

Chapter 17

Censors and Censorship Boards in Franco's Spain (1950s–1960s): An Overview Based on the TRACE Cinema Catalogue

C. GUTIÉRREZ LANZA

Introduction

This contribution, which is part of the work undertaken by the TRACE project,¹ sets out to provide an account of the tensions that arose as a result of censorship policies and activities in relation to foreign cinema in Spain during the 1950s and 1960s. During this significant period within Franco's regime (1939–1975), the views of successive government ministers changed from conservative to more liberal. As a part of this liberalization process, in contrast to previous decades, the 1960s witnessed a political *apertura* ('opening up') from within, and a series of institutional readjustments which caused numerous changes in the way the censorship system worked. Official decisions at the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* ('Ministry of Information and Tourism'²; hereafter 'MIT') under Minister Manuel Fraga Iribarne were generally assumed to be more permissive and tolerant than under his predecessors.

A very important role in this process of *apertura* was played by translated – both dubbed and subtitled – cinema. A new, more liberal *Junta de Clasificación y Censura de Películas Cinematográficas* ('Cinema Classification and Censorship Board'), created in 1962, raised the level of tolerance and approved for the commercial circuits many dubbed films which had been banned by the previous *Junta* on the grounds of poor moral standards. This way, some morally controversial topics such as infidelity, adultery and broken marriages, characteristic of many foreign melodramas, made their way onto Spanish screens. Besides, from 1967 Spanish audiences were

allowed to watch many foreign films which were not considered suitable for the commercial circuits, by patronising the so-called *Salas Especiales* (those special cinemas of no more than 500 seats in cities with populations of over 50,000 or in specific tourist resorts, exclusively intended to show foreign films in their original or subtitled versions or Spanish 'films of special interest' in a proportion of 3:1 respectively) or *Salas de Arte y Ensayo* (those *Salas Especiales* destined to show selected 'quality films').

However, this new, more open attitude resulted in opposition from pro-regime extreme groups on the one hand, especially from the most conservative members of the Catholic Church, who could not accept the growing distance between the Church and the State, and resistance from anti-regime groups on the other hand, suspicious of a more lenient approach to the control of cultural products. A fierce attack from some members of the Catholic Church on the new, more progressive ministerial decisions of the Fraga Iribarne period resulted in an extensive official *Informe* (an unpublished report) issued in 1963, which not only tried to defend and justify those new liberalizing decisions, but also provided a detailed account of the profiles of the new censors and a list of the films and plays approved or banned by this new team.

This *Informe*, and the change of course in the Ministry reflected by it, together with the official ministerial decisions (*Órdenes* and *Decretos*) on censorship published at the time in the periodical *Boletín Oficial del Estado* ('Official State Bulletin'; hereafter 'BOE'), will be used as our main sources; examples from the handwritten and signed reports issued by cinema censors will also be used. Such reports are part of the documentation TRACE researchers have consulted in the AGA (*Archivo General de la Administración*, 'General Administration Archive') when investigating the English-Spanish translation and censorship of foreign cinema productions. They have also been integrated in the TRACE cinema catalogue of English-Spanish translated censored films that have been compiled and analysed in the framework of the TRACE project. These documents will be used to provide empirical evidence of the internal procedures of censorship under Franco in relation to translated films (dubbed for the commercial circuits and subtitled for *Salas Especiales* and *Salas de Arte y Ensayo*).

Censors and Censorship Boards in Spain (1950s–1960s): A Brief Historical Account

Background

In 1942 the *Comisión Nacional de Censura Cinematográfica*, whose work was overseen by the *Junta Nacional Superior de Censura Cinematográfica*,

took over responsibility for cinema censorship (BOE 26 November 1942). From then on the presence of the representative of the *autoridad eclesiástica* ('ecclesiastical authority') was compulsory in any of the sessions of the *Comisión Nacional*.³ This increasing control of the official censorship bodies by the Catholic Church, particularly characteristic of the 1940s, confirms its privileged position with respect to other social groups at the time. It reached its peak in 1946, the year when the Spanish regime was condemned and sanctioned by the United Nations and when the *Junta Superior de Orientación Cinematográfica* was created (*Orden Ministerio de Educación Nacional* 28 June 1946; BOE 19 July 1946) in an attempt to simplify procedures and apply unified criteria to all decisions. As stated in article 4 of this *Orden*, the presence of the ecclesiastical representative, considered an expert in moral and religious issues, remained compulsory. Moreover, from then on the Church representative was the only member of the board to enjoy the power of veto, which preserved his own independence from the rest of the members of the board. This privilege was also emphasized in article 13 of the *Orden* of 7 October 1947 (BOE 11 October 1947), which contained the internal guidelines of the *Junta Superior*.

The conservative years (1950s): The need for international recognition of the regime

A politician with traditionalist views, Gabriel Arias Salgado, was in charge of the Ministry of Information and Tourism in the 1950s – from 18 July 1951 until 10 July 1962. During this decade, the conservative views of the Ministers and their wish to preserve the nature of the Spanish regime contrasted with the need for acceptance abroad, which included the establishment of political agreements with other countries. After very complex negotiations, Spain signed the *Concordato* ('Concordat') with the Vatican in 1953 under Pius XII which, among other things, allowed Franco to control the selection of new bishops, something which many members of the Spanish Church had not easily accepted. Spain was also finally admitted as a member of the United Nations in 1955 (Lleonart Amsélem, 1995: 101). These events heralded on the one hand the awaited international recognition of the Spanish regime and on the other hand the start of the growing distance between the Spanish Catholic Church and the Spanish State. This emergent decline in the relationship between the Catholic Church and the State was made evident in the regulations of the *Junta de Clasificación y Censura*, created in 1952 (*Decreto* of the *Presidencia del Gobierno* 21 March 1952; BOE 31 March 1952). As part of this *Junta*, in the Censorship Branch there was an *Ordinario Diocesano*,⁴ who was in charge of the preservation

of moral standards, but he was prevented from using the power of veto, which was finally abolished by ministerial law issued by the MIT on 20 February 1964 (BOE 14 March 1964).

Directions on film censorship had originally been given by Pius XI in his Encyclical Letter 'Vigilanti Cura' (Pius XI, 1936), later repeated by Pius XII in his Encyclical Letter 'Miranda Prorsus' on motion pictures, radio and television (Pius XII, 1957). On 17 February 1950, the Spanish ecclesiastical authorities approved the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* ('Instructions and Standards Regarding Moral Censorship of Public Performances'). It was a written code of censorship norms which coexisted with the official, political censorship system and provided a unified moral guide for public performances aimed at critics, priests and audiences by means of the following film classification, published in the same year in the periodical *Ecclesia* (for further discussion, see Martínez Bretón, 1988):

- (1) *Todos, incluso niños* ('all audiences, including children');
- (2) *Jóvenes* ('young viewers from 14 to 21 years of age');
- (3) *Mayores* ('adults 21 years and older');
- (3R) *Mayores, con reparos* ('adults 21 years and older, with reservations regarding moral grounds');
- (4) *Gravemente peligrosa (léase rechazable)* ('seriously dangerous [the film should be banned]').

Although this code was systematically used to classify every film that was shown on Spanish cinema screens, only the official boards of censorship had the power to issue the final verdict. According to the TRACE cinema catalogue, out of a total of 1321 films authorized by the *Junta de Clasificación y Censura*, dubbed from English into Spanish and shown in Spanish cinemas during the Arias Salgado period, only 13 (0.98%; 13/1321) were classified as '4' by the religious censors. The relatively small percentage of so-called 'seriously dangerous' films authorized by the *Junta* for showing demonstrates that the *Junta* was very much in favour of preserving the moral doctrine of the Church at that time. The 13 foreign films which were actually approved for showing are shown in Table 17.1, by date of release in Spain.

The political *apertura* (1960s): Opposition and resistance

During the 1960s there was a desire for a new spirit of cultural liberalization in Spain. The new Minister of Information and Tourism, Manuel Fraga Iribarne (10 July 1962–29 October 1969), initiated a period of 'moderate

Table 17.1 Foreign films dubbed into Spanish from English, classified as '4' by religious censors, approved by civil boards and shown in Spanish cinemas during the Arias Salgado period (18 July 1951–10 July 1962)

<i>Original title (director and year)</i>	<i>Translated title</i>	<i>Release in Spain</i>
Rio (Brahm 1939)	<i>Noches en Río</i>	22/10/1951
<i>The Lady Gambles</i> (Gordon 1949)	<i>Dirección prohibida</i>	26/11/1951
<i>Rope of Sand</i> (Dieterle 1949)	<i>Soga de arena</i>	31/12/1951
<i>Duel in the Sun</i> (Vidor 1946)	<i>Duelo al sol</i>	12/10/1953
<i>My Forbidden Past</i> (Stevenson 1951)	<i>Odio y orgullo</i>	01/02/1954
<i>Gone to Earth</i> (Powell & Pressburger 1950)	<i>Corazón salvaje</i>	28/09/1954
<i>Kiss Tomorrow Goodbye</i> (Douglas 1950)	<i>Corazón de hielo</i>	27/09/1955
<i>Love in the Afternoon</i> (Wilder 1957)	<i>Ariane</i>	14/10/1957
<i>Cat on a Hot Tin Roof</i> (Brooks 1958)	<i>La gata sobre el tejado de zinc</i>	01/02/1960
<i>Portrait in Black</i> (Gordon 1960)	<i>Retrato en negro</i>	02/04/1961
<i>That Kind of Woman</i> (Lumet 1959)	<i>Esa clase de mujer</i>	28/08/1961
<i>Go Naked in the World</i> (MacDougall 1961)	<i>Desnuda frente al mundo</i>	06/11/1961
<i>Butterfield 8</i> (Mann 1960)	<i>Una mujer marcada</i>	23/11/1961

Source: TRACE cinema catalogue.

tolerance' (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 152), which included the reappointment of José María García Escudero as the new *Director General de Cinematografía y Teatro*. Previously appointed to the post in 1951, García Escudero had resigned prematurely in 1952, mainly because of his liberal approach and his willingness to promote certain films that included social criticism.

García Escudero was quite an influential figure during and after the Francoist period. As the author of several books and articles, the organizer of conferences and the subject of many interviews, his works and public appearances allowed him to express not only his liberal views on the cinema in general, but also his critical opinions about the Spanish political, social, religious and cultural situation. Of especially notorious

importance were his opposition to the kind of puritanical censorship practised by the Spanish Catholic Church and his defence of an 'intelligent censorship', quoted many times later on, which was the topic of his conference on Censorship and Freedom at the *Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca* on 16 December 1951:

Los beneficios de la censura – dije – se perciben en seguida y sus perjuicios sólo a la larga; con la libertad sucede al revés: produce muchos males inmediatos, que el tiempo transforma en buena medida en bienes. (García Escudero, 1995: 228)

[The benefits of censorship – I said – are perceived immediately and its drawbacks only in the long run; with freedom it is the opposite: it causes a lot of immediate harm, which to a large extent time turns into good.]

García Escudero was in favour of a radical change in the way moral issues were traditionally addressed, by promoting the type of education which would allow the viewers to judge cinematic events from a critical distance, thus making censorship unnecessary:

Esa educación moral tiene un presupuesto, que es la educación cinematográfica. [...] Pues bien, se trata de enseñar a dominar la película en vez de ser dominado por ella. (García Escudero, 1970: 44)

[This moral education comes with the assumption of education about the cinema. [...] Therefore, it is about teaching [the audience] to control the film instead of being controlled by it.]

Within this context, the new period opened up with the reorganization of the *Junta de Clasificación y Censura de Películas Cinematográficas* by *Decreto* of the MIT dated 20 September 1962 (*BOE* 28 September 1962); the internal guidelines ruling the Censorship Branch of the new *Junta* were issued by the MIT on 20 February 1964 (*BOE* 14 March 1964). After the selection of candidates, the new *Junta* was constituted and the names of the new members belonging to the Board of Directors and to the cinema Censorship and Classification Branches were made official and public (*Orden* MIT 3 December 1962; *BOE* 11 December 1962).⁵ The Board of Directors was headed by the *Director General de Cinematografía y Teatro*, José María García Escudero; this, together with the personal and professional profiles of the other members of the *Junta*, marked the start of a period of change moving towards a more lenient attitude to censorship on the part of the authorities, which not only had an impact on the public showing of films in cinemas but on other types of cultural events as well.⁶ Suffice it to say that,

according to the TRACE cinema catalogue, out of a total of 1017 films translated from English (all of them dubbed into Spanish, except for the ones shown in special cinemas), approved by the new *Junta* and shown in Spanish cinemas during the Fraga Iribarne period, 67 films (6.59%; 67/1017) were classified as '4' ('seriously dangerous') by religious censors. The fact that nearly 7% of films officially approved for showing had been classified as 'seriously dangerous' by the Church censors, compared to circa 1% between 1951 and 1962, demonstrates that a poor moral classification of a film no longer necessarily prevented it from being approved. Table 17.2 shows a sample of eight of those films, by date of release in Spain (our selection includes one film per year of release, from 1962 until 1969).

During this period, the long-awaited code governing civil censorship boards was approved on 9 February 1963 and finally published in 1963 both in the *BOE* (8 March 1963) and in the periodicals *Revista internacional del cine* and *Film ideal*. Although the Christian basis of this code was still apparent, its publication not only silenced the general demand for a specification of what was and was not permissible, but also caused different reactions and comments, for example, in the form of a 194-page volume of articles, interviews, editorials and opinion polls, entitled *La censura de cine*

Table 17.2 A sample of eight foreign films dubbed from English into Spanish, classified as '4' by religious censors, approved by the new *Junta de Clasificación y Censura de Películas Cinematográficas* and shown in Spanish cinemas during the Fraga Iribarne period (10 July 1962–29 October 1969)

<i>Original title (director and year)</i>	<i>Translated title</i>	<i>Release in Spain</i>
<i>Bonjour Tristesse</i> (Preminger 1958)	<i>Buenos días, tristeza</i>	18/10/1962
<i>Sweet Bird of Youth</i> (Brooks 1962)	<i>Dulce pájaro de juventud</i>	18/03/1963
<i>The Night of the Iguana</i> (Huston 1964)	<i>La noche de la iguana</i>	07/11/1964
<i>Where Love Has Gone</i> (Dmytryk 1964)	<i>Adonde fue el amor</i>	13/05/1965
<i>The Idol</i> (Petrie 1966)	<i>Falso ídolo</i>	05/12/1966
<i>This Property Is Condemned</i> (Pollack 1966)	<i>Propiedad condenada</i>	15/05/1967
<i>Point Blank</i> (Boorman 1967)	<i>A quemarropa</i>	26/08/1968
<i>Alfie</i> (Gilbert 1966)	<i>Alfie</i>	22/08/1969

Source: TRACE cinema catalogue.

en España, edited in 1963 by Pascual Cebollada, one of the members of the new *Junta*. After the publication of the code, for many the situation remained more or less the same (further details may be found in various sources: e.g. the periodical *Dirigido por...*, 1974: 30; Pérez Merinero & Pérez Merinero, 1975: 97). As pointed out by Gutiérrez Lanza, some people thought that:

[...] the code was too general, too ambiguous, and too open to interpretation; thus it did not help script writers and translators anticipate the censors' final verdict. Moreover, the most intolerant critics maintained that extensive foreign cultural material was representative of Protestant cultures, whose society allowed both divorce and adultery, and whose cinema was flooded with marriages heading for disaster and other depictions of sin. [...] By contrast, enemies of censorship did not believe that the atmosphere was sufficiently liberal and still argued for more tolerant attitudes. (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 154)

Another influential measure that was taken following García Escudero's reappointment was the raising of the age limit for adult audiences (2 March 1963; *BOE* 9 March 1963) from 16 to 18. This measure allowed many controversial topics such as the ones banned by Norm 8.4 of the 1963 code (adultery, abortion, prostitution, the use of contraceptive devices, suicide, etc.) to be considered suitable for an audience over the age of 18, as long as specific 'harmful' words and expressions were not explicitly mentioned.

A few years later on 12 January 1967 a new guideline was issued (*Orden MIT, BOE* 20 January 1967), stating the need to start showing films of special interest in the *Salas Especiales* and the *Salas de Arte y Ensayo*. The very existence of these *Salas* was in itself a sign of liberalization. Although they did not completely escape the effects of censorship and were not part of the commercial circuit – thus reaching relatively small audiences – thanks to them, many foreign 'quality films' were seen by Spanish viewers, which greatly contributed to improving the image of Spain abroad. For example, according to the periodical *Cine Asesor* (1967), among the first set of films distributed exclusively for *Salas de Arte y Ensayo* from October to December 1967 were the foreign films listed in Table 17.3, all of them shown in their original versions with Spanish subtitles.

Meanwhile, in response to the harsh criticism from certain ecclesiastical circles against what they considered to be the excessive permissiveness of the official censorship, in 1963 the *Dirección General de Cinematografía y Teatro* issued a private unpublished report, the *Informe sobre la Censura Cinematográfica y Teatral*,⁷ which specifically aimed at defending three factors: the personal profiles of the members of the new *Junta*, stressing

Table 17.3 Foreign films exclusively distributed for *Salas de Arte y Ensayo* from October to December 1967

<i>Original title (director and year)</i>	<i>Translated title</i>
<i>Mamma Roma</i> (Pasolini 1962)	<i>Mamma Roma</i>
<i>Repulsion</i> (Polanski 1965)	<i>Repulsión</i>
<i>Ensayo de un crimen</i> (Buñuel 1955)	<i>Ensayo de un crimen</i>
<i>Beata</i> (Sokolowska 1965)	<i>Beatriz</i>
<i>The Servant</i> (Losey 1963)	<i>El sirviente</i>
<i>Akahige</i> (Kurosawa 1964)	<i>Barbarroja</i>
<i>Hiroshima, mon amour</i> (Resnais 1959)	<i>Hiroshima, mon amour</i>
<i>Saturday Night and Sunday Morning</i> (Reisz 1961)	<i>Sábado noche, domingo mañana</i>

Source: Anonymous (1967).

those aspects which would bring them near ecclesiastical doctrine; the procedures followed during the design of the censorship norms of 1963; and the controversial decisions taken by the new *Junta*, that is to say, the approval for an audience over the age of 18 of many 'problematic' foreign films previously classified as 'seriously dangerous' by the Catholic Church. Each of these points is discussed briefly below.

Personal profiles of the Junta

The *Informe* pointed out that two of the official Church members had been appointed by both the Archbishop of Pamplona and the Patriarch of Madrid-Alcalá, while the appointment by the MIT of the rest of the ecclesiastical members had been confirmed by the corresponding ecclesiastical authorities. According to the *Informe*, the non-Church members of the *Junta* were doctors, lawyers, public servants, writers and critics: *seglares de plena confianza, caballeros cristianos cien por cien, hombres de alta cultura y de carrera* ('secular men completely trustworthy, Christian gentlemen a hundred per cent, erudite men of high culture') (MIT, 1963: 30).

Procedures followed by the Junta

Still trying to defend and justify the new 'permissiveness', in relation to the code of censorship norms approved on 9 February 1963, the *Informe* points out that, imprecise though these may seem, their detailed description allows them to work as a guide not only for those in charge of their application but also for authors, directors, producers, distributors and exhibitors.

Approving 'seriously dangerous' foreign films: The Junta's defence

In relation to the approval for an audience over the age of 18 of many so-called problematic films, the *Informe* claimed that the decisions taken by the new *Junta* could not possibly damage the attitudes of young people. Another argument which they used to defend themselves against the Church's objections was that decisions had been straightforwardly accepted by the cinema industry. In fact, even in the case of those films criticized as harmful by the Church and approved by the new *Junta* for an audience over the age of 16, the film producers voluntarily accepted at a later point the suggestion made by the *Dirección General*, raising the age of attendance to the new limit of 18. Table 17.4 shows those films which, according to the *Informe*, were approved by the new *Junta* and were later affected by this shift in age of 16 to 18 as the dividing line for young people and adults; i.e. they could no longer be shown to young people of 16 and 17 years of age. All of the films – cited here in the order in which they appear in the *Informe* – were foreign in origin.

Other films approved by the new *Junta* were also believed to be appropriate for an audience over the age of 18 on three grounds: firstly, that individual and subjective judgement makes differences of opinion unavoidable; secondly, that many of the critical comments show confusion between 'strong' and 'immoral' (a film can be both strong and highly moral as long as, according to Pius XII, evil deeds are presented in such a way that they deserve to be damned); and thirdly, that civil censorship cannot be as strict as religious censorship, devoted to educating people's

Table 17.4 Films approved by the new *Junta* and later affected by the shift in age from 16 to 18 (young people/adult borderline)

<i>Original title (director and year)</i>	<i>Translated title</i>
<i>Bonjour Tristesse</i> (Preminger 1958)	<i>Buenos días, tristeza</i>
<i>Splendour in the Grass</i> (Kazan 1961)	<i>Esplendor en la yerba</i> [sic]
<i>Eclisse, L'</i> (Antonioni 1962)	<i>El eclipse</i>
<i>Phaedra</i> (Dassin 1962)	<i>Fedra</i>
<i>Walk on the Wild Side</i> (Dmytryk 1962)	<i>La gata negra</i>
<i>Sweet Bird of Youth</i> (Brooks 1962)	<i>Dulce pájaro de juventud</i>
<i>The Best of Everything</i> (Negulesco 1959)	<i>Mujeres frente al amor</i>
<i>Isola di Arturo, L'</i> (Damiani 1962)	<i>La Isla de Arturo</i>
<i>Sanctuary</i> (Richardson 1961)	<i>Réquiem para una mujer</i>

Source: *Informe sobre la Censura Cinematográfica y Teatral* (1963).

consciences. For all these reasons, since civil and religious censorship serve different purposes, the *Dirección General* believed that there was no obstacle to the *Junta's* approval of at least some of those films that had previously been classified by the Church as 'seriously dangerous': '4. *Gravemente peligrosa (léase rechazable)*'.

Case Study: *The Best of Everything* (Negulesco, 1959): *Mujeres frente al amor*

The censorship documents associated with the film *The Best of Everything* (Negulesco, 1959) (translated into Spanish as *Mujeres frente al amor*), kept in file number 20.996, clearly exemplify the kind of negotiations that were taking place at the start of the 1960s both between the censors and the distributors and among the censors themselves. This morally controversial film, classified as 'seriously dangerous' by religious censors and included in the group of films approved by the new *Junta* and later affected by the shift in age from 16 to 18 (see Table 17.4), was finally given official approval following a number of changes to the film dialogue in the Spring of 1963. The film had originally been banned by the *Junta de Clasificación y Censura* on 14 September 1960, and again by the *Comisión Superior* on 10 October 1960 with the Spanish title *Mujeres en busca de amor* ('Women in search of love') in spite of some initial changes in the dialogue which:

aunque no son sustanciales, sin embargo adaptan mejor el clima moral de la película a las condiciones sociales de la nación. (Letter from A.S. Films S.A. addressed to the *Comisión Superior de Censura*, 10 October 1960)

[although not substantial, however, they adapt the moral climate of the film to the social circumstances of the nation.]

One of the censors of the *Comisión* leaves no room for doubt in his report about why the film was still not acceptable:

No creo posible que, aún admitiendo las rectificaciones de diálogo propuestas por la casa importadora, pueda aprobarse esta película. Es una narración cruel, despiadada, escalofriante de una juventud femenina, rota o aplastada por conseguir 'su hombre' como imperativo máximo de su ser, como razón exclusiva de su vida. Quizá en la realidad de la sociedad norteamericana, pueda ser ejemplar esta película: pero ese supuesto implicaría una terrible realidad que no es posible admitir en España, ni aún en el juicio más pesimista. (Censorship report by Don Antonio Fraguas, 10 October 1960)

[I don't think it possible, even if the modifications in the dialogue proposed by the importers were admitted, for this film to be approved. It is a cruel, merciless, horrifying narration of a young woman, broken or smashed because of the fact that obtaining 'her man' is her main duty, the sole *raison d'être* of her life. Maybe in the reality of North American society, this film can be considered to be exemplary: but this conjecture would imply a terrible reality which is not possible to admit in Spain, not even under the most pessimistic judgement.]

With the Spanish title *Mujeres frente al amor* ('Women opposing love'), the ban on the film was confirmed by the new *Junta de Clasificación y Censura* on 9 November 1962. In a letter addressed to the *Junta de Clasificación y Censura* dated 25 October 1960, A.S. Films S.A. had declared that the film was being presented 'without any modifications either to the image or the dialogue' – although the earlier letter of 10 October 1960 had reported some preliminary changes – on the grounds that the American League of Decency had classified it for adults without objections. This time, however, there were more differences of opinion among the censors, six of whom thought that the film could be approved for adults over the age of 16 and seven of whom thought that it should be banned again because of the immoral attitude of the characters. On 12 November 1962, the distributors again insisted on the possibility of changing the dialogue to achieve greater acceptance on the part of the authorities. The two-page list of changes to the dubbed screenplay suggested by the distributors and recorded in the censorship file included:

DIÁLOGO ACTUAL. APRIL: Mi madre nunca dice nada del amor. No se le ocurriría decirme que no tuviera un amante, como tampoco me diría que no robase un coche.

DIÁLOGO QUE SE PROPONE. APRIL: Mi madre nunca me dice nada del amor. Cree que viene y se va como un pájaro. Pero los pájaros también tienen sus nidos. Yo los he visto hacerse el amor.

[CURRENT DIALOGUE. APRIL: My mother never says anything about love. She wouldn't think of telling me not to have a lover, as she wouldn't tell me not to rob a car.

SUGGESTED DIALOGUE. APRIL: My mother never tells me anything about love. She thinks it comes and goes like a bird. But birds also have their nests. I've seen them making love.]

DIÁLOGO ACTUAL. CAROLINE: Abrazame [sic] Mike. Hazme el amor, te lo ruego. Aunque no me quieras nada.

DIÁLOGO QUE SE PROPONE. CAROLINE: Abrazame [sic], Mike. Lo necesito, te lo ruego. Aunque no me quieras nada.

[*CURRENT DIALOGUE. CAROLINE:* *Hold me Mike. Make love to me, I beg you. Even if you don't love me.*

SUGGESTED DIALOGUE. CAROLINE: *Hold me, Mike. I need it, I beg you. Even if you don't love me.]*

DIÁLOGO ACTUAL. SHALIMAR: Pero tu [sic] no debes olvidarte de que soy un hombre casado.

DIÁLOGO QUE SE PROPONE. SHALIMAR: Pero tu [sic] no debes olvidarte de que yo no soy libre.

[*CURRENT DIALOGUE. SHALIMAR:* *But you mustn't forget I'm a married man.*

SUGGESTED DIALOGUE. SHALIMAR: *But you mustn't forget I'm not free.]*

As can be seen above, in order to please the most conservative members of the censorship board, the suggested changes to the translated dialogue tend to avoid specific words and expressions considered highly immoral and dangerous, such as *amante* ('lover'), *hazme el amor* ('make love to me') and the open reference to marriage in the words of the two lovers, *soy un hombre casado* ('I am a married man').⁸ These changes in the translation of the dialogue, together with the new more liberal approach in official circles, allowed the new *Junta de Clasificación y Censura* to approve the film on 29 November 1962. Nevertheless, there were still some noticeable differences of opinion among the censors, eight of whom thought that the film could be approved for adults over the age of 16 (prior to the age change to 18) and six of whom thought it should be banned. According to the reports kept in the censorship file, all members of the new *Junta* produced very carefully justified written evidence of the reasons for their verdicts, which reflect the special interest they took in this controversial film. Those in favour of the banning of this 'immoral film' still argued that it was *peligrosa y nociva, sobre todo para muchachas jóvenes* ('dangerous and harmful, especially for young women') (Censorship report by Srta. Elisa de Lara, 29 November 1962). On the other hand, those in favour of its approval, in accordance with García Escudero's more liberal views, explained that *esta película es un testimonio social de EEUU* ('this film is a social testimony of the USA') (Censorship report by Don Juan Miguel Lamet, 29 November 1962) and *el público comprenderá y repudiará la situación, las muchachas jóvenes sobre*

todo ('the audience will understand and repudiate the situation, young women especially') (Censorship report by Don Juan Miguel Lamet, 29 November 1962). So, among other things, the approval was now being justified on the grounds that the action did not take place in Spain and, therefore, that that kind of behaviour was not characteristic of Spanish society. Finally, almost half a year later, after the adult age limit had been raised from 16 to 18, A.S. Films S.A. applied for a new classification of this film, which was certified by the new *Junta* on 2 April 1963 for adults over the age of 18.

Conclusion

The case study on *Mujeres frente al amor* reported above is highly representative of the film censorship situation of the 1960s in Spain: the moral tolerance threshold was gradually being raised, causing many differences of opinion between the more conservative and the more liberal censors, and leading the distributors to endless negotiations with the censorship boards in order to have their films approved. The appearance in film of themes such as infidelity, adultery, broken marriages, and so on was frequently justified on the grounds that the reprehensible behaviour depicted in the film was 'foreign', not Spanish. These topics started to be considered acceptable and became common in imported films which were permitted to be shown in cinemas, as long as there were no explicit references to these topics by means of specific words and expressions. Therefore, in order to avoid the film being banned, both translators and distributors made changes to the screenplay before seeking the approval of the censorship board. Other parts of the dialogue left unaltered in the translated version were, however, later revised and changed by the censors.

One of the main impediments to the process of liberalization in Spain in the 1960s was that it was still based on the same old legal, administrative and political mechanisms that had been at work for decades. As a result of this anachronistic situation, 'there was a feeling of widespread insecurity among artists and intellectuals on the grounds that non-conformism could be legally repressed by the prevailing apparatus at any time' (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 155). However, although conservative forces regained some power during the final years of the Franco regime, thanks to the degree of liberalization which had been achieved in Spanish society in the previous years, attempts to restore the initial power of the censorship apparatus did not succeed.

Notes

1. Research for this article has been undertaken as part of the TRACE project, funded by the regional government of Castilla y León, Spain [LE020A09] and the Ministry of Science and Innovation [FFI2008-05479-C02-01/FILO]. The acronym stands for *Traducciones censuradas*/Censored translations. See <http://trace.unileon.es/>; <http://www.ehu.es/trace/inicio.html>.
2. All translations are my own.
3. The *Comisión Nacional de Censura Cinematográfica* consisted of the so-called Presidente and five other members: a representative of the military, of the ecclesiastic authority, of the Ministry of National Education, of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, and of the Department of Cinematography (BOE 26 November 1942).
4. The *Ordinario Diocesano* is the member of the Catholic Church who, among other duties, oversees the selection of school teachers of the Catholic religion.
5. The new *Junta de Clasificación y Censura de Películas Cinematográficas* consisted of a *Rama de Censura* ('Censorship Branch'), a *Rama de Clasificación* ('Classification Branch'), and a Board of Directors common to both branches. According to the *Orden* issued by the MIT on 3 December 1962 (BOE 11 December 1962), the members of the Board of Directors were: *Presidente, Director General de Cinematografía y Teatro; Vicepresidente primero, Subdirector General de Cinematografía y Teatro; Vicepresidente segundo, Secretario general de Cinematografía y Teatro; Secretario, don Sebastián Bautista de la Torre; Vocal nato de las dos Ramas, Jefe de Servicios de Cine de la Dirección General de Cinematografía y Teatro*.
6. For more information about the changes brought about by the new 'spirit of aperture' towards a more lenient control of English-Spanish translated theatre or narrative, please refer to the (un)published works of other members of the TRACE research team (see <http://trace.unileon.es/>; <http://www.ehu.es/trace/inicio.html>).
7. I would like to thank Dr Raquel Merino (Universidad del País Vasco) for providing me with the unpublished *Informe sobre la Censura Cinematográfica y Teatral* and *Mis siete vidas: de las brigadas anarquistas a juez del 23-F* by García Escudero (1995) for the purposes of this chapter.
8. These are examples of suggested changes made by the distributors. Other case studies have also confirmed that censorship was mainly implemented before the translations reached the censorship boards, because of opposition of the censors to the use of what they considered to be morally incorrect words or expressions. This was the case not only for English-Spanish cinema translation but also in other textual areas such as narrative and theatre. For more information about this, please refer to the (un)published works of the members of the TRACE research team (see <http://trace.unileon.es/>; <http://www.ehu.es/trace/inicio.html>).

References

- Anonymous (1967) *Cine asesor. Hojas archivables de información – exclusivas para empresas*. Madrid.

- García Escudero, J.M. (1970) *Vamos a hablar de cine*. Madrid: Biblioteca Básica Salvat.
- García Escudero, J.M. (1995) *Mis siete vidas: de las brigadas anarquistas a juez del 23-F*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, S.A.
- Gutiérrez Lanza, C. (2002) Spanish film translation and cultural patronage: The filtering and manipulation of imported material during Franco's dictatorship. In M. Tymoczko and E. Gentzler (eds) *Translation and Power* (pp. 141–159). Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lleonart Amsélem, A.J. (1995) El ingreso de España en la ONU: Obstáculos e impulsos. *Cuadernos de Historia Contemporánea* 17, 101–119.
- Martínez Bretón, J.A. (1988) *Influencia de la Iglesia Católica en la cinematografía española (1951–1962)*. Madrid: Harofarma.
- Ministerio de Cultura. Archivo General de la Administración. *Mujeres frente al amor*. Expediente No. 20.996. SIGNAGA 36/03987.
- MIT (Ministerio de Información y Turismo). Dirección General de Cinematografía y Teatro. (1963) Informe sobre la Censura Cinematográfica y Teatral. Unpublished.
- Pérez Merinero, C. and Pérez Merinero, D. (1975) *Cine y control*. Madrid: Miguel Castellote.
- Pius XI (1936) *Vigilanti Cura*. On WWW at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_29061936_vigilanti-cura_en.html. Accessed 7.10.2009.
- Pius XII (1957) *Miranda Prorsus*. On WWW at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_08091957_miranda_prorsus_en.html. Accessed 7.10.09.