors are decorated and regain the military honor of the vanquished; in Fort Apache (John Ford, 1948) Captain York (John Wayne) reestablishes order after the massacre, and in The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender, General Franco wins the war and imposes the law on “those people who do not know what they are doing.” In this last case, the malicious character does not appear on screen, he remains outside, but omniscient, like a divine figure situated beyond the light that frames the clouds in the sky. It is the voiceover that knows everything, that dictates everything, and that really tells the story of the film.

The final collage shows a direct influence of Soviet formalism –paradoxes of an anticommunist film- by the juxtaposition of images that do not form part of the dramatic development and whose association tries to create a longing in the viewer with metaphorical values (Sánchez-Biosca 95), has to do with a narrative discontinuity characteristic of the assembly of Eisenstein’s attractions that in this case establish “emotional and conceptual connections” (Bordwell 286) among the themes that the Franco apparatus wants to promote: warmongering, nationalism, and Catholicism.

Another direct intertextual relationship is that between Captain Cortés and Coronel
Thursday (Henry Fonda) in *Fort Apache*. Both heroically succumb obsessed with the adherence to orders and the defense of their military honor. They are characters equally pitiful, but with a substantial difference: while Ford established a critical view of the most ultraconservative military conventions, the Spanish film lacks those connotations.

4. INTERPRETIVE APPROXIMATIONS TO SENTIMENTALITY

The different subplots fulfill very specific functions in identifying with the viewer and openly appealing to the emotions, the good feelings and the humanitarian character of the refugees, although at times in barely credible fashion. Marisa makes her Catholic and conservative orientation evident by her own narration. It is a resounding voice, whose function is to underline aspects that appeal to the view with an ideological background. Luís de Aracil is a well constructed character who gives much dramatic play and evolves (or devolves) through the story. At the beginning he is a “dangerous man”, with a certain amount of authority to dissuade the peasants who are going to occupy the property, invoking the “law”, the “rights” and the “reasons.” But the most significant from the propagandistic point of view, is the radical turn after his flight toward the Republican front, whose motive is the rejection of communism. A man of profound (not explicit) convictions, he redeems his Republican vagaries and falls into the arms of a conservative woman, repents for his “Republican sins” and turns toward the band of defenders and “order.”

Captain Cortés is the most monolithic character of the film. His convictions do not change throughout the story. His simple character remains ultra-conservative. Nevertheless, he is coherent with his actions, which are consistent with his heroics at the end of the film. At the end, he pays with his life for his loyalty to his institution and, to top it all off, he falls dead under the motto "The Civil Guard dies, but never surrenders." It is all a messianic end – extremely unbelievable– for a martyr who dies faithfully following military orders while disobeying the orders of the representative of the Government of the Republic, the republic to which he cannot subordinate himself. The principles of the Civil Guard –the corps organized to guarantee public safety in the rural areas— places the defense of human lives and property on the same level. To assign the same importance to these two very different entities is a notable slight against the value of human life.

In the secondary plots the social relationships among the troops in everyday situations is packed with acts of camaraderie and solidarity. The acts of religious fervor of women and children in a ramshackle environment under the permanent harassment of the enemy confer on them a high degree of victimization. A populism very representative of Francoism is employed in this film: flamenco presentations are interposed with religious Spanish folk songs and situations that include humorous and human touches. There is a definite attempt to exploit the human dimension of the characters who are convinced of their destiny in order to encourage the viewer to identify with them. As Galán (89) indicates, the tendency to displace the political message determines the effectiveness of the propagandist film: “the viewer, fired by the story he sees narrated on the screen, is not conscious of the quality of the ideology that is being applied.”
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The military aspect of The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender is not only a propagandistic necessity of the regime, but also supposes an outdated apology of the Numantine spirit used in films before the war films of the post-war period: All’s Well in the Alcazar [Sin novedad en el Alcazar] (Augusto Genina 1940) and The Last of the Philippines (Los últimos de Filipinas, 1945). In this occasion, the epic is embodied by the corps of the Civil Guard, which needed encouragement in those times. We should realize that the Civil Guard, poorly paid and of low social consideration, is the force charged with defeating the Maquis guerrillas throughout different rural areas in Spain. The Anti-Franco guerrilla movement was promoted primarily by the Communist Party (1945-1952) and its objective was to topple Franco once the Second World War was finished. This means that with The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender, in addition to underlining its anticommunism, the propagandist apparatus seeks to extol the nobility of the rural environment and, especially, the Civil Guard.

5.2. This praise for the country is accompanied by a mystical quality characteristic of a sacred place where the principal plot of the film is developed. It has to do with a venerated sanctuary converted into a spiritual reserve and a victim of the vandalism of international communism. It is neither a military academy (like Alcazar in Toledo), nor an exotic colony (like the Philippines) but a sacred place, next to the collective imagination, where the heroic, patriotic, religious, and military is mythologized. Two of these concepts run the length of the entire story: “the military” and “the sacred.” The Sanctuary acquires a symbolic value that joins these two elements to the heroic and messianic merits of the martyr who lies in the tomb. This is the same set of values that the Franco regime has repeatedly in its propaganda. Even up to the point where the Virgin of the Head is converted into the perfect metaphor for the dictatorial state that accommodates these two testaments: the army loyal to Franco and the Catholic hierarchy.

5.3. In the film, the term “revolution” is associated with injustice and selfishness, negative values that are attributed to the enemies, revolutionaries, and communists who are always depicted as uncultured, brutish and soulless. The objective is none other than to demonize the labels “revolution” and “communism”. Let us not forget that Franco’s Spain needs to reestablish diplomatic ties – especially with the United States- to break out of its isolation in an international context in which the Soviet Union and communism represent the black beast to the Americans during the Cold War (1947-1991). The Franco regime, with its anticommunism, finds a point of commonality with the interests of the United States.

5.4. At no point does the film mention the term “Republican”, and neither are the symbols of the republic represented since they are icons identified with the real enemy of the regime. Faced with this dilemma, Franco is obligated to avoid association of Republicanism with his enemies, since the Republican ideal is directly linked with parliamentary democracies. For the same motives –although in the other direction- in The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender neither Falangist characters nor symbols appear. The regime, after the victory of the allies and the start of the Cold War, is not interested in Falangist symbols (salutes with the arm raised, blue shirts) being associated with Italian fascism or Nazi Germany, defeated in 1945.
With this “erasure” of visual and aural symbols, the regime avoids being declared explicitly against parliamentary democracy, and avoids being connected to defeated totalitarian nationalism.

The Sanctuary Does Not Surrender (1949) is a precursor to the propagandistic change that will come to life a year later in the second version of Race, entitled Spirit of a Race (1950). This change in the communication of the regime’s image, while appearing to be complex and strategic is only a cosmetic change. At the bottom of the issue the warlike will of an authoritarian state prevails, a “social concept” that seeks to organize society under military forms of obedience to authority and discipline, without any right to dissent. Nevertheless, Franco, with all the propagandist possibilities that fictional film offered him, managed to hide his opposition to conventional parliamentary democracy, accentuate his anti-communism, maintained the loyalty of his supporters and favored the diplomatic attempts to break out of isolation. These objectives kept him in power for four decades (1936-1975), even beyond the death of the dictator and without the slightest hint of reconciliation.
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Editors’ note:
In order to facilitate the reading of this article, during the translation of the original text, all quotations in Spanish from the film’s script have been translated and presented only in English.