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Abstract

*Amanecer en puerta oscura* (1957, José María Forqué) is a Spanish Western starring Francisco Rabal which depicts banditry from the nineteenth century and which won the Berlin Silver Bear.  In the climactic scenes of the film, the statue of Jesús el Rico (a crucifix carried on high by *encapuchados* during the Easter celebrations) raises its hand to choose which one of three prisoners to pardon in a re-enactment of the Parable of the Good Thief. This paper will examine documents from the censorship files under the Franco dictatorship and reviews of the film to explore the representations of wrongdoing in the film and the intersections of spectatorial relations with ethics.
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In the climactic scenes of José María Forqué’s *Amanencer en puerta oscura* (1957), a statue of Christ bearing the cross is carried on high in a procession by *encapuchados* from the Jesús el Rico brotherhood in Malaga during the Easter celebrations. A close shot shows how the hand of the statue sways from left to right in front of three condemned men before, in a moment of dramatic tension, it comes to rest in front of Juan Cuenca (Francisco Rabal), a bandit and outlaw. The bandit is pardoned according to an old custom and walks away from the gallows. Here, Cuenca is a figure who plays at the limits both of state law and of notions of what is the morally just or ethically right path. Played by the charismatic Francisco Rabal, Cuenca is constructed as a transgressive hero who emerges seemingly in contradistinction to the context of the Francoist control of cinematic production in which he appears.

In *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, Gilles Deleuze wrote that ‘American cinema constantly shoots and reshoots a single fundamental film, which is the birth of a nation-civilization’.[[2]](#footnote-2) If he had in mind the racism of Griffith’s *Birth of a Nation* (1915), he also referred to the Hollywood Western with its invoking of the providential claims of Manifest Destiny and its mythic quest for rootedness, settlement and colonization. Cinema under Francoism, for its part, inspired by the founding narratives of submission and conversion which the Falange poached from Spain’s colonial past of conquest and empire, played and replayed the story of the sinner who converts to Catholicism; whether through dubbing practices which altered the meaning of Hollywood films to endorse religious messages or through homegrown films which harnessed the seductive power of the cinematic image to turn it towards more religious ends.[[3]](#footnote-3) *Amanecer en puerta oscura* presents us with a hybrid of the Western and the religious film. It is an interesting case in that, although its grand finale is bathed in religious imagery, it appears that its hero does not repent at the end of the film.

If publicity for *Amanecer en puerta oscura* avoided classifying the film in terms of genre, iconographically it belongs to the *cine de bandoleros*, a sub-genre of the Spanish-style Western. A press release shows Rabal on horseback, a coloured blanket as a poncho, hat on his head and gun in his hand. Another depicts three men on horseback galloping away from a whitewashed village, the church steeple prominently displayed. The film’s tagline was, ‘¡polvo de los caminos de huida, sudor de angustia y sangre de delitos en el alma de tres hombres perseguidos!’[[4]](#footnote-4) The pardoned bandit was well-known in the cultural imaginary, whilst religious themes were often associated with tales of bandits.[[5]](#footnote-5) In this article, I will view this *película de bandoleros* according to Marsha Kinder’s theory of ‘intentional hybrids’, where playing off one narrative convention of representation with another is both intentional and productive. Cuenca is constructed as the hero of the piece, in spite of his resistance to National Catholicism. Thus, whilst the film’s final scenes appear to endorse the imagery of National Catholicism, here I shall explore the way that the film encourages the spectator to make ethical decisions regarding wrongdoing, decisions that may operate independently of state law and National Catholic ideology. I shall consider the ways that the film may serve as a critique of church/state power in the Francoist Spain of the 1950s.

**The Pistol in Close-up**

*Amanecer en puerta oscura* is set in Andalusia in the nineteenth century and begins in an opencast mine run by English profiteers. John Parry, an English foreman, slumps, drunk, against the copper-coloured earth before grabbing a sharpened stick and launching it like a spear at one of the Spanish workers who loses his footing as a result. This senseless act of violence is observed by Andrés Ruiz, one of the workers at the mine, who fights with Parry and kills him. Spanish mines were sold to international consortia at the end of the nineteenth century (for example, the Río Tinto in Huelva which was sold in 1873) and the depiction here is of a company rife with coercion, threats, corruption, cover-ups and exploitation.

Pedro Guzmán, an engineer at the mine, is playing darts in a carefully tended garden with friends, his well-to-do girlfriend and her father, a local judge, when he receives instructions from Carter, the company director, to bring in Ruiz, who is a friend of his from another social sphere, for questioning. However, the plan backfires when the company directors intervene and stage an ambush to bring in Ruiz themselves. In a panicky and chaotic standoff, Guzmán shoots Carter.

When, in the tense moments before Guzmán shoots Carter, the camera dwells on a close-up of the pistol, this is a clear iconographical marker for the Western. The Hollywood Western has its origins in the earliest filmmaking, for example Edwin S. Porter’s *The Great Train Robbery* (1907). Thomas Edison had produced short filmic documents on life in the West but Porter’s film added narrative although, as Gunning has shown, it can also be viewed as part of silent film’s ‘cinema of attractions’.[[6]](#footnote-6) In the film’s most memorable sequence, a bandit shoots directly at the screen. In this sequence (projectionists were given free choice as to whether they ran this sequence at the start or at the end of the film), George Barnes, playing one of the outlaws, is filmed face-on, ostensibly making eye contact with the audience in an early form of direct address. He takes his pistol and fires directly at the screen which becomes covered in a cloud of pistol-smoke. Whether or not those early audiences really did duck at the image of the bandit shooting at the screen, for Gunning the image has to do with spectatorial thrills rather than with documentary.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Drawing on Gunning, Eleftheriotis has analysed the role of the close-up of the pistol in *Ringo and His Golden Pistol* (1966) and concludes that in that film, ‘the gun becomes relatively independent of narrative function and of moral ideological codes: its function is to shoot, and if this looks good, everything is fine’.[[8]](#footnote-8) In *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, the editing is slick and fast paced, the whitewashed walls of the village show up in brilliant contrast to the colourful ponchos under Cecilio Paniagua’s cinematography. The pistol is lovingly framed in close-ups. The pistol is arguably then, just one more iconographical marker in this high-quality Spanish-style Western. Eleftheriotis has written of the ‘spaghetti-Westerns’ (a term coined by American critics) of the 1960s and 70s that these:

can be seen as a hybrid par excellence, an improbable mixture of cooking and filmmaking. “Spaghetti” here not only connotes inferiority and foreignness but also contamination as a dangerous and degenerate impurity. In this way, merely as a generic classification, the Italian engagement with an American genre is precluded to be an inferior, impure and contaminating exercise.[[9]](#footnote-9)

But if the term ‘chorizo-Western’ appears on one website in connection with *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, testament to its status as a Spanish-Italian co-production but suggesting an unlikely hybrid, nonetheless, as Marsher Kinder has noted in relation to the Spanish context, imitation of a Hollywood genre was not in itself cause for a sense of inferiority but could involve a sophisticated process of cultural reinscription.[[10]](#footnote-10) This Spanish-style Western was deemed to be of such quality that it won the Silver Bear at Berlin in 1957. This suggests that quality and playfulness could place the film in an artistic sphere rather than a political one to the eyes of censors.

Aside from its showy status, narratively, the gun, as iconographical marker for the Western, might at first appear to denote what Deleuze has termed the ‘movement-image’. The ‘movement image’ is a component of a cinema of action, of propulsion, of purposeful movement and human agency which registers a belief in action and reaction, in causality and in problem resolution. As an ethics of cinema, this cinema is invested in moral judgment and in the difference between good and evil. Deleuze finds this cinema in films which support the founding of American civilization and, conversely, in Sergei Eisenstein’s dialectical montage which foregrounds social injustice and the emergence of the proletariat. As Alasdair King writes, ‘both [types of cinema] rely on confidence in the efficacy of movement, on a conviction of the achievability of social progress toward a universal endpoint, and on the ability of cinema to produce images commensurate with this faith in movement’.[[11]](#footnote-11) The opening credits to *Amanecer en puerta oscura* have already informed us that, ‘la inquietud política y el malestar social condicionaban la vida del país y justificaban la revuelta’. The close-up of the gun stresses its importance for a change in the social order. The pistol here might be an example of Deleuze’s situation/action/situation formulation whereby the gun would signify the action required to destabilize/stabilize a current situation.[[12]](#footnote-12) In the sequence where Guzmán shoots Carter, Guzmán has persuaded Ruiz to come to speak ‘a los extranjeros’. There is a standoff between Ruiz (the worker) and Carter (the foreign boss) as the latter, in a visual echo of the frontal shot of the outlaw shooting at the screen from *The Great Train Robbery*, points his gun at Ruiz. Reaction shots between Ruiz and his wife (who is holding their baby in her arms), underscore the danger of the situation for Ruiz. Carter shoots and wounds Ruiz, who falls to the ground and Carter points the pistol at him again, smiling cruelly downwards. From here chaos ensues, as women, children and horses rush to escape the scene. From a shot heard off-screen, we understand that Guzmán has shot Carter. Here, as in the Western, the pistol iconographically makes an appeal to justice, its own moral code, which is not necessarily related to institutional law and order (generally represented in a Western by the sheriff’s badge and here by the Civil Guard’s cap). The close up on the pistol appears to make an ethical demand of the spectator—Guzmán kills a man but his wrongdoing may be justified (he acted out of solidarity to a friend whose life was at stake) by his conscious resistance to oppression. Guzmán has earlier been positioned on the side of the foreigners. The shooting gun here is an interesting visual echo of an earlier scene where Guzmán has been playing darts in a garden with his upper-class girlfriend and her father, who is a local judge, together with a visiting foreign trader. We see that they are playing darts on a dartboard which is the face of a Cuban ‘mulata’ of the sort used to sell coffee, sugar and rum in the late nineteenth century. In this scene, Guzmán flings a dart at the board, which stabs the Cuban face in a variation of a face-shootist dialectic that we have seen earlier. This is a symbolic pastime for Guzmán’s association with those who use exploitation to run the mines (Spanish practices in Cuba in the nineteenth century were famously exploitative).[[13]](#footnote-13) When the shooting gun later appears as a visual echo of the earlier image with the dartboard, it graphically illustrates Guzmán’s move from siding with the oppressors, to supporting the oppressed. José María Forqué noted in interview that the ‘arranque’ for the film was ‘el planteamiento social’, going on to say that this film presents ‘un enfrentamiento entre españoles y extranjeros, unos los oprimidos y otros los opresores’. Forqué explains that the presence of Alfonso Sastre, a playwright famous for his ‘social issue’ theatre, was instrumental in the design of the social theme of this film for, ‘descubrimos que los mineros de aquella época eran tratados como los negros del Congo’. Andrés Ruiz represents ‘la resistencia a la explotación a la que se une el ingeniero con razones personales y éticas’.[[14]](#footnote-14) When Guzmán comes to find Ruiz to tell him that the company bosses are asking for him, Guzmán asks who was responsible for the death of Parry. Another worker responds by stepping forward to flank Ruiz: they were all responsible, he says. This film predates Kubrick’s *Spartacus* (1960) (with its famous line, ‘I am Spartacus’ where the rebels declare their solidarity with the protagonist), but the gesture of unity is similar. The notion that Ruiz and Guzmán may be ‘ethically’ in the right, even if on the wrong side of the law, is reinforced in a later scene where local bandit Juan Cuenca meets a local priest, Padre Francisco, in a small hilltop churchyard. After rescuing the fugitives from certain capture by the Civil Guard (the Civil Guard had followed Ruiz’s wife to some caves where the pair were hiding out), Cuenca proceeds to rob the outlaws. But as he later shows his booty to the priest, the latter chastises him, telling him that the fugitives had resisted oppression. Cuenca goes back to Guzmán, Ruiz and his wife and returns their valuables. As spectators, we are now on the side of Cuenca and the outlaws.

**Cine de bandoleros**

After ‘Film Europe’ declined with the onset of the Second World War, European film industries had returned to co-productions in the 1950s as a strategy to curtail the increasing dominance of Hollywood films in domestic markets.[[15]](#footnote-15) Collaborative agreements could bring the benefits of shared production costs as well as opening up new markets beyond national boundaries. Co-productions could also mean the sharing of economic risks or filming abroad but they also entailed obstacles: this might typically involve fulfilling national quotas of actors and technicians from each country and compliance with legal requirements from each national industry as well as the approval of two or more systems of censorship. Francoist Spain had particular interest in co-productions as part of a new policy of political and economic ‘apertura’ that left behind the previous period of autarky. In the mid-fifties, co-production arrangements began as specific initiatives supported by the government as a means to obtain foreign currency (a more defined structure of legal arrangements would arrive in the following decade partly as a response to the Spanish-Italian spaghetti Westerns).

In this context, Natividad Zaro, a screenwriter whom Forqué called the ‘Spanish Modesty Blaise’, wife of the Falangist politician Eugenio Montes and who had worked on *Surcos* (1951) (which although now considered a critical success, was at the time considered a commerical failure), began to become known for ‘películas de romanos’. With her production company Atenea Films, Zaro actively sought out opportunities for co-production, specialising in those with Italy. Between 1951 and 1961 Atenea Films worked on twelve co-productions. Zaro approached José María Forqué with the idea of the bandit who is pardoned. The script was to be written jointly by Forqué and Alfonso Sastre, who was already well known for bringing social issues to the theatre. The cinematographer Cecilio Paniagua came on board, as did the scenographer Simont, while the cast reflected its international production: Francisco Rabal, Luis Peña, Isabel Pomés and the Italians Alberto Farnese and Luisella Boni.

In his typology of Francoist historical film genres, José Enrique Monterde includes a series of films of the 1940s and 50s featuring ‘el bandolerismo rural’: *La Lola se va a los puertos* (J. de Orduña, 1947); *Las aventuras de Juan de Mairena* (J. Buchs, 1948); *Aventuras de Juan Lucas* (R. Gil, 1949); *La duquesa de Benamejí* (L Lucia, 1949); *Luna de sangre* (F. Rovira-Beleta, 1950); *Carne de horca* (L. Vajda, 1953); *Diego Corrientes* (A. Isasi, 1959); *La rosa roja* (C. Serrano de Osma, 1961) and *José María el Tempranillo* (J.M. Forn, 1964).[[16]](#footnote-16) However, the *cine de bandolero* format had struggled with its associations with the folkloric view of Spanishness as peddled by the *españolada*. Valeria Camporesi cites reference to the *cine de bandoleros* within her discussion of ‘Spanishness’: ‘en efecto, una versión específica de la españolada histórica fue a menudo propuesta como la posible versión española de los westerns’. ‘Españolada’ and ‘españolidad’ are terms which she traces back to the 1920s and which cut across the political spectrum with varying degrees of approbation or negativity.[[17]](#footnote-17) A film from 1949, *La duquesa de Benamejí*, meanwhile, for Camporesi, ‘hubiera aterrado a los productores de hace seis años, cuando el cine español transcurría tan plácidamente entre peluconas históricas y novelas de Alarcón. Un título y un tema que se hubieran proscrito entonces por un santo temor al riesgo de la españolada’. Camporesi explains that, ‘ha sido Luis Lucia el valiente que lo ha afrontado ahora sin aquellos tontos escrúpulos. Porque, a fin de cuentas, en esa galería de bandoleros, de contrabandistas, de jinetes serranos, hay un ‘western’ casi legítimo’.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Núria Triana-Toribio concurs, suggesting that the ‘high-brow *españolada*’ was revived with this film amongst others: CIFESA (the state-run film production company under Francoism) engaged in this ‘elevation’ of the *españolada* with, for example, *la duquesa de Benamejí* and *Lola, La Piconera* (Lucia, 1951).[[19]](#footnote-19) The anxiety over clichéd representations of Spanishness created for external consumption is demonstrated in José María Elorrieta’s *El bandido generoso* (1954), the film credited with launching the career of Concha Velasco, in which a priest dresses up as a bandit to attract tourists to the local area. The *españolada* is mercilessly parodied in a way that echoes Berlanga’s *Bienvenido Mr Marshall* (1953) about a village in Castile where the inhabitants dress as Andalusians to impress a party of visiting Americans. In *El bandido generoso*, the priest is reluctant to take on the role of bandit until persuaded to do so as a way to help the starving children of his parish (an indictment on post-war poverty). The film is full of local jokes—the best way to take money off someone is ‘el subarriendo de un piso’, whilst the best heist he has ever pulled off was the stealing of a million pounds from the Bank of Gibraltar. When an American, Margaret O’Collins, from Massachussets, hints that she would like to reproduce the bandit (named, ‘Generoso’) in celluloid, he replies, ‘es que me van a reprodusí a muñeco? No, sí, lo que yo digo,.. me van a usar pá propaganda… Caja de porvorones marca “El bandido” en los panderetas, jerez seco “El bandido” si no es ya popular’.[[20]](#footnote-20) If *El bandido generoso* pandered to popular tastes, reinforcing the stereotype of the bandit alongside flamenco dancing and singing, films such as *La duquesa de Benamejí* countered with what Triana-Toribio terms a ‘“dignified” representation of folklore for the consumption of the middle class’.[[21]](#footnote-21) Triana-Toribio cites Camporesi’s discovery that ‘*españoladas* could be the predecessor[s] of the social cinema, a realist alternative to the neo-realist model’.[[22]](#footnote-22) This ‘dignification’ of the *españolada*, and a purifying of this material, aimed to create an ‘authentic’ representation of Spanishness (64). But Heredero notes the confluence of a change in Spanish politics (the Falange now chose Opus Dei technocrats to manage political and economic affairs). In addition, the scrutiny afforded cinema by the Salamanca Conference of 1955 (where Javier Bardem famously declared Spanish cinema to be ‘politically useless, socially dishonest, intellectually void, aesthetically hideous and industrially decrepit’)[[23]](#footnote-23) meant that the excesses of the *españolada* had already become the target of jokes and caricature, in private or in public’ and the attempt to elevate the *españolada* would eventually fail.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Nevertheless, the spaghetti-Western would enjoy great success in the 1960s. These Italian-American co-productions were often filmed in Spain and with hindsight it is interesting to view *Amanecer en puerta oscura* as a blueprint for a high-quality, Spanish version of the Western. There were precedents: the aforementioned *La duquesa de Benamejí* (1949), in which Amparo Rivelles plays both duchess and gypsy (gypsy and bandit were often linked in these films), is framed by the singing of a ballad about the exploits of its protagonists. This is a reminder that tales of bandits featured heavily in the *romances de ciegos* and other popular ballads. This adds self-reflexivity to the question of ‘Spanishness’ and the roles of gypsy and bandit.[[25]](#footnote-25) Ladislao Vajda’s bandit-film, *Carne de horca* (1953), meanwhile, deconstructed the bandit so far as to destroy the myth. Opening with a tale told in the street as a *romance de ciego*, it depicts the bandits as cruel, devious and treacherous, with none of the ‘lovable rogue’ identity of other folkloric bandits. This may have been an ‘elevation’ of the theme in terms of its gritty realism, but it also subversively suggested that the view of the bandit propagated by folklore was nothing more than a romanticised myth.

It appears that with *Amanecer en puerta oscura* Forqué sought to create an ‘elevation’ of the ‘bandolero’ film in part through a blending with the social issue format. Forqué was looking for a high quality project for his next film after the success of *Embajadores en el infierno* (1956) and felt ‘la necesidad de mantener las expectativas creadas’.[[26]](#footnote-26) Forqué began with a visit to Andalusia to ‘llevar a cabo un meticuloso proceso de localizaciones y de captación de ambiente y del espíritu del sur’.[[27]](#footnote-27) His aim, it seems, was to rehabilitate the ‘legendaria tradición romántica del bandido generoso’:

‘el bandido generoso forma parte del romance nacional, es una tradición de gran raigambre popular. Para reforzar este concepto quise que la estructura estética de la película estuviera inspirada en los romances de ciegos, en aquellos cartelones que, de forma ingenua y simple, contaban hechos truculentos y aventuras legendarias. A esta estética, muy elemental, le di cierta estructura académica, donde los planos tenían un rigor plástico, consecuencia de mi antigua formación’.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The intention appears to have been a heightened aesthetic to show off the production values available in Spain as well as the Spanish landscape and themes as location shots. Thus, ‘el paisaje andaluz, en todo su rotundo colorido; las montañas, los cielos y los campos, los pueblos de deslumbrante blancura, son retratados magistralmente por la cámara de Cecilio Paniagua.’[[29]](#footnote-29) Seen from this perspective, the final scene of processing hooded figures might be viewed as a substitution of cliché-ridden Spanishness with scenes of authentic Spanish flavour. The scenes of the *encapuchados* might be viewed as an elevation of the *españolada* *par excellence*.:

la película se resuelve en una secuencia realmente impresionante, donde la alternancia de planos, sabiamente dosificados, el ajustado ritmo del montaje, los rostros patéticos de los tres reos, en contraste con el estatismo expresionista de la imagen de Cristo, componen un conjunto que, al servicio de una situación de alto voltaje dramático, dejan sin respiración al sobrecogido espectador.[[30]](#footnote-30)

It is perhaps telling that Eugenio Montes, the husband of Natividad Zaro, remarked that the film was ‘españolesca’, rather than an ‘españolada’.[[31]](#footnote-31)

During the shooting of *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, released in 1957, Francisco Rabal was not the international star that he would later become*.*  He had enjoyed some success playing the outlaw: in *Luna de sangre* (1951) he had played the fugitive Andalusian who is forced to take refuge in the mountains during the French invasion due to a crime of passion.[[32]](#footnote-32) With *Amanecer en puerta oscura,* Rabal, ‘es el bandolero que vuelve a refugiarse en los montes andaluces, visto en el lanzamiento publicitario de cuerpo entero, ante su caballo, y también con un primer plano de su rostro, grave u oscuro’.[[33]](#footnote-33) The same critic goes on to note that with this film ‘por primera vez el nombre se aísla del resto del reparto y se coloca sobre el título del film’.[[34]](#footnote-34) Contemporary reviews of the film hailed Rabal as ‘nuestro Marlo Brando’ and lauded the naturalness of his performance (in fact he came close to receiving the award for best male performance in 1957 in Berlin.[[35]](#footnote-35) In *Amanecer en puerta oscura* Rabal plays the part of the uncouth diamond in the rough to perfection. After saving Guzmán, Ruiz and Rosario from the Civil Guard, Cuenca approaches the group on horseback and nonchalantly chews a piece of straw as he demands their valuables. His short braided jacket is dusty and worn. He is down on his luck and in spite of his masculine appeal he seems vulnerable and impulsive. Forqué spoke of his ‘risa grande y mirada de chico golfo. Esa mirada de Paco creo que es una de las claves de su éxito. Parece que pide protección’.[[36]](#footnote-36) Cuenca’s sudden outbursts of cackling laughter or rage are explained by his difficult past: the terrible wrongdoing of his best friend and wife who had an affair which has left him distrustful of people in general.[[37]](#footnote-37) He is, at heart, a good person, whether this has to do with the demands of his character or the structured polysemy of his star persona:[[38]](#footnote-38) ‘Paco Rabal consigue unas de las mejores interpretaciones de su vida artística y logra dar vida a su tipo de bandolero salvaje y sin escrúpulos, siempre ahogando los impulsos generosos que contra su voluntad tratan de escapársele del alma’.[[39]](#footnote-39) In his repeated narratives of the individual fighting against the hand he has been dealt, he comes, ‘un prototipo de joven que debe hacer frente a toda clase de dificultades que obstaculizan su normal y autónomo desarrollo’.[[40]](#footnote-40) As Morgan-Tamosunas has written, Rabal’s screen person is that of a ‘roughly-hewn, earthy “man of the people”’ with a ‘rough, tough, proletarian physicality’ who emanates a ‘discourse of authenticity’.[[41]](#footnote-41) In one scene in *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, after stealing from Guzmán and Ruiz, Cuenca gallops up to a hilltop church to visit Francisco the priest, who is outside making tiles from clay to fix the church roof. Cuenca’s movements here are like an adolescent with something on his mind: he throws himself down to drink from a leather-cased bottle. Padre Francisco, it becomes clear, is part father figure, and part conscience to Cuenca. After informing Cuenca that the outlaws are on the run merely because they rose up against their oppressors, Cuenca gallops back to the outlaws and returns their valuables. In the later scene discussed above, the three outlaws return to their whitewashed Andalusian village where the streets are deserted during siesta time. While Ruiz goes to fetch his baby son, Guzmán goes to ask his girlfriend to marry him. Cuenca, meanwhile, visits his parents and then goes to a local shop for provisions. Close-ups of Cuenca’s face show how he attempts to startle the horrified old lady tending the shop (she has already sent a boy for help) and it appears that his intention is to steal as he stuffs food into a bag and chews bits of sausage, displaying his uncouth nature. But then, surprisingly, he slams some coins down on the counter. ‘¿Me paga?’ exclaims the old lady, and when Ramón, Cuenca’s father-in-law, arrives in time with the intention of avenging the death of his daughter, we are on Cuenca’s side even when Ramón is thrust onto the floor, his head pinned to the tiled step. The scene draws on a host of similar scenes in the history of the Western of the bandit who strides into town to cause havoc. But here just as Cuenca toys with the old lady, appearing to be just one more thieving bandit, before slapping coins down on the counter with a grin, the scene is beautifully orchestrated to give the sense that the filmmakers are here in perfect possession of their material. With this scene Forqué not only launches Rabal’s international career (Rabal is not just the actor from the Spanish backwater but a star with the potential of Marlon Brando), but also displays the potential of Spanish cinema as a partner for international quality co-productions.

**The ethical cinematics of *Amanecer en puerta oscura***

Whilst for Deleuze in *Cinema 1*, grand narratives of action show confidence in the achievability of social progress, in which cinema produces images which confirm a faith in movement, he begins to outline examples of the affection-image, which are ‘moments of vacillation’.[[42]](#footnote-42) Describing images by Dreyer and Bresson, he cites moments in which protagonists are presented with a series of situations that require them to act in moral ways, conscious or not of the range of choice that confronts them. Whereas other categories of the movement-image are fully identifiable within a situation of causality, of actions and subsequent reactions, these affection-images register ‘virtual expression of choices yet to be accomplished’ taking place in disconnected spaces or in what he terms the ‘anyspace whatever’. The affection images anticípate the full crisis in the image that Deleuze sees in post-war European cinema (culminating in the ‘time-image’). ‘Our confidence in movement and in the meaningfulness of history itself is shattered and the dominant cinema of the movement image, underminded not least by the aestheticisation of politics under fascism, loses its hold as we witness the emergnce of a new series of signs and images on screen’ (59).

In *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, the dialectic of images—close-up of the pistol; shot of the person pointing the gun; reaction shot of the person being aimed at, constitute the affection-images of the film. If the pistol at first signals action and resolution (the theme of the overthrowing of the oppressor), action gives way to the vacillation of the choice. Repeatedly, the camera dwells on the close up of the pistol and the face in tandem, encouraging the spectator towards a consideration of the ethical choices available to the protagonists. Thus, in the scene where Guzmán shoots Carter, the camera dwells on the gun at Carter’s side, allowing the spectator to reflect on the ethical considerations of what follows, and through the visual echo of the dartboard, to reflect on Guzmán’s switched allegiance from the foreigners to his friend; in the scene in the village shop, the camera focuses on the pistol but Cuenca does not shoot Ramón. In a later sequence the film presents vacillation as a practical break-down of one of the protagonists. After Guzmán and María marry and she learns of her father’s death (of a presumed heart attack after the shock of hearing that she has run away), María erupts into hysterical sobs and has to be physically restrained by her new husband. The next day, a close shot captures her against the blue sky and grey rocks as she looks at Rosario who is feeding her baby, but appears to not really see her. There is a long take as she is filmed against the sky and looks as if she is really occupying ‘any space whatever’ in the sense that the sequence appears out of place with the rest of the film and signals her loss of identity now and the wrestling with her conscience following the death of her father. Rosario looks on at her with a concerned expression before forcing a smile which eventually registers with María and she rushes to sit beside Rosario: the moment of vacillation is over and Rosario informs her of her duties to her new husband and a life of ‘penas y desgracias’. Vacillation here brings the chance for reflection on María’s position. A space is opened up for the spectator to reflect on María’s ethical situation. Does her duty to her husband, an outlaw, overtake the love she feels for her father, one of the exploiters? Finally, her duty to her father is replaced by her duty to her new husband, but the landscape, fractured by the silhouette of the rocks against the sky, illustrative of the ‘any space whatever’ of her difficult ethical decision, haunts that part of the film.

**From affection-image to the spectacle of the scaffold**

Deleuze begins his section on the affection image with the assertion that ‘the affection-image is the close-up, and the close-up is the face’. Furthermore, ‘Eisenstein suggested that the close-up was not merely one image among others, but gave an affective reading of the whole film. This is true of the affection-image: it is both a type of image and a component of all images’ (87). The dialectic of close-ups on faces (shootist and aimed at) and the pistol in *Amanecer en puerta oscura*, gives an affective reading of the whole film, which here signals a vacillation of the choice of whether to take away a life.

In the final scenes of the film, the finger of Christ comes to rest on Cuenca, who is pardoned and walks away from the gallows. This dialectic of images of close-ups of faces (the statue, the three condemned men, their loved ones) creates high tension. The pictorial arrangement of this image might be said to resemble Porter’s shooting bandit in *The Great Train Robbery,* with the pointing finger substituted for the bandit’s pistol pointed directly at the screen. The play of images is, then, the repetition of the affection image. We might also be reminded, perhaps, of the conscription poster for World War I featuring Lord Kitchener, ‘Your Country Needs You’ which was copied by James Montgomery Flagg’s rendition of Uncle Sam to recruit in America during World War II. Carlo Ginzburg has analysed the Kitchener poster (in particular the all-seeing eyes and the pointing finger) and shows how this visual paradigm was rolled out in Russia and Germany to aid conscription there. Ginzburg finds resemblance between the conscription posters, early cinema (his example is Lumière’s trains and people rushing towards the screen), early twentieth century advertising posters and medieval religious paintings of Christ. Considering these images to articulate what Aby Warburg would call a ‘pathos formula’, he considers whether a similarity might be drawn between the conscription posters and the religious paintings: in both there is a call made on the viewer, ‘a call to arms, a religious call’.[[43]](#footnote-43) Warburg’s ‘pathos formula’ describes not just the way that certain visual motifs have been repeated throughout time since antiquity, but also the way that they capture an ‘intense vitality’, an ‘affective overload’ and cast it into a form.[[44]](#footnote-44) The image in *Amanecer en puerta oscura* harnesses the memory of the shock of early cinema as well as the arresting soliciting of the gaze in the conscription posters to make a direct address on the audience.

The pistol has, throughout the film, solicited an ethical gaze (the question posed is ‘when is it right to take a life?’)–here the pointing finger of Christ evokes the image which structures the film to provide a religious answer (‘only God can choose when to take a life’). The pardoning of Cuenca is in keeping with the theme of the pardoned bandit to be found in folklore. Furthermore, through Rabal’s performance and the centrality awarded to Cuenca at the level of diegetics, we are firmly on Cuenca’s side as he is pardoned rather than being sent to the gallows. He is the ‘bandido generoso’ (as the moment when he returns the booty to the outlaws justifies) and is rewarded as a result. Sánchez Vidal attributes the sympathy shown to Cuenca as a variation on the ‘Parable of the Good Thief’.[[45]](#footnote-45) But in spite of his moody conversations with his mentor Padre Francisco (José Marco Davó), it is less than clear that Cuenca has repented of his actions. In the final scenes shot in the cell as the three outlaws await execution, whilst the other two discuss who is the most worthy of a pardon, he merely expects to die. Father Francisco was wrong all along, he says. The final scene is, then, an act of divine power designed to display to Cuenca the power of God.

But as an ‘affection-image’, tensions deriving from the film’s ethical considerations emerge. In part, this has to do with the film’s hybrid nature. We have seen how the ending of the film attempts to re-inscribe the Western as a religious film. But at the same time, if this is a Spanish-style Western, it is also a social issue film. According to Marsha Kinder’s theory of intentional hybrids, such a ‘cultural re-inscription’ can function subversively. Here, the social issue plot demands that the foreign mine-owners be seen as the enemy as the outlaws are forced to go on the run after an attempt at resistance to injustice. But the final scenes sit oddly with this tale of rising up against oppressor.

Directly after the image of Christ and the pointing finger appears in the film we see how Cuenca, in a reverse angle, reaches up to the Christ statue, arms outstretched in supplication, informing the statue that he is not worthy of God’s benevolence. Visually, the image might be seen to resemble Goya’s painting *Third of May, 1808*, in which a Spanish man stands with arms outstretched whilst being threatened by the bayonets of the invading armies of Napoleonic France. If that image emphasises the Spanish heroic struggle, Christian sacrifice and promise of redemption, nevertheless the memory of that painting evoked here serves to underscore the violence inherent in the pointing finger of Christ in *Amanecer en puerta oscura*. The pointing finger mercifully saves one bandit but it simultaneously and silently dispatches two other outlaws to the gallows. The ethical vacillations of the affection-image (or dialectic of affection-images) lead us to consider the fate of the other two outlaws. If Guzmán has seemed rather self-interested (after his initial display of solidarity with his friend Ruiz, at the start of the film), Ruiz, a father and husband, merely acted as he did to save a colleague from injustice. The spectacle of the scaffold is impressive and awe-inspiring but also might be seen as swift and merciless.

As an interesting further development, contemporary views of the bandit film may have been influenced by the reactions to the earlier *La duquesa de Benamejí* for which censors had asked for various changes to the film due to the ‘ingrato recuerdo’ inspired by the bandits in that film to the *maquis* or Republicans who had taken refuge from the law.[[46]](#footnote-46) As Moreno Nuño has shown, the Franco regime drew on a range of juridical, medical and cultural discourses to elide the figure of the *maquis* with that of the *bandolero*.[[47]](#footnote-47) She notes that the romanticism of accounts of bandits from Sierra Morena in Andalusia in the work of, for example, Mérimée was consolidated in the 1930s with an anthropological approach to the supposed propensity towards crime, for example, of the Andalusians in theories by C. Bernardo de Quirós and Luis Ardila and then clearly linked by Francisco Aguado Sánchez in his historiographical study *El maquis en España* (1975) where he describes anti-Francoist guerilla soldiers as bandits, killers and hijackers under the orders of the Communist Party.[[48]](#footnote-48) Secundino Serrano has studied how Francoist literature inserted the *maquis* within the bandolero literary tradition: ‘negado el contexto represivo que obligó a los republicanos a echarse al monte, orillada la violencia structural que impedía su reinserción en el nuevo regimen y despojados de toda ideología, huidos y guerrilleros aparecían como la última secuencia del bandolerismo decimonónico’.[[49]](#footnote-49) It was this range of juridical, medical and cultural discourses which helped Francoist psychiatrist Vallejo Nájera to develop his theories of the degenerate nature of the ‘rojos’.[[50]](#footnote-50) Finally, guerrilla soldiers were considered bandits under the law, first judged under the Ley de Responsabilidades Políticas (Political Responsibilites Law) of 1939, and later under the Decreto-Ley sobre Bandidaje y Terrorismo (Decree-Law on Banditry and Terrorism) of 1947, rewritten in 1960. It is worth noting, however, that, as Moreno Nuño observes:

if the legal national discourse criminalized guerrilla soldiers as bandits, the Francoist government developed a completely opposite legal policy on armed resistance at international forums. The atrocious repression of the guerrilla inside Spain is a paradigmatic example of the schism that existed between a heinous national political practice—a brutal legalized state violence—and the international public discourse.[[51]](#footnote-51)

In fact it was this schism that allowed the Francoist government to respond to international pressure through ‘well-known cosmetic changes and an offensive diplomatic policy. This successful operation, which softened some of the most radically fascist traits of the regime for the sake of garnering international approbation without turning the dictatorship into an acceptable democratic regime, includes the ratification of the Geneva Conventions’ (9).

Returning to the final scene of *Amanecer en puerta oscura* and the scene of mercy and redemption for Cuenca, this too may be seen to have parallels in contemporary state policy. ‘Mercy’ was in fact one of the ideological tenets of the regime. The first parole decree, reserved for those who could prove their ideological allegiance to the Franco regime, was issued in 1939 to mark Franco’s ascent to power. As Ruiz observes,

The Franco regime employed Catholic themes of redemption and charity to justify publicly this massive process of liquidating the penal legacy of the civil war. Paroled prisoners, having expiated their ‘sin’ of supporting the Republic, were ready to re-enter the national community. The preamble of the December 1943 decree depicted a benevolent ‘Patria, a great family shaped in its spirituality by the most pure Christian principles, [which] induces us [the regime] to extend generously the legal precepts of forgiveness . . . [and] to incorporate to national and family life a considerable number of Spaniards who induced by foolish propaganda abandoned the roads of good’.[[52]](#footnote-52)

‘Redemption’, then, as Ruiz notes, ‘was not just the key feature of the parole process but of Nationalist penal policy in general. Prisoners could be ‘reformed’, it was believed, through religious regeneration’ (Ruiz 118).

In terms of the diegetics of the film, the credits at the start of the film encourage us to see this film not so much as a story from the past, but as one with relevance in the present:

No es todo inventado en esta historia. Su desenlace está basado en un hecho real que se repite, año tras año, hasta nuestros días, en la madrugada del Miércoles Santo. La historia comienza con un hecho que pudo ocurrir en la Andalucía del siglo XIX [. . .].

Whilst the film therefore depicts an old tradition, it is emphasized that pardons of this kind, but also executions, continued in the present day. This is further emphasized profilmically as one of the press releases featured a stylized image of three gallows which were arranged such that they resembled the yoke and arrows of the Falange party flag. Francoist executions in fact would continue until 1975 (even if the mode of execution was mainly by firing squad).

Although Forqué situated his film in the nineteenth century, censorship documents reveal that officials were more concerned with how the film might reflect negatively on 1950s Spanish external policy. Correspondence from the AGA censorship archives shows that Forqué had to write to emphasise that the film’s events took place in the nineteenth century and not in the present.[[53]](#footnote-53) Censors noted concerns that the film should not portray Americans in a bad light. As correspondence between the censorship panel and the production company shows, Forqué had to insist that the foreign company portrayed in the film was in fact English rather than American. In 1956 a Spanish delegation at the UN presented a claim for the devolution of Gibraltar, which may have meant that the censors were not so concerned at the English being portrayed in an unfavourable light, through the vilification of Parry and the other foreign mine-owners. But Spain was actively courting US investment during the 1950s (which would culminate in heavy US–Spanish investment in the 1960s). Whilst Spain famously did not benefit from US aid under the Marshall Plan (as caricatured in Berlanga’s *Bienvenido Mr Marshall*, 1953) nevertheless the Spanish-US accord had been signed in 1953, which agreed US aid for Spain in exchange for allowing the US to construct and utilize air and naval bases on Spanish territory. In addition to US aid, US investments soon followed. Finally, if censors specified that the Civil Guard could not be seen to miss their targets when shooting, in the film, the Civil Guard is portrayed as respectful of Ruiz’s wife when they come to question her. Furthermore, towards the end of the film they round up the outlaws and neatly dispatch them to prison, where the outlaws are sent to the gallows or saved according to the ancient religious church edict. It is not unreasonable to see the final scene of pardoning, then, as a display not just of the miraculous workings of Divine Justice, but also of the close relationship between church and state in 1950s Spain. The Concordat had been signed as recently as 1953. In *Amanecer en puerta* oscura, it is clear that the pardon is permitted to take place because the state allows it. Yet at the same time, it hints at the way that state law was given justification through the elision of state and divine power. In the film therefore sovereign power is fused with Divine Justice in a showy display.

*Amanecer en puerta oscura* begins as a Western with a social conscience, but after encouraging our ethical siding wth the outlaws, it then asks us to accept divine justice without question. This is rendered as a spectacle of the instrument of repressive state law justified by an alignment with religion. In this provocative and thought-provoking ending to the film, the final ‘affection image’ of the close up of the hand and face of the Christ statue invites critical reflection on the images seen. This is a display of state power which is designed to show the sovereign as merciful. But in fact the film is haunted by the imagery of unaccountable violence brought to bear on those who did not come in line with the policy of ‘redemption’ as fostered by the Franco regime.
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