# AUTHORSHIP AND THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL CINEMA IN SPAIN

MARVIN D'LUGO*

In a recent issue of *Film Quarterly*, James Naremore observes the ironic state of film studies when referring to the question of cinematic authorship:

> [E]ven though the generation of '68 produced some of the most valuable and brilliantly iconoclastic writing in the history of film, they never really dispensed with authorship. They may have tried, in Foucault's famous phrase, to "imagine a world in which it does not matter who is speaking," but clearly they didn't live in such a world. For every "great man" they tried to kill off in the realm of naive consumption, they created another in the realm of theory, producing a kind of academic star system. Meanwhile, figures like Hitchcock and Sirk continued to serve important functions for [the British film journal] *Screen*, just as Balzac and Flaubert served important functions for Roland Barthes.[1]

It is this "function" of authorship that, as Naremore says, has been largely ignored in critical discourse on film, giving the false impression that the cinematic author is a "dead subject."[2] Pointing to the international contexts within which certain aspects of the issues of film authorship arise, Naremore notes the essential contradictions that appear to lie at the heart of authorship and which therefore sustain it as a theme of film scholarship.[3] The objective of this essay is to explore some of those contradictory spaces within which the cultural politics of authorship have operated, and to delineate an area that film theory has conveniently suppressed from consideration. My specific objective is to draw attention to the ways in which the idea of cinematic authorship may be applied productively to a rigorous revaluation of the concept of national cinema.

As Foucault argues in his seminal essay, *What is an Author?*,[4]

* Professor of Spanish & Director of Screen Studies, Clark Unviersity. A.B., 1965, Brooklyn College; A.M., 1967, Ph.D., 1970, University of Illinois.

[1] James Naremore, *Authorship and the Cultural Politics of Film Criticism*, FILM Q., Fall 1990, at 20.

[2] *Id.*

[3] *Id.* at 21.

[4] Michel Foucault, *What Is An Author?*, *in* LANGUAGE, COUNTER-MEMORY, PRACTICE 113 (Donald F. Bouchard ed. & Sherry Simon et al. trans., 1977).

> [T]he author's name characterizes a particular manner of existence of discourse. Discourse that possesses an author's name is not to be immediately consumed and forgotten; neither is it accorded the momentary attention given to ordinary, fleeting words. Rather, its status and its manner of reception are regulated by the culture in which it circulates.[5]

The author's name is what Foucault would call a "discursive function," privileging certain categories of textuality over others, imbuing those privileged texts with a value that, as he observes, has a particular function and modality within the cultures where those discourses circulate:

> [U]nlike a proper name, which moves from the interior of a discourse to the real person outside who produced it, the name of the author remains at the contours of texts—separating one from the other, defining their form, and characterizing their mode of existence . . . a private letter may have a signatory, but it does not have an author; a contract can have an underwriter, but not an author; and, similarly, an anonymous poster attached to a wall may have a writer, but he cannot be an author. In this sense, the function of an author is to characterize the existence, circulation, and operation of certain discourses within a society.[6]

In film studies, the critical attention paid to theories of authorship has almost never confronted with any seriousness either the issue of such discursive privilege, or the matter of that process of circulation of which Foucault speaks. Rather, it has emphasized issues of textuality over the contexts of cinematic discourse. The history of the idea of authorship, or auteurism, has been marked by a pendulum swing away from an initial romanticized cult of individual authors to efforts aimed at the analysis of the cinematic apparatus and its mobilization of subjectivity derived from Sausserian linguistics, Althusserian Marxism, and Lacanian psychoanalysis, leading finally to the apparent disappearance of the author from film scholarship. But in fact, as Naremore contends, the author has never really disappeared but has been metamorphosed into other types of critical discourse.

The "golden age" of much of the theoric discussion of authorship in film runs from the mid-1960s well into the 1970s. The product of that scholarship was a canon of auteur studies focusing primarily on a number of directors identified with the

---

[5] *Id.* at 123.
[6] *Id.* at 123-24.

Hollywood studio system or with European or "art" cinema. The notion of cinematic authorship first gained currency in France during the period immediately following World War II, in the pages of *La Revue de Cinéma*, and was followed in the 1950s by the rise of a polemical movement in favor of auteur criticism launched by the editors of *Cahiers du Cinéma*. In the second issue of *La Revue*, an article appeared entitled "*La création doit être l'ouvrage d'un seul.*"[7] As Edward Buscombe points out, part of the project of *La Revue* was to raise the cultural status of cinema by making the case that film was an art form and, like painting, offered the possibility of individual expression.[8]

Francois Truffaut's 1954 essay in *Cahiers du Cinema*, entitled "*Une certaine tendance du cinéma français*,"[9] advocated an even more strident attitude that Truffaut called "*la politque des auteurs*." Focusing on the unity of a cinematic work produced by the personality of its creative auteur, the *Cahiers* position, as elaborated by Truffaut, was an attack on the tradition of French "cinema of quality," which stressed the importance of script writing and literariness as central to the cinematic enterprise, thereby eclipsing other elements specific to the cinematic medium. The politics of authorship was intended to redress this imbalance by focusing on the centrality of more cinematically specific qualities. Thus, the *Cahiers* group opposed the tradition of French art cinema by emphasizing the achievement of decidedly populist and popular Hollywood film directors: Alfred Hitchcock, Howard Hawks, John Ford, and Orson Welles. In the hands of the editors of *Cahiers*, auteurism was, as Buscombe points out, somewhat less than a theory.[10] It was, rather, a polemical position that served to engage other critics and audiences in the appreciation of the cinematic qualities of films.

On this side of the Atlantic, Andrew Sarris's hyperbolic embrace of "*la politique des auteurs*" did as much to popularize the idea of auteurism as to mystify it.[11] It was Sarris, for example, who, in his essay *Notes on the auteur theory in 1962*,[12] first coined the phrase "auteur theory." This theory consists of a number of ten-

---

7 Edward Buscombe, *Ideas of Authorship*, SCREEN, Autumn 1973, at 75, *reprinted in* THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP 22 (John Caughie ed., 1981).

8 *Id.* at 22-23.

9 Francois Truffaut, *Une certaine tendance du cinéma français*, CAHIERS DU CINÉMA, Jan. 1954, at 9.

10 Buscombe, *supra* note 7, at 22-23.

11 *See* Andrew Sarris, *Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962*, FILM CULTURE, Winter 1962-63, *reprinted in* THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP 64 (John Caughie ed., 1981).

12 *Id.* at 62.

ets. First, "[o]ver a group of films, a director must exhibit certain recurring characteristics of style, which serve as his signature. The way a film looks and moves should have some relationship to the way a director thinks and feels."[13] Secondly, "[t]he *auteur* theory values the personality of a director precisely because of the barriers to its expression. It is as if a few brave spirits had managed to overcome the gravitational pull of the mass of movies."[14]

Of the many romantic notions of cinematic authorship to which Sarris's theory lay claim, the most interesting from the standpoint of the subsequent circulation of authorial discourse was his view of the cinematic author as an oppositional figure. Sarris recognized the industrial structure of the film industry not merely as an "interference" to the filmmaker's creativity, but as an essential element in a tension between the author and his material, a tension that, as John Caughie says, "comes to structure the 'interior meaning' of the film."[15] Sarris writes: "Because so much of the American cinema is commissioned, a director is forced to express his personality through the visual treatment of material rather than through the literary content of the material."[16]

In the post-1968 period, the idea of the cinematic auteur was increasingly seen as an embarrassingly romantic indulgence. As students of film looked for a more intellectual, if not a more scientific, approach to the cinema, the auteur theory underwent a series of transformations that finally yielded a methodologically more respectable, and presumably more coherent, approach to cinematic analysis. The principal apologist of this new auteurism was the English theorist and film writer, Peter Wollen, whose treatment of auteurism in the 1972 postscript to his book, *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*, marked the conversion of the idea of cinematic author into something akin to a theory. Wollen wrote:

> To my mind, the *auteur* theory actually represents a radical break with the idea of an 'art' cinema, not the transplant of traditional ideas about 'art' into Hollywood. The 'art' cinema is rooted in the idea of creativity and the film as the expression of an individual vision. What the *auteur* theory argues is that any film, certainly a Hollywood film, is a network of different

---

[13] *Id.* at 64.

[14] Andrew Sarris, *Toward a Theory of Film History*, FILM CULTURE, Spring 1963, *reprinted in* THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP 65 (John Caughie ed., 1981).

[15] *Id.*

[16] Caughie, *supra* note 7, at 64.

> statements, crossing and contradicting each other, elaborated into a final 'coherent' version. Like a dream, the film the spectator sees is, so to speak, the 'film facade,' the end-product of 'secondary revision,' which hides and masks the process which remains latent in the film 'unconscious'. . . by a process of comparison with other films, it is possible to decipher, not a coherent message or world-view, but a structure which underlies the film and shapes it, gives it a certain pattern of energy cathexis. It is this structure which *auteur* analysis disengages from the film.
>
> The structure is associated with a single director, an individual, not because he has played the role of artist, expressing himself or his own vision in the film, but because it is through the force of his preoccupations that an unconscious, unintended meaning can be decoded in the film, usually to the surprise of the individual involved. The film is not a communication, but an artefact which is unconsciously structured in a certain way. *Auteur* analysis does not consist of retracing a film to its origins, to its creative source. It consists of tracing a structure (not a message) within the work, which can then *post factum* be assigned to an individual, the director, on empirical grounds.[17]

Wollen's view of auteurism wrested away from the text the very condition of creativity that had for the French cinephiles established the basis of the film as a work of art, namely the status of the filmmaker as artist. In its place, the apparent subjectivity of the artist was transformed into a range of cultural and ideological codes whose decipherment was achieved through recourse to the systematicity of particular methodological practices: Saussurian linguistics, Marxism, or psychoanalysis. In principle, such a revision would appear to posit the question of the relation of textual practices, here codified in the name of the author, to the larger ideological framework of the social order within which such texts arise and circulate. But in Wollen's approach, and that of others who followed his lead, questions of cinematic authorship henceforth became almost exclusively questions of institutional or textual practice informed by a progressively more elaborate theoretic apparatus that either ignored or supressed the name of the author. The critical animosity to the "name of the author" is perhaps most pointedly expressed in Stephen Heath's 1972 essay in *Screen,* "Comments on the 'Idea of Author-

[17] PETER WOLLEN, SIGNS AND MEANING IN THE CINEMA 167-68 (1972), *reprinted in* Caughie, *supra* note 7, at 146.

ship,' "[18] which is a response to Edward Buscombe's earlier essay on *auteurism*. Heath observes:

> The function of the author (the effect of the idea of authorship) is a function of unity; the use of the notion of the author involves the organisation of the film (as 'work') and, in so doing, it avoids—this is indeed its function—the thinking of the articulation of the film text in relation to ideology . . . (the modes of subject-ivity); it thus allows at once the articulation of contradictions in the film text other than in relation to an englobing consciousness, in relation now, that is, to a specific historico-social process, and the recognition of a heterogeneity of structures, codes, languages at work in the film and of the particular positions of the subject they impose.[19]

Ironically, as the critical practice of auteurism came under increasingly more strident attack during the 1970s, the intensive critical and theoretic revision of the films of Alfred Hitchcock began to emerge around psychoanalytic feminist film theory.[20] Such critical discourse, while seldom acknowledging its relation to auteurism, effectively resemanticized auteur studies into a broader critical discourse. Canonical film theory thus succeeded in the seemingly contradictory task of suppressing auteurism while salvaging the author. While the critical dissent against the earlier notion of the cinematic auteur had largely been silenced, the very idea of film authorship had obviously not abated and, according to Naremore, even seemed to flourish.[21]

Since the seventies, the exploration of authorship appears to have resurfaced in film scholarship in a variety of ways. Thomas Schatz, in *The Genius of the System*, proposed that the critical focus in American film history should be on the role of the movie mogul in the development of studio styles.[22] Another example is the study of independent filmmakers and theorists, such as Jean-Luc Goddard and Pier Paolo Pasolini, who represent alternatives to dominant American cinema. Finally, there has been a growing awareness of major figures in Third World cinema such as Toms Gutiérrez Alea of Cuba and Ousmane Sembene of Senegal, whose works reveal notions of the cinema's relation to society

---

18 Stephen Heath, *Comments on the Idea of Authorship*, SCREEN, Autumn 1973, *reprinted in* Caughie, *supra* note 7, at 214-20.

19 *Id.* at 217.

20 *See generally* TANIA MODLESKI, THE WOMEN WHO KNEW TOO MUCH: HITCHCOCK AND FEMINIST THEORY (1988)(offering a detailed examination of the polemical issues of feminism and authorship that have focused on Hitchcock's films over the last two decades).

21 Naremore, *supra* note 1, at 20-21.

22 THOMAS SCHATZ, THE GENIUS OF THE SYSTEM (1988).

that is at radical variance with the traditions of European and American film culture.[23]

The insistence upon the author in critical discussion leads to the question that lurks at the root of Naremore's discussion: What is the fundamental attraction of the idea of the author in film scholarship? To come to grips with that question, one needs to return to Foucault, whose original interrogation of "What is an author?" moved him to formulate a series of new questions about the discursive formations of authorship. "What are the modes of existence of this discourse? Where does it come from?; how is it circulated; who controls it? What placements are determined for possible subjects?"[24]

As I have indicated, the principal debates over auteurism were centered around what is known in film studies as the "classical text," that is, the Hollywood style of narrative cinema. To consider these new questions of circulation and control, I want to shift to a relatively uncharted area of cinematic geography in which the idea of the author continues, in Foucault's words, "to circulate," and thus to pose some of the suppressed questions of why that circulation continues. In Latin America, as a telling example, "author cinema" has a special connotation as opposition cinema. Numerous filmmakers have received critical attention for those films that challenge the political repression and excesses of authoritarian regimes. Related to this project of opposition cinema have been filmmakers' efforts to develop "alternative" styles of filmmaking that oppose what they see as the cultural colonialization of their film industry by the aesthetic and economic pressures of Hollywood cinema.

Author cinema in Latin America has often been called "second cinema." This term is derived from the classification first espoused by Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, two Argentine theorists of revolutionary filmmaking in the Third World. Solanas and Getino identified three major currents in world cinema. The classical cinema of Hollywood and the major European industries they designated as "First Cinema." Author cinema that emerged in opposition to the dominant forms of neocolonial filmmaking identified with the Hollywood model was designated "Second Cinema." "Third Cinema" was theorized as a militant, antihegemonic cinema aimed at bringing an audience of peasants and workers into a direct confrontation with the real-

23 Foucault, *supra* note 4, at 138.
24 *Id.*

ity of their political and cultural dependency, thereby moving them to revolutionary action.[25]

According to Solanas and Getino, Second Cinema was an effort, albeit a limited one, at cultural and political decolonization. They observed: "This alternative [cinema] signified a step forward inasmuch as it demanded that the filmmaker be free to express himself in non-standard language and inasmuch as it was an attempt at cultural decolonization."[26] In this context, we can readily discern how in Latin America the status of the author and of author cinema is linked to the concept of the nation. By breaking with the dominant Hollywood style of cinematic form and production, filmmakers seek alternative filmic practices that will align them with the aspirations of authentic and liberated national cultures.

Roy Armes has studied the careers of a number of Third World auteurs,[27] and has found a marked tendency for these filmmakers to define their own activity as auteurs in relation to nationalist movements opposed to neocolonialism. These include men like Fernando Birri in Argentina, Toms Gutiérrez Alea in Cuba, and Satyajit Ray in India. According to Armes, in the 1950s and 1960s a generation of Third World filmmakers took direct inspiration from the Italian neorealist movement; others, however, simply read in the example of their Italian counterparts—a startling example of alternative strategies that seemed remarkably apt for the context of their own cultural circumstance. [28]

---

25 Octavio Getino, *Some Notes on the Concept of a "Third Cinema," reprinted in* ARGENTINE CINEMA 99 (Tim Barnard ed., 1986).

26 Fernando Solanas & Octavio Gettino(sic), *Towards a Third Cinema, reprinted in* MOVIES AND METHODS 51 (Bill Nichols ed., 1976).

While acknowledging the project of author cinema in the Third World, Solanas and Getino are extremely critical of the potential such an enterprise affords filmmakers: "[S]uch attempts have already reached, or are about to reach, the outer limits of what the system permits. The *second cinema filmmaker* has remained 'trapped inside the fortress' as Goddard put it, or is on his way to becoming trapped." *Id.* at 51-52.

27 ROY ARMES, THIRD WORLD FILM MAKING AND THE WEST, 80-85 (1987).

28 *Id.* at 80. Armes describes the ideal of Italian neorealism conception and praxis this way:

> The creators of neorealism had all worked in the mainstream of Italian commercial cinema during the early 1940s, and when they began making their own films in the early postwar years, not only did they inherit their equipment and commercial outlets from a fascist cinema they wished to supercede, but they also had to confront an audience shaped by the escapist entertainment cinema of the Mussolini years. Neorealism was a cinema made with limited means: often the rushes could not be viewed because there was no money to pay for prints, and films were shot silent (and post-synchronized) to allow shooting on location in the streets. But the resultant films were neither amateurish nor avant-garde: thanks to their professionalism and

Armes notes how:

> the processes of national independence and popular struggle and a growing awareness of a distinctive Third World identity can bring [these filmmakers], as intellectuals, into a new relationship with the mass of their fellow countrymen, and they show in their films a similar desire to uncover a hidden reality—in their case, the world concealed beneath the distortions and lies of colonial or neocolonial cultural dominance. Realist film making—for which the neorealists in Italy could serve as exemplars—set itself a number of tasks that distinguish it from mainstream entertainment cinema.[29]

With Armes we thus return to the notion that was originally expressed by Sarris, that the American filmmakers evolved their auteurist identities in opposition to the production system imposed by the Hollywood studios.[30] Sarris's sense of the auteur as opposition figure was defined as an emotional and creative tension with the system. But in societies on the margin of European and American film culture we can discern how the identity of the individual film author is inextricably bound to the question of national identity in ways that define a radically different kind of study of cinematic authorship.

It is in this context that I want to consider the case of authorship in Spanish cinema. Though obviously not a Third World culture, historically, Spanish cinema has occupied roughly the same position as culturally colonized national cinemas in the Third World. That culture of dependency has contributed in no small way to the emphasis upon author cinema as perhaps *the* single dominant feature of film production in Spain for the last four decades. Its emergence in the early 1950s was the direct result of the discovery of the Italian neorealist film movement by students of Spain's National Film School. Long dissatisfied with official cinema, controlled and regulated through elaborate censorship and subsidy systems, the young men of the National Film School of the 1950s were looking for ways to express Spain's social reality that had been systematically blocked by the patterns and ideology of national cinema. For the reasons that Armes described in relation to Latin American cinema, neorealism seemed to provide at least the strategies, if not the substance, of what these

---

artistic quality, they succeeded in conveying the truths of contemporary poverty, unemployment, and old age to audiences throughout the world. *Id.* at 81.

29 *Id.* at 82-83.

30 Sarris, *supra* note 11, at 64.

men sought: a re-engagement with Spanish cultural reality and the embrace of an anti-hegemonic style that was a rebuke of the Francoist ideology of representation.

As in the romantic notion of the author as rebel, the men who emerged as authors in the Spanish cinema of the 1950s were nearly all opponents of the status quo cinema and the imposter culture it purveyed. In a famous critique of the effects of governmentally coerced film production, the outspoken Juan Antonio Bardem described the relation of Spanish film to its audience in these terms:

> Living with its back to Spanish reality, our cinema has not been able to show us the true face of the problems, the land, or the people of Spain. This atemporal, hermetic, and false creation of a supposedly Spanish reality, such as it appears in our films, totally distances itself from the rich realist tradition of the Spanish novel. Right here and now, the spectator of Spanish cinema is unable to learn from a Spanish film about the Spanish style of living, how Spaniards revel, or how they suffer. . .The vision of the world, of this Spanish world, portrayed in Spanish film is false![31]

Bardem's denunciation of Spanish film under Francoism is inseparable from his broader rejection of the cultural politics of the Franco regime, which, since the end of the Civil War in 1939, had cleverly used the film industry to its own propagandist and ideological ends. The rise of author cinema in Spain, which Bardem's position heralded, thus became inevitably aligned with the project of redefining Spanish national culture.

During the 1950s a number of young directors rose to prominence as opposition filmmakers. Their work was perceived in official circles and received by Spanish audiences as a rejection of the policies and ideology of Francoist "official culture." Of these, Bardem himself cut the most striking figure. He gained notoriety for his critical presentation of social repression in his films, and was, in his published articles on Spanish cinema in the counter-cultural journal *Nuestro cine*, an outspoken critic of the Spanish film industry. Bardem's aggressive positions led to continual difficulties with both the censors and the government. While publicly martyred at home (he was even arrested for a short while by the Civil Guard while shooting a film that was said to have displeased government authorities), the publicity he and

---

[31] MARVIN D'LUGO, THE FILMS OF CARLOS SAURA: THE PRACTICE OF SEEING 21 (1991) (quoting Emmanuel Larraz) (citation omitted).

his films enjoyed at European film festivals was as much a rebuke of fascist Spain as it was the recognition of the individual artist.[32]

Bardem's early career thus defines a paradigmatic situation that recurs throughout much of Third World cinema: the alienation of individual filmmakers within a repressive culture and their subsequent encounter with a form and substance of popular filmmaking that effectively critiques the official construction of the nation as a means of connecting with the popular will; the international "ghettoization" of such films and their creators, which leads to their "appreciation" at foreign festivals as "authors" closely identified to national causes. Inevitably, this national/international interface reveals the insistent alignment of certain types of national cinema with the external "construction" of the author.[33]

The cult of the cinematic author gained force throughout the late 1950s and 1960s in Spain through a variety of additional channels. One of these was the direct influence of European journalistic support of auteurism in magazines such as *Cahiers du Cinema* which, in turn, led to the development in Spain of cognate journals with a similar auteuristic bent. Such publications, though small in circulation, became the catalyst for the increased consciousness of the idea of cinematic authorship as a potent weapon in the counter-cultural movement against Francoism. They brought to the attention of a generation of aspiring filmmakers the work of foreign auteurs—Rossellini, De Sica, the Italian neorealists, the recently emergent French New Wave, and finally even their own fellow countryman, Luis Buñuel who, in

---

[32] The position of Bardem's work at home and abroad confirms Paul Willemen's observation the Third World Cinema's shifting semantic field as viewed by European audiences:

> In Europe, most Third Cinema products have definitely been consumed in a Second Cinema way, bracketing politics in favour of an appreciation of the authorial artistry. A pessimist might argue that the deeper a film is anchored in its social situation, the more likely it is that it will be 'secondarised' when viewed elsewhere or at a different time unless the viewers are prepared to interest themselves precisely in the particularities of the sociocultural nexus addressed . . . .

Paul Willemen, *The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections, reprinted in* QUESTIONS OF THIRD CINEMA 9 (Jim Pines & Paul Willemen eds., 1989).

[33] Much of what is said here of Spanish cinema can easily be applied to any of a number of Third-World cinemas. Armes, for instance, draws particular attention to the 1960s Brazilian Cinema Novo movement which, like "New Spanish Cinema," evolved from young opposition filmmakers embracing neorealism and attempting to cultivate ties with populist anti-colonial aspirations. As such, Cinema Novo increasingly came to identify with the ideal of the nation, and the works of movement members, especially Glauber Rocha, gained prominence at foreign film festivals as auteurs whose productivity was aligned with the popular aspirations of the Brazilian people. *See* ARMES, *supra* note 27, at 71-85.

exile since the 1930s, was one of the favorites of the French film press but whose work had been all but unknown in Francoist Spain.

To these external influences upon the formation of the institution of Spanish cinematic authorship must be added two other seemingly contradictory forces that emanated from the government. The first was the censorial apparatus itself. The continual coercion of the film industry by the government through the elaborate system of pre-shooting and post-production censorship led a number of filmmakers intuitively to attempt a quasi-symbolic and seemingly hermetic mode of cinematic expression that, it was believed, could somehow fool the censors and yet communicate with the Spanish public. In advancing such a project, the filmmaker became an ingenious double scriptor of the film.

Here perhaps the case of Bardem's colleague and sometimes collaborator, Luis García Berlanga, is most telling. Berlanga's 1953 comedy, *Welcome Mister Marshall,* is a biting attack on the Francoist idealization of Spanish folkloric culture posed as merely a comedy about life in a sleepy, backward Castilian town. The suggestive textual system of the film, replete with dialogue and plot situations that mocked the regime's cultural policies, surprisingly, was able to pass the censors and achieve a wide popular success. Other less frivolous examples abound throughout the final decades of the dictatorship in which the ingenuity of the filmmaker circumvented the censors' scissors and thereby established a distinctive signature as a critical voice of dissention.

A period of liberalization in the bureaucratic handling of the film industry occurred during the 1960s in which the government attempted to appropriate for its own advantage the promotion of the cult of authorship. The underlying premise of their packaging of "New Spanish Cinema" (the generation of young filmmakers, many of whom had recently emerged from the National Film School) was to show the outside world that Franco's Spain repudiated its belligerent origins and was opening itself to new ideas, even to internal political opposition.[34] Even as the censorship system continued to impose upon given filmmakers' works often severe restrictions on their power of expression, other government offices were providing subsidies and even special festival screenings for these films.

---

[34] In their critique of the idea of Second Cinema, Solanas and Getino speak of the ways in which "the system" often exploits to its own advantage the voices of opposition film authors as these authors remain naive about the flexibility of the system in assimilating their opponents. Nichols, *supra* note 26, at 52.

In following the course of one of these Spanish auteurs, Carlos Saura, today perhaps the best known of Spanish filmmakers, one can more precisely chart the politics of Spanish cinematic authorship. Saura's work becomes emblematic because it dramatizes, as the work of few other authors does, the critical bridge between the construction of the author as an external, contextual practice and the interior discursive practices that similarly define cinematic authorship. It suggests to us, as well, a type of textual praxis that is faithful to the post-structuralist goal of examining the ideological uses of cinematic textuality while recognizing the historical and political circulation of the name of the author as a privileged discursive formation. Saura is, to a degree, a product of the peculiarly politicized cultural environment of the Franco dictatorship. His increased awareness of the possibility of authorial identity as a filmmaker was nurtured by a critical view of the repressive and anachronistic state of Spanish culture and, as well, a growing resentment of the intimidation and coercion of the censorship system. During the formative period of his career, from 1959 to 1963, Saura's first two films, *Los golfos* (*Hooligans*) and *Llanto por un bandido* (*Lament for a Bandit*), were severely treated by the censors. Not only were shooting scripts of these films rejected, forcing massive rewrites, but the final copies of both works were cut up by the censors who objected to specific scenes and dialogue. Understandably, Saura sought some sort of authorial control over the material aspects of film production that might guard against such incursions. He would eventually find such control through his collaboration with Elías Querejeta, the producer of his next film, *The Hunt* (1965), who would collaborate with Saura in a dozen more films over the next seventeen years.

Querejeta's plan was to develop an "international" style for Saura's films that would acknowledge the national and international contexts that defined Spanish film. He proposed a strategy that would enable them to get the support of the government subsidy office and address two well-defined audiences, one Spanish and the other a limited cosmopolitan public abroad. Querejeta well understood that while a domestic audience was the prime target of a Spanish film, foreign festival recognition was essential if a Spanish film was to attract an audience at home. Querejeta understood, as well, that Bardem's appeal to foreign audiences in the 1950s was the result of that director's cinematic denunciations of the Francoist regime. Recognizing these textual and contextual parameters, Querejeta proposed to redefine

what Saura had previously viewed as an adversary relation with the censorship boards into a more constructive collaboration.

Still opposing the regime, Querejeta was looking for a way to "negotiate" a film through the bureaucratic machinery so that it might actually receive the necessary support of the government while, in effect, critiquing from within the very system that supported it. The result of this strategy was a series of films that stylistically shifted focus from a neorealist to a seemingly more modernist cinema; that is, from an overtly political cinema of denunciation to a much more cerebral one that sought to expose the ideological deceits of Francoism. The effectiveness of this strategy may be gauged by the fact that in their first collaboration, *The Hunt*, Saura won the Silver Bear at the 1966 Berlin Film Festival for Best Direction, with the head of the jury, Pier Paolo Passolini, citing him for "the courage and indignation with which he presented a human situation characteristic of his timed society."[35]

Yet, ironically, while actively pursuing such authorial control over the material aspects of film production, Saura revealed within his films clear evidence that the notion of authorship remained for him a problematic issue. Running parallel to nearly every one of his films is what might be termed the narrative "allegory of authorship." That is, symbolic plots that place under the mark of suspicion the very presumption of the characters' individuality that, outside the fictionality of the film, Saura appears to pursue. His filmography, in effect, evolved as a double-tiered configuration of dramatized "authors-in-the-text" and the biographical "author-outside-the-text" as described by Kaja Silverman,[36] each in apparent conflict with the other. As he achieves progressively more authorial control, his protagonists seem more emphatically locked in the trap of discovering the social and historical constraints of Spanish culture that have denied them their true autonomy.

No more than a half dozen of the protagonists of Saura's films are literal authors-in-the-text. Yet, throughout his other films the paradigm evolves of individuals who strive to achieve a figurative authorship, that is, as the external author has done, to become originators of discourse. That authorial discourse is most often expressed within Saura's films through a scopic regis-

---

[35] D'LUGO, *supra* note 31, at 67 (quoting Roman Gubern)(citation ommitted)(translated from Spanish).

[36] KAJA SILVERMAN, THE ACCOUSTIC MIRROR 193-212 (1988).

ter. The characters are often portrayed as spectators, viewing the world around themselves and, through their gaze, attempting to reason the logos of this world as well as their own position in it. Seemingly unobtrusive, these on-screen spectators fulfill a double role within the cinematic narrative. They function as the on-screen agency of visual narration, an insistent trope of classical narrative cinema. They enact a form of discursive resistance to the dominant forms of representation, however, by questioning what they see.

The function of Saura's specularized authors-in-the-text is to place in question the larger relation of cinema to the dominant forms of cultural and political imaging that spectators have internalized. Such patterns of figuration within the cinematic text are aimed at exposing for the audience the discursive practices that shape their own sight and, consequently, their knowledge and understanding of the world. In *The Imaginary Signifier*, Christian Metz argues that "the cinematic institution is not just the cinema industry . . . it is also the mental machinery—another industry—which spectators 'accustomed to the cinema' have internalized historically and which has adapted them to the consumption of films. The institution is outside us and inside us, indistinctly collective and intimate, sociological and psychoanalytic. . . ."[37] With Saura, therefore, the question of extratextual authorship is always linked intimately with the interior textual construction and deployment of allegories of authorship.

The restaging of spectatorship within Saura's filmic narrative expresses in its most basic form the filmmaker's distrust of the simple visual dictation of social reality that many of his contemporaries during the Franco years were clamoring for in the name of social realism. We find evidence from the very start of his professional career that Saura preferred to use the cinematic medium to map the emotional and spiritual relation of Spaniards to the dubious projections of a mythologized Spain that had "Francoized" Spanish culture. Central to his development, therefore, was the intense scrutiny of the socially determined ways of seeing that the characters in any given film had absorbed as part of their formation as Spaniards. Against the normative patterns of institutionalized social sight, Saura depicted other characters who "mirrored" the position of the real spectator of the film, but who, unlike the spectator, paused to gaze and interrogate the social *mise-en-scene* in which they found themselves.

37 CHRISTIAN METZ, THE IMAGINARY SIGNIFIER 19 (Celia Britton et al. trans., 1982).

Through this interrogative practice of seeing, Saura was able to question the discursive practices that had naturalized the various myths of "Spanishness" that had formed and deformed the contemporary Spaniard.

To repeat the forms of intelligibility of a repressive and backward society was, to his thinking, a futile task. His intuitive response to this circumstance of constraint was to look outside the illusionist frame of the cinematic apparatus to the place of the spectator, and, from there, to conceptualize his films within an intertextual mode, that is, the folding back upon itself of the discourse of Spanishness, postulating the narrative and its telling as a "textual rewriting or restructuration of a prior historical or ideological *subtext*."[38]

Although developed as a necessary response to the constraints of state censorship during the final fifteen years of the Franco dictatorship, Saura's elaboration of an author's cinema has continued well beyond that period, principally as he has increasingly come to see in the figure of authors-in-the-text a way of bringing a larger audience to question hegemonic patterns of culture that have shaped individual and cultural identity. In continually positing the questions of authorship "in-the-text," Saura's films suggest the richness and complexity of the concept of cinematic authorship that challenges the notions of "culture-blind" theoreticians of cinema. Authorship, as Saura's work attests, is not simply a reified figure external to the textual practices that define a given film. When fully realized within textual and cultural practice, the notion of the author can become the cipher of a series of discursive resistances to the ideological as well as industrial patterns that shape the cinematic institution.

As we attend to the modes of existence and circulation of authorial discourse in cinemas that lie on the margins of the sphere of domination defined by the Hollywood film industry, we may begin to discern the condition of authorial cinema as a part of an insistent strategy of cultural resistance. As Foucault's model of interrogation of the idea of authorship suggested to us, we need to begin the process of recognizing the multiple histories—social and political if not personal—that traverse the figure of the author.

---

38 FREDRIC JAMESON, THE POLITICAL UNCONSCIOUS 81 (1981).