

Inconsolable Memory

Angel G. Loureiro

In the first twenty-five years of democracy in Spain, the maquis was the subject of three fiction films. In contrast, in the first decade of the twenty-first century more than fifty films, most of them documentaries, focus on the armed resistance to Franco. This remarkable disparity and the documentary genre favored in the new century are two important factors for any analysis of the presence of the maquis in the Spanish cinema of the democratic era. Obviously, the recent and sustained attention to the maquis in documentaries has to be related to the intense interest that the Spanish Civil War has attracted in recent years, both among scholars and the general public. However, what has fascinated and mobilized Spaniards is not so much the new historical knowledge about the war as its causes, consequences, responsibilities and after-effects. Although in the last few years there has been a flood of new publications on the war, it could be argued that the discussions held in assorted public venues have not generally been based on a rigorous, actualized knowledge about the war but have been grounded instead on what, with questionable rigor, has been called “historical memory.” There is, however, a plurality of “historical memories,” although one of them, centered on certain victims of the war and early Francoism, has become hegemonic since the 1990s. Of course, the existence of multiple memories does not imply that all of them are of equal value, and there lies the crux of the problem—what we have are warring memories that are susceptible to change with time.

Instead of “historical memory,” Jay Winter suggests the usage of “historical remembrance,” which would be constituted by “acts and practices of groups of people who come together to remember particular historical incidents and upheavals” (278). Winter argues that the emphasis on remembrance should be linked to the emergence of memory—to the detriment of history, which it displaces—that begins to take place with the

Armed Resistance: Cultural Representations of the Anti-Francoist *Guerrilla*
Hispanic Issues On Line (2012)

intense attention the Holocaust started to receive in the 1970s. The quasi-sacred character that memory has in Jewish culture helps to understand why memory is valued over history when remembering the Holocaust.¹ When the Holocaust begins to be reconsidered from the point of view of the witness, the past is contemplated above all as the memory of the victims of an act so barbaric that it resists historical comprehension. This type of memory of the past, centered on the victim, entails the obligation of communal remembrance of past events, of collective commemoration. This practice is thus not merely an act of remembrance of a barbaric past that, in the Spanish case, and according to some theories, would have been forgotten, neglected or avoided until recently. Despite the numerous publications on the Civil War, and despite the considerable scholarly knowledge about the war, there is an insistence on the idea that the past has not been properly remembered, hence the injunctions to “recover” the memory of the past. This apparent paradox between increased historical knowledge and neglected memory can be explained only if we realize that what matters in the calls to remember the past is not the knowledge of that past but the need to remember it collectively, to make it the object of a moral, collective commemoration.

As Winter argues, historical remembrance works at cross-purposes with positivist history (289). In contrast with the always debatable representations of the past provided by historical knowledge, memory is valued for its seemingly immediate knowledge based on the testimonies that, in their ensemble, constitute a collective memory. It is not surprising, therefore, that the injunctions to “recover” the memory of the past grant a fundamental value to the testimony of the friends and families of the victims. However, when one sets memory above history, and especially when one speaks about historical memory in a totalizing, presumably universal way, one forgets that there are many historical memories of the Spanish Civil War—that historical memory is plural, although not all memories of the past are of equal value; one forgets also that memory has a history, that memory is as much a construction as history is, that both are constructed with plots, protagonists and materials that a community privileges at a given historical moment.² One of the more questionable presuppositions that underlay “historical memory”—as it is commonly used in the case of Spain—is the idea that the memory of a historical past is simply a question of memory or forgetfulness, and therefore a question of a will to remember or a desire to forget. Collective memory, which is always multiple and conflictive, is not a question of wanting to remember or wishing to forget, but is always a form of representation that is shaped by contemporary social and political interests. Even the individual memory of the historical past changes with time because, as Halbwachs argues, it is anchored in collective forms of remembrance; therefore, even the direct witnesses of past events do not have an unaltered memory of them, but remember instead—construct the past—in ways that shift in accordance with the values and interests that shape

collective forms of remembering.

Keeping in mind the previous considerations, one can understand the apparent paradox that results when the historian Santos Juliá offers a voluminous catalog of works on the Civil War published during the Transition as a reply to the accusations that during that historical period there was a willful neglect of the memory of the Civil War. Juliá's response (59–69) is accurate but also misses the point; he is replying to an accusation that is not formulated correctly and, furthermore, does not consider that what matters is not so much the quantity of works published about the past but the community's shifting bonds with, and uses of, the historical past. Leaving aside the fact that frequently the past that is more intensely remembered (and felt) is not the one that is an explicit object of conversation or discussion, the recrimination that the Civil War was not remembered during the Transition has to be understood in the sense that *it was not remembered through narratives centered on the victims of the war and Francoism*, the favored protagonists of the collective narratives about the past that have become hegemonic in Spain since the 1990s. In the last two decades, there has been a massive, generalized shift in the way history is contemplated, with collectives now focusing on the past's human-induced calamities and horrors. As a consequence, the past has become the object of grievances and grieving. This contemporary relationship with history contrasts markedly with the now defunct idea of a teleological history—prevalent for almost two centuries—according to which history was supposed to be headed in an inexorable, clearly-plotted way towards a better future. Whether that future would come on its own, or it had to be forced by revolutionary violence, the promise of a better tomorrow made acceptable all sorts of sacrifices on behalf of personal and collective advancements.

Paloma Aguilar has offered compelling evidence that the Civil War had a decisive political role during, and on, the Transition. However, to assess that role, and therefore to determine the level and ways in which the Civil War was the subject of public and private discussion during the Transition, it is crucial to understand that in the 1970s the Civil War was still considered within the long-duration framework of teleological history—the war as a grand ideological, Europe-wide battle against totalitarianism. In that fight, it was naturally assumed that there would be victims, and that sacrifices would need to be made. Jaime Camino's documentary *La vieja memoria* (1977) is a good example of the “heroic” view of the Civil War that still prevailed in the 1970s: in this documentary, whose title alludes to the persistence of the memory of the war, not a single person interviewed—and they represent an assortment of political parties of the left and the right involved in the war—speaks about victims. On the contrary, interviewees mostly emphasize the efforts and sacrifices made—the defense of Madrid in the fall of 1936, one of the most hailed events of the Civil War, has a central role in the documentary where it is portrayed in an unabashedly romantic, heroic way.

In fact, in 2005, several witnesses interviewed in the documentary *Maquis* (directed by Guillermo García Ramos) interpret the armed resistance to Franco from a heroic and teleological point of view when they argue that all the maquis's sacrifices and personal deprivations, as well as their families's humiliations, had been worth suffering because they led to the freedom and democracy the country is now enjoying. In the words of Santiago Carrillo in that documentary, "Había que arriesgar la vida y había que aceptar todos esos sufrimientos porque ése era el precio de la victoria" (It was necessary to risk one's life and to accept all sorts of suffering because that was the price of victory). In agreement with that way of explaining personal sacrifices on behalf of a better future, Carrillo sees a continuity between the maquis and later forms of resistance to Francoism: "El ejemplo de los guerrilleros sirvió después para el desarrollo de todo el movimiento obrero, estudiantil, intelectual; en la práctica estaba engarzado con esa lucha de los guerrilleros. Era un cambio de estrategia pero era la misma lucha" (The example of the guerrilla fighters was useful later for the development of the workers's, students's and intellectuals's movements, which were linked to the fight of the maquis. There was a change of strategy, but it was the same fight).³

This (heroic) way of assessing history is now held only by some people of older generations— like Carrillo—and it even imbues the younger Alfonso Guerra's statements in that same documentary. However, that way of contemplating history has become increasingly obsolete since the 1970s, and has been gradually replaced by memory as the privileged way of constructing a past through narratives that have victims and witnesses as central protagonists, and grieving as a central form of affective connection with that past. Even in some cases, those viewed in past times as heroes who sacrificed themselves for a trans-individual cause are being considered in more recent times as victims, because in memory-centered narratives, history is mostly no longer made but endured. A commemoration of the past centered on horrors and victims entails a necessarily affective relationship with that past, and therefore commemorative narratives will favor an affective rhetoric in which the "past" becomes what Henry Rousseau calls "un passé qui ne passe pas"—a past that never passes, that refuses to become past.⁴ In that type of memory-centered relationship with the past, "memory" evinces that it is not properly or simply a faculty or the result of remembrance, but an affective relationship with a past that memory makes intensely present. This turn to memory explains the fact that in the last twenty years the Spanish Civil War has had (for many people) a much more intense immediacy than it did during the Transition, a historical moment in which the Civil War was a much more *affectively* distant referent, especially for the younger generations, for whom the past that mattered most, the past that served as primary reference—the past they most wanted to leave behind—was the oppressive and repressive past of Francoism.⁵ An affective rhetoric, which at its limit entails a wish to cancel the distance between

victim and spectator, prevails in many films and novels about the war and Francoism that came out after the late 1990s and it has even found its way into some history books. A good example of the temporal collapse intrinsic to a rhetoric of grieving can be found in some lines of a song about the maquis, “El emboscado” (The forest refugee), by the folk group Atlántica whose first stanza, which is also the song’s refrain, sounds while the credits are displayed at the end of the documentary *Los del monte* (2006): “Aún resuena por los aires, / De los montes y las brañas, / El llanto del emboscado, / Que vivió entre las montañas” (Still resounds in the air, / of the mountains and the meadows, / the weeping of the refugee / who lived hidden in the forest). The contrast between the two ways—heroic and affective—of giving shape to the past shows that the way the past lives in the present is not simply a matter of memory or amnesia, but of the value and the use (of the currency, one could say) that a particular way of relating to the past has at a given historical moment for a particular community. The favored way of relating to the past affects the plots, protagonists, rhetoric and values used to “represent” the past. If the past always determines the present, it is not less true that the present, and the imagined future, affects in decisive ways the past’s shifting shapes.

During Franco’s dictatorship, two basic narratives about the maquis were in circulation. According to the official version, propagated mainly by the press, the radio, a handful of films and, at the end of the Dictatorship, through *El maquis en España: Su historia* (1975), a book by lieutenant colonel Francisco Aguado Sánchez (1975), the maquis are characterized as bandits, assassins and robbers. A second, alternative version—a very complex and changing one, as we will see—circulated in whispers through oral narratives, especially in the areas where the maquis was active. Given the scarce and limited tradition of anti-Francoist representations of the maquis during the Dictatorship, it would seem that the directors who made films about the maquis after Franco’s death would have considerable latitude to effect their cultural constructions of the armed guerrilla. However, there were various limits imposed by the subject matter itself on its cultural representation, among them: the lack of a tradition of representation of the maquis; the plurality of political affiliations and motivations that impelled the variously called “maquis,” “huidos,” “fugados” or “escapados” (run aways), or simply “los del monte” or “los del bosque” (the refugees in the mountain forests); the long life of the guerrilla, which lasted from 1937 until 1965 (although its peak moment was from 1942–1948, and more precisely between 1944–1947); the evolution of the role played by the maquis for the different political groups that supported them; and, finally, the changing ways in which the maquis were considered socially (or even considered themselves) at different times. In fact, the shifting relationship between the maquis and the communities in which they operated affected, in decisive ways, the activities and evolution of the guerrilla. Such shifting also

complicated the maquis's future cultural representations—in particular, that relationship was deeply transformed by the massive repression unleashed by the government against the maquis's families and links in 1947 and by the maquis's tactical change dictated by the Communist Party in 1948.⁶

It is quite significant, but not surprising, that the leftist directors who felt compelled to make the maquis the focus of their films after the Dictatorship were born around the years of the Civil War—one of their decisive childhood experiences was to hear stories about the mysterious maquis who were living in nearby mountains. It seems thus natural that two directors born in the mountainous north of Spain—which was teeming with guerrillas in the 1940s—Mario Camus (born in 1935) and Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón (1942) were the first film directors who, after Franco's death, made the maquis the focus of their work in their respective films *Los días del pasado* (1978) and *El corazón del bosque* (1979). Among anti-Francoist filmmakers they had only two precedents. The first was *El espíritu de la colmena* (1973), a film in which Víctor Erice (born in 1940) gave a short but decisive role to a political runaway—a character based on the childhood experiences of Erice's co-script writer, Ángel Fernández Santos (born in 1934), whose father had given shelter to a maquis. Another director, Pedro Olea (1938), gave also a significant role to a maquis in *Pim, pam, pum . . . ¡fuego!* (1975), although Olea places him in the urban space in which he ends up hiding from the police, and not in the rural environment in which he had operated. The fact that these directors were children in the maquis's active years induces some of them to represent the maquis in their films from a child's point of view, as is the case in *El espíritu de la colmena* and also, as we will see, in *El corazón del bosque*.

Los días del pasado and *El corazón del bosque* are structured around the traveling search for a guerrilla fighter in the maquis's operating area. In *Los días del pasado* the guide who will bring us closer to the maquis is Juana, a schoolteacher who requested to be assigned to a school in the mountains of Asturias (in the border with Santander) where she knows her boyfriend Antonio is fighting. The election of Juana as our guide into guerrilla territory is highly significant because through her, the film focuses primarily not so much on the guerrilla's fight as on Juana's seven-year long exhausting wait for Antonio.⁷ In sum, the film presents a drama that has its origins in the clash between two alternative logics: that of the maquis, who does not want to stop fighting, and that of the girlfriend, whose life is left in indefinite suspension by the same cause Antonio wants to continue fighting. This clash is made explicit towards the end of the film, in a dialogue where Juana characterizes the seven years in which Antonio has been fighting (the film takes place in 1945, right after the end of the Second World War) as “lost time.” “No digas eso. Hago lo que tengo que hacer” (Don't say that. I am doing what I must do), replies Antonio, who asks Juana to keep waiting. “Tengo veintisiete años, Antonio . . . No tengo fuerzas. No puedo más. Me

voy ir a casa, con mi gente . . . no puedo más” (I am twenty-seven years old, Antonio . . . I no longer have strength. I can’t go on. I am going home, with my people . . . I can’t go on). And when she tells Antonio, “Haz lo que tengas que hacer” (Do what you must do), he replies: “Tú también” (And you too).⁸

Los días del pasado premiered in Madrid on March 1, 1978. In an article published in *El País* the day before, Camus provides some guidelines to understand the film: Juana and Antonio are ordinary people “que tienen encima piedras enormes de silencio y de olvido” (who have over them a thick layer of silence and oblivion). Camus’s film calls attention to a guerrilla warfare about which Spaniards had, at that time, scarce reliable information; he also emphasizes the exhaustion of a civil population that had to endure its own type of suffering during the years of armed resistance. Thus, Camus can state that to Juana, as much as to Antonio—to the schoolteacher as much as to the maquis—“les tocó cumplir un duro destino” (they had to endure a harsh fate), “el peor de los papeles en una época dura y hostil” (the worst of roles in a harsh and hostile period). “Fate” and “roles” are terms that point to a tragic vision of the war’s causes and consequences. There has been considerable debate about whether the Spanish Civil War can be considered a tragedy, a term used to describe it already while the war was being waged, by such disparate figures (from the left and from the right) as Indalecio Prieto and Melchor Fernández Almagro. The term “tragedy” was also favored years later (in the 1970s in particular) in some Francoist versions of the war, according to which a sort of inescapable fate had impelled Spaniards to a fratricide war.⁹ There was no such a thing as an inexorable fate that led unavoidably to a military confrontation, but there were, instead, circumstances and personal decisions that could have led the events in very different directions. However, once the war started, it could be considered a tragedy, not on account of its causes and personal responsibilities, but on account of its effects. In this sense, it is a tragedy that Antonio is forced, morally and politically, to wage a guerrilla war which the maquis can only lose, as the Socialists admitted already in the 1940s (and for that reason the maquis was for them not an armed fight but a testimony of resistance), and as the Communists finally recognized in 1947 when it was evident that western democracies were not going to remove Franco from power, an assurance that led the dictator to unleash a brutal offensive against the maquis and their families in that same year of 1947. It is also a tragedy that a young woman sees her life interrupted for seven years, has to end up deciding she can’t wait any longer and thus leaves her boyfriend in the lurch. The film alludes also to other civil dramas, like that of Juana’s father who was jailed for several years after the war, or that of Gelín, the ten-year-old boy whose father was killed during the war and who is still learning to read and write; above all, the whole film is pervaded by an atmosphere of mistrust and lack of communication in a rural community that has had to

endure an enormous amount of suffering as a consequence of the war and the guerrilla. In its emphasis on these civil dramas, and in Juana's final decision to resume a life that has suffered a long interruption, the film points to the onerous, widespread costs of the war among the civil population: a suffering—and this cannot be emphasized enough—that stands in stark if mute contrast with the prominence of the more obvious, and spectacular, victims of the ideological and military confrontation that have been the focus of the cultural constructions and civil vindications of the past in recent years. The costs—the suffering, repression, limitations, frustrations—for the civil population during the war and the long and harsh postwar years were incalculable, and if anything from that period needs to be remembered anew—if any memory is in dire need of “recovery,” of being re-presented—it is the unimaginable costs inflicted on the overall civil population during the Dictatorship, costs made more pernicious because they had to be endured daily, and silently, leaving behind a dour wake of frustration—the empty memory of what could not be. These costs were not evident and spectacular, but their silent, unspoken nature belies their rigor and extent, and they deserve much more attention if one wants to reach a rigorous understanding of the processes and dynamics that were operative in the Transition. Such dynamics were determined to a large extent by people's memory of the Dictatorship and by the populace's determined and relentless political pressure throughout the Transition, not simply by the secret decision of a cabal of politicians who would have reached a political pact without much intervention from the civil population—as it is maintained by a determinedly wrongheaded but widespread interpretation of the Transition. In this optic, Juana's exhaustion in *Los días del pasado* was in accordance with a pervasive tiredness about the years of the Dictatorship, which was primarily seen, especially by the younger generations, as a long interruption they yearned to leave behind in their desire to live in freedom and to recover, to the extent that it was still possible, so much lost time. For this reason, the long night of Francoism had as much relevance during the Transition—although in a different register—as the second-hand memory of the Civil War.

Los días del pasado starts with an epigraph that is written on the screen word by word before the credit titles are shown: “Las arenas del mar, / las gotas de la lluvia, / y los días del pasado . . . / ¿quién podrá contarlos?” (*Eclesiástico* 1.2) (The sands of the sea, / the drops of rain, / and the days of the past . . . / ¿who would be able to count them?). This quote, taken from a book of the *Bible* also known in Spanish as *Libro de la Sabiduría de Jesús, hijo de Sirah* (*Ecclesiasticus* in English), is a curious translation because several versions of the *Bible*—the *Biblia* published by Editorial Herder and *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (in which the book is included among the Apocrypha with the title *Sirach*)—use “eternity” instead of “past,” a translation that makes sense considering that the *Ecclesiasticus*'s section

from which Camus takes the quote is an illustration, according to the *Oxford Bible* “of the impossibility of fathoming the depths of divine wisdom” (the book begins with the verses “all wisdom comes from the Lord / and remains with him forever” [note to 1.1]). The lines refer to an uncountable infinity while the translation used in the film points to a past still to be narrated or to whom could narrate it—as much in the sense of who has the right or the authority to narrate it, as in the ways in which the past can, or should, be narrated. Whether Camus had all these possibilities in mind or not, what matters is that the film, by narrating the days of the past in the way it does, gives a response to all those questions and possibilities: morally, the days of the maquis can, or should, be told by someone who is willing to create a version of the maquis that rescues them from the oblivion Camus refers to in his article, from the perverse distortions of the Francoist versions; to the implicit question of how to narrate their days, the film responds with a double tragedy—that of the maquis who feels compelled to fulfill until the end a political role that dooms him to a tragic outcome, and that of the girlfriend who, tired of waiting, decides to resume her life knowing full-well that she will be scarred forever by her renunciation, as one can see at the end of the film, when Juana, now a schoolteacher in a southern seaside town, stares pensively into the void, remembering the doomed Antonio.

Camus’s narrative choices—the final and painful decisions each of the two characters make: the two dramatic ends—are among many others he could have made because he could have told the past of the maquis in many other ways. By deciding on his particular strategy, but implying with the epigraph that there are nonetheless uncountable ways of narrating the past, this film does not claim any morally superior territory according to which its way of telling the past—of constructing a remembrance of the maquis—would be the only, or the most correct one: such narrative modesty goes hand-in-hand with a political integrity that contrasts with the puzzling judgment of a critic who denounces “la desmovilizadora operación ideológica practicada por un film en el que participaron, en sus facetas claves, notorios miembros del PSOE” (the maneuver of ideological demobilization effected by a film in which well known members of the PSOE had critical roles), without specifying what such maneuver consists of. That same critic dispenses another absurd accusation against the film: “El cansancio y desaliento sentimental de Juana en el final del film se hace discurrir parejo a la claudicación y abandonismo político de la causa guerrillera” (Company 769) (Juana’s exhaustion and sentimental discouragement at the end of the film run parallel to the political abandonment of the guerrilla warfare). This holier-than-thou, incoherent critique—there is no political demobilization in the film, since Antonio keeps fighting until his death—furthermore ignores the historical reality of the period in which the film takes place (the soon to be reached decision by the Communists, not the Socialists, that the armed resistance was politically

ineffective) and exhibits a moral harshness that stems from an obdurate insensitivity to the characters's realistic and tragic dilemmas.

In its distinct division in two parts, the poster for *Los días del pasado* already alludes to the two dimensions, personal and political, embodied by the maquis and the schoolteacher. The upper portion consists of a school photograph that reproduces a scene in the film in which Juana and her pupils sit in two rows for a picture taken at the school door. As much for its theme as for its style, the poster's lower portion contrasts noticeably with the upper portion, consisting of a drawing in which four maquis defend themselves with rifles against the attack of an invisible enemy. This section of the poster has a balloon with the words "hicieron la guerra con alpargatas . . . ¡Y aún seguían en ella!" (they fought the war wearing espadrilles . . . And they were still fighting!), a phrasing that appears, with almost identical words, in the Camus article quoted above ("hicieron la guerra en alpargatas y siguieron en ella largos años" [they waged the war wearing espadrilles, and kept fighting for many years]). In 1978, the poster's reference to the maquis wouldn't be immediately evident for many Spaniards. "Espadrilles" and the "war" are indirect references to the Republicans who kept fighting as maquis after the Civil War was over, but those cryptic references to the maquis are clarified somehow by the statement that presides over the poster, "este relato intenta mostrar un trozo del lado oculto de nuestra más cercana e íntima historia" (this story aims to show a fragment of the hidden side of our immediate and intimate history), a statement that resembles the one used by Camus in his article when he refers to Juana and Antonio as ordinary human beings—"que tienen encima piedras enormes de silencio y de olvido" (who have over them a thick layer of silence and oblivion). It is noteworthy that Camus uses two words, silence and oblivion, that have been bandied about frequently in recent years; however, what is most significant in *Los días del pasado* is not that the film breaks the very real silence and forgetfulness that surrounded the memory of the post-war maquis for most Spaniards in 1978, but the way it does it—the personal and political conflicts that the film foregrounds in its effort to show the spectators a possible version of a recent, repressed past.

No matter how schematic Antonio's psychological portrayal is, by characterizing him through a poignant personal dilemma and an unwavering political determination, the film's representation of a maquis stands out in clear contrast with the purely political depiction that prevails in recent documentaries such as *Maquis* (2005), in which the guerrilla fighters are reduced to their roles in the armed resistance while the interviews with their civil links and family members focus on the perils and hardships they had to endure (jailing, torture) for the support they lent to the armed resistance. Neither the documentary itself nor the former maquis or relatives interviewed refer at any moment to any doubts or dilemmas the maquis, their liaisons, or their family members might have faced in those harsh and difficult years (of course, the responsibility for such limited view falls

squarely on the director's shoulders). It would seem that all that was going on in the years of the maquis was a determined, unhesitating ideological conflict in which the only personal costs were those inflicted by the repressive forces. In other words, the protagonists featured in *Maquis* can be neatly divided into two groups whose members are determined by their political roles—fighters and victims. In this classification, there is no space left for human dilemmas or hesitations.¹⁰ Although it focuses on the maquis as fighters, *Los del monte* (2006) places great emphasis on the fighters's personal vicissitudes and predicaments, which stemmed from their complex relationships with both the communities near which they operated and the Civil Guard in charge of fighting them (far from being simple, the relationship with the Civil Guard was quite complex and nuanced on many occasions). As a consequence, the maquis featured in this documentary are represented not simply as fighters or victims but as complex human beings. This documentary also confronts head-on the politically calculating role of the Communist Party by recording the opinions of some of the foremost historians of the maquis, among them Secundino Serrano. According to Serrano, at the beginning of the armed resistance the Communist Party “les dio objetivos políticos” (gave them political objectives), thus transforming them from runaways into maquis, but in the end “abusó de ellos” (used them) because “pensó en términos políticos, no en términos humanos” (the party thought in political terms, not in human ones) when it decided to continue the guerrilla warfare so that the party would have a political presence in Spain. In the documentary *Maquis*, Serrano states, “no sé si se puede criticar al PC” in retrospect (I don't know whether one can criticize the Communist Party), “pero lo que sí que es cierto es que a partir del año 1946 y sobre todo del 1947 no tenía sentido ninguno mantener a los guerrilleros en los montes de España. Los estaban condenando literalmente a morir” (but what is true is that starting in 1946, and above all from 1947 on, it didn't make any sense to keep the maquis in the mountains of Spain. They were condemning them to die).¹¹

The end of 1979—a little over a year later after Camus's film was released—saw the premiere in Madrid of the film *El corazón del bosque*, directed by Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón, based on a script co-written by Gutiérrez Aragón and Luis Megino. Shown in Madrid's Alphaville movie theatre, it stayed on screen for several months and was a critical success. *El corazón del bosque* is very close to *Los días del pasado* in its geography, both taking place in the border area between Asturias and Santander. Furthermore, the two films focus on the relationship between the maquis and the civil population and, in particular, their families and loved ones. In a way similar to Camus's film, *El corazón del bosque* ends up as a drama that stems from conflicts between the personal and the political. However, Gutiérrez Aragón's film differs from Camus's by placing the action in 1952. 1952 is considered by historians as the final year of the armed resistance,

although some men stayed in the mountains, or in hiding, until 1965, the year in which the Civil Guard killed “O Piloto,” (The Pilot) who is believed to have been the last guerrilla fighter. While for Camus the main concern was how to represent a maquis at a time when there was hardly any sympathetic precedent or tradition of its representation, for Gutiérrez Aragón the most pressing issue was how to represent a maquis, El Andarín, at a time when he no longer can be considered a maquis, having cut his ties with the political group with which he had been affiliated—referred to in the film as the Party, a clear allusion to the Communist Party. In *Los días del pasado*, the maquis are portrayed as representatives of a fight that in the year in which the film takes place—the end of 1945—was being carried out with the hope that the western democracies would intervene in Spain and depose Franco. However, how does one represent a maquis that has decided to isolate himself, who is no longer properly a maquis? What is, then, El Andarín? When the political parties changed their strategy and abandoned guerrilla warfare, Gutiérrez Aragón stated in a 1979 interview, “Los guerrilleros que quedaban se convirtieron en luchadores por su propia subsistencia, es decir, en bandidos o mendigos. La película comienza justamente ahí. Está basada en hechos reales . . . aunque se muestran recopilados, como si se tratara de una antología de anécdotas y caracteres del maquis” (The maquis that remained in the mountains kept fighting for their own survival, that is, they became bandits or beggars. The film starts precisely at that point. It is based on real facts . . . although they are condensed, as if it were an anthology of anecdotes and characters of the maquis).

In 1947 Franco dictated a decree-law on “Bandidaje y Terrorismo” (“Banditry and Terrorism”), placing the fight against the maquis under military jurisdiction, which gave the government leeway to declare a state of war or of exception in the areas where the maquis were fighting; this order also allowed the government to apply at will the “ley de fugas” (by which the Civil Guard could kill a prisoner who actually or allegedly tried to escape). That law was reinforced by an increase of the Civil Guard’s resources and by the creation of a system of awards and punishments for the civil guards, based on the zeal they displayed in their pursuit of the maquis. Additionally, the government created incentives for informers, and began to inflict severe punishments on the maquis’s families and links, detaining, torturing, or killing them so that they would betray, abandon, or isolate the guerrilla fighters (Serrano 231–43). The maquis replied to these measures with extreme harshness and brutality (especially against informers), engaging also in personal vendettas, which was “la constatación de que la guerrilla se encontraba en un proceso de desintegración y no existía un control político de la misma” (Serrano 244) (the confirmation that the maquis was starting to disintegrate and was no longer under political control). The regime’s harsh strategy caused an enormous number of

casualties among the maquis, his families and links, and it had a crucial role in the opposition's resolution to abandon the armed resistance as a political tactic, a decision that transformed the guerrilla fighters into mere runaways. In October of 1948, Stalin advised the leaders of the Spanish Communist Party to abandon the armed struggle gradually and to start working instead with the unions and other legal mass organizations, thereby shifting the struggle from the countryside to the city. However, the demobilization of the maquis proceeded with many doubts and contradictions, and many decisions were made without consulting with the maquis or ignoring their views (Serrano 287–91). The opposition cancelled the armed resistance in 1949, although in some cases it continued until the spring of 1952 when, with hardly any maquis left in the mountains, the Communist leaders in exile decreed the definitive cancellation of the armed resistance (Serrano 340, 293).

Serrano tackles head-on a problem of definition and terminology that in Gutiérrez Aragón's film corresponds with the issue of how to represent a "maquis" who has decided to stay in the mountains on his own once the armed resistance had been officially cancelled: "La permanencia en el monte a partir de 1950 provocó que combatientes antifranquistas, a los que nadie había negado su condición de guerrilleros, terminaran siendo vistos como expropiadores o bandidos en el lenguaje coloquial" (Serrano 255) (Their permanence in the mountains after 1950 was the reason that the anti-Francoist fighters, until then widely recognized as maquis, became robbers or bandits in the minds of common people). In this regard, Serrano gives as an example the case of Juan Fernández Ayala, "Juanín," a member of the Communist Party whose stay in the mountains, until his death in 1957, transformed him from a maquis into a "bandido generoso" (a generous bandit) because in his final years he was not backed by any political party that would provide him with "el soporte de legitimidad necesario para proseguir con la violencia revolucionaria" (the necessary legitimacy to continue waging revolutionary violence), a lack of support that transformed him into "un delincuente de origen político" (Serrano 255) (a delinquent with a political origin). As one can see, the same people who, before 1948, could be called maquis or guerrilla fighters (although the government called them robbers and bandits) become very difficult to categorize already in 1949, and hence the great variety of terms the historian Secundino Serrano uses to refer to them, "expropiadores" (expropriators), "bandidos" (bandits), "hombres acosados" (hounded men), "huidos sin esperanza" (Serrano 340) (hopeless runaways). Juanín was precisely who Gutiérrez Aragón had in mind when he created the character El Andarín, who is based on the director's childhood memories of the maquis, and especially of Juanín, who was in hiding near the town where Gutiérrez Aragón's family lived. The maquis, states Gutiérrez Aragón, "estaban mitificados por la astucia y la valentía, no por ser héroes populares . . . Iba más por el lado de la leyenda y

la mítica que por el político” (Torres 102) (were turned into legends on account of their guile and courage, not because they were popular heroes . . . They were closer to the stuff of legends and myths than to the political realm). In another interview, the director goes into more detail regarding the stories about the maquis he had heard in his childhood: “Vivíamos en los años cuarenta y las chachas me formaron un imaginario de historias oscuras y de maquis, porque casi todas eran hijas de fusilados o de perdedores de la guerra, circunstancia que les había empujado a servir, como el caso de Genia, que me contaba siempre historias boscosas, secretas y misteriosas” (Herederó, “*El cine*” 15) (I was a child in the 1940s, and my family’s maids shaped my imagination with enigmatic stories about the war and the maquis, because most of them were daughters of people who had either been executed by the Francoists or had lost the war, and for that reason they had been forced to become servants, as was the case of Genia, who always would tell me secret, mysterious stories that took place in forests).

In the 1950s, the maquis becomes an “anacronismo” (Serrano 340) (anachronism) or, in the words of Gutiérrez Aragón in a 1979 interview (“Entrevista”), the Andarín becomes a “héroe que vive más allá de su tiempo” (a hero who lives beyond his time), and thus is transformed “en un esclavo, en un mendigo” (into a slave, into a beggar), terms that further complicate the shifting terminology used by Serrano to refer to what the maquis became once the political parties renounced the armed resistance. How can a film director, therefore, represent a figure that cannot be referred to by a proper term? When they were doing research for the film, Gutiérrez Aragón and Megino realized that “los hechos que se producían en un valle eran similares o iguales a los de otros, como si fueran arquetipos antropológicos” (the information we obtained was very similar or even identical in one valley after another, as if they were anthropological archetypes), such as love stories between a maquis and another maquis’s sister, or a relationship with a family member who supported a maquis, usually a brother-in-law, but ends up betraying him. For that reason, Gutiérrez Aragón thinks that “la película es más antropológica que política” (the film is more anthropological than political), and in this sense, the director concludes, “un maquis tiene mucho más que ver con un cuento fantástico que con la política. Es alguien del que se habla en susurros nocturnos, al que se adora y se teme” (“Entrevista”) (a maquis is more related to a fantasy story than to politics. He is someone people talk about in whispers at night, who is revered and feared). Based on these premises, Gutiérrez Aragón was inspired by the anthropological theories expounded by Frazer in *The Golden Bough*—a work very much in fashion in Spain in the 1970s—and also by Vladimir Propp’s theories about the typology of folktale narratives.¹² However, the fact that in their field research Gutiérrez Aragón and Megino found archetypes that kept reappearing in different valleys (or perhaps, imbued with Frazer’s and Propp’s ideas, they were more attuned to

repetitions than to differences), does not mean that the film is “anthropological,” as Gutiérrez Aragón proposes. No matter its resemblance to a fantasy story or a folktale narrative, *El corazón del bosque* is political through and through because it attempts to represent what a human being becomes once he loses the political support that made him a maquis and becomes increasingly isolated from his native, rural community. The problem Gutiérrez Aragón had to face was how to represent a recluse whose decision to remain in the forest places him outside of the political realm while he is still nonetheless the aim of politics.

The film has some features that resemble elements typical of folktale narratives, like the search, the transformation, and the number three: a character, Juan, who is sent by “the Party” to convince El Andarín to depose the armed struggle and go into exile, makes three attempts to find the elusive runaway who has suffered a drastic transformation in the years he has spent in the forest. The presence of the number three, so common in folktale narratives, responds to the repetitions that Gutiérrez Aragón and Megino found in their field research, and it is also in accordance with the director’s childhood memories of the maquis as a legendary being that inspires terror and awe simultaneously. Besides, the folktale structure is a good solution to the dilemma of how to represent a human being who has lost his political and communitarian bonds and thus has become something indefinable. In this way, the forest ends up becoming the film’s true protagonist because, as a result of the maquis’s transformation, the forest goes from being the maquis’s refuge to become a mysterious, feral space ruled by the law of the fittest. In the director’s opinion, the forest where El Andarín lives is “un lugar horroroso que se acerca más a la visión que dan de él los cuentos infantiles, donde es la morada de las brujas, los ogros y, en definitiva, de la muerte. A los últimos maquis los derrotó el bosque más que la Guardia Civil” (Torres 113) (a place of horror that resembles the space of folk tales, where it is the dwelling place of witches, ogres and, in sum, death. The last maquis were defeated by the forest much more than by the Civil Guard).¹³ The film’s poster reinforces the forest’s prominence and the undefined status of the maquis. Designed by the legendary film director Iván Zulueta about the time when he was directing *Arrebato*— a film in which children’s narratives also play a central role— the poster’s center is the image of the old tree that in the film is closely linked with El Andarín. The figure of Angela Molina (who portrays the main female character) seems to sprout from the tree’s stem (actually, she is so fused with the tree that her right arm is almost indistinguishable from the tree itself), while the stunned image of Juan raises out of the tree’s thick, twisted branches. For his part, El Andarín—drawn at a smaller scale—seems to rest (or be dead) by the tree’s base. As we have seen, in *Los días del pasado* Juana served as the spectator’s guide into the world of the maquis; in a similar way, in *El corazón del bosque* we join Juan when he goes in search of El Andarín to

attempt to convince him to abandon the forest and the armed resistance. However, in the forest Juan finds much more than he bargained for—he does not encounter a fighter but a strange, indeterminate, monstrous being. As Gutiérrez Aragón states, the film is “una reflexión sobre una realidad que ya no tiene certezas absolutas” (a meditation about a reality that no longer offers any absolute certainty). Neither heroes nor villains, he continues, the film’s protagonists are mere survivors who are “privados de una ideología que analice la realidad en los justos términos en que lo hacían en otros tiempos” (Heredero, “*El cine*” 81) (deprived of an ideology that in the past could accurately analyze reality).

Recent documentaries contrast sharply with the two films made during the Transition. While it is true that documentaries follow methods and protocols that differentiate them from fiction films—although the border between them is not always well-defined—those differences do not explain the contrast between the older films and recent documentaries. For the most part, the latter present the members of the maquis as one-dimensional people defined fundamentally by their role in the anti-Francoist resistance while their relatives are portrayed as unflinching supporters of the maquis and victims of personal humiliations inflicted by authorities. In these elegiac documentaries, there is not even a hint of an exploration about the sharp ideological and tactical differences between Communist, Socialist and anarchist maquis, or about the decisive changes undergone by the armed resistance throughout the years, much less any reference to the deadly struggles between Communist and Anarchist maquis or to Stalin’s role in the changing tactics of the Communist armed resistance. For the most part, all that seems to matter in recent documentaries is the anti-Francoist resistance—its heroes and its victims—even if it is at the expense of a rigorous history and a probing examination. An example of this approach can be found in the documentary *La guerrilla de la memoria* (2001), which consists of interviews with former maquis, their links and relatives. This documentary offers a historical-political explanation devoid of problems and nuances, reducing the armed resistance to an exemplary, one-dimensional narrative of resistance threaded with suffering and sacrifices. This impression is reinforced by the strategy of letting the interviewees’s voices flow uninterrupted, omitting any trace of interviewers or interlocutors, a strategy that seems geared to create the impression that the truth of the past (the “memory” of the past) flows by itself—is “recovered”—without any mediations. Although it consists only of personal testimonies—it is more a document of collective “memory” than a historical exploration—there is, in the documentary, a severe simplification of history and politics as well as an obvious evasion of complexity. In the history this documentary outlines, there is no specification of the witnesses’s political affiliations—Communist, Socialist, anarchist. Instead, they are simply presented as “anti-Francoists” who, according to some testimonials offered in the documentary,

presumably fought together. This assessment is belied by historians of the maquis who not only point out the enormous differences between the maquis led by the Communists (the most active), the Socialists (who opted mainly for a testimonial resistance), and the anarchists, but stress also the fights and disagreements between maquis of different affiliations as well as the betrayals, punishments and purges inflicted by the Communists on the anarchists. Several testimonies emphasize that “éramos una guerrilla popular anclada en el pueblo” (we were a popular guerrilla anchored in the populace), a questionable statement that does not consider the significant regional differences (although the maquis interviewed operated in Galicia, Andalucía, Levant and Catalonia) or the temporally changing status of the maquis and the shifting views the populace had about them. As it often happens in other documentaries geared towards “recovering” the memory of the Civil War, history is flattened and simplified, and historical specificities and ideological differences and complexities are erased. As could be foreseen in this type of intervention, in the end the documentary reiterates the predictable platitudes about memory and forgetfulness that have become common currency, lodging vague accusations (“esos intentos de hacer que no se hable . . . es una traición a la historia, no a nosotros” [the attempts to impose silence . . . betray history, not us]), as one former maquis observes. Curiously, the same former maquis who wants to set history straight (his political affiliation as a maquis is never mentioned, but it can be deduced that he fought with the Communist guerrilla), contends that it was the maquis, not the leadership of the Communist Party, who understood the need to abandon the armed struggle and leave the country.

Because it does not sidestep problems and historical nuances, the most cogent testimonial in *La guerrilla de la memoria* is offered by Eduardo Pons Prades, a former fighter in the French maquis and an expert on the urban guerrilla in Spain. He is the only one who speaks in the documentary about the anarchist urban guerrilla in Spain’s post-war period (this type of guerrilla is rarely mentioned in the documentaries of the type examined here, and in *La guerrilla de la memoria* has the marginal presence granted to a curious oddity). Pons Prades’s is the only voice that breaks with the wishful, commemorative unanimity of the other witnesses interviewed in the documentary when he observes that not all people who fled to the mountains organized themselves to fight or even had political ideas or objectives beyond the mere wish to survive. This type of observation complicates the political representation of the runaways as well as the cultural and historical representation of that experience (as do, in different ways, Camus’s and Gutiérrez Aragón’s films), because such reconstruction of a people and a period cannot be reduced to questions of memory and forgetfulness, of amnesia and “recuperation” of memory—the stereotypes that, predictably, end up being enunciated by the narrative voice in *La guerrilla de la memoria*, when the narration states that after their exile, the maquis returned

to Spain to wage a new fight—“that of memory”—an idea that is also announced on the DVD cover: “Esta es una historia sobre la memoria, y por lo tanto sobre el olvido. Es también la historia de un viaje con los guerrilleros antifranquistas, un viaje en el tiempo, hacia los recuerdos, un viaje de vuelta a los montes y a los árboles. Un viaje hacia un momento de la historia de España que ya nadie visita” (This is a story about memory, and therefore about oblivion. It is also a story about a journey with the anti-Francoist maquis, a journey back in time, towards the memories of the past, a journey back to the mountains and the trees. A journey to a time in the history of Spain to which nobody goes back any more).

Even in a more nuanced and less simplifying documentary as *Los del monte*, the complaints about silence and forgetfulness are not lacking. In this documentary, such complaints appear in the voice of the writer Julio Llamazares, author of *Luna de lobos* (1985), an important novel on the guerrilla fighters, about stories he frequently heard in his childhood:

Lo que les ocurrió a los maquis es que han sido maquis siempre, porque en la época de Franco no se podía hablar de ellos porque eran los malos de la película, en la democracia no se podía hablar de ellos porque era una época en la que había habido un pacto de olvido, y ahora que ya ha pasado más el tiempo pues se ha muerto la mayoría y siguen en el olvido prácticamente y de hecho esa continua revisitación que se hace, la continua aparición de libros sobre los maquis, sobre los del monte, precisamente [¿es?] por esa mezcla de realidad y fantasía, de leyenda y de mito que tienen.

(What has happened to the maquis is that they have always been maquis, because in Franco’s time one could not speak about them because they were the movie’s bad guys, when democracy arrived one could not talk about them because there had been a pact of forgetfulness, and now that more time has elapsed it turns out that most of them are dead, and they continue in oblivion, and actually the constant revisitation of the issue, the persistent publication of books about the maquis, about the men in the mountains, [is due?] precisely to that mixture of fantasy and reality, of legend and myth that surrounds them).

Although one has to wonder who or what prevented Llamazares from speaking or writing about the maquis at any time after Franco’s death (his novel found an estimable success in the early times of Spanish democracy and was made into a film), what is most relevant in this apparent stereotypical complaint about silence and forgetfulness is the way Llamazares connects silence and representation, two issues that are inextricably linked. It is not strictly true that one could not speak about the maquis in Franco’s time—Llamazares himself refers to the “historias de los

del monte que yo escuchaba como si fueran cuentos fantásticos, cuentos para niños” (*Los del monte*) (stories about the men in the mountains that I used to listen to as if they were fantastic tales, children’s tales), although years later he realized how serious and even tragic those stories were. When he enunciates the apparent tautology that the maquis “have always been maquis,” Llamazares is alluding to the difficulty of producing a cultural representation of the maquis that could supersede the socially and culturally persistent image of the maquis as protagonists of fantastic tales. This is the representational quandary that, in different ways, Camus and Gutiérrez Aragón raise and respond to; it is also the question that is sidestepped, and seemingly never considered, by documentaries such as *Maquis* or *La guerrilla de la memoria*, in their assumption that the issue is simply a problem of silence and forgetfulness that can be solved by letting the witnesses speak, thus recovering the silenced memories of the past. If such were the case, the solution would be epistemologically very simple.

Most Spanish citizens cannot have, properly speaking, a “historical memory” of the Civil War and early Francoism, but have access only to representations of the past, to collective narratives that construct, and transmit, a “memory” of the past: historical memory is not properly a memory, but nothing more, and nothing less, than shared narratives. Llamazares’s statement also calls attention to the fact that “historical memory,” as representation of the past, has its own history. Furthermore, it also raises the issue that certain memories of the past can be so deeply ingrained as to become naturalized, therefore resisting renewal and becoming obdurate to the passage of time, as if they were permanent—as no memory, always flowing and fleeting, can ever be. The early fantastical narratives about the maquis are an example of memory of the historical past that resists renewal, as Llamazares attests. However, a historical representation must never “forget” the double historical dimension that underlies it—the historicity of the object of representation, and the historicity of the representation itself. When such double historicity is neglected, we have either bad history, bad cultural representation of the past, or both.

The persistence of the conceptual questions regarding “historical memory,” the affective nature of memory as the predominant way of relating to the past, and the unmistakable commemorative nature of the vindications of historical memory, are clear signs that the issue of “historical memory” will not go away, no matter the copious number of publications on the war and Francoism, the massive “spectacular” attention the media have bestowed on the issue, the public debates “historical memory” has generated, or the political solutions that have been implemented. The issues surrounding “historical memory” will not go away because its concepts and rituals are displaced signs of a profound discontent with history’s unrelieved horrors and unredeemable catastrophes.

Notes

1. For the conflict between memory and history in Jewish culture, see Yerushalmi. Memory begins to be favored at the same time—the 1970s—as history’s objectivity starts to be questioned by Hayden White and others who see history as a construction and no longer as a “scientific” knowledge of the past. The emergence of memory and the corresponding “crisis” of history have to be related also to Lyotard’s pronouncement—made also in the 1970s—about the contemporary decline of the grand teleological narratives of history.
2. For a consideration of the “historization of memory” and the “memorizing of history”, see Ricoeur, 385–393.
3. In the same documentary, Alfonso Guerra also explains the maquis in heroic and teleological terms, seeing it as a “gesta moral grandiosa” (grandiose moral deed), “digna de ser vivida” (worthy of being lived), that led to democracy: “lo que la Constitución del 78 quiere proteger y amparar es por lo que ellos lucharon” (what the Constitution of 1978 wants to protect are the same ideas for which they fought).
4. See Henry Rousso and Eric Conan, *Vichy: Un passé qui ne passe pas*. For memory’s affective rhetoric in recent constructions of the Spanish Civil War, see Loureiro, “Pathetic arguments” or the Spanish-language version, “Argumentos patéticos: Historia y memoria de la guerra civil.”
5. Among many other possible testimonies that the past that mattered most—the past that was more affectively present—to young people during the Spanish transition to democracy, see Ribas. However, as Paloma Aguilar argues, the Civil War had a decisive role in the political and institutional changes effected during the Transition, but even in this case, the memory of the war—the way assorted collectives related to the war—was not endowed with the affective investment that has become prevalent in recent years. As Aguilar shows, the memory of the war was a decisive factor in the Transition’s institutional solutions, but most of the Transition’s cultural production (especially notable documentaries like *La vieja memoria*, *Después de . . .*, or *Caudillo*) that dealt seriously with Franco or the war attracted very little public interest, which leads Aguilar to state that “no existió tanto un problema de oferta cultural como de demanda” (297) (there was not a problem of cultural offer, but of demand). While the documentaries just mentioned did not find an audience, some of the top grossing films in the Transition dealt with aspects of *daily life* under the Dictatorship (*Furtivos*, *El amor del capitán Brando*, *La guerra de papá*, *La escopeta nacional*, *La colmena*), a fact that would seem to reinforce the idea that at the popular level (and definitely among young people) the past that was most affectively charged during the Transition was that of the repressed, miserable daily life under the Dictatorship.
6. For an overall view of the maquis in Spanish cinema, see Carlos Heredero, “Historias de maquis en el cine español: Entre el arrepentimiento y la reivindicación.” In “La representación del maquis en la historia del cine español: De bandoleros a guerrilla,” Carmen Moreno-Nuño offers another broad view that includes also literary works on the maquis.
7. The centrality of Juana’s character is made evident by the fact that she is present in the film’s vast majority of sequences (all but five) (Sánchez Noriega 269).

8. In his resolute determination to fight till the end, Antonio overcomes the agony and exhaustion—a consequence of having been fighting since 1936—he had expressed in a letter to Juana. In that letter, which Juana reads at the beginning of the film in the train that is taking her to the North, Antonio tells her about the vicissitudes he has gone through in recent years (his internment in a concentration camp in Algiers after the end of the Spanish Civil War; his participation in the French resistance; his return to Spain as a maquis), experiences he shared with other Spanish maquis: “¿Cuántas guerras más tengo que hacer para que podamos vivir con dignidad? Juana, han pasado siete años como si hubiera sido un instante. Allí en Argelia apenas si sabíamos de la guerra que estaba muy cerca. Y un día los franceses nos atendieron y nos llevaron a Francia. Y nos vimos otra vez con el fusil, escondiéndonos en los bosques haciendo la guerra contra los alemanes. Éramos muchos y fueron cayendo lejos de su casa un montón de españoles. Nosotros seguimos, sabiendo que era una tristeza morir allí, pero era lo único que había que hacer . . . Ganamos la guerra, Juana. Cayó París. Cayó Berlín. Y ahora que los soldados dejan las armas, nosotros volvemos a empezar” (How many more wars do I have to wage so that we can live with dignity? Juana, seven years have passed by, and it feels as if it had been just an instant. Down there in Algiers we scarcely knew the war was so close. And one day the French took care of us and moved us to France. And then we had to carry a rifle again, hiding in the forests, waging war against the Germans. There were quite a few of us Spaniards, and many of them died far away from their homes. We kept going, knowing how sad it was to die there, but we knew that we didn’t have any recourse but to keep fighting . . . We won the war, Juana. Paris fell. Berlin fell. And now that the soldiers are putting down their arms, we are starting over).
9. See Boyd’s analysis of the idea of the Civil War as a tragedy in the school texts of the 1970s and 1980s (90–94).
10. It is very revealing to compare the testimonies from members of an array of parties (Communists, anarchists, Falangists, Catalan Nationalists) that compose *La vieja memoria* with the one-sided, monolithic political views that are expressed in *Maquis*.
11. It could be instructive to contrast the narratives produced by historians like Secundino Serrano and Francisco Moreno in these documentaries with the stories weaved by the witnesses and the documentaries in their totality. Towards the end of *Los del bosque*, several old maquis make reference to the Party’s abandonment, which left them without resources to flee or even to subsist. In contrast, the documentary as a whole tends to present a somewhat benevolent image of the armed fight, by insisting on the generosity and bravery of the maquis, and on the admiration and respect the civil guards felt towards them. While *Maquis* simplifies the issue by reducing its protagonists to fighters and victims, *Los del monte* presents a more complex picture, but somehow lightens the suffering and traumas of the fight’s protagonists.
12. For an exploration of the presence of Frazer’s ideas in *El corazón del bosque*, see Molina Fox, 64–69. Gutiérrez Aragón had already shown an early inclination towards folktale narratives when he selected *Hansel and Gretel* as the subject of his thesis practice at the Escuela Oficial de Cinematografía in 1969.
13. Gutiérrez Aragón wrote the script for *Furtivos* (1975), directed by José Luis Borau, another film in which the forest plays a central role in the clash between rebels and authorities.

Works Cited

- Aguado Sánchez, Francisco. *El maquis en España: su historia*. Madrid: Librería Editorial San Martín, 1975. Print.
- Aguilar, Paloma. "La evocación de la guerra y del franquismo en la política, la cultura y la sociedad españolas." *Memoria de la guerra y del franquismo*. Ed. Santos Juliá. Madrid: Taurus/Fundación Pablo Iglesias, 2006. 279–317. Print.
- La Biblia*. Dir. P. Serafín de Ausejo. Barcelona: Herder, 1975. Print.
- Boyd, Carolyn. "De la memoria oficial a la memoria histórica: La Guerra Civil y la dictadura en los textos escolares de 1939 al presente." *Memoria de la guerra y del franquismo*. Ed. Santos Juliá. Madrid: Taurus/Fundación Pablo Iglesias, 2006. 79–99. Print.
- Camus, Mario. "Los días del pasado." *El País* 28 February 1978. Web. 6. August, 2012.
- Company, Juan M. "Los días del pasado." *Antología crítica del cine español. 1906–1995*. Ed. Julio Pérez Perucha. Madrid: Cátedra/Filmoteca Española, 1997. 767–69. Print.
- "Entrevista con Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón." *El País* 3 March 1979. Web. 1. August, 2012.
- La guerrilla de la memoria*. Dir. Javier Corcuera. Oria Films, 2002. Film.
- Herederó, Carlos F. *El cine según Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón. Historias de vida y de ficción*. Huesca: Festival de Cine de Huesca, 1998. Film.
- _____. "Historias de maquis en el cine español. Entre el arrepentimiento y la reivindicación." *Ficciones históricas*. Spec. issue of *Cuadernos de la Academia* 6 (1999), 215–232. Print.
- Juliá, Santos. "Memoria, historia y política de un pasado de guerra y dictadura." *Memoria de la guerra y del franquismo*. Ed. Santos Juliá. Madrid: Taurus/Fundación Pablo Iglesias, 2006. 27–77. Print.
- Los del monte*. Dir. Alfonso Domingo. RTVE, 2006. Film.
- Loureiro, Angel G. "Pathetic Arguments." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 9.2 (July 2008): 225–237.
- _____. "Argumentos patéticos: Historia y memoria de la guerra civil." *Claves de razón práctica* 186 (October 2008): 18–25. Print.
- Maquis*. Dir. Guillermo García Ramos. Multicanal, New Atlantis, Tesauro and TVE, 2005. Film.
- Molina Fox, Vicente. *Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003. Print.
- Moreno-Nuño, Carmen. "La representación del maquis en la historia del cine español: De bandoleros a guerrilla." *Letras Peninsulares* 16 (2003): 353–70. Print.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocripha*. Ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. Revised Standard Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "L'ère de la commémoration." *Les Lieux de mémoire*. Vol. 3. Paris: Gallimard, 1992. Print.
- Ribas, José. *Los setenta a destajo: "Ajoblanco" y libertad*. Barcelona: RBA Libros, 2007. Print.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004. Print.
- Roussó, Henri, and Eric Conan. *Vichy: un passé qui ne passe pas*. Paris: Fayard, 1994. Print.

- _____. *La hantisse du passé. Entretien avec Philippe Petit*. Paris: Les éditions Textuel, 1998. Print.
- La vieja memoria*. Dir. Jaime Camino. Profilmes, 1977. Film.
- Sánchez Noriega, José Luis. *Mario Camus*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998. Print.
- Serrano, Secundino. *Maquis: historia de la guerrilla antifranquista*. Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 2002. Print.
- Torres, Augusto M. *Conversaciones con Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón*. Madrid: Fundamentos, 1992. Print.
- Winter, Jay. *Remembering War. The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. Print.
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor. Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 1996. Print.

Loureiro, Angel G. "Inconsolable Memory." *Armed Resistance: Cultural Representations of the Anti-Francoist Guerrilla*. Ed. Antonio Gómez López-Quiñones and Carmen Moreno-Nuño. *Hispanic Issues On Line* (Fall 2012): 100–122. Web.
