
Chapter Title: The Transatlantic Dialogism in Narrative and Aesthetics of Bildungsfilms: La lengua de las mariposas, Machuca, El espíritu de la colmena, El premio, El laberinto del fauno and Infancia clandestina

Book Title: The Two cines con niño

Book Subtitle: Genre and the Child Protagonist in over Fifty Years of Spanish Film (1955-2010)

Book Author(s): Erin K. Hogan

Published by: Edinburgh University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/10.3366/j.ctv7n0b9p.14>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Edinburgh University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Two cines con niño*

JSTOR

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Transatlantic Dialogism in Narrative and Aesthetics of *Bildungsfilms*: *La lengua de las mariposas*, *Machuca*, *El espíritu de la colmena*, *El premio*, *El laberinto del fauno* and *Infancia clandestina*

Introduction

In this monograph, I have thus far illuminated the rich dialogism of child-starred cinemas in Spain. The final chapter will broaden this study's geographic scope to provide an overview of the dialogism and aesthetics of *bildungsfilms* across the Atlantic in the 2000s. Latin American cinema, with films hailing from Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela, has enjoyed its own bumper crop of approximately fourteen child-starred *bildungsfilms* over eleven years.¹ The *bildungsfilms*, defined as 'películas de aprendizaje o formación con protagonistas que son niños' (Deveny 2012: 397) (coming-of-age films with child protagonists), that I will examine here link sexual and political awakening at the time of military or paramilitary coups in Spain, Chile, and Argentina.² Compared with other subgenres of the *nuevo cine con niño* enumerated in the monograph's introduction, the *bildungsfilm* is the variant that most closely resembles the definition of cinema of 'childhood' in the *Diccionario temático del cine*:

[C]ontrasta con retratos más realistas, imaginativos o con mayor voluntad de indagación en el estadio infantil con historias sobre la nostalgia del paraíso perdido de la infancia, los recuerdos filtrados por la memoria, experiencias sorprendentes (felices o traumáticas), procesos de aprendizaje y conocimiento del mundo, etc. Obviamente, en muchos de ellos es el punto de vista cognitivo del niño—más o menos verosímil—lo que otorga a la historia un carácter híbrido, muy capaz de combinar la tragedia con la mirada ingenua, la fabulación sobre realidades cotidianas con la distorsión de los hechos. (Sánchez Noriega 2004: 270)

[[I]t contrasts with more realistic, imaginative or critical portrayals of the phase of childhood and stories of the nostalgia of the lost paradise of childhood, recollections filtered by memory, surprising (happy or traumatic), processes of learning and discovery of the world, etc. Obviously, in many of them it is the cognitive point of view of the child—more or less credible—that which grants the story a hybrid character, very capable of combining tragedy with the naïf gaze, story-telling of daily realities with distortion of the facts.]

The motifs of the lost paradise of childhood beside gained knowledge of the adult world pervade the *bildungsfilms* at the heart of this chapter. With attention to national acculturations, I will pair select Spanish and Latin American films to reveal common political use, motifs, and aesthetics of cinematic childhood across national cinemas.

Scholarship on contemporary Latin American cinema falls on both sides of the genre studies divide. These features correspond to Stephen M. Hart's nation-image in contemporary Latin American cinema: 'The emergence of the protagonist-as-nation genre . . . it was that the 35mm paradigm of the 1970s to 1990s tipped Latin American films into a tried and tested genre of the "national drama"' (2015: 65). By contrast, Carolina Rocha and Georgia Seminet resist defining child-starred films in generic terms: 'they represent a hybrid of existing genres and share particular, identifiable features; however, they do not constitute any single cinematic genre' (2012: 15). By contrast, *The Two* cines has followed Altman's insistence on genre as process and not as an immutable category with fixed definition and borders: 'Genres are not just *post facto* categories, then but part of the constant category-splitting/category-creating dialectic that constitutes the history of types and terminology' (Altman 1999: 65; italics in the original). Therefore, my genre study shares more commonality with the observations of Stephen M. Hart, Jay Beck, and Vicente Rodríguez Ortega; the latter two: 'provide a thorough investigation of contemporary Spanish cinema within a transnational framework by positing cinematic genres as the meeting spaces between a variety of diverse forces that necessarily operate within but also across territorial spaces' (Beck and Rodríguez Ortega 2008: 1). I set out to show how national cinemas drink from the font of international genre cinema, specifically the *bildungsfilm* in this chapter, to paradoxically address national specificities. Thereby, the binary at the heart of genre cinema readily transforms from the two Spains to the two Chiles and even two Argentinas.

In the first part of the current chapter, I analyse the narrative and aesthetic similarities of an enriching if unlikely friendship and its devastating betrayal at the time of Generals Francisco Franco's 1936 and Augusto Pinochet's 1973 coups, respectively, in *La lengua de las mariposas* (*Butterfly*) (José Luis Cuerda 1999 Spain) and *Machuca* (Andrés Wood 2004 Chile).³ I will argue that national division and duality appear as organising concepts in the two Spains of *La lengua de las mariposas* and the two Chiles of *Machuca*. The focus on schooling in both films highlights the first noun of the compound noun, *bildungs-film*, meaning education. In the second part of this chapter, I compare two pairs of

features that display two main aesthetic trends in the representation of childhood and resistance under military dictatorship: the arthouse, naturalist aesthetics of biopolitical childhood in *El espíritu de la colmena* and *El premio* (*The Prize*) (Paula Markovitch 2011 Mexico–Argentina) versus the fantastic, expressionist aesthetics of the paramilitarised child in *El laberinto del fauno* (*Pan's Labyrinth*) (Guillermo del Toro 2006 Mexico–Spain) and *Infancia clandestina* (*Clandestine Childhood*) (Benjamín Ávila 2011 Argentina). I will contend that each aesthetic mobilises the child protagonist in the cultural memory wars. My theoretical framework in this chapter continues to be informed by Bakhtin's dialogism and Altman's dualism (1999: 24), considering how states, now plural, and genre interact across the Atlantic.

Two Spains, Two Chiles

With forty years between the Nationalist and military junta coups and five years between these filmic representations, *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca* exhibit striking similarities regarding cinematic responses to their respective national conflicts. *La lengua de las mariposas* belongs to the robust *nuevo cine con niño* genre and to a longer tradition of child-starred filmmaking in Spain, where film censorship ended in 1977. *Machuca*, released two years following the abolition of censorship (Sorensen 2009: 79), is rather unique within Chilean filmmaking, which does not abound in child protagonists but rather in exceptional documentary filmmaking.⁴ Two Chilean films of note with child protagonists are *Largo viaje* (Patricio Kaulen 1967) and *Gringuito* (Sergio M. Castilla 1998). *Machuca*'s and *Lengua*'s trajectories are not only cinematic, however, since both are literary adaptations. *Lengua* won the Goya for Best Adapted Screenplay while *Machuca* won awards for Best Film, Director, Actor (Ariel Mateluna), Actress (Manuela Martelli), and Cinematographer in festivals around the world and was nominated for a Best Spanish Language Foreign Film Goya.⁵ Nevertheless, *Machuca* is less unique and a better indication of genre convention when examined within the wider tradition of *bildungsfilms* in Spanish. Spain and Chile nationalise the *bildungsfilm* by appropriately contextualising the binary involved in the conflict.

Comparisons in this chapter fall under the umbrella of transatlantic studies, which have examined, for better or for worse, Spain's transition to democracy as a model for Latin American countries who descended into military dictatorship in the 1970s as Spain was emerging from its own. The most renowned link between Spain and Chile within the context of human rights abuses under dictatorship is of course Spanish

former judge Baltasar Garzón's warrant for Pinochet's arrest in 1998, while the former head of state was in London, for the human rights violations of Spanish nationals under his seventeen-year regime. Pinochet led a United States-backed coup on 11 September 1973 that deposed the Americas' first democratically elected Socialist President, Salvador Allende. Pinochet imprisoned, tortured, and disappeared more than 3,000 dissidents (Skidmore et al. 2014: 289). While Spain's transition to democracy has long been considered exemplary, Chile's 1988 referendum, which voted Pinochet out of the presidency, and subsequent efforts to adjudicate human rights abusers, primarily in Argentina, could have been instructive for Spain. Luis Martín-Cabrera observes the impunity of transatlantic dictatorships:

[O]ne of the functions of the dictatorship on both sides of the Atlantic was to suspend the previous legal apparatus in order to implement a radical redefinition of sovereignty. The aim of such a redefinition was to increase the biopolitical powers of the state in order to authorize the extinction of lives without punishment. (Martín-Cabrera 2011: 86)

Indeed, Franco's regime concluded due only to his death and Garzón's attempts forty years later to investigate the crimes of Francoism led to his disbarment in 2012.⁶ Although Pinochet had been removed from the highest office, he was still awarded the position of 'senator for life'. Following Garzón's warrant, Pinochet was allowed to return to Chile and placed under house arrest until his death in 2006. Garzón's work encouraged the initiation of transitional justice within Chile and faced paralysing opposition in Spain.

We return now to the concept of the two Spains, which I first presented in the introduction of this book, and take into consideration its comparison with the theory of the 'two demons' in Latin American dictatorships. Spanish poet Antonio Machado (1875–1939) addresses the two Spains in *Campos de Castilla* (1910). The polarisation of the nation grew in the nineteenth century and came to a head with the Spanish Civil War from 1936 to 1939 (Pereira-Muro 2003: 179). Machado's understanding of his culture is illuminating and particularly insightful for a discussion of *La lengua de las mariposas* given his biographical similarities with the character Don Gregorio (Fernando Fernán Gómez) and the poetic intertexts in Cuerda's film and Rivas's story. In both LIII of *Proverbios y cantares* (Machado 1998: 158) and 'Recuerdo infantil' (1903) of *Soledades* (Machado 1983: 18–19), childhood is juxtaposed with two Spains or other suggestions of national fratricide. LIII warns that one of the two Spains, the dying or the yawning nation, would freeze the heart of a younger Spain that wants

to live (Machado 1998: 158; Machado 1982: 145).⁷ The conflict begins at birth, according to Machado, and continues, at the least, into early schooling. 'Recuerdo infantil' depicts a tedious math lesson accompanied by the monotonous sound of rain and the teacher's voice and by the decoration of biblical Cain's murder of his brother Abel (Machado 1977: 21). Childhood figured in Machado's poetry, including one of his final verses (Gibson 2006: 628–9). The two Spains, portrayed as brothers in a fight to the death, prefigure the onset of the Spanish Civil War at the end of the *La lengua de las mariposas*. Most films of the *nuevo cine con niño*, as I noted in the book's introduction, reify the two Spains despite historical realities that are more than two dimensional.

Cuerda's feature focuses on the eight- or nine-year-old Moncho (Manuel Lozano), his family, and his friendship with teacher Don Gregorio, who is reminiscent of Antonio Machado and other instructors of the Second Republic (1931–9), in the months leading to the onset of the Civil War. Don Gregorio's quotation of Machado's Soneto V 'Huye del triste amor' (Gibson 2006: 376) likens grief for his twenty-two-year-old wife to the death of Leonor, Machado's wife, at the age of eighteen. The educational thought that most heavily influenced the schools of the Restoration and Second Republic was Krausism, a philosophy founded by the German thinker Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781–1832). Spanish jurist Julián Sanz del Río championed Krause's ideas in speeches from 1857 to 1859 (Puelles Benítez 1986: 283) and Krausism informed the Instituto Libre de Enseñanza (ILE), which Francisco Giner de los Ríos founded. *La lengua de las mariposas* is an excellent example of the ILE's commitment to secular education and the 'active or intuitive' methodology of putting the student in contact with nature through field trips and science lessons. According to education scholar Manuel de Puelles Benítez, the ILE adapted to the student:

[F]rente al intento de la escuela nueva de crear un mundo al niño, la Institución respetaba su propio mundo tratando de ponerlo en relación con el de la sociedad en que el niño nace y donde ha de forjarse su personalidad. (Puelles Benítez 1986: 289–90)

[[F]aced with the new school's attempt to create a world for the child, the Institution respected the child's world by trying to relate the child to the world into which he was born and in which he will form his personality.]

Antonio Machado was not only a product of the Institución and an educator (in Soria and Segovia, Castilla and Baeza, Andalusia) but also becomes an icon of the Institución in *Lengua* and the inspiration for Don Gregorio's character.

Moncho is an asthmatic boy whose condition has delayed his incorporation into public schooling before the action of the film. Raised in a loving family, Moncho's socialisation into 1936 Galicia, the region of Franco's birth, takes place before the spectator's eyes. Moncho's mother presents him on the first day of school to Don Gregorio: 'es como un gorrión y esta es la primera vez que sale del nido' ('he's a sparrow out of the nest for the first time'). His parents represent the two Spains: his mother Rosa (Uxía Blanco) is a church-goer while his father Ramón (Gonzalo Uriarte) is an atheist affiliated with the Republic. Ramón, a tailor, recognises teachers as 'las luces de la República' ('They're the light of the Republic') and gifts Don Gregorio the suit that the persecuted teacher will ultimately wear as he is carted off at the end of the film for presumed execution. Moncho's relationship and bedtime conversations with his older brother Andrés (Alexis de los Santos) are reminiscent, but more encouraging, of sibling pairs from *El espíritu de la colmena* and *Secretos del corazón*. The figures surrounding Moncho foster his growth. Moncho learns that there is nothing to fear in Republican schooling because the teachers do not use corporal punishment (like his father's) but rather allow their pupils to explore nature. Moncho learns lessons in human nature through the natural sciences.

Birds, bees, butterflies and bridges feature prominently as coming-of-age motifs of transition and growth in the Spanish films discussed here and in Chapter Six: *El espíritu de la colmena* (Víctor Erice 1973 Spain), *Secretos del corazón* (Montxo Armendáriz 1997 Spain), and *El viaje de Carol* (Imanol Uribe 2002 Spain). In Cuerda's film, Don Gregorio's first lesson on butterfly tongues facilitates the pupils' contact with nature and teaches about butterflies and pollination. In class, Don Gregorio explains human nature via the natural sciences: birds, bees, and butterfly tongues. For instance, Moncho learns about a bird, the *tilonorrinco*, that gives its mate an orchid. Avian nicknames associate Moncho to birds: 'gorrión' and 'pardal.' As Moncho comes of age, his interests shift from the animal to human world. On an outing with Don Gregorio during which Moncho uses his teacher's gift of the butterfly net, the sounds of girls bathing in the river draw his attention away from butterflies to the birds and the bees. As he approaches Aurora (Lara López), Don Gregorio encourages Moncho to bestow a flower upon his first love by reminding him of the *tilonorrinco*'s romantic behaviour. At the time of the coup, when Don Gregorio is captured, Moncho's new vocabulary ('tilonorrinco', 'espiritrompa') acquires ambiguous new meanings.

Before engaging in the comparison of the two Spains and two Chiles, I would like to give further background on the 'two demons' theory and

Machuca. The two demons, a conception that Carlos Demasi has traced within Uruguayan dictatorship and transitional justice, illuminates points of contact and of divergence in the interpretation of national conflicts across the Atlantic. The theory describes the ‘quiebre de las instituciones’ (breakdown of institutions) (Demasi and Marchesi 2004: 67) at the time of Uruguay’s 1973 coup but it is a concept that appeared post-facto as a means, Demasi argues, to justify the coup as inevitable (67–70). Highly sceptical of the interpretation, Demasi notes that it emerged in tandem with amnesty politics and exculpated the military and civil society alike (70–1). The editors of *Dictatorships in the Hispanic World: Transatlantic and Transnational Perspectives* compare Chile to Uruguay, observing: ‘Although Chile has been more successful than their neighbouring country Uruguay in the confrontation of a harrowing political past, the post-dictatorial era witnessed an overall climate of social amnesia’ (Swier and Riordan-Goncalves 2013: 7). Differing from the two demons, the two Spains is not a post-facto (post-war), reconciliatory concept and is, I suggest, a better descriptor of alternating discourse in Spanish politics that shuffles the responsibility from one band to the other.⁸ Put in another way, historian Julián Casanova argues that contemporary Spain now needs to move beyond testimonials and memory narratives to educate its citizenry of the history of the war, categorically stating: ‘Without the military uprising of July 1936, there would not have been a civil war in Spain’ (2016: 217). Thus, other demons (Cainite brothers) plague Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón’s *Demonios en el jardín* (1982 Spain) from Chapter One. But, in accordance with Demasi’s reading of Uruguayan politics, the two demons are to blame for the downfall of childhood paradise in *Paisito*’s (Ana Díez 2008) Montevideo (Hogan 2012). In this sense, what I am calling the two Chiles has more in common with Spanish cultural politics than Latin American.

The social experiment defeated in *Machuca*, like *Lengua*, also celebrates the value of education and particularly its potential for social justice. Instead of the Spanish Instituto Libre de Enseñanza, *Machuca*’s spectator witnesses the Escuela Nacional Unificada (ENU) that makes possible the interactions and subsequent friendship of eleven-year-old children representing the two Chiles: middle-class and fair-skinned Gonzalo Infante (Matías Quer) and lower-class and darker-skinned Pedro Machuca (Ariel Mateluna). Father McEnroe (Ernesto Malbran) of St. Patrick’s School, based on filmmaker Andrés Wood’s (1965–) school director Father Gerardo Whelan at St. George’s School (Sorensen 2009: 90), teaches lessons in mutual respect and community that echo Allende’s democratisation policies and were inspired by Marxist thought (Núñez Prieto 2003: 16, 41,

99). The ENU's aims were to: achieve equality in education, encourage childhood development, regularise the education system, and tie it to the social, cultural, and economic development of the country, decentralise school administration, guarantee the best working conditions for educators, and promote the democratic participation of all the educators and community in the transformation of the education system (Núñez Prieto 2003: 16–17). Pedro Machuca was inspired by Carlos Fariña, perhaps the youngest dissident (at thirteen years old) whose remains from 1973 were found thirty years later in the La Pincoya neighbourhood of Santiago with twelve bullet wounds.⁹

As another political *bildungsfilm*, the boys' social awakening, learning about class struggle in 1973 Chile, takes place alongside their sexual awakening, both early adolescents being infatuated with Pedro's neighbour Silvana (Manuela Martelli). The boys' friendship is, similar to *Lengua's* storyline, truncated at the time of Pinochet's coup. The military takes control of St Patrick's, ousting Father McEnroe, and raids Machuca's village. Concerned about his friend's absence from school, Gonzalo goes to Pedro's shantytown where he witnesses the harassment and execution of its inhabitants and even the murders of Silvana and her father. In betrayal of the friendship between the boys, Gonzalo utilises the markers of his privilege, his physical appearance and wardrobe, to allow him to escape the scene relatively unscathed while Pedro is not to be seen again, erased like the roadside graffiti that bears witness to the civil unrest.

Despite their narratives' points of contact, a comparison of *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca* is uncommon. Each film is typically discussed within its respective country's politics of memory and with attention to narrative rather than form. One exception notes the destruction of the educational sphere and importance of each film for Spanish and Chilean historical memory. The authors argue:

Este despertar para o passado que os filmes mobilizam num momento de reestruturação da memória e da identidade social destes países é de extrema relevância para a reflexão e para a reescrita de uma história até então adormecida nas mentes traumatizadas das sociedades em questão. É como o reescrever no simbólico muro mostrado em *Machuca*. (Braggio et al. 2014: 200)

[This awakening to the past that the films mobilise in a moment of restructuring of memory or social identity of these countries is of extreme relevance to the reflection and rewriting of a history thus far dormant in the traumatised minds in question. It is like the rewriting on the symbolic wall in *Machuca*.]

Braggio, Fiuza, and Magalhães Debiazi refer to the aforementioned roadside graffiti that, over the course of the film, reads: ‘No a la guerra civil’ (‘No Civil War’), ‘guerra civil’ (‘Civil War’), and is finally blank. They argue that both features fill in this blank in the traumatic national histories of coup and dictatorship. Ho-Joon Yim paradoxically compares *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca* to argue *Machuca*’s uniqueness within Chilean film and its role in educating the national public (2017: 212). Similarly, Kristin Sorensen contends that *Machuca*: ‘works through posttraumatic Chilean memories that have been sanitized by other forms of media in a manner that is deeply affective yet also inclusive of a diverse and divergent audience’ (2009: 83). Moisés Park focuses on the child protagonists of this history from below: ‘*Machuca* es una representación de la historia por parte de los derrotados, que—como se explicará—no son meramente los pobres, los militantes, la izquierda o los allendistas, sino los niños’ (*Machuca* is a representation of the history told by the defeated, that – as will be explained – are not only the poor, the militants, the left or Allende supporters, but rather the children) (2014: 117). Translated from the Chilean into the Spanish context, from ‘derrotados’ to ‘vencidos’, *La lengua de las mariposas*, like other *nuevo cine con niño* films, focalises through the perspective of history’s defeated. As scholarship and Sorensen’s overview of reception indicate, *Machuca* allows for debate of issues central to historical memory.

Despite the film’s success in the box office and at festivals, there are differences of opinion with regards to *Machuca*’s politics of representation. Reception of the film has been overwhelmingly positive, noting that the feature serves to educate Chileans today about the coup, but some rightly note that United States involvement in the coup is overlooked (Martín-Cabrera and Voionmaa 2007: 69; Sorensen 2009: 93–101). For others, the use of child protagonists infantilises and simplifies the complex history. Tzvi Tal critiques this use in *Machuca*, which ‘politiza la memoria e infantiliza la historia’ (politicises memory and infantilises history) (2005: 137). Rita De Grandis, in an interpretative inversion, finds: ‘The child’s perspective renders that traumatic past simpler and more palatable for transnational and national audiences, contributing to the official discourses that stigmatize and occlude this past so as to foster democratic cohesion’ (2011: 236). As I have demonstrated in this book, child protagonists more often (re)politicise rather than depoliticise national conflicts through sentimental portrayals that disarm spectators’ critical apparatus. In fact, as I will note with *Infancia clandestina* (and *Viva Cuba*), the press of such films often insists that they are apolitical.

La lengua de las mariposas utilises animal imagery to symbolise national

division while *Machuca* expresses class division through fruit analogies. Moncho is a sparrow who is introduced not only to the ‘*espiritrompa*’ and ‘*tilonorrinco*’ of the birds and the bees but also to the law of nature between the wolf and the lamb. Don Gregorio’s retirement speech to students and parents, the film’s thesis sequence, makes reference to this truth and to his condition as lamb while reaction shots identify the two Spains of the Galician town. Don Gregorio’s musings on freedom annoy the town’s priest and Guardia Civil officer and offend the town cacique Don Avelino (Jesús Castejón) and his school-aged son, both of whom storm out of the classroom. Don Gregorio is certain, after all, that ‘*el lobo nunca dormirá en la misma cama con el cordero*’ (‘the wolf will never lie down with the lamb’). The parable of the wolf and lamb is also told through the story of the Chinese girl (‘*la niña china*’), which precedes Don Gregorio’s conclusion speech, from Rivas’s ‘*Un saxo en la niebla*’, in which a Chinese girl is adopted as a wife and loses her voice when she escapes and is attacked by wolves. She is, nevertheless, married to a wolf. The marriage of the sheepish Chinese girl to her wolfish husband exemplifies the mismatched couple that school teacher Don Gregorio fancifully wills never come to pass in Spain. The earlier carnivalesque inversions of the Second Republic, the film’s characters are even shown celebrating Carnival, return to the status quo with the Nationalist coup and victory. The division between Republicans and Nationalists is latent in the film (Yim 2017: 205). Boal’s (Roberto Vidal Bolaño) marriage to ‘Nena’ (Milagros Jiménez, named ‘Carolina’ in Rivas) is reminiscent of livestock ownership and colonialism.

Boal appears and acts like a wolf. The short story includes more of the husband’s physical and verbal violence towards the girl than the film. Boal threatens her: ‘*Te abro la crisma, Carolina!*’ (‘I’ll box your ears, *Caroline!* You know I will!’) (Rivas 2000: 44; Rivas 2006: 34; emphasis in the original). Rivas describes Boal’s hairy fist as ‘*una enorme maza peluda*’ (‘an enormous, hairy hammer swinging through the air’) (2000: 44; 2006: 34). Boal devours his food like a wolf: ‘*masticó de forma voraz*’ (‘he chewed voraciously’) (Rivas 2000: 49; Rivas 2006: 41). He manhandles his wife to unbutton her blouse and show Andrés and Moncho the scars on her back from the wolf bites. The narrator fears for Carolina in Boal’s hands: ‘*Temí que se quebrase como un ala de ave en las manos de un carnicero*’ (‘I was afraid she would snap like a bird’s wing in a butcher’s grasp’) (Rivas 2000: 50; Rivas 2006: 41). Boal guards his wife, who is dressed in a ‘woolen shawl’ (‘*chal de lana*’) ‘*como un inquieto pastor de Ganado*’ (‘like a shepherd anxious about his flock’) (Rivas 2000: 53; Rivas 2006: 45). Finally, as the narrator (Andrés in the film) imagines fleeing with the girl, he visualises the brute on his knees howling with the wool shawl in

his paws: 'Boal aullaba en la noche, cuando la niebla se despejaba, de rodillas en el campo de la feria y con el chal de lana entre las pezuñas' ('Boal howled in the night, as the mist cleared, on his knees in the fairground, holding the woolen shawl in his paws') (Rivas 2000: 53; Rivas 2006: 46). Rivas most clearly describes Boal as a wolf in this final sentence. This pair indicates the world that Don Gregorio has known is, in 1936, about to be turned upside down.

La lengua de las mariposas tells the history of the coup as a tale of two Spains with visual language in addition to the dialogue, narrative, and characterisation that we have just examined. The opening intertitles of Cuerda's film also prefigure the split between two opposing forces, since they tell that the Spanish people were 'caught in the middle'. Cuerda stages the competition for Moncho's education between religious and secular representatives in a sequence outside school. Moncho represents the Spanish people caught between his secular teacher (on the left both physically and ideologically) and the priest (on the right). The priest complains that Moncho was slated for *monaguillo* (altar boy) before he started attending Don Gregorio's class. Don Gregorio and the priest compete for influence over Moncho in Latin. The priest first tests Moncho's retention of ecclesiastical responses in Latin. In doing so, he acts as an appropriative ventriloquist that treats Moncho as a dummy for the performance of church ceremony, a practice suggested earlier in *Tómbola* (1962). Moncho, on the eve of the Civil War, has forgotten the response requesting peace: 'dona nobis pacem'. The priest, like Moncho's mother who calls him a sparrow, describes Moncho's experiences: 'las aves saltan del calor de los nidos' ('birds leave the warmth of their nests'). Birds, and other air-borne creatures, symbolise freedom for Moncho and Don Gregorio, who invites the children to 'volar' ('fly free') following his speech. Don Gregorio responds (also in Latin) that freedom only makes men stronger: 'la libertad estimula el espíritu de los hombres fuertes' ('freedom stimulates the spirits of strong men'). The priest's authority does not allow, as does Don Gregorio's approach, for liberty. Don Gregorio, in fact, does not elicit any rote-memory replies from his students but rather engages them in active learning. Their discussion illustrates tenets of the ILE: 'la necesidad de la neutralidad religiosa, que no supone escepticismo o indiferencia, sino estímulo del sentimiento religioso, abierto a los grandes problemas de la humanidad' (the necessity of religious neutrality, which does not presume scepticism nor indifference, but rather stimulation of religious sentiment, open to the great dilemmas of humanity) (Puelles Benítez 1986: 289). In another sequence, Moncho asks his new spiritual leader Don Gregorio, who has replaced the priest, about life after death. Don Gregorio cau-

tiously asks what his parents have told him; Moncho's mother believes in heaven and his father cynically jokes that the rich will bring their lawyers to Judgement Day. Don Gregorio confides that he does not believe in the afterlife and believes that people may choose to make the here and now Hell. Moncho's teacher does not impose his opinion on his student.¹⁰

In *Machuca*'s thesis sequence, another school assembly scene, Gonzalo's mother María Luisa (Aline Küppenheim) articulates her perplexity at the school's philosophy of mixing the social classes: 'pears and apples'. The social composition of a private school in Santiago de Chile in 1973 and a public school in small town Galicia in 1936 are indeed different but it is precisely greater diversity in the Chilean classroom to which privileged parents object. The only racial diversity found in *Lengua* takes the form of the Chinese girl, who is silenced and enslaved to her husband rather than educated.¹¹ Following the Eucharist, Father McEnroe addresses the growing unrest at the school, which mirrors conditions beyond the school's gate. The debate that unfolds about social justice, integration, and paternalism supports and questions, by opposing camps, Allende's social policies. María Luisa challenges St Patrick's and the *Unidad Popular*'s policies and in fact marches with the Patria y Libertad party: '¿Cuál es la idea de mezclar las peras con las manzanas? Porque yo quisiera saber por qué se empeñan tanto . . . No digo que seamos mejores ni peores pero, pucha, que somos distintos' ('what's the whole idea of mixing pears and apples? I'd like to know why it is you try so hard . . . I'm not saying that we're better or worse, just different'). Her analogy points to skin colour and difference. Machuca's mother Juana (Tamara Acosta), seated with the other disadvantaged newcomers to the community in the back of the church, defends her convictions on the basis of her life experience:

Yo me vine así a Santiago a los quince porque no quería que mis hijos fueran los culpables de todo siempre. Pero parece que aquí en la ciudad es igual. Los culpables siempre somos los mismos. Así es como tiene que ser. Y a ustedes nadie los va a culpar por seguir con la misma historia. Yo me pregunto no más, ¿cuándo se van a hacer las cosas de otra manera? ¿Cuándo se van a atrever a hacer algo distinto?

[I came here to Santiago when I was fifteen because I didn't want my children to be blamed for everything. But I can see things here are the same. Everything is always our fault. That's just how it is. No one will blame you for not changing. Sometimes I ask myself, when will things change? When will we dare to do things differently?]

Juana, as McEnroe instructed her son, must speak up in order to be heard. Her humble home is decorated with posters depicting Allende's initiatives as she supports his efforts to change the status quo. For *Machuca*, María Luisa, Juana, and their sons represent the two Chiles divided into

pears and apples. Juana's viewpoint is privileged in the film named after her fictional son; however, the dualism of the fruit analogy is mirrored in the co-protagonists Gonzalo and Pedro. Park recognises and refutes *Machuca's* polarity:

La dicotomía pobre-allendista y rico-pinochetista no se refleja con claridad en la ya película; esta ilusión de que Chile estaba dividido en dos y que las clases sociales determinaban la posición ideológica se niega en el filme. De hecho, Wood enfatiza las contradicciones y la paradoja que niega la bipolaridad en Chile.' (Park 2014: 132)

[The dichotomy poor-Allende supporter and rich-Pinochet supporter is not clearly reflected in the film; this illusion that Chile was divided in two and that social class determined ideology is negated in the film. In fact, Wood emphasises the contradictions and paradox that negates bipolarity in Chile.]

While assembly seating reveals some blending of the two Chiles, Machuca's community is still seated at the back and the film itself is divided between Gonzalo's and Machuca's worlds.

Each film's climax takes place at the moment of betrayal. The beautiful friendships formed between Moncho and Don Gregorio, Gonzalo and Machuca are conquered by self-preservation and fear. Moncho's mother (in the film, father in Rivas) encourages her husband and sons to cast aspersions at Don Gregorio in order to publicly affiliate themselves with the new order. Reaction shots reveal self-contentment on the faces of Nationalist characters and anguish on the faces of Republican characters. Moncho shouts 'ateo', 'rojo', and finally the ambiguous 'tilonorrinco' and 'espiritrompa' as he follows the other boys running after the truck with the prisoners and throwing rocks. His new vocabulary may be directed in anger at Don Gregorio or in anger at his abandonment. Moncho's run transforms into slow motion and then freeze frame and then black and white. His forward movement, his growth through education over the course of the film, arrives at a sudden halt. His development is truncated as the coup occurs and the film arrives at its conclusion.

Cinematography also heightens the climax scene in *Machuca*. Following the military takeover of St Patrick's, Gonzalo goes to Machuca's community to check on him. Colour is dampened in the image of the lethal military raid on Machuca's neighbourhood. Victims are yanked out into the open for execution. Shot-reverse shot editing reveals the reaction shots of both Machuca and Gonzalo (Figure 8.1). The terrifying and violent chaos is shot mostly from Gonzalo's point-of-view with an unsteady hand-held camera. In *Machuca*, we witness with Gonzalo and Pedro the killing of Silvana and her father. A soldier, who blocks Gonzalo's escape, prompts



Figure 8.1 Gonzalo (Matías Quer) witnesses vivid violence in muted colour in *Machuca*.

Gonzalo's betrayal in appeal to his appearance of privilege. Gonzalo's flight occurs in an emotionally charged slow motion, like Moncho's final minutes; however, the friendship and lives of some of these friends ends here in *Machuca* but the feature does not. Wood's film continues in order to show Gonzalo's new normal under Pinochet. His parents have split, and he now lives with his sister, his mother, and her older lover in a mansion, ostensibly having benefited from Pinochet's rise to power. Ho-Joon Yim sees *La lengua de las mariposas* as offering a more nostalgic, mythic representation of the days leading to the national conflict and *Machuca* as more of a historic microcosm of the precipitating events (2017: 201). This scholar explains the differences, considering that the creators of *Machuca* felt a greater responsibility to educate their audience:

Las políticas diferentes de ambas películas hacia el pasado traumático, en cierto grado, provienen de la tendencia o situación del cine nacional. *Machuca*, siendo una de las pocas obras chilenas que abordan el pasado, no podía ignorar la responsabilidad de reflejar la verdad histórica, mientras que *La lengua* se sitúa en la tendencia prevaleciente del cine español contemporáneo. (Yim 2017: 212)

[Differing politics in the two films with regards to the traumatic past, to a certain degree, come from the tendency or situation of national cinema. *Machuca*, one of the few Chilean works to deal with the past, could not ignore its responsibility to reflect historic truth, while *La lengua* is situated within a prevailing tendency of contemporary Spanish cinema.]

I insist on narratives as mediations of history; why not tell *Machuca* in Chilean cinema's more prevalent documentary form? I suspect that

the creators of both *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca*, in varying degrees, wish to educate a younger audience and emotionally engage an older one with memories of their youths and visions of the future for their children.

The two Spains and two Chiles, in my view, do not serve to justify their respective coups, as Demasi argues of the two demons theory, but rather to recognise suffering during the violent repression of military dictatorship by showcasing its most vulnerable citizens. If indeed Gonzalo does not have any other choice than to extricate himself from the danger of an ‘insurmountable’ coup (Tal 2005: 148), Moncho does what he is told. Cuerda directed Manuel Lozano in the final scene to attack Don Gregorio on the orders of his character’s mother, who intended to shield Moncho’s Republican father.¹² Instead of exculpating both Spains and Chiles, these films utilise their child protagonists to move and educate their spectators with regard to their respective social projects quashed by military coups. *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca* explore politicised coming-of-age where the child protagonist, Moncho or Gonzalo, is obligated to affiliate with one of the two Spains or Chiles. This affiliation of both characters with the triumphant right represents the defeat of their growth and squandered potential, a negation of who they could have become in more inclusive societies. Becoming is central to *bildungsfilms* and, in the next set, child protagonists undertake a different trajectory, becoming dissidents and militants in varying degrees.

Transatlantic Aesthetics of *Bildungsfilms*:
El espíritu de la colmena (Erice 1973), *El premio*
 (Markovitch 2011), *El laberinto del fauno* (Del Toro 2006),
 and *Infancia clandestina* (Ávila 2011)

Our comparative perspective progresses chronologically from coups in Spain and Chile to the years following military takeover in Spain and Argentina. *El espíritu de la colmena*, set on the arid Castilian plain in 1940, and *El laberinto del fauno*, set at the foot of a lush Spanish hillside in 1944, take place during the early post-war years in Spain, as does *Pa negre* analysed in the previous chapter. The protagonists of *El premio*, set in coastal San Clemente del Tuyú in 1977, and *Infancia clandestina*, set in Buenos Aires in 1979, are children of militants fighting the Junta regime of Argentina’s Dirty War (1976–83). The Spanish films herein discussed make reference to the *maquis* resistance to Franco’s dictatorship while the Argentine films refer to dissidence that includes the *montonero* paramilitary group fighting Jorge Rafael Videla’s military regime. The filmmakers

draw upon their childhoods during these periods: Víctor Erice (1940–) grew up in 1940s and 1950s Basque Country (Heredero 1998: 312–13); Paula Markovitch (Buenos Aires 1968–) grew up the daughter of ‘semi-clandestinos’ in San Clemente del Tuyú (Casas 2013); Benjamín Ávila’s (Buenos Aires 1972–) *montonero* parents and younger brother were disappeared by the regime; and, with a more remote connection, Guillermo del Toro (Mexico 1964–) was mentored and befriended by Spanish Republican exiles and their children in Mexico (Anonymous 2006b: 20). Overarching themes of obedience and disobedience, celebrating the latter, are shared among the four films discussed in this section. *El espíritu*’s Ana (Ana Torrent) befriends a *maqui* and *El laberinto del fauno*’s twelve-year-old Ofelia (Ivana Baquero), I argue, becomes a fantastic version of a *maqui*.

Secundio Serrano defines *maqui* as metonymical for the Galicism for bush, hence the resistance fighters based in the bushes, and notes the pejorative evaluation, painting them as cowardly and unruly, of these fighters in the *Diccionario de la Real Academia*: ‘Maquis. – Persona que, huida a los montes vive en rebeldía y oposición armada al sistema político establecido’ (Maqui. – a person who, having fled to the hills lives in rebellion and armed opposition to the established political system) (2001: 1–2). Thus, the *maqui* is defined by his or her hide-out in the forest, marginality to the Francoist system, and open rebellion against it. In historian Paul Preston’s more positive assessment, by contrast to the *Diccionario*’s, the *maquis* continued their valiant armed efforts against the Franco regime into the early 1950s:

Hasta finales de la década de los cuarenta, las fuerzas armadas de Franco se vieron obligadas a emprender operaciones militares contra grupos armados que se habían implicado en un vano sino heroico intento de cambiar el resultado de la guerra. De modo esporádico, la Guerra Civil, o la violenta resistencia contra el establecimiento de un Estado franquista, continuó hasta la retirada de las últimas unidades que componían la guerrilla a principios de los cincuenta (2001: vii).

[Until the end of the 1940s, Franco’s armed forces were obligated to undertake military operations against armed groups that had tried not in vain but in a heroic attempt to change the result of the war. Sporadically, the Civil War, or the violent resistance to the Francoist State, continued until the withdrawal of the last military units that composed the guerrilla at the beginning of the 1950s.]

El laberinto del fauno’s affiliations mirror Preston’s; Captain Vidal (Sergi López), the villain, leads the Nationalist defence against *maquis* Mercedes (Maribel Verdú), her brother, Doctor Ferrerio (Álex Ángulo), and Ofelia in *El laberinto del fauno*.

Argentina’s so-called Dirty War is the period in which 10,000 to

20,000 Argentines were disappeared by General Jorge Rafael Videla's regime, installed by virtue of coup in 1976 (Skidmore et al. 2014: 259).¹³ In Ávila's film, twelve-year-old Juan (Teo Gutiérrez Moreno) and his family, like other *montoneros*, took exile in Cuba for training before returning to Argentina to continue their clandestine warfare in 1979 (Gillespie 2008: 22, 139). Rather than comparing 'sibling films' – *El premio*'s girl protagonist and *Infancia clandestina*'s boy protagonist – of the same release year and setting, I will focus on the aesthetic affinities of the motion pictures set in Argentina with those set in Spain for the purpose of showing the wider trend of mobilising child protagonists for the cause of historical memory.

Having discussed *El espíritu de la colmena* at greater length and with a focus on the biopolitics of the Gothic child in Chapter Five and fantasy in coming-of-age in Chapter Six, in the current chapter I will compare the auteur aesthetics of Erice's film in comparison to those of Cecilia's (Paula Galinelli Hertzog) biopolitical climate of clandestine childhood in *El premio*. As I discussed in Chapter Five, we can read Ana as a Gothic child whose sensitivity and curiosity encourage her sympathy with the unnamed *maqui*, a civil dead persecuted and devoid of right to life in Franco's Spain. In this chapter we will focus on the inhospitable environments of each film as indicators of their hostile political climates. The fabulations of Ana's older sister Isabel (Isabel Tellería) ignite seven-year-old Ana's imagination, which conflates the re-warmed cadaver that is Frankenstein's monster with the *maqui* in hiding in an abandoned and isolated building on the meseta. In *El premio*, seven-year-old Cecilia Edelstein and her mother have fled Buenos Aires in the winter of 1977 to the remote seaside locale of San Clemente del Tuyú in fear of their safety following the disappearance of the girl's political dissident father. While *bildungsfilm* boy protagonists learn the meaning of the verb 'chingar' (*La lengua de las mariposas* and *Secretos del corazón*) or that parental 'vacation' means 'disappearance' (*O Ano em Que Meus Pais Saíram de Férias*), Cecilia learns that 'pesimista' means that her father will likely never return and has probably been killed. *El premio* witnesses the transformation of the bright schoolgirl from bare life to biopolitical discipline through enrolment and lessons at school, where she wins a prize from the military for best patriotic essay. The film itself, produced by the director's country of residence, won numerous awards: Mexican Ariels for production, screenplay, and first work as well as awards in Armenia, Cuba, France, Germany, and Israel. I wish to explore how the naturalist aesthetics of the film communicate the bleakness of their home country through the destructive wind and sea elements that assail their dilapidated refuge. The elements of repression,

more subtly portrayed in *El espíritu de la colmena* under Franco's censorship, nearly reach gale force in Markovitch's 2011 film.

Unlike Chilean film but like Spanish cinema, Argentina has a tradition of child-starred cinema. While Spain from the 1940s to the 1960s had *niños prodigio* Pablito Calvo, Joselito, and Marisol, followed by adolescent stars, Argentina had its own *pibes prodigio* of the 1940s and 1950s in the figures of Toscanito (Andrés Poggio 1934–) and Adrianita (Adriana Bianco 1941–), likewise followed by adolescent stars. Spanish and Argentine cinema also had some cross-over, evidenced in Adrianita's photographed appearance with Pablito Calvo (Anonymous 1998: n.p.) and Joselito's performance alongside adult Argentine actress Libertad Lamarque (1908–2000) in the Spanish film *Bello recuerdo* (Antonio del Amo 1961).¹⁴ Toscanito, Adrianita, and later Polín (Diego Puente 1953–) in *Crónica de un niño solo* (Leonardo Favio 1965) portray the life of children on the street. Children as victims of appropriations begin to appear in the 1980s in representations of the Dirty War with *La historia oficial* (Luis Puenzo 1985). The significance of the child within this historical backdrop, during which approximately 500 babies were kidnapped (Haberman 2015: n.p.), continues in the posterior films I discuss in this chapter.

Aesthetic similarities between *El espíritu de la colmena* and *El premio* have not escaped the critics nor has the dialogical relationship between *El espíritu de la colmena* and Spanish cinema depicting the post-war, including *El laberinto del fauno*, as I analyse in Chapter Six. Paul Julian Smith notes: 'This premise of the child as unknowing witness to historical horror is well-known in Spanish-language cinema. Since Erice's masterful *The Spirit of the Beehive*, there have been almost forty years of films from Spain on the theme. And 2011 brought, in addition to *The Prize*, contributions to the genre from as far apart as Buenos Aires and rural Colombia' (Smith 2014: 221).¹⁵ Although the approach to periods of political conflict through the child's gaze and coming-of-age are quite common, I contend that *El premio* distinguishes itself from other Argentine films with similar subject matter due to its stark, naturalist aesthetics. Thus, I disagree with Verónica Inés Garibotto that *El premio* corresponds to recent Argentine filmography that 'build[s] a privatized and romanticized version of recent Argentine history and [is] (thus) acclaimed worldwide' (2015: 269). *El premio* is, like *Pa negre* (Villaronga 2010 Spain), the exception that proves the rule. The naturalist aesthetics and acoustics of *El premio* neither romanticise Cecilia's clandestine childhood nor the militant's struggle but rather communicate the bare life of the child protagonist.

El espíritu de la colmena and *El premio* resemble each other in their sombre colour palette, sparse dialogue, and blustery soundtrack. I will focus my



Figure 8.2 Cecilia (Paula Galinelli Hertzog) of *El premio* stubbornly roller skates on the beach of San Clemente del Tuyú in the winter.

comparison on the ambient sound of bare life in the features. They divide their explorations of post-war and Dirty War bare life among their rebellious girl protagonists' homes, schools, and natural surroundings. While Ana's beehive-like home is expansive, if empty, and comfortable, Cecilia's seaside shack is the epitome of precariousness and her school exemplifies Dirty War indoctrination. The films are most similar in their artistry of absence and emptiness, which are beautifully expressed in the girls' solitary scenes on the meseta and beach (Figure 8.2). Ambient sound and musical soundtrack are the focus of these sequences and the means to express the vulnerability of bare life, embodied by outcasts and clandestine individuals.

Sound design in the first of the meseta sequences is comprised of the wind and wind instruments, accompanied by the cello, in the instrumental popular children's song 'Vamos a contar mentiras' (Let's tell lies). Ana and her sister stand gazing upon the well and abandoned building, Isabel's fabled homestead for Frankenstein's monster and the coming hideout for the *maqui*. Wind represents exposure, vulnerability, and danger beyond the beehive. Screenwriters Ángel Fernández Santos and Víctor Erice give the element of air the prominence of a character in the screenplay, describing the prominence of the wind in this sequence:

El sonido del viento. El viento que penetra a través del tejado desvencijado, entre las vigas, a través de los marcos de las ventanas destrozadas. Entre los escombros, una gorra, apergaminada y sucia, restos de loza . . . las huellas del paso de seres humanos. Estas imágenes de la desolación, del abandono, se diría que proporcionan a Ana un instintivo sentimiento de desamparo, de malestar. (1976: 72)

[The sound of the wind. The wind that penetrates the ramshackle roof, between the rafters, through the frames of the destroyed windows. Between the debris, a dirty

parchment-like cap, shards of crockery . . . the remnants of the passage of human beings. It could be said that these images of desolation and abandonment, provide Ana with an instinctive feeling of neglect and discomfort.]

The wind invades the space of the abandoned building and reveals absence, remains, and abandonment. It intensifies the sensation of neglect in this place where a clandestine fighter finds temporary shelter. It is true for both films that 'the wind is air in its active and violent aspects' (Ciriot 2002: 373). The building and well represent spaces made dangerous by a hostile and repressive regime. As is the case with symbolism of the monster, however, air is also polysemic. At other times, within the confines of state institutions, asphyxiation is the threat. A classmate at school recites the verses of Rosalía de Castro's poem XIII from *New Leaves* (*Follas novas* 1880) that refer to the need for air to breathe (Castro 1991: 71).

Absence of air, affection, or free speech characterises Ana's surroundings. According to Erice's experience, a vacuum replaced the presence of adults in the aftermath of the Civil War:

A veces pienso que para quienes en su infancia han vivido a fondo ese vacío que, en tantos aspectos básicos, heredamos los que nacimos inmediatamente después de una guerra civil como la nuestra, los mayores eran con frecuencia eso: un vacío, una ausencia. Estaban –los que estaban–, pero no estaban. Y ¿por qué no estaban? Pues porque habían muerto, se habían marchado o bien eran unos seres ensimismados desprovistos radicalmente de sus más elementales modos de expresión. (Erice 1976: 144)

[Sometimes I think that for those of us whose childhood was lived fundamentally in that vacuum that, in so many basic ways, those of us who were born immediately after a civil war like ours inherited, the grown-ups were frequently that: an emptiness, an absence. They were there – those who were – , but they were not present. And why weren't they present? Because they had died, they had left, or they were consumed and radically devoid of ways to express themselves.]

Erice describes Ana's parents and the emptiness that the young girl aims at filling with her investigations and associations with the *maqui* and Frankenstein's monster.

Markovitch turns up the volume of the blustery soundtrack from *El espíritu de la colmena* in *El premio*. The opening sequence of *El premio* masterfully introduces the bare life of the refugee, Cecilia. We see that the stubborn and solitary girl is out of place, obstinately attempting to roller skate on a beach in the winter. The soundtrack of the discordant piano tune over ocean waves further indicates the dissonance of the image. The threatening tide ultimately sinks the wheels of her skates. Cecilia finds herself in this inhospitable environment on account of a government

hostile to the politics of her parents. When the forces of the wind and ocean strike again halfway through the film, they reach and inundate Cecilia's and her mother's dilapidated shelter. The presumed politically compromising literature they had buried in the sand is dredged up by the ocean current and Cecilia's mother attempts with great determination the futile task of sweeping the water out and placing blankets under the front door as a stop-gap measure. They are exposed. Markovitch explicates her use of the weather metaphor: 'Incluso con la metáfora del agua que entra a la casa, del viento, de que todo entra, es expresar esa sensación de desamparo de que el alma no está a salvo' (Even with the metaphor of the water that enters the house, the wind, everything that enters, is to express that sensation of abandon, that not a soul is safe) (Acevedo Kanopa 2012: n.p.). As the seawater inches closer to their home, so does the military. Their house is flooded right before Sargento Estévez (Diego Alfonso) appears at Cecilia's school to announce the patriotic essay contest.

Cecilia's school is a laboratory for techniques of state coercion. As such, *El premio* portrays power, embodied by the Sargent and Cecilia's teacher, through certain camera angles and disciplinary practices. During the class visit, the teacher and Sargent stand side by side as the officer asks whether the children love their country and the instructor enthusiastically coaches them that they in fact do. The teacher instructs her students that they are soldiers and should therefore stand at attention. The discrepancy in camera angles communicates the power of the military, from a high angle, over the school children, from a low angle (Figure 8.3). This visit details the biopolitics of childhood during the Dirty War in so far as it demonstrates the utilisation of school children for the reproduction of state ideology. Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* also reminds us



Figure 8.3 Sargento Estévez (Diego Alfonso) addresses the schoolchildren in *El premio*.

that school pedagogy was adapted from military discipline in the first place (1979: 159). Bribed with hot chocolate amidst the damp cold and the opportunity to win a prize, the docile and dutiful schoolchildren comply with the mechanisms and calculations of the military regime.

Cecilia, the stubborn seaside roller skater, rebels against her mother's authority but is readily coerced by school and military influence. During her integration to the new school and among new peers, Cecilia Edelstein learns new things like how to make the sign of the cross and how to love the country that killed her cousin and disappeared her father. However, in a first draft of her essay, she writes the unthinkable: an indictment of the military. In a panic, Cecilia and her mother beg the teacher during the middle of the night to allow her to re-write the essay. The submission, for which her mother suggests that she write 'Lo contrario . . . Que los militares son buenos y valientes. Cualquier bobada dices' ('The opposite . . . That the soldiers are good and brave. Any nonsense!'), wins Cecilia the prize. Her mother also becomes complicit in the biopolitics of the regime out of fear, as Eduardo Bustelo observes: 'La biopolítica consigue transformar la infancia no como responsabilidad de los adultos sino de acuerdo con la inseguridad de éstos' (Biopolitics transforms childhood not into the responsibility of adults but rather in accordance with adult insecurity) (2007: 52).

A series of painful coercions act upon Cecilia's docile body to prepare her for the prize ceremony. The student does not have formal shoes and clothes to wear for the event, so the teacher loans Cecilia her daughter's shoes, which are one size too small. We see the painful grimacing on Cecilia's face as she learns to march like a soldier in these restrictive shoes. Cecilia undergoes reform for her biopolitical rebirth. Her body, requiring correction, represents that of the dissidents. Bustelo notes: 'La biopolítica toma la vida como si la sociedad ahora tuviese un único cuerpo. Y el biopoder se expresa como un control que invade las profundidades de las conciencias de los adultos y de los cuerpos de la infancia' (Biopolitics understands life as if a society had one body. And biopower expresses itself as the control that invades the deepest consciences of adults and the bodies of children) (2007: 51). The teacher proceeds to forcefully dress Cecilia in a more formal school apron, which buttons in the back and is therefore more reminiscent of a strait jacket than her earlier uniform. Her biopolitical transformation is also gendered since her teacher wants Cecilia to look beautiful for the sargeant. Cecilia appears less and less elated by the prize as she comes to realise what her mother had been trying to teach her: that she is receiving an award from those responsible for her father's likely death. Defeatedly rather than triumphantly, Cecilia sings the words

of the national anthem before the voice-over addresses her and the other children as soldiers.

The ceremony at the military headquarters is the culmination of a number of disciplinary techniques that the teacher employs over the course of the film. These include determining who aided and abetted a cheater by condemning the entire class to walk under the rain until the culprit confesses. The schoolyard, also where the military distributed the hot chocolate, is the place of reward and punishment according to the values of the military state. Cecilia's only friend, Silvia (Sharon Herrera), identifies her as the guilty party. The teacher applauds Silvia for informing on Cecilia and asks the girls to forgive each other. Enacted on a smaller scale, the surveillance of classmates that leads to punitive action and forgiveness for betrayal is indicative of the more violent repression of adult dissidents like Cecilia's father and cousin.

Infancia clandestina, like *El premio*, follows the militarisation of its child protagonist but does so with political and aesthetic differences that bring to mind *El laberinto del fauno*. *El premio* observes Cecilia's incorporation into the power of the state while *Infancia clandestina* witnesses Juan's mobilisation for resistance to the state as a soldier for Perón. Juan's trajectory is similar to Ofelia's since both young people fight their respective authoritarian regimes. Just as *El premio*, filmed in Argentina with Argentine actors by an Argentine director living and financing her film in Mexico, is difficult to categorise geographically, so is Guillermo del Toro's *El laberinto del fauno*, filmed in Spain as a Spanish-Mexican co-production with Spanish actors by a Mexican director. *El laberinto del fauno* is transnational in its production and highly dialogical with *El espíritu de la colmena*, as discussed in Chapter Six, and with fairy tales and children's literature (Clark and McDonald 2010; Diestro-Dópido 2013: 15–16; Hubner 2010: 51).

Del Toro's and Ávila's films explore connections between *infancia* and infantry. However, Ávila's feature is more explicit in terms of the militarisation of its child protagonist but not as overt as in the forced inscription of child soldiers by Peru's Shining Path in *Paloma de papel* (Fabrizio Aguilar 2003) or by the Farabundo Martín National Liberation Front during the Salvadoran civil war in *Voces inocentes* (Mandoki 2004). *El laberinto del fauno*'s and *Infancia clandestina*'s militarisation of children inhabits to varying degrees the realm of the symbolic obscured by expressionistic fairy tale and comic book aesthetics. Del Toro's Ariel, Goya, Argentine academy award and Oscar-winning film is constructed according to juxtaposed binaries – one pair consisting of the house headquarters of Ofelia's stepfather Captain Vidal (Sergi López) opposed to the forest hideout of

the *maquis* resistance and the other pair composed of Franco's Spain in 1944 and Princess Moana's timeless underground kingdom. These are the two Spains whose mapping in Del Toro's mise en scène and characterisation is mutually revealing with regards to Ofelia's mobilisation.

In the film, the young and avid reader of fairy tales arrives with her expectant mother to Captain Vidal's headquarters to discover that she is the long-lost Princess Moana who nevertheless needs to prove herself through a series of tests assigned in the forest's labyrinth by the wily faun. Ofelia's mother dies in childbirth and Ofelia is killed by Captain Vidal but is reborn as Princess Moana. The *maquis* triumphantly kill Vidal and appropriate his newborn son, concluding the film. Although martyrdom is Captain Vidal's military career aspiration and he is indeed killed at the conclusion of *El laberinto del fauno*, I will argue that, in this revisionist heroine's tale, the martyred soldier is Ofelia rather than Vidal.

Under the orders of the faun, Ofelia receives training in obedience and disobedience. I wish to denaturalise Ofelia's instruction in resistance in accordance with the *maquis*' Republican ideals and to reject the assumption of childhood innocence. Thus, I dispute Antonio Gómez López-Quñones' argument: 'Ofelia functions in *Pan's Labyrinth* as an entity non-normalized (at least not completely) by institutions designed for the progressive transformation of children into citizens of a specific collective project' (2012: 51). By contrast, I suggest that Ofelia is indeed normalised into the diegetic collective project of the *maquis*, an adult political community, and the extra-diegetic agenda of Republican historical memory. Sarah Wright argues that recent child-starred films are highly invested in historical memory: 'The child is therefore symbolic not only of the loss of historical memory and its recuperation after a time-lag but also it is often a site of trauma in contemporary memory wars' (2013: 14). Ofelia, like Moncho, is one of many recent child protagonists of the *nuevo cine con niño* to be mobilised by and for the vanquished of the Spanish Civil War. The child protagonist is not only a site but also a militant in the memory wars.

El laberinto del fauno and *Infancia clandestina* are alike in their colour scheme, their protagonist's element of disguise, and their militarisation of childhood. Ávila's Argentine-Spanish-Brazilian co-production also belongs to a collective project, that of historical memory valuing resistance during the Dirty War and more specifically the participation of family members in this homage. Still, materials accompanying Film Movement's DVD of the feature propose a de-politicised reading of childhood, stating: 'This is not a political film. It is essentially a coming of age love story, set in a time that was politically significant.'¹⁶ I beg to differ that the personal is political in Ávila's autobiographical film; the militarisation of

a child politicises the young person. The director affirms that, although politicising childhood was not his film's aim, it is unavoidable: 'No quise que la película fuera ni política ni dramática, pero sabía que iba a serlo, inevitablemente' (I did not want the film to be political nor dramatic, but I knew that it inevitably would be) (Ranzani 2012: n.p.). Over the course of the Argentine Academy and Film Critics award-winning and Goya-nominated film, Juan struggles with his identification with his family's cause and his desire to lead a life of greater freedom to pursue childhood things like a class camping trip and first love. However, the deaths of his father and uncle and the disappearances of his mother and baby sister leave Juan to draw strength from his *montonero* training.

It is my contention that *El laberinto del fauno* and *Infancia clandestina* disguise political violence and the militarisation of their twelve-year-old protagonists with graphic novel-style aesthetics that may encourage depoliticised readings of childhood. Verónica Inés Garibotto is another critic sceptical of the use of the child's perspective in the *bildungsfilm*: 'The child's perspective allows for a coming-of-age narrative that – rather than bringing the political dimension of left-leaning violence to the fore – privatizes, romanticizes, and converts revolutionary violence into an individual trait' (2015: 269). Conversely, other scholars like Sarah Thomas appreciate the role that 'graphic violence' (Thomas 2015) plays in problematising memory. Geoffrey Maguire sees value in the aesthetic: 'these animated sequences highlight the medium's potential to express not the inherent gaps in the postmemorial narration of the past, but the richness and vibrancy of the child's reiteration of such intense and formative memories' (2017: 153). Similar to Garibotto's scepticism towards *Infancia clandestina*, Francisco J. Sánchez argues that *El laberinto del fauno* commercialises and capitalises on Spanish history: 'by silencing the Republic, the film displaces the political context of the nation of Spain into a trans-Atlantic Spanish region in which Spanish functions as a brand of cultural goods' (2012: 142). Deborah Shaw has been of two minds regarding the fairy-tale fireworks of *El laberinto del fauno*, first arguing in her 2013 monograph that they distort history. She revised her interpretation from 2013 in 'Reading *Pan's Labyrinth* in the Era of Neo-fascism' at the University of Houston on 4 April 2017, contending that fantasy elements create a transcendent, anti-fascist document that transnationalises the national and transhistoricises the historical thereby offering 'hope and resistance for current and future generations' (Shaw 2013: 83).¹⁷ Shaw would now advance that *El laberinto del fauno* has made its politics more universal rather than dismantle them. I will argue that the expression of the child's perspective through animated aesthetics obscures the political

significance and use, particularly in Ofelia's case, of the child protagonists' representations.

El laberinto del fauno translates chronological precision, that of Captain Vidal's obsession with time and meticulous care for his deceased father's pocket watch, into the parlance of fairy tales in the Pale Man sequence. Michel Foucault's study of the adaptation of military discipline, in particular the utilitarian use of time, to the classroom shed light on Ofelia's schooling:

It is this disciplinary time that was gradually imposed on pedagogical practice – specializing the time of training and detaching it from the adult time, from the time of mastery; arranging different stages, separated from one another by graded examinations; drawing up programmes, each of which must take place during a particular stage and which involves exercises of increasing difficulty; qualifying individuals according to the way in which they progress through these series. (Foucault 1979: 159)

Ofelia's timed fairy-tale trials recall the training that Foucault describes here and are a point of intersection between the girl's training in the disciplines of military obedience and *maqui* disobedience.

The mission involving Ofelia's retrieval of a dagger from the ogre's den, Ofelia's second of four interlocking tasks of increasing difficulty, is timed with an hourglass and mandated by fairy-tale instructions and interdictions. The faun and his guidebook (*libro de las encrucijadas*) direct the following:

Con la tiza, trazaréis un contorno de una puerta en cualquier parte de vuestra habitación. Una vez abierta la puerta, iniciad el reloj de arena. Dejaos guiar por las hadas. No comáis ni bebáis nada durante vuestra estancia y aseguraos de volver antes de que caiga el último grano de arena.

['Use the chalk to trace a door anywhere in your room. Once the door's open, start the hourglass. Let the fairies guide you. Don't eat or drink anything during your stay, and come back before the last grain of sand falls.']

Ofelia, of course, does not follow these instructions. Her training under the faun, although presented as an apprenticeship in obedience, prepares her in the skills of disobedience that are primary for the *maquis*. The Pale Man's banquet table exposes the ugliness of Captain Vidal's dinner party, while the fairy-tale magic dresses up Ofelia's *maquis* mobilisation.

Although Manichaeism is maintained through the affiliations of *El laberinto del fauno*'s characters, Ofelia's *maqui* mobilisation undermines their opposition. For instance, the *maqui* doctor's last words categorically distinguish between the two camps: 'Obedecer, por obedecer – así sin

pensarlo – sólo lo hacen gentes como usted, Capitán’ (‘to obey – just like that – for the sake of obeying, without questioning, that’s something only people like you can do, Captain’]. But, Ofelia’s childhood is not unlike that celebrated by Franco’s regime, whose March 1938 Boletín del Estado announced: ‘Que el niño perciba que la vida es milicia, o sea, disciplina, sacrificio, lucha y austeridad’ (The child should perceive life as militancy, that is, discipline, sacrifice, struggle and austerity) (Martín Gaité 1987: 21). Indeed, Ofelia/Moana makes the ultimate sacrifice of her own life for her brother’s. She follows the *maquis*’ play book of disobedience that wins her brother for the resistance fighters.

In *Infancia clandestina*, the boy’s initiation into the *montonero* resistance is shown through his own drawings of a series of disguises worn by Cuban revolutionary Che Guevara. The ease with which Juan transforms the appearance of his illustration of Che prefigures his own docility as a child soldier for the *montoneros*. A chain of command is evident in the narration by Juan’s parents Horacio (César Troncoso) and Charo (Natalia Oreiro) that explains and directs their son’s ‘mission’. Juan, named after former president Perón (1946–55 and 1973–4), assumes the disguise of Ernesto, named after Guevara. Juan’s parents belong to the generation to which Peronism attended for its measures promoting childhood well-being and education:

Perón significantly dedicated to youth what was his last annual address to congress, stressing that the young people of 1955 were the ‘first product of the Revolution’ and that they would carry the burden of perpetuating it on their shoulders. The reasoning attributed a historical responsibility to a particular age group envisioned as molded by the social well-being that Peronism had impressed upon the country. (Manzano 2014: 23)

Montoneros such as Juan’s parents answered Perón’s call to perpetuate the revolution.

The body of a soldier of any age is trained in instrumentality; it is a docile body. Not fully cognisant of the sacrifice and danger of the *montonero* endeavour, Juan demonstrates his docility and utility by clicking his heels and answering his remarkably carefree Coronel-uncle and joyfully shining his shoes. There is a sense that Juan is a toy soldier who at first plays at *guerrillero*, not unlike the child protagonists of *Paloma de papel* and *Voces inocentes*, before greater sacrifice is required of him. The boy’s maternal grandmother Amalia (Cristina Banegas) expresses the only words of concern questioning the normalcy of Juan’s false identity and militarisation: ‘You want your children to be guerrilleros?’ (‘¿Querés que tus hijos sean guerrilleros?’). Her enquiry makes room for a third



Figure 8.4 María (Violeta Palukas) blindfolds Juan/Ernesto (Teo Gutiérrez Moreno) for a camp game in *Infancia clandestina*.

Argentina that prefers not to engage in the conflict. Amalia's stance suggests that, if the film's action were to continue, it is unlikely that she would join the activism of the Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo who have clamoured for justice for their disappeared children and grandchildren.

The common political vision shared by Juan and his parents manifests in the feature's motif of eyeglasses, in turn evoking the common trope of the child's gaze in film, and impersonation that carry across Juan's role models of Che Guevara and his father Horacio. Juan/Ernesto does not share the perspective of his classmates. He and his girlfriend are at first blinded by their feelings for each other (Figure 8.4) but María's (Violeta Palukas) miming of 'lentes de gente decente' ('decent folks' eyeglasses'), a certain competing conservative and Euro-centric perspective, foreshadows their split. Juan resists what dominant ideology, indicated in lyrics of the school camp song, sees as improvements but demonstrates his docility for *montonero* instruction. In a key sequence for Juan/Ernesto's political coming-of-age, the boy's imagination refashions the campfire song in conjunction with a fantasy of his father's and his own funerals on television. Juan/Ernesto's substitution for his father indicates his acceptance of a more engaged role in the fight. While Juan/Ernesto does not wear his father's glasses, he does share Horacio's political viewpoint. Juan/Ernesto follows in his father's footsteps, unlike *Pa negre*'s protagonist who tries on his father's eyewear at the beginning of the film only to reject his father and all he represents in the end. Although Juan/Ernesto earlier plotted a getaway from the *montonero* lifestyle with his girlfriend, he progressively assumes a larger role in the *guerrilla* when he shelters his baby sister in their panic room and is captured upon his parents' disappearance. This is

not to say, however, that Juan's affective experience is equal to that of his parents.

Vision and the child's point-of-view are also primary to Ávila's short film, *Veo veo* (2011), although its more mundane aesthetics recall Markovitch's film more than *Infancia clandestina*. The short film's eight-year-old protagonist Juancho (Lucas Esteban Rodríguez) relocates to a new home and school in 1977 due to his father's *montonero* ties. There is no animation in the film, also dedicated to Ávila's mother, yet Juancho like Del Toro's Ofelia and Erice's Ana makes sense of his father's two-year absence through fable. In fact, his older sister explains that their militant father, whose death Juancho like Juan/Ernesto later learns about on television, is like Robin Hood. Like Cecilia, Juancho compromises the safety of his father and his family as a result of a school assignment. The students are asked to bring in a photo of their father for the class's family tree. Juancho's father had been excised from all photos except, by accident, one remaining negative. He and his new neighbour and classmate Eva (María Agostina Gatabria), whose mother had died a while before, develop the photo with her father. In *Veo veo*, visibility regards not how the son sees, as in *Infancia clandestina*, but what he is able to see, namely the countenance of his father. It is forbidden fruit of the family tree, developed by Eva's photographer father.

Animation signals a journey into the surreal and, with this departure, Juan's subjectivity vis-à-vis the violence and loss surrounding him. The colour-coding that signifies a contrast between the real and magical worlds in *El laberinto del fauno* finds a different expression in *Infancia clandestina*. Live action pertaining to the resistance is often bathed in green lighting that recalls sequences animated in a complementary red and green colour scheme. Juan's subjectivity to a certain extent literally and figuratively colours the events of the film according to his experience of the traumatic events around him in a slow motion non-linear stream of consciousness fashion that imitates snapshots, like the family photos that Juan burns in the previous scene, or comic-strip frames. Its soundtrack recalls carousel music and the fair funhouse to which Juan/Ernesto and María temporarily escaped. The animated sequences that open and close the film depict violence, first, crossfire between the military and Juan's parents that precipitates their exile and, second, Juan's apprehension for questioning. It would be incorrect to assert that all traumatic incidents in Juan's life are depicted in animation, given that the interrogation sequence is shot in similar lighting to his imagined funeral, or that coloured lighting is absent in other moments, as during the boy's vision of his deceased uncle and observation of intergenerational arguments regarding the importance and safety of the militia.

Infancia clandestina more directly explores the militarisation of children than *El laberinto del fauno* but does not martyr its child protagonist. Both characters are orphaned, and their baby siblings are seized, but Juan's is a story of survival. He is ultimately released to his only remaining immediate family, his maternal grandmother to whom he surprisingly self-identifies as Juan rather than Ernesto. In an interview, Ávila states his response to the political climate of fear espoused on-screen by the grandmother:

La construcción del discurso del miedo que se terminó de instalar en los '80 en la Argentina asoció a la militancia con la muerte . . . En la situación política que se está viviendo hoy, se empieza a entender que la militancia no es sinónimo de muerte sino sinónimo de cre[c]er. (Ranzani 2012: n.p.)

[The construction of the discourse of fear that was entrenched by the 1980s in Argentina associated militancy with death . . . In today's political situation, we are beginning to understand that militancy is not a synonym for death but rather for growth.]¹⁸

Infancia clandestina commemorates to a greater extent the lives rather than the deaths of the militants. However, the protagonist's self-identification to his grandmother as Juan rather than Ernesto suggests that the boy rather than the militant survives.

The historical contexts of each film shed light on why militancy is a synonym for death in *El laberinto del fauno* and an indication of growth in *Infancia clandestina*. These quest films set in 1944 and 1979 situate themselves within the politics, biopolitics, and political economy of memory of 2006 Spain and 2011 Argentina. Greater progress has been made in Argentina with regards to transitional justice and human rights. *Infancia clandestina* was first released in 2011 on the tails of two decades of investigations, prosecutions, and convictions of those responsible for the disappearance of dissidents and their children during the Dirty War. *El laberinto del fauno*, on the other hand, precedes Spain's Law of Historical Memory by a year but a very entrenched policy of forgetting remains. As discussed in Chapter Six, the 2007 Spanish law is limited to a more, although not entirely, symbolic recognition of the crimes committed against the Republican side of the Spanish Civil War.

These films, then, wage a battle on the symbolic plane, or a cinematic biopolitics in which child protagonists are incorporated into a political struggle on-screen rather than, in the case of Spain, or in addition to, Argentina's example, in a courtroom. After Baltasar Garzón's disbarment, Argentine judge María Servini de Cubría made efforts to investigate and then try Spanish human rights violators in Argentina (Anonymous 2014: n.p.) but the Spanish State obstructed these efforts (Ryan 2016: 6). The

politicisation of child characters may be disguised by fairy tales and graphic art but these films politically deploy their child protagonists nonetheless. Like the *maquis*, who continued battling decades after the Spanish Civil War was lost, the child militant protagonists Ofelia/Moana and Juan/Ernesto are drafted, as soldiers and graphic images, to carry on the resistance and the quest for justice in the cinematic memory wars.

Conclusions: Rites of Passage and Motifs of Transatlantic Dialogism

In this chapter, I have explored the common biopolitical use and aesthetics of *bildungsfilms* across the Atlantic to illuminate the pervasive and far-reaching use of the child protagonist in the cinematic memory wars. My analysis of the two Spains and two Chiles in this genre study of the *bildungsfilm* reiterates the dualism that Rick Altman observes as central to genre cinema. It is clearly the case of Spanish-language *bildungsfilms* of national conflict that: '[c]onstantly opposing cultural values to counter-cultural values, genre films regularly depend on dual protagonists and *dualistic* structures (producing what I have called dual-focus texts)' (Altman 1999: 24; emphasis in the original). Child protagonists of these films must choose one of the two Spains, two Chiles, and two Argentinas: the regime or the resistance. They must mobilise and take strides for one or the other camp at great sacrifice to their well-being for a potential greater good or to its detriment. Growth and well-being are contingent upon political freedom in *La lengua de las mariposas* and *Machuca* and brought to a halting end in both features. *El espíritu de la colmena* and *El premio* reveal defeat and absence in the years of military dictatorship. *El laberinto del fauno* and *Infancia clandestina* explore rebellion in fantastic dimension to these dictatorial regimes. Tragic conclusions of the films herein discussed amount to a misalignment with the repressive regime and, as I will now explore as an extension of Chapters Six and Eight, in thwarted rites of passage.

I have noted how these coming-of-age films deal in becoming, or, articulated in the terms of Chapter Six, rites of passage. My reading of *El espíritu de la colmena* and *El laberinto del fauno* in Chapter Six focuses on fantasy, rites of passage, and the ritual function. In the current conclusion to Chapter Eight, I would like to explore briefly how deviations from rites of passages produce tragic endings in *La lengua de las mariposas*, *Machuca*, *El premio*, and *Infancia clandestina*. In review, a completed rite of passage occurs along three stages: the preliminary in which the child undergoes separation, the liminary in which the child is in between states,

and the postliminary in which the child is embraced by a new community (Muir 2005: 21). Moncho separates from his family to attend school with Don Gregorio (preliminary), learns new ways of thinking thanks to Don Gregorio and the ILE that he implements in early indications of pubescence (liminary), but he separates again (in the end from the Republican community) in order to demonstrate membership among the Nationalists (postliminary). Moncho's political rites of passage deviate, and turn tragic, in the sense that the community to which he is incorporated is not Don Gregorio's. The same is true for *Machuca*: Gonzalo separates from his family through schooling and visits Machuca's neighbourhood (preliminary), Gonzalo's comings and goings to Machuca's community and pubescence indicate that he is in between two worlds (liminary), but Gonzalo extricates himself from Machuca's world to return to a somewhat changed home life (postliminary). Machuca's preliminary and liminary steps (towards Gonzalo's family) follow along the same lines until his disappearance. The tragedy resides in the deaths and disappearances and Gonzalo's abrupt deviation from his trajectory towards Machuca in accordance with St Patrick's School's teachings. The embrace of Gonzalo's mother upon his, perhaps, reluctant return indicates his incorporation into Pinochet's Chile.

El premio and *Infancia clandestina* espouse another kind of reversal in the rites of passage of their protagonists. Cecilia's separation from Buenos Aires for San Clemente del Tuyú is one of forced exile. Like Moncho, Gonzalo, Machuca, and Juan/Ernesto, Cecilia preliminarily separates from her mother for school where she learns another way (that of the military regime) of thinking. Betwixt and between (liminary) the regime and its dissent, she fights her mother in order to receive the military's prize while also engaging in prepubescent flirtation with a classmate. Her tragedy consists of receiving the prize that signifies her postliminary acceptance of and into the regime. Although Cecilia, it seems, finally changes her mind, it is too late: she receives the award, and nothing will bring back her father. Juan/Ernesto's postliminary rite of passage is somewhat more complex. First, he and his family return to Argentina from Cuba and he separates from them for school (preliminary). Unlike Cecilia, he is more aware of and at odds with the ideology of his school. Still, he finds himself betwixt and between two worlds in his pubescent infatuation with María. This represents a seduction, in the etymological sense, away from his family's political convictions. Juan/Ernesto proves his adherence to the *montonero* community during capture (postliminary). But, in his tragedy, Juan/Ernesto has no other family to return to other than his grandmother, whose politics do not align with his parents'. Like Gonzalo,

Juan/Ernesto does not reunite with the family of his choice. In accordance with the politics of the features, Moncho, Gonzalo, Machuca, Cecilia, and Juan/Ernesto end up misplaced. Their rites of passage suddenly re-orient, taking a sharp turn right particularly in the cases of Moncho and Gonzalo.

Footwear and wardrobe indicate by metonymy the chosen trajectories of the (anti-)heroes and heroines and what they become. Shoes relate to identity formation, the political path, and the rites of passage that child protagonists travel in each film. I would like to conclude my reflection on the transatlantic *bildungsfilms* with a final examination of these motifs in the characterisation of child protagonists. Ana does not follow in her father's footsteps, audible from his home study, but rather she steps into the footprint of the fugitive. Her identification with him rejects Francoism. Moncho's mother dresses him in his Sunday best, a suit that better resembles his father's than Don Gregorio's, for a display of distance from his teacher. Gonzalo's footwear makes possible his betrayal of Machuca. His Adidas shoes, a gift from his mother's married Argentine lover, denote his class membership and privileged exception from harassment. He becomes complicit with Pinochet's Chile. Cecilia is officially forced into submission to Argentina's last military dictatorship when she accepts her prize in crippling borrowed shoes. Juan/Ernesto, by contrast, shines shoes like a good soldier for Perón. Ofelia dons a new outfit with ruby booties, having muddled the formal wear gift from her stepfather, as Princess Moana. These child protagonists are outfitted with the combat footwear of the cinematic memory wars fought in the language of genre.

Notes

1. *Kamchatka* (Marcelo Piñeyro 2002 Argentina), *Valentín* (Alejandro Agresti 2002 Argentina), *Andrés no quiere dormir* (*Andrés Doesn't Want to Take a Nap*) (Daniel Bustamante 2009 Argentina), *El médico alemán* (*The German Doctor*) (Lucía Puenzo 2013 Argentina), *O Ano em Que Meus Pais Saíram de Férias* (*The Year My Parents Went on Vacation*) (Cao Hamburger 2006 Brazil), *Mutum* (Sandra Kogut 2007 Brazil), *Paisito* (*Small Country*) (Ana Díez 2008 Spain-Uruguay), *Viva Cuba* (Juan Carlos Cremata Alberti and Iraida Malberti Cabrera 2005 Cuba), *La edad de la peseta* (*The Silly Age*) (Pavel Giroud 2006 Cuba), *Habanastation* (Ian Padrón 2011 Cuba), *Voces inocentes* (*Innocent Voices*) (Luis Mandoki 2004 Mexico-El Salvador), *Paloma de papel* (*Paper Dove*) (Fabrizio Aguilar 2003 Peru), *Las malas intenciones* (*The Bad Intentions*) (Rosario García-Montero 2011 Peru) and *Pelo malo* (*Bad Hair*) (Mariana Rondón 2013 Venezuela). Julie Gavras's *Faute à Fidel* (*Blame it on Fidel!*) (2006) follows a young French girl's political awakening linked to anti-Franco and pro-Allende activism.

2. All translations to English in Chapter Eight are mine except those provided in the subtitles and published translations, which I denote with quotation marks around the text inside the brackets.
3. Birds also serve as symbols of the contrary and contradictory – retaliation or freedom – in *Cría cuervos* (*Raise Ravens*) (Carlos Saura 1976 Spain), *Pa negre* (*Black Bread*) (Agustí Villaronga 2010 Spain) and *El florido pénsil* (Juan José Porto 2002 Spain). *Cría cuervos* also has a Latin American sister, the Peruvian film *Las malas intenciones* (García-Montero 2011); see Thomas (2014).
4. In fact, *Machuca* has a dialogical relationship with Patricio Guzmán's *Battle of Chile* (Sorensen 2009: 86) and world cinema by virtue of intertext with French director Louis Malle's *Au revoir les enfants* (1987) (Park 2014: 124–6).
5. José Luis Cuerda adapted his film with Rafael Azcona from three stories from *¿Qué me quieres, amor?* (1996) by Manuel Rivas. I will focus on the adaptations of 'La lengua de las mariposas' and 'Un saxo en la niebla' rather than on 'Carminia', in which the child characters participate to a lesser degree. Cuerda was born in Albacete in 1947 and has made more than eleven feature-length films (Quintana 1998: 264–5). Azcona (1926–2008) was born in Logroño and is one of the most respected and successful screenwriters in the history of Spanish cinema; his screenplay for *Belle Époque* (Fernando Trueba 1992) was nominated for an Oscar (Torrerío Gómez 1998: 102–3). Rivas was born in A Coruña, Galicia in 1957 and has written in *gallego* and Spanish in the genres of journalistic articles, short stories, and novels. He interviewed Baltasar Garzón in Isabel Coixet's documentary *Escuchando al juez Garzón* (*Listening to Judge Garzón*) (2011). *Machuca* was co-written by Eliseo Altunaga, Roberto Brodsky, Mamoun Hassan, and Andrés Wood and based on Amante Eledín Parraguez's *Tres años para nacer* (2002), Roberto Brodsky's *Últimos días de la historia* (2001), and the experience of Eledín Parraguez and Wood as students at the St George School (Sorensen 2009: 83).
6. See Erin K. Hogan, 'A Politics of Listening in Isabel Coixet's *Listening to Judge Garzón* (2011)', *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 29.1 (2016): 65–79.
7. In this parenthetical citation, I direct readers to the Spanish and English publications of Machado's poetry.
8. *Viva Cuba* (Cremata and Malberti 2005) offers a counterpoint by illustrating the two Cubas through its ten-year-old boy and girl co-protagonists and by arguing for friendship and reconciliation. As both Operation Pedro Pan, the exile of approximately 14,000 Cuban children to the United States from 1960 to 1962, and the Elián González affair, in which the six-year-old emigrant was caught between the politics of Cuba and the United States in 1999 to 2000, demonstrate, the United States and Cuba have utilised the child as a political icon. Anita Casavantes Bradford follows 'Two Cubas': 'Between 1959 and the onset in 1999 of the Elián González custody battle, the politics of childhood in Havana and Miami would continue to articulate the processes of alienation, fragmentation, and reformation that led to the creation

of Two Cubas on opposite shores of the Straits of Florida' (2014: 184). *Viva Cuba* depicts the Two Cubas within Cuba; Malú (Malú Tarrau Broche) and Jorgito (Jorge Milo) come from families on the opposite ends of the political spectrum, but the children respond to the threat of Malú's leaving the country with her mother. Nevertheless, the film insists on the similarity in Cuban habits and customs; their mothers cast each other prejudicial glares when they simultaneously step out their front doors to call their children home for a meal. The parental generation is thoroughly embroiled but Malú and Jorge learn to value their unity in the film's proposal for Cuba's future. For more on *Viva Cuba*, see Dunja Fehimović, 'Not Child's Play: Tactics and Strategies in *Viva Cuba* and *Habanastation*', *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 34.4 (2015): 503–16.

9. Roberto Brodsky gave a talk on his screenwriting for *Machuca* and *Mi vida con Carlos* (Berger 2010) at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, entitled 'Baltimore, imágenes del pájaro y la jaula', on 14 April 2016 from 7 pm to 8:30 pm.
10. However, despite Don Gregorio's secular agenda, the teacher becomes a profane martyr. Three moments in the film support this reading: 1) Don Gregorio baptises Moncho in the river as a response to his asthma attack, 2) the teacher's followers deny and forsake him and as a result he is apprehended by authorities, and 3) the instructor is stoned by his pupil Moncho.
11. Other references include Moncho's uncle who left for America and the 1930 Cuban song, 'El manisero' by Moisés Simons, played during Carnival.
12. Hogan conducted an interview of José Luis Cuerda in Madrid on 19 November 2009.
13. Daniel Feierstein maps the terminology referring to the period: 'Dirty War' refers to the 'repression carried out by Argentina's last military government' and is used outside of Argentina and especially in academic literature written in English (2014: 131–2).
14. Child star crossings were fully realised with the young career of Pulgarcito (Cesáreo Quezadas Cubillas 1950–) from Mexican cinema. Also within Mexican cinema, Castro de Paz asserts that *En el balcón vacío* (Jomí García Ascot 1962) is the 'espíritu de la colmena' of Spanish Republican exile (Castro de Paz 2005: 381).
15. It is important to note, however, that the happy scene of reunification between father and daughter that Smith's Guadalajara Film Festival review discusses is absent in the DVD of *El premio* distributed by Global Film Initiative. Cecilia is not reunited with her father. According to co-producer Dankmar García (Elite Studios), many variations and endings were shot of the film and it was not presented in its final cut in Guadalajara nor at the Berlinale (e-mail, 11 August 2017).
16. The reception of *Viva Cuba* in the American Associated Press's (NBC's Today) interview of Cremata similarly, and I would argue erroneously, downplays politics. The article opens with a description and the director's

categorisation: 'Cuban film director Juan Carlos Cremata's new movie is about a young girl who runs away from home because her mother plans to leave Fidel Castro's Cuba and she doesn't want to go. But "Viva Cuba" isn't a political film – it's a human one. "It's not that the girl wants to stay in Cuba because of the Revolution," Cremata told the Associated Press in a recent interview. She wants to stay, he said, because Cuba "is where her friends are, where her school is, and above all, where her beloved grandmother is buried." Depoliticizing the subject of Cuban exiles is about as easy as taking the fruit out of an apple pie, but judging from the international reaction, Cremata has succeeded in moving beyond nationalism to reach a universal audience' (Anonymous 2006a: n.p.).

17. Shaw uploaded her Houston talk to her Academia.edu page (https://www.academia.edu/32306454/Reading_Pan_s_Labyrinth_in_the_era_of_neo-fascism).
18. There appears to be a typo in the body of the article, which repeats the title: 'Militancia no es sinónimo de muerte, sino de crecer.' *Página 12* staff were not available to clarify.