

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“Translation and censorship of Hollywood films in Spain
during the 1950s and the 1960s”

verfasst von / submitted by

Max Taylor, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (MA)

Wien / Vienna, 2017

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / Degree
programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 060 331 351

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / Degree
programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Übersetzen Deutsch Spanisch

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Michèle Kaiser-Cooke, M.A.

1. Table of Contents

1. Table of Contents	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Theoretical framework	7
3.1. Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)	7
3.2. Censorship and patronage	8
3.3. Translational norms	10
3.4. Domesticating translation	12
4. Censorship	14
4.1. Censorship and translation	15
4.2. Self-censorship	18
4.3. Censorship by the state	19
4.4. Censorship and the Church	22
4.5. Censorship as practised during the apertura	25
5. Dubbing	27
5.1. Dubbing and nationalism	27
5.2. The dubbing process	29
6. Translation and censorship under Franco: Trends and developments	32
6.1. 1931-1939: The Second Spanish Republic and the Civil War	32
6.2. 1939-1945: The beginnings of Franco's regime	32
6.3. 1945-51: Nacionalcatolicismo	33
6.4. 1951-62: Ultracatolicismo	34
6.5. 1962-69: Apertura	35
6.6. 1969-75: The final throes	38
7. The apertura: a closer analysis	40
7.1. Normas de Censura of 1963	43
8. Hollywood cinema	45
8.1. Hollywood abroad	45
8.2. Censorship in Hollywood	47
8.3. Hollywood Cinema in Franco's Spain	48
9. Methodology	55
9.1. Censorship codes	56

9.2. Films to be analysed	62
9.2.1. Alfred Hitchcock (1899-1980)	63
9.2.2. Vertigo	64
9.2.3. North by Northwest	64
9.2.4. Rebel Without a Cause	65
9.2.5. Strangers on a Train	66
10. Results	68
10.1. Vertigo	68
10.2. North by Northwest	73
10.3. Rebel Without a Cause	78
10.4. Strangers on a Train	83
11. Analysis	86
11.1. Vertigo	86
11.2. North by Northwest	88
11.3. Rebel Without a Cause	90
11.4. Strangers on a Train	92
11.5. Final analysis	94
12. Conclusion	99
13. Appendix	102
13.1. Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos	102
13.2. Orden de 9 de febrero de 1963	103
14. Bibliography	107

2. Introduction

Franco and his right-wing party FET y de las JONS (*Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista*¹) controlled Spain from 1939 to 1975. During this period, they exercised strict control over Spanish and foreign media in order to avoid the release or publication of potentially damaging or inflammatory material. This entailed rigorous censorship laws, with all foreign films being subjected to thorough examination to ensure that their message aligned with Francoist ideals. If a film was deemed to be blasphemous, sexually immoral, pro-Communist, anti-Nationalist, or anti-authoritarian, the responsible institutions could censor it or ban it outright. Dubbing was an extremely useful manipulative tool in this regard; swathes of dialogue were often removed or modified, and sometimes the whole plot would be drastically altered to bring it into line with Franco's brand of morality.

One period that merits particular attention is that of the *apertura* (opening) of 1962-1969, which was heralded as a time of both political and cultural liberalisation. This thesis addresses the hypothesis that the *apertura* resulted in a significant relaxation of cinema censorship in Spain. Our critical examination will take into account the complex political, cultural, and social situation that the country faced in the 1960s. Translation in any medium can be a political process as well as a linguistic one, and under Franco's regime the political element was often very much to the fore. Did the *apertura* truly result in greater censorial leniency? Or was it just a political gambit designed to partially assuage the frustrations of Spanish filmmakers, distributors and audiences, while presenting the international community with a rose-tinted image of a supposedly liberalised nation?

Several scholars have intimated that the liberalising progress was decidedly more modest than was indicated at the time, and that what little change existed was limited to sexuality and eroticism rather than matters of politics or religion; however, such assertions are generally unaccompanied by empirical evidence that would support or refute the statement (e.g. Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000; Gubern, 1976). This seems to be a widespread problem in material relating to the *apertura*; though this period has been discussed at length by numerous translation scholars (e.g. Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002; Neuschäfer, 1994; Rabadán, 2000), empirical evidence is scarce (for an interesting but limited example see Barbal, 2008). An empirical study would be of considerable benefit to a true understanding of this transitional

¹ 'Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx of the Juntas of the National Syndicalist Offensive'

period and the changes (if any) that this brought about for film translation at the time. This thesis will therefore be based in large part on Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) as established by Gideon Toury, in the belief that such an approach would help greatly in demonstrating to what extent these political developments were borne out in actual film censorship and translation.

The principal focus of this thesis will be the interlingual translation element of censorship; that is, how the original English-language scripts were translated into Spanish in such a way as to align with Francoist principles such as nationalism, Catholicism, and sexual morality. At the same time, this interlingual aspect will be considered within the framework of translation in the broader sense, encompassing the entire process by which the original American script was transformed into the final censored Spanish version. (This is discussed in greater detail in Section 4.1)

This thesis will focus on cinema rather than, for example, literature or theatre. Film was deemed to be the medium that required the most stringent censorship during this period because film, unlike literature, was seen as accessible to all, and therefore had greater potential as a propaganda tool. In 1940, for instance, an article in the official film publication *Primer Plano* declared: 'es indudable que el cinematógrafo representa hoy el arma más eficaz de luchar un movimiento político cualquiera en pro de sus ideales'² (quoted in Miguel González, 2000: 62-63). Literature was consumed by a smaller proportion of society and those who read it were supposedly more intelligent and better-educated than the average film-goer, meaning that they were less likely to be swayed if they encountered questionable moral content. The veracity of this is debatable – Vandaele, for instance, refers to the notion as 'generally patronizing or paternalistic' (Vandaele, 2010: 90) – but true or not, it meant that film censorship was for the most part more drastic and deemed even more necessary than literary censorship (see for example Randall, 1970: 3); this, together with the fact that censored films generally had a much broader audience than did censored literature, mean that it is of particular interest.

² 'There is no doubt that the cinematographer is, today, the most effective weapon for any political movement fighting for its ideals' (my translation, hereafter MT).

3. Theoretical framework

3.1. Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)

The 1970s and 1980s saw the emergence of functionalist and descriptive schools of thought within the field of translation. Rather than simply pass judgement on the quality of particular translations, as had hitherto been traditional, the functionalist approach was concerned with the translation's reason for being, the purpose it was to serve in the target culture, and who was to benefit from the translation's dissemination (Hermans, 2009: 93-95). In determining the answers to these questions, it relied in large part on Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). DTS is a school of thought developed by Gideon Toury that emphasises the key role played by empirical research in the study of translation; it 'holds that carefully performed studies into well-defined corpuses, or sets of problems, constitute the best means of testing, refuting, and especially modifying and amending the theory itself in whose terms the research is being carried out'. Facts, not theories, are the cornerstone of translation studies: '[...] what constitutes the subject matter of a proper discipline of Translation Studies is (observable or reconstructable) facts of real life rather than merely speculative entities resulting from preconceived hypotheses and theoretical models' (Toury, 1995: xi). Such an approach is fundamental if we are to fully comprehend the censorship practices employed during Franco's regime; only by analysing the translated media themselves can we begin to understand the extent to which foreign media was appropriated and bowdlerised to suit the aims of the Spanish authorities. Rosa Rabadán makes a similar observation in her essay on translation under Franco: 'los EDTs son el forjado y los cimientos de la disciplina, el lugar de encuentro de aproximaciones lingüísticas y textuales, semióticas y culturales, independientemente de la procedencia del investigador o de los objetivos de su investigación'³ (Rabadán, 2000: 15).

This is not to say that empirical studies can replace theoretical methodology entirely; rather, theoretical assumptions must be based on a sound empirical foundation. Toury makes this point in his essay 'A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies':

Translated texts and their constitutive elements are observational facts, directly susceptible to the eye. As against this, translation processes [...] are nevertheless

³ 'Descriptive Translation Studies represent the structure and foundation of the discipline, a meeting point for linguistic, textual, cultural, and semiotic approaches, independently of the investigator's background or the objectives of his/her investigation' (MT).

only indirectly available for study as a kind of “black box”, an open system whose internal structure can only be guessed at, or tentatively reconstructed. This reconstruction must take place on the basis of the relationships between the respective observable input and output, with the aid of further theoretical assumptions and hypotheses [...] (Toury, 1982: 25).

That is to say, it is

only reasonable to claim that research into translation should start with the observational facts, the translated texts themselves (and their constitutive elements), and proceed towards the reconstruction of non-observational facts, and not the other way around. (1982: 25)

Theo Hermans also endorses the use of a primarily empirical approach: in *Manipulation of Literature*, he writes that 'practical fieldwork and case studies are [...] a necessity, since ultimately the theory remains a tentative construct which stands or falls with the success of its applications' (Hermans, 2014: 12). In an ideal situation, the use of such studies will result in a two-way process, with case studies being conducted using solid theoretical frameworks and the results of these studies guiding researchers as to whether they should corroborate or amend the theoretical structures. This will be the aim of this thesis. Hermans does, however, issue a warning:

In practice, the relation between the two is less straightforward. Case studies vary greatly in scope and emphasis, and may develop their own momentum. On the other hand, the theory consists of an aggregate of hypotheses which tend to be used highly selectively by individual researchers, and even in its entirety it offers no more than a simplified and abstract model at one remove from the real world (Hermans, 2014: 12).

This thesis is naturally not immune to such dangers. The fact that we have selected four films for analysis out of thousands, and that we have deemed which sections of dialogue are relevant to our study and which not, means that this study is by no means entirely objective nor comprehensive. Nonetheless, the in-depth analysis of several films from the period should greatly help to illustrate and complement the theoretical and historical elements of this thesis; in this way, at least, it sets itself apart from the bulk of existing literature on Francoist film censorship.

3.2. Censorship and patronage

In 1984, André Lefevere established the concept of 'patronage', a concept that aptly describes the methods by which Franco controlled the media during his regime. Patronage is understood as 'the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading,

writing, and rewriting of literature' (Lefevere, 1992: 15). Note that 'rewriting', and not just writing, receives an explicit mention. For Lefevere, there are two 'control factors' that ensure that any literary system abides by the prevailing standards of the society as a whole: one is patronage itself, and the other is the work of 'rewriters', who attempt to bring source texts into line with official conventions. In response to the *traduttore, traditore* adage, then, Lefevere remarks that translators cannot avoid being traitors, 'not as long as they remain within the boundaries of the culture that is theirs by birth or adoption' (Lefevere, 1992: 13).

While rewriters work specifically within the literary system, patronage controls the society as a whole, its goal being to harmonise the artistic system with the other systems present in a society or culture. The patronage system exercises its command using a three-pronged approach that combines ideological, economic, and status components; these restrict the content of literary output, determine the financial compensation for the work of rewriters, and dictate the rewriters' social status, respectively. To achieve this, institutions are created to monitor and control the distribution of artistic material: critical journals, censorship boards, and educational institutions all have their part to play. Acceptance of these institutions implies acceptance of the system of patronage in the respective culture and by extension the acknowledgement of the patrons' status and power (Lefevere, 1992: 14-18).

Lefevere further distinguishes between differentiated patronage (whereby the ideological, economic and status elements are independent of one another) and undifferentiated patronage (whereby all of these elements are dispensed from the same source). Of the two, differentiated patronage is more typical of liberal, democratic societies, as it permits artistic dissent and does not require that status and financial compensation be conditional on the artist's ideology. Undifferentiated patronage is more typical of totalitarian regimes such as Franco's, which restrict the influence of nonconformist elements by restricting their production and dissemination or altering them so that they support the officially enforced social norms (Pegenaute, 1999: 86). This can only be achieved through the rigorous control of media and communication, which in turn allows the authorities to hold a monopoly on symbolic power; 'the three constituents [i.e. ideology, economy, and status] are dispensed by only one patron in an attempt to monopolize all the different cultural spheres and to promote only system-preserving activities' (ibid: 88).

This model is clearly applicable to the censorship system of Francoist Spain. Franco sought to maintain his tight grip on Spanish society through rigorous control of cultural output, whether produced in Spain or imported from abroad; not only did this mean that it was

strictly forbidden to criticise him or the institutions under his command, it also meant that all cultural material had to be brought into line with the Catholic moral dogma of the time.

Though far from perfect, the system was for the most part successful; like it or not, artists found themselves obliged to adhere to the official moral doctrines if they did not want their work to be banned or ruthlessly expurgated by the state censors. The censorship system did invite some subversiveness: for instance, Miguel Delibes's *Cinco Horas con Mario* (1966) made it past the censors because its main character celebrated everything wrong with Franco's regime; while readers could appreciate the irony, the censors apparently could not. For the most part, however, the resistance to constraints was sufficiently limited that the state could ensure 'the perpetuation of a homogeneous worldview' (Merkle, 2004: 6). It has been argued that even the authorities in Hitler's Germany were unable to exercise censorship as comprehensively and severely as in Franco's Spain: 'it appears that control in Germany's longer-lived fascist neighbour was more complete, partly due to the participation of the Church. Not only were the Nazi control mechanisms less thorough, but confusion remained on what exactly was 'pernicious' to the regime' (Sturge, 1999b: 17).

3.3. Translational norms

Both Descriptive Translation Studies and Lefevere's concept of patronage feed into Toury's theory of translational norms, which can also aid us in our understanding of Francoist censorship policies. The translator, as one of 'culture's authorised spokespersons', was required to appropriate and internalise those translational norms that reflected the social and cultural constraints of the time (Merkle, 2004: 7). Toury was the first to apply the idea of norms to the translator's decision-making; as a translator is to a degree bound by the norms prevalent in his or her society, the finished translation can be seen as the product of these norms.

As such, though norms can serve as a useful decision-making tool for the translator, they can also be exploited by the system so as to restrict cultural output within a given society.

Gutiérrez Lanza explains this in *Translation and Power*: 'in such a situation where threatening values must be replaced, translational norms [...] aim at maintaining the ideological uniformity of the target culture' (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 141). This requires an (often extreme) adaptation of the original source material, a manipulation that 'favours the transmission of dominant values', facilitating 'a process of naturalisation [that] allows dominant ideology to become ingrained in everyday discourse, to become rationalised as

common-sense assumptions about the way things are and the way things should be' (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 141).

Hermans (1991: 155-170) likewise describes how norms can be manifested in normative forces, which ensure that behaviour falls into line with those values presented as 'correct'; these forces can be more or less severe depending on the nature of the system. A regime such as Franco's is naturally intolerant of dissident elements and does not allow for a diversity of 'correctness' notions; on the contrary, authoritarian regimes generally seek to use norms to decrease the complexity of the system and the elements being imported into it. This helps to restrict the potentially negative influence of elements coming from external systems, maintain the stability of the system, and leave less room for doubt as to what is or is not acceptable (Pegenaute, 1999: 86). However, as discussed in Section 4.5, this is complicated by the fact that the norms surrounding film censorship were notoriously ambiguous. While Franco's regime is typical of totalitarian systems in that it relied in large part on more 'mandatory' norms, which depend to a greater extent on explicitly codified rules and commands (Hermans, 1991: 160-168), this did not extend to all fields. In fact, the lack of explicit norms with regard to film censorship was the cause of much controversy among artists working under Franco's rule (see Section 4.5).

We can also distinguish between 'preliminary' and 'operational' norms. Adherence to preliminary norms is exhibited in the initial choice of works to be translated, which in itself constitutes a key element of the censorship system: the Francoist system sought to restrict access to harmful external influences by forbidding countless works and punishing those who by surreptitious means managed to gain access to them. Operational norms, as far as the import of foreign material is concerned, refer to the translation process itself; offensive words were removed, potentially harmful passages excised, and characters or events reinterpreted so as to bring the work into line with Francoist principles.

Of course, it is possible for individuals to refuse to abide by the society's dominant social norms, but such 'non-normative behaviour' is rare, especially in totalitarian systems such as Franco's, as it can result in severe sanctions (Toury, 2012: 176). However, this is not to say that Francoist Spain was an entirely entropic system that did not allow for external interference or change. Norms are by their nature dynamic; as such, the seeds of new norms may exist alongside fully-fledged mainstream norms and the remnants of old ones (Toury, 2012: 175). Not even societies such as Franco's Spain can eliminate external influences

entirely, and ultimately, Franco could only slow the increasing liberalisation and secularisation of society, not halt it altogether.

3.4. Domesticating translation

Venuti distinguishes between 'domesticating' translations and 'foreignising' translations (e.g. Venuti: 1995). 'Domesticating' translations are those that 'assimilate foreign literary texts to dominant values at home', thereby expurgating the text's 'foreignness', while 'foreignising' texts 'engage readers in domestic terms that have been defamiliarised'. Venuti expresses a clear preference for the latter strategy, this being the 'most powerful in recreating cultural values and the most responsible in accounting for that power' (Venuti, 1998: 5). This is the very reason that Franco's Spain rejected the foreignising approach, as the Spanish government was more concerned with creating and maintaining Spain's own national identity, rather than celebrating the cultures of nations with opposing ideologies. Yet one cannot simply state that open systems tend to employ more foreignising translations while dictatorships opt for domesticating translations, for foreignising translations can also be used to assert the superiority of one's own culture over the source culture. In Nazi Germany, for instance, foreignising translation was the dominant mode precisely because this could contribute 'to a domestic agenda which constructs ethnocentric "knowledge" of the foreign culture and asserts the racially-determined nature of cultural production'; as such, 'a foreignising approach has a highly domesticating function' (Sturge, 1999b: 19).

Venuti's theory of domesticating translation is of relevance here because the Francoist censorship apparatus was not merely seeking to remove immoral content from domestic and foreign media; it sought to use censorship and translation as a means of cultural appropriation, mending the gap in Spanish cultural output by filling it with heavily modified material from abroad. Theories of domesticating and foreignising translation are often used in discussions of Anglophone colonialism and hegemony, with domesticating translation being seen as a way for English-speaking countries to spread their influence abroad (e.g. Venuti, 1995: 21); however, this school of thought can also be applied to the aims of Francoist Spain. Vandaele, for instance, writes that 'under Franco, translation was not about cultural mediation [...] it was protectionist, untruthful, deceptive, and domesticating', terming Franco's censorship system a 'defensive system' that 'acknowledged the otherness of alien intruders, but only to transform it' (Vandaele, 2006: 281). Similarly, Pegenaute states that totalitarian regimes such as Franco's generally 'consider what is "different" to be dangerous' and that

translation is suited to such a dictatorship because it ‘can be used to do away with everything that is not germane to the regime’s ideology’ (Pegenaute, 1999: 83).

Cinema from abroad was domesticated in that any element deemed to run counter to Catholic morality or Fascist ideology was erased; in some cases, entire scenes were simply removed, while in others, the offending dialogue would be replaced by dialogue that was either neutral or pro-Francoist ideology in tone. In this manner, Franco and his ministers sought to acquire foreign material and make it their own. At the same time, however, they were aware that a degree of ‘foreignising’ translation was not necessarily to be avoided at all costs; just as Hitler’s regime adopted a foreignising approach in its quest to paint other races and nationalities as weak and depraved, so Franco’s government came to adopt a more relaxed approach to foreign than to domestic cinema, seeking to present Spain as an ‘islote de paz’⁴ in a sea of immoral, secular societies suffering under the agitated pace of contemporary life (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 43). This relationship between translation and the social conditions in which it is produced

points to the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts (Venuti, 1995: 18).

For this to be successful, therefore, cultural dissimilarities need to be limited or erased entirely so that ‘whatever difference the translation conveys is now imprinted by the target-language culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its canons and taboos, its codes and ideologies’, allowing the regime in question to ‘bring back a cultural other as the same’ (Venuti, 1995: 18). This is the primary reason that dubbing, not subtitling, was the film translation method of choice in Franco’s Spain; while the latter explicitly draws attention to the differences between source and target material, the former allows for ‘the illusion of transparency’, ‘masquerad[ing] as true semantic equivalence when it in fact inscribes the foreign text with a partial interpretation’ (Venuti, 1995: 21).

⁴ ‘oasis of peace’ (MT).

4. Censorship

Broadly speaking, the aim of censorship is ‘to preserve the political, cultural, religious (in short, ideological) premises on which a regime is based [...] [it] implies a strict control of media and communication in an attempt to monopolize symbolic power’ (Pegenaute, 1999: 88). However, censorship is not found exclusively in totalitarian regimes. One could argue that ‘there has never been a society without some form of censorship’, that ‘some kind of censorship can be found in all models of social organization’ (Kuhiwczak, 2009: 46; Pegenaute, 1999: 88). Official state censorship was by no means new to Spain when Franco enforced it in the late 1930s: it had its roots in the reign of Fernando and Isabel, and had been prevalent in the democratic Second Spanish Republic that Franco’s regime replaced; what is more, though official censorship was abolished in 1977, the records show that it was practised even after the first socialist government had come into power, and was only discontinued in 1983 at the earliest (Merino / Rabadán, 2002: 125). As Linder notes:

Spain could be said to be somewhat of an expert in censorship, as Spain’s writers and translators have long been exposed to the likes of Torquemada’s Inquisition and other periods of political and cultural conflict during which censorship was common practice. Franco’s censorship, therefore, slipped neatly into the long-running national history of censorship and repression (Linder, 2004: 156).

What set Francoist censorship apart, even from other authoritarian regimes, was its longevity and the extent to which its application would vary according to the political leaning of the minister in charge (Merino / Rabadán, 2002: 125).

Why, then, did Franco allow translations of foreign cultural material at all? Toury considers translations as ‘products used to fill a void that has emerged in a given culture at a particular historical time’ (Camus Camus, 2010: 42). The problem was that Spain was not capable of producing enough cinematic material to satisfy its population; there simply were not enough human and technical means to produce everything the Spanish screens demanded (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 64). Besides, ‘Franco’s regime was more concerned with the repression of alternative cultures than with the promotion of a genuine and coherent culture of its own’ (Pegenaute, 1999: 86). The situation was exacerbated by the fact that most Spanish intellectuals had sided with the Republicans (Franco’s Civil War opponents) and had therefore been exiled, persecuted, banned from their posts, or otherwise alienated by Franco’s dictatorial rule, making it hard ‘for the regime to find a basis on which to erect its own culture’ (Pegenaute, 1999: 87). With Spain’s artistic output insufficient to fulfil the public’s needs, there was no choice but to allow the import of foreign cultural material; it was just

essential that this foreign material not contradict the moral, religious, and political values of Francoist Spain. Ultimately, Franco's intention was to 'give the illusion of intercultural transfer while blocking it by means of carefully planned censorship apparatus' (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 156).

In her essay on censorship and translation, Merkle distinguishes between preventive, or prior, censorship, and post-censorship: the former denotes 'the suppression of information in the form of self-censorship, boycotting or official state censorship before the utterance occurs', while the latter refers to 'punishment for having disseminated a message to the public' (Merkle, 2004: 131-132). In this chapter we will analyse these various aspects and their relevance to translation in Franco's Spain.

4.1. Censorship and translation

The transformation of the original American script into the censored Spanish version cannot be neatly divided into a set of discrete steps. The translators, distributors, and censors were all to some degree responsible for this transformation, and the influence of each varied from film to film. Gutiérrez Lanza outlines the most common model: the distributor would enlist an English-Spanish translator, whose translation would then be submitted to the appropriate Spanish authorities along with a copy of the film and the original script. Both the translators and the distributors would themselves make changes to the original screenplay so as to avoid problems; once in the hands of the censorship board, the censors would then further revise and, where necessary, remove any potentially offensive material (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 318). All parties involved were concerned with achieving a successful outcome and it therefore stands to reason that the distributing companies and translators, not just the state-appointed censors, would have had a sensitivity for the norms dictating Francoist morality. On the surface, this poses something of a problem, for it means that we cannot say for sure exactly where the 'translation' process ended and the 'censorship' process began. Yet no matter the context, the boundaries between censorship and translation are always bound to be blurred, with the one blending into the other, and we should not restrict our notion of translation merely to the initial Spanish rendering of the original English-language text. As such, this thesis understands 'translation' in a broader context, encompassing also the intralingual censorship employed by the Spanish censors.

While '[s]ome definitions of translation [...] suggest a rigid notion of "translation proper", whereby 'actual translation is seen as a purely lexico-semantic operation that is inherently different from certain techniques of cultural adaptation that are also found in translated texts' (Schmid, 2008: 31), there are others, such as Batlogg, who assert that *all* communication is a form of translation: 'Translation findet nämlich immer dann statt, wenn wir Inhalte oder Positionen einer Gruppe einer anderen Gruppe so vermitteln wollen, dass sie von dieser verstanden werden' (Batlogg, 2008: 144).

This thesis adopts the latter approach, agreeing with Schmid that

complex communication problems require complex solutions [...] Splitting this activity up into a patchwork of rigidly compartmentalized categories of textual operations runs counter to the fundamental explanatory goal of Translation Studies, which is precisely to give a comprehensive and coherent account of actual translational practice (Schmid, 2008: 31).

It serves little purpose to limit definitions of translation to 'interlingual' translation; rather than treat translation solely as a way to bridge gaps between languages, we can see it as a way for information to be communicated across cultures, be these related to location, language, profession, age, or a host of other factors. The presence of several different languages, then, is not a prerequisite for translation to take place; rather, 'the crucial feature of the concept of translation is a transformation between cultural concept systems' (Schmid, 2008: 41).

As such, scientific texts can be translated for a lay audience, poems written in regional dialect can be translated into a more standardised language, and novels can be translated into abbreviated, 'child-friendly' versions. What sets the case of Francoist censorship apart from these examples is that its principal focus was not to 'bridge gaps', but to aid the government in its program of cultural appropriation. Numerous studies of the period have made clear that faithfulness to the original script was deemed of far less importance than faithfulness to Francoist ideology; translations of any sort were allowed by Franco's government not because they wanted to create connections between cultures, but because, given the dearth of high-quality domestic material, they found themselves forced to manipulate foreign material in order to meet the demands of the Spanish public.

Yet this process, the censorship of translated scripts so that they could be assimilated into Francoist ideology, is still a mode of translation, no matter what its primary objectives; potentially dangerous texts, available within Spain only to the small number of state-

appointed censors, were transformed into ideologically ‘clean’ versions of the same original text so that they could be made available to the general Spanish population. The issue here was not one of understanding – Spanish filmgoers would have been perfectly capable of comprehending the original, undoctored translations – but one of erasing all traces of anything that could be damaging to Franco’s regime. This is where our understanding of what constitutes translation differs from Batlogg’s definition quoted above; the notion that translation consists of texts being transformed solely so that they might be *understood* does not allow for cases such as this, where the body commissioning the translation does so principally to suit its own ends, not those of the target audience.

Bachmann-Medick likewise brings this concept of translation as a benevolent act of reconciliation into question: ‘One central view of cultural translation processes that extends from the study of culture to cultural policy has proved to be especially questionable: the widespread notion that translation forges ties and builds bridges’ (Bachmann-Medick, 2006: 239). Instead, translation forms part of a ‘power play’, to borrow Fawcett’s term:

It is easy for translation to masquerade as an ‘innocent’ activity in which an honest translator communes with the original author and passes on undistorted the message of the source text. In reality, translation in all its forms is frequently the site of a variety of power plays between the actors involved. Some of these are quite deliberate manipulations of the original for a wide variety of reasons, ranging from the desire to save money to the desire to control behaviour, from the desire to follow perceived norms (and keep the translator out of prison, or worse) to the desire for cultural hegemony (Fawcett, 1995: 177).

The concept of translation as a social, cultural, and political process rather than a purely linguistic one has been gaining increasing traction over the past decades, thanks to the so-called ‘translational turn’ that took place at the end of the 1980s:

Die kultur- und sozialwissenschaftliche Karriere der Übersetzungskategorie begann mit einer kulturwissenschaftlichen Neuorientierung der Übersetzungsforschung vor allem seit den späten 1980er Jahren. Der Übersetzungsbegriff blieb nun nicht mehr auf die Übertragung von Sprachen und Texten beschränkt, sondern öffnete sich immer stärker für Fragen kultureller Übersetzung und sogar für die Analyse der vielschichtigen und spannungsreichen kulturellen Lebenswelten selbst (Bachmann-Medick, 2006: 239).

This ‘turn’ has meant that the criteria that had hitherto been traditionally used for the assessment of translation – ‘Original, Äquivalenz, “Treue”’ – have been increasingly joined or even replaced by criteria such as ‘kulturelle Repräsentation und Transformation, Fremdheit und Alterität, Deplatzierung, kulturelle Differenzen und Macht’ (Bachmann-Medick, 2006:

239). Now, culture itself is viewed by many as a process of translation (e.g. Bachmann-Medick, 2006: 247); Bassnett, for instance, writes that

today the movement of peoples from around the globe can be seen to mirror the very process of translation itself, for translation is not just the transfer of texts from one language into another; it is now rightly seen as a process of negotiation between texts and between cultures, a process during which all kinds of transactions take place mediated by the figure of the translator (Bassnett, 2002: 5).

We would therefore do well not to restrict our notion of translation purely to that of ‘die Repräsentationssphäre der Zeichen- und Symbolzirkulation’, but rather to adopt a broader approach that encompasses all of these social, cultural, and political processes that make up intercultural transformation (Bachmann-Medick, 2006: 249). In this light, we do not need to view the transformation of the original American film text into the doctored Spanish version as a series of individual and isolated steps; instead, we should view these steps as dynamic, interwoven stages of a single translation process, with each stage to some extent dependent on the other. Translation, then, is not merely one part of this process – namely, the rendering in Spanish of the English text – but the process in its entirety, including the work of the censors and the cultural manipulation, in all its manifestations, exercised by them and by the Francoist authorities.

4.2. Self-censorship

Self-censorship was practised both in the source culture – the USA, in the case of Hollywood film – and the target culture Spain. American and Spanish distributors, screenwriters, and translators all played some part in the final Spanish translation of the original American film production (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 318). Though its extent is hard to assess, one could even argue that self-censorship is ‘much more pervasive and ultimately more responsible for restrictions in translation than is censorship itself’ (Tymoczko, 2009: 24); Gutiérrez Lanza argues that it was ‘the most common device for translators to make a dubbed version acceptable’ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 154). The extent of self-censorship was sufficient for Sturge to question the validity of the patronage model in this context; she argues that in Franco’s Spain there was in fact no ‘single agent’, given that ‘translators and publishers had to police their own production to a great extent, working within incoherent and contradictory norms’ (Sturge, 1999a: 136). Despite this notable lack of concrete censorship criteria, writers and translators at least came to develop a sense for what was expected of them and what would be deemed unacceptable, leading them to write in a particular way, to self-censor, in order to give the state as little as possible to complain about (Neuschäfer, 1994: 49).

In this light, Tymoczko describes self-censorship as a clear instance of hegemony, whereby hegemony ‘is secured through processes in which dominant groups [in this case, the Francoist authorities] constantly negotiate with subordinate groups [the writers and censors in the government’s employ] so as to win their active consent to a political and ideological consensus that favours the dominant group’ (Tymoczko, 2009: 30). In the ‘perfect’ totalitarian regime, post-censorship would be obsolete, for these ‘subordinate groups’ would adhere to the system’s official values in the belief that it is in their best interest to do so. This hegemonic system leads translators to assimilate the society’s dominant values into their translations in the hope that this will advance them professionally and benefit the reception of the translation itself (ibid: 31).

Alternatively, as we have seen, one can consider the translator’s self-censorship in terms of norms; the translator may choose to reject non-normative behaviour for fear that this will lead to sanctions, whatever form they may take. Either way, ‘it is the tendency to conform to dominant discourses and standards that lies at the root of self-censorship in translation’ (ibid: 31). This conformism may not always be conscious; the translator can come to develop an intuitive or subconscious sensitivity to norms which in turn can lead to an unconscious submission to, and collusion with, the dominant cultural norms in his or her society (ibid: 36).

It is impossible to completely distinguish self-censorship from other manifestations of censorship, and all censorship modes depend on each other to some degree. For example, official state censorship and post-censorship encourage writers and translators to themselves exercise self-censorship, either in the hope that this will benefit them or in the belief that censorship is a beneficial process that is required for the dissemination of dominant social norms. It will therefore be beneficial also to consider self-censorship, as an ‘internal’ process, when we analyse film translations in Franco’s Spain, and not just the ‘external’ process of official state censorship.

4.3. Censorship by the state

Merkle outlines three ways in which the state can practise censorship: boycotting, official prior censorship, and official post-censorship (Merkle, 2004: 131-132). Boycotting, as we have seen, was common practice in Franco’s Spain, constituting the ‘preliminary norm’ whereby the Francoist authorities simply banned the import and possession of works deemed

to have too great a negative potential on the Spanish public. In an attempt to restrict the influence of foreign values, Spain in many ways closed itself off from the outside world; even following the *apertura* and the increase in tourism, the import of works from abroad was highly selective. In addition, those films that were granted release were very rarely shown in their original language; even after Franco rescinded the law making it illegal for films to be shown in any language other than Spanish, the showing of original films without dubbing was restricted to the *salas especiales*, cinemas introduced in the late 1960s that showed films with subtitles and were aimed at a more intellectual audience.

This approach is typical of what De Geest calls ‘closed systems’, systems that separate or isolate themselves from others (De Geest, 1992: 32-45). We may refer to Franco’s Spain as a closed system because it sought to significantly restrict foreign influence, severely limiting the import of cultural products from abroad and removing overly foreign or ‘dangerous’ values so as to align foreign material with the Francoist agenda. Added to this were the deaths of Hitler and Mussolini in 1945, just a few years into Franco’s rule, which concluded the fascist rule of Germany and Italy and deprived Franco of his two closest allies. Until that point, Franco

could believe that the curious blend of totalitarianism and Catholicism of his new State might find a place in a new European order created by Hitler; with the defeat of the Axis, the Spanish edition of fascism was left isolated and alone, a monstrous survival in a hostile world of democracies and socialist states (Carr and Fusi Aizpurna 1979: 105).

However, the ‘closedness’ of a system should not be understood in absolute terms, given that there is a certain degree of permeability between systems, no matter how authoritarian the regimes in question: ‘even the most extreme of undifferentiated patronage remains riddled with gaps’ (Sturge, 1999b: 16). In Franco’s Spain, Hollywood cinema played a key part in challenging the official ideology by confronting film-goers with different cultures and perspectives:

[...] even within a hermetically sealed culture such as Francoist Spain, the dominant ideology could never be totally monolithic; its hegemony was always being contested and negotiated by conflicting historical forces and by alternative ideologies. In the context of the 1950s, both neorealism and Hollywood provided Spanish filmmakers with such alternative ideologies (Kinder, 1993: 20).

Depending on the situation, the decision to boycott might come before the prior censorship stage (thus rendering prior censorship unnecessary) – this was the case for films being shown

by distributors who had upset the regime, for example.⁵ Alternatively, during prior censorship it might be decided that the film was too dangerous to be shown even with substantial cuts. In fact, the outright banning of such films constituted the first rule of the 1963 *Normas de Censura*, the only official written set of film censorship norms produced by the Francoist government; see Section 9.1 for more details.

Prior censorship was carried out by the official state censors. The foreign distribution company would send a copy of the film and the script, along with an initial translation, to the Ministry of Information and Tourism; this would then be forwarded to the responsible censorship authority. The censors would screen the work for potentially dangerous elements and note these in a final report. The distribution company would then be informed if the film could be screened as it was, if cuts needed to be made, or if the film was to be banned outright.

Finally, even after a work had been censored, it could still undergo ‘post-censorship’, the ‘punishment for having disseminated a message to the public’ (Merkle, 2004: 131-132). In his essay on censored translations of *The Big Sleep* in Franco’s Spain, Pegenaute refers to this as ‘external censorship’, which is ‘a statutory sanction issued by an identifiable authority to be found outside the literary system [...] and exerted on translation as a finished product for non-compliance with (mostly ideological) decrees’ (Pegenaute, 1999: 88). Though Pegenaute is speaking here of the literary system, the same holds for the system governing cinema in Franco’s Spain; translations of foreign films that were deemed dangerous or inappropriate would be sanctioned in that they could be banned, forced to undergo further alterations (a process which could be very costly in terms of time and money), or deemed watchable only by older audiences (the upper age limit was 16 and over until 1963, and 18 and over from 1963 onwards) (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 154). Other means of post-censorship by which the state could influence and domesticate artists are listed by Neuschäfer:

[...] el “silencio administrativo” (es decir, el olvido puro y duro), la limitación de la tirada o de las fechas de representación [...] la asignación de cines de gran aforo o de pequeño aforo [...] la categorización de las pelis (autorizadas para todos o para

⁵ See Section 8.3 for further details of Francoist boycotting practices.

un público restringido) [y] las “hojas de inspección” que redactaban posteriormente las autoridades provinciales⁶ (Neuschäfer, 1994: 52).

4.4. Censorship and the Church

The Catholic Church exercised considerable influence in Franco's Spain and played an integral part in the censorship process. This is one of the distinguishing features of Franco's brand of censorship; for while state censorship in Spain can be dated back to Fernando and Isabel, 'under Franco it acquired a new colour, with the religious tints typical of any authoritarian regime that also purports to be defending the true and only religion' (Merino & Rabadán, 2002: 126). This is to be expected of a regime such as Franco's, whose cultural attitude was to promote religious and military ideals, whose 'only ideological support was provided by the Church and the Falange', and which shall be remembered for the blend of Fascist nationalism and fervent Catholicism that came to be known as *nacionalcatolicismo* (Pegenaute, 1999: 87). Spain's religious unity was seen as a prerequisite for its political unity, and the intellectual and moral values that made up Francoist ideology were therefore based heavily on Catholic morality (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 142).

The Church and the government each relied to a great extent on the support of the other, and while the government 'set out to promote a fervent national patriotic spirit and unquestioning loyalty to the nation's leader', the Church 'undertook a similarly fervent endeavour in the sphere of morality' (Linder, 2004: 157). Catholic officials went about this in a variety of ways: not content merely to preach their own brand of morality every Sunday, they strove to take control of Spanish social life by assuming control of the education system and doing their best to censor all media they deemed unacceptable. In order to achieve this, the Church sought to have Catholic sympathisers assume high-ranking positions and be employed as 'readers', i.e. censors (Linder, 2004: 156-157). This combination of state and religious control was in part what made Franco's censorship so effective (e.g. Sturge, 1999b: 17); even those Spaniards who had fought for the Republicans during the Civil War were likely to pay some heed to the moral instruction of the Church. In her in-depth interviews of Spaniards who grew up in Franco's Spain, María Antonia Paz notes that 'the interviewees coincided in relating good upbringing to "the Christian environment" in which they lived' (Paz, 2003:

⁶ '[...] "administrative silence" (i.e. oblivion, pure and simple), the limitation of the print run or period of release [...] the allocation of cinemas with larger or smaller audiences [...] the film certification (authorised for all or only for a restricted public) [and] the "inspection documents" that the provincial authorities subsequently drew up' (MT).

360). As such, the success of Franco-era censorship rested in large part on two pillars: ‘por una parte el peso político de la Iglesia en el control de lo que se editaba, por otra la sumisión de gran parte del público a los dictados y recomendaciones de la misma’⁷, which together ‘permitieron que el poder eclesial se consolidara cada vez más’⁸ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 1997: 285). For many Spaniards, morality and Catholicism were inextricably linked and in this way, the Catholic Church lent Franco’s censorship apparatus an authority that it might not otherwise have had. Colmenero Martínez notes that the Church, as an institution, ‘[impregnó] un sustrato moral que permeabilizó en parte de la sociedad española’⁹ and that while ‘las encuestas populares de finales del régimen franquista señalaban que la gente no quería censura en el cine [...] en las salas cinematográficas había un miedo y respeto ante lo prohibido, aquello que la Iglesia Católica había condenado en el púlpito’¹⁰ (Colmenero Martínez, 2014: 147).

This relationship has prompted Merkle to write that ‘[when] Church and State combine forces in exercising control over discourse, religious authorities may enforce prior or repressive censorship with particular vengeance’ (Merkle, 2004: 3). It should come as no surprise that the censorship codes of the time were founded on Catholic teachings: heresy and sexual immorality were especially taboo, with homosexuality and adultery in particular being ‘anathema’ to the regime (Merino & Rabadán, 2002: 132). Indeed, research of the period has shown that censors were just as watchful for sexual content as they were for political content (Linder, 2004: 155). Such was the Church’s aversion to eroticism and sexuality of any sort that it objected to physical affection between men and women even when they were married or related. Linder talks of the ‘almost complete physical and emotional separation of men and women’ during Franco’s regime, even going so far as to remark that ‘[the] celibate clergy, perhaps unable or unwilling to understand what affectionate love meant or should mean for lay people, taught men and women to accept unquestioningly that even in the marriage and in the family, affection was an ill’ (Linder, 2004: 158).

⁷ ‘on the one hand, the political weight of the Church, given its control in the editing process; on the other, the submission of a large proportion of the public to the Church’s commands and recommendations’ (MT).

⁸ ‘allowed the power of the Church to become ever greater’ (MT).

⁹ ‘to some extent pervaded Spanish society with its moral principles’ (MT).

¹⁰ ‘population surveys at the end of Franco’s regime indicated that people did not want censorship in the cinema [...] there was, in cinemas, a certain fear of and respect for the forbidden, that which the Catholic Church had condemned from the pulpit’ (MT).

It should also be noted that in the realm of sexual morality, the Church took a more lenient approach with men than it did with women. While separating women into two categories based on their sexual morality – those of ‘impeccable morality’, and therefore suited for marriage, and those of ‘more assailable morality’ who were unfit for marriage – the Church was relatively tolerant of male immorality, turning a blind eye to ‘minor sins such as male infidelity, male promiscuity’ (Linder, 2004: 157).

While religious officials were concerned with the censoring of all media, they were particularly wary of cinema, particularly cinema from abroad, and believed it extremely important that action be taken to limit its immoral influence. Father Remigio Vilariño was one of many who were greatly concerned about cinema’s potential for sexual corruption; at the beginning of the 20th century, shortly after the invention of cinema, he declared that

[el] cine es un constante peligro para la castidad; escenas que hasta hace pocos años jamás, jamás, jamás eran presenciadas sino en la intimidad de los que el santo vínculo había unido en una persona, ahora las ven los niños, las niñas, no sólo cuando aún no han perdido la virginidad, sino cuando todavía son incapaces de perderla¹¹ (Padre Remigio Vilariño, quoted in Colmenero Martínez, 2014: 143).

It was therefore fortunate for Father Vilariño and his peers that the Catholic Church was accorded a position of considerable influence within the Francoist censorship apparatus, though the extent of their authority did decline throughout the 1960s. García Escudero, Minister of Information and Tourism during this decade, was renowned for his liberal views and it was well known that he wished to replace the ‘puritanical’ censorship practised by the Spanish Catholic Church with an ‘intelligent’ censorship based more on secular morality and common sense (e.g. Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 309).

In Spain, once a film had been subjected to official state censorship (which was already shaped to a large extent by the Catholic Church), one could find reviews of it in various Catholic publications – such as the influential *Eclesia* – that extolled religious morality and condemned any material deemed lewd, violent, or otherwise dangerous. In America, from 1933 until the 1980s films were similarly subject to two censorship codes; first, the ‘official’ Hollywood Production Code, and second, that of the Catholic Legion of Decency, an

¹¹ ‘cinema poses a constant danger for chastity; scenes that just a few years ago were never, ever, ever witnessed except in intimate situations between those whom had been joined together by holy matrimony, are now being seen by children who are not only still virgins but who are still incapable of losing their virginity’ (MT).

organisation committed to reducing the spread of content that the American Catholic Church deemed objectionable. However, after two influential decades, the League's influence began to decline, such that US cinema had become essentially independent of religious viewpoints by the end of the 1950s (Black, 1998: 4). This is in contrast to the situation in Spain, where fervent Catholic Arias-Salgado would serve as Minister for Information and Tourism until the early 1960s; this cultural exchange between countries with different religious ideologies was one of the factors that made the Spanish translation of American cinema so problematic.

4.5. Censorship as practised during the *apertura*

Most censors carried out censorship on the side and not as their main profession (Neuschäfer, 1994: 49; Miguel González, 2000: 69); of the non-Church officials who made up the *Junta superior de orientación cinematográfica* (JSOC, Supreme Board of Film Guidance), the majority were doctors, lawyers, public servants, writers, and critics (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 313). The three principal censorship strategies these censors could employ were: the authorisation for translation and subsequent publication of works or authors whose views coincided with those of the authorities; the translation of works that were 'ideologically "clean"', i.e. genres such as sci-fi with stories and settings that were far removed from reality; and the publication of translations that had been 'conveniently "corrected" to suit the interests of both the regime and the Church' (Merino & Rabadán, 2002: 137). These 'corrections' included replacing potentially dangerous passages with ones that were ideologically favourable, sanitising linguistic expressions, altering morally dubious comments, and modifying or simply removing any type of erotic or sexual reference.

One of the defining characteristics of censorship under Franco was its arbitrariness (e.g. Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002; Neuschäfer, 1994; Merino & Rabadán, 2000). Gutiérrez Lanza writes that the ambiguity in the wording of various censorship standards meant that censorship could maintain its usual rigidity or become more tolerant without losing its basis in a written legal text; it depended on the governmental team in question (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 40). Similarly, Pegenaute writes that 'censorship depended to a large extent on the idiosyncratic intuitions of "low-level" readers, who had to internalize what was expected of them without having real access to an explicit code of rules' (1999: 91). Works could be interpreted in radically different ways, depending on whether the team of censors was benevolent or severe, and moral or religious criteria could be cited when it was really a political question (Neuschäfer, 1994: 49). It also often came about that works that had been denied publication one month would be granted it a few months later when a second application was made

(Pegenaute, 1999: 91). Writing in 1975, following the publication of a second set of norms to replace those of 1963, Pérez Merinero writes:

Hoy como ayer, con Código o sin él, el subjetivismo y la arbitrariedad son las notas a destacar en el ejercicio de la censura cinematográfica. El sistema no ha cambiado sustancialmente desde 1939, de ahí que no debe sorprender el hecho de que la censura cinematográfica - solo una mínima parte de su aparato restrictivo - tampoco haya alterado sus rumbos de actuación. El control perfecto y la vigilancia e intervención celosa y constante siguen en vigor¹² (Pérez Merinero, 1975: 97).

However, although there were never any concrete norms, there were at least some patterns that could help censors reach a judgement. According to Neuschäfer, these were primarily linked to sexual morality, Catholicism, and political principles; Rabadán, too, describes the areas deemed potentially dangerous as being sex, religion, and politics; and Abellán groups them into the categories of sexual morality, political opinions, improper use of language, and religion (Neuschäfer, 1994: 49; Merino & Rabadán, 2002: 132; Abellán, 1980: 43).

Translators at the time were also aware of this and exhibited particular caution when translating dialogue that fit into one of these categories.

¹² ‘Today as yesterday, with the Code or without it, subjectivity and arbitrariness are the key elements in the exercise of film censorship. The system has not changed substantially since 1939, for which reason it should not be surprising that film censorship – which is just one minimal part of the restrictive apparatus – has also not changed its actions. Absolute control along with zealous supervision and intervention are still in force’ (MT).

5. Dubbing

5.1. Dubbing and nationalism

Dubbing came about shortly after the advent of ‘talkies’, or sound film, in the late 1920s. America’s first solution had been to release multiple versions of each film that was to be exported, with the dialogue for each one recorded in a different language. However, with up to fifteen versions of each film being produced, it soon became clear that this system was neither efficient nor financially sound. From then on, the two methods used were dubbing and subtitling.

The Francoist government (along with those of Italy and Germany) disapproved of linguistic heterogeneity, concerned that this might have a negative effect on Spain’s national unity; dialects and minority language were banned in the hope that this would help fortify political union. It is no surprise, then, that dubbing should be the preferred method of Franco’s authoritarian regime. A strictly nationalistic system tends to ‘reject or limit outside influences, since the home system is perceived as the embodiment of a firmly established, superior tradition’; as such, translation in nationalist states must be ‘target-oriented to make foreign material conform as much as possible to the local standards’ (Danan, 1991: 612). Dubbing is the perfect strategy for bringing about this linguistic conformity; the original, foreign language is erased entirely and replaced by a dialogue in the domestic tongue. It is ‘an assertion of the supremacy of the national language and its unchallenged political, economic, and cultural power within the nation’s boundaries’; subtitling, on the other hand, is ‘an extreme form of source-oriented translation’ that does not erase the foreign language, but promotes it, and therefore ‘corresponds to a weaker system open to foreign influences’ (Danan, 1991: 612).

Dubbing allows not only for the erasure of foreign *linguistic* influence, but also for the reduction of foreign *cultural* influence. Candace Whitman-Linsen defines dubbing as ‘the process of cinematography by which a recorded voice is “glued”, after the fact, to a visible speaking screen actor’ (Whitman-Linsen, 1992: 12); one consequence of this, crucial to Franco’s control of cultural imports during his four-decade rule, is that ‘as long as at least isochrony is observed, anything can be placed into the mouths of the unsuspecting screen actors’ (ibid:157).

As a means of controlling the impact of cultural imports, then, dubbing was a far more suitable technique for film translation than subtitling: using dubbing, anything potentially offensive or inflammatory in the original film could simply be erased and replaced with a sanitised Spanish translation. In this manner, ‘the obligatory dubbing of all foreign films, originally introduced to facilitate the understanding of the dialogue by Spanish viewers, became the main controlling instrument in the hands of the censors’, while ‘manipulation of dialogue sometimes reached astonishing limits of mental deviousness’ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 147). With subtitling, on the other hand, multilingual viewers might be able to spot when a doctored translation did not correspond to the original soundtrack.

Though it was not always successful, censors tried as a rule to mask the extent to which the original film had been doctored; as Gutiérrez Lanza notes, ‘una ideología será tanto más efectiva cuando menos se note su presencia en el mensaje’¹³ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 1997: 283). In the early to mid-1940s, at least, it seems that this was successful: ‘lo que los receptores leían o veían era considerado por ellos como el propio texto original, como un sustituto fiel y fiable del original y que funcionaba como tal sustituto en la sociedad española de la época’¹⁴ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 37). However, as the film-going public became more savvy, this readiness to accept the dubbed Spanish version as being equivalent to the original began to change. For instance, Ávila describes the incensed reaction of the Spanish public in 1947 when they believed they had been denied Rita Hayworth’s notorious striptease in *Gilda*:

la aureola de escándalo erótico protagonizado por Rita Hayworth era el principal atractivo. Pero cuando los espectadores comprobaron que el anunciado striptease de la protagonista se limitaba a quitarse un guante, los gritos de protesta fueron notorios, convencidos de que la censura había vuelto a meter la tijera¹⁵ (Ávila, 1996: 67).

Ironically, in this instance the Spanish censors were not to blame: despite the film’s notoriety, there had never actually been a striptease to censor. However, the public’s outraged reaction

¹³ ‘the less one notices the presence of an ideology in a given message, the more effective this ideological message will be’ (MT).

¹⁴ ‘the audience considered what they read or saw to be the original text, a faithful and reliable substitute for the original, a substitute that functioned as such in Spanish society of the time’ (MT).

¹⁵ ‘the aura of erotic scandal around Rita Hayworth was the main attraction. But when the spectators realised that the main character’s much-discussed striptease was limited to the removal of a glove, the shouts of protest were infamous, with viewers convinced that the scissors of censorship were responsible’ (MT).

demonstrates that by 1947, the public was already well aware of the censorship being exercised on film translation in general.

Eight years after these protests, Spanish director Juan Antonio Bardem (uncle of actor Javier) delivered a biting criticism of the Francoist exploitation of film dubbing:

Yo, personalmente, soy enemigo del doblaje en español de las pelis extranjeras. [...] Estamos en condiciones para poder sincronizar a cualquier personaje en cualquier película cualquier dialogo. [...] Si hemos conseguido transformar, gracias al doblaje, los adulterios en incestos, no es nada difícil que un diálogo concreto lo podamos transformar en un lenguaje abstracto sin ninguna relación con la escena en que se pronuncia¹⁶ (Bardem, 1955).

The adultery/incest incident is a reference to the now notorious dubbing of *Mogambo*. Married couple Grace Kelly and Donald Sinden are transformed into siblings in the dubbed Spanish version so as to make it acceptable for Kelly to be attracted to Clark Gable, the result being, of course, that ‘la ocultación del adulterio implicaba a cambio la evidencia de una situación incestuosa’¹⁷ (Gubern, 1981: 137).

Mogambo is not the only film to suffer an infamously bowdlerised dubbing: in *Arco del Triunfo*, when Ingrid Bergman is asked if she is married to her lover, she shakes her head and says ‘Sí’; in *Las Nieves del Kilimanjaro*, urgent declarations of love become a prayer; in *El Ídolo de Barro*, a woman’s husband becomes her father; and in *Las Lluvias de Ranchipur*, the female protagonist’s husband is quietly killed off off-screen so as to sanitise her adulterous affair (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 148). The case study presented in Chapters 10 and 11 yields evidence of numerous such bowdlerisations that, though perhaps less extreme, were similar in their ideological motivation.

5.2. The dubbing process

In her article ‘Film dubbing: Its process and translation’ Martínez outlines the key steps in the production of a film script translation for dubbing purposes (Martínez, 2004: 3-6). As noted

¹⁶ ‘Personally, I am greatly opposed to the Spanish dubbing of foreign films. [...] We are in a position to dub any dialogue for any character in any film. [...] If we have managed, thanks to dubbing, to transform adultery into incest, we can very easily transform a specific piece of dialogue into abstract language that is completely unrelated to the scene in which it is uttered’ (MT).

¹⁷ ‘the concealment of adultery suggested instead the presence of incest’ (MT).

in Section 4.1, in Franco's Spain the exact steps varied from film to film, but in general terms Martinez's model applies. First of all, the client, normally a distributor, sends a 'master' copy of the film to the dubbing studio, along with the original script. A copy of the material is then sent to an independent translator, who works from the script and the film itself; the process is complicated by the fact that the script is often not the definitive copy, meaning that there are discrepancies between the script and the film. In cases where the script is unavailable or incomplete, the translator must work without it and rely on the film instead. Whitman-Linsen writes that in reality, the vast majority of translators only have the script to work from and for the most part have 'only the barest indication of what is actually happening in the scene' (Whitman-Linsen, 1992: 105). Often, the translator is also responsible for the work of synchronisation, of matching the translated dialogue to the gestures and mouth movements; this may also be done by the dubbing director or even an actor. Problems can arise when synchronisation is carried out by someone who does not understand the original language, as is often the case. This can lead to differences between the original and translated text; however, form remains the priority, while content is of secondary importance. The synchronised dialogue is then further improved by the production company before the actual voice-recording begins. Dubbing sessions are organised as efficiently as possible to ensure minimal expenditure of time and money; during these sessions, the director provides the actors with the text they are to read and gives them instructions on how to read their lines, which requires an explanation of the context and the character speaking. Once all of the actors and all of the scenes have been recorded, the dubbed dialogue is coordinated with the image and sound.

Successful dubbing takes into account the content of the original utterance, the context in which the utterance is made, the movement of the lips, and the gestures of the character speaking (e.g. Whitman-Linsen, 1992: 17). Reproducing the lip movement pattern of the original version is a process that Rowe describes as pushing '[the] semantic camel' through 'the phonetic needle eye' (1960: 117). This metaphor is something of an exaggeration; in practice, it only poses a true challenge with close-ups, and even then the mouth and lip movements can be broadly categorised as closed, half-closed, and open, with labials and labio-dentals requiring the greatest attention (Müller, quoted in Pisek, 1994: 89-90). However, if done badly, it can be extremely distracting for the viewer; the same applies when synchronising the translated dialogue to the gestures of the on-screen characters, a process that is further complicated by the varying meanings of different gestures in different cultures (Whitman-Linsen, 1992: 33).

However, what concerns us here is not the matching of the dialogue to lip movements and gestures, but rather the dialogue's content and context. As we have already seen, faithfulness to the original dialogue was of secondary importance; the main priority was to ensure that there was nothing in the translation that could undermine the national ideology, and censors had no qualms about carrying out drastic alterations such as *Mogambo*'s husband/brother transformation. Numerous such examples can be seen in the comparisons of the Spanish translation with the American original in Chapters 10 and 11.

6. Translation and censorship under Franco: Trends and developments

In Section 4.1 we saw the central role played by social and cultural processes in discussions of censorship and translation. Translation is a fundamentally political process, particularly in such an environment as Francoist Spain, and in order to understand its relevance – and the motivations driving it – it is essential to view it within its historical context.

6.1. 1931-1939: The Second Spanish Republic and the Civil War

In 1931 the Spanish monarchy was abolished and the Second Spanish Republic was proclaimed. This development was greeted with great enthusiasm by the Spanish population, most of whom believed the Republic was to mark the end of dictatorship and the beginning of a fair democratic society and social reform. It was initially controlled by left-leaning parties but came under the power of the conservatives in November 1933, who then governed until February 1936, when the left-wing parties came to power once again.

Right-wing groups saw this return to power as a threat to the Spanish identity and the beginning of the path to Marxist revolution. In July 1936, these Nationalist forces staged a coup in an attempt to overthrow the Republican government; however, victory was not as easy as they had hoped, and the ensuing conflict between Republican and Nationalist forces was to last for almost three years. In 1939, the Nationalists, under General Franco, emerged victorious from the Civil War and took control of Spain.

6.2. 1939-1945: The beginnings of Franco's regime

The issue of censorship had taken a back seat from 1936 to 1939, as Franco and the Nationalists were preoccupied with subduing the Republican forces. However, 1938 did see the passing of the first laws that would structure official censorship in Spain; these laws established the official bodies that would be responsible for censorship, with the *Comisión Nacional de Censura Cinematográfica* (CNCC, National Commission of Film Censorship) and the *Junta Superior de Censura Cinematográfica* (JSCC, Supreme Board of Film Censorship) being the most significant.

These bodies started operating in 1942. Material was analysed by the JSCC while the CNCC was responsible for actually exercising censorship. The latter group was made up of the

commission president and five other members, including one military representative and one Church representative. At this early stage, the military representative was in charge of signing the report that dictated whether the film be authorised or banned. During this period, members of Franco's right-wing party FET y de las JONS gained influence on the censorship boards (Vandaele, 2010: 87).

In 1941 Franco decided to borrow one of Mussolini's policies and impose dubbing by law, to present 'la lengua propia como símbolo de identidad nacional'¹⁸ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 25). Though this measure was then rescinded in 1946, dubbing remained the standard for commercial film translation in Spain under Franco. Gutiérrez Lanza describes this development as having catastrophic consequences for Spanish cinema: 'tuvo fatales consecuencias para el cine de producción nacional, puesto que abocaba a este a una competencia desigual con el cine extranjero, inclinando la balanza de las preferencias del público español hacía el cine importado durante los años de posguerra'¹⁹ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 25). This predilection for foreign films, particularly those from the USA, can be seen in data from the first 15 years of Franco's regime; of the 3,364 films released between 1939 and 1954, 1,518 – almost half the total output – were from the USA, and only 560 were Spanish (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 26).

6.3. 1945-51: *Nacionalcatolicismo*

After 1945, ideological influence began to shift from the Falangists – the members of Franco's extreme nationalist party FET y de las JONS – to the Catholic Church. The CNCC and the JSCC could now only hold session if the official Church representative was present, and the Church could forbid films from being shown whenever they found moral justification. This development exacerbated conflicts between Catholic and fascist censors; the Catholic censors were greatly concerned with upholding religious devotion and sexual morality, while the Falangists loved the sex and violence that Hollywood brought to Spain; 'fascistoid aesthetics were notably unconcerned by moral issues of a sexual kind' (Vandaele, 2006: 287). From the mid-1940s onwards there was a new orientation of the state towards the

¹⁸ 'language itself as a symbol of national identity' (MT).

¹⁹ 'it had devastating consequences for domestically produced cinema, leading it into unequal competition with foreign cinema, shifting the preferences of the Spanish public in favour of imported cinema during the postwar years' (MT).

philosophy of *nacionalcatolicismo*, the peculiarly Francoist blend of Falangist nationalism and moral reactionary Catholicism.

In 1946, the *CNCC* and the *JSCC* were merged into one body, the *Junta superior de orientación cinematográfica* (*JSOC*, Supreme Board of Film Guidance).

6.4. 1951-62: *Ultracatolicismo*

The 1950s are often referred to as the “ultra-catholic” decade of Franco’s regime (e.g. Vandaele, 2010: 87). In 1951, the *Ministerio de Interior* was replaced by the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*, which would now be responsible for censorship until the end of Franco’s regime. The newly appointed Information and Tourism Minister, Gabriel Arias-Salgado, was characteristic of the conservative Catholicism and harsh censorship of this period; he declared censorship to be a way of enabling the Spanish people to have ‘the freedom to do only good’ (Linder, 2004: 158) and he ‘obsessed over prurience and cultural pollution flowing into Spain from the outside’ (Rosendorf, 2007: 81). Sexual immorality was the main concern and Arias-Salgado was renowned for his anti-erotic zeal, so that the period between 1950 and 1962 was characterised by ‘un enérgico mandato, obsesionado básicamente por la defensa a ultranza de la moral sexual y del régimen del General Franco’²⁰ (Martínez-Breton, 1988: 91).

1950 saw the publication of the first Spanish code of censorship norms, the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* (Instructions and Standards Regarding Moral Censorship of Public Performances, hereafter *Instrucciones*). These were not intended for use by the official state censorship boards, but rather by Catholic authorities; critics and journalists were expected to use the standards when writing film reviews so that the Spanish public had a coherent moral guide when they were deciding what films to watch. Though there was still no counterpart for use by government officials, the censors were aware, for the most part, of what kind of material they should be watching out for, including: criticism of Francoist ideology; immorality (homosexuality, adultery, suicide, etc.); anything supportive of Marxism, socialism, or non-authoritarian ideologies; and work by artists hostile to the regime (Pegenaute, 1999: 89). However, during this decade as during the rest of Franco’s regime, arbitrariness was a defining characteristic of the censorship being exercised; to a

²⁰ ‘a zealous term of office, fundamentally obsessed with the uncompromising protection of sexual morality and of General Franco’s government’ (MT).

large extent, it was down to luck whether a film was banned or whether extensive cuts were made. In November 1960, almost a thousand artists and intellectuals sent a paper to the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* protesting at the arbitrary nature of official censorship practices, but this document was ignored by the authorities and there was no resulting change in the censorship system (Gubern, 1981: 125).

At the same time, despite the harsh censorship practices of the period, the 1950s saw substantial efforts by the Spanish government to begin disseminating abroad a liberal, modernised image of Franco's Spain. As such, during this decade the Franco regime 'was in the midst of implementing a program to promote American tourism to Spain, as a central element of the regime's efforts after World War II to improve Spain's economic and diplomatic/political circumstances', the primary objective being to "sell" Spain's image abroad and particularly to the United States' (Rosendorf, 2007: 80). This was bound to cause contradictions in a country that was 'still in the throes of the strictest cultural, moral, and religious censorship, when you could be fined for kissing publicly', with newspapers reading 'like official government communiqués' (Besas, 1985: 69). Indeed, the confusion caused by these conflicting motivations – harsh censorship on the one hand, promotion of tourism from more liberal countries on the other – prompted a Catalan director of the time to remark that:

[our] Ministry [...] functioned as two ministries that contradicted each other. One that was vigilant and one that fomented tourism. The one [...] prohibited bikinis on the screen and the other was encouraging tourism that brought bikinis. Thus one would be asking oneself, 'Which of the two should I follow?' (Heredero, 1993: 29).

6.5. 1962-69: *Apertura*

In the 1960s, things began to change. This period saw a significant upturn in the economy, precipitating 'a decade of unprecedented prosperity [...] which catapulted the country from its oppressive backwardness to the brink of stylish continentalism' (Besas, 1985: 71).

Tourism was becoming ever more important for the Spanish economy; though the regime was worried about the consequences this would have, the economic considerations were too important to overlook: 'los poderosos económicos que dependían del turismo fueron causa suficiente para que nuestras autoridades cerraran los ojos ante las revolucionarias

innovaciones en la indumentaria femenina y en el comportamiento que los extranjeros traían consigo’²¹ (Tejado, quoted in Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 151-2).

This increase in tourism brought Spaniards into contact with people from comparatively liberal and democratic countries, fomenting discontent with Franco’s authoritarian government. From the 1950s onwards there had been strikes, protests, and university demonstrations; the country was still officially ruled according to the principle of *nacionalcatolicismo*, but it seemed that ‘the corrective measures of public morality and religiosity hadn’t taken root among the common people [...] All that was publicly sacred was privately profaned’ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 151). Now, in 1962, in an effort to present Spain in a more liberal light, Franco brought in some new, more liberal politicians – for the most part technocrats affiliated with the Catholic organisation Opus Dei – to take charge of various ministries (Vandaele, 2006: 280).

This ministerial re-shuffling was followed by the so-called cultural *apertura* in 1963. Manuel Fraga Iribarne, the young Minister of Tourism and Information who succeeded Arias-Salgado, was made responsible for designing the legal framework for the new censorship system. Fraga was ‘dynamic, agile, intelligent, and liberal by Franco standards’; together, he and his team moved to stimulate tourism and admit more lenient censorship criteria (Besas, 1985: 72). The latter was in part so that more foreign films could be shown and Spain could share in the box-office winnings, and in part because, ‘as a result of relaxing societal sexual standards and court rulings overturning rigid obscenity laws, the sexual taboos long governing Hollywood began to fall by the wayside’; it therefore ‘became necessary to avoid the ridicule that the banning of various prestigious films was likely to provoke’ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 152). This development did not go down well with the conservative and Catholic sectors of society, as exemplified in an article from the religious weekly journal SIPE, which accused the state of being ‘alineado a un mercantilismo sin escrúpulos y abocado a una inevitable venta de la moral cristiana, poco menos que por un puñado de dólares’²² (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 152).

²¹ ‘the influential financial leaders who depended on tourism were reason enough for our authorities to turn a blind eye to the revolutionary innovations in female clothing and to the behaviour that foreigners brought into the country’ (MT).

²² ‘aligned to an unscrupulous commercialism that would lead to the inevitable selling-out of Christian morality for little more than a handful of dollars’ (MT).

A key member of Fraga Iribarne's team was José María García Escudero, also of liberal persuasion, who was named head of the *Dirección General de Cinematografía y Teatro* (General Board of Cinematography and Theatre). García Escudero was of the opinion that the state should advocate an education that would render censorship unnecessary, by encouraging viewers to place a certain critical distance between themselves and the films they were watching; he had also been among the many Spanish film professionals who had heavily criticised contemporary national cinema in an open colloquium known as the *Conversaciones de Salamanca* in 1955. This colloquium had expressed a pressing need for a transparent censorship code and eight years later this would be one of the new cabinet's achievements: the *Normas de Censura Cinematográfica* (Standards Regarding Film Censorship, hereafter *Normas*) were published on 8 March 1963. This code still had its foundation in Christian principles such as the importance of marriage; it banned any attacks on the Church, Franco, or fundamental Francoist principles (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 152). Despite this, the influence of the Catholic Church on cinematic releases declined throughout this period, as evidenced by the proportion of films that gained the most condemnatory rating ('4') from religious censors; while only 13 of the 1,321 films approved by the previous censorship board had been given a '4', 67 of the 1,017 films approved by Escudero's censorship board were to gain this severe rating (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 308, 311).

In 1963, a new age limit was also set for Spanish film audiences: the highest limit was now for those aged 18 and above, rather than 16 and above, meaning that previously banned films could now be shown to a strictly adult-only audience. It was always made clear to the audience that any unsavoury behaviour in such films was due to the Protestant morals of the country of origin and did not represent behaviour typical for Spain (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 43).

In 1964 it was decided that the Church representative should no longer have the final say on whether a film should be banned. This development was connected with the Second Vatican Council, which ran from 1962 to 1965. The Council rethought the Church's stance on human rights and they now became more guarded with their previously unwavering support for Franco's regime. 1964 also saw the introduction of a law encouraging the exhibition of Spanish films; whereas previously most cinemas had to show at least one day of Spanish films for every four days of foreign films, this was now changed to one day of Spanish films to three days of foreign films (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 27).

In 1967 the *salas de arte y ensayo* were created; these were special cinemas which showed original or subtitled versions of foreign films (as well as Spanish films of special interest). During the *aperturista* period, critics were also granted a new lease of freedom, particularly in specialist publications such as the new intellectual review *Nuestro Cine*; the Catholic publication *Eclesía*, meanwhile, decided to discontinue its moral film reviews as the censors believed they could no longer exercise control over an ‘immoral’ society (Vandaele, 2006: 293-294).

6.6. 1969-75: The final throes

A governmental note on film censorship during the first ten months of 1971, issued by the Ministry of Information and Tourism, laments that:

El hecho cierto es que hoy por hoy la producción cinematográfica extranjera sigue acusando un acentuado matiz de disolvente inmoralidad y de corrosivas doctrinas. Esta situación, que viene manteniéndose desde hace ya bastantes años, ha obligado a este Ministerio – competente en la materia – a extremar su atención y a adoptar medidas tendentes a evitar la invasión de nuestro país por la oleada de una cinematografía extranjero inmoral, y social y políticamente disolvente²³ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000:45-46).

The final years of Franco’s rule witnessed a desperate, last-ditch attempt to restore the initial power of the censorship system. The Spanish public was becoming ever more vocal in its desire for a democratic system, and strikes and protests were rife. In an attempt to maintain power, Franco appointed the ultra-conservative Minister Sánchez Bella to succeed Fraga Iribarne, who in turn was ‘sent into a golden exile’ as the Spanish ambassador to Great Britain (Rosendorf, 2007: 96). Sánchez Bella set about undoing the progress that Fraga Iribarne had made, strengthening censorship despite the economic setbacks this risked (Neuschäfer, 1994: 53). The *salas de arte y ensayo* disappeared, state subsidies of cinema were diminished, and foreign films were once more forced to undergo rigid censorship (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 154).

In 1974, the year before Franco’s death, the new president Carlos Arias Navarro named Pio Cabanillas as Minister of Information and Tourism, leading to the beginning of another

²³ ‘The fact is that one can increasingly discern in the foreign film production of today an element of immorality, of corrosive ideology. This situation, which has persisted for some years already, has forced this Ministry – competent in this field – to increase its vigilance and to adopt measures to avoid our country’s being invaded by a surge of immoral and socially and politically corrupt cinema from abroad’ (MT).

apertura; however, this was much more effective in the press than in the realm of cinema (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 46). Gubern explains the modest progress made during this second period of cultural ‘opening’ in ironic fashion: ‘[los] nuevos centímetros de epidermis de visión autorizada para el espectador español, a bombo y platillo aperturista, no van a resolver los males del cine ni a detener el deterioro de la cultura cinematográfica española’²⁴ (Gubern, 1976: 175).

Franco died in November 1975 after a battle with Parkinson’s disease and a series of heart attacks. With him dead, there was little to hold his government together and his dictatorship was soon dissolved in favour of a modern democracy. However, this did not lead to an immediate dissolution of the censorship system; it remained in place until it was officially banned by the Constitution of 1978 (Neuschäfer, 1994: 47).

²⁴ ‘[the] new centimetres of skin authorised for viewing by the Spanish filmgoer, accompanied by much *aperturista* fanfare, are not going to solve the problems of cinema nor halt the deterioration of Spain’s film culture’ (MT).

7. The *apertura*: a closer analysis

Historical verdicts on the efficacy of the *apertura* are mixed. Some affirm that the purported goals of the *apertura* were indeed accomplished: that is, censorship became considerably more lenient; films were released that had previously been banned; the *consulta voluntaria* granted artists a greater degree of freedom; and the publication of an official set of censorship guidelines gave censors and film-makers alike a better sense of what was deemed acceptable (see for example Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002). Not only that, but it could also be argued this period saw the opening up of Spain to the outside world:

The self-contradictory aspects of the verdicts of the censors, the unexpected permissiveness of the church representatives (in some cases), and the noticeable relaxation of civil censorship in the 1960s shows that film translation could no longer be understood as an impermeable barrier against foreign information, but as an act of intercultural communication and information transfer that was capable of challenging the prevailing status quo by introducing new elements into the target system (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 156).

However, a common assertion among many scholars of this period is that Fraga Iribarne's supposedly liberalising measures did not actually bring about any profound change; Gubern is not alone in claiming that the *apertura* under Fraga Iribarne was 'arbitraria y zarandeada por los avatares de la coyuntura política de cada momento'²⁵ (1981: 184; see also Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000). Their main aims had little to do with liberalisation in itself; instead, they were focussed on convincing foreign countries that Spain's regime was no longer harsh and repressive, and allowing Spanish artists a degree of extra leniency while still banning anything politically controversial.

On top of this, many claimed that the limited progress that had been made in the relaxation of censorship and translation laws was limited to issues of eroticism and did not have any effect on political matters. Some accused Escudero of changing his views depending on whom he was with, trying to situate himself between reactionaries and progressives, and therefore questioned his actual commitment to the *apertura*; it is worth noting, for instance, that he never tackled the topic of freedom of expression (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 43-44). Lastly, the fact remained that from the beginning, the *apertura* had really been a product of economic, rather than cultural, considerations; the aim had been to stimulate the Spanish economy, encourage tourism, and paint a more liberal picture of Spain abroad, not to encourage

²⁵ 'arbitrary and buffeted around by the vicissitudes of the political situation of the moment' (MT).

freedom of expression and support more provocative art for its own sake. The consequence of this was that ‘al reformismo económico no correspondió un equivalente desarrollo político de signo liberal’²⁶ (Gubern, 1981: 182).

Arguably more successful than the new set of *Normas de Censura* were two other innovations introduced during this period: the raising of the upper age limit for film-going audiences, and the creations of the *salas especiales* and the *salas de arte y ensayo*. The raised age limit allowed the broaching of taboo topics such as adultery, abortion, and suicide, so long as these were not condoned; meanwhile, although the *salas* did not escape censorship entirely, they did at least grant access to a wider variety of quality foreign cinema and improve Spain’s image on the international scene (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 312).

These contradictions are to be expected of a decade that was characterised by the impossible challenge of opening the doors to a (comparatively) liberal world while maintaining severe censorial practices. Given this situation, it is not surprising that Fraga’s Iribarne’s achievements were disappointingly limited:

su política [...] sufrió como pocas las tensiones y contradicciones entre la necesidad de liberalización cultural propiciada por sectores de la burguesía (tanto por razones económicas como ideológicas) y las exigencias antiliberales e inmovilistas inherentes al mantenimiento en el poder de un régimen autoritario²⁷ (Gubern, 1981: 184).

Fraga Iribarne believed that ‘American films made in Spain, Spanish films distributed by Hollywood, and American tourism were all integral elements in creating a positive image – and avoiding deepening a negative one – for Spain in the US and throughout the world’ (Rosendorf, 2007: 95). However, it should also be remembered that Fraga Iribarne, though ‘sincere in his desire to open Spain up more to the outside world [...] was still a functionary of the Franco dictatorship and prepared to be ruthless in protecting its interests’ (ibid: 94). For instance, on reading a copy of Fred Zinnemann’s *Behold a Pale Horse* in 1963, the depiction of a *Guardia Civil* officer as a corrupt adulterer drove Fraga

²⁶ ‘there was no corresponding political liberalisation to accompany the economic reformation’ (MT).

²⁷ ‘his policies [...] suffered like few others the tensions and contradictions between the need for cultural liberalisation promoted by sectors of the bourgeoisie (for both economic and ideological reasons) and the illiberal, intransigent demands necessary for an authoritarian regime to retain power’ (MT).

Iribarne ‘apoplectic’ to such a degree that he threatened to boycott the Columbia studio’s productions if the film was shown anywhere in the world (ibid: 94-95).

The limited reforms achieved during the *apertura* period were certainly not enough to assuage the growing dissent among certain demographics of the Spanish population, with the decade seeing mass support for anti-Francoist movements, particularly among workers and students; ‘las tímidas reformas eran incapaces de encallar, y menos aún de asimilar, a los grupos de la oposición política que rechazaban de plano al regimen y a sus autorreformas, viciadas del raíz desde el punto de vista democrático’²⁸ (Gubern, 1981: 183).

At the same time, critics on the other side of the political spectrum were alarmed by the message being sent by the government’s moderate liberalisation; this is demonstrated, for example, by a letter written by 1970s minister Sánchez Bella:

No es posible seguir tolerando estas posturas en el mundo del cine y del espectáculo y tal vez, acaso, del libro. Para el autor que no actúe correctamente no pueden existir ni teatros oficiales, ni acreedores, ni premios del cine o del espectáculo; para el empresario o productor que respalde o ayude a directores o ayudantes de dirección o guionistas enemigos, no puede haber ninguna clase de subvención²⁹ (Letter from Alfredo Sánchez Bella to Fernando María Castiella, 30.08.1963, *Ministro de asuntos exteriores*).

And perhaps these right-wing critics had reason to be concerned; though taboo subjects were never condoned and were for the most part depicted in a negative light, their appearance in mainstream cinema meant that it did at least become more acceptable for them to be discussed. Vandaele notes that doctored dubbings of Billy Wilder’s films, for example, still ‘exposed audiences to the metropolitan atmosphere and lifestyle’ that they depicted (Vandaele, 2006: 306): even censored films could contribute to liberalisation.

²⁸ ‘the timid reforms were unable to silence, and even less able to assimilate, those groups of the political opposition who completely rejected the regime and its self-reforms, which from a democratic point of view were rotten to the core’ (MT).

²⁹ ‘It is impossible to go on tolerating these stances in the world of cinema and theatre and perhaps even literature. For the author who fails to behave correctly there can be no official theatres, no financial backers, no film or theatre awards; for the businessman or producer who supports or aids directors or directors’ assistants or screenwriters who are enemies of the state, there can be no form of subsidy’ (MT).

7.1. *Normas de Censura* of 1963

The publication of the 1963 *Normas de Censura* was a milestone in film censorship: censors now had an official set of guidelines on which to base their decisions, rather than being forced to rely on their own sense of what the regime might find unacceptable. However, these new *Normas* were still so vague that they could be interpreted in radically different ways depending on the censor, so that unpredictability and arbitrariness continued to plague production companies. The code was attacked by both sides: for conservative critics, the code only purported to champion moral values in a way that was not going to influence the public, while those on the left demanded that the code be made more tolerant and liberal (Gutiérrez Lanza, 1997). However, Gutiérrez Lanza notes that the *Normas* were at least more permissive for foreign films than they were for films produced in Spain; immoral behaviour in films from overseas supported the depiction of Spain as a peaceful haven compared to the chaotic societies dominant in much of the Western world (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 42).

In his book *Behind the Spanish Lens*, Besas notes the six principal ‘novelties’ of this new set of censorship norms:

- 1) that a film should not be judged by its individual scenes but by its general intent;
- 2) that if a film was considered to be “seriously dangerous” it was to be prohibited rather than cut or changed;
- 3) that films should [...] censure evil, but that this censure need not be shown explicitly on screen if sufficient elements were given so that the spectator’s conscience could draw the proper conclusion;
- 4) that the evil-doer need not necessarily repent at the end of the story or go to ruin from a human or external standpoint;
- 5) that there was no reason to prohibit the showing of individual or social ills or to avoid producing uneasiness in the spectator by portraying the degradation and suffering of others, if these scenes were in accordance with the principle of a faithful critique; and
- 6) that there was no reason for prohibiting films that limit themselves to presenting authentic problems, even where they were not given a full solution, provided the conclusion was not contradictory to these regulations. (Besas, 1985: 73).

For the most part, then, these new elements seem relatively progressive, at least in comparison with the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* that had served as the only reputable set of written censorship norms throughout the 1950s. However, Besas goes on to enumerate the long list of themes that were still deemed ‘taboo’:

justification of suicide, euthanasia, vengeance-seeking and duelling, divorce, adultery, illicit sexual relations, prostitution and scenes attacking the institutions of matrimony and family, abortion and contraceptive methods, sexual perversions, alcoholism, drug addiction, brutality, cruelty toward people and animals, morbidity and terror, colloquial expressions, disrespect for religion or institutions that should demand respect, tendentious historical interpretations, undermining of the duty to

defend the country, and scenes in conflict with the Catholic church, the fundamental principles of the state, or the head of state. (1985: 73)

Ultimately, the new code fell prey to the problem suffered by many sets of censorship codes: it was sufficiently ambiguous that it could be interpreted in a wide variety of ways, ranging from the relatively liberal to the ruthlessly censorious (Gubern, 1981: 195). It is possible that this ambiguity was intentional, thereby granting the authorities a significant amount of leeway to permit or forbid films as it suited them (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 40). Even some of the more conservative groups in Francoist Spain accused the new code of being too idealistic, to the extent that much of its content was essentially inapplicable, ‘salvo cuando se quisieran utilizar de un modo selectivo contra películas específicas’³⁰ (Gubern, 1981: 196). For example, critics were generally expected to adhere to the numerous criteria banning violence but were forced to ignore the code’s violation in certain genres, such as the Western or the horror film, to avoid banning all instances of such genres or excising the majority of their content (ibid: 196).

Officials of the Catholic Church were among those criticising the new norms, describing them as impractical both for the censors and for the Church itself. The Church maintained that censors and critics should continue using the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* of 1950; these had been developed by the *Dirección Central de Acción Católica* (Central Catholic Action Board) and the *Comisión Episcopal de Ortodoxia y Moralidad* (Episcopal Commission for Orthodoxy and Morality) and were based in part on the criteria laid down by Pope Pius XI in the encyclical *Vigilanti Cura* (Colmenero Martínez, 2014: 145).

³⁰ ‘except when censors wished to use them selectively against specific films’ (MT).

8. Hollywood cinema

8.1. Hollywood abroad

Until 1914, no one country truly dominated the world film market; it was only with the onset of the First World War that the USA gained the stimulus and advantage it needed to draw ahead of its European competitors. As Segrave puts it, ‘some people saw a war; others saw an opportunity’ (Segrave, 1997: 12). While global demand for films continued to rise, European output plummeted, and severe shipping problems made it difficult to export the little product that there was. The situation remained bleak even after the conflict had ended; those countries affected were forced to focus all of their efforts on undoing the devastation of the war, and aiding the recovery of the ailing domestic film industries was hardly seen as a top priority. Naturally, American film executives sought to downplay the war’s role in propelling the USA’s film industry, instead asserting that American movies were simply ‘the best’, that ‘only Americans knew how to make good films’ (ibid: 12).

1917 had seen the creation of the Committee on Public Information, a government institution designed to promote American values abroad, and cinema was to play a key role in this objective – as Woodrow Wilson himself made clear: ‘The film has come to rank as the very highest medium for the dissemination of public intelligence, and since it speaks a universal language, it lends itself importantly to the presentation of America’s plans and purposes’ (quoted in Thompson, 1985: 93-4). This motivation, coupled with the obvious financial incentives, drove the USA’s attempts to market American films as far and wide as possible. Once a film had been made, it cost little extra to export it to foreign markets, and the profit margin was thus extremely high; retaining dominance of the global film market was therefore seen as absolutely crucial (Segrave, 1997: 198).

This was especially true in the 1950s, which was a difficult decade for Hollywood. The baby boom of the 1940s meant that young married couples were mostly staying at home, while the rising sales of automobiles and domestic appliances meant that most families had less money left over for going to the cinema. That, combined with the rising popularity of television, had a ‘dramatic’ effect on cinema attendance, and ‘the major studios became increasingly competitive and international in their outlook, since they could no longer rely on a film recovering its production costs in North America alone’ (Lodge et al., 1992: 14).

The principal body responsible for promoting and disseminating American films abroad was the Motion Picture Export Association (MPEA). The Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) used the MPEA as a means to ‘respond to the rising tide of protectionism resulting in barriers aimed at the importation of American films into other countries’ (Cones, 2013: 241). Guback writes in 1969 that:

[the] MPEA facilitates overseas activities of its members in a variety of ways by expanding and keeping open foreign film markets, expediting transfers of earnings to the United States, reducing restrictions imposed on the distribution of American films through direct negotiations and “other appropriate means”, disseminating information of interest to members about trading conditions abroad, negotiating film import agreements, and in some cases, negotiating rental terms. [...] It negotiates, compromises, threatens, and bargains to achieve its key objectives. It tries to win friends and influence local policy (Guback, 1969: 44).

The spread of American cinema was welcomed by some European countries but heavily opposed by others. European audiences relished the wealth of films on offer and cinema-owners were happy to profit from U.S. features; however, Hollywood’s invasion was detrimental for many countries’ film industries, leading a number of governments to impose restrictions on imported American productions.

A number of countries also expressed concern about the political and cultural influence that American pop culture, and Hollywood in particular, were exerting on domestic society:

Prácticamente todas las naciones se han sentido alguna vez ofendidas por otro país a través del cine. Sobre todo, como digo, se han sentido ofendidas por Estados Unidos [...] sus pelis incitan a la controversia por su mezcla de espectáculo, cosmopolitismo e historicismo³¹ (Diez Puertas, 2003: 234).

The sex, violence, and other unsavoury behaviour depicted in many Hollywood films was a source of contention, and many European countries were worried about America’s exertion of ‘soft power’, the process by which ‘[a] country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because other countries—admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness—want to follow it.’ (Nye, 2004: 5). Spain was not the only country seeking to establish its own national identity: most European powers had a similar objective and therefore did not always welcome the USA’s cultural invasion, be it through film or any other medium.

³¹ ‘Practically every nation has at some point felt offended by another through the medium of cinema. Above all, they have felt offended by the United States [...] their films incite controversy due to their mixture of spectacle, cosmopolitanism and historicism’ (MT).

8.2. Censorship in Hollywood

After a ‘stormy’ beginning immediately following the invention of cinema, various groups saw to it that cinema’s ‘potential for offensive and threatening depiction’ was kept in check: censorship boards, religious groups, and the film industry itself through its own code of regulation, the 1930 Motion Picture Production Code (Randall, 1970: 3). (This code was also referred to as the Hays Code after Will H. Hays, who was the president of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA) from 1922 to 1945). This framework remained largely unchanged until the 1950s, a decade which saw the spread of television and the constitutional decision that films be guaranteed the right to free speech (Randall, 1970: 3). Thanks to these two developments the 1950s saw a considerable relaxation in censorship practices, allowing ‘a more sophisticated approach to social issues such as sexuality, adolescence, urban violence and drug addiction’ (Lodge et al., 1992: 235). As such, if the 1920s were dominated by ‘slapstick’, the 1930s by ‘innuendo’ and the 1940s by ‘sarcasm’, the defining characteristic of the 1950s was ‘prurience’ (Lodge et al., 1992: 307). Naturally, this put it at odds with Spanish values: while in the 1940s, Hollywood product had deliberately been rendered inoffensive and universal so as to make it easier to export, by the 1950s the moral standards depicted in U.S. cinema ‘were rapidly diverging from the Spanish principles of obsessive sexual puritanism’ (Miguel González, 2000: 83; Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 147). By the 1960s, the Hays Code had given ground to the extent that for the first time, ‘it was clear that when a man chased a woman on the screen he was more interested in bedding than wedding her’ (Lodge et al., 1992: 402).

In 1966, the old Motion Picture Production Code was replaced by a newer, more streamlined version, which, it declared, was ‘designed to keep in closer harmony with the mores, the culture, the moral sense and the expectations of our society’ (Motion Picture Production Code, quoted by Hayes). In reality, this new version was precipitated by the artistic and commercial inconvenience of some of the old code’s prohibitions – nudity and profanity, for example – and by the ‘repeated stretchings’ of these provisions, which had ‘weakened public confidence in the seriousness and integrity of self-regulation itself’ (Randall, 1970: 201). This lack of confidence was not something new; the Motion Picture Production Code ‘[had] never been free of criticism, nor its purposes free of ambiguity’ (ibid: 199). While many saw it as a bastion of morality, many others attacked it as ineffective – especially with regard to erotica – while still others regarded it as an unjustifiable constraint on the freedom of speech (ibid: 199). It seems that the 1966 Code wished to address the concerns of the latter group: while

censorship is not explicitly mentioned anywhere in the original Motion Picture Production Code, in the 1966 version it is attacked in no uncertain terms:

Censorship is an odious enterprise. We oppose censorship and classification-by-law (or whatever name or guise these restrictions go under) because they are alien to the American tradition of freedom.

Much of this nation's strength and purpose is drawn from the premise that the humblest of citizen has the freedom of his own choice. Censorship destroys this freedom of choice. [...] Parents have the primary responsibility to guide their children in the kind of lives they lead, the character they build, the books they read, and the movies and other entertainment to which they are exposed (Hayes, http://productioncode.dhwritings.com/Code_1966.html).

8.3. Hollywood Cinema in Franco's Spain

During the Franco era, no film could be authorised for any showing in Spain if it did not have the appropriate censorship certificate. This was also true for private showings; even foreign embassies were not exempt. This led some distributors to falsify the certificates, thereby bypassing the censorship process and avoiding the time, money, and attendant regulations that this process entailed. Of course, this was a risky option, as any violation of the rules would be met with a considerable fine. Once a film had been approved for release by the *CNCC* (see Section 6.2), no local authority or official could ban the film from being shown on censorship grounds, as this would risk undermining the Commission's authority and prestige. The most they could do was monitor local showings and, if anything aroused their suspicion, request the revision of the film in question (Abellán, 1980: 23).

Franco's Spain was not alone in fearing the propagandistic power of film; it has often been argued that of all art forms, cinema is viewed as that with the greatest power to influence, manipulate, and corrupt. Writing in 1970, Randall remarks that

[over] the years, the movies have probably been the most attractive, popular – and worried about – of all media of communication. Their extraordinary power to capture reality and give it representation in the most simply understood terms has not only guaranteed them a large following, but convinced many persons that they have a special capacity for harm. In a mass society this power and popularity has aroused a strong censorship interest that has shadowed the movies since their beginning and taken a toll of free expression. No other medium has been subject to quite the intensity or variety of moral measurements and restraints as have the movies (1970: 3).

Vandaele likewise refers to the ‘neo-platonic’ idea, particularly popular among the Catholicists (less so among the Falangists) that some sectors of the population (such as the uneducated, children, and, in some cultures, women) were more vulnerable to corrupting influences than were the elite (i.e. educated men) and that they should therefore be protected from certain kinds of media (Vandaele, 2010: 90).

Franco was conscious of the propagandistic power wielded by cinema; he even had his own screenplay, *Raza*, filmed in 1940. The film, which enjoyed immediate success in Spain, Germany, and Italy chronicles the Spanish Civil War through the eyes of an ‘exemplary’ Spanish family, championing the ideals of patriotism, courage, and love for one’s family (Vernon, 1986: 26). This version of the Spanish Civil War, that of the conflict as a ‘holy war against the evil Republicans’, was a major theme of Spanish cinema well into the 1960s; Crussells calls it ‘probablemente la más representativa película de propaganda sobre la Guerra Civil española realizada durante el franquismo’³² (Crusells, 2011: 1). Other popular genres included historical war epics focussed on Spain’s glorious past and folkloric flamenco films (Danan, 1991: 610). A sub-genre that emerged in the 1950s and the 1960s was characterised by ‘la exaltación de los aparatos represivos del Estado’³³; using the North American crime film as its model, this brand of cinema celebrated the *Guardia Civil* and the police responsible for carrying out Franco’s bidding (Gubern, 1981: 130).

However, the meagre number of low-quality Spanish films was not enough to satisfy public demand and so the Spanish authorities found themselves forced to import material from abroad. Unsurprisingly, most of the material was imported from the world’s leading cinematic power, the USA, which brought with it a host of problems and was not looked on favourably by many Spanish ministers. Throughout most of the 1950s, the Ministry of Information and Tourism under Arias-Salgado ensured that only a small number of American films were allowed into Spain, and this continued even after the cabinet re-shuffle that marked the beginning of the *apertura*. According to the Ministry, this policy was aimed to protect domestic producers from competition from American productions, which were much more popular with Spanish audiences. In reality, however, this was only one of several factors; Rosendorf describes how

³² ‘probably the most representative propaganda film about the Spanish Civil War to be made during the Francoist period’ (MT).

³³ ‘the celebration of the repressive apparatus of the State’ (MT).

[the] Ministry of Information and Tourism was congenitally suspicious of Hollywood – as late as 1960, internal MIT documents warned that the American film producers and distributors amounted to ‘the sector most easily penetrated by Judaism and communism,’ and that the regime had to be very wary in its dealings with them as a result (Rosendorf, 2007: 81).

TABLE 1

Number of American films authorised for exhibition in Spain, compared with total number of films shown in the country (adapted from Guback, 1969: 43)

Year	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
American films	201	193	157	87	86	74	109	140	158	127
Total films	348	393	328	211	245	200	274	346	333	310

1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
70	48	51	93	99	95	98	109	137	116	111
333	288	289	287	311	358	364	427	436	450	470

In an attempt to halt the increasing dominance of American cinema, in 1955 Spain came up with the basis for a new agreement with the MPEA, conditions of which included that the number of films that American companies could release in Spain be reduced from 100 to 80 (of which 68 had to be dubbed and the others subtitled), that tax be increased on imported dubbed films, and that one Spanish film be shown for every four foreign films imported. The first two of these demands were typical for European countries where the MPEA was active, though it should be noted that even France, which was avowedly opposed to the invasion of Hollywood cinema, limited American imports to 140 films, rather than a paltry 80. Regardless, it was the 4-to-1 stipulation that proved truly contentious, leading to a boycott of the Spanish film market by the MPEA. Though the MPEA intended this to be a short-term tactic to achieve its aims, Spain refused to give in and the boycott continued until 1958. When it became clear that the Spanish government was not prepared to surrender, the MPEA ended its embargo in March 1958 and resumed the shipment of films to Spain even though no film pact had been officially agreed upon (Segrave, 1997: 211; Guback, 1969: 27).

In the early 1960s, Spain introduced another set of conditions based on a complex point system (known as the *baremo* system), with MPEA members being awarded licences to

release films in Spain depending on how many points they had accrued. These points were awarded based on factors such as the age of the company, the number of employees, and, most importantly, the number of Spanish films it had distributed. The problem was that Spanish films were not especially lucrative in comparison with American productions; though U.S. films made up only one third of the films shown in Spain in 1962, they received almost two thirds of the total box office earnings (Guback, 1969: 29). The result was that ‘a distribution company would be more anxious to handle American than Spanish films, but it [could] receive authorisation to import the former only after it [had] actively distributed the less popular and less rewarding Spanish films’ (Guback, 1969: 29).

TABLE 2

Domestic and foreign film production in selected European countries between 1951 and 1962 (Danan, 1991: 609).

	Ital.	W.Ger.	Spain	Swed.	Denm.	Finl.	Norw.	Neth.	Total
Domestic Films	1915	1164	877	309	182	254	138	N/A	
Imports									
American	2613	2441	1162	2061	2209	2352	2251	2438	17527
British	482	461	307	581	458	442	625	670	4026
Italian	N/A	372	340	198	133	256	203	393	1895
French	478	514	292	437	372	472	395	659	3619
W.German	293	N/A	153	230	428	367	346	749	2566
Swedish	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	155	134	294	N/A	583
Total Imports	4406	4768	2816	3765	3898	4419	4478	5232	
Domestic Films % of Total Films	30.3	19.6	23.7	7.6	4.5	5.4	3	N/A	
Imported Films % of Total Films	69.7	80.4	76.3	92.4	95.5	94.6	97		

The MPEA was outraged at this new system, accusing the Spanish authorities of adopting unjust nationalist policies. This in turn prompted the following reaction from the President of the Spanish Distributors Association:

Charges have been levelled at Spanish authorities and against Spanish distributors for pursuing a nationalist policy. The truth of the matter is that the Spanish government, without opposition from Spanish distributors, has been giving the same consideration for MPEA companies as it has to all Spanish companies. This cannot be termed a nationalist policy.

MPEA has always claimed extra privileges [...] This position is neither just nor reasonable. (Variety, April 26, 1961.)

Despite the new *baremo* system, the MPEA opted not to impose another mutually harmful boycott and instead maintained a fraught relationship with Spain, the conditions of which changed each year; the result was that the major film companies were allowed to release around 100 films in Spain annually. The number of American films released in Spain gradually increased from the mid-1960s with the liberalisation of trade policy, and in 1971 the *baremo* system was replaced by one that granted licences to distributors based on the box office earnings of domestically produced films. Under this new system, the number of foreign films released in Spain almost tripled (Segrave, 1997: 212; Guback, 1969: 43-44). It is worth noting that Spain was much slower than other European countries in relaxing the system of protectionism; Danan puts this down to Spain's political situation and its weak domestic film industry (Danan, 1991: 608).

Diez Puertas writes that the difficult relationship between the USA and Franco's Spain was not just a question of politics, but also due to a 'conflictiva colonización cinematográfica'³⁴ (Diez Puertas, 2003: 277). The creation of a sense of nationalism among the Spanish public was essential to Franco's agenda, and this rested in part on the creation and maintenance of a sense of Spanish identity. Thus one of the aims of Francoist censorship, especially early on in the General's rule, was to try to prevent North American films from establishing too great a monopoly on Spanish cinema. However, as described in Chapter 4, there was a constant longing among the public for films from abroad, with Hollywood productions proving especially popular. This arose in part because of the lack of competition in the early years of cinema, with much of Europe too impoverished following the world wars to make significant investments in the film industry. A result of this was that Hollywood 'immediately create[d] a universal and permanent way of viewing the world of cinema' (Miguel González, 2000: 62),

³⁴ 'contentious cinematographic colonisation' (MT).

so that the more popular European films tended to be those that imitated the US model. This popularity was part of what was thought to make them dangerous, and Catholic censors in particular were worried about the corrupting influence this Protestant liberal democracy could have on the Spanish public. One reviewer in the religious weekly journal SIPE writes about the dangers of Hollywood's over-reliance on marriage as a 'happy ending' device:

cómo el pueblo norteamericano en su mayoría es protestante o escéptico, su cine es representativo de una moral protestante que admite, por lo tanto, el divorcio. [...] Casi todas esas películas terminan en boda, para no quitar romanticismo (y veneno) a esas escenas llamadas sentimentales, y que son vulgarmente pasionales. Terminan en boda, y así ocultan y callan el divorcio, que – casi siempre – ocurre años después. [...] Cada película aislada, expurgada con unos cortes, puede hasta parecer moral y aleccionadora, y esto es lo único que puede juzgar la censura oficial³⁵ (SIPE, quoted in Martínez-Bretón, 1988: 75).

One key aspect of Francoist film censorship was the disparity between the censorship of foreign and domestic material; the preferential treatment shown toward foreign films in this respect led to many complaints from Spanish film-makers. Spanish films were required to undergo a *censura previa* (prior censorship), while foreign films were not, and the Spanish institutions were expressly protected by the censorship codes, unlike their foreign counterparts. As such, American films could present the police as corrupt and immoral, and Italian films could celebrate anti-fascist demonstrations, while any similar depictions in Spanish productions would be removed. This stance led Antonio Ecelza to complain that

si además del inferior nivel cultural, técnico, industrial, etc., de nuestros cineastas, amén del de nuestras estrellas, amén del doblaje, tenemos sobre nuestras espaldas este nuevo y extraño handicap, va a ser realmente difícil que las películas españolas venzan a las foráneas en la lucha por el favor del público³⁶ (1963: 23).

Despite the numerous protests, films from abroad would continue to benefit from this more lenient approach throughout Franco's rule, with the appearance 'of themes such as infidelity,

³⁵ 'given that the North American population is mostly Protestant or sceptical, its cinema is representative of a Protestant morality that, as such, allows divorce. [...] Almost all of these films end in a wedding, so as not to deprive these supposedly sentimental scenes, which are vulgarly passionate, of romanticism (and poison). They end in a wedding, and they say nothing of the divorce that – almost always – occurs some years later. [...] Each individual film, once it has been subjected to a few cuts, can even appear moral and edifying, and this is the only thing that official censorship can judge' (MT).

³⁶ 'if, on top of the inferior cultural, technical, industrial, etc. standards of our film-makers, as well as that of our stars and of dubbing, we also have to cope with this new and strange handicap, it is going to be very difficult for Spanish films to beat foreign ones in the fight for the favour of the public' (MT).

adultery, broken marriages, and so on [...] frequently justified on the grounds that the reprehensible behaviour depicted in the film was ‘foreign’, not Spanish’ (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2011: 318). As previously mentioned in Section 3.2, allowing Spanish audiences to witness acts of immorality and depravity in foreign cinema could even suit the ends of the Francoist regime, by presenting Spain as a bastion of morality in a godless world. To show these acts being practised in Spain, however, might make it seem to the audience that they were being implicitly condoned: ‘si dentro de ciertos límites severos se podían mostrar en la pantalla las lacras de la sociedad o de la familia en un país extranjero, tales lacras no podían exhibirse en la sociedad o en la familia españolas’³⁷ (Gubern, 1981: 141). This strategy is not peculiar to Franco’s Spain: it can also be seen in another totalitarian system of the 20th century, that of Hitler’s Germany. In her investigation of translated literature under Hitler’s regime, Sturge writes that in the *Bücherkunde*, an official Nazi literary journal, ‘translations from French and English literature are usually considered informative inasmuch as they indicate the inferiority of the source language culture’; as such, while ‘the English must be accurately portrayed as degenerate snobs [and] the French as morbid and nihilistic’ Americans must be shown to be ‘stricken by social collapse’ (Sturge, 1999b: 118).

³⁷ ‘even if, within certain strict limits, the defects of society and family in a foreign country can be shown, such defects cannot be shown with regard to Spanish society and family’ (MT).

9. Methodology

As laid out in Chapter 2, we will seek to test our hypothesis by means of an empirical approach based on Descriptive Translation Studies, using the theoretical framework detailed in Chapter 3 to inform our analysis of the results.

In her analysis of the censored Spanish translation of Ingmar Bergman's *The Seventh Seal*, Gloria Barbal lists the instances where the original version of the film has been altered in some way (Barbal, 2008). She then chooses certain criteria – such as ‘religion’ and ‘morality’ – and allocates each instance of alteration to one of these criteria, thus concluding, for example, that of those instances, 52.4% were altered for religious reasons, 47.6% for reasons of morality. To determine whether the *apertura* was successful in its purported aims, we will adopt a modified version of this approach. Barbal's choice of criteria seems somewhat arbitrary: there is no indication as to why these particular criteria have been chosen; it is not explained what elements need to be present for a particular criterion to be invoked; it is not explained how one can distinguish between criteria as similar as ‘religion’ and ‘morality’; and there is little thought given to a contemporary Franco-era understanding of these criteria, only to our own modern-day understanding. What is more, there is mention only of those instances where the translation has been notably altered from the original Swedish version, never of those where the censors and translators have opted for a translation more ‘faithful’ to the original text.

The case study presented here seeks to avoid similar flaws by making use of the two most influential written censorship codes of the time: the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* of 1950 and the *Normas de censura* of 1963 (see 9.1.). By using these fixed criteria, we can gain a clearer idea of what censors at the time would have been instructed to alter or eliminate. While eliminations are easy to identify, judging what constitutes an alteration is far more subjective. It is not merely a question of the utterance's meaning, for it is a common censorship strategy to retain the significance of an utterance but couch this in less explicit terms; an example from the case study is the translation of ‘It's a brassiere. You know about those things’ with ‘Y lo preguntas? Ya sabes para que sirve’.³⁸ The meaning remains the same, but at a superficial level the utterance is sanitised by removing any explicit reference to the brassiere in question. More helpful than terms such as ‘meaning’ is Vermeer's theory of the text's *skopos*, a ‘complexly defined intention whose textual

³⁸ ‘And you're asking me? You know what it's for’ (MT).

realisation may diverge widely from the source text so as to reach a set of addressees in the Target Culture' (Vermeer, 2012: 183). An analysis of the text's *skopos*, its desired function, is better suited to our analysis as it encompasses the levels both of language and of meaning. When comparing the original with its translation, we must decide whether the aims of the two texts are divergent; and if so, why?

In addition, rather than focus solely on the changes wrought by the censors and translators, we will also take note of those sections of the original script that have *not* been greatly altered in the translated version; this will give a more accurate view of the extent of the censors' leniency and will also shed some light on how consistent the censors were in applying these criteria.

For each film, we show the instances that pose a possible infringement of the criteria shown below and present these alongside their Spanish translation. Where necessary, contextual details are given to make clear why a particular piece of dialogue has been included. We then analyse these findings in the light of the theoretical framework and socio-cultural context as laid out above.

In each case, of course, the film will be analysed in its original version; that is, we will be analysing the same version that audiences of the time would have seen in the cinema. From a practical point of view, this poses more of a challenge for the dubbed Spanish version than for the American original, as most films translated during the Francoist era have since been re-dubbed. The films under study here have therefore been chosen from among those that have not been re-dubbed since Franco's time. The implications of this limitation are discussed in Chapter 11.

9.1. Censorship codes

The following table is an adaptation of the two censorship codes under discussion. The original versions were not grouped according to category, as they are here; this is purely to allow for a better overview of the codes and their relationship to one another.³⁹

³⁹ Translations are all my own. For the original codes, see Appendix.

Criterion	<i>Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos, 1950</i>	<i>Normas de censura, 1963</i>
Eroticism and sexuality	[Category 2 films] may not contain – unless it is to condemn them – [...] amorous, passionate or sensual storylines, free love, adultery, provocative clothing, a frivolous concept of marriage, seduction, crude or lewd dialogue, suggestive or impudent phrases, phrases with a double meaning, obscene or provocative gestures [...] Amorous storylines can be tolerated if they are properly depicted, and may allude to vice if this is depicted in a discrete manner and always condemned. [Category 3 films, though for adults, may not contain] carnal appetites, sensuality or immoral amorous storylines with crudely presented scenes or passages [...] excessively provocative clothing should be avoided. [...] Divorce [and] free love can be tolerated [...] if they are not depicted in an unnecessarily explicit manner. Films may also depict a certain degree of sensuality [...]	Nine. The following are forbidden: 1. The presentation of sexual perversions as the focus of the plot, or in any way unless it is necessary for the development of the action and these perversions have clear and explicit moral consequences. Ten. The following are forbidden: Images and scenes that could provoke low passions in the average spectator; allusions presented in such a way that they are ultimately more suggestive than the presentation of the act itself. Eleven. The intimacy of conjugal love will be respected, with the prohibition of those images and scenes that offend this intimacy. Nineteen. [...] Pornographic films [...] are banned for any public.

Criterion	<i>Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos, 1950</i>	<i>Normas de censura, 1963</i>
Religion	[Category 2 films] may not contain – unless it is to condemn them – divorce [...] suicide [...] a frivolous concept of marriage [...] repeated disobedience to one’s parents, or familial independence and disharmony. [Category 3 films, films for adults] must avoid [...] settings or characters that are incompatible with our Nation or its fundamental institutions [...] modernist [settings are allowed] so long as they do not run counter to our Christian psychology and customs. [Category 4 films, those deemed gravely dangerous] are those films in which the aforementioned objections also include elements of [...] religious irreverence, anticlericalism, false mysticism or explicit anti-patriotism.	The following are forbidden: 1. Justification of suicide. 2. Justification of mercy killings. [...] 4. Justification of divorce as an institution, of adultery, of illicit sexual relations, of prostitution, and in general of any violation of the institution of marriage and of the family. 5. The justification of abortion and contraceptive methods. [...] The disrespectful presentation of religious beliefs and practices. Seventeen. Any violation of any sort against the Catholic Church, its dogma, its morality, and its worship is forbidden.

Criterion	<i>Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos, 1950</i>	<i>Normas de censura, 1963</i>
Politics	[Category 2 films] may not contain – unless it is to condemn them – [...] any idea, tendency or phrase of an anti-patriotic nature. [Category 3 films] must avoid [...] settings or characters that are incompatible with our Nation or its fundamental institutions. [Category 4 films, those deemed gravely dangerous] are those films in which the aforementioned objections also include elements of [...] explicit anti-patriotism.	Fourteen. The following are forbidden: [...] 2. The degrading or undignified representation of political ideologies and anything that violates our institutions or ceremonies in any way. [...] 3. The tendentious falsification of historical facts, figures and settings. Sixteen. Forbidden films include those whose message denies the obligation to defend our Nation and the right to demand this. Seventeen. Forbidden films include those which violate the following in any way: [...] 2. The fundamental principles of the State, national dignity and interior and exterior security of the country. 3. The figure of the Head of State.

Criterion	<i>Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos, 1950</i>	<i>Normas de censura, 1963</i>
Violence and crime	[Category 2 films may contain] violent acts or deaths in the action storylines of crime films [...] so long as they do not constitute the end of the film [...]	Eight. The following are forbidden: [...] 3. The justification of vengeance and duelling. Nine. The following are forbidden: [...] 2. The presentation of drug addiction and alcoholism in a way that could induce these in the viewers. Twelve. The following are forbidden: images and scenes of brutality, of cruelty towards persons or animals, and of terror, depicted in a morbid way or in way that is unjustified with regard to the plot and the corresponding film genre, and in general those that offend human dignity.

Criterion	<i>Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos, 1950</i>	<i>Normas de censura, 1963</i>
General	The 3R certificate [authorised for adults, but with some objections] is assigned to any film that exceeds the limits described above, [...] always according to critical judgement through direct observation and the judgement of the critics.	One. Each film must be judged not only based on the individual images and scenes, but as a whole, based on the entirety of its content and in accordance with the different genres and film styles. If a film as a whole is judged to be gravely dangerous, it will be forbidden rather than authorised with alterations and cuts that alter the film significantly. Two. Evil can be presented as a simple fact or as an element of dramatic conflict, but never as justifiable or attractive, nor in a manner that incites sympathy or triggers a desire to imitate. Three. The presentation of circumstances that give a human explanation of morally reprehensible conduct must be done in such a way that this does not appear to be objectively justified to the spectator. Four. The film must logically lead to a condemnation of evil [...] but it is not necessary for this condemnation to be shown on the screen if there are sufficient elements for the condemnation to take place in the spectator's own conscience. [...] Six. There is no reason to ban the presentation of individual or social ills

9.2. Films to be analysed

We have sought to restrict the number of variables in order to facilitate a comparison between censorship as practised before and after the beginning of the *apertura*. For that reason, we have chosen to restrict our study to the censorship and translation of films from just one country, the USA.

The USA suits the purposes of this study because of all the countries whose film productions were shown in Spain, its films were the most popular, the most lucrative, and the most influential (not to mention the most controversial). María Antonia Paz's interviews of Spaniards alive in Franco's Spain demonstrate that 'the movies that were valued most, which were also the most widely seen, were American movies' (Antonia Paz, 2003: 564). It is also interesting to note how the values of an open, liberal democracy are assimilated into a closed totalitarian regime. In addition, from a practical point of view, the fact that the USA was the most prolific of all film-making nations during this period means that there is a greater wealth of material to analyse. This study will further be restricted to the study of 'Hollywood' cinema; that is to say, mainstream, big-budget cinema rather than art-house or independent pictures.

We will also focus primarily on the work of one director, Alfred Hitchcock. Again, one reason to recommend Hitchcock for such a study is his prolificacy: with over 50 films to his name, Hitchcock provides us with a variety of films that are suited to the aims of this study. He was also one of the most renowned, celebrated, and significant directors of the time, both in the USA and in Spain; of all the filmmakers mentioned in Paz's interviews, '[t]he film director mentioned most is Alfred Hitchcock' (Paz, 2003: 365). In addition, his penchant for dark plots, twisted characters, and sexual innuendo ensure that there is plenty of material for censors to omit or manipulate (or not, as the case may be).

Though Hitchcock's work will form the basis of our study, we will also look at a film by Nicholas Ray, *Rebel Without a Cause*. Like Hitchcock's works, it is peopled by troubled, complex characters caught up in violent situations; and, like Hitchcock, Ray uses the plot as a vehicle for the exploration of dark psychological themes. As one of the most notorious films of the 1960s, its treatment by Franco's censors will be of great value to our discussion.

Plot summaries are given so that the sections of dialogue flagged up for discussion may be understood in the context of the film as a whole.

9.2.1. Alfred Hitchcock (1899-1980)

The power of universal appeal has been the most retarding force of the motion picture as an art. In the efforts of the maker to appeal to everyone they have had to come down to the common simple story with the happy ending; the moment they begin to become imaginative, then they are segregating their audience (Hitchcock in Gottlieb, 1995: 190-191).

Nicknamed 'The Master of Suspense', Hitchcock directed over 50 films and in 1979 received the American Film Institute's Life Achievement Award. Raised in London by strict Catholic parents (whose punishments would serve as a source of inspiration for his film-making), Hitchcock stayed in England until 1939, when he moved to Hollywood. He remained active in film-making until his death in Bel Air, California, in 1980.

Hitchcock remarked that Britain's tough censorship code was one of the reasons that he moved to Hollywood:

I wanted to make an anti-capital punishment film where the prison governor revolts and refuses to hang his man. It's a stirring subject. But here [i.e. in Britain] there would be difficulties with the censor. America can send over things of this sort, because the attitude here is that America can do what she likes with social subjects in her own country. In England this has to be left alone (Gottlieb, 1995: 194).

Though the USA had an ostensibly stringent censorship code of its own, the late 1950s saw numerous film-makers treat this code with complete lack of regard, as noted by Doherty: 'Like parochial schoolboys baiting the nuns, Hollywood filmmakers in the latter half of the 1950s razzed the Code with devilish impertinence' (Doherty, 2009: 327). According to Doherty, 'Alfred Hitchcock took a front seat in the row of naughty boys'; examples include Hitchcock's penchant for visual innuendo, such as the 'orgasmic editing' in *North by Northwest* when a shot of the main characters embracing cuts to a shot of a train entering a tunnel (Doherty, 2009: 327). Similarly, in an interview he gave while filming *Psycho*, 'Hitchcock carefully promised some sort of serious transgression in respect to Hollywood norms of censorship [...] replying memorably to one question about what he planned to do about the Production Code by pointing out [...] that "men do kill nude women, you know"' (Freedman, 2015: 210). Of course, in *Psycho*'s shower scene we do not actually ever see Janet Leigh in the nude, but Hitchcock's careful editing and cinematography created as much as possible the *illusion* of nudity without risking the wrath of the censors. This flirtation with the limits of acceptability would be a hallmark of Hitchcock's oeuvre.

9.2.2. Vertigo

Vertigo was released in the USA in 1958 and in Spain one year later. It tells the story of Scottie, a detective who suffers from vertigo, who is asked by his college friend Gavin Elster to follow his wife, Madeleine. Madeleine's grandmother, Carlotta Valdes, died by her own hand and Gavin believes Madeleine to be possessed by Carlotta's spirit. Scottie follows Madeleine and quickly falls in love with her. When Scottie rescues Madeleine after she throws herself into a bay, the love becomes mutual, but Madeleine dies when she falls from a church tower. After a spate in a mental asylum, Scottie meets Judy Barton, Madeleine's *doppelgänger*, and sets about making her more and more like Madeleine. However, when the two of them revisit the church tower, Scottie discovers that Judy and Madeleine are in fact one and the same, and that he has been the unwitting pawn in an elaborate plot to kill Elster's wife, who was in fact pushed from the church tower while Madeleine looked on. Scottie manages to forgive Judy but the film ends on a tragic note when, frightened by a nun who emerges from the shadows, she throws herself from the tower and dies.

Though *Vertigo* easily earned enough to break even on its original release, it was one of Hitchcock's less successful productions, and reviews were mixed; an article in the *Los Angeles Times* – entitled 'Vertigo Induces Same in Watcher' – is typical in that it admires the scenery but finds that 'the twice-told theme, hard to grasp at best, bogs down in a maze of detail' (*Los Angeles Times*, 29 May, 1958). Hitchcock himself noted that plot was of secondary importance, his priority being 'the over-all visual impact on the screen' (Truffaut, 2015: 246). Eroticism also plays an important role in the film, with the leading male character, as is typical for Hitchcock, enjoying a seductive and innuendo-laden relationship with a blonde *femme fatale*. In a conversation with Hitchcock, Truffaut praises this element of the film, remarking that '[the] whole erotic aspect of the picture is fascinating' (Truffaut, 2015: 245). The sexuality in the film caused some problems for the Francoist censors, as we shall see in the next chapter; for one thing, it has to be made clear in the Spanish version that Judy Barton took part in the plot to kill Elster's wife because he had hired her to do so and not, as is clear in the original version, because she and Elster are lovers (Gil, 2009: 143).

9.2.3. North by Northwest

North by Northwest came out in the USA in 1959 and was released in Spain the same year. There are a number of parallels to *Vertigo*: mistaken identity, the double-crossing *femme fatale*, the high-altitude finale. This time the main character is Roger Thornhill, a regular

advertising executive who is taken to a mansion under the orders of a Mr Townsend, who believes him to be a man called George Kaplan. Thornhill is set up in a drunk-driving incident and arrested. In a quest for answers, Thornhill goes to speak to Townsend in the UN building but only gets into more trouble when a man who claims to be Townsend is killed and Thornhill framed. It is now revealed to the audience that Kaplan is merely a decoy set up by the FBI to draw attention away from their real inside agent. On the run, Thornhill meets Eve Kendall, who unbeknownst to him is working for Vandamm, the main villain of the film. After some near-death experiences, Thornhill is told everything by the 'Professor' of the FBI, and we find out that Kendall is in fact an FBI agent working to retrieve valuable microfilm from the Vandamm. Scottie rescues Kendall, retrieves the microfilm, and avoids falling from the face of Mount Rushmore. He and Kendall live happily ever after.

North By Northwest is generally ranked among the best of Hitchcock's works and was extremely popular upon its release. In his conversations with Hitchcock, Truffaut tells him that 'North by Northwest is the picture that epitomizes the whole of your work in America. It's always difficult to sum up all the ups and downs in stories in a few words, but this one is almost impossible' (Truffaut, 2015: 249). As in *Vertigo*, all of the scenes between the leading male and female characters have an undercurrent of sexual tension. In fact, their first scene together was deemed too risqué by American censors, with Kendall's line 'I never make love on an empty stomach' being altered post-production to 'I never discuss love on an empty stomach', which explains the discrepancy between Kendall's words and the movement of her lips in the theatrical release. The official censorship documents show that the Spanish censors were relatively benevolent in their treatment of the film (e.g. Gil, 2009: 21); perhaps this is due to the subtle use of double meanings to be found throughout the film. Regardless, the aforementioned scene was heavily altered to render it less indecent, and a number of kissing scenes were omitted.

9.2.4. Rebel Without a Cause

Nicholas Ray's wilfully controversial film was released in the USA in 1955 and released in Spain nine years later. James Dean plays Jim Stark, a teenager who has just moved to a new town with his parents. Jim and his family have been forced to move around a lot because of Jim's alcoholism and his problems with the law. On his first day at his new school, Jim gets into an argument with a popular gang led by a thug called Buzz and ends up in a knife fight. That evening Jim is invited to take part in a 'Chickie Run', which involves driving stolen cars towards the edge of a cliff and jumping out as late as possible; the driver who jumps out first

is labelled a 'chicken'. Buzz gets stuck in the car and plunges to his death, leaving his gang wrathful and Jim wracked with guilt. Finding no comfort from his overbearing mother and emasculated father, Jim seeks solace in an abandoned mansion with his two new friends: Judy, an attractive girl, and Plato, a troubled homosexual. Buzz's gang follow them to the mansion to seek revenge on Jim for Buzz's death; scared, Plato grabs his gun and shoots one of the gang members then hides out in a nearby planetarium. Police arrive and order him to come out, but Plato remains inside until Jim and Judy coax him out. Seeing the gun, the police shoot him and Plato dies. Jim makes peace with his parents and introduces them to Judy.

Though it did extremely well at the box office in countries all over Europe, *Rebel Without a Cause* also caused a good deal of controversy before it was released in Spain: due to its depiction of violence, juvenile crime, nihilist behaviour, and implied homosexuality, it was banned in New Zealand and only released the following year after an official appeal, and in Britain it was released with an X-rating even after several scenes had been cut (Nikkhah, 2009). Far from being seen as the milestone masterpiece as which it is heralded today, it was branded as 'an exploitation movie explicitly dealing with contemporary problems of adolescent crime' (Slocum, 172). While *Rebel Without a Cause* was released as part of the 1960s drive to improve Spain's image and present it as a worldly, liberal-minded nation, Gubern sees the release of such movies as a symptom of the confused censorship policy of the time: 'demostraba la contingencia y fragilidad de los criterios censores, que en una epoca juzgaron algo como pernicioso, mientras en otra posterior la perniciosidad se había desvanecido a sus ojos'⁴⁰ (Gubern, 1981: 200).

9.2.5. Strangers on a Train

The earliest of the Hitchcock films under analysis, *Strangers on a Train* came out in the USA in 1951 and was not released in Spain until 1965. In it, tennis star Guy Haines meets psychopathic socialite Bruno Anthony on a train. Bruno recognises Guy and tells him about his plan for a perfect murder: Bruno will do away with Guy's wife Miriam, who refuses to agree to a divorce, and Guy will kill Bruno's father, whom he hates. With no motive, neither of them will be suspected of the murder they committed, and they will both get away free. Guy humours Bruno and forgets him shortly after disembarking. However, Bruno was serious

⁴⁰ 'it demonstrated the uncertainty and fragility of the censorship categories, which judged something as harmful during one period but in a later period failed entirely to recognise this harmful element' (MT).

about his plan; he strangles Miriam in a theme park then meets with Guy to tell him how to set about killing Bruno's father. Guy is horrified but too scared to tell the police. Frustrated by Guy's refusal to carry out his end of the deal, Bruno decides to frame him by planting his cigarette lighter at the scene of Miriam's murder. Guy finds out about this and races to stop Bruno; following a fist-fight onboard an out-of-control carousel, Bruno dies and Guy is absolved of all suspicion.

The film met with mixed reviews and Hitchcock himself expressed disappointment with the final result: 'As I see it, the flaws of *Strangers on a Train* were the ineffectiveness of the two main actors and the weakness of the final script. If the writing of the dialogue had been better, we'd have had stronger characterizations' (Truffaut, 2015: 198). Today, however, it is generally thought to be one of his best, with renowned critic Roger Ebert placing it in the top five of all of Hitchcock's works (Ebert, 2004). Based as it is on murder and adultery, there are numerous potentially controversial plot elements and sections of dialogue. Much has been made of the villainous Bruno's homosexuality – Hitchcock even going so far as to edit separate versions of the film for the USA and the UK, toning down the homosexual undertones in the American version (Ebert, 2004); however, the gay references are so subtle that it seems the censors did not trouble themselves with their removal.

10. Results

10.1. Vertigo

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
I'm not going to crack up.	No es para tanto.	It's not as bad as all that.	
It's a brassiere. You know about those things. You're a big boy, now.	Y lo preguntas? Ya sabes para que sirve. Eres mayorcito.	And you're asking me? You know what it's for. You're grown up.	
It's brand new. Revolutionary uplift. No shoulder straps, no back straps, but does everything a brassiere should do.	El último grito. Verdaderamente revolucionario. Sin tirantes, ni elásticos, ni nada. Pero cumple perfectamente su misión.	State-of-the-art. Truly revolutionary. No shoulder straps, no elastic, nothing. But it fulfils its mission perfectly.	
Hell of a hobby. A do-it-yourself type of thing.	Qué maravilla. Hay gustos para todo.	How marvellous. There are tastes for everything.	Scottie, of the inventor who spends his free time designing brassieres.
How's your love life, Midge?	¿Qué hay de tu vida amorosa, Midge?	What about your love life, Midge?	
Yeah, I'm a brute. We were engaged once though, weren't we?	Servidor. ¿Fuimos novios una vez, verdad?	A suitor. We were engaged once, right?	Scottie to Midge, on their three-week engagement.
That's Skid Row, isn't it?	Un poco apartado, verdad?	A bit out of the way, isn't it?	
He's probably on the bum and wants to touch you for the price of a drink.	Probablemente estará deprimido y quiere vivir tiempos mejores.	He's probably depressed and wants to relive better times.	
Well, I'm on the bum; I'll buy him a couple of drinks and tell him my troubles.	Le invitaré a una copa.	I'll invite him for a drink.	

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
I married into it.	Casándome con él.	Marrying into it.	Gavin Elster, on how he gained his current position in the ship-building business.
[...] the power... the freedom.	[...] la libertad... el poder.	[...] the freedom... the power.	Gavin Elster, talking of how it would have been to live in San Francisco in the past.
No, it's not that. We're very happily married.	No, no es eso; estamos una pareja feliz.	No, it's not that; we're a happy couple.	Gavin Elster, assuring that the reason he wants his wife followed is nothing to do with supposed infidelity.
Foreign. But sweet.	A mí suena muy bien.	It sounds lovely to me.	Madeleine's landlady, of the Spanish name Carlotta Valdes.
It is not an unusual story.	No es una historia sensacional.	It is not a sensational story.	Pop Leibel, on the story of how Carlotta Valdes' husband abandoned her and took their child with him.
Young, yes, very young.	Joven, sí, muy joven.	Young, yes, very young.	Pop Leibel, of Carlotta Valdes' age when she was found by her older husband.
And she was found singing and dancing in a cabaret by the man.	Y ese hombre lo encontró cantando y bailando en un cabaret.	And that man found her singing and dancing in a cabaret.	Pop Leibel, of Carlotta Valdes' insalubrious beginnings before she was found by her future husband.

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
He had no other children; his wife had no children. So he kept the child and threw her away. You know men could do that in those days. They had the power... and the freedom.	No tuvieron hijos varones; su esposa no se los dio. Así que quedó con la niña y abandonó a la madre. En esos tiempos se podía hacer eso si era hombre influyente.	They had no male children; his wife didn't give them to him. So he stayed with the girl and abandoned the mother. In those times you could do that if you were an influential man.	
Her clothes became old and patched and dirty.	Sus vestidos envejecían al tiempo que su volvían blancos sus cabellos.	Her clothes became old at the same time that her hair became white.	
By her own hand. There are many such stories.	Suicidándose. Conozco otras muchas historias.	Committing suicide. I know many other stories.	
The child who was taken from her, whose loss drove Carlotta mad and to her death, was Madeleine's grandmother.	La hija que le arrebataron y cuya perdida volvía loca a Carlota fue la abuela de Madeleine.	The girl they took away from her, whose loss drove Carlotta mad, was Madeleine's grandmother.	
She is not my wife.	Entonces deja de ser quien es.	Then she stops being who she is.	Gavin Elster, of his wife's behaviour when she goes into one of her trances.
Natural fear. Her grandmother went insane and took her own life. Her blood is in Madeleine.	Era natural. Su abuela se volvía loca y se suicidó. Madeleine lleva su sangre.	It was natural. Her grandmother went insane and committed suicide. Madeleine has her blood.	
- One shouldn't live alone. - Some people prefer it. - No... it's wrong.	- No se debe vivir solo. - A veces es preferible. - No lo creo.	- One shouldn't live alone. - Sometimes it's preferable. - I don't think so.	

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Carlota Valdes committed suicide when she was twenty-six.	Carlota Valdes se suicidó cuando tenía 26 años [very muffled].	Carlota Valdes committed suicide when she was twenty-six.	
What a terrible thing to do.	Era terrible lo que me sucedió.	It was terrible what happened to me.	Madeleine, of her jumping into the bay during one of her trances.
[Kissing scene]	[Omitted]		
I've always said you were wasting your time in the underwear department.	Siempre he dicho que estás perdiendo tiempo con esos figurines.	I've always said you're wasting time with these figurines.	
You'll be free.	¿De acuerdo?	Okay?	Scottie to Madeleine, describing how she can be rid of her trances.
[Kissing scene and several lines of dialogue]	[Omitted]		
- It's not fair, it's too late. It wasn't supposed to happen this way, it shouldn't have happened! - It had to. We're in love. That's all that counts.	- No es justo, ya bastante, no había debido ocurrir así, no había debido ocurrir. - Tuvo que ocurrir; estamos enamorados y eso es lo importante.	- It's not fair, enough already, it shouldn't have happened like this, it shouldn't have happened. - It had to happen; we're in love and that's what's important.	Madeleine and Scotty, of their romantic liaisons.
You believe that I love you?	¿Crees que te amo?	You believe that I love you?	Madeleine to Scotty.
And if you lose me, you'll know that I loved you and wanted to go on loving you.	Entonces si me pierdas sabrás que te amaba y quería seguir amándote.	And if you lose me, you'll know that I loved you and wanted to go on loving you.	Madeleine to Scotty.

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
The son of a -	[Omitted]		
Nymphomaniacs.	Hipocondriacos.	Hypochondriacs.	
Mother's here.	Me tienes aquí.	You've got me here.	Madeleine to Scotty, during a flirtatious conversation.
Oh, I thought so! A pick-up!	Lo suponía. Un conquistador.	I thought so. A womaniser.	Judy to Scotty when he arrives at the door of her hotel room.
My mother got married again.	Mi madre volvió a casarse.	My mother got married again.	
Well, I've been on blind dates before. Matter of fact, to be honest, I've been picked up before.	Me han invitado ya otras veces. No es usted el primero que propone conquistarme.	I've been asked out other times. You're not the first one to try to seduce me.	
You were the victim of Gavin Elster's plan to murder his wife.	Fuiste la víctima del plan de Gavin Elster para asesinar a su mujer.	You were the victim of Gavin Elster's plan to murder his wife.	
- Can I see you tomorrow? - Tomorrow night? Well...	- Puedo verla mañana? - Mañana por la noche? Pues...	- Can I see you tomorrow? - Tomorrow night? Well...	
- I've been understanding since I was seventeen. And the next step is...	- Lo entiendo desde niña. Y el siguiente paso es...	- I've been understanding since I was a child. And the next step is...	Judy, explaining why she doesn't believe that a morning encounter will lead to nothing more.
- And nothing else? - No. - That's not very flattering either.	- Y nada más? - No. - Eso tampoco es muy halagador.	- And nothing else? - No. - That's not very flattering either.	Judy, inquiring whether her relationship with Scotty will really just consist of meeting and talking.
He'd broken her neck	Él la había estrangulado.	He had strangled her.	

Original dialogue (1958)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
You were his girl.	Tu eras su cómplice.	You were his accomplice.	
Did he ditch you?	Te abandonó?	Did he abandon you?	
You shouldn't keep souvenirs of a killing.	No se puede guardar los recuerdos de un crimen.	You shouldn't keep souvenirs of a crime.	

10.2. North by Northwest

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Something for your sweet tooth baby, and all your other sweet parts.	Estos bonbones nunca serán tan dulces como tú, bonbon.	These sweets will never be as sweet as you, sweetie.	
Good, because honest women frighten me... I don't know, somehow they seem to put me at a disadvantage.	Las mujeres sinceras me asustan... Me hacen sentirme en un plano de inferioridad.	Honest women frighten me... They make me feel inferior.	
What I mean is: the moment I meet an attractive woman, I have to start pretending that I've no desire to make love to her.	Lo que quiero decir es que cuando encuentro a una mujer atractiva tengo que empezar a fingir que no habría deseo de pretender.	What I mean is: the moment I meet an attractive woman, I have to start pretending that there's no desire to court her.	
Is that a proposition?	Es una declaración?	Is that a declaration [of love]?	
I never discuss love on an empty stomach.	Nunca hablo de amor antes de comer.	I never discuss love before eating.	

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
I'm 26 and unmarried. Now you know everything.	26 años y soy soltera. Ahora ya sabe usted todo.	26 and single. Now you know everything.	Eve Kendall to Roger Thornhill, implication being that she is available for a night-time rendezvous in her sleeping compartment in the train.
What do you do besides lure men to their doom on the 20th Century Limited?	¿Y qué hace además de arrastrar a los hombres a su perdición en el expreso siglo veinte?	What do you do besides lead men to their doom on the 20th Century Limited?	
It's going to be a long night... And I don't particularly like the book I've started... You know what I mean?	Va a ser una noche muy larga... Y francamente no me gusta el libro que he empezado a leer... Sabe que quiero decir?	It's going to be a long night... And frankly I don't like the book I've started to read... You know what I mean?	Eve Kendall, after Roger Thornhill has asked her why she doesn't turn him in even though she knows he's wanted by the police.
- I'd invite you to my bedroom if I had a bedroom. - I've got a large drawing-room all to myself. - That's not fair, is it?	- Le invitaría a mi compartimiento si lo tuviera. - Yo tengo un departamento para mí sola. - No le parece que eso no es justo?	- I'd invite you to my compartment if I had a compartment. - I've got a compartment all to myself. - Doesn't that seem unfair to you?	
You wouldn't happen to have an extra pair of pajamas, would you?	Que por lo menos no le molestaré con el impedimento de las maletas.	At least I won't annoy you by getting my luggage in your way.	Roger Thornhill, after explaining to Eve Kendall that he has no luggage with him on the train.

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Shall I climb up and tell you why?	Es necesario que se lo digo para comprenderlo?	Is it necessary for me to say it for you to understand?	Eve Kendall, to Roger Thornhill as he lies in the top bunk-bed in her sleeping compartment in the train, after he has asked her why she is going out of her way to help him.
- I'm a big girl. - Yeah, and in all the right places, too.	- Ya soy mayorcita. - Sí. Pero para este caso eres menor de edad.	- I'm grown up. - Yes. But in this instance you're underage.	
- Now, where were we? - Here. - Nice of him to have opened the bed. Only one bed [...] Well it's a good omen. Don't you think? - Wonderful. - Know what it means? - It means you're going to sleep on the floor.	- Bueno, y yo dónde duermo? - En el suelo. - Estuvo bien de abrir la cama. Sólo una cama. Una buena idea, no crees? - Maravillosa. - Sabes que significa? - Significa que vas a dormir en el suelo.	- Well, where do I sleep? - On the floor. - Nice of him to have opened the bed. Only one bed [...] It's a good idea. Don't you think? - Wonderful. - Know what it means? - It means you're going to sleep on the floor.	
[Kissing scene]	[Omitted]		An entire scene is omitted in which Roger Thornhill and Eve Kendall exchange flirtatious dialogue in between kisses.
You're the smartest girl I've ever spent the night with on a train.	Eres la muchacha más lista con quien he tropezado en mi vida.	You're the smartest girl I've come across in my whole life.	

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Our own little pump room for two.	Tranquilos y cómodos, no?	Quiet and comfortable, no?	
We're not going to get involved. Last night was last night and that's all there was, and that's all there is, there isn't going to be anything more between us.	No nos compliquemos la vida. Guardo muy buen recuerdo de nuestro encuentro. Es todo que puede haber entre nosotros, un agradable recuerdo.	Let's not complicate life. I still have a very fond memory of our meeting. It's all there can be between us, a pleasant meeting.	Eve Kendall, giving Roger Thornhill the cold shoulder the day after their amorous encounter in the train.
Better take your things off.	Pásate al cuarto de baño y quítate el traje.	Go to the bathroom and take off your suit.	Eve Kendall to Roger Thornhill as they stand in the bedroom of her hotel room.
What am I going to do with my clothes off for twenty minutes? Couldn't he take an hour?	Espero que los veinte minutos no se conviertan en una hora.	I hope twenty minutes doesn't become an hour.	Roger Thornhill, of the valet mending his clothes.
You could always take a cold shower.	La ducha fría dolifica los nervios.	A cold shower will soothe the nerves.	Eve Kendall to Roger Thornhill, in reference to his repeated attempts to woo her.
- When I was a little boy I never even let my mother undress me. - Well, you're a big boy now.	- De pequeño no consentía que nadie ni mi madre me desnudara. - Ahora es como un niño grande.	- When I was little I didn't let anyone undress me, not even my mother. - Now you're like a big boy.	
I bet you could tease a man to death without half trying.	Apuesto a que llevarías a un hombre a su muerte sin casi proponértelo.	I bet you could lead a man to his death almost without trying.	
- He was in your room? - Sure. Isn't everybody?	- Estaba en su habitación? - Claro. No es entrada libre?	- He was in your room? - Sure. Isn't it free entry?	Leonard and Roger, talking of Roger's being in Eve's room.

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
She's worth every dollar, take it from me. She really puts her heart into her work. In fact her whole body.	Reconozco que lo vale. Pone en su trabajo los cinco sentidos. Pone su corazón.	I know she's worth it. She puts all five senses into her work. She puts her heart into it.	Roger to Vandamm, of Eve's treachery of Roger and her working for Vandamm.
Am I to be dropped into a vat of molten steel and become part of a new skyscraper? Or are you going to ask this female to kiss me again and poison me to death?	Dejarme caer en un baño de acero fundido y convertirme en parte integrante de un nuevo rascacielos? O va usted a pedir a esta hechicera que me de la muerte con su veneno?	Drop me into a bath of molten steel and turn me into part of a new skyscraper? Or are you going to ask this sorceress to bring death upon me with her poison?	Roger to Vandamm, of Eve and her treachery and Vandamm's plot to kill him.
You little fool.	Qué haces, ha vuelto loca?	What are you doing, have you gone mad?	Roger to Eve when she pulls a gun on him.
And what about that treacherous little tramp with him?	Y usted cómo le parece la formidable mujerzuela que le acompañe?	And what do you think of the formidable tart accompanying him?	
His mistress.	Es su novia.	His girlfriend / His fiancée.	
Yeah – for using sex like some people use a fly-swatter.	Sí. Para usar sus atractivos con premeditación y alevosía.	Yes. For using her good looks with premeditation and malicious intent.	
And just as soon as your malevolent friend Vandamm takes off tonight, I'm going to undo my bandages, and you and I are going to do a lot of apologizing to each other, in private...	Una vez que tu malévolo amigo Vandamm te haya despedido esta noche tú y yo reunimos en privado y nos demos toda clase de explicaciones.	Once your malevolent friend Vandamm has bid you farewell tonight, you and I can meet up in private and give each other all sorts of explanations.	Roger Thornhill to Eve Kendall

Original dialogue (1959)	Spanish dialogue (1959)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
If you fellows can't lick the Vandamms without asking girls like her to bed down with them and fly away with them and probably never come back alive, maybe you better start learning to lose a few cold wars!	Si ustedes no pueden acabar con Vandamm y compañía sin pedirle a una mujer que le resuelva la papeleta comprometiéndolo su dignidad y su vida, vale más que vayan aprendiendo a perder la guerra fría.	If you can't finish off Vandamm and co. without asking a woman to fulfil the role, compromising her dignity and her life, it would be better that you start learning to lose the Cold War.	

10.3. Rebel Without a Cause

Original dialogue (1955)	Spanish dialogue (1964)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
He hates me! [...] He looks at me like I'm the ugliest thing in the world. [...] He called me a dirty tramp! My own father!	Debe de odiarme. Sí, me odia. [...] Me mira como si se tratara de algo horrible. [...] ¡Ha dicho que soy una cualquiera! ¡Mi propio padre!	He said I'm a hussy! My own father!	
Not looking for company?	No estaba buscando compañía?	You weren't looking for company?	Police officer to Judy, asking her why she was wandering the streets late at night.
Do you have any idea why you shot those puppies?	¿Tienes idea de porqué mataste a aquellos perritos, John?	Do you have any idea why you killed those puppies, John?	Police officer to Plato.
Can you tell me why you killed those puppies?	¿Puedes decirme porqué mataste a aquellos perritos?	Can you tell me why you killed those puppies?	

Original dialogue (1955)	Spanish dialogue (1964)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
I don't see what's so bad about taking a litte drink... I cut loose pretty good in my day too.	No lo veo que haya nada de malo en tomar alguna vez un tragito... Yo también eché alguna cana al aire en mi juventud.	I don't see what's so bad about taking a litte drink... I liked to get a bit wild in my youth as well.	Jim Stark's father, after Jim has been taken to the police station for drunken behaviour.
He's just loaded, honey.	Que ha bebido demasiado.	He's drunk too much.	
Someone ought to put poison in her Epsom salts.	Alguien debería envenenar sus sales de frutas.	Someone ought to poison her fruit salts.	Jim Stark, of his mother.
But then I don't know what to do anymore. Except maybe die. If he had the guts to knock Mom cold once then maybe she'd be happy and she'd stop picking on him.	Ya no sé qué hacer a no ser quizá morirme. Quiero decir que si en alguna ocasión él se atreviera a darle un bofetón a mi madre, quizá ella fuera feliz y dejaría de fastidiarle de una vez.	I don't know what to do except maybe die. I mean if he ever dared to give her a slap, maybe she would be happy and she'd stop annoying him once and for all.	Jim Stark, of his parents' relationship.
- You know, I bet you're a real yo-yo. - I love you too.	- Sabes una cosa, creo que eres un buen chico y que voy a apreciarte. - Yo también te aprecio a ti.	- You know something, I think you're a good guy and that I'm going to appreciate you. - I appreciate you too.	Judy to Jim Stark.
- What's that? - A new disease.	- Quién es este tipo? - Un vecino nuevo.	- Who's that guy? - A new neighbour.	

Original dialogue (1955)	Spanish dialogue (1964)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Destroyed as we began in a burst of gas and fire. The heavens are still and cold once more. In all the immensity of our universe and the galaxies beyond, the Earth will not be missed. Through the infinite reaches of space, the problems of Man seem trivial and naive indeed. And Man, existing alone, seems to be an episode of little consequences.	Destruídos tal como empezamos, por un estallido de gases y fuego. El cielo aparecerá tranquilo y imperturbable una vez más. En la inmensidad del universo nuestro mundo no será echado de menos. En la infinita profundidad del espacio, los problemas de la humanidad son cosas triviales e ingenuos. Y el hombre solo consigo mismo es un minúsculo episodio que carece de importancia.	Destroyed as we began in a burst of gas and fire. The sky will seem still and cold once more. In all the immensity of our universe, the Earth will not be missed. In the infinite depth of space, the problems of humanity seem trivial and naive. And Man, all alone, is an episode of little consequences.	Lecturer, of the end of the universe.
What you waiting on, toreador? I thought you wanted some action.	A qué esperas, torito? Creí que te gustaría la lección.	What are you waiting for, little bull? I thought you'd appreciate the lesson.	Buzz to Jim, prior to their knife fight.
Split for what? A couple of old poopheads?	Rajarlo? Para qué vamos a ensuciarnos las manos con un mequetrefe?	Cut him? Why would we get our hands dirty for some schmuck?	Buzz, after one of his friends suggests fleeing the scene of a fight to avoid being caught by the security officer and the professor watching them.
I bet you'd go to a hanging, wouldn't you?	No querías perderte el espectáculo, verdad?	You didn't want to miss the spectacle, right?	
You have to get to know him.	Aún no lo conozco bien.	I don't know him well yet.	Plato, of Jim Stark; Plato's homosexual feelings for Jim are apparent by this point.

Original dialogue (1955)	Spanish dialogue (1964)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
You want to see a monkey?	Mira qué bonito.	Look how pretty.	Jim, showing Judy her face in a mirror.
Why don't you come home with me? I mean nobody's home at my house—and I'm not tired, are you?	Quieres venir a mi casa? No hay nadie y estaremos solos. Aunque yo no estoy cansado.	You want to come to my house? There's nobody there and we'll be alone. But I'm not tired.	Plato to Jim Stark.
Your lips are soft.	Tus labios son suaves.	Your lips are soft.	
I'll work my fingers to the bone.	Trabajaré como una negra.	I'll work like a Negro.	
JIM: Well, we're newlyweds. JUDY: There's just one thing. What about - PLATO: Children? Well, we really don't encourage them. They're so noisy and troublesome, don't you agree? JUDY: Yes. And so terribly annoying when they cry. I just don't know what to do when they cry, do you dear? JIM: Of course. Drown them like puppies. JUDY: See, we're very modern.	JIM: Somos recién casados. JUDY: Hay que aclarar una cosa. Dónde pondremos - PLATO: Los niños? No nos gusta tenerlos aquí. Son juguetones y molestan. No es cierto señora? JUDY: Oh sí, son muy engorrosos cuando lloran. No sé que hacer con ellos entonces. Y tu cariño? JIM: Creo que ahogarlos es lo mejor.	JIM: We're newlyweds. JUDY: One thing. Where do we put - PLATO: The children? Well, we don't like having them here. They're so noisy and troublesome, don't you agree? JUDY: Yes. They're terribly annoying when they cry. I just don't know what to do with them, do you dear? JIM: I think drowning them is the best idea.	Jim, Judy, and Plato acting out a spontaneous role-play as they look around an abandoned mansion often frequented by Plato.

Original dialogue (1955)	Spanish dialogue (1964)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
PLATO: Shall I show you the nursery? It's far away from the rest of the house. If you have children they can carry on and you'll never even notice. In fact, if you lock them in you never have to see them again, much less talk to them. JUDY: Talk to them! Heavens! JIM: Nobody talks to children! JUDY: They just tell them one thing and mean another.	PLATO: Como verán, el cuarto de los niños está separado del resto de la casa. Y si tienen muchos niños encontrarán grandes ventajas en esto. Crecerán sin que ustedes se den cuenta. Si los ponen aquí, no tienen que volver a verlos ni hablar con ellos. JUDY: Hablarles, ¿porqué? JIM: Nadie habla a los niños. JUDY: No, sólo se los mandan.	PLATO: As you can see, the nursery is separate from the rest of the house. If you have lots of children you'll find this very advantageous. They can grow up and you'll never even notice. If you put them in here you never have to see them or speak to them again. JUDY: Talk to them! Why? JIM: Nobody talks to children! JUDY: They just order them around.	

10.4. Strangers on a Train

Original dialogue (1951)	Spanish dialogue (1965)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
Even news about people I don't know. Like who'd like to marry whom when his wife gets her divorce.	Hasta de personas que no conozco. Como quién se casaría con quién cuando se consiga el divorcio.	Even people I don't know. Like who would marry whom when the divorce happens.	
But right now I suppose divorce is still the simplest operation.	Considero el divorcio una operación muy sencilla.	I see divorce as a very simple operation.	
I hate him too. I tell you, I get so sore at him sometimes that I want to kill him.	Yo también le odio. Le aseguro que hay momentos en que me pone tan furioso que quisiera matarle.	I hate him too. I tell you that there are moments when he makes me so mad that I'd like to kill him.	Bruno, of his father.
I suppose she played around a lot, huh?	Supongo que se ha divertido lo suyo.	I suppose that she's had some fun.	Bruno, of Guy's cheating wife Miriam.
Want to hear one of my ideas for a perfect murder?	Le explico una de mis ideas para un crimen perfecto?	Should I explain one of my ideas for a perfect crime?	
You want to hear about the busted light socket in the bathroom, or the carbon monoxide in the garage?	Prefiere la del enchufe eléctrico al aire en el cuarto de baño o la de monóxido de carbono en el garaje?	Would you prefer the one with the electric switch in the bathroom or the carbon monoxide in the garage?	
Oh what's a life or two? Some people are better off dead. Take your wife and my father, for instance.	¿Qué importa una vida o dos? Hay gente que está mejor muerta. Por ejemplo su mujer y mi padre.	What do a life or two matter? There are people who are better off dead. For example your wife and my father.	

Original dialogue (1951)	Spanish dialogue (1965)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
- My hurry? That's funny, coming from you! You're the one who's in a hurry, aren't you? - When you wouldn't give me the divorce right away, I sort of hoped it was because you were a little bit jealous. - I got over being jealous a long time ago, Miriam.	-Prisa? Tiene gracia tu pregunta. Tú eres la que tienes prisa, no? - Cuando no quisiste concederme el divorcio enseguida, tuve la esperanza de que fuera por celos. - Hace tiempo que se me pasaron los celos, Miriam.	- Hurry? That's a funny question. You're the one who's in a hurry, aren't you? - When you didn't want to give me the divorce right away, I hoped it was because you were jealous. - I got over being jealous a long time ago, Miriam.	Guy and Miriam, of Miriam's cheating and their impending divorce.
It's pretty late to start flirting with a discarded husband. Especially when you're going to have another man's baby.	Es un poco tarde para flirtear con un marido que no quieres. Sobre todo yendo a tener un hijo con otro hombre.	It's a bit late to flirt with a husband that you don't love. Especially when you're going to have another man's baby.	
You black conniving little liar!	Eres una maldita embustera!	You're a damned liar!	
I'd like to break her neck!	Lo mataría. Soy capaz de matarla.	I would kill her. I could kill her.	
I said I'd like to break her foul, poisonous, useless little neck!	Te digo que le mataría con mis propios manos.	I tell you, I could kill her with my own hands.	
I said I could strangle her!	Me entran ganas de estrangularla!	I feel like strangling her!	
Now it's hit and run driving!	Ahora me da por conducir alocadamente!	Now he's driving like a madman!	Bruno's father, of Bruno's recent exploits.
She was a tramp.	Era una mujerzuela.	She was a tramp.	
From what I hear, she pursued it in all directions.	Por lo que dicen ella lo perseguía en todas direcciones.	From what they say she pursued it in all directions.	Barbara, of Miriam's loose behaviour.

Original dialogue (1951)	Spanish dialogue (1965)	English translation of Spanish dialogue	Context
You're free.	Es maravillosa.	It's marvellous.	Guy's sister-in-law to Guy, on finding out he has a probable alibi.
You mean the professor was boiled?	De modo que el profesor estaba borracho.	So the professor was drunk.	
But tell me, Judge, after you've sentenced a man to the chair, isn't it difficult to go and eat your dinner after that?	Dígame señor, después de condenar a un hombre a la silla eléctrica, no le resulta sentarse a comer tal cosa?	Tell me, Sir, after you've sentenced a man to the electric chair, isn't it difficult to sit down and eat?	
So few murderers are caught.	Entonces cogen a muy pocos asesinos.	So they catch very few murderers.	
Now surely, Madam, you're not going to tell me that there hasn't been a time when you wanted to dispose of someone. Your husband, for instance.	No me va a decir Usted, señora, que nunca en su vida ha tenido deseos de menos de verse libre de alguien. De su marido, por ejemplo.	Now Madam, you're not going to tell me that there hasn't been a time in your life when you've at least had the desire to free yourself from someone. Your husband, for instance.	
Guy, did you know Mr. Hennessy helped crack that axe murder I was reading about? You know, the one where the body was cut up and hidden in the butcher's shop? He was locked in the ice box with the left leg for six hours!	Sabías que el Señor Hennessy había ayudado a resolver este crimen por descuartizamiento, aquél en que el criminal metió el cadaver en una carnicería? Estuvo seis horas en la refrigeradora encerrado con la pierna izquierda.	Did you know Mr. Hennessy helped crack that axe murder, the one where the criminal put the body in the butcher's shop? He was locked in the ice box with the left leg for six hours!	
First thing you know, they'll be talking about orgies.	Enseguida van a decir que celebramos orgías.	Soon they'll be saying that we have orgies.	

11. Analysis

11.1. Vertigo

Vertigo was released in Spain in 1959, towards the end of Arias-Salgado's tenure as Minister of Information and Tourism. It should therefore come as little surprise that much of the sexual innuendo and flirtatious dialogue that pervade Hitchcock's films was altered or excised. In one of the very first scenes, Scottie questions Midge about the brassiere sitting on her desk. It is clear from the beginning of the film that Midge works in the underwear department; but when this is explicitly mentioned at a later stage (Scottie: I've always said you were wasting your time in the underwear department), the Spanish translation is sanitised, with Scottie merely telling her she is wasting her time with 'those figurines' (Scottie: Siempre he dicho que estás perdiendo tiempo con esos figurines). The objective here is not to disguise the nature of Midge's occupation – for it is clear from her sketches and from the lingerie adorning her workspace that she works in the underwear department – but rather to render any allusions to it less explicit. The same is true of Midge's description of the bra on her desk; in the Spanish version, rather than simply tell Scottie that it is a brassiere, she evades the question (Midge: Y lo preguntas?). And while she states in the original version that it 'does everything a brassiere should do', in the Spanish version she remarks that it 'cumple perfectamente su misión', thereby retaining the cheeky allusion while managing to avoid saying at any point what it actually is. The Spanish 'sostén' or 'sujetador' would have been perfectly acceptable in this context, and one can only assume that the choice to avoid using either of these words is ideologically rather than linguistically motivated.

This pattern can be seen throughout the film. When Scotty approaches Judy in her hotel bedroom, for example, the allusions to the insalubrity of the situation are still present; when Scotty asks Judy 'Puedo verla mañana?' and she replies 'Mañana por la noche? Pues...', it is just as clear in the Spanish version as in the original that she is considering whether or not to sleep with a man she has only just met. This is also true of a later exchange between the two; when Scotty tells Judy that he only wants to talk and dine with her, nothing more, her response in both versions is one of disappointment (Judy: That's not very flattering either / Judy: Eso tampoco es muy halagador). The translators are content, then, to make unsubtle allusions to Judy's carnal appetites, but when required to translate Midge's joke about 'nymphomaniacs', they reject the direct equivalent 'ninfómanas' in favour of 'hipocondriacos'. The context of the joke is harmless, and nobody specific is being alluded to, yet still the translators deem the word 'nymphomaniac' as being more harmful than

references to the sexual activity of the film's female characters. To name another example, it seems they have no major qualms about translating Scottie's impertinent question 'How's your love life, Midge?' with the equally impertinent '¿Qué hay de tu vida amorosa, Midge?'. The implication in both versions is that Midge could actually *have* a love life, rather than saving herself for the perfect man; perhaps they felt that her reply of 'You're the only man for me, Johnny-O', was sufficient to render her sexless.

For the most part, then, it is mere words that are changed or deleted, rather than the connotations. There is, however, one notable exception; perhaps the most significant transformation in the film is that of 'You were his girl' to 'Tu eras su cómplice', which alters the nature of Judy's relationship with Elster: now, rather than his mistress, she is merely his 'accomplice', and any sexual element of her agreeing to help Elster dispose of his wife is considerably subdued. Similarly, while in the American version Scottie asks Judy 'Did he ditch you?', in the Spanish version his question does not have the same connotations of the end of a relationship: 'Te abandonó?'.

Despite this, the female characters of the film are hardly depicted as paragons of sexual virtue; in the Spanish version as in the original, Midge is single but potentially sexually active, Madeleine seems quite happy to fall in love with Scottie even though we still think, at this point, that she is married to Gavin Elster, and Judy seems ready to begin a relationship with the first man she meets. Though it may seem surprising that the depiction of these characters is so far from the chastity and sexlessness that the Church expected of decent Christian women, there are two factors that help explain this. Firstly, it is clear that these are American women, not Spanish: as such, their 'immoral' behaviour can be explained away by their nationality and the dubious morality supposedly dominant in the United States. Secondly, their depiction is in fact compatible with the Church's stance of the time, whereby women could be divided into those of 'impeccable morality' who were therefore worthy of marriage, and those of 'assailable morality', who were not (Linder, 2004: 157). None of these three women is depicted as a role model for viewers to follow: Midge is middle-aged and single, still in love with a man who does not love her back; Madeleine is suicidal and mentally unsound; and Judy is sad, damaged, and world-weary. On top of that, given that, at the end of the film, the former seems doomed to a life of spinsterhood while the latter two die after falling from a church tower, it must be clear to the viewer that these are not women to be emulated.

Moreover, in other sections of the film, dialogue is changed so as to make clear the woman's desired role in the family. While in the American version, Pop Leibel recalls of Carlota's husband: 'He had no other children; his wife had no children', in the Spanish version this is altered to 'No tuvieron hijos varones; su esposa no se los dio'. This piece of dialogue therefore becomes a criticism of Carlota's failure to provide her husband with male offspring, which is in stark contrast to the far more neutral recount in the original.

Another theme that must have distressed the Spanish Catholic Church is suicide, which plays a key role in *Vertigo*'s twisted plot. At no point do the translators excise references to suicide, but they do understate how widespread it is: in the Spanish version Pop Leibel, after telling the story of Carlota's suicide, remarks 'Conozco otras muchas historias' ('I know many other stories'), rather than 'There are many such stories'.

The last theme to be discussed in this analysis is freedom, which, though far from being an explicit subject of the film, still receives several mentions. In each case, where freedom refers to the freedom of a particular character, the word 'libre' or 'libertad' is used: when Scottie tells Judy that they will soon be free from the past, for example, or when he describes how Elster was free once rid of his wife. Yet when it refers to the population at large, it is altered. Pop Leibel remarks that men could abandon their wives in the old days, because 'They had the power... and the freedom', but in the Spanish version this becomes 'si era hombre influyente'. Similarly, when describing how life used to be in San Francisco, Gavin Elster talks of 'the power... the freedom', emphasising and savouring the last word. In the Spanish version, the order is reversed, and Elster instead talks of 'la libertad... la poder' ('the freedom... the power'), again lingering on the last word and making this, not freedom, the focus of attention. In Franco's authoritarian regime there were naturally severe limitations on freedom of speech and freedom of the press, which attracted much criticism from artists and intellectuals. Extolling the virtues of freedom – in a social, rather than psychological sense – and in particular implying that people used to be more free than they were during Franco's government, was therefore to be avoided.

11.2. North by Northwest

North by Northwest was also released in Spain in 1959. These two films share more than a release date: in terms of the plot, we again have the male character caught up in a conspiracy he doesn't understand, seduced by a woman with ulterior motives, and tormented by tall

structures. In order to facilitate parallels between this film and the last, we will again begin by analysing the erotic elements of Hitchcock's film.

This eroticism only begins to play a part quite late into the film, when Roger Thornhill first comes across Eve Kendall. Once they are acquainted, the flirtation begins almost straight away, with Thornhill confessing: 'What I mean is: the moment I meet an attractive woman, I have to start pretending that I've no desire to make love to her.' In the Spanish version, 'make love to' becomes 'court': 'Lo que quiero decir es que cuando encuentro a una mujer atractiva tengo que empezar a fingir que *no habría deseo de pretender*'. Admittedly, some of their flirtatious dialogue is left unaltered, such as the remarks 'I'm 26 and unmarried. Now you know everything' and 'It's going to be a long night... And I don't particularly like the book I've started... You know what I mean?' but these are rendered more harmless by the removal of all overly explicit references to nudity or sexual intercourse. 'Bedroom' becomes 'compartment' (Kendall: Le invitaría a mi compartimiento si lo tuviera / Kendall: I'd invite you to my bedroom if I had a bedroom) and Thornhill's indirect allusion to the fact he'll be sleeping naked – 'You wouldn't happen to have an extra pair of pyjamas, would you?' – becomes the far more prosaic 'At least I won't annoy you by getting my luggage in your way'. And it seems that Thornhill's remark to Kendall that she is big 'in all the right places' also violated the *Instrucciones*' stipulations regarding 'sensuality' and 'carnal appetites', for this becomes a remark about how she is too young to get involved in Thornhill's quest to clear his name (Kendall: I'm a big girl. Thornhill: Yeah, and in all the right places, too / Kendall: Ya soy mayorcita. Thornhill: Sí. Pero para este caso eres menor de edad).

The couple's steamiest encounter is omitted entirely: not for the dialogue, which is relatively tame compared to the rest of their conversation, but the pair's passionate kissing. In the original version, it is made clear that their encounter does not stop at kissing: right before this scene, Thornhill and Kendall discuss the 'problem' of there only being one bed, and shortly afterwards Thornhill tells Kendall 'You're the smartest girl I've ever spent the night with on a train'. In the Spanish version, this is sanitised to become 'You're the smartest girl I've come across in my whole life', while the 'only one bed' exchange is rendered more harmless by Kendall's prefatory statement that he must sleep on the floor (Thornhill: Now, where were we? Kendall: Here. / Thornhill: Bueno, y yo dónde duermo? Kendall: En el suelo.). Likewise, when Kendall later reflects on the encounter, her assertion that 'Last night was last night' becomes 'I still have a very fond memory of our meeting' ('Guardo muy buen recuerdo de nuestro encuentro').

Once Thornhill discovers that Kendall is ostensibly working for Vandamm and that she spent the night with him only so that she could later lead him into a fatal trap, his indignation is extreme. Feeling cheated and insulted, his pride wounded, his insults against her all concern her sexuality, demonstrating his feelings of betrayal at being seduced by someone with ulterior motives: ‘I bet you could tease a man to death without half trying’; ‘She really puts her heart into her work. In fact her whole body’; ‘Are you going to ask this female to kiss me again and poison me to death?’; ‘And what about that treacherous little tramp with him?’; ‘[She uses] sex like some people use a fly-swatter’, etc. Given that such aspersions highlight the extent of their relationship, the Spanish translation is in every case significantly toned down, with words like ‘tease’, ‘body’, and ‘sex’ replaced by the less loaded ‘lead’, ‘heart’, and ‘good looks’.

11.3. Rebel Without a Cause

Rebel Without a Cause was released in the USA in 1955 but only came out in Spain in 1964, and is thus the first of the films under analysis to be released after the beginning of the *apertura* and the publication of the official *Normas de censura*. The contrast between the censorship and translation of this film and the previous Hitchcock films is significant; however, the modifications that there are demonstrate that the approach to censorship was still far from one of ‘anything goes’.

Rebel Without a Cause seems to have greatly benefited from the emphasis in the new set of norms on the allowance of immoral behaviour so long as this is not presented in a ‘justifiable or attractive’ manner. The film is rife with controversial topics – puppy-killing, baby-drowning, familial strife – but presumably the translators believed that they were not depicted ‘in a manner that incites sympathy or triggers a desire to imitate’. As such, much of the potentially controversial dialogue remains unmodified: it is not disguised that Plato shot a litter of puppies, for example, nor that Jim Stark’s family is being ripped apart by arguments and that Jim despises his father. It is possible that some of the factors already mentioned above are in play – the fact that the action clearly takes place in the immoral United States, the sorry, disaffected state of the teenaged protagonists, and the redemptive ending, with the psychopath and closeted homosexual Plato killed by the police, and Jim and Judy set on leaving their old selves behind in order to live a steady life and begin a stable relationship.

The idea that immoral behaviour is allowed in part because it occurs in a foreign country is supported by the modification of Buzz’s and Jim’s dialogue during their knife-fight: rather

than refer to Jim as a toreador (in reference to Jim's failed joke about bulls during a lecture), he refers to him as a *torito*, or little bull, thereby distancing the action from an esteemed Spanish tradition in favour of a less culturally specific term.

With this in mind, then, it is even more surprising that some apparently harmless exchanges should be significantly doctored. It is perhaps unsurprising that Jim Stark's remark to Plato: 'I bet you'd go to a hanging, wouldn't you?' is replaced by the less morbid 'You didn't want to miss the spectacle, right?'; what is more surprising is the heavy modification of Jim and Judy's first conversation. Judy says to Jim, 'You know, I bet you're a real yo-yo,'⁴¹ to which Jim replies with a sarcastic 'I love you too'. In the Spanish version, however, this exchange becomes far more polite: Judy tells Jim that she thinks he's a good guy whom she will like, and Jim replies, with no trace of sarcasm, that he likes her too (JUDY: Sabes una cosa, creo que eres un buen chico y que voy a apreciarte. JIM: Yo también te aprecio a ti). It is already clear at this point that there is an attraction between Jim and Judy, and it seems likely that the translators did not want to depict Jim's being a 'yo-yo' – his drunkenness, his nihilism, his pent-up anger, his hatred of his family – as in any way attractive, in line with items of the *Normas* such as rule number two: 'Evil can be presented as a simple fact or as an element of dramatic conflict, but never as justifiable or attractive, nor in a manner that incites sympathy or triggers a desire to imitate'. Thus far in the film, the viewers have only seen Jim's unhinged behaviour and world-weary outlook bring despair and humiliation to him and his parents, and as such are unlikely to feel his behaviour is worth emulating. However, Judy's words could feasibly be construed as a tacit admiration of his conduct, which in Franco's Spain was naturally to be avoided. What is more, Judy's and Jim's relationship ultimately becomes their saving grace; together, they make an effort to reconnect with their families, leaving their cynical and rebellious behaviour behind. Judy's insult-compliment taints that, rendering their relationship more complicated and their attraction to one another less pure. The same applies to two instances of modification later in the film: when Judy talks to her friends, she does not tell them that Jim is 'a new disease', but simply that he is 'a new neighbour' ('Un vecino nuevo'); and when Jim shows Judy her face in a mirror, rather than ask her 'You want to see a monkey?' he simply tells her that she looks pretty ('Mira qué bonito').

The other most significant modification comes directly after Jim's and Buzz's knife-fight; on seeing that a lecturer and a security officer are watching the fight, one of Buzz's cronies

⁴¹ The Oxford English Dictionary defines 'yo-yo' as a chiefly North American slang term meaning 'a stupid, insane, or unpredictable person'.

suggests that they leave, to which Buzz replies ‘Split for what? A couple of old poopheads?’ In Spanish this becomes ‘Cut him? Why would we get our hands dirty for some schmuck?’ (‘Rajarlo? Para qué vamos a ensuciarnos las manos con un mequetrefe?’). The difference this modification makes is twofold: first, it makes Buzz seem willing to leave the fight at that, rather than eager to continue; and secondly, it renders the dialogue less dismissive of the two authority figures. It seems strange, however, that this should have been deemed worthy of censoring by the translators, when Jim Stark openly attacks and abuses his own father in several other scenes.

Otherwise, it seems, the censors were remarkably lenient: there is one scene, for instance, as Plato is showing Jim and Judy around an abandoned mansion, in which all three of them make a mockery of the institution of marriage, of child-rearing, of exactly the kind of familial model that the Spanish Catholic Church actively promoted. In both versions, children are referred to as tiresome and undesirable, with Jim suggesting that the best way to deal with them is to drown them (‘Drown them like puppies’ / ‘Creo que ahogarlos es lo mejor’). It seems that the only line in this scene that the translators deemed too dangerous was Judy’s assertion that adults ‘tell [children] one thing and mean another’; in Spanish, this is translated as ‘they just order them around’ (‘Sólo se los mandan’).

Another scene that explicitly runs counter to the teachings of the Catholic Church is that in the planetarium, where a lecturer tells his students about the end of the universe, and humanity’s place within it: ‘Destroyed as we began, in a burst of gas and fire [...] Man, existing alone, seems to be an episode of little consequence’. The Spanish translation makes no attempt to modify the sense of this passage; perhaps, again, in the hope that this will be seen as an unfortunate characteristic that paints American schools in a negative light.

11.4. Strangers on a Train

Strangers on a Train’s Spanish release came in 1965, two years after the publication of the *Normas de Censura* (and fourteen years after its original release in the USA). Two of the overriding themes of *Strangers on a Train* are murder and divorce, which perhaps explains why it took so long for its Spanish release to be approved. As with *Rebel Without a Cause*, censorship is again surprisingly lenient; in this case, this is perhaps because most of the questionable acts are committed either by Bruno – who is clearly a psychopath, and who dies at the end of the film – and Miriam, a selfish adulteress who gets murdered while on an outing with two libidinous men.

The *Normas* of 1963, based as they are on a Christian framework, explicitly forbid '[the] justification of divorce as an institution, of adultery, of illicit sexual relations'. The key factor, then, is whether the behaviour presented in the film can be deemed *justifiable* or not. While lines such as 'It's pretty late to start flirting with a discarded husband, especially when you're going to have another man's baby' are certainly scandalous, the behaviour they depict is not justified in any way; on the contrary, Guy's cheating wife Miriam is presented as so conniving, promiscuous, and self-obsessed that her murder comes as a relief. Similarly, though Bruno frequently expresses his murderous hatred for his father – indeed, the whole plot hinges on it – there is no doubt from the very beginning of the film that he is a deluded sociopath. However, when it is Guy, the 'hero' of the film, who is expressing potentially dangerous sentiments, these are for the most part toned down. 'I said I'd like to break her foul, poisonous, useless little neck!', for instance, becomes 'I tell you, I could kill her with my bare hands' (Te digo que le mataría con mis propios manos').

At the same time, little is done to hide the nature of Guy's relationship with Anne Bennet, even though this would, despite Miriam's promiscuity, still constitute adultery. However, it should be remembered that men and woman were held to very different standards; while it may have been unacceptable for a woman to cheat on her husband no matter the circumstances, men's sexual behaviour was generally looked on with a more lenient eye. There is also little done to hide Guy's wish to end his relationship with Miriam even though, in this case, the depiction of their relationship could well be seen as a *justification* of divorce; the only instance of dialogue modified to offset this comes during the scene of Guy's and Bruno's first encounter, when Bruno tells Guy that he considers divorce the *simplest* operation. In Spanish, this is changed to 'I consider divorce *a very simple* operation' ('Considero el divorcio una operación muy sencilla'). For the most part, however, divorce is presented as a necessity, not an evil.

Another element that *Strangers on a Train* has in common with *Rebel Without a Cause* is the disrespect shown to parental figures: while Jim Stark physically abuses his father, Bruno's hatred for his own father is such that he wishes to have him killed. Lines such as 'I hate him too. I tell you, I get so sore at him sometimes that I want to kill him' remain unaltered, as does 'Oh, what's a life or two? Some people are better off dead. Take your wife and my father, for instance'. The *Normas de Censura* of 1963 ban the justification 'of any violation of the institution of marriage and of the family'; again, it is unclear exactly what constitutes a 'justification', but we can assume that Bruno's clear psychopathy coupled with Guy's clear

distaste were sufficient that the censors did not consider such sentiments potentially dangerous. The same applies for Bruno's impertinent and morbid questioning of a judge: 'But tell me, Judge, after you've sentenced a man to the chair, isn't it difficult to go and eat your dinner after that?' is unchanged, as is the statement 'So few murderers are caught'. At first glance this could be seen as a violation of rule fourteen of the *Normas de Censura*, which forbids '[t]he degrading or undignified representation of [...] anything that violates our institutions or ceremonies in any way', given Bruno's implication that the judge should be troubled by a guilty conscience and by his throwing doubt on the efficacy of the justice system; yet once more, it is not Spanish institutions that are being degraded, but American ones, which is entirely in keeping with the 1963 Code.

It is worth noting that there is little of the pre-*apertura* tendency to sanitise individual words as well as the utterance's meaning: the translation of Barbara's unpleasant account of an axe murder remains faithful to the original, as does her father's line 'First thing you know, they'll be talking about orgies' ('Enseguida van a decir que celebramos orgías').

11.5. Final analysis

The application of Descriptive Translation Studies to the study of this period brings significant insight into an area that is otherwise lacking in concrete empirical research, shedding light on what was considered an affront on Francoist norms and values. Yet it also demonstrates the need for many more such studies; while an analysis of four films is enough to illuminate our understanding, it would greatly benefit from other case studies with which to compare it. The broader the scope, the more successfully the goal of DTS can be achieved: namely, not simply to illustrate what we think we already know, but to inform the existing theoretical framework and highlight the need for modification and nuance.

Our research of the Francoist period has made it clear that Franco's Spain underwent a significant political upheaval in the early 1960s, one which many thought would precipitate an upheaval in Spain's patronage system. On the face of it, one might assume that this was achieved. Based on our case study, the censorship practised after 1963 certainly appears less stringent than that before: in purely numerical terms, of those sections we flagged up as potentially contentious, a considerably smaller proportion of those in the post-*apertura* films were significantly modified as compared to the pre-*apertura* films (49.4% of sections pre-*apertura* compared with 28.6% of sections post-*apertura*). Yet in fact, there was no fundamental change to patronage's exercise of control before and after 1962. In Lefevere's

terms, the system remained ‘undifferentiated’ – that is to say, the financial success and social standing of the censor and translator still depended on the degree of his/her conformity to Francoist ideology. Official authorities retained their monopoly on artistic output, and artists were no more able than before to work outside of the prescribed norms.

The difference, then, was not that artists had more freedom to break the rules, but that the rules with which they were forced to comply were themselves less stringent. Our case study provides examples of this newfound leniency: minimal attempts are made to disguise the adultery, divorce, familial hatred, and murder on which *Strangers on a Train* hinges, nor the violence and scandalously anti-authoritarian behaviour in *Rebel Without a Cause* that caused such controversy in relatively liberal and open-minded democracies. While in 1959 words as prosaic as ‘brassiere’ were being censored, in 1965 a respectable character is permitted to talk freely of ‘orgies’.

In this regard it is again worth considering the *skopos* of the translations, their intended aim. One can reasonably conclude from a comparison of the various film translations shown above that the *skopoi* of the American original and Spanish translation diverged further before the *apertura* than they did afterwards. Yet such developments in translation and censorship do not necessarily mean that the new ministers were primarily concerned with bringing about artistic freedom. If we consider translation and censorship within a social and political context, it seems more probable that the Spanish authorities’ aims were to improve their global status and financial situation while silencing some of the voices within Spain clamouring for more liberal policies. Translation is a political process, not merely a linguistic one, and it is essential that such factors are taken into account.

Patronage’s exertion of control depends in large part on the adoption of norms, in Toury’s sense of the word. The Francoist period is an interesting one in this regard, given that there were sets of mandatory written norms that were nonetheless characterised by their arbitrariness. The translations presented above support this criticism. In *Vertigo*, for instance, an apparently harmless section is completely altered: in a discussion between Midge and Scotty about Scotty’s former classmate Gavin Elster, Midge’s remark that ‘He’s probably on the bum and wants to touch you for the price of a drink’ becomes ‘He’s probably depressed and wants to relive better times’ (‘Probablemente estará deprimido y quiere vivir tiempos mejores’), to which Scottie simply replies ‘I’ll invite him for a drink’ (‘Le invitaré a una copa’) rather than ‘Well, I’m on the bum; I’ll buy him a couple of drinks and tell him my troubles’. During the same conversation, ‘That’s Skid Row, isn’t it?’ becomes ‘A bit out of

the way, isn't it?' ('Un poco apartado, verdad?'). Yet just before this exchange, Scotty bluntly asks Midge about her life ('Qué hay de tu vida amorosa, Midge?') and makes explicit and flippant reference to their three-week engagement ('¿Fuimos novios una vez, verdad?').

Similar examples can be seen in *Rebel Without a Cause*: numerous immoral stretches of dialogue survive without modification – Pedro's confession of animal cruelty, Jim's assertion that he wishes his father would punch his mother, etc. – but Judy's telling Jim that he's 'a real yo-yo' is somehow deemed unacceptable. Such discrepancies can be explained in retrospect with reference to the norms of the time, in particular the stipulation of the 1963 *Normas* that immoral behaviour be allowed provided it is not too explicit or incite such behaviour in the viewer; however, artists must have been immensely frustrated by their inability to second-guess the censor's opinion within such a broad framework.

The norms in Franco's society were therefore of principal use to the authorities, and not to the translators and censors themselves. The latter benefit from norms when they can be used as practical decision-making tools, but in Franco's Spain this was not the case: pre-1963, translators and censors were forced to rely a) on their own internalised sense of what was acceptable and b) the written set of *Instrucciones* that were intended primarily for Catholic film journalists; post-1963, the new *Normas de Censura* were worded with sufficient ambiguity that the authorities could permit or reject certain topics and phrases as it suited them. As noted in Section 7.1, this allowed them, for instance, to be more lenient with genres such as the crime drama and the Western, for which there was demand in Spain but which conventionally involved more violence and bad language than was otherwise deemed acceptable (Gubern, 1981: 196). It also meant that the number of controversial films allowed in could be closely controlled, thereby permitting enough contentious material to satisfy the Spanish public and improve Spain's image abroad, without allowing so much as to truly jeopardise domestic morality.

For the most part, this interlingual translation involved a 'domesticating', rather than 'foreignising', approach (as discussed in Section 3.4 and in Venuti, 1995). Examples of domestication, of American values being assimilated into Francoist ideology, abound in the pre-*apertura* films: in *Vertigo*, references to sex, nudity and lingerie are sanitised, the dominant role of the man is affirmed, and references to freedom are toned down. In *North by Northwest*, translators and censors adopt a systematic approach to moderate the sexual element of Kendall and Thornhill's relationship: for instance, Thornhill's recrimination that Kendall '[uses] sex like some people use a fly-swatter' becomes a remark that she '[uses] her

good looks with premeditation and malicious intent' ('usar sus atractivos con premeditación y alevosía'), while his cry of 'If you fellows can't lick the Vandamms without asking girls like her to bed down with them and fly away with them and probably never come back alive, maybe you better start learning to lose a few cold wars!' becomes 'If you can't finish off Vandamm and his gang without asking a woman to fulfil the role, compromising her dignity and her life, it would be better that you start learning to lose the Cold War!' ('Si ustedes no pueden acabar con Vandamm y compañía sin pedirle a una mujer que le resuelva la papeleta comprometiendo su dignidad y su vida, vale más que vayan aprendiendo a perder la guerra fría!'). In this manner, American films with their more liberal 'American' attitudes are appropriated and doctored so as to more closely resemble a Spanish product in line with the Francoist values of chastity, obedience, and female subservience. Foreignising translation, whereby the difference of the source culture is highlighted so as to make the audience more aware of the original film's provenance, is scarce.

This changes after the *apertura*. With the new set of norms, foreignising translation took on a new significance, one that actually aided Francoist Spain in its domesticating agenda (see for example Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 43). The new emphasis that the *Normas de Censura* placed on the importance of *justification* of immorality – and not just its presentation – made it easier for foreign films to depict previously unacceptable behaviour, as this could be explained by the secular or Protagonist society in which this behaviour took place (see for example Gubern, 1981: 141). This is a likely explanation for the inclusion of such questionable behaviour in *Rebel Without a Cause* and *Strangers on a Train*; those responsible for such behaviour are for the most part troubled individuals living in a godless and immoral society (consider for example the professor's nihilistic speech on the futility of human worry and our overwhelming insignificance within an infinite and uncaring universe). The efficacy of this approach, however, is up for debate; in Paz's comprehensive discussion of her 40 in-depth interviews, there is no mention that film-goers of the time felt that foreign cultures or peoples were presented in a negative light; on the contrary, she concludes the very opposite (Paz, 2003: 370).

In short, though our case study indicates that the *apertura* was accompanied by a clear change in censorship practice, a period so characterised by social and political contradictions does not allow for easy generalisations. Though the data does corroborate the theory that the *apertura* was accompanied by a notable relaxation in censorship, there are a number of qualifying factors. One is the introduction of a new age limit: films such as *Rebel Without a Cause* could now be shown to a strictly adult-only audience, reducing the need for such

stringent censorship aimed at protecting Spanish children from unsavoury behaviour. Another was the increasingly popular belief that immorality depicted abroad was of less potential harm to the Spanish state than was immorality depicted in a domestic setting.

What is more, we cannot assume that the motivation behind this newfound leniency was borne entirely of liberal-mindedness and progressive thinking. There were a number of factors that contributed to this change – financial, social, political – one of which was the need to avoid ridicule for allowing in too few films from abroad or for doctoring foreign films beyond recognition (Gutiérrez Lanza, 2002: 152). By this thinking, a small number of controversial films were allowed Spanish release in order to appease the Spanish public and allow Spain to present itself more convincingly as a liberal democracy rather than an authoritarian regime with a chokehold on all media. Spain's improved image would then allow it more influence on a global scale, encouraging tourism and investment and improving Spain's economic situation. Another financially sound reason for allowing in controversial films was, of course, that this would drive up cinema attendance and increase revenue.

Despite the efforts of authorities to highlight that immoral behaviour in foreign films was due to the Protestant morality of the society in question (see for example Gutiérrez Lanza, 2000: 43; Gubern, 1981: 141) it seems that the presentation of foreign values – and in particular American values – did have a gradually liberalising effect on audiences of the time. Vandaele notes that censored versions of Wilder's films 'exposed audiences to the metropolitan atmosphere and lifestyle' in which they took place (Vandaele, 2006: 306), while Paz ends the discussion of her 40 in-depth interviews with the conclusion that '[i]n short, neither nationalism nor censorship could avoid, if such was contemplated, the distribution and largely peaceful acceptance of the values and models displayed by Hollywood in those years' (Paz, 2003: 370). Whether wittingly or unwittingly, then, the political *apertura* and its much-vaunted, albeit limited, relaxation of translation and censorship policies did open up the formerly closed system of Franco's Spain to outside influence, bringing about a slow but gradual change in societal norms.

12. Conclusion

In Chapter 3 of this thesis we set out the theoretical framework. Firstly, we set out the benefits of an approach based on Descriptive Translation Studies, as established by Toury; such an approach has much to contribute to research on this period as it brings to the forefront the actual subjects of discussion, the finished translations themselves. We then went on to give an overview of Lefevere's theory of patronage, Toury's theory of norms, and Venuti's theory of domesticating versus foreignising translation, all of which are applicable to the translation undertaken during this period and which illustrate the nature of the Francoist censorship apparatus.

In Chapter 4 we gave a definition of translation and emphasised that this should by no means be restricted to interlingual textual transfer, but rather encompasses all forms of cultural mediation. Censorship and cultural manipulation are therefore just as much a part of the translation process as is the transfer of the original American text into its Spanish version. We followed this with a discussion of the blurred boundaries between self-censorship and state censorship, and described the fundamental role played by the Catholic Church in the Francoist censorship apparatus.

In Chapter 5 we discussed the advantages of dubbing to an authoritarian, nationalist regime such as Franco's, and outlined the key steps involved in the dubbing process.

Chapter 6 described the political trends and developments in Franco's Spain between 1939 and 1975. Immediately following the Civil War, it was above all Franco's Falangists who wielded the power; however, they were soon usurped by the rising influence of Catholicism, which reached a peak in the 1950s with the religious zeal of Minister Arias-Salgado. This was followed by a re-shuffling of Franco's cabinet in the early 1960s; in an effort to foment tourism and enhance Spain's international standing, more liberal ministers were appointed, among them Minister Fraga Iribarne. Fraga Iribarne oversaw the political and cultural *apertura* as well as the publication of Spain's first official set of censorship norms, the *Normas de Censura* of 1963. The efficacy of the *apertura* is debatable, and its effects were to a large extent undone by the far-right regime that followed Fraga Iribarne's tenure. The arguments surrounding the *apertura*'s consequences were summarised in Chapter 7.

Chapter 8 put the translation of Hollywood films into context by detailing the controversies surrounding Hollywood's 'invasion' of the global film market. Spain was not alone in fearing

that the USA would use its cinematic influence to enforce its own potentially harmful agenda, posing a threat to Spain's domestic film market in the process. In an attempt to keep this under control, Spain imposed strict limits on the import of American films, and even enforced boycotts against certain companies and associations.

Chapter 9 described the case study's methodology: namely, an approach based on Descriptive Translation Studies that analyses the true effects of the *apertura* by comparing the original versions of *Vertigo*, *North by Northwest*, *Rebel Without a Cause*, and *Strangers on a Train* with their Spanish translations. Sections of dialogue were chosen for discussion based on the two most influential sets of written norms: the *Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos* written up by the Catholic Church in 1950, and the official *Normas de censura* of 1963.

Chapter 10 presented the findings of this case study and Chapter 11 analysed the significance of these findings. It was deduced that the *apertura* of 1963 did indeed bring about a relaxation of censorship practice, but that this should not be attributed principally to the liberal-minded, progressive intentions of those in power. Furthermore, the study confirmed that there was a considerable degree of arbitrariness with regard to the norms' application, which must have been a source of great confusion and frustration for censors and translators of the time, and which suggests that the norms were of more use to those implementing them than those forced to abide by them. It was also suggested that there was a shift from an almost entirely 'domesticating' approach to a more 'foreignising' approach that aimed to highlight the moral inferiority of Protestant America; whether or not this was successful is debatable, as there is evidence that exposure to American values gradually led to their adoption by the Spanish public.

Lastly, some suggestions will be made for further study. Though three of the four films analysed are from the same director, they are sufficiently different from one another that the scope for direct comparison is limited. Further studies could analyse different versions of the same film; in some cases, films have been dubbed and re-dubbed four or five times, and a comparison of these renderings would make the changes over the years much more clearly visible. Linder does something of the sort in his study of numerous editions of Chandler's novel *The Big Sleep*; the results give a valuable insight into translational practices and translators' solutions to contentious passages in different time periods and under different ministers.

Subsequent studies might also select more films for analysis; while four films is sufficient to give a limited insight into translational practices of the time, the scope is too small for us to be able to draw truly reliable conclusions. It would also be interesting to see how translations varied from genre to genre, and within the *apertura* period rather than simply before and after its beginning. Given the preoccupation with Spain's image abroad, it also seems likely that famous films – which includes all of the films analysed here – would be treated more leniently than less well-known films, where plot changes might not be so readily noticed. Finally, literature on this period is lacking empirical data comparing the translation and censorship of foreign films with those of Spanish films; an in-depth study of this sort would help to illustrate the assertion that these two practices differed considerably.

It is also worth noting that the films in this case study have been chosen in part because they have not been re-dubbed since their original Spanish release. While there are numerous reasons why a film might not have been re-dubbed, one of them is that the original dubbing might be deemed sufficiently 'faithful' to the original film that no further dubbed version is necessary. This in turn suggests that the films chosen for our case study might have suffered less harsh censorship than others of the same time period.

In Section 3.1 we noted that Toury talks of translation processes as being 'only indirectly available for study as a kind of "black box", an open system whose internal structure can only be guessed at, or tentatively reconstructed'; the best we can do is to reconstruct this process 'on the basis of the relationships between the respective observable input and output, with the aid of further theoretical assumptions and hypotheses' (Toury, 1982: 25). In this light, it should be reiterated that no case study can be entirely objective: in this case study, the choice of films for study, the selection of sections for discussion, and the judgement as to what constitutes a 'change' all inevitably entail a degree of subjectivity. Similarly, other researchers may form a different hypothesis as to what motivated the translators and censors to make such changes.

13. Appendix

13.1. Instrucciones y normas para la censura moral de espectáculos

(Originally published in *Ecclesia*, 17 February 1950 and 4 March 1950; reproduced in Gutierrez de Terán, 2011: 198-200.)

1. Todos incluso niños
2. Jóvenes
3. Mayores
- 3R. Mayores, con reparos
4. Gravemente peligrosa

En relación con el argumento, las películas calificadas con 1 no deben contener “vicios o personajes viciosos, escenas o pasajes truculentos, de miedo, presentación de vampiros, robos, duelos, salvo en caso de ser elementos cómicos o grotescos. En ningún caso actos o muertos violentos, suicidio, asesinato, tramas exclusivamente amorosas o con algún pasaje sensual.” Eso sí puede tolerarse alguna escena amorosa pasajera si está presentada con absoluta honestidad. También se permiten tramas de aventuras que no sean “excesivamente truculentas o violentas”.

Respecto a las películas con calificación 2, “no deben contener – a no ser para condenarlos – el divorcio, la vagancia, embriaguez o el hurto habituales, el suicidio, asesinato y en general vicios o personajes viciosos, tramas amorosas, pasionales o sensuales, amor libre, adulterio, vestidos provocativos, concepto frívolo de matrimonio, seducción, diálogos groseros o impúdicos, frases sugerentes o picarescas, de doble sentido, gestos obscenos o provocativos, incitación a la vagancia y al rencor, reiterada desobediencia a los padres, o independencia y desunión familiar. Deben rechazarse las películas [...] que presenten al delincuente desde un punto de vista simpático o atrayente, y asimismo cualquier idea, tendencia o frase de carácter antipatriótico.” Añade asimismo que “pueden tolerarse los argumentos amorosos correctamente expuestos y aludir ligeramente al vicio exponiéndolo en forma discreta y condenándolo siempre, bien con el desprecio o la desestimación, [o] con el castigo de la justicia humana. Puede tolerarse hechos o muertes violentos en aquellas tramas de aventuras propias del género policiaco [...] sin que constituyan la finalidad del espectáculo [...]

La calificación 3 se refiere a películas para adultos, pero que no presentan “apetitos carnales, sensualidad o argumentos amorosos desordenados con escenas o pasajes crudamente expuestos.” Tampoco deben representarse personajes que protagonicen situaciones como perversiones, prostitución, violaciones... y deben evitarse vestidos provocativos en extremo, diálogos incitantes, y ambientes o actores contrarios a la Patria o a sus instituciones fundamentales. Pero sí se toleran argumentos fuertes si se exponen con decoro y sin alabar el vicio. Por tanto se tolera el divorcio, el amor libre, la embriaguez y la vagancia, la drogadicción... si se presentan sin innecesaria explicitud. También se permite una cierta sensualidad no reiterada, y mostrar ambientes “modernistas, que no pugnen con nuestra psicología y costumbres cristianas”.

Por fin llegamos a la calificación 3R que alude a cualquier película en que se sobrepasen los límites anteriormente descritos, pero – y esto es importante – siempre “según el juicio de la observación directa y del criterio de los críticos”.

La calificación 4 se refiere a películas en las que los reparos anteriores adquieran caracteres de violencia, crudeza o desenfreno, así como irreverencia religiosa, anticlericalismo, falso misticismo o antipatriotismo declarado.

13.2. Orden de 9 de febrero de 1963

(Agencia Estatal Boletín Oficial del Estado, No. 58, 8 March 1963)

Primera: Cada película se deberá juzgar, no sólo en sus imágenes o escenas singulares, sino de modo unitario, en relación con la totalidad de su contenido y según las características de los distintos géneros y estilos cinematográficos. Si una película, en su conjunto, se considera gravemente peligrosa, será prohibida antes que autorizarla con alteraciones o supresiones que la modifiquen de manera sustancial.

Segunda: El mal se puede presentar como simple hecho o como elemento de conflicto dramático, pero nunca como justificable o apetecible, ni de manera que suscite simpatía o despierte deseo de imitación.

Tercera: La presentación de las circunstancias que puedan explicar humanamente una conducta moralmente reprochable deberá hacerse de forma que ésta no aparezca ante el espectador como objetivamente justificada.

Cuarta: La película debe conducir, lógicamente, a una reprobación del mal, considerado, al menos, como atentado contra los principios de la moral natural, pero no es necesario que esa reprobación se muestre explícitamente en la pantalla si se dan elementos suficientes para que pueda producirse en la conciencia del espectador.

Quinta: La reprobación del mal no se asegura siempre de manera suficiente con una condena en los últimos planos o hecha de modo accidental o marginal; tampoco exige, necesariamente, el arrepentimiento del malhechor ni su fracaso humano o externo. Es conveniente que el mal esté contrapesado por el bien durante el desarrollo de la acción.

Sexta: No hay razón para prohibir la presentación de las lacras individuales o sociales, ni para evitar lo que produzca malestar en el espectador al mostrarle la degradación y el sufrimiento ajenos, si se obedece a los principios de una crítica rectamente hecha y no se atenta a lo dispuesto en estas Normas.

Séptima: No hay razón para prohibir un cine que se limite a plantear problemas auténticos, aunque no les dé plena solución, con tal que no prejuzgue una conclusión inaceptable, según estas Normas.

Octava: Se prohibirá:

1º. La justificación del suicidio.

2º. La justificación del homicidio por piedad.

3º. La justificación de la venganza y del duelo. No se excluirá su presentación como simples hechos en relación con costumbres sociales de épocas o lugares determinados, siempre que se evite una justificación objetiva y general.

4º. La justificación del divorcio como institución, del adulterio, de las relaciones sexuales ilícitas, de la prostitución y, en general, de cuanto atente contra la institución matrimonial y contra la familia.

5º. La justificación del aborto y de los métodos anticonceptivos.

Novena: Se prohibirá:

1º. La presentación de las perversiones sexuales como eje de la trama y aun con carácter secundario a menos que en este último caso esté exigida por el desarrollo de la acción y ésta tenga una clara y predominante consecuencia moral.

2º: La presentación de la toxicomanía y del alcoholismo, hecha de manera notoriamente inductiva.

3º La presentación del delito en forma que, por su carácter excesivamente pormenorizado, constituya una divulgación de medios y procedimientos delictivos.

Décima: Se prohibirán aquellas imágenes y escenas que puedan provocar bajas pasiones en el espectador normal y las alusiones hechas de tal manera que resulten más sugerentes que la presentación del mismo hecho.

Undécima: Se respetará la intimidad del amor conyugal, prohibiendo las imágenes y escenas que la ofendan.

Duodécima: Se prohibirán las imágenes y escenas de brutalidad, de crueldad hacia personas o animales, y de terror, presentadas de manera morbosa o injustificada en relación con las características de la trama y del género cinematográfico correspondiente, y, en general, las que ofendan a la dignidad de la persona humana.

Decimotercera: Se prohibirán las expresiones coloquiales y las escenas o planos de carácter íntimo que atenten contra las más elementales normas del buen gusto.

Decimocuarta: Se prohibirán:

1º La presentación irrespetuosa de creencias y prácticas religiosas.

2º La representación denigrante o indigna de ideologías políticas y todo lo que atente de alguna manera contra instituciones o ceremonias. En cuanto a la presentación de los personajes, ha de quedar suficientemente clara para los espectadores la distinción entre la conducta de los personajes y lo que representan.

3º El falseamiento tendencioso de los hechos, personajes y ambientes históricos.

Decimoquinta: Se prohibirán las películas que propugnen el odio entre pueblos, razas o clases sociales o que defiendan, como principio general, la división y el enfrentamiento, en el orden moral y social, de unos hombres contra otros.

Decimosexta: Se prohibirán las películas cuyas tesis nieguen el deber de defender la Patria y el derecho a exigirlo.

Decimoséptima: Se prohibirá cuanto atente de alguna manera contra: 1°. La Iglesia Católica, su dogma, su moral y su culto.

2°: Los principios fundamentales del Estado, la dignidad nacional y la seguridad interior o exterior del país.

3° La persona del Jefe del Estado.

Decimoctava: Cuando la acumulación de escenas o planos que en sí mismos no tengan gravedad, cree, por la reiteración, un clima lascivo, brutal, grosero o morboso, la película será prohibida.

Decimonovena: Cuando las películas se vayan a proyectar exclusivamente ante públicos minoritarios, las anteriores Normas se interpretarán con la amplitud debida, conforme el grado de preparación presumible en dichos públicos. Las películas blasfemas, pornográficas y subversivas se prohibirán para cualquier público.

Vigésima novena: En casos excepcionales se prohibirán los títulos de las películas que en sí mismos vulneren lo dispuesto en estas Normas o que desorienten a los espectadores, con daño moral de éstos, sobre el contenido real de las películas.

14. Bibliography

Abellán, Manuel L. 1980. *Censura y Creación Literaria en España (1939-1976)*. Barcelona: Peninsula.

Auiler, Dan. 2000. *Vertigo: The Making of a Hitchcock Classic*. New York: Macmillan.

Ávila, Alejandro. 1996. *La Censura del Doblaje Cinematográfico en España*. Barcelona: Cima Libros C. Global.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2006. *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Barbal, Gloria. 2008. Un Bergman “a la española”: Traducción y Censura de *El Séptimo Sello*. In: Seruya, Teresa (ed.) *Translation and censorship in different times and landscapes*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 119-130.

Bardem, Juan Antonio. 1955. La Princesa de Éboli. *Objetivo 5*, 35-56.

Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation Studies*. London, New York: Psychology Press.

Batlogg, Aurelia. 2008. Ich, wir, und die anderen: Wissenschaftskommuniktion als Translation. In: Kaiser-Cooke, Michèle (ed.) *Das Entenprinzip. Translation aus Neuen Perspektiven*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 143-196.

Besas, Peter. 1985. *Behind the Spanish Lens*. Denver: Arden Press.

Black, Gregory. 1998. *The Catholic Crusade Against The Movies, 1940-1975*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Camus Camus, Carmen. 2010. Censorship in the translations and pseudo-translations of the West. In: Gile, Daniel, Hansen, Gyde & Pokorn, Nike K. (eds.) *Why Translation Studies Matters*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 41-55.

Carr, Raymond / Juan Pablo Fusi Aizpurna. 1979. *Spain: from Dictatorship to Democracy*. London: George Allen.

Colmenero Martínez, Ricardo. 2014. Iglesia católica y cine en el franquismo. *Historia Actual Online* 35 (3), 143-151.

Cones, John W. 2013. *Dictionary of Film Finance and Distribution: A Guide for Independent Filmmakers*. New York: Algora Publishing.

Crusells, Magí. 2011. Franco, un dictador de película: nuevas aportaciones a Raza. E-archivo, Centre d'Investigacions Film-Història, Universitat de Barcelona.

http://e-archivo.uc3m.es/bitstream/handle/10016/11317/franco_crusells_CIHC_2010.pdf

Danan, Martine. 1991. Dubbing as an Expression of Nationalism. *Meta : journal des traducteurs*, 36 (4), 606-614.

De Geest, Dirk. 1992. The Notion of 'System': Its Theoretical Importance and its Methodological Implications for a Functionalist Translation Theory. In: Kittel, Harald (ed.) *Geschichte, System, Literarische Übersetzung / Histories, Systems, Literary Translations*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 32-45.

Diez Puertas, Emeterio. 2003. *Historia Social del Cine en España*. Madrid: Fundamentos.

Doherty, Thomas. 2009. *Hollywood's Censor: Joseph I. Breen and the Production Code Administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ebert, Roger. 2004. Strangers on a Train. <http://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/great-movie-strangers-on-a-train-1951> (accessed 20/05/2016).

Ecelza, Antonio. 1963. Consideraciones en torno a un año de exhibición. *Nuestro Cine* 25, 20-23.

Fawcett, John. 1995. Translation and power play. *The Translator* 1:2, 177-192.

Freedman, Jonathan (ed.). 2015. *The Cambridge Companion to Alfred Hitchcock*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gil, Alberto. 2009. *Censura Cinematografica en España*. Barcelona: Eds. B.

Gottlieb, Sidney (ed.). 1995. *Hitchcock on Hitchcock : Selected Writings and Interviews*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Guback, Thomas H. 1969. *The International Film Industry: Western Europe and America since 1945*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Gubern, Román. 1976. Notas para una historia de la censura cinematográfica en España (1937-1974). In: Gubern, Román & Font, Domènec (eds.) *Un Cine para el Cadalso*, Barcelona: Euros, 15-182.

Gubern, Román. 1981. *La Censura : Función Política y Ordenamiento Jurídico bajo el Franquismo (1936-1975)*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península.

Gutierrez de Terán, Juan Orellana. 2011. *Como en un Espejo: Drama Humano y Sentido Religioso en el Cine Contemporáneo*. Madrid: Encuentro.

Gutiérrez Lanza, Camino. 1997. Leyes y criterios de censura en la España franquista: traducción y recepción de textos literarios. In: Vega, Miguel Ángel & Martín-Gaitero, Rafael (eds.) *La Palabra Certida - Investigaciones en torno a la Traducción*. Madrid: Ed. Complutense, 283-289.

Gutiérrez Lanza, Camino. 2000. Proteccionismo y censura durante la etapa franquista: Cine nacional, cine traducido y control estatal. In: Rabadán, Rosa (ed.) *Traducción y censura inglés-español: 1939-1985*. León: Universidad de León, 23-57.

Gutiérrez Lanza, Camino. 2002. Spanish film translation and cultural patronage: the filtering and manipulation of imported material during Franco's dictatorship. In: Tymoczko, Maria (ed.) *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 141-160.

Gutiérrez Lanza, Camino. 2011. Censors and censorship boards in Franco's Spain (1950s - 1960s): an overview based on the TRACE cinema catalogue. In: Asimakoulas, Dimitris & Rogers, Margaret (ed.) *Translation and Opposition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 305-321.

Hayes, David P. *The Motion Picture Production Code*. http://productioncode.dhwritings.com/multipleframes_productioncode.php (accessed 23/05/2016).

Herederó, Carlos F. 1993. *Las Huellas del Tiempo: Cine Español, 1951–1961*. Valencia: Archivo de la Filmoteca de la Generalitat Valenciana.

Hermans, Theo. 1991. Translational Norms and Correct Translations. In: Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty & Naaijken, Ton (eds.) *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: John Benjamins, 155-170.

Hermans, Theo. 2009. Translation, Ethics, Politics. In: Munday, Jeremy (ed.) *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 93-106.

Hermans, Theo. 2014. *Manipulation of Literature*. Oxon: Routledge.

Kinder, Marsha. 1993. *Blood Cinema: the Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Kuhiwczak, Piotr. 2009. Censorship as a collaborative project: A systemic approach. In: Ní Chuilleanáin, Eiléan (ed.) *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 46-56.

Lefevre, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Oxon: Routledge.

Linder, Daniel. 2004. The Censorship of Sex: A Study of Raymond Chandler's *The Big Sleep* in Franco's Spain. *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction: Translations and Representations: Exploring the Hispanic World* 17:1, 155-182.

Lodge, Jack (ed.). 1992. *Hollywood: 60 Great Years*. London: Prion Books.

Martínez, Xènia. 2004. Film dubbing: Its process and translation. In: Orero, Pilar (ed.) *Topics in Audiovisual Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-9.

- Martínez Bretón, Juan Antonio. 1988. *La Influencia de la Iglesia Católica en la Cinematografía Española (1951-62)*. Madrid: Harofarma.
- McGregor, Alexander. 2013. *The Catholic Church and Hollywood: Censorship and Morality in 1930s Cinema*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Merino, Raquel & Rabadán, Rosa. 2002. Censored Translations in Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project — Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish). *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction: Censorship and Translation in the Western World* 15:2, 125-152.
- Merkle, Denise. 2004. *External and Internal Pressures on the Translator: Relationship to Censorship*. www.aile-icla.org/2004/Denise%20Merkle.doc (accessed 18 May, 2016).
- Miguel González, Marta. El cine de Hollywood y la censura franquista en la España de los 40: un cine bajo palio. In: Rabadán, Rosa (ed.) *Traducción y Censura Inglés-español: 1939-1985*. León: Universidad de León, 61-86.
- Neuschäfer, Hans-Jörg. 1994. *Adiós a la España Eterna*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Nikkhah, Roya. To cut or not to cut – a censor's dilemma. *The Telegraph*, 21 June 2009. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/film-news/5586314/To-cut-or-not-to-cut-a-censors-dilemma.html>
- Nye, Joseph S. 2004. *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Paz, María Antonia. 2003. The Spanish remember: movie attendance during the Franco dictatorship, 1943–1975. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 23:4, 357-374.
- Pegenaute, Luis. 1999. *Censoring Translation and Translation as Censorship: Spain under Franco*. Leuven: KU Leuven.
- Peréz Merinero, Carlos & Pérez Merinero, David. 1975. *Cine y Control*. Madrid: Miguel Castellote.

Pisek, Gerhard. 1994. *Die große Illusion: Probleme und Möglichkeiten der Filmsynchronisation*. Trier: WVT, Wiss. Verlag.

Rabadán, Rosa. 2000. Con orden y concierto: la censura franquista y las traducciones inglesas-españolas 1939-85. In: Rabadán, Rosa (ed.) *Traducción y Censura Inglés-Español: 1939-1985*. León: Universidad de León, 13-22.

Randall, Richard S. 1970. *Censorship of the Movies: the Social and Political Control of a Mass Medium*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Rosendorf, Neal Moses. 2007. 'Hollywood In Madrid': American Film Producers and the Franco Regime, 1950–1970. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 27:1, 77-109.

Rowe, Thomas. 1960. The English Dubbing Text. *Babel*, 6 (3), 116-120.

Scheuer, Philip. *Vertigo* Induces Same in Watcher. *Los Angeles Times* (29 May, 1958).

Schmid, Benjamin. 2008. A duck in rabbit's clothing - integrating intralingual translation. In: Kaiser-Cooke, Michèle (ed.) *Das Entenprinzip. Translation aus Neuen Perspektiven*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 19-74.

Segrave, Kerry. 1997. *American Films Abroad. Hollywood's Domination of the World's Movie Screens*. North Carolina: McFarland and Company.

Slocum, J. David. 2005. *Rebel Without a Cause: Approaches to a Maverick Masterwork*. New York: SUNY Press.

Sturge, Kate. 1999a. "A danger and a veiled attack" - translating into Nazi Germany. In: Boase-Beier, Jean & Holman, Michael (eds.) *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*. Manchester: St Jerome, 135-146.

Sturge, Kate. 1999b. *"The Alien Within": Translation into German during the Nazi Regime*. London: University College London.

- Thompson, Kristin. 1985. *Exporting Entertainment: America in the World Film Market, 1907-1934*. London: BFI.
- Toury, Gideon. 1982. A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies. *Dispositio* 7:19/21, 23–39.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins (Benjamins Translation Library 4).
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. The nature and role of norms in translation. In: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 168-182.
- Truffaut, Francois. 1966. *Hitchcock*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2009. Censorship and self-censorship in translation: Ethics and ideology, resistance and collusion. In: Ní Chuilleanáin, Eiléan (ed.) *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 46-56.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. 2006. Take three: the National Catholic versions of Billy Wilder's Broadway adaptations. In: Billiani, Francesca (ed.) *Modes of Censorship and Translation*. Manchester: Jerome Publishing, 279-310.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. 2010. It was what it wasn't. In: Rundle, Christopher & Sturge, Kate (eds.) *Translation under Fascism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 84-116.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, Hans. 2012. Skopos and Commission in Translation Theory. Translated by Andrew Chesterman. In: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 183-191.
- Vernon, Kathleen. Re-viewing the Spanish Civil War: Franco's film *Raza*. *Film and History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies* 16:2, 26-34.
- Whitman-Linsen, Candace. 1992. *Through the Dubbing Glass: the Synchronization of American Motion Pictures into German, French and Spanish*. Frankfurt am Main; Wien: Lang.

Abstract

From 1939 to 1975, Spain was under the control of Francisco Franco and his right-wing party *FET y de las JONS*. During this period, all films underwent strict censorship to ensure that they aligned with Francoist ideals. However, 1963 was marked by a liberalisation of Spanish policy and a relaxation of censorship laws; this period was known as the *apertura*, or opening. This thesis first lays out the theoretical framework, based on Toury's theory of norms, Lefevere's theory of patronage, and Venuti's theory of domesticating and foreignising translation; it also makes the argument that translation encompasses all forms of cultural mediation, including censorship and cultural appropriation. The complex relationship between censorship and dubbing is then outlined, as are the political developments surrounding Francoist censorship policies and Hollywood's presence in Francoist Spain. Using an approach based on Descriptive Translation Studies, the thesis then assesses the impact of the *apertura* on the translation and censorship of foreign films by analysing the Spanish translations of four Hollywood films released around this time: *Vertigo*, *North by Northwest*, *Rebel Without a Cause*, and *Strangers on a Train*. This case study indicates that there was indeed a relaxation of translation and censorship policies following 1963. However, this should not simply be seen as a sign of cultural liberalisation; a period so characterised by social and political contradictions does not allow for easy generalisations.

Zusammenfassung

Von 1939 bis 1975 wurde Spanien von Francisco Franco und seiner rechtsextremen Partei *FET y de las JONS* regiert. Während dieser Periode wurden alle Filme streng zensiert, damit sie der Franco-Ideologie entsprachen; doch 1963 kam eine Liberalisierung der spanischen Politik und damit auch der Zensurgesetze. Diese Periode wurde die *apertura*, 'Öffnung', genannt. Zuerst legt diese These das Theorierahmen fest; dieses basiert auf Tourys Normensystem sowie Lefeveres Theorie von *Patronage* und die von Venuti entwickelten Begriffe 'domestication' (Domestizierung) und 'foreignisation' (Verfremdung). Es wird argumentiert, dass alle Arten kultureller Mediation, auch Zensur und kulturelle Aneignung, als 'Übersetzen' beschrieben werden können. Dann wird das komplexe Verhältnis zwischen Zensur und Synchronisierung beschrieben, sowie die politischen Entwicklungen rundum die Franco-Zensurpolitik und die Präsenz von Hollywood in Francos Spanien. Ein auf DTS basierter Vorgang wird dann verwendet, um die Wirkung der *apertura* auf die Zensur und das Übersetzen ausländischer Filme zu analysieren. Dabei werden die spanischen Versionen vier Hollywood-Films studiert: *Vertigo*, *North by Northwest*, *Rebel Without a Cause*, und *Strangers on a Train*. Diese Studie deutet an, dass es doch eine Lockerung der Übersetzungs- und Zensurpolitik nach 1963 gab; diese kann aber nicht einfach als ein Zeichen kultureller Liberalisierung gesehen werden, denn eine Periode, die so stark von sozialen und politischen Widersprüchen geprägt wird, ermöglicht keine trivialen Verallgemeinerungen.